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MEMORANDUM

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

FROM: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

DATE: September 23, 1980

The Senate will hold its regular meeting of the Faculty Senate on Monday, October 6, 1980, 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

A. Roll
* B. Approval of Minutes of the June 2, 1980, meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Resignation of Presiding Officer Pro Tem, Michael Fiasca, and Election
   2. Special Run-off Election for IFS Position
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
      Questions to President Blumel from the Senate Steering Committee:
      a. "What is the procedure for faculty consultation for interim administrative appointments?"
      b. "Does the UO now have approval from the State Board to proceed with the investigation of the move to a semester system? What are the implications, if any, for PSU?"
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from Officers of the Administration
   Registration Report -- President Blumel
* F. Unfinished Business -- Proposed Constitutional Amendment -- Bentley
* G. New Business
   1. Proposed Policy for the Use of "W" and "I" Marks -- Midson
   2. Proposed New Faculty Grievance Procedure -- R. Nussbaum/Blumel
H. Adjournment

* The following documents are included with this mailing:
  Regarding Agenda Items: B - Minutes of June 2, 1980, Senate meeting
  F - Proposed Constitutional Amendment**
  G1- Proposed "W" and "I" Policy**
  G2- Proposed new Grievance Procedure**

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

REMININDER:
Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass the Senate mailing on to their alternates.

All Senators are required to name an alternate prior to the first Senate meeting. Please do so below and return the slip to the Secretary of the Faculty, Ulrich H. Hardt, President's Office.

My name ____________________________ . My alternate for the 1980-81 year is ____________________________ .

Please return this slip immediately. Thank you.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, June 2, 1980

Presiding Officer: Steven Brenner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Butler, Corn, Dobson, Forbes, Gard, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Hoffmann, Howard, Jorgensen, Nicholas, Rauch, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Vant Slot.

New Senators Present: Buell, Burns, Oh, Jenkins, Lehman, Asbury, Scheans, Brooke, Bennett, Bunch, Abbott, Dueker.

New Senators Absent: Moor, Diman, Conroy, Goslin, Anderson.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Minutes of the May 5, 1980, Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A round of applause was given to Dick Halley on his retirement.

Brenner read a letter by the Governor to the PSU Faculty Senate, in which the Governor promised he "will examine with care (the proposed Higher Education Budget) and recommend to the 1981 Legislative Assembly a faculty compensation adjustment package that responds to your concerns to the extent that resources and general equity permits." The Governor also urged the Senate to voice its concerns directly to the Chancellor's office so that those views may influence the department's budget requests.

Brenner also reported that the Association of Oregon Faculties has negotiated a salary package which the Chancellor will propose, containing the following three components:

1. cost of living amount at least equal to that given to all state employees
2. an amount for merit and promotion equal to 2 percent per year,
3. an amount of money for catch-up in the range of 12-15 percent, recognizing that higher education salaries have lost 17.8 percent since 1970.
Waller gave a report from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting of April 4-5. The Educational Policies Committee said that all institutions are studying and preparing to make reports on the possible adoption of a semester system by the State System of Higher Education. The Faculty Affairs Committee discussed the status of grievance procedures and policy within the state system and also took up the issue of vacation-time allotments for persons on 9-month appointments, a problem not covered in the administrative rules. The Finance Committee moved that the IFS should support the salary improvement plan proposed by the AOF; the committee also felt that the comparisons heretofore used for salary improvements in the state system should go beyond the 19 other institutions to also include comparisons with industry, government, and other organizations and institutions.

The IFS also expressed concern about the Chancellor's response on state system policy concerning program reduction and termination and the potential policy suggested in a memorandum by Vice-Chancellor Lemman, whereby an institution faced with the possibility of program reduction or termination might consider as an alternative the reduction of a faculty member's FTE in place of outright termination. E.g., the faculty member might be relieved of institutional obligations such as advising or committee work and be reduced to teaching three courses only; however, the IFS feels that a .75 FTE for teaching only three courses may present a problem of equity when compared with those who teach three courses and do advising, committee work and research on 1.0 FTE. Consequently the IFS has asked that the staff memorandum from Vice-Chancellor Lemman be withdrawn.

