MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

FROM Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Monday, June 2, 1980, at 3:00 p.m., 150 CH.

Agenda:
A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 5, 1980, meeting.
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
      Question for President Blumel, submitted by Ann Weikel
      a. "What is the status of, and when will the Faculty Senate see, the reports of the committees on Research, Institutional Reorganization, and General Education Requirements?
      b. Also what was the outcome of the survey on moving to the semester system?"
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Election for 1980-81
   1. Election of Presiding Officer of the Senate
   2. Election of Presiding Officer Pro Tem of the Senate
   3. Election of (Admin., BA, DCE, ED, SW, UA) members of the Senate Steering Committee
   4. Divisional caucus for election of Committee on Committees
F. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   *1. Advisory Council--Erzurumlu
   *2. Committee on Committees--Cumpston
   3. Elections Committee--Tamblyn
   *4. Educational Policies Committee--Tuttle
   *5. Research and Publications Committee--McMahon
G. Unfinished Business--none
H. New Business
   *1. Constitutional Amendment by Committee on Committees. First reading--Cumpston
   *2. Motions by Educational Policies Committee--Tuttle
I. Adjournment.

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
   B Minutes of the May 5, 1980, Senate Meeting
   F1 Annual Report--Advisory Council**
   F2 Annual Report--Committee on Committees**
   F4 Annual Report--Educational Policies Committee**
   F5 Annual Report--Research and Publications Committee**
Faculty Senate Agenda
June 2, 1980

H1 Constitutional Amendment by Committee on Committees**
H2 Motions by Educational Policies Committee**
H3 Master's Thesis Definitions**

Note: Elections Committee Annual Report (F3) will be circulated on June 2.

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

Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass this material on to their alternates.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 5, 1980
Presiding Officer: Steven Brenner
Secretary pro tem: Charles LeGuin

Alternates Present: McKittrick for Alexander, Farr for Shotola, Yetka for Underwood.

Members Absent: Breedlove, Burden, Clark, Dreyer, Hashimoto, Millner, Muller, Newberry, Sugarman, Weikel, White.

Ex-officio Members: Blumel, Corn, Dobson, Gard, Harris, Heath, Nicholas, Rauch, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Vant Slot.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

M. Enneking asked for clarification of the phrase in Blumel's response to Questions for Administrators at the March 3 Senate meeting. "In previous years all athletes have been investigated as well." Blumel responded that the investigation covered athletes for only the past two years.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Hammond called attention to the Nussbaum/Hammond letter on general education and sought responses from the faculty so that further discussions might take place before the current school year is over. Brenner reported on responses to the Senate letter on salaries received from Jason Boe, Ed Fadeley, Chancellor Lieuallen, and Louis Perry, all expressing sympathy and understanding for the Senate's concern, all offering only moderate hope for prompt improvement in the salary situation. Brenner promised to continue reporting on responses to the Senate's letter. Brenner called attention to the AOF meeting to be held in Corvallis on May 10 and urged attendance: the more in attendance, the greater attention will be paid to AOF. Tuttle promised full details of the meeting would be circulated to the faculty this week.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report: Budget Committee

Acceptance moved by Tracy, seconded by Kimbrell. Referring to the "By Function" chart accompanying the report, R. Nussbaum questioned the distinction between instruction and institutional support. Harris explained that there was no prior historical data for making the distinction between instruction and research; that institutional support is the administrative component of the budget, while academic support is derived from the Dean's office. Bates
questioned whether the May 15 Budget Committee report to President Blumel would be made available to the Senate. Tracy responded that he would present this report at the June Senate meeting.

The Annual Report of the Budget Committee was unanimously accepted.

2. Annual Report: University Athletics Board

Neklason moved acceptance of the report; Chino seconded. Referring to Item C, Johnson inquired why there should be eight sports; he also asked if the Committee had carried out its own investigation of athletic wrong-doing. Neklason replied that NCAA required eight sports for Division I classification, and that the Committee had not undertaken any investigation of its own. Kimbrell raised the issue of athletic finances. Neklason replied that the Committee had requested restoration of the deleted $250,000 as necessary to a desirable athletic program which would be in compliance with Title IX. M. Enneking asked how the Committee squared its request for restoration of funds with the student position on the athletic budget. Neklason replied that the Committee did not consider itself an advocate of either the student or the Athletic Department position; it only sought to support the best possible athletic program for the University.

