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The Senate will hold its regular meeting on Monday, May 4, 1981, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 CH.

Agenda:

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 6 and 13, 1981, Senate Meetings

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

   a. Question to President Blumel (submitted by the Senate Steering Committee):

   "We understand that the University of Oregon has implemented a new early retirement incentive program of which several faculty members have taken advantage. How do PSU's early retirement incentives compare with those of UO? What specific steps is the administration taking to implement similar incentives at PSU at the earliest possible date?"

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of the Administration and Committees

   *1. Budget Committee Annual Report-- Brenner

   *2. University Athletics Board Annual Report--Lockwood

   *3. University Scholars Board Annual Report--Limbaugh

   *4. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report--Rose

F. Unfinished Business

   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 1), First Reading-- Midson

   *2. Proposed Constitutional Amendment (Article III, Section 3), First Reading--Karant-Nunn

G. New Business

   *1. Challenge Program Recommendation--Tosi

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:

B Minutes of the April 6 and 13, 1981, Senate Meetings

E1 Budget Committee Annual Report**

E2 University Athletics Board Annual Report**

E3 University Scholars Board Annual Report**

E4 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report**

F1 Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1**

F2 Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 3**

G1 Challenge Program Recommendation

Senators unable to attend the meeting should pass this mailing on to their alternates.
Minutes:
Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 1981
Presiding Officer: Marjorie Enneking
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: DeGraaf for Giachetti, Courtney for Brooke, Male for Burden, Westbrook for Burns, Chapman for Dueker, Parshall for L. Nussbaum (part of meeting).

Members Absent: Alexander, Clark, Dreyer, Feldesman, Heyden, Manning, Muller, White.

Ex-officio Members Blumel, Corn, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Gard, Gruber, Hardt, Heath, Hoffman, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, Parker, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Van't Slot.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Howard and Erzurumlu were present at the March 2 Senate meeting, and Howard's question for the chair (p. 21) was concerning the Committee on Committees' recommendations regarding all University committees, made last spring.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Karant-Nunn reported that the Advisory Council had written a letter to the State Board of Higher Education and that a reply from Edward Harms was on file in the Secretary's office.

M. Enneking announced that the next meeting of the all-University committee chairs would be held on Thursday, April 16, at noon in 230 SMC.

Gard reminded the Senate that the 1981 Condon Lecture would be delivered by Dr. Ruddell, internationally known authority on cell biology.

Leu announced that three $1000 graduate scholarships in Education will be available in honor of Dr. Elizabeth Drews.

The "quality of life" program was announced for April 8, with Dr. Grams speaking on the topic "Who Rules the University?"

Bentley urged the immediate return of the Committee on Committees' survey regarding service on committee preference.
1. The Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee was accepted. Referring to #13, Tuttle asked how many students were involved, and Midson replied not many. Buell wanted to know the rationale behind increasing the TOEFL score from 500 to 525. Midson said it was an effort to raise the standard of general education, particularly with students who had language difficulty. Heath added that CADS made the request for the increased TOEFL score after hearing many complaints by PSU faculty that foreign students could not do the required work. Students scoring below 525 will be placed into the ESL program if space allows.

2. The Annual Report of the Committee on Effective Teaching was accepted. Midson inquired how the total amount of dollars available was determined, and Heath responded that last year's allocations were essentially used, in spite of the budget cuts.

3. The Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee was accepted. Yorks emphasized that most of the Committee's work was concerned with disciplinary procedures, and that the Committee responded to student requests as an advocate of students. He wondered if the procedures in the Student Conduct Code specifying Hearing Panel selections would be adequate should student complaints increase significantly. Williams, however, pointed out that of the eighteen disciplinary cases, only one has asked for a hearing so far.

4. Brenner gave what he termed the "second interim report" of the Budget Committee, pointing out that the Committee's final decisions on recommendations for the nature of program reductions would not be made for two or three weeks. A subcommittee has written a draft for discussion purposes within the full Committee whose members are now discussing the criteria for program eliminations and the nature of specific cuts. A second draft is not expected for two weeks. All scenario selections and rankings are being discussed thoroughly. He reported that the Budget Committee had received only a few reactions following his report at the March Senate meeting, and he pointed out that there was no conspiracy against Arts and Letters or Sciences, because the value weights assigned to them and the professional schools were so close. He presented the following chart to show the nature of reductions, instruction vs. non-instruction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL CUT/YR.</th>
<th>INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NON-INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 1 M</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brenner said that $1 - 6 million were the only cuts being considered, and that cuts beyond $6 million were unlikely. He also pointed out that the plan protects more of the non-instruction area, because those funds have always been cut first and services are threatened. He talked in terms of three types of reduction within instruction and explained how they would be balanced. a) Find as many dollars as possible of "specific cuts" which do not involve layoffs or serious program quality deterioration (e.g., move department heads from 12 to 9 months). b) Use "program eliminations" at each level of cut, focusing on the program's nature vs. the University's mission. c) Allocate the "general cuts" to the rest of the departments on a selective basis, using growth projection as the major criterion. Three aspects of growth were turned into criteria: pure growth (student FTE growth), student growth vs. faculty growth, and workload (actual student/faculty ratio vs. standard ratio established in 1973-74).

Brenner presented the following visual to illustrate the general cut criteria implementation:

- **Pure Growth**
- **Student Growth vs. Faculty Growth**
- **Workload S/F Ratio vs. Standard**

**6 Groups Score 1 to 6**

**6 Groups Score 1 to 6**

**6 Groups Score 1 to 6**

**Composite Score 3 to 18**

**Create 4 Groups**

Scores: 3 to 7 Most protected
8 to 10
11 to 13
14 to 18 Least protected

* Groups were determined to equalize $ per group
As the overall size of the budget reduction increases, the groups are phased in, starting with the least protected group first. At each $1 million more of reduction, another group is phased in. The final number of groups has not been determined.

The work remaining to be done by the Budget Committee is the establishment of program elimination criteria, determination of program eliminations and at what levels they occur, and specific recommendations for non-instructional reduction. Brenner summarized his report by saying that the Budget Committee is taking its job very seriously and has attempted to take the most University-wide view possible. At this point the Committee favors program elimination over across-the-board cuts, and it wants to protect the Library and Computer Center. He emphasized that input to the Committee should be given immediately. Gard asked how program was defined and Brenner replied that the Committee had consulted with Corn who had said that program could be units, departments, or units within departments. Ross wanted to know if there will be any qualitative evaluation of programs or if the Committee is looking at dollars only. Brenner replied that the Committee assumed that all programs are good; he doubted if any program coordinator would step forward and identify his/her program as mediocre. Ross urged that at the university level one ought to ask what the University should look like. The market concept is not sufficient; one must consider quality. Toulan added that graduate programs, especially Ph.D. programs, must be treated differently; reductions cannot be done statistically. Brenner reiterated that the growth scenario seems to be the best at this time. Gard pointed out that indirect cost recovery ought to be considered, and Brenner agreed, emphasizing that cuts at the various levels are really minimal. Youngelson wanted to know if minimal levels would be considered, and Brenner reassured that all cuts will be carefully looked at before final plans are made. Gard suggested that the 1979-80 student/faculty ratio would have been better to use rather than the 1973-74, and Buell said that a formula must be found that does not make the plump plumper and the lean leaner. Hales pointed out that the University has grown since 1973-74 and now included new Ph.D. programs whose student/faculty ratio must be considered. At this point Karant-Nunn said it should be remembered that the Budget Committee is rendering advice to the President; it is not making decisions, but Kimbrell added that we live in danger that the President will take the Committee's advice. Bunch said he was pleased with getting this kind of detailed information on the financial picture of the University and urged Senators to give input to the Budget Committee, as requested by Brenner.