R. Nussbaum responded that Lemman has agreed not to issue his "Teach Only" memo, following a May 10 panel discussion of various administrative personnel and officers of AAUP on the topic of retrenchment. Lemman also committed himself to prior consultation with individuals or groups who gave him feedback, should possible retrenchment become necessary in the future, making consideration of a "Teach Only" policy necessary.

Tracy reviewed the Budget Committee's report to the President regarding the semester system. One half of the 111 questionnaires sent to administrative and academic units were returned. Of those, half said no budget changes would occur with a change to a semester system. The Committee did identify an approximately $50,000 savings because of one less registration. One potential loss of income of $6,000 was associated with the Helen Gordon Child Development Center because of loss of student/parent user fees. Two major concerns expressed were loss of community college transfer students who would not be able to enter PSU after the winter quarter (cf. 123 students in spring 1979 and 106 students in spring 1978), and PSU students who would transfer to community colleges after the fall semester, because they could earn more credits at less tuition cost. The Budget Committee makes no recommendation on whether PSU should make this conversion.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

President Blumel replied that the Committee on Research has completed an excellent report and has met with the President. The report is available and if the Senate would like to have it he would be happy to forward it.

The Committee on Academic Organization reached some tentative conclusions some time ago, and that report is also available to the Senate. The essence of that study was to recommend the establishment of two additional major separate academic units: Performing Arts, and Engineering and Applied Science. No further action has been taken on the Performing Arts recommendation; there is a proposal on today's agenda for separating Engineering and Applied Science from the College of Science.
No report has been received from the General Education Requirements Committee to this date. Heath suggested that a preliminary report may be forthcoming in the fall.

Blumel indicated that the Scholastic Standards Committee forwarded its report on the semester system. 428 faculty replies were received.

55.8% preferred semesters for educational reasons
23.1% preferred quarters for educational reasons
21.1% saw no difference for educational reasons

61.2 percent favored the change to semesters and 38.8 percent were opposed. Blumel emphasized that much more information was needed, e.g., from students. Clearly the number of part-time students at PSU is related to the number of options that exist for enrollment during the year. The conversion process itself is a considerable undertaking and represents a large one-time cost. The high number of transfers between Oregon institutions might demand that all Oregon universities be on the same system; PSU is subject to transfers more than the other institutions.

Heath related that the University of Oregon is going forward in its examination of the issue but has completely ignored student input to this point. The University is seeking institutional autonomy to proceed with this investigation, but they have indicated that it would take three years to put a change into effect, once the go-ahead has been given. The UO Law School is on a semester system already. Heath also said that Community College presidents clearly are not favorable toward this change, pointing out that their task is to offer more alternative schedules to students, not fewer.

ELECTION FOR 1980-81

1. Election of Presiding Officer
   Marjorie Enneking
2. Election of Presiding Officer Pro Tem
   Michael Fiasca
3. Nominations and election of Senate Steering Committee
   Loyde Hales - ED
   Ansel Johnson - ES elected
   Alice Lehman - HPE elected
   Don Moor - PHL elected
   Laureen Nussbaum - FL elected
4. Results of divisional caucus for election of Committee on Committees
   Administration: Charles White
   Business: Jim Bentley
   DCE: Ray Adams
   Education; Alma Bingham
   Social Work: James Breedlove
   Urban Affairs: Carl Abbott

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Erzurumlu presented the Advisory Council Annual Report and added to it that the Council also considered policy and procedures for the evaluation of academic officers and recommends that a schedule of those reviews be made available to faculty as part of the materials provided at the beginning of each academic year, so that appropriate input could be submitted by the faculty of that particular unit.
Passell, commenting on the President's letter, pointed out that the language of Article III, Section 3 was not clear, but that the intention of the framers of the constitution was that a department be able to select its own head. He noted that the "Internal Management Directive" also gave two somewhat conflicting directives: 1) that the Constitution is the law of the University, and 2) that the President has veto power over the Faculty.