The Annual Report of the University Athletic Board was unanimously accepted.

3. Annual Report: University Scholars Board

Jones requested privilege of the floor for Deinum. Limbaugh moved acceptance of the report; Dressler seconded. Toulan pointed out the confusion existing because of the use of the rubric USP by both the University Scholars Board and Urban Studies. R. Nussbaum noted the absence of Richelle's lecture from the list of visiting scholars for 1979-80, and requested that the dates of the Richelle lecture be officially appended to the Scholars Board Annual Report. Crowley commended the Scholars program for its useful and well arranged lecture series; Kimbrell questioned the need for the Scholars lecture series since the AAA Committee provided departmental visiting scholars. Fiasca wondered if there were not too many guest speakers on campus, taking up too much time. Deinum pointed out that the Scholars speakers were primarily for the Scholars program, which shared the visitors with the rest of the University.

The Annual Report of the University Scholars Board was unanimously accepted.

4. Annual Report: Teacher Education Committee

N. Rose was given privilege of the floor. Feldesman moved acceptance of the report; Youngelson seconded. Concerning sentence 2, paragraph 3 of the Report, Bates asked what input the faculty has for setting major teaching norms? Youngelson questioned whether norms were set by the School of Education faculty or by the general faculty? Blumel pointed out that the responsibility for requirements was more diffuse at Portland State than was usual or perhaps appropriate, that the emphasis was on
increasing controls by the School of Education. Fiasca supported Blumel's remarks as appropriate, urged departmental consultation with the School of Education for the establishment of major teaching norms, and pointed out that this recommendation had in general been ignored.

The Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee was unanimously accepted.

5. Report of the Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Advising

Diman was given privilege of the floor. Fisher moved acceptance of the Report; Feldesman seconded. Chino inquired how the recommendation made in paragraph 4 would be implemented. Diman pointed out the Report's provisions for acquiring advisors, noted that they were not mandatory and referred to the Report's final page to recommendations on required consultation. Grimes questioned whether the Report went far enough and pointed out the need for mandatory advising. Heath noted that the Committee received no workable responses from the faculty on the issue of mandatory advising and signature control. Diman doubted that anything mandatory would be acceptable to the faculty and offered this as the Committee's view. Various suggestions for a tightened advising system as well as some of the problems involved in such a system were explored: Feldesman suggested that there was a time lag difficulty in advising transfer students; Kimbrell proposed a junior standing check and brought up the burden imposed on departmental secretaries by additional advising controls; Chino and Blumel questioned the wisdom of mandatory controls and called for substituting suggestive for obligatory language in the Report. Blumel thought that it was the student's responsibility to lay out his own program. Diman replied that the faculty should show options rather than directly plan the student's program. Youngelson raised the possibility of legal ramifications inherent in faculty signature control, but Bates thought this would not present a serious problem. The issue of faculty planning and signature control was further examined by Johnson, Midson, Brenner, and Crowley. Bates proposed amending paragraph 4 of the section of the report, entitled Recommendation on Required Consultation with Advisor. The amended sentences, the last two of paragraph 4, would read: "The advisor would go over the grad check and confer with the student regarding unmet requirements towards the degree." The remainder of the sentence would be deleted. The final sentence of the paragraph would end after the word advisory (the clause, "and sign the departmental copy to that effect." would be deleted.) The Bates amendment was moved by Halley and seconded by Feldesman and Streeter. The amendment passed. Heath moved that the word "required" in paragraph 3, sentence 2 of page 1 of the Report be changed to "urged," in keeping with the anti-mandatory sentiments expressed in the Senate. There was general acceptance of this language change.