5. Pointing out that the Advisory Council is not made up of representatives from all divisions of the University, Karant-Nunn said it was therefore not surprising that the thrust of the Council's discussion should be different from the Budget Committee's -- philosophical rather than statistical. Above all the Council thinks that it should ask what a university is, and it has discussed the following points with the President:

a. First and foremost, totally and perpetually, the Library must be spared (books, journals, bindings, services).
b. If program reductions become necessary, retain those that
   - constitute a part of the traditional liberal arts curriculum
     without which the University is not a university,
   - currently respond to sizeable and proven needs of the
     community,
   - maintain a high quality of instruction,
   - bring PSU national renown, and
   - meet a reasonable standard of cost effectiveness.

c. If cuts have to be made, they and their effects should be pointed
   out visibly to the public (e.g., no commencement exercises, no
   cosmetic building upkeep).

d. Dismissal of faculty and administrators should be in proportionate
   percentages.

e. All employees should be given options of taking vacations.

f. Faculty should be allowed to reduce FTE voluntarily.

g. The University should gain publicity and inform the public.

h. The PSU Foundation should launch an energetic fund-raising campaign
   to pick up the slack.

i. Alumni should be built up in order to lend more support.

Daily asked whether the Council had talked about having the entire faculty
go to Salem, short of a strike, and Karant-Nunn said it had not been
considered. E. Enneking asked what the effects would be if PSU made the
crisis look worse than OSU or UO did. Blumel replied that PSU is
inevitably more public because of collective bargaining. He had to write
the letter of early warning; he had to go to the SBHE and consult with
them regarding the declaration of exigency and program elimination. Even
raising the possibility changes the sense under which the institution
operates. The other schools would rather not raise questions, because
the very fact of raising them damages the schools. The President pointed
out that he had taken the preliminary steps and had asked for discussion
at the March Senate meeting. So far he has received specific recommenda­
tions only from the AAUP, and those verbally. He again asked for input
from the Senate. Swanson wanted to know if PSU would be more hurt than
the other universities, and Blumel replied that the Chancellor says all
will be hurt equally. Kimbrell asked whether exigency was the same as
bankruptcy. Blumel said that exigency meant not having the money to
fulfill the contractual obligations. He said that there had not been
enough discussion of the effects of declaring exigency and that we needed
to talk of the impact on students and the long-term impact on society.
Johnson pointed out that during the last five years PSU faculty have bent
over backwards to serve all students, and Blumel observed that the funding
formula used is self-defeating; now because of reduced funding we must
serve reduced numbers of students. Midson asked if the President, after
identifying the areas of cuts, would go public with them before declaring exigency. Blumel replied that the collective bargaining plan did not allow that. He also indicated that he needed the advice from the Advisory Council, Budget Committee, Council of Academic Deans, and the Educational Policies Committee before a decision is made. Buell wanted to know when the legislature is likely to give its final word on the biennium budget. Blumel thought in late May or June, which makes maximum faculty input impossible. M. Enneking said it was important that we hear all committee reports on this issue so that the faculty will be informed before votes are necessary on whether to declare exigency now or later. Beeson asked if a detailed PSU plan for retrenchment would be viewed as a target of opportunity.

6. In the interest of time, Tuttle summarized the Educational Policies Committee's report to the President on budget reductions. It is here given in its entirety.

---

Report to President Blumel on Budget Reductions

April 1, 1981

Introduction

The Educational Policies Committee's chief concern is with long-range educational policy and with recommendations and procedures for the short-run, insofar as they are seen from the perspective of our mission and insofar as they appear to move us toward or away from our long-range goals.

We see our missions and goals from the point of view of The Portland State University Guidelines, as interpreted in the light of common sense and of the role of the university in our society.

We feel compelled to declare at outset that every opportunity must be taken to state cogently and forcefully to the public and its representatives that this university has never been afforded the funds necessary to fulfill the responsibility it has been given to bear, and to communicate our serious concern at being asked to do the job we are professionally committed to with even less adequate support than before.

The recommendations, evaluations, and observations that we make in what follows do not address by any means all aspects of the impending budgetary crisis. Some of our statements may seem to state the obvious, and some may seem to deal with matters that are too narrow or too distant to have individually any great impact on the immediate problem. But we believe that they reflect guiding principals useful in judging the long-range educational desirability of short-range acts.

Ranking of Educational Values

Since the end of last November, the Educational Policies Committee has devoted its weekly meetings to discussing what would make a long list of wide-ranging values and actions. All of the values discussed most frequently, most intensively, and sometimes most heatedly appear on the list of ten values offered as
Exhibit 4 in the Budget Committee's statement presented at the March Faculty Senate meeting. In the following table, rankings of those values by the Budget Committee are based on its assigned weights; rankings by the Educational Policies Committee reflect an averaging of the rankings made by nine of eleven voting members. The selected comments that follow reflect strongly expressed reservations or qualifications, some of which, e.g., the fear of discriminating against diversity, will reappear in statements further along in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Committee Ranking</th>
<th>FINAL BUDGET GOALS AND VALUES LIST (Budget Committee Interim Report)</th>
<th>Educational Policies Committee Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) Provide programs in arts and sciences that are generally recognized as essential to a university.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2) Provide programs in selected professional fields.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3) Offer programs and services which meet the needs and demands of our urban constituency.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>(4) Strive to maintain and improve the quality of academic programs.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(5) Provide graduate and doctoral programs which meet state, regional, and national needs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6) Engage in research and creative activities in all academic areas of the university.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(7) Provide cultural and recreational events for both the University and surrounding communities.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8) Attract a diverse group of quality students.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>(9) Maintain and attract quality faculty and staff by adequate compensation and support services.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(10) Continue the progress made toward achieving affirmative action goals.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, based on E.P.C. discussions of these and related values:

*(1) A minority of the committee leans toward shifting more of our lower-division, undergraduate responsibility to the community colleges.

(2) A majority of the committee believes that our stated goal of diversity and breadth would not be best served by a vocational orientation.

(3) Discussion of our urban mission has stressed not only programs with an urban focus, but also our responsibility to the diverse needs of a large constituency of part-time and special students of all ages and differing backgrounds.