Jones pointed out that under President Gregory Wolf the Psychology Department was informed that its election of department head was a recommendation to the president and not a notification of the department's action; therefore President Blumel's interpretation has precedence and has been the policy since 1969. Blumel agreed that that has been the meaning accepted by the president and has been applied in that way ever since; it was explicitly discussed and communicated to deans and department heads at that time.

Crowley wanted to know how the statement of policy related to the specific instance of grievance. Passell agreed that the Philosophy Department has a grievance but didn't know where the grievance stood right now. Erzurumlu said that the matter has come to the attention of the Advisory Council and was referred there by the Arbitration Panel on the grounds that University-wide issues were involved. The Council conveyed back to the Arbitration Panel the entire set of deliberations, including opinions drafted by most members of the Council; the Arbitration Panel actually has the case at this time. Passell relayed that he met with them and finally also wrote a letter to them stating that negotiations couldn't go on and requesting action from the Panel. His understanding was that the issue would be sent back to the Advisory Council for consideration. Bunch, speaking as a member on the Council, reassured the Senate that the Council would move with all due haste to resolve the case out of consideration for the people involved in this two-year-old case.

The Advisory Council Report was accepted unanimously.

2. Cumpston presented the Annual Report of the Committee on Committees. Toulan questioned the statement that the Campus Planning Committee had seen a lack of activity during 1979-80. L. Nussbaum pointed out that seven members of the Planning Committee had responded that "not much was going on." The Report was accepted.

3. The Elections Committee Annual Report was presented by Tamblyn and was accepted by the Senate.

4. Tuttle offered the Educational Policies Committee Annual Report. R. Nussbaum inquired who should set priorities for program development, noting that faculty should be involved and that perhaps a constitutional amendment should clarify which committees are given that responsibility. Blumel indicated that there is some manifest overlap and continuing confusion about committee assignments; it has pretty well been left to the initiative of the committees for which areas they wish to assert responsibility. Tuttle said it was clear, in accordance with the constitution, that the Budget and Curriculum Committees and the Graduate Council should get together with the EPC. The Annual Educational Policies Committee Report was accepted.

5. McMahon's Annual Report of the Research and Publications Committee was accepted unanimously.
NEW BUSINESS

1. The Committee on Committees presented the first reading of its proposed constitutional amendment to eliminate the Elections Committee and to move up the dates of the various stages of the election process. The amendment is offered on the recommendation of the Elections Committee, chaired by Tamblyn. Computerized election procedures make the committee obsolete; over the last 4-5 years one member of the committee has coordinated the process while the computer has done the work. Cumpston emphasized that the elections process does not require the maintenance of a faculty committee to carry out an essentially clerical function, and the recommendation is that the task be turned over to the office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Chino asked about the function of the first reading of a proposed amendment. Brenner replied that the amendment is subject to debate and modification by majority vote and that the approved version is then passed on to the Advisory Council for review and proper numbering—the action is to refer a version to the Council, not to adopt one.

Hales questioned whether the elections process should be turned over into the hands of one person and favored at least a monitoring organization, like the Senate Steering Committee, to supervise the counting of the results and the tabulations. Tamblyn replied that the computer does the counting and that there has not been a functioning Elections Committee in the last 4-5 years. Scheduling of Committee meetings and work is simply impossible. Grimes pointed out that the Secretary of the Faculty works for the Steering Committee and is a part of it, and the work is thus reviewed by the Committee.

Johnson wondered why the amendment had to be discussed today. Brenner countered that it was brought to the Senate for action. Chino thought that perhaps next year's Senate should deal with the matter, since they would be the body voting on the final version of the amendment, and he moved to table the motion till the first Senate meeting of the fall. Blumel called for a point of order, noting that one cannot table till a time specific. The motion was revised to "postpone the consideration of the proposed constitutional amendment till the first Senate meeting of the fall." The motion carried.