The Senate unanimously recommended to President Blumel adoption of the amended report on undergraduate advising.
NEW BUSINESS

A motion to publish all course grade distribution was introduced by Crowley who pointed out that his motion provided an efficient means for finding out about W and I grade abuses and distribution in particular, but that it would also serve as a means of assuring conformity to accepted standards, as is required in the Faculty Handbook and in the Catalogue. He noted that 75 percent of grades given at PSU are C and above, and that certain departments do not give D and F grades, only I and W. Chino observed that if grade distribution was made general knowledge students might flock to certain easy courses. Halley noted that grades by section are currently available in departments. Kimbrell believed that grade inflation relates to the late drop date, since only those who are passable remain after the drop date. Brenner suggested that a copy of the complete grade print out be made available to each department. Youngelson would like to have grade distribution by section available in order to check on A-B concentration. Dobson questioned that the Crowley motion would get at the problem and raised the issue of possible violation of privacy. She pointed out that distribution of grades to departments is current practice and suggested further investigations of means of giving more extensive circulation to grade distribution information. Jones, sharing the general concern with grade inflation, declared against the Crowley motion. Johnson moved to table the motion; Halley seconded. The motion to table carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
The Advisory Council met weekly during the academic year and occasionally during the summer. President Blumel brought items of university-wide importance to the Council's attention and sought advice on various matters. The Council received and acted upon inquiries and requests from faculty members, committees, and departments. Council members also brought various general welfare concerns to President Blumel's attention and discussed both academic and personnel topics with him. Following is a brief summary of Council's activities. The Advisory Council;

Provided suggestions for the preparation of long range planning documents by individual units. In this regard, the Council recommended that planning documents be forwarded in their entirety to all review levels, and that reasonable feedback be provided to each originating unit during the review process.

Made nominations for the appointment of search committee memberships for the positions of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of the College of Science, Dean of the School of Education, and Director of the Library as well as for the B. P. Millar Award Selection Committee and ad hoc committee for the establishment of a Faculty Club at PSU.

Recommended that eligibility for the B. P. Millar Award for Faculty Excellence be limited to persons with current regular faculty status, on at least 0.5 FTE, and that the selection committee establish appropriate nominating procedures to ensure consistent and relevant supporting information for each candidate.

In accordance with its charge as provided in Article VI, Section 4, item 5 of the Constitution of PSU Faculty, advised the President on the interpretation of the Constitution as follows:

a) A grievance filed by the Philosophy Department was referred to the Advisory Council by the Arbitration Panel on grounds that "university-wide issues were raised by this grievance". In this regard, the Council examined the wording of Article III, Section 3, of the Constitution which sets forth the procedures for the exercise of faculty authority in the selection of department heads. There was a lack of unanimity about the intent and meaning of the wording of Article III, Section 3. Two literal interpretations of this section were proposed.

The following interpretation was adopted by a vote of 4 to 2:

"We find that while there is considerable room for well intentioned people to disagree reasonably in the interpretation and emphasis
of particular words and phrases of Article III, Section 3, the intent and meaning of the material taken as a whole is that department faculty shall choose their department head and the President shall appoint that choice of the department faculty."

A motion to adopt the alternative interpretation (shown below) failed by a vote of 2 to 4:

"Department faculty members have authority to draft and publish procedures whereby a choice for department head will be determined. That choice will be forwarded as a recommendation through appropriate administrative officers to the appointing authority for consideration. The appointing authority has the prerogative of approving or disapproving the recommendation."

President Blumel's response to the adopted interpretation is attached.

b) On the request of the English Department, the Advisory Council addressed the question whether faculty of 0.5 FTE or more, yet less than 1.0 FTE will be allowed to vote on the "mode by which the department's choice of department head shall be determined." The consensus of the Council was that the definition of faculty as provided in Article II should govern the interpretation of "Full-time members" in Article III, Section 3, Paragraph 3. Accordingly, all faculty members with 0.5 FTE or more in a department will be eligible to vote on the "mode by which the department's choice of department head shall be determined." However, in the event of split appointments a faculty member will be eligible to vote in one department only.

Met with Dr. Castleberry of Washington State University who was visiting for PSU's reaccreditation in the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

Participated in the meetings with the Advisory Councils of OSU, UO, PSU, and HSC, and hosted the fall joint meeting of the Advisory Councils.

Met with members of the State Board of Higher Education during their visit to PSU, and provided input about general faculty concerns.

Met with the candidates for the position of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and provided individual evaluations to President Blumel.