*These numbers correlate with the numbers of the FINAL BUDGET GOALS AND VALUES LIST
(4) Academic quality must be measured not only in terms of the conventional standards for individual programs, but also in terms of how well we meet the diverse needs of the students.

(5) Graduate programs should be expected to meet high standards of quality and reasonable measures of productivity.

(6) No one questions the importance of this value; strong reservations have been expressed about the use of "publication" as a measure of performance.

(7) Not discussed.

(8) See comments on (1), (2), and (3). There has been strong expression of the fear that we might be tempted to discriminate against low-credit registrants through changes in scheduling practices.

(9) A minority feels that the greater risk of long-term damage to educational quality comes from continued, even accelerated, erosion of faculty income and support services, rather than from loss of staff through selective program reduction.

(10) The majority feels that affirmative action goals, unlike the other values on the list, now have legal protection, and that this value, important as it is, is not really comparable to the others.

Among the values it has discussed that are not on the foregoing list, one that the Committee has returned to several times is the value represented by our library collections. Our distress at the cuts made in the Library budget last fall was partly relieved by the partial restorations made during winter term. We did not attempt to rank the library among the foregoing values, but if we had it would certainly have been placed very high, and we strongly recommend against further reductions that interfere with building our holdings.

Because we have no more details of the Budget Committee's proposed priority process than were presented to the Faculty Senate, the Educational Policies Committee is unable to comment further on that process, except to express its admiration for the Budget Committee's success in having been able to commit itself to such a clear set of premises and conclusions.

On Long-Range Prospects

All members of the Educational Policies Committee have had constantly in mind the knowledge that steps taken to deal with large budget reductions can, without our realizing it, change forever the shape of the University. Thus, from the standpoint of long-range educational policy, judgments made about priorities under the pressure for immediate decisions must not be seen as definitive of long-range policy, even though made with as much care as time permits. Judgment even more carefully made must guide the actions that will be made possible by the eventual restoration of funding. We recommend reaffirmation of The Guidelines as the basis for the continued development of the University.
Financial Exigency and Planned Program Reduction

This committee has neither the data nor the expert advice required to enable it to identify the precise circumstances and the exact levels of budget reduction that would necessitate declarations under these two conditions. We also realize that decisions will have to be made finally on hypothetical bases.

Even though our recommendations of December 11 proved in some respects to be premature, we believe their principle premise is sound and relevant to our continuing situation, and so we repeat it:

> We believe that essentiality (of programs and services) is determined at this time by our moral obligation to allow presently enrolled students to continue in their chosen educational paths, as provided for in the University catalog, or to give them fair warning of any inescapable need to change their direction.

We believe that commitments we have made through our instructional programs must be given the highest priority, and that our justification as an educational enterprise rests upon our combination of students, creative and scholarly teachers, library, and physical facilities. We recommend against eliminating any significant part of our instructional program as an alternative to giving timely notice to faculty not contributing to that enterprise; but we strongly recommend, otherwise, taking the strongest measures to avoid declaring financial exigency at all, including such last resort methods as these:

1) Nine month appointments for department heads and possibly some other administrators;

2) Faculty load increased (but absolutely limited to the first year of the biennium);

3) Salary reduction.

On the matter of salary reduction, we urge that a strong argument be presented to the Board and the Legislature for expressing it as deferred compensation.

We recommend also a reasonable application of the principle of student and community demand. Demand is fickle. Yet any program that posits job placement as a principal goal, but that enrolls and places few students, ought to be closely scrutinized.

Enrollment Limitations

In contemplating enrollment limitations, the Committee has kept in mind the special nature of the University's urban clientele, and of its policy of responding to a diversity of student needs. We recommend that highest priority be given to admitted students continuing in their programs; that the next highest priority be given, first, to students transferring from community colleges and, second, to transfers from other colleges and universities; and that lowest priority be given to entering freshmen, admitted first come, first served. We recommend against raising the entrance GPA.
This recommendation has an apparent implication that needs comment. These priorities are for the short-term only. We do not intend to imply that we favor shifting the lower-division program to the community colleges. We do, however, insist on our program commitments to presently admitted students.

In recommending that we continue to admit freshmen under present GPA requirements, we acknowledge our continuing responsibility to provide opportunities for demanding preparatory and remedial work in some areas. We recommend that this work pay its own way by means of an arrangement through D.C.E.

We want nothing we say here to be construed as suggesting any relaxing of the expectation of the highest quality of performance by students once admitted. As for quality, it is an important criterion for determining program priorities. But the conventional measures of program quality are not the sole measures of the quality of University. The quality of the University rests in part on the extent to which we meet, with a variety of high quality programs, the diverse needs of the community.

Other Measures

During discussions, Committee members have raised from time to time several measures that could have more or less impact on the cost of higher education. These include extending the principal of differential tuition; serious review, perhaps by the Curriculum Committee or by a Select Committee, of course duplication and overlap; establishing equitable standards for faculty loads; initiating and implementing a policy on early and partial retirement; reorganizing the academic structure of the University.

No topic has recurred more often in our discussions than that of the need for the most vigorous and sophisticated program to carry Portland State's message to the community and to the state. We believe the faculty can do more than it has been asked to do, and more than anyone else, to give that message strength, first through its productivity in the classroom, the laboratory, the study and the studio; and then, importantly, as voices speaking for the University in every available medium and forum. Only by this means can we gain the support from private resources that the modern public university must have to be truly effective.

Educational Policies Committee

Gerald Blake, Urban Affairs
Oma Blankenship, Health & Physical Education
Michael Carl, Education
John Dart, Geography
Roger Moseley, Management
Thom Neff, Engineering & Applied Science
Guido Pinamonti, Social Work
Walter Shold, Division of Continuing Education
Robert Tuttle, English, Chairperson
Robert VanAtta, Earth Sciences
Robert Walker, Television Services
7. Lovell, chairperson of the AAUP Budget Committee, showed four graphs to illustrate the budgetary structure of PSU and the effects of various cuts on that structure. He also distributed the detailed report which follows the graphs.
FACULTY IMPACT...

$1,000,000 = 16.6 F.T.E.
1% = 6.3 F.T.E
3% = 18.9 F.T.E
6% = 38 F.T.E.
10% = 63 F.T.E.

VACANCIES 2/10/81 = 28.7 F.T.E.

ASSUMES; $36,000,000 BASE, 50-60% TEACHING

FACULTY @ $23,000 + 0.28% = $30,000
REPORT OF THE AAUP BUDGET COMMITTEE: Hugh Lovell (Chairman), Marvin Beeson, Oma Blankenship, Nathan Cogan, John Hammond, Joseph Kohut, Jane Kristof, John Lind, Don Moor, Shripad Tuljapurkar, Elaine Spencer, Howard Widdowson, and David Wrench

April 2, 1981

1. The present financial problem has brought about an unprecedented amount of communication between the faculty and the administration. In the process many faculty members have been involved in detailed study of budget and other documents of which they were previously unaware. We believe that the University as a whole will benefit from the increased level of faculty understanding of budgetary and policy issues, that it should not be limited to periods of financial entrenchment, but should become a permanent feature of University life.