2.a. The Educational Policies Committee moved that "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." Tuttle explained that "hereafter" meant as soon as practicable. Chino pointed out that "shall" should be used in the motion if reporting to the Dean of Social Science was imperative.

M. Enneking wanted it clarified whether Black Studies classes would satisfy social science credits in the general distribution requirements, and Tuttle said they would. Chino and R. Nussbaum asked about the appropriateness of assigning credit based on the administrative location of a program rather than on the content of a course. Johnson and Heath pointed out that cross-referenced courses exist all across the University. Chino said that for that reason he favored the separation of academic and applied units. Heath reminded the Senate that the General Education Requirements Committee, chaired by Smeltzer, is currently examining this question and will probably bring a recommendation that only a narrow range of content-oriented selections satisfy general distribution requirements. At the present time the problem is University wide.
Toulan supported the motion of the move of Black Studies, saying that the department had altered its mission in recent time so that it now belongs in the College of Social Science.

The motion to transfer the Black Studies Department and Center to Social Science passed unanimously.

2.b. The EPC moved that "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."

Tuttle pointed out that the only immediate probable change within the unit will be the change in the title of the director. Hammond wanted to know what status the department would have. Blumel replied that for a long time we had an independent department of Health and Physical Education which some years ago was redesignated as a School. Institutional authority allows us to separate a unit off and designate it as an independent department or division, reporting directly to the Academic Vice President. However, the establishment of a School or College would require the appropriate action by the Chancellor and the State Board of Higher Education. Blumel emphasized that the intention of this proposal was to establish the unit as a division of Engineering and Applied Science, chaired by a head rather than a dean.

Midson wanted to know if the distribution of courses would still fall under Science. Heath responded that they would no longer be in the College of Science, therefore they would not count as science credits. Passell asked whether there had been budget review. Blumel replied in the affirmative and said that there were no budget implications with this move. Tuttle added that the current budget of the department would simply move to the divisional status. Lehman asked if this proposal would have implications for representation in the Senate and on committees. Brenner answered that it would.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Newberry presented a new definition of the M.F.A. thesis, separate from the M.A., M.S. theses. This new definition meets the approval and requirements of the Department of Art and Architecture and the Graduate Program. The motion for approval carried.

4. Youngelson moved that the proposed recommendations in the Annual Report of the Committee on Committees be adopted. Johnson questioned whether it was necessary for the Senate to move on recommendations that were passed from one year's committee to another's. Brenner saw it as an encouragement for the committee. The motion carried.

Before adjournment Hammond urged the Senate to express its appreciation for the work of Presiding Officer Steve Brenner, and a round of applause followed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.
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.
Six weeks

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.
James R. Bentley
Mary H. Cumpston
Steven B. Brenner
Carl Martigny
Cees Wester
c\nClaudine J. Fisher
Rudi H. Martin
J. Smith
Dan Parcell
Dan Newberry
These regulations are jointly proposed by the Academic Requirements Committee, Scholastic Standards Committee and the Graduate Council.

They are intended to:

1) provide policy where none now exists and thus prevent inconsistent treatment of students in the use of grading marks.

2) provide a rationale for the use of withdrawal (W) and incomplete (I) marks and thus reduce the present confusion and inappropriate use of these marks.

3) tighten the present liberal use of withdrawal (W) and incomplete (I), which together account for 1 in 7 of all course results at PSU.

Distribution

In addition to the summary in the PSU Bulletin General Catalog, Faculty should be provided with a complete copy of grading policy and rationale when they join the teaching staff, and thereafter at least once a year.

New and returning students should be informed of grading policy before or during registration. Thereafter, details should be available at general registration, and/or published in the class schedule.

The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for ensuring distribution of policy.

Use of "W" Withdrawal from Course

PROPOSED POLICY* RATIONALE

Withdrawal from a course must be initiated by the student. This must be recorded by the Registrar with a student signature.