May 14, 1980

Ralph Bunch
Victor Dahl
Marj Enneking (Secretary)
Chik Erzurumlu (Chairman)
Joe Kohut
Susan Karant-Nunn

attachment
I think it appropriate that I comment on the Advisory Council's recent interpretation of Article III, Section 3, of the Faculty Constitution, on the appointment of Department Heads.

A reading of the comments of individual members of the Council suggests that the majority interpretation was based largely on a literal reading of the second paragraph of the article. I do not find any evidence that they intended to express an opinion as to the appropriateness of the article, nor did they formally address the issue of the ultimate authority of the president in the governance structure.

I believe that the original acceptance of Article III, Section 3, as an amendment to the Faculty Constitution was based upon an interpretation contrary to that now made by the Council; namely, that the departmental election is to recommend a head whose appointment is subject to approval by the president after review by the appropriate intervening administrative officers. That interpretation has been well publicized and consistently applied for more than a decade as the basis for administrative action in the appointment process. It is consistent with the Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives of the Oregon State System of Higher Education as they relate to the responsibility and authority of the president, and, with widespread practice in American colleges and universities.

While I believe, and assert as a policy, that the president, by virtue of the responsibility placed upon him, must retain the ultimate appointing authority for department heads, as of other administrative officers of the University, I also believe and assert as a policy that the faculty voice in the appointment of department heads will ordinarily be determining. Administrative review has been and will be strictly limited to the willingness and the ability of the person nominated to carry out the responsibilities of the position as required by the University and its governing board, and by the laws governing the operation of public agencies of the State of Oregon. That policy is consistent with the tradition of shared authority in academic governance of American colleges and universities as enunciated by the American Association of University Professors. In those instances when the administration is unable to accept the department recommendation -- which have in the past been rare and are likely to be so in the future -- an alternative recommendation will be sought from the department.
Practice at this university, though not spelled out as a matter of policy, has involved communication to the affected department of the reason for non-appointment when administration review has differed with the decision of the department. While I can conceive of circumstances where such communication might adversely affect the career of a person whose nomination has been rejected, I believe the over-all good of the department and the University would ordinarily outweigh possible negative effects upon a particular individual. I therefore will continue to give my reasons for non-appointment when requested to do so by the departmental faculty.

JCB.m
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

1979-80

James Bentley
Marvin Beeson
Larry Bruseau
Mike Fiasca
Margaret Heyden

Rayko Hashimoto
Laureen Nussbaum
Charles Tracy
Norman Wyers
Helen Youngelson
Mary Cumpston, Chairperson

The Faculty Constitution charges the Committee on Committees with recommending to the President candidates for membership on constitutional and administrative committees except as specified otherwise by charter or regulation.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY

During the 1979-80 academic year the Committee made approximately 150 recommendations for committee assignments on 38 university-wide committees, including the newly established University Safety Committee. In response to concerns expressed on the Committee effectiveness survey forms the Committee recommended the addition of two science faculty to the Research and Publications Committee and suggested that the President consider combining the International Programs Board and the International Students Board.

COMMITTEE PREFERENCE SURVEY

The annual Faculty Survey of Committee Preference was distributed in March. 290 faculty responses yielded approximately 650 indications of preference. Results were consulted in making recommendations for appointment to 1980-81 committees. Copies of the tabulation will be made available to next year's Committee on Committees and to the Secretary to the Faculty.

COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

Former Committees on Committees have discussed the need to review the duties of existing committees and to seek a means to recognize faculty committee service. On March 31, this Committee distributed a questionnaire to faculty currently serving on university-wide committees. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain members' perceptions of the effectiveness of committees and to identify committees about which members had particular concerns. Written responses totaled 140. Though responses were generally positive, certain recurring concerns were reported for some committees:
A. **LACK OF CLEAR MANDATE**
   1. Committee on Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment
   2. University Athletics Board
   3. International Students Board
   4. International Programs Board
   5. Student Health Services Advisory Board
   6. Financial Aids Committee (suggested a change in role and name, emphasis on scholarships, addition of consultant from University Foundation.)

