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MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

DATE September 24, 1981

FROM Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on Monday, October 5, 1981, at 3:00 p.m. in 75 Lincoln Hall. (Please note ROOM CHANGE).

Agenda

A. Roll

B. Approval of Minutes of the June 1 and August 11, 1981, meetings

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Collective Bargaining Report--Moor, AAUP
      --President Blumel

D. Questions Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
      a. Question for Associate Vice President Dobson, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:
         (a) "What is your response to the apparent disregard of academic responsibility by instructors of some courses taught in DCE? Specifically, is your Office prepared to undertake substantive changes in DCE policy and supervisory personnel to insure that these abuses will not recur?"
      (b) Considering the damage done to the reputation of this University, with the prominent coverage given this matter by both Portland daily newspapers, is the University prepared to make a public response of reassurance to the community that unethical practices in teaching will not be tolerated at PSU?"
      b. Question for President Blumel, submitted by the Senate Steering Committee:
         "What happened to last year's administrative reviews? How and where are the results accessible?"
      c. Question for President, submitted by Ralph Bunch:
         "Morale is a continuing concern of all organizations; much has been written on the subject, and there are knowledgeable individuals among us. What is the Administration's stance on the subject, and what are its programs to measure and to create and maintain high faculty morale at PSU?"
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from Officers of the Administration
   1. Registration Report--President Blumel

F. Unfinished Business--none

G. New Business
   1. Proposed Changes to Degree Requirements--Rose
   2. AAUP Budget Reduction Recommendation--R. Nussbaum
   *3. Advisory Council Motions--Beeson

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B. Minutes of June 1 and August 11, 1981, Senate Meetings

G1 Proposed Changes to Degree Requirements**

G2 AAUP Budget Reduction Recommendation**

G3 Advisory Council Motions**

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

Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass this mailing on to their alternates.

The Constitution requires that prior to the first Senate meeting each academic year elected members must provide the Secretary of the Faculty with the name of an alternate.

My name ________________________.

My alternate for 1981-82 is ________________________ Dept. _____.

Please return slip immediately to: Ulrich H. Hardt, P.O.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 1, 1981
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Enneking
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Alberty, Alexander, Bates, Beeson, Bennett, Bentley, Bingham, Buell, Bunch, Chavigny, Chino, Clark, Conroy, Crowley, Dart, Diman, Dressler, Dueker, Dunbar, E. Enneking, M. Enneking, Feldesman, Fiasca, Giachetti, Goslin, Grimes, Hales, Heflin, Heyden, Howard, Jenkins, Johnson, Kimbrell, Kirrie, Lehman, Manning, Midson, Moor, Mueller, L. Nussbaum, R. Nussbaum, Oh, Patton, Rad, Scheans, Sugarman, Swanson, Tuttle, Youngelson, White, Williams, Myers.


Members Absent: Adams, Bierman, Breedlove, Bruseau, Burden, Burns, Daily, Dreyer, Goekjian, Gorg, Muller, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Erzuru1mu, Forbes, Gard, Gruber, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Hoffmann, Morris, Nicholas, Parker, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Vant Slot.


New Senators Absent: Cumpston.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the May 4 Senate meeting were approved with the following changes: page 66, line 9, was corrected to read "58, or 55 after thirty years of service, without loss of actuarial benefits) seems to be favored." Lines 11-12 should read "The salary sub-committee of Ways and Means will be discussing the bill."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Sugarman reported on the IFS meeting held at PSU on May 29-30. The group discussed the desirability of having a faculty member on the State Board and will be pursuing the matter. They are looking into Affirmative Action policies in the various institutions and the Chancellor's office. They want to actively participate in the selection of a new chancellor, when that time comes. The IFS approved a motion to urge the presidents of the colleges and universities to consider seriously the implementation of voluntary early retirement programs designed to ameliorate the effects of expected 1981-82 budget reductions. Such programs should provide faculty 60 years of age or over opportunities to retire and continue part-time employment. One such proposal, presented by John Dart at a recent PSU faculty meeting, could save the institution approximately $25,000 per retiree. IFS will also look into policies of faculty development and post-tenure review. Finally, IFS discussed the way the problems and needs of Higher Education have been presented to the Legislature and the general public by the Chancellor's office. An evaluation of this will take place at the next meeting.
2. Hardt announced the election results for the Advisory Council. The following persons will serve until 1983: Ann Bennett, Gordon Dodds, Donald Moor.