Withdrawal from a course can be viewed as a reversal or negation of the process of registration, and as such is a transaction between the university, represented by the Registrar, and the student.

"W" on a transcript is generally interpreted as the result of action by a student. It will not be permissible for an instructor to independently withdraw a student from a course. (The only exception would be where there is a published policy

*Underlined sections are the official policy statements to be included as a minimum in any document. The rationale may be included at the discretion of authors of reprints of this policy.
that students not attending would be automatically dropped due to space limitations. In such cases there would be no record.

There is no rationale for assigning W's at the same time as grades, which are measures of academic achievement not the result of an administrative process. The W should be removed from options on the grading register.

A student may withdraw with no record on the transcript up to the end of the fourth week of the term.

This is a shorter period than the present 6 week limit for no record. Students should be able to decide whether they wish to remain in a course well within the 4 week period.

A 4 week cut off also corresponds to the period for determining FTE enrollment.

A student withdrawing after the end of the 4th week shall have a W recorded on his/her transcript.

He or she may withdraw for any reason before the end of the 8th week. As a courtesy students are advised to notify the instructor concerned of the intended or completed withdrawal.

A student wishing to withdraw after the 8th week must petition the Deadline Appeals Committee or Graduate Council. A W is recorded if the petition is allowed. Reasons for withdrawal beyond the 8th week must be beyond the student's control, and medical reasons must be documented. Instructor's comments are required on the petition.

With this policy it would be easier than now to withdraw between the 6th and 8th week as the student would no longer need the instructor's permission. It would be more difficult to withdraw after the 8th week. This extension to an 8 week option would be similar to other college deadlines for withdrawal.

A W on a transcript is intended to have neither a favorable nor a prejudicial connotation but is simply a record. People may interpret the accumulation of W’s as they please. The total number of requests for W is expected to drop rapidly if this policy takes effect because the policy will prompt students to make decisions earlier.

Weeks elapsed are measured from the 1st day of classes.
Date of withdrawal is the date the Registrar's Office receives the signed form.
8 week Summer Term classes will use 3 and 6 week deadlines instead of 4 and 8 weeks.

Figure 1 RESPONSIBILITY FOR DECISION AND DEADLINES FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM COURSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>week</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old policy</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policy</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Deadline Appeals Committee or Graduate Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - deadline for no record
A student may be assigned an I mark by an instructor when all of the following four criteria apply:

1. Quality of work in the course up to that point is C level or above (or B at graduate level)  
   This is more precise than the present term "satisfactory"

2. Essential work remains to be done.  
   "Essential" here means that a grade for the course couldn't be assigned without dropping one or more grade points below the level they may achieve upon completion of the work. The word "minor" has been dropped.

3. Reasons for assigning an I must be acceptable to the instructor.  
   The student does not have the right to demand an I. The circumstances must be unforeseen or be beyond the control of the student. An instructor is entitled to insist on appropriate medical or other documentation.

4. Consultation must have occurred and a formal agreement must be reached between instructor and student.  
   Without consultation an A-F grade must be assigned and may only be changed by a supplementary grade report if the instructor chooses to accept a request for an I from the student. This need for consultation will allow faculty, when appropriate, to encourage students to finish and thus avoid a backlog of I's harmful to the student.

A written record of the remaining work and its completion date should be kept by both instructor and student.  
Apart from the obvious benefit in avoiding disputes, this will ensure clear understanding of the terms under which work is to be completed. In addition, this will be helpful should instructors leave, take sabbaticals, or as in the case of temporary faculty, become hard to trace.

The instructor may specify the highest grade that may be earned. This should not exceed the level of achievement displayed during the normal course period.  
The I may not be used to enable students to improve upon grades that would otherwise be given.

The deadline for completion of an incomplete should be no longer than two terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Incomplete</th>
<th>Term by end of which work is to be completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present one year deadline unnecessarily encourages procrastination.