B. **OVERLAP WITH OTHER COMMITTEES:**
   1. Academic Requirements Committee and Scholastic Standards Committee
   2. Educational Policies Committee, Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council

C. **LACK OF ACTIVITY**
   1. Academic Appeals Board
   2. Campus Planning Committee
   3. Campus Safety & Security Committee
   4. Campus Environment, Parking & Transportation Committee
   5. University Safety Committee
   6. Committee on Acquisition of Arts & Artifacts (an ad hoc committee on acquisitions may have an impact on this committee)
   7. International Programs Board

D. **LACK OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION**
   1. Affirmative Action in Faculty Employment Committee
   2. Educational Activities Advisory Board
   3. General Student Affairs Committee
   4. Deadline Appeals Board
   5. Campus Environment, Parking & Transportation Committee
   6. Educational Policies Committee
   7. Committee on Effective Teaching
   8. Academically Controlled Auxiliary Activities Committee

E. **OTHER CONCERNS**
   1. Budget Committee - members expressed the feeling that committee has a "rubber stamp" role; that information is received too late to allow committee input; that its ideas and recommendations are not taken seriously.
   2. Elections Committee - the need for this committee has been questioned in view of the newly computerized elections system.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The results of the Committee Effectiveness Survey suggested that, in some cases, continuing review of concerns above is warranted. We recommend the following to the 1980-81 Committee on Committees:
1. That the Committee look closely at the Campus Planning, Campus Environment, Parking & Transportation, and the Campus Safety and Security Committees to determine whether it should recommend combining them.

2. That the Committee consult with the committees listed in A, B, C, of this report and present whatever recommendations may be appropriate to the Senate or the administration.

3. That the Committee review the charges and membership requirements for all Constitutional committees and take whatever action may be appropriate to improve the effectiveness of those committees.

4. That the Committee develop a method to recognize satisfactory committee service. It should be noted that many faculty members when asked to serve, declined, stating that they would receive no recognition for committee service within their academic units.

The Committee feels that in the case of the Elections Committee, direct action is appropriate. Members have begun the process necessary to amend the Faculty Constitution as follows:

Dissolve the Elections Committee; charge the Secretary to the Faculty with responsibility for conducting the annual election; advance the date of the election to allow adequate time to tabulate the results.

These recommendations are based upon extensive feedback from committee members both written and oral. It is the hope of the Committee on Committees that this effort will result in constructive changes in faculty governance through the committee process.
EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Report to the Faculty Senate

June 2, 1980

During the 1979/80 academic year the Educational Policies Committee engaged in the following activities:

1. Reviewed three program proposals referred to the Committee by President Blumel:

   A. A proposal originating in the College of Arts and Letters to merge the present Departments of Speech Communications and Journalism, the Center for the Moving Image, and the teaching component of Television Services into a single Department of Communications. After testimony and study the EPC returned the proposal to President Blumel, recommending its restudy, revision, and return to the EPC.

   B. A proposal originating in the Black Studies Department to move the Department and the Black Studies Center from the School of Urban Affairs to the College of Social Science. After testimony and study the EPC approved the proposal and will move its approval by the Senate later in this meeting under new business.

   C. A proposal supported by the 1978/79 Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organization that the program in Engineering and Applied Science be detached from the College of Science and established as a separate academic unit reporting directly to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The EPC has approved this proposal also and will move Senate approval under new business.

2. Early in the year the Committee decided that the existing guidelines for writing tentative program proposals needed revising in light of new policies announced in the 1979 Goals Statement. The Committee compiled a list of questions for the guidance of persons preparing to testify before the Committee. As a result of its experience with the list, the Committee forwarded late in Winter quarter several specific recommendations to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for bringing program proposal guidelines into line with stated University goals.

3. Along with the preceding recommendation, the EPC also strongly recommended that the OAA curricular and program guidelines documents make explicit the constitutionally mandated role of the EPC in the review of proposals for new programs and program changes.

4. As some of the foregoing suggests, the Committee has been looking closely at its constitutional charge, and two questions have arisen:

   A. How can the Committee fulfill its responsibility to participate actively in the formulation and revision of educational policy?