2. The AAUP Budget Committee spent most of the time at its disposal in an effort to define and weigh the goals and values which it believes should govern the retrenchment process. The attachment to this report lists the various goals and values which we identified, and groups them into seven major categories.

   ACADEMIC QUALITY - 21.4%  
   UNIVERSITY CHARACTER - 6.8%  
   STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES - 11.1%  
   MORALE - 31.5%  
   MANPOWER NEEDS - 9.3%  
   DEMAND - 8.1%  
   OTHER GOALS - 11.7%

3. The PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement provides that layoffs within a department are to be made in inverse order of seniority except as modified (a) to insure "the ability of the remaining faculty to meet adequately the needs of the department, including the need for various areas of specialization" and (b) to comply "with the University's Affirmative Action Program and goals."

The AAUP Budget Committee believes that the departmental faculty is the body best qualified to judge the department's needs, including the need for specialization. However, the fact that a decision to lay off a particular person is recommended by his or her department does not necessarily mean that the decision is fair, or just, or in conformity with the requirements of the University as a whole. We believe that the administration should review departmental recommendations with this in mind, and that the Association be prepared to assist appeals against unjust decisions at either level as provided by Article 19 of the Agreement.

4. We make the following specific recommendations:

   a. Adequate notice. By this we mean notice during the fall quarter of loss of employment to be effective at the beginning of the fall quarter of the following academic year. Terminations should not be effective during the academic year.

   b. Employment at 0.96 to avoid short notice. If a choice must be made between the termination of some faculty on short notice, and 0.96 FTE for all faculty, we favor 0.96 FTE.
c. Those to be terminated should be given a choice between one year's notice at full time and two year's notice at one-half time (or the equivalent).

d. Program reductions are to be avoided if possible. Opportunistic and/or across the board reductions are to be preferred if budget reductions are relatively small. Program reductions should be avoided unless budget reductions are relatively large. If program reductions are necessary, consideration should be given to the elimination of a graduate program or some other identifiable aspect of a given department's activities.

e. Termination due to budget reduction should NOT be used as a pretext for termination due to other reasons. Faculty members, if any, who are remiss in their performance, have a basic right to prior warning and an opportunity to improve before extreme disciplinary measures are taken. The use of budget reduction as a pretext for the termination of any such people deprives them of a fundamental right. It also leaves those who were honestly terminated for budgetary reasons suspicious and fearful that undisclosed, and/or improper reasons also figured in the decision to terminate them.

f. Assistance should be provided to those who are terminated. This should include (a) measures to assist them in adjusting to loss of position and income, including relocation in the University or elsewhere, retraining, and University-arranged internships to help them make the transition of business or other employment; (b) emergency financial support to those who need it, including coverage under health and other insurance plans, and (c) continued University privileges, including use of a University title, for those who are laid off.

g. An immediate report on the impact that forced or voluntary early retirement would have on a faculty person's retirement or other benefits.

Note: These recommendations are not intended to rule out voluntary leaves of absence, shared appointments or other responses available for departmental consideration under Article 18, Section 4 of the Agreement.
WEIGHTED LIST OF BUDGET GOALS AND VALUES - AAUP BUDGET COMMITTEE - APRIL 3, 1981

Quality instruction 4.5%
Advancement of knowledge 3.3%
Wide range of undergraduate subjects and disciplines 4.1%
Wide range of graduate subjects and disciplines 3.1%
Library and other basic facilities 4.2%
Community oriented research and education 2.2%

Courses that broaden student perspectives 3.4%
Self-development in performing and creative arts 2.7%
Counseling, student health, etc. 1.7%
Individualized programs for exceptional students 1.5%
Remedial courses and physical education 1.8%

Career related and professional programs 3.5%
MA/MS programs in career-related fields interdisciplinary 2.7%
PhD programs in career related interdisciplinary fields 3.1%

Preserving the urban emphasis of activities and programs 2.2%
Maintaining regional and international programs that contribute to the cosmopolitan character of the University 1.5%
Meeting the needs of students who combine work and study or who return after months or years of full time work 3.1%

Retain as many people as possible, even on reduced FTE 7.9%
Provide at least nine-months' advance notice of layoff 7.4%
Maintain adequate instructional and research support 8.8%
Provide full time employment to retained faculty 3.9%
Provide catch-up and keep-up salary increases 3.5%

Strong student demand 3.1%
High rates of enrollment growth 2.0%
Good employment opportunities for graduates 1.7%
Significant external (financial) support 1.3%

Maintain integrity and effectiveness of existing programs 1.1%
Meet the University's long range objectives 1.4%
Be consistent with University's affirmative action program 1.3%
Maintain favorable student/faculty ratios 1.3%
Encourage faculty productivity and development 2.3%
Favor traditional departments over special programs 1.4%
Achieve significant savings over cost 1.0%
Maximize end of biennium budgets, etc. 1.5%

ACADEMIC QUALITY - 21.4%
STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES - 11.1%
MANPOWER NEEDS - 9.3%
UNIVERSITY CHARACTER - 6.8%
MORALE - 31.5%
DEMAND - 8.1%
OTHER GOALS - 11.7%

99.9%
At 5:13 p.m., the Senate meeting was recessed until April 13 at 3:00 p.m.

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING, APRIL 13, 1981**

Members Present: Alexander, Bates, Beeson, Bennett, Bentley, Bierman, Bingham, Buell, Bunch, Burden, Chino, Clark, Conroy, Crowley, Dart, Diman, Dressler, Dueker, E. Enneking, M. Enneking, Fiasca, Giachetti, Cockjian, Grimes, Heyden, Howard, Johnson, Kimbrell, Kirrie, Lehman, Manning, Midson, Moor, Morris, Mueller, Muller, L. Nussbaum, R. Nussbaum, Oh, Rad, Scheans, Sugarman, Swanson, Tuttle, Youngelson, White, Williams, Wyers.


Members Absent: Adams, Alberty, Breedlove, Bruseau, Chavigny, Daily, Dreyer, Dunbar, Feldesman, Goslin, Gorg, Hales, Hefflin, Jenkins, Patton, Wurm.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Gard, Gruber, Guy, Hardt, Harris, Heath, Hoffman, Howard, Morris, Parker, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Van't Slot.