The instructor may set a shorter deadline which shall be binding.
An agreement to a longer period must be by petition to the Scholastic Standards Committee or Graduate Council. A Graduate level petition also requires approval of the Graduate Committee of the school/college and the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

An instructor's comment is required and a positive recommendation should carry much weight. When this recommendation requires repetition of undergraduate classes within one year, committee approval is automatic.

An incomplete mark becomes part of the permanent transcript record after the deadline expires, except by petition to the Scholastic Standards Committee or Graduate Council.

To remove an I an instructor must file a supplementary grade report. When an instructor is unavailable to assign a final mark another faculty member may be designated according to departmental guidelines. A student's expressed preference should be considered in such cases.

Walkaway Students

The following procedures are recommended in cases where students cease to attend or never attend and also fail to communicate with the instructor.

If a student, to the best of the instructor's knowledge, has never attended class the name on the grade register should be lined out (or a new symbol used) which will be interpreted as "no basis for grade".

The alternative of leaving the space blank will be misinterpreted as an omission in many cases and returned to the instructor. A deliberate response is preferable.

A student who has participated in a course but who has failed to complete essential work, or attend examinations, and who has not communicated with the instructor should be assigned an F, D, or whatever grade the work has earned.

If the student feels that a mistake was made, a petition for a grade change is always available.

9/22/80
Attached for your review is a proposed new grievance procedure for the Portland State University faculty. It is being submitted as a result of a memorandum of understanding, dated August 1, 1979, between Portland State University and AAUP-PSU. This memorandum of understanding, which arose in connection with the collective bargaining agreement between the same parties, dated October 15, 1979, required that the parties meet for the purpose of preparing a grievance procedure to be used by the faculty in matters not governed by the collective bargaining agreement. In addition, that agreement provided that the grievance procedure would have a mechanism for peer review and required that the procedure be presented to the Faculty Senate for ratification and to the President for approval before being put into effect.

As a result of the memorandum of understanding, AAUP-PSU and representatives of the PSU administration met over a period of a number of weeks and arrived at this joint proposal after extensive discussions. AAUP-PSU was represented by David Newhall, Don Moor, Anne McMahon, and Gavin Bjork. The administration was represented by Michael Corn, Margaret Dobson, and Ed Grubb. In addition, the University's affirmative action officer, Major Morris, participated in the discussions.

We believe that this proposal will provide due process for fair and thorough resolution of grievances. We also believe that it is in the best interests of the institution as a whole to proceed towards implementation as soon as possible. Therefore, we recommend its ratification at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.
I. Purpose and General Explanation

The purpose of this procedure is to provide the faculty of Portland State University with a means for prompt and efficient handling of grievances. The procedure covers a broader range of grievances than those grievable under current collective bargaining agreements between Portland State University and various bargaining agents.

The emphasis is on solving problems in a collegial manner with members of the University community confronting each other directly as peers seeking to resolve conflicts in a way that embodies mutual respect and fairness. The procedure encourages settlement of disputes at the lowest possible level by direct communications between the conflicting parties. In filing grievances, grievants are expected to do so in a timely manner so that subsequent events do not make adjustment of grievances impossible or highly impractical.

Peer review and an opportunity for peer hearing are provided. The grievant is also assured of an opportunity to appeal to the President of the University. Appeal from the decision of the President is governed by the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

II. Definitions

A. "Grievance" means any complaint of unfair or inequitable treatment by the University.

B. "Grievant" means one or more members of the Portland State University Faculty asserting a grievance, but shall not include administrators or similar persons in supervisory positions. For purposes of this definition "a member of the Portland State University Faculty" means a person holding at the time of the assertion of the grievance a full or part-time appointment at Portland State University with a rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Instructor, Instructor, Research Associate, Research Assistant, or Lecturer.

C. "Day" means a day when classes or examinations are scheduled and held in accordance with the official academic calendar of the University, excluding Saturdays and Sundays.

D. "Dean" shall have its ordinary meaning but includes in appropriate cases University administrators serving in an equivalent supervisory capacity.