   B. How can the Committee ensure that it continue to contribute to the review of program development in light of existing policy?
Items 2 and 3 above are partial answers to these questions. Other approaches to answers will be explored next year:

A. Can the EPC discharge its obligation under the constitution if it limits its attention to undergraduate matters?

B. What is the EPC's proper role in the setting of priorities for program development?

Other questions raised for exploration next year include the place of special programs, such as Women's Studies, Black Studies, and area studies, in the academic structure of the University, and the precise role of D.C.E. in relation to other portions of the University's program that necessarily reach directly into the surrounding community.

The EPC anticipates also playing a role in the University's long range planning, now underway.

EPC Membership

Gerald Blake, Urban Affairs
Oma Blankenship, Health and P.E.
Andrea Bride, Student
Andy Brunette, Student
Michael Carl, Education
John Dart, Geography
Roger Moseley, Management
Guido Pinamonti, Social Work
Walter Shold, D.C.E.
Leonard Simpson, Biology
Robert Tuttle, English, Chairperson
Robert Walker, Television Services
Jim Heath, OAA, Consultant
The function of the Research and Publications Committee at Portland State University is to stimulate faculty research and other scholarly activities in all academic disciplines. To maximize the effect of its limited resources, the Committee provided support for projects leading to a) additional external research funds, b) tangible contributions to scholarly activities.

The following summarizes the accomplishments of the Committee:

1. An announcement of the Committee's deadlines was sent to each member of the faculty and published in the Bulletin. Requests for travel funds and/or publication costs were directed to the PSU Foundation for Faculty Travel and Publications.

2. The Committee received and evaluated 38 applications from the PSU faculty for support of research and other scholarly activities. These requests totaled $69,616.00.

3. The Committee awarded $33,000 directly to 29 applicants to foster research and other scholarly achievements. This represents a major proportion of the funds apportioned by the University to support such activities and has remained at the same amount since the 1977-78 academic year. Severe budget cuts, totaling $15,775, were made in grants funded and it seemed apparent to the Committee that additional monies were needed to provide adequate support.

The Committee acted upon a directive from the Senate Steering Committee to reconsider the requirement for a publicly announced presentation of a completed funded project. As the type, time, audience and content of the presentation is left to the discretion of the individual receiving funding, it was the consensus of the Committee that there was no abridgement of academic freedom. A recommendation will be made to the 1980-81 Committee that they rephrase the public presentation statement on the application in order to clarify the freedom of choice regarding the type and manner of the presentation.

Sandra Anderson
Rod Diman
Marc Feldesman
Richard Forbes
Don Gibbons

Don Howard
Robert Lockerby
Joyce Petrie
Marlene Piper
Ann Weikel

Alice Yetka
Dick Streeter, Ex officio
Stanley Rauch, Ex officio
Joan McMahon, Chair
PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The purpose of this proposal is to eliminate the Elections Committee as a constitutional committee and transfer the elections function to the Secretary of the Faculty. There are several reasons for this proposal:

1. The elections task in the past involved much clerical work requiring the services of several people. The clerical burden has been reduced by using the computer. This work can be done more efficiently in the office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

2. Although the elections process is important, it does not require the maintenance of a faculty committee to carry out an essentially clerical function. As part of its review process the Committee on Committees has recommended that the Elections Committee be abolished in the interest of reducing unnecessary committee functions.

3. The Secretary of the Faculty has agreed to assume this responsibility if so directed by the Senate.

In accordance with Article VIII of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty, we propose the following amendment to the Constitution:

1. Article IV, Section 4, part 4 (f) - Delete paragraph (f) referring to the Elections Committee, which reads as follows:

   f) Elections Committee. This committee shall administer the annual elections for the Senate, the Advisory Council, and the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate as described in Article V, VI, and VII.

   It shall report to the Senate at least once each year.

2. Article V, Section 2, parts 1, 2, 3, and 4 - Substitute "Secretary of the Faculty" for Elections Committee and subsequent references to the Elections Committee as the committee or this committee and substitute the dates noted above the underlined dates for those underlined, as follows:

   Section 2. Election of the Senate.

   1) Determination of Divisional Representation.