3. Midson reported that the Academic Requirements Committee was asked by OAA to review the 1980-81 suspension of the Wr. 121 prerequisite. ARC made an interpretation and some suggestions; the Head of the English Department asked that these be announced to the Senate. Midson reviewed the history of the Wr. 120 course. In 1977-78 the Senate implemented the course, and as such the class differs from a normal departmental course requisite. The prerequisite for Wr. 121 was determined to be a 35 or better score on the Test of Standard Written English. Wr. 120 was decided upon as a method ofremedying deficiencies. At the beginning of the 1980-81 school year, faced with the need for urgent budget cuts, the administration took the expedient course of dropping Wr. 120. Upon the recommendation of the English Department Head, the prerequisite was also suspended. Upon reviewing the suspension, ARC recommended that the one-year suspension be allowed to stand and that no further suspension be made and the prerequisite be automatically reactivated in 1981-82. Meanwhile ARC proposes that the following options be explored, if insufficient course sections of Wr. 120 are offered in 1981-82:

-- Allow students to take Wr. 120 at Community Colleges
-- Make available private tutoring opportunities
-- Offer a non-credit course through DCE, for the purpose of raising the TSWE score above 34

Blumel added that the Educational Sub-committee of Ways and Means has discussed the presence of remedial courses at colleges in its consideration of budget reductions. It seems probable that there will be a budget note admonishing the State Board to discontinue remedial course work in universities and colleges. The State Board will have to consider the prerogative of the political intrusion into the academic area. The P.E. service course requirement falls into the same category, and the Chancellor and State Board have argued vigorously. The strongest positions possible against intrusion have been taken in testimony before Ways and Means, the President assured.

3. M. Enneking announced four open meetings to be held this week by representatives of the Legislature from the Portland area, to discuss Governor Atiyeh's revenue proposal. Faculty were urged to attend.

4. Lehman announced the open interviews scheduled for the four candidates for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies this week.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for Administrators

   a. Dean Trudeau, in response to the question of the status of the proposal to establish a Department of Communication, said that the proposal was returned to the Educational Policies Committee and was in a holding pattern awaiting the outcome of the legislative session. He felt there was no point to pursue the matter further at this time.

   In order to add a dimension to Dean Trudeau's remarks, Andries Deinum of the Center for the Moving Image read a few excerpts from Educational Policies Committee reports to the President, dated December 13, 1979, and November 20, 1980, dealing with the reasons for its unanimous rejection of two Arts and Letters proposals for establishing a Department of Communication. The first proposal was returned because it "falls conspicuously short of supplying the information that the Committee would need in order to judge the proposal's worthiness..." The EPC
recommended that a revised proposal make "clear the academic objectives...and the justification..." The second rejection expressed the EPC's disappointment that this proposal again failed "to supply...the information called for in the Office of Academic Affairs preliminary proposal guidelines." The Committee urged that the Dean of Arts and Letters "appoint a small committee charged with developing a (new) proposal." Deinum pointed out that such a committee had not been formed yet, but that he, for one, was eager to serve on it, since he believes that whatever may befall the University, it will need a Communications Department. L. Nussbaum asked if the Senate could establish a committee. M. Enneking answered it could, but the item was out of order.

b. In responding to Professor Howard's question, Vice President Todd said that there are two issues which needed to be addressed:

1. first, there is an assumption in Howard's question that academic-year faculty currently enrolled in the best Blue Cross plan (Plan III) will lose their benefits unless they formally re-enroll in the new Blue Cross Plan or another available State plan and

2. second, there is an assertion that no effort was made to personally notify affected faculty.

No individuals who currently have family coverage on Blue Cross Plan III who did not re-enroll will lose their benefits. The State Employees Benefits Board, which is responsible for contracting for health insurance for persons on academic appointment, initially stipulated that individuals with family coverage on Blue Cross Plan III had to re-enroll in Blue Cross Plan II or in another available State plan. The University Personnel Office has unilaterally worked out an arrangement with Blue Cross to permit the University to automatically transfer those with family coverage on Plan III who did not re-enroll to Plan II effective August 1, 1981. Blue Cross does continue to insist, for legal reasons, that academic employees affirmatively act to re-enroll in a specific plan, but, because of the efforts of the PSU Personnel Office, no one will be without coverage if they did not re-enroll. While the University may ultimately encounter legal problems or problems with a limited few faculty members who did not re-enroll, we are willing to take these risks to insure that academic employees currently on Blue Cross Plan III will have continuous coverage.

On the second issue, Todd said that individual faculty members currently on Blue Cross Plan III who did not re-enroll by May 8, 1981, were contacted individually on May 11, 1981, and again on May 26, 1981. In addition to these individual notifications, information on health benefits had been passed on to all persons on nine-month academic appointments four different times between April 22 and May 4 through memos, bulk mailings and PSU Bulletin articles.

