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MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

DATE December 23, 1981

FROM Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary of the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 11, 1982, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

Agenda

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 7 and 14, 1981, Meetings

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

   a. Submitted to Vice President Gruber by the Senate Steering Committee:

   "As of December 31, 1981, what was the state of the early-phase retirement requests (Options I and II, broken down by divisions) in terms of the number of applications 1) received and 2) not approved or withdrawn?"

   b. Submitted to Peter Vant Slot by the Senate Steering Committee:

   "What has been done to present PSU's case before the Legislature?"

   To be followed by a report regarding alumni activity and assessment of legislative concerns regarding Higher Education by Chuck Clemans, Superintendent of Oregon City Public Schools and PSU alumnus.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees -- none

F. Unfinished Business

   *1. Recommendation, Ad hoc Committee on Instructional Media -- West

   *2. Constitutional Amendment, Article VI, Sections 2 and 3 -- Beeson

G. New Business

   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 4 -- Beeson

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of December 7 and 14, 1981, Senate Meeting
F1 Recommendation, Ad hoc Committee on Instructional Media**
F2 Constitutional Amendment, Article VI, Sections 1 and 3**
G1 Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 4**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 7, 1981
Presiding Officer: Mary Cumpston
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: McKitrick for Alexander, Raedels for Jenkins, Gordon for McMahon, Constans for Muller.

Members Absent: Bierman, Waldroff.

Ex-officio Members Present: Blumel, Corn, Dobson, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Gruber, Hardt, Harris, Hoffmann, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, Parker, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Vant Slot, Williams

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the November 2, 1981, Senate meeting were approved as circulated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Beeson announced his intention to ask for the suspension of the rules and to introduce an Advisory Council resolution under New Business on the day's agenda.

QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Vice President Gruber reported that records showed that 104 faculty were eligible for the early/phased retirement plan. As of December 4, 1981, the following applications have come in: Engineering and Applied Science 2
Education 3
Science 3
Arts and Letters 8
Social Science 7
Business Administration 1

The total of 24 applications represent 23% of those eligible. Six of the 24 are opting for total retirement while the rest are choosing a phased retirement. Gruber pointed out that more applications are coming in almost daily, the deadline being December 31. Johnson asked if any administrators are included; Gruber responded that to date he had processed only requests from faculty.
The Curriculum Committee's Annual Report was accepted as circulated.

2. The Annual Report of the Graduate Council was accepted as distributed.

3. Sapp presented the Library Committee's Annual Report; the report was accepted.

4. Speaking for Chairperson Benson, Griffiths offered the Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee, and the Senate received the document as presented.

5. President Blumel made a report on the latest budget developments. The new state revenue projections show an additional shortfall of $250 million, substantially larger than originally forecast. The Governor then announced that he would call a special session of the legislature, and he ordered that all state agencies prepare plans for budget reductions in 5% increments up to 20%. For Higher Education a 20% cut of the general fund portion would amount to something over $47 million.

The Chancellor developed a set of recommendations which he presented to the Finance Committee of the Board. The four packages are $12 million each, except for the fourth one, which is defined as a $15 million problem, because of a $3 million underfund of the compensation package in the regular session of the legislature.

a. Package 1: The 4% recurring cuts already planned for amount to $8 million. Tuition increases of $20-25 each term during the remainder of this year at OSU, UO, and OIT would bring in approximately $5 million and not affect a loss of enrollment. Making Summer Sessions self-supporting would generate $1 million. The remainder of the necessary cuts is to be accommodated by temporary savings through furlough of all employees.

b. Package 2: A forgoing of salary improvement for the next year would save approximately $12 million.

c. Package 3: A system-wide reduction of 5,000 students, which would involve 425 faculty members, 85-90 classified employees, and other associated expense reductions, would achieve a savings of approximately $12 million. (If the loss of tuition income from those 5000 students is figured into this package, the total budget reduction is approximately $18 million). This step involves the elimination of professional schools at several institutions in the state system.

d. Package 4: A further reduction of 5000 students and comparable reduction in faculty and staff would produce another savings of $12 million. This step would necessitate elimination of other professional schools and the likelihood of some institutional closures.