      By the first Monday in April of each year, the chief administrative officer of each division (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2) shall report to the Elections Committee the name of each faculty member, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned to each division. At the same time names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in academic programs not in any "division" shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer to the Elections Committee. These faculty shall be assigned by the Senate Steering Committee to divisions as prescribed in Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2. The Elections Committee shall then determine the number of senators to be allocated to each division, apportioning one senator for each multiple of ten full-time equivalent faculty or fraction thereof. A newly instituted division shall elect its senator(s) in the next regular senate election.
2) Nomination. One month prior to the date of Senate elections, the Election Committee shall obtain from each divisional administrative officer an approved list of the faculty members assigned to his division. This list will be circulated with the directions that any potential candidate may delete his or her name if he or she does not wish to be a candidate for a Senate position. No later than two weeks before the Senate election, this committee shall submit a list of eligible candidates to every faculty member in the divisions, and request the nomination of a number of names equal to twice the number of Senate vacancies occurring in that division at the end of the school year. The total number of nominees shall equal twice the number of Senate vacancies in that division. Those persons on this ballot who are named the greatest number of times shall be the nominees. All persons tied for the final position shall be declared nominees.

3) Election. On the third Monday in May the Elections Committee shall mail ballots containing the names of final nominees for Senate election to faculty members of the respective divisions. Each divisional faculty member shall vote for no more than a number of candidates equal to the number of Senate vacancies occurring in his or her division for that year. The person or persons receiving the greatest number of votes shall be elected. In case of ties for the final position, run-off elections shall be held.

4) Terms and Limits of Membership. Senate members shall be chosen for three-year terms. These terms shall be so arranged that approximately one-third of the Senate shall be elected each year. The Elections Committee shall inform each division as to the number of vacancies and length of term of each position to be elected each year.

No members shall be eligible for re-election until one year has elapsed following his or her term of office or resignation. No person shall be eligible to represent more than one division.

3. Article V, Section 2, part (5), substitute "Secretary of the Faculty" for Elections Committee as follows:

5) Interim Vacancies. Interim vacancies that occur in the Senate shall be filled by appointment by the Elections Committee, which shall designate to fill the unexpired term the non-elected nominees who in the immediate past Senate election had the greatest number of votes in the division in which the vacancy exists. An interim appointee shall be eligible for election at the end of his term.

4. Article VI, Section 1, substitute "Secretary of the Faculty" for Elections Committee and each subsequent reference to the committee and this committee that refers to the Elections Committee, and substitute the dates noted above the underlined dates for those underlined, as follows:
Article VI. Advisory Council.

Section 1. Election. The Faculty shall elect during spring term by secret ballot, three members of an Advisory Council of six members, from the membership of the Faculty other than ex-officio members of the Senate (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 1). The election shall be administered by the Elections Committee. This committee shall circulate a list of all eligible full time faculty members to members of the faculty with the directions that any potential candidate may delete his or her name if he or she does not wish to be a candidate for an Advisory Council position. Names of current Advisory Council members are to be excluded, since no member may succeed himself or herself.

No later than four weeks before the Senate election On the first Monday in May, the Elections Committee shall submit the list of valid nominees to every member of the faculty, and request the nomination of no more than six eligible candidates. The six persons named the greatest number of times shall be declared the nominees for election to the Advisory Council. All persons tied for the final position shall be declared nominees, and all nominees shall stand for election.

On the third Monday in May, ballots bearing the names of those nominees willing to serve shall be mailed to the members of the faculty. Each member shall vote for no more than three candidates; ballots not so marked shall be declared void. The three persons receiving the greatest number of votes shall be elected.

In case of a tie vote for the final position or positions, an additional ballot listing only the nominee involved in the tie vote shall be taken. All such election procedures shall take place before June 1.

5. Article VI, Section 3, part (2) - substitute "Secretary of the Faculty" for Elections Committee as follows:

2) Vacancies that occur on the Advisory Council shall be filled by appointment by the Elections Committee which shall designate the nominee who in the immediately past Advisory Council election has had the greatest number of votes, provided that his or her designation does not result in more than four holdovers from the preceding council. The interim appointee shall complete the regular term of office.