Therefore, information was distributed campus wide, and individual faculty who had not re-enrolled by May 8 were contacted individually. But, regardless of this effort, some faculty still did not re-enroll; the University will automatically transfer this group to the new Blue Cross Plan II.

Todd pointed out that faculty members whose Plan III coverage has been automatically transferred by the University to the new Blue Cross Plan II still could select another of the coverages available if they notify the Personnel Office by July 15, 1981.
c. Vice President Gruber described the criteria used by CADS in making their budget reduction suggestions. In recognition of the mission of the University as an urban institution, CADS reaffirmed these general criteria to guide PSU through the difficult days ahead:

1. The University has always been and should remain a comprehensive institution devoted to the liberal arts tradition characterizing other great institutions of higher learning.

2. The University shall endeavor to protect the quality and diversity provided by the numerous specialized programs and institutes created through the slow and gradual process of growth and maturity since the beginning of the institution.

3. Programs should be judged on the basis of their contribution to the entire educational process and experience and not only on the basis of isolated teachers or criteria.

4. Enrollment growth and decline has always been and will continue to be cyclical, and while an important criterion, should not be the sole measure of the worth or value of academic programs or disciplines.

5. In a serious budgetary retrenchment effort, balance must be maintained to insure that whatever remains of the institution be genuinely a University where quality of education and the enrichment of society through diversity and innovation are viable enterprises.

Gruber explained that he asked each Dean to respond to the request of reduction. The Deans made their presentations to CADS between March and May in terms of program planning and evaluation in response to the Governor's package and the Chancellor's decision package 1, 3, and 4. In that contingency planning, each Dean prepared reductions in terms congruent with the University mission, based on such ideals as "essential, highly desirable, and desirable qualities." Deans in turn had been in touch with department heads during the preparation of their recommendations. Student demands and the University's responsibility to students in the pipeline of existing programs is a priority to be examined very closely, and protection of the faculty, models to conserve existing programs of quality, have also been extensively discussed and are contained in the five items above.

d. President Blumel said that it was not possible to present a preliminary plan for program reduction or financial exigency. That is contingent upon the declaration of a state of financial exigency or condition necessary for program reduction or elimination. He felt that the political circumstances are such that he did not find it possible to make such a declaration. A little more is known now than a month ago. The latest revenue projections for the State are considerably less favorable than had been hoped. This has resulted in a revision by the Governor in his recommended budget which would call for across-the-board reductions of 3 percent below his original recommendations. Ways and Means sub-committees have prepared budget recommendations which have done two things: 1) they have recommended the Governor's original budget and 2) they have recommended cuts below the Governor's original budget equal to 10 percent of the general fund portion of that budget. The outcome depends on the fate of the revenue measures which the Governor has proposed or alternative measures designed to raise sufficient revenue to fund the Governor's budget recommendations. The Revenue Committee of the House has indicated that no clear signals will be forthcoming before late June, therefore the President concluded that it would be inappropriate to make a declaration or to prepare and publish a preliminary plan. On the other hand, the President has received recommendations from the University Budget Committee and reports from the Advisory Council and
Educational Policies Committee and from AAUP. All have been studied. He has also received recommendations from the Vice President relative to potential budget reductions. No further action will be taken until more definitive information is available. A general faculty meeting will be called next week to outline conditions as perceived at this time. The President will also meet with the Budget Committee, should it become necessary to invoke the formal planning process for program reduction or financial exigency, to review a preliminary plan before it is published.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
Kimbell wondered if an ad hoc committee could be appointed to study how enrollment reductions could be accomplished. He suggested that the University accept those students who come but get rid of those who do not perform, thus raising standards not through entrance examinations but by classroom examinations. He wanted the Steering Committee to either appoint a committee or advise the appointment of such a committee. Heath pointed out that the Scholastic Standards Committee has been given the explicit charge of maintaining the academic integrity and reputation of the University and suggested that that committee should be given this problem to discuss. M. Enneking agreed and suggested a motion be made under new business.

Howard wondered when the staggered Senate terms will begin, and Hardt answered that they will start with this year's elections.

As a follow-up to the motion passed at the end of the May meeting, A. Johnson asked whether a committee had been formed to study early retirement options. Blumel replied that it had not been and will not be appointed because it is inconsistent with the requirements of collective bargaining.

ELECTIONS FOR 1981-82

Throughout the meeting, elections were held for officers of the Senate and for the Steering Committee. Five people nominated declined to serve as Presiding Officer. Mary Cumpston was nominated, and it was moved that she be elected by acclamation. The motion carried. Dan Scheans was nominated for Presiding Officer Pro-tem and was elected by acclamation.