The rationale presented for that order was that we ought not dismantle the system, should the financial problem be short-term. This proposal will be presented to the State Board of Higher Education later this week. At this point it is not clear whether the State Board will accept the proposal, or if the legislature would choose this particular mode of dealing with the problem even if the Board accepted the proposal. If the legislature sees the need for on-going cuts, they may substitute 3 and 4 for 1 and 2, for example. President Blumel concluded by saying that beyond a certain point the problem is finally viewed as a system-wide problem. He does not feel that the Board will ask institutions to individually plan for cuts of up to 20%.
UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Tang for the Curriculum Committee and Johnson for the Graduate Council presented the course and program proposals for Social Science, Business Administration, Health and Physical Education, Engineering and Applied Science, and Social Work.

Both bodies recommended approval of the two new courses in Anthropology, and the Senate approved the request.

The change in the BA/BS degree program in Geography was recommended by the Curriculum Committee, and the Senate approved the request.

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of three new courses in Geography, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council moved that graduate credit be allowed only for Geog 440 and 480. The course proposal for Geog 424 did not indicate graduate work requirements, nor were graduate students expected in the course. Brooke moved to amend the motion to include Geog 424 for graduate credit; up to 20% of the enrollment is expected to be graduate students. The amendment was passed, and the main motion was passed by the Senate. The Graduate Council then recommended approval of Geog 411 and 523, and the Senate approved the request.

The Curriculum Committee recommended the changes in existing courses and the dropping of old courses in Geography, and the Senate approved the request.

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the request for seven new courses in History, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council requested graduate credit be granted for HST 498 only, and that the remaining six courses be resubmitted with a request for program change next year. Johnson stated that these courses are required for the Public History program, a program not yet approved by the Senate, and suggested that the program and courses should be submitted together next year. The Senate approved the request.

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of all changes in existing courses in History, with the exception of HST 491 which has been withdrawn by the department. The Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council recommended approval of HST 480, 481, 482 and not of HST 433, because the title does not include "History of Brazil." Johnson pointed out that the Senate had just approved a "History of Portland" course. Bates countered that the Senate had also just approved a course titled "East Asia" and moved to amend the Graduate Council motion to include HST 433, Brazil. Nunn recalled that his original course request 16 years ago simply asked for "Brazil" with a HST prefix. The amendment was passed, and the main motion was then passed.
The Curriculum Committee recommended acceptance of the program changes in Political Science, and the Senate accepted the changes.

Both the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council moved that the Political Science request for three new and changed courses be approved, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council recommended that the new and changed 500-level courses in Psychology be approved, and that PSY 524 be dropped, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council recommended acceptance of two new courses in Public Administration, and the Senate approved the recommendation.

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of three new Sociology courses. Lehman asked about the possible overlap of SOC 364 with HPE, and Tang responded that the HPE representative on the Curriculum Committee checked into that matter and determined that there was no problem. The Senate approved the request.

The Curriculum Committee moved that the request for the change in the existing program of Women's Studies be approved, and the change was accepted by the Senate.

The Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the request for seven new courses in Women's Studies, and the Senate approved the request.

The recommended changes in existing Women's Studies courses were also approved by the Senate.

From the School of Business Administration, the Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the changes in old courses in Accounting, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council recommended approval of the request for program changes in the MAT/MST in Business Education and changes in the course description of MGMT 530, and the Senate approved the changes.

The Curriculum Committee recommended changes in four existing courses of the Marketing Department, and the Senate approved the recommendation.

From the School of Health and Physical Education, the Curriculum Committee recommended approval of the request to change an old course and the request for two new courses, and the Senate approved the request.

The Graduate Council recommended approval of the request for the new courses in Social Work, with the exception of SW 543 and 544 which need an acceptable statement regarding potential overlap. Ross commented that SW 544 has been taught for more than twelve years as a 507 and 510 under the title of Marital Therapy, Marriage Counseling, and others. SW 543 has been taught as a 507, and though there is some overlap with existing courses, Sociology for instance, the focus in Social Work is on intervention and the practice area rather than a study area. An amendment was offered to include SW 543 and 544. Chino concurred that the orientation of Sociology is quite different from that of Social Work, though the subject matter is the same. Johnson and Dunbar from the Graduate Council emphasized that all requests for new courses should carefully deal with the question of possible overlap with other existing courses; this request did not. Burden pointed out that SW 544 did overlap with
Education course in Counseling. The amendment was passed, and then the Senate approved the request as amended. Kimbrell inquired about SW 700, and Ross explained that it is a course which is not applied toward a degree. Dobson added that 700 is a system-wide number for service credit.

The Curriculum Committee recommended changes in the existing program of Engineering and Applied Science as requested to meet the accreditation standards. Brenner asked what the budgetary implications for the Math Department would be, and Tang responded that the trade-off between Computer Science and Math is about equal. The Senate approved the request for changes in EAS.

The Curriculum Committee recommended the change in the numbering for MTH 95 to MTH 100 in keeping with a simultaneous change at UO and OSU. This also involves a change in course descriptions of MTH 93 and 94. The recommendation was approved by the Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Beeson/Feldesman moved the temporary suspension of the rules to consider the Advisory Council's resolution circulated at the beginning of the meeting. The motion was passed by more than the required 2/3 majority. Beeson/Feldesman moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"Be it resolved that: The Faculty Senate of Portland State University wholeheartedly support President Blumel's declaration (November 2, 1981) that PSU will be unable to fulfill its mission as the metropolitan area's major university if its budget is cut below the present level and that, should further cuts be imposed, the Board would have to reconsider the distribution of resources within the system.

We conclude that, were further significant reductions to be assigned to Portland State University, there would then be no reasonable alternative to temporary closure of the University and temporary layoff of all University personnel."

Moor explained that the intention of offering this resolution is to support President Blumel's statements of November 2 and to adopt, on behalf of the faculty, a posture relative to further budget cuts. It is essential that we make clear to the ECC, legislature and voters that reducing higher education budgets does not result in more efficient service to students but in loss of service. Quiet acceptance of cuts so far has reinforced the widely prevailing opinion that Oregon's universities are wasteful, if not profligate. The public is still largely unaware of losses students directly, and all Oregon citizens indirectly, suffer from increased tuition, curtailed programs of instruction and research, depleted library resources, and debilitating effects of drastically lowered faculty morale.

Since increased revenues and large-scale savings by restructuring the system will not likely appear, the Advisory Council believes that the appropriate response to the budget crisis is one that makes the effect on the University visible to those who determine its budget. The resolution therefore recommends whatever shortening of the academic year is required to absorb the cuts assigned us; the state should be able to see to what extent it does not receive what it is unwilling to pay for.
Moor said there is considerable flexibility in the length of lay-off that could be accomplished without critical disruption of students' academic careers. If a substantial lay-off were required, one academic term could be shortened to two-thirds its usual length and classes scheduled as during Summer Session. Teaching loads and student class hours would be correspondingly reduced. Students would receive full courses of instruction, but fewer electives would be available. The loss of salary from such a shortening of one term would be 11%, although the savings to the University would be slightly less than that.

The advantages of temporary lay-offs over reductions in salary and forgoing salary increases are that they make visible the effects budget cuts are having and they make us eligible for unemployment insurance compensation, if the lay-offs are greater than a week. Further, temporary lay-offs do preserve the integrity of academic programs and avoid the need to finger colleagues for termination.

In support of the President and Chancellor, Moor asked for the approval of the resolution, not as a call to walkout nor a statement of acquiescence in lay-offs, but as an expression of determination to suffer, if suffer we must, with at least some of the dignity that we expect of ourselves.

Waller was uncertain about the meaning of "reconsider the distribution of resources within the system." Moor explained that the legislature has asked that the allocations to various institutions be looked at, and that programmatic needs be examined by geographic location for possible elimination or consolidation and resulting savings. Waller also wanted to know why 11% savings were necessary. Moor replied that it was not clear at this time how long the institution would be closed. If the closure exceeded a week, faculty would gain a small amount of compensation through unemployment; however, shorter closures could also have their use. Should a cut of 20% be necessary, a temporary closure for parts of two terms would result. Waller pointed out that the third and fourth packages of the Chancellor's proposal are precisely what the first paragraph of the resolution asks for, i.e., a redistribution of resources within the system, major programmatic cuts, including the possibility of the closure of an entire institution. Moor countered that the resolution should not be interpreted as an endorsement of the Chancellor's proposal.

Blumel asked how far this particular approach could be used. Beeson said that it could be used up to 20% if we were faced with a short-term problem. Two terms would have to be shortened to affect a 20% savings. He hoped, however, that only a 10% cut would be required. Brenner asked if this approach would be recommended if the problem were long-term and went beyond the biennium. Beeson felt that in that case programs would have to be scaled down, but he warned that too many things can happen in five or six years for us to be making plans at this time. Referring to the second paragraph, Brenner asked if other reasonable alternatives would be considered. Beeson emphasized that the paragraph is prefaced by a reference to the mission of this University, and he saw no other alternative that would help to maintain that mission. Brenner identified other possibilities, such as tuition increases and early retirements, but Goekjian called the early retirement issue a red herring, because it is still cutting faculty and asking us to do the same amount of work with fewer resources and for less pay. This resolution says we will work for what we are paid and work within the possibilities of the University capacity. He supported the resolution.
Heneghan reported that he first read the resolution to mean that the University would close down until more funds were made available. He suggested that a possible length of closure be identified in the resolution. Dunbar asked why the savings from temporary lay-offs at PSU would not benefit the rest of the state system. Blumel clarified that what was meant was to save the amount of money required by the assessment against PSU's budget.

Toulan raised the question of the long-term implications of closing for a long period as compared to three or four days. He also wondered about a lay-off of persons on grants who are being paid by other funds, and he warned that the University could lose the grants which would actually compound our problem. Beeson admitted that a resolution cannot address every technicality. Kimbrell wanted to know if the agreements the University has with AAUP, OSEA, and AFT can be violated. Moor replied that the agreements can be negated under a declaration of financial exigency. Todd pointed out that classified employees have a temporary-interruption-of-work article which permits them to receive paid leave if their work has been temporarily interrupted; therefore, the savings being discussed would not follow with classified personnel.

Chino observed that the second paragraph of the resolution makes an almost irrevocable commitment to a particular course of action, and he suggested that the paragraph be dropped. Dueker suggested that this motion may be more powerful if channeled through AOF, rather than coming only from the faculty at PSU. Bates pointed out that the state-wide officially elected body would be the IFS rather than AOF or AAUP.

Blumel said he was very interested in the Senate's feeling on this matter because the second paragraph raises a key question as to the attitude of a representative faculty body to the question of temporary closure, which means loss of income, versus further program reductions and lay-offs of faculty members.

White/Chino moved to delete paragraph two; they did not want to have PSU on record as wanting this course of action when there may be others. The 126,000 unemployed Oregonians really do not care whether professors show up in the unemployment line, nor does higher education have the popular support among the citizens. Karant-Nunn would have preferred to retain the second paragraph. She maintained that the legislators think we are crying wolf, because when reductions are made nothing ever happens that anyone is acutely aware of. She viewed this as a tactical proposal, one suggesting action that cannot be missed by the public and legislators. L. Nussbaum and Kirrie supported that view, warning against irreversable elimination of programs. Youngelson pointed out that the resolution does not bind us to any particular action. Brenner warned that people will reject the validity of the statement that no reasonable alternatives are available and urged an improvement of the language of the resolution. Goekjian called to attention that no reasonable alternative had been proposed while many unreasonable ones have appeared in the media and other places. He felt that PSU is not called upon to present a step-by-step contingency plan, and he urged that Senators should pass this resolution as a matter of principle. Midson also spoke against the amendment saying that a faculty willing to cut its own salary is giving a strong message to the public.

At this point Karant-Nunn offered a substitute amendment and White/Chino withdrew their amendment.

"Be it resolved that should further significant reductions be assigned to Portland State University, PSU would be unable to fulfill its mission as set forth in Guidelines for Portland State University (March, 1979). One means of meeting such reductions should be the brief temporary closure of the University and the brief temporary lay-off of all University personnel."
R. Nussbaum spoke against the amendment, because the purpose of the Advisory Council's resolution was to support the language which the President chose in the announcement of his final plan. This proposed amendment has no reference for the Council's support of what President Blumel said. R. Nussbaum challenged the Senate to have the courage to say that if the public does not pay for the University it will not have the University. Bjork also supported the original resolution because of reference to the mission of PSU as the metropolitan area's major university, and Goekjian agreed that the original statement of "no reasonable alternative to temporary closure" was much stronger than "one means of meeting...," which in the Chancellor plan is a faculty furlough.

The amendment failed.

When the original resolution was discussed, Chino still objected to the threatening language of the second paragraph. Midson suggested that this resolution could be passed now and a refined version could be presented the following week. Beeson agreed that in order to have its impact the resolution had to be passed today and sent to the Board in time for its meeting this week.

Chino/Brenner moved to adjourn the meeting until the following Monday. The motion lost.

The Advisory Council's resolution was passed 28 to 20.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m. until December 14 at 3:00 p.m.
The reconvened December meeting began with a report by President Blumel of the December 11 and 12 State Board meeting. Nothing particularly startling came out of the meeting, except the decision to increase tuition across the board at all institutions by approximately $50 each term, effective Winter 1982. This increase is a surcharge to be leveled against all students, with a pro-rata increase for part-time students. Non-resident students are exempted from this increase on the grounds that they are presently paying over the full cost of instruction. The Chancellor's retrenchment plans were approved essentially without change. Blumel also reported that PSU's Senate resolution had been delivered to the Chancellor and Board. Blumel said he did not sense any particular reaction to the resolution. The context of the discussion was FTE reductions coupled with the reductions in service provided versus additional lay-offs.

NEW BUSINESS

1. The advisory Council proposed a constitutional amendment of Article VI, Sections 2 and 3 regarding the eligibility for election to the Advisory Council. The Council was asked to clarify the language of sentence one in paragraph 2 of Section 3. for the January final reading. Moor reminded the Senate that a first reading of a constitutional amendment does not call for a vote, but White read from the Constitution that “the proposed amendment, if introduced at the meeting, is subject to debate and modification by majority vote.” Because a modification has been proposed, he felt a vote should be taken. It was moved to accept by acclamation the proposed amendment with its modification, and the motion was passed.

2. Cumpston introduced the Advisory Council's report, which dealt with an interpretation of the Constitution, by saying that the Senate may receive the report, refer it back to the Advisory Council, reject it, or debate it, but that no other action needed to be taken. Beeson agreed that this was a communication from the Council to the Senate, made necessary by controversy in the past over how the Constitution is to be interpreted on the issue of the length of service of department heads.
L. Nussbaum/R. Nussbaum proposed the following:

"In view of the need for an unambiguous expression of the faculty's intent concerning the meaning of the present language of the last paragraph of Article III, Section 4 of the Faculty Constitution, I move that the Advisory Council propose to the Faculty Senate an additional sentence which states the Advisory Council's interpretation as presented today explicitly as a constitutional amendment."

Corn agreed that the Constitution would have to be amended in order to arrive at the Advisory Council's interpretation. He felt that the Council's report did not follow any clear reasoning and also that it did violence to the English language. He pointed out that the words "without prejudice to re-election or re-appointment" have legal meaning which generally refers to no loss of rights or waiver of rights. The Advisory Council has arrived at the opposite conclusion that in fact there can be a loss of rights or waiver of rights in terms of the number of consecutive terms the department head can serve. Corn further pointed out that the term "re-election" as now used in the Constitution implies