The recessed Senate meeting was called to order by M. Enneking, and she asked the President to respond first to the four committee reports from the previous week dealing with the financial crisis. Blumel said that there had been numerous expressions of lack of clarity regarding the disadvantages and advantages of declaring financial exigency and the timing of that declaration. He explained the distinction as being between two formal processes, the difference hinging on the notice required for affected persons being laid off. According to the collective bargaining agreement, any program reduction or elimination would require a 12-month notice; under declared financial exigency a 12-month notification is not mandatory. Thus no program reductions requiring termination of faculty would be possible for fall of 1981 without financial exigency, and notice would have to be given by June 15, 1981, for fall 1982. Since collective bargaining requires specific steps to be taken in the development of plans for either program reduction or financial exigency, and since it is doubtful that they can be effectively accomplished in time for notices to be given by June 15, the only option available to us would be the declaration of financial exigency. So Blumel said we are faced with the question of whether, and if so, when to declare exigency, that being the only alternative open. We have no way to know with any real certainty what the outcome of the appropriation process of the legislative session will be; we only know that there will be major budget reductions. The formal process for the declaration was begun with the February 17, 1981, letter to the PSU faculty, and the Senate was given notice at the March 2 meeting. Consultation has also occurred with
AAUP. Now the timing has to be decided, and the President asked the Senate for advice on the timing. The President is required, subsequent to that declaration, to prepare a tentative plan for reductions, but it cannot be presented until the declaration of exigency is made. The tentative plan is a basis for full discussion of all the possibilities. Blumel pointed out that if he were to do this before the legislative decisions were made, the plan would of necessity have to be a set of contingency plans, up to a certain maximum cut-off. Though there are advantages to having early notification, there would be a degree of uncertainty, and the contingency plans of notification could cause morale problems which may be worse than the inevitable morale problems we face simply because of the circumstances. Manning wanted to know what impact a declaration of a cut of 10% would have on the legislature -- would it be an invitation to cut even deeper. Blumel did not see it as a serious threat. Johnson reported having read that if PSU declared financial exigency then the whole system would follow suit. Blumel indicated that the Chancellor had made that assertion at the board meeting; if exigency became a reality for one institution, it would be a reality for all. Kimbrell pointed out that at this point we have only one given, the Governor's proposed budget. He suggested planning for that possibility and wondered if that budget required declaration of exigency. Blumel countered that we have two specific sets of information, the Governor's budget and the direction of the Ways and Means Committee to plan for budget reductions of 10% below that, and we have, pursuant to that, the action of the State Board in saying how the system would accomplish that further 10% reduction. Dueker thought that we risk, if we wait, being given a much reduced budget that would be more difficult to live with. Proposing our own cuts and pointing out at this time where the problems will occur gives us an opportunity to influence the budget in terms of making our problems known to the legislature. Blumel added that public discussion of the impacts of the cuts would be recognition of the consequences, and therefore the results might be positive. Ross wanted to know if there is a distinction between declaration of exigency and being in exigency. Blumel agreed that the distinction is between a declaration and actually having to implement it; therefore the Chancellor's comment should be taken in that light: the entire system would not be thrown into exigency unless that condition had to be implemented. Swanson wanted to know how you could declare exigency without being there, and once you declare it, how do you get out of it if you aren't there. Blumel responded that we are dealing with circumstances of a high degree of uncertainty; our best judgement at this particular time is that the outcome is going to require reductions. Swanson then asked whether the declaration is the thing that gets us into exigency. Blumel explained that we are there in the sense that we take certain steps; there is nothing to say that if circumstances change that those steps could not be reversed or cancelled. Conroy wanted to know if there may be a chance that UO or OSU would declare exigency first and PSU would have to follow and whether there was an advantage to declaring first. Blumel saw no particular advantages to being first; rather, there may be disadvantages to being there by yourself. Bierman discerned two questions, one is the welfare of the faculty concerned, and the other is the public question. He asked whether the declaration affected the plans being made to protect the faculty who may be involved in it. Exigency permits people to get a shorter notice, which really does not help things; it is merely a legal provision. He believed that trying to second-guess the legislature and trying to influence them with early declaration of exigency is a dangerous game. Blumel countered that it was clear that everything depended on the fate of the revenue measures. While no one is able to predict the outcome at this time, people in Salem who are willing to talk most candidly about this issue
suggest that some of the Governor's revenue package will likely be passed, but not all of it. The situation does not look good. Bates asked if anyone had identified which portions of the Governor's proposal may be cut. Blumel answered that at this time they were viewed as an amount of revenue rather than specifics of a plan. Bates also wanted to know if there was anything in the contract or process that would prevent us from deferring the declaration of exigency while going ahead with contingency planning such as is being done now. Blumel said there is nothing to preclude the kind of discussion and analysis being done now by various committees. The question is how far the process is likely to go prior to a declaration and prior to the presentation of some specific plan which is the basis for general discussion. Midson observed that the legislature will have an idea of the severity of the cuts, because they have asked us to provide them with the plans. Blumel said that they will only be aware of general consequences of the cuts, e.g., reduced student FTE will imply a reduction in staff. Brenner pointed out that one factor which had not been mentioned had to do with what kind of salary package we will eventually get. The current budget plan is for 6% salary increases during each year of the biennium. If the increase should be larger, then the dollars have to come from somewhere, and if the revenues are fixed and there is no tax package, the expenditures will go up by whatever the difference in the salary package is. Thus getting half of the Governor's tax package may not mean only a 5% cut in programs -- we may go back to the 10% cut level. Fiasca asked if the State Board or the presidents had discussed taking action simultaneously, system-wide. Blumel reported that the Chancellor had proposed at one point that early declaration of exigency be made for the entire system. There was a great deal of disagreement about that. The institutions which did not favor the plan were very fearful of the external, largely national consequences of that kind of publicity in terms of the image and reputation of the institutions, the ability to recruit quality people, and they therefore wanted to delay as long as possible. The decision was therefore made not to declare exigency yet; this is not to say that at some point further down the line the Board might not decide to in fact declare exigency system-wide.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Karant-Nunn presented the final reading of a constitutional amendment of Article VIII, Paragraph 2, reporting that the Advisory Council found this amendment satisfactory. The amendment was passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

1. E. Enneking moved "that Math 95 not be approved as part of the 18 credits in Science toward Out-of-major Distribution Requirements." Heath spoke in support of the motion but wondered if the change would still get into the next catalog. Tosi and Dobson thought it would. White talked about changing the numbering system so that all courses below 50 would be non-college credit. Manning wondered why the University should offer any courses at all which were not college level. Bennett said that we have an obligation to continue preparatory classes as a community service. Bates reminded the Senate that the distribution requirement was the only thing under discussion today. With that the motion was passed.
2. Midson presented a number of motions from the Academic Requirements Committee. These had been presented in terms of recommendations in the Committee's Annual Report earlier in the agenda, but the Committee now sought the force of a formal motion for points 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 17 in the report. All were passed. In connection with #14, the Division of Engineering and Applied Science circulated their "Eligibility, Selective Admission and Continuation Policies." After reviewing that, the Senate was satisfied. #15 was presented for approval in principle. Heath explained that the ARC had been given and approved a set of standards which provide minimum qualifying criteria for students who wish to go into upper-division programs in Business Administration. What the ARC has asked for is a detailed account of the selection criteria which B.A. will use in case there is an over abundance of students relative to the resources available, and in case choices have to be made from among qualifying students. Heath pointed out that if B.A. chose specific standards, they would have to be approved by the ARC. Parker clarified that we were only talking about admission standards. Youngelson moved to eliminate the last sentence of statement 15; the amendment passed, and the main motion passed.