E. "Department Head" shall have its ordinary meaning but includes in appropriate cases University administrators serving in an equivalent supervisory capacity. In the event there is no person in the position of department head, or its equivalent, the dean shall assume the obligations of the department head as required by this grievance procedure.

F. "Vice President" means the Vice President who is in the reporting line of a given academic staff member or another Portland State University officer with academic rank who reports directly to the President of the University, whether or not such person holds the title of Vice President.
III. General Provisions

A. At any step, a grievant has the right to be accompanied, assisted, or represented by other persons, including counsel, designated by the grievant. Except in cases of illness, absence from the country, or official leave of absence, the grievant shall be present in person when the grievance is presented and at any subsequent hearings. A grievant has the right of self-representation at any step of this grievance procedure.

B. The parties may agree to modify the time limits prescribed in the grievance procedure. All such agreements shall be in writing and signed by the grievant and the administrator who is required to act within the time limit being modified.

C. Failure of the grievant to take action within the time limits specified at any step, including any extensions, shall be considered acceptance by the grievant of the decision. Failure by the accountable administrator to act within the specified time limits, including any extensions, shall allow the grievant to proceed to the next step.

D. If, at any time, a grievant seeks resolution of a grievance through any agency outside Portland State University, whether administrative or judicial, Portland State University shall have no obligation to proceed further under this grievance procedure with respect to such a grievance.

E. A grievant may withdraw a grievance at any time.

IV. Presentation of Grievance

A. Grievances shall first be presented within 30 days from the date of the act or omission upon which the grievance is based or from such later date that the grievant knew or reasonably should have known of such act or omission. However, no event shall a grievance be presented more than 120 days after such act or omission except in those cases where the grievant is out of the country or on an official leave of absence.

B. ORAL PRESENTATION OF GRIEVANCE.

1. Having decided that he or she wishes to seek redress for a grievance, the grievant shall orally present a grievance to the grievant's department head. At the time of this presentation, the grievant shall state that a grievance is being presented.

2. The department head shall discuss the grievance with the grievant and shall endeavour to obtain whatever additional information may be necessary to take action on the grievance.

3. If the grievance involves a person other than the grievant and the department head, the department head if possible shall arrange a meeting which includes the other person involved. If this meeting establishes a need for more information than has already been presented or secured, the department head shall gather such information.

4. At this stage the persons involved shall make sincere and significant efforts to settle the grievance.

5. Within 10 days of the first presentation of the grievance, the department head shall orally notify the grievant of the outcome and record the date of notification.

6. In the expectation that a high percentage of grievances will be settled at this stage, no grievance file shall be generated.

C. WRITTEN PRESENTATION OF GRIEVANCE

1. Step One: Dean's Review

a. If the grievant is not satisfied with the decision of the department head and desires to proceed further, the grievant shall, within 5 days of being notified of the department head's decision, present the grievance in writing to the dean on the form attached as Appendix A.

b. Upon receipt, the dean shall immediately transmit a copy of the written grievance to the department head and shall create a grievance file into which all written materials concerning the grievance will be placed. The grievance file shall be available at any time to the grievant.

c. The dean shall schedule a meeting with the grievant to attempt to resolve the matter. This meeting shall occur within 10 days of the written presentation of the grievance. Either party may bring to the meeting any persons he or she wishes. The dean may conduct further meetings and inquiries as deemed necessary and proper.

d. The dean shall conclude the review and notify in writing the grievant and the department head of the decision on the grievance within 10 days of the meeting.