Nominations for the Senate Steering Committee included Brooke, Bunch, Chino, Diman, Kirrie, Lehman, and Midson. After two elections, the following were designated as members: Brooke, Diman, Lehman and Midson.

Divisional caucuses resulted in the election of the following members to the Committee on Committees:

2 years
Conroy, AL
Rad, EAS
Patton, HPE
Giachetti, LIB
Bjork, SC
Chino, SSC

1 year
Shimada, BA
Waldroff, DCE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Limbaugh presented the annual report of the University Scholars' Board, and the report was accepted. Karant-Nunn drew to the Senate's attention that the faculty response to lectures of visiting scholars of international stature has been abyssmal. Limbaugh said that attendance at some lectures has been quite good but pointed out that departments have not always responded when they were asked for input at the planning stage. M. Enneking suggested that in these days of tight budgets
departments might look at the lecture series as an opportunity to bring in important scholars.

2. Karant-Nunn presented the annual report of the Advisory Council, and it was accepted.

3. Bentley presented the annual report of Committee on Committees and publicly commended the committee members for their diligent work. The report was accepted. Howard wondered if this year's Committee had fulfilled last year's charge to develop a method of recognizing satisfactory service on University committees. He observed that it should be part of a committee chairperson's duty to report to the Committee on Committees regarding the satisfactory or unsatisfactory service of committee members. Beeson and Bentley replied that the item was discussed several times but not resolved. It will be passed on to next year's Committee as unfinished business.

4. Tuttle presented the annual report of the Educational Policies Committee, and it was accepted.

5. Howard presented the annual report of the Research and Publications Committee. He gave the following update to the written report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total budget approved</th>
<th>$33,740</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support of Library</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research</td>
<td>$31,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heneghan wanted to know if awards went only to people who submitted requests for grants and Howard answered in the affirmative; the only exception was the money for the Library. Mueller asked for a breakdown by division. Howard answered that roughly 2/3 were from the areas of physical and biological sciences and 1/3 from all the other areas combined; the money allocated followed about the same proportion. To Buell's question about how many proposals had been received, Howard replied 34, of which 27 were funded. The report was accepted.

6. Karant-Nunn, speaking for the Advisory Council, offered a constitutional amendment of Article III, Section 1. Midsom clarified the intention of the amendment, which originated in the Academic Requirements Committee, by saying that the amendment basically answers the question of how degree requirements are eliminated. The Faculty Constitution now only specifies how degree requirements are built but not how they are dismantled at a later stage. He cited the Wr. 120 incident and the state legislature's maneuvering to decide what shall and shall not be required for a degree as two examples for the need of having this procedure in writing. Following some discussion, the Advisory Council changed the wording of the amendment in the second sentence as follows: "In an emergency the Academic Requirements Committee and/or the Graduate Council; the Advisory Council, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate shall first be consulted." Chino's editorial addition of "whichever is appropriate" following "Academic Requirements Committee and/or Graduate Council" was ruled inappropriate, but the Secretary was ordered to include the clarifying phrase in these minutes. The constitutional amendment was passed as revised.

7. The Advisory Council presented a constitutional amendment of Article III, Section 3. E. Enneking wondered whether this amendment considered existing departmental guidelines which now may allow different terms of office for department heads or which limit consecutive terms to two. Corn said that it sounds like a conflict, but R. Nussbaum disagreed, saying that the last paragraph of the amendment left things sufficiently open to different interpretations. A. Johnson warned that no amendment could be made today, and reminded the Senate that last month three different attempts at
amendments had failed. Bunch urged the acceptance of the constitutional amendment, saying that it is the result of one year of compromise and discussion between the Advisory Council and the President. Karant-Nunn added that the Advisory Council obtained from the President three major concessions to the faculty: a) reasons for refusing a departmental recommendation will be given in writing b) time limits are set so that no case could drag on c) grievances could be handled through the faculty grievance procedure. R. Nussbaum also felt that the amendment is an improvement over the current wording and that it clearly limits the reasons why a person could be refused when chosen by the department; in the past that has been a cloudy area, and the constitution did not protect against that. Moor agreed that all of the reasons given above would be reasons for adopting the proposed amendment if there were now no clause in the constitution relating to the matter. Nothing has been said to show how the amendment would improve the existing statement, a statement that AAUP is pleased with. If no clause now existed, Moor said he could vote for the newly proposed one. Karant-Nunn reported that the Advisory Council saw the present constitution as ambiguous in relation to specific cases; it not only permitted difficulties to come into being but to continue. Further, it is in conflict with the Administrative Rules of the State of Oregon. Moor replied that there is no question that the Administrative Rules give the ultimate authority of appointing a department head to the President; the Rules do not say, however, that he may not transfer this authority. If the President accepts this Constitution as an official University policy, then he has thereby transferred whatever authority those words transfer. Blumel wanted to point out that he disagreed that there had been a change resulting from the unit determination question. The constitutional amendment was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. The first motion of the Committee on Committees was amended to delete "be designated as an Informal Campus Steering Committee that," and the main motion passed.