3. At this point in the agenda Moor moved that the Senate turn to the discussion of the declaration of exigency and its timing. The motion passed. M. Enneking urged that the Senate first discuss the question of timing, since other recommendations regarding programs would be coming down the road later. Bates felt that the Senate has an advisory function and should be allowed to exercise it on the total topic under discussion, and not just timing. R. Nussbaum wondered if there was any discussion of the AAUP Budget Committee's report which had been given at the end of the previous meeting. There being none, Moor moved that

"The Senate recommend that the President declare neither financial exigency nor the need to reduce or eliminate departments or programs until final legislative action determines the budget for the next biennium."

Chino asked whether the collective bargaining agreement precluded real discussion of the issues or priorities prior to the declaration of exigency, since the legislature has asked us to submit contingency plans for various levels of reduction. He wondered if these plans could not be specified in conjunction with the collective bargaining unit prior to a declaration of exigency, so that everything is agreed upon. If then exigency is required, there can be a very ready approval of what has already been done and agreed upon. Blumel responded that the agreement precludes the issuing of tentative or preliminary report by the administration prior to a declaration. Other kinds of discussion can and should go on in the Senate, Budget Committee, or other bodies. If we wait and then have to do something very quickly, we violate the intent of the collective bargaining agreement, if not the letter. Blumel pointed out that the legislature had asked the State Board, not the institutions, to submit a plan in
general terms. A portion of that general plan is allocated to PSU, and it was that which was outlined in the March Senate meeting. Moor agreed that the President is prohibited from making proposals at this time, though bodies of the faculty may propose. Youngelson asked for the rationale behind the motion. Moor explained that very serious harm is done when it is proposed that certain departments should be cut and others not; there would be in-fighting; when departments are identified, certain individuals will know that they are being proposed for termination; the morale problem it would create is known to some extent, because of what happened twice before in 1971 and 1974 when people were told before it was known that there was an emergency that they would lose their jobs. It turned out in those cases that they didn't lose their jobs in the end, but they suffered a good deal, as did the administrator who was responsible for one of the decisions. Bennett suggested that equally devastating to morale and other aspects of the University's function would be the counterpart situation, where month after month all departments and all individual faculty members (with very limited exceptions) know that they could be on a list of potential cuts. Unless and until specific proposals are presented to the faculty for discussion, no one will know whether they are on or off the book. Until that time, no one can really get back to the business of running the University, developing programs that will be preserved, even if some others might be cut, or looking for viable alternatives for those faculty or programs that might be eliminated. Buell believed that waiting for the news would do more damage to morale than if we made our statement and our stand now, and thereby have some possibility of affecting the outcome to be more advantageous to us. Burying our heads in the name of humanity in the face of this exigency or bankruptcy situation, and waiting until summer, when the campus is virtually deserted, to make program proposal cuts, is absolute madness. Moor said that waiting till mid-summer may not mean that we would have to give very short notice before September; the budget cuts would have to be much more severe than anybody is anticipating. As long as the .96 reduction is an option, it will not be necessary to give anyone notice in the first year of the biennium. Brenner pointed out, however, that the .96 did not save enough money to cover the entire cost of the 10% cut. It is misleading to think that the 4% would be enough money to cover everything. The 10% cut means approximately $4.5 million at PSU. The first year's cut would be about $3 million; the 4% of salaries amounts to $1.2 million -- nearly $2 million off. That money would have to be saved some way. To do it without eliminating people would mean, for instance, that we totally eliminate all library budgets, all equipment, and we would still be $800,000 short. Buell argued that faculty and students would speak with a louder voice if they knew specifically how they will be affected by program cuts; therefore we should not put off the basic reality. Beeson said that the problem he had with declaring exigency now is that we really don't know the severity of the cuts and we're dealing with so much uncertainty that we will not know which of the several plans will
ultimately be enacted. R. Nussbaum agreed that having to deal with six different plans would be very confusing and demoralizing. If we could have certainty, he said he might be in agreement with Buell. The problem was weighing between two equally distasteful possibilities. Gard wanted the President to expand on the disadvantages he saw in having PSU declare exigency first. Blumel explained that it does single the institution out; to a certain extent that has already been done. The consequences of our announcements and the discussions have had that effect externally. E. Enneking wanted to know, if exigency were declared, how specific the plan going to departments would be. Would they be general questions like what impacts a 10% cut would have? Blumel explained that plans would have to make some tentative allocations to the departmental program level for various levels of cuts. Sugarman reported that the IFS met with about 30 legislators on Saturday, and he wondered if declaring exigency now would not stimulate those who support higher education to support the Governor's tax program. Dueker supported that view. He testified a week ago at a sub-committee meeting in Salem and reported coming away with the feeling that if we sit by we will get a larger cut than if we marshal our efforts and mobilize our support and make our case heard. Chino added that it was important that faculty, administrators and students cooperate in their endeavor to apprise the legislature of the effects various cuts would have on the institution in order to give them the incentive to preserve higher education. Youngelson also felt that concern for faculty welfare demanded early knowledge of the probable situation. Brenner reported that three departments had let their faculty know where they stood in the pecking order of seniority; if a plan were to be put out, unnecessary anxieties of those people who would not be cut would be put to rest, and those who are likely to be cut would be given extra months in which to make their difficult decisions. Beeson wanted to know the timeline for the plan, if exigency were declared. Blumel said that the intent would be to have it out for proper discussion before the end of the academic year, but he pointed out that the exact time is difficult to predict, since he is looking for input to various faculty bodies now discussing the problem. Johnson said that financial exigency means you can't pay your bills, not you may not be able to pay your bills; in that sense the timing ought to be delayed until you know that you cannot pay them. Blumel warned that you cannot use the literal meaning, and that it is a question of judgement. Moor argued for compassion for those likely to be cut. He said that AAUP was presenting various options for accomplishing different cuts, among them the proposal to allow people who would be cut the second year to work half time in the first year and half time in the second year. Sugarman reminded the Senate that IFS and AOF have both come out against the .96 option; also several legislators seem strongly opposed to it. Brenner reminded the Senate that .96 was also opposed by the faculty in the survey. Moor said, however, that AAUP wants to make .96 a possibility and will bargain for it. Bunch said that the faculty survey was taken before much information was known. Blumel pointed out that the money
reduction of the .96 plan had to also include the classified staff and must be argued with both groups. Swanson wanted to know if departments would have considerable liberty in deciding how to accommodate cuts. Blumel replied that departments would have broad possibilities and much latitude for making reductions. E. Enneking called for a roll call vote on the motion. The vote was 19 yes, 22 no, 1 abstention.

Beeson moved that "the Senate recommend that the President not declare exigency until we have the new revenue projections in May, unless necessary." Howard saw no advantages to this motion over the previous one. Bentley warned that we should not tie the President down to waiting for the legislature. The motion was defeated.

Bennett then moved "that the Faculty Senate forward to President Joseph Blumel a recommendation that a declaration of financial exigency, if deemed necessary, be made at the earliest practical date, thereby permitting prompt and timely consideration of specific plans for program modification and/or staff reductions." Bates argued that this motion went to the other extreme, and he proposed an amendment that allowed the President to exercise his own judgement. M. Enneking ruled that that was not an amendment. Kimbrell observed that the Senate had given the President confusion and not advice. L. Nussbaum and Grimes spoke in support of the motion. Bingham and Bierman wanted to know what the motion would accomplish. Beeson asked if the President could declare exigency now and submit the plan later. Blumel emphasized that he will not make up his mind until all information is in from the constitutional committees, the AAUP, and the Senate. Bierman stated that the intent is that the declaration is going to be declared, but Bates pointed out that Bierman had overlooked the crucial phrase "if necessary." A roll call vote on the motion resulted in 20 yes, 16 no and 3 abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

TO The Faculty Senate

FROM The University Budget Committee

DATE April 10, 1981

SUBJECT: Annual Report

At the beginning of the year, the Budget Committee set two goals for itself:

1. TO help the President develop a University budget which would insure the continued growth and development of our programs during the next year and biennium.
2. TO develop information from which the adequacy of funding of PSU's programs could be determined.

The idealism of the early Fall quickly gave way to the stark reality of the University's current budget situation. The developments within the Oregon economy forced the committee to focus virtually exclusively on the first of our two goals. The Governor's Budget for 1981-83 proposes a funding level at Portland State which would require a cut in expenditures of approximately 2.75 percent of the Education and General portion of the 1979-80 Beginning Base Budget. Stalled tax increase proposals led the Joint Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature to direct all State Agencies to develop proposals for an additional 10 percent cut in their budgets (making a total cut at PSU about 12.75 percent per year based on the 1979-80 Beginning Base Budget). Additional uncertainties about state revenues, expenditures, and allocations of budget reduction burdens, forced this committee to undertake a complex, detailed and extensive process to prepare a set of budget contingency plans for PSU.

1st Interim Report

At the March 2nd meeting of the Senate, the committee presented its tentative findings concerning the following matters:

1. Size of the problem
2. Committee decision process
3. Values used
4. Value weighting
5. Alternative budget reduction processes (scenarios)
6. Scenario rankings

A full copy of this report appears in the April 6, 1981 minutes of the Faculty Senate.

2nd Interim Report

At the April 6th meeting, the committee expanded its report to the faculty detailing the following:

1. Selection of two scenarios for use in the committee's future work: minimization of impacts on growth programs and use of program eliminations where appropriate.
2. Types of budget reductions planned:
   a. Specific cuts (non-personnel)
   b. Program eliminations
c. General cuts to programs

3. The magnitude of reductions in instruction and non-instruction for each level of potential budget reduction.

4. The three growth related criteria used to determine the magnitude of the general cut for each department and program (pure growth, student vs. faculty growth, and workload).

5. Data used in making the committee's analysis.

6. The general cut approach which reduced programs which did poorly on our growth criteria more than those which did well.

7. The tasks remaining for the committee including decisions on program elimination recommendations and the details of our final proposed plan.

The specifics of this 2nd report should appear in the current Senate minutes.

Declaration of Financial Exigency or Budget Reduction

In our role as advisory to the President, the committee studied the financial facts surrounding the impact of possible budget reductions on PSU. We concluded that there was an overwhelming probability that it will be necessary to declare a state of financial exigency or budget reduction should even a small portion of the currently discussed 10 percent budget reduction below the Governor's Budget become reality.

In so far as the timing of that declaration is concerned the committee voted unanimously (seven members present) to recommend that the University's tentative plan or set of plans be developed as rapidly, as is consistent with thorough analysis, and then disseminated to all faculty so that appropriate input concerning the tentative plan(s) would be forthcoming before the end of this academic year.

The committee rejected the alternative of waiting until some "final" budget is developed for PSU for a number of reasons.

1. Many departments have already discussed layoff priorities. Early discussion of plans could reduce the anxiety of many.
2. Waiting for "final" budgets would likely delay discussions of the tentative plan(s) until about July 15th at the earliest. Many faculty may not be on campus at that time.
3. Early discussions of a tentative plan might influence some of the decisions made at the legislature as a result of the mobilization of faculty and students. Such action would come too late if begun after the legislature has established a budget.
4. It is fairer to affected faculty and students to let them know their situation as soon as possible.

Conclusions

It is too soon to know just what the final outcome of the work of this committee will be. We are still debating the details of many key elements of our proposed plan. But it is not too soon to recognize the level of effort, dedication, professionalism and objectivity which has been the
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standard within this committee the entire year. The atmosphere of openness and collegiality prevailing in this committee made it possible to carry out our onerous task this year with care and concern for the future of the entire University.

Respectfully submitted,

University Budget Committee 1980-81

Members
Steven Brenner, Management (Chairman)
Kenneth Butler, Library
John Cooper, English
Kenneth Dueker, Urban Affairs
Carl Fanger, Engineering and Applied Science
Alfred Levinson, Chemistry
John Longres, Social Work
Nancy Matschek, Health and Physical Education
George Timmons, Education
John Walter, Economics

Consultants
John Gruber, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Kenneth Harris, Budget Officer
Lou Merrick, Assistant Budget Officer
James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Advisory Council

Re: Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 3

CURRENT WORDING

The Faculty of each department shall by secret ballot of all full-time members decide the mode by which its choice of department head shall be determined. Appointment of departmental head shall be in conformity with department members' judgment as arrived at through published departmental procedures.

The department head shall serve a stated term of three years but without prejudice to his or her re-election or re-appointment. The published procedure for determining the department's recommendation to the appropriate dean shall be implemented by April 15 of the department head's third year in office and every third year thereafter.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

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

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

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

The department head shall serve a stated term of three (3) years but without prejudice to his or her re-election or re-appointment.
To: Senate Steering Committee  
From: Academic Requirements Committee  

March 12, 1981

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

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

[Signatures]

Tony Asher  
R. N. Muller  
Rudi N. M. Kramer  
Larry Brusean  
Marvin K. Brusean  
Carol H. Johnson
TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
May, 1981

The Teacher Education Committee is to serve in an advisory capacity to coordinate the activities of the schools, colleges and departments which are directly involved in teacher education. The Committee is to provide a communication link between the School of Education and those departments concerned with teacher education. It is to advise the School of Education on problems of admissions and graduation and academic standards.

The major concerns addressed by the Committee this year relate to (1) the interaction between the academic departments and the School of Education when requirements for teaching endorsements are developed and (2) the quality expectations for work required for a standard certificate and/or MAT/MST. Requirements for teaching endorsement refer to the courses listed by departments in the catalog under the heading "Secondary Education Program."

In an effort to bring to the attention of those involved in teacher education the desirability of input from both the academic area and the School of Education, the Committee recently adopted the following policy.

The Teacher Education Committee believes that when a college, school or department establishes the requirements for a new secondary endorsement or makes a change in an existing secondary endorsement, the unit should seek input from sources that are in contact with public school teachers as well as relying on the judgement of its own faculty. To this end the Teacher Education Committee strongly recommends that a faculty member, who is a subject matter specialist in the area of the endorsement of the School of Education be involved in the deliberations that lead to the development of new requirements. It is the belief of the Teacher Education Committee that the joint input of the subject matter unit and of the School of Education will prove beneficial.

Copies of the policy will be sent to those involved at Portland State in setting teaching requirements.

In some situations, academic departments have had different quality expectations for their MS/MA degrees than for their MST/MAT degrees. The Committee supports the concept that the requirements for the standard teaching certificate and the MST and MAT degrees should have the same quality expectations as other graduate programs but a differentiated content. The Committee expects to complete proposed policy statements related to this concept. These statements would be reviewed by the graduate and other appropriate committees before final consideration is given to implementing these policies.

Mary Argast - student
C. Pollock - BA
R. Scruggs - HPE
N. Rose, Chairperson - SCI

Valerie Messervy - student
G. Guthrie - PSY
D. Leu - ED

M. Fiasca - ED
R. Morton - AA
G. Guy - ED
The Board received and discussed a report from the Director on the effects of possible budget reductions. The Board also received a request from the Student Advisory committee to recommend a change in the name of the program from University Scholars' to University Honors. The Board will be discussing this request and proposing a process for consulting with departments and administrative officers as to its desirability and feasibility.
During the 1980-1981 academic year, the University Scholars' Board met to review current program offerings and those proposed for 1981-1982. Although the program budget was reduced by 10%, money was raised through grants from private foundations, from the Oregon Committee for the Humanities, and from a benefit concert organized by the students in the program. Consequently the colloquia and lecture series originally planned for this year have been held. Enrollment in the colloquia has been at a maximum level; and the four lecturers who have visited to date have met with the Scholars' colloquia and with departments, and community groups. Professor Heilbroner's lectures were attended by 1000, Professor Kuklick's by 100, Professor Stent's by 350, and Professor Paul's by 75. Special meetings were arranged with the Departments of Economics, Philosophy, and Biology and with the Institute for Policy Studies with the appropriate visiting scholar. Scholars' students held receptions for the appropriate departments and used money raised by the benefit concert to provide food and refreshments. With the exception of the faculty of the Department of Economics who attended the reception for Professor Heilbroner and were most gracious to him, the faculty response was abysmal. The students have decided to suspend this social feature of the program for the faculty.

Six colloquia are being developed for the 1981-1982 academic year. In planning this year, the Board discussed the process of developing the colloquia and identifying the visiting scholars. The Director of the Program reported that for three years letters were sent to each department head describing the colloquia, explaining the funding, and requesting that faculty make recommendations. In three years, four proposals were ade, all of which were developed. In asking faculty about the minimal response, the most frequent answer was that the information had never been received. For this year certain areas of interest have been identified and individual faculty have been contacted as to their interest and suggestions. To date five visiting scholars have indicated that they are willing to participate: Professor Aldo Scaglione, Professor of Comparative Literature, Univ. of North Carolina; Professor John Schaar, Professor of Political Science, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz; Professor Mark Poster, Professor of History, Univ. of California, Irvine; Professor Steven Stanley, Professor of Geophysics, Johns Hopkins; Professor William Clebsch, Professor of Religious Studies, Stanford.

As in the past appropriate departments will be asked if they would like to invite the visitors to meet with faculty and students in special seminars etc.

There were no decisions relating to personnel as no decisions needed to be made. A subcommittee of the Board received 20 proposals for independent study projects and 10 proposals for Undergraduate theses. The subcommittee reviewed the proposals and made recommendations for approval or alteration. Forty-five students were admitted to the program during this year. Six students received degrees at Fall and Winter commencement. Twenty students have applied for Spring and Summer term commencement. Ten students have left the program, four by choice, six who have fallen below the minimum GPA requirement. No appeals were made to the Board. One hundred and seventy-five students are currently in the Program.
D. Recommended the appointment of a faculty member to serve as AIAW representative to the Board. One of this individual's responsibilities would be to make eligibility determinations for student-athletes in the women's varsity program.

E. Engaged in extensive discussions regarding the long term role of both varsity and non-varsity athletics at Portland State. This discussion will be continued throughout the remainder of this academic year and will probably extend into the 1981-1982 academic year.

University Athletics Board Members

Robert Lockwood, chairperson
James Hale
Steve Kosokoff
William Manning
Mary Grimes
John Heiser
Gary Scarff

Administration of Justice
Education
Speech Communication
Business Administration
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Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Lockwood
Chairperson
UNIVERSITY ATHLETICS BOARD

Annual Report
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Faculty Senate

May 4, 1981

The University Athletics Board is composed of five (5) faculty members, two (2) student members, and seven (7) ex-officio members, including: the Vice-President for Finance and Administration, the Faculty NCAA Representative, the Dean and Program Executive of the School of Health and Physical Education, the Director and Associate Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, and the Director of the Intramural Sports Program. The Board serves as the institutional advisory body to the President and the Faculty Senate in the development of, and adherence to, policies and budgets governing Portland State's programs in intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, club sports, and general student recreation.

During the 1980-1981 academic year, the University Athletics Board has been involved in the following activities:

A. Reviewed, recommended modifications, and approved the budgets for intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, club sports, and general student recreation for 1981-1982.

As regards varsity athletics, the Board's deliberations were some of the most extensive in the Board's history. The result of these often painful deliberations was a recommendation to the President that the following sports be dropped from the varsity program:

1. Men's basketball
2. Men's and Women's gymnastics and swimming
3. Women's fencing

The Board also recommended that men's varsity football be shifted to the Division II Level.

B. Monitored Portland State's continued interest in a conference affiliation for men and women's intercollegiate athletics.

C. Approved revisions in the Eligibility Regulations for Intercollegiate Athletic Programs at PSU to make it clear that no disparity existed in the treatment of men and women student-athletes.
standard within this committee the entire year. The atmosphere of openness and collegiality prevailing in this committee made it possible to carry out our onerous task this year with care and concern for the future of the entire University.

Respectfully submitted,

University Budget Committee 1980-81
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John Cooper, English
Kenneth Dueker, Urban Affairs
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George Timmons, Education
John Walter, Economics
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John Gruber, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Kenneth Harris, Budget Officer
Lou Merrick, Assistant Budget Officer
James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
April 15, 1981

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Jim Heath, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
       Karen Tosi, PSU Challenge Program Coordinator

SUBJECT: Challenge Program Recommendation

Last January, the Office of Academic Affairs provided the Faculty Senate with the annual report for the Challenge Program (formerly known as Project Advance). At that time, OAA promised to make a recommendation during Spring term regarding the future of the program.

OAA recommends that the Senate approve continuation of the Challenge Program. The ceiling of 800 students authorized by the Senate in May, 1977 should be continued.
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