6. Article VII. Substitute "Secretary of the Faculty" for Elections Committee as follows:

Article VII. Election of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

The faculty shall elect during spring term by secret ballot one institutional representative to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, from the membership of the faculty other than ex-officio members of the Senate. The election shall be administered by the Elections Committee concurrently with the selection of the Advisory Council, and according to the same procedures as described in Section 1.
To: The Faculty Senate

From: The Educational Policies Committee

At the June 2, 1980 meeting of the Portland State University Faculty Senate the Educational Policies Committee will move the approval of two proposals:

1. The Black Studies Department and the Black Studies Center, now reporting to the Dean of the School of Urban Affairs, will report hereafter to the Dean of the College of Social Science.

   Discussion: This move was proposed by the Department of Black Studies on October 15, 1979. Between that date and December 31, 1979 the move was discussed at length in the College of Social Science, and the move was recommended to the Office of Academic Affairs by the College of Social Science. The proposal has subsequently been reviewed and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs, and it was forwarded to the EPC by President Blumel on March 30, 1980.

   The Educational Policies Committee finds that the proposed transfer entails no academic, administrative, or budgetary changes within the Black Studies Program, and that the move does not conflict with any current University educational policies. The move will return the Black Studies Program and faculty to a broad social science context, which will more effectively support the program's wide range of study in Black history and experience.

2. The program in Engineering and Applied Science, now reporting to the Dean of the College of Science, will be established as a separate academic unit reporting directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

   Discussion: This proposal was made on Jan. 4, 1979 by the Department of Engineering and Applied Science to the Office of Academic Affairs. On April 20, 1979, the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Organization recommended that the program in Engineering and Applied Science be established as an independent Division. Subsequently the program, which has the unanimous support of its faculty, has been reviewed by the College of Science and has received the endorsement of the national accrediting agency, the Engineers' Council for Professional Development, as well as the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. The proposal was sent to the Educational Policies Committee by President Blumel on April 11, 1980.

   The EPC finds that the changes within the program that would result from the proposed move will not conflict with current University educational policy. On the contrary, raising the visibility of the program and granting it higher administrative status will probably strengthen it in the competition for faculty, administrators, and research sponsors of the highest quality, and will thus help strengthen the University in fulfilling its urban mission.
THESIS DEFINITION

The presentation of the thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the master's degree is required in certain departments. If a thesis is presented, the student must register for 6 to 9 credits of thesis in the appropriate department. Grades for thesis are not recorded until the thesis has been approved.

When the thesis is required, it becomes a major factor in determining the eligibility of the candidate for the degree. Each school, college, and department defines the nature of research, scholarship, and creativity accepted for a thesis, but in all cases a high level of resourcefulness, productivity, and mature perception of the discipline is expected.

The quality of the culminating work must comply with the professional and academic standards of this and other leading universities. The depth of research, the synthesis of available knowledge, the originality of insight, and the solution to problems or the creative achievement must attest to the distinction of the student.

The subject of the thesis must be within the major field of the candidate. Although the thesis is not required necessarily to show original results, it must reveal independent investigation, including the knowledge and application of the accepted methods of scholarship and methodology in the major field.

The thesis represents the independent work of the candidate for the degree. The thesis must be developed under the direction of a faculty member approved by the major department for graduate instruction.

Any thesis proposal involving human subjects, including survey research, must have prior approval of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee.

M.A., M.S. Thesis

M.A. and M.S. theses should be prepared in accordance with the PSU Style Manual for Theses and Dissertations, which is available in the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. The thesis should be accompanied by four copies of an abstract of not more than 600 words.

M.F.A. Thesis

M.F.A. theses should be prepared in accordance with accepted standards in the appropriate field, as defined by the accrediting organization or the major department. In cases where the thesis is presented in media other than writing, a thesis report together with at least one complete record of the thesis prepared in the appropriate medium will constitute the University's record of thesis achievement.

Thesis Copies and Deadlines

Three copies of the thesis or thesis report must be filed with the Office of Graduate Studies and Research no later than three weeks prior to the close of the term in which the degree will be granted. Two copies of the thesis or thesis report will be bound by the library. The third copy will be forwarded to the major department. The submission date of the thesis to the Office of Graduate Studies and Research appears on the GO-17 Recommendation for the Degree.