The second motion of the Committee on Committees passed.

The third motion was presented. Bentley explained that many groups directly reporting to the Vice President of Finance and Administration are not administrators (e.g., the University Scholars Program and Counselors) and should not be categorized as "Administrative" in the committee structure of the Faculty Governance Guide. The motion passed.

2. R. Nussbaum moved "that the Committee on Committees in consultation with the Advisory Council make it an item of priority to decide whether the present representation on key policy-making committees should not be changed to conform with the representation rules that apply to the Faculty Senate." He felt that the representation just on the basis of schools and entities without regard to the number of people they represent is an unequal representation, especially in important matters like those of the Budget Committee and the Educational Policies Committee. The motion was passed.

3. Sugarman invited the Senators to join him in a round of applause for Marj Enneking for a splendid term as Presiding Officer of the Senate. She in turn gave credit to the Secretary of the Faculty "who really keeps this whole operation going."

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, August 11, 1981
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Enneking
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Abbott, Alberty, Bates, Beeson, Bennett, Bentley, Bingham, Breedlove, Brooke, Bruseau, Bunch, Burden, Chavigny, Chino, Conroy, Dart, Diman, Dressler, Dreyer, Dunbar, E. Enneking, M. Enneking, Giachetti, Hales, Gorg, Heyden, Howard, Johnson, Kimbrell, Kirrie, Lehman, Midson, Moor, Mueller, Muller, Oh, Rad, Scheans, Sugarman, Swanson, Tuttle, Youngelson, White, Williams, Wurm, Wyers.


Members Absent: Tate, Daily, Bierman, Goekjian, Goslin, Heflin, Jenkins, Manning, Patton.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Leu, Morris, Parker, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Dobson.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Fred Waller reported on the present status of Wr. 120 and the pre-requisites for Wr. 121. Because of one-year cuts leveled against the English Department in 1979, Wr. 120 was suspended for the year. At that time it was recommended that Wr. 120 be put back into the schedule for 1980-81; in fact, eleven sections of the course were included in the original schedule submitted for 1980-81. However, new cuts of the English Department made it impossible to offer the course. The Ways and Means Sub-committee on Education in the meantime recommended a ten percent reduction which included a note to the effect that the Board of Higher Education should consider the imposition of admission standards based on student qualifications for specific enrollments in those programs of levels consistent with resources available to them. It is anticipated that remedial classes in mathematics and English will be eliminated in 1982-83. On June 29 and 30 Heath, Waller, Holloway and others met to discuss the Wr. 120 problem, to explore the problem itself and the alternatives by which it might be met. On July 1, Dean Heath wrote the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the chairperson of the Advisory Council and the Academic Requirements Committee "...that the Department of English will not offer Wr. 120 during 1981-82 or in future years." He added that the requirement adopted by the Senate in January 1978 that students must attain a minimum score of 35 on the Test of Standard Written English or pass Wr. 120 before being allowed to enroll in Wr. 121 remains unchanged. The decision not to offer Wr. 120 was influenced by two considerations: 1) the need to reduce the University budget for 1981-82, and 2) the strong sentiment expressed in the State legislature that by 1982-83 higher education offer remedial courses only as such courses are self-supportive. The English Department will assist students who do not attain the prescribed score of 35 on TSWE, to identify ways by which they may qualify to take Wr. 121. Some of the possibilities of doing that were identified in Midson's ARC memorandum of April 24, 1981, to Vice President Gruber. The Department has proposed a
non-credit Wr. 40 Basic Writing Skills class through DCE at the cost of about $25 for students; the course would consist of one large section using exercises and short quizzes to review basic skills in English grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word usage. Also proposed had been a Writing Workshop through the Department's own TBA funds, but those funds were just recently cut. Waller concluded that the Department and University needs to look at the requirements for admission to Wr. 121; those requirements were instituted when both Wr. 120 and 121 could be offered.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

1. White distributed the Summer Session enrollment report and pointed out that there was a 4.7 percent increase at this point over Summer Session 1980 -- the only Summer Session in the State showing an increase.

2. M. Enneking announced that Fred Waller had been elected to serve on the Inter-institutional Senate.

3. Sugarman reported that he (for IFS) and Morris (for AAUP) testified before the State Board of Higher Education on August 7 in opposition to a recommendation to the Board by the staff that a third type of appointment be added to the Administrative Rules, in addition to the fixed term and tenure-related appointments. The "extendable contract" was presented to meet an emergency in the collective bargaining procedure at SOSC where it is difficult to attract good candidates because of a limited number of tenure-related appointments available. Both sides in the collective bargaining at SOSC agreed to support the idea of an extendable contract, a three-year contract that after the first year can be extended indefinitely year after year with no apparent end. Sugarman and Morris opposed the idea because this was not an emergency requiring hasty action by the Board, because the recommendation did not place temporary limits on it, and because this administrative change could affect all the colleges and universities in the State. They felt that this recommendation was not merely an addition to the number of types of contracts available but actually an attack on tenure. The Board responded that it did not require the universities to use the extendable contract but merely made it permissive. Sugarman felt that Mr. Perry on the Board attacked tenure and, all its negative aspects. Another member felt that minority faculty are not treated equitably in the tenure system and the extendable contract would represent an opportunity for minority members of faculties. President Olum of UO made a strong statement in support of tenure and said that the University would not touch the extendable contract. Mr. Petersen of the Board offered a compromise proposal that applied only to SOSC, and the Board voted 6 to 4 to support the compromise which will be brought to the Board for final approval. Bunch asked what the PSU administration's stand had been on this proposal. Blumel responded that PSU did not testify on the proposal; his position was that the new option would not be used at PSU, because we would not be able to attract a high quality faculty under that kind of system. Hales asked if this was a temporary or indefinite approval. Sugarman said that the proposal asked for temporary approval, but he felt that there was a strong intention to make it permanent.

4. Heath reported that Institutional Research has looked at the possibility of using the computer to restrict enrollment to a maximum of 21 hours for undergraduates and 16 hours for graduates. Overloads from 22 to 25 hours require an advisor's signature, and loads over 26 hours must be approved by the ARC. The computer is now programmed to lock out any undergraduates taking more than 21 hours, unless they have prior approval on file before registration. Faculty were asked to inform advisees of this new development. A. Johnson asked Heath to comment on the PCC and PSU combination where students have taken 30 to 40 hours. Heath said that some students have taken 18 hours at PSU and 18 hours at community colleges or other
4-year institutions. When they present those credits for graduation, their credits will be challenged, unless they have the proper documentation on file. Obviously we cannot control concurrent enrollment in more than one college, but credits so earned must be approved by the advisor, or the ARC, or the Graduate Council. He emphasized that DCE is PSU and counts as such on transcripts. The question was raised whether this computer system could be over-ridden on drop/add day. Heath responded that it will take a period of time to catch an overload created on that day, but the computer will reject such a registration. He also admonished that students should not register for more than 21 hours in "shopping" for classes, because the computer will throw out courses according to its programmed priorities.

5. Blumel announced that the legislature adopted a budget for Higher Education the first year of the biennium. He recalled the following events: When it became apparent that there would be serious revenue problems after the Governor's original budget proposal, the Ways and Means Committee adopted a budget report containing a list of budget cuts 10 percent below the Governor's recommended level. The impact of that on Higher Education would have been a $30.6 million cut for the biennium. Restorations from that level of cuts returned $19.8 million to the System. The impact on PSU of these reductions for this year follow.

The Governor's original budget adjustment
required a cut at PSU of $1,069,822

The Governor's revised recommendation following the revised revenue forecasts cut an additional 3 percent or $317,766

Figure on which we based our original budget this year $1,387,588

Additional legislative cut $100,000

Underrealized indirect cost recoveries $300,000

1981-82 budget reduction figure $1,787,588

One other element related to legislative action is that the amount appropriated for salary and fringe benefits underfunds fringe benefits (the cost of medical and dental benefits) by an estimated $300,000 for this year. PSU must find ways of saving that amount through various ways, such as wage savings, temporary leave salaries, and energy savings. Blumel said that the University put the 1981-82 budget together with that level of reduction and was able to do that, as was the objective all along, without requiring the termination of any person on tenure or tenure-track. Positions lost were vacant positions which were taken out of the budget; only those positions were eliminated that would not cause serious program disruption. A limited number of fixed-term positions will not be renewed. Further, OAA does not have the usual undistributed instructional resources amount used for lectureships and extra sections.

Blumel commented that the legislature approved a one-year budget with the instructions to the Department of Higher Education that it come back, either to the Emergency Board or to a special session of the legislative assembly, next spring with a budget plan for 1982-83 which regularizes or restructures the System of Higher Education and the institutions to accommodate to a lower level of on-going funding. That means that we must come back with a plan of program reductions or elimination to accommodate on a permanent basis the budget reductions which are
expected to be on-going. Various faculty committees have been discussing this problem and are preparing guidelines. The President is required by the terms of the retrenchment policy to present a preliminary plan. This plan will be presented on September 16 at an opening meeting of the faculty in the hope that the remainder of that week will be devoted to discussions by departments, schools and colleges of that preliminary plan and its implications. The outcomes of these discussions and reviews must be submitted to the State Board of Higher Education for their action, because any program elimination will require Board action. The Committee on Instruction meets in November and the full Board in December. The consolidated State System plan should be submitted to the legislature no later than March 15.

Blumel suggested that given the magnitude of the problems, we ought to be grateful that we did not have to terminate people on short notice. Many of the worst scenarios we talked about earlier in this year really did happen. A. Johnson asked for elaboration of the magnitude of the problem for the next year, and Blumel answered that we already know that the general fund appropriation to the System of Higher Education is $2 million less in the second year of the biennium than in the first. This reduction can be made up by other revenues, such as tuition, but the emphasis will be on program reduction and elimination. E. Enneking asked if the 6 percent salary increase package was subject to collective bargaining, and Sugarman wanted to know if merit increases are also affected by collective bargaining. Blumel answered that both were and could not be discussed in this context. A. Johnson wanted to know what the impact of no extra section money would be. Blumel pointed out that he had not said that no extra section money was available; there is LVOP vacant position, and sabbatical money, but there is no additional money from OAA. The impact of that will be that fewer sections and courses will be offered and enrollment will be affected. There are other contingency problems. If the State's general fund revenue forecast should be negative again, then we have potential problems of further cuts. The same could happen if the State's tuition income is less than projected.

NEW BUSINESS

Midson presented the motion that PSU undergraduate admissions be modified as indicated. A. Johnson wanted to know how many students would have been affected this year by a high school GPA raised to 2.5. Forbes estimated 125 but said that some of those could have entered under special admissions categories, e.g., the combined SAT score of 890. Westbrook wanted to know if that group of 125 was a particular ethnic group. Forbes said that we do not have information on ethnic background at this time, but that changes were held to a minimum because we did not have that kind of information. For instance, the GED was held at 55, because a majority of minority and non-traditional students have used this test to enter PSU, and even a slight change would affect large numbers. Section I, "Freshman Resident," was passed.

Howard wondered if transferred courses which carry a grade of D are used to figure the cumulative GPA, and Heath said only if students are considered for honors. Petrie observed that not transferring in courses with a D grade becomes a financial penalty and wondered about the legality of it, since D is a passing grade. M. Enneking pointed out that this kind of policy exists currently in PSU's graduate program, thus precedence exists. White recalled that this issue had been discussed thoroughly years ago when it was voted to accept transferred D grades, to preserve the relationship between schools. He warned against accepting PSU D grades but rejecting those from other accredited schools. Heath pointed out that the Senate last year approved a request from Engineering not to allow D to be transferred in. This was at the request of the Accrediting Association. The argument used was that students were not ready to proceed to the next level of work and should
repeat the course. Dunbar reported that many transfer students are shocked when they find out PSU accepts D's. Beeson observed that D's from community colleges are not very acceptable grades. Section 3 was passed.

Section 5 was passed.

Addressing Section 7, Brooke expressed concern that many foreign students after meeting the TOEFL entry requirement either stagnate or decline in their use of English. He suggested that we think of another step in which foreign students show that they have improved after entry at PSU. Rad wanted to know why the GPA of 2.25 had not been increased. Forbes pointed out that foreign students ought not to be treated differently than domestic students and the 525 score on TOEFL will be a better indicator of student ability than increasing the GPA from 2.25 to 2.50. Heath reminded the Senate that the 525 score is an increase from 500, and it goes into effect this fall. Section 7 was passed.

Howard urged that a similar kind of examination should be made in order to upgrade the retention requirements. Heath reported that the Scholastic Standards Committee has been given that assignment for the fall.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: Academic Requirements Committee

July 27, 1981

Proposed Changes to Degree Requirements

The Academic Requirements Committee proposes the following motions to the Faculty Senate regarding the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements:

1. That the minimum number of credits earned at four-year institutions be 93. (The current requirement is 78)

2. That the maximum number of credits transferred from regionally accredited two-year institutions be eliminated. (The current limit is 108)

3. That the minimum number of upper division (300- and 400-level) credits be 72. (The current requirement is 62)

These requirements will apply to students first admitted to a four-year institution of higher education in Fall 1982 or later.

Comments

1. The present requirement of 78 credits from a 4-year institution is considered to be insufficient. 93 is proposed, it being one-half of the 186 needed for graduation, the rationale being that 2 years of a 4-year program should be at a 4-year institution.

2. It is preferable to eliminate the two-year institution maximum limitation rather than reset a new maximum down from 108. A stated maximum is redundant as an effective limit of 93 is implied by the above 4-year institution requirement. This allows a competent student to spend two full years at a 2-year institution, to earn and transfer more than 93 credits, and to use those beyond the 93 to satisfy distribution credit, major concentration, etc.

3. In ARC's opinion, 62 upper division credits, being only 33% of the total, is too few. While 50% would be an excessive demand, the intermediate figure of 72 credits (approximately 40%) seems most appropriate. It is divisible by the usual course credit value: 3. The increase is equivalent to a change of one course per term at upper division rather than lower division over 3 terms.

Departments and colleges were polled on this question. The vast majority either were strongly in favor of an increase or had no objection. An analysis by ARC of data supplied by Institutional Research indicates that a majority of graduating students already have well over 72 upper division credits.
AAUP BUDGET REDUCTION RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendations were transmitted to President Joseph C. Blumel by the Executive Council of the PSU-AAUP in response to the President's preliminary plan for institutional budget cuts. We ask the Faculty Senate for its support of these recommendations:

1. Considering its responsibilities toward the faculty, the students and the viability of Portland State University, PSU-AAUP rejects President Blumel's proposed plan for reduction and elimination of academic programs as a means to meet the drastic reductions in the budget. We consider the proposed self-mutilation of our university to be lacking in justification and thus to be premature. We formally ask that the declaration of exigency be rescinded. The Department of Higher Education has not complied with the directive from the Legislature to base a long range plan for retrenchment on a thorough systemwide analysis of educational resources, demographic distribution of needs and fiscal constraints. We concur with this legislative directive as a responsible, rational and equitable process in the face of a persistent shortage of state revenue. Such an unbiased outside review of the state system, followed by a plan for program reduction, elimination and relocation should precede a declaration of financial exigency and proposed irreversible cuts at any one institution.

2. In view of the fact that early and partial retirements are, in many cases, of great value to the university, PSU-AAUP proposes that the administration reconsider its early retirement plan in order to bring the incentives more in line with those at comparable institutions.

In any case, the university should provide to faculty members eligible to retire, specific information concerning the effects of early and phased retirement. Comprehensive financial counseling should be made available and each eligible person should be provided with a detailed chart showing the likely effects of inflation on the real income of retired persons. These projections should be supplemented by records of the declines in real income suffered by PSU faculty who retired 5, 10, and 15 years ago.

3. PSU-AAUP urges the administration to take the necessary steps, in concert with other institutional executives, toward removal of legal and administrative barriers, thereby permitting:

   a. persons partially retired on 0.33 FTE appointments to remain members of medical/dental groups,

   b. the institution to contribute to insurance premiums,

   c. tuition benefits to be provided to dependents of retired and terminated faculty.
Advisory Council Meeting, Thursday, September 24, 1981

Motion 1

The Advisory Council recommends the following motion to the Faculty Senate for its approval:

We, the Portland State University Faculty Senate, urge that, in cases of departments that are, in the President's final plan, to be eliminated or assigned a cut that cannot be accomplished immediately without layoffs, the President accept from such departments plans that would commit them to accomplish the reduction over a period of relatively few years, even if the delay should require temporary restrictions on hiring in other units.

Motion 2

The Advisory Council recommends the following motion to the Faculty Senate for its approval:

A. In view of the fact that early and partial retirements are, in many cases, of great value to the University, the Faculty Senate proposes that the Administration reconsider its early retirement plan in order to bring the incentives more in line with those at comparable institutions.

In any case, the University should provide to faculty members eligible to retire, specific information concerning the effects of early and phased retirement. Comprehensive financial counseling should be made available and each eligible person should be provided with a detailed chart showing the likely effects of inflation on the real income of retired persons. These projections should be supplemented by records of the declines in real income suffered by PSU faculty who retired 5, 10, and 15 years ago.

B. The Faculty Senate urges the Administration to take the necessary steps, in concert with other institutional executives, toward removal of legal and administrative barriers, thereby permitting:

1. persons partially retired on 0.33 FTE appointments to remain members of medical/dental groups,
2. the institution to contribute to insurance premiums,
3. tuition benefits to be provided to dependents of retired and terminated faculty.

[Signature]
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