2. Step Two: Peer Hearing

a. If the grievant is not satisfied with the dean's decision and desires to proceed further, the grievant shall, within 5 days of receipt of the dean's written decision, file a request for a hearing with the chairperson of the University Faculty Grievance Panel, using the form attached as Appendix B.

b. The Faculty Peer Hearing Committee, having been duly constituted in accordance with Section V below, shall obtain the grievance file from the dean and provide opportunity for the grievant, dean, and department head to submit any additional written information or written statements in connection with the grievance.

c. A request for a hearing shall be granted automatically if any fact, material or relevant to the grievance, remains in dispute. The Hearing Committee may deny a hearing only if the committee decides that the grievance lacks substance and no useful purpose would be served by a hearing. No such denial shall be made without first giving the grievant an opportunity to appear before the committee. The dean may also be in attendance at such an appearance.
Step Four: Discretionary Review by President

a. If the grievant is not satisfied with the action of the vice president, the grievant may, within 5 days of receipt of the vice president's decision, petition the President to review the matter.

b. Such petition may be granted or denied within the discretion of the President. Within 10 days of receipt of the petition, the President shall notify the grievant in writing whether the grievance will be reviewed.

c. If a review is denied, the reasons for the denial shall be provided in writing to the grievant.

d. If the matter is reviewed, the President shall notify the grievant in writing of the decision and of the reasons for the decision within 30 days of the presentation of the petition for review. As part of the decision, the President may take such further action as deemed necessary and proper, including granting or denying relief, or remanding the grievance for further proceedings.

5. Step Five: Appeals of the President's Decision

Appeals of the President's decision shall be governed by rule 580-21-390 of the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

V. University Faculty Grievance Panel and Faculty Peer Hearing Committee

A. Membership.

1. All members of the Portland State University faculty who are employed for a full academic year at .50 FTE or more are eligible for membership on the University Faculty Grievance Panel. The panel shall consist of 12 members selected through a random process by the Secretary of the Faculty. The President of the University shall appoint each of these 12 persons to serve for a term of one academic year. Any person selected shall be required to serve and may be excused by the President, upon request, only in exceptional circumstances.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty shall convene the panel within 10 days of its appointment to elect a chairperson. The Secretary of the Faculty shall explain the duties of the chairperson. The election shall be accomplished by secret ballot and majority vote.

3. Vacancies, including the chairperson, occurring during the term of the panel, shall be filled in the same manner as the initial selection and appointment.

B. Faculty Peer Hearing Committee.

1. When a Hearing Committee is requested by a grievant, the chairperson of the Grievance Panel and the Secretary of the Faculty, without delay, shall draw through a random process five names from the panel, excluding the chairperson. These five persons shall be the Hearing Committee for the grievance at hand. The chairperson shall promptly notify the persons
selected. The chairperson shall also notify the parties of the persons selected.

2. Within one day of receipt of such notice, each party may challenge any selection for cause. All such challenges shall be decided by the chairperson of the Grievance Panel. In addition each party is entitled to one peremptory challenge. Peremptory challenges shall be exercised within one day after all challenges for cause have been decided and replacements selected.

3. All vacancies resulting from challenges, for cause or peremptory, shall be filled by drawing names of the remaining panel members in the manner described above.

4. If the panel is exhausted, additional members shall be selected at random by the Secretary of the Faculty and temporarily appointed by the President in the same manner as permanent members of the Faculty Grievance Panel.

5. Upon completion of the selection of the Hearing Committee, the chairperson of the Grievance Panel shall promptly convene the committee. The chairperson of the Grievance Panel shall make the first nomination for chairperson of the Hearing Committee, and conduct an election in which the five members of the Hearing Committee select their chairperson. At this point the Hearing Committee is duly constituted and shall proceed with its business.
APPENDIX A

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCE

NAME ____________________________________________

DEPARTMENT _______________________________________

Statement of unfair or inequitable treatment suffered by grievant (describe carefully and give date of occurrence):

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Remedy sought: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Authorized Representative (if any)

__________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Grievant's signature: _______________________________________

Date of Filing: ____________________________________________

Submit to your Dean

Retain a Copy For Your Records

APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR PEER HEARING

To: Chairperson of Faculty Peer Hearing Panel

I am not satisfied with the action of ______________________ with respect to my grievance, filed on ______________.

Date

I hereby request a hearing.

The following materials are enclosed to supplement the file.

Signature

Date

Submit to your Dean

Retain a Copy For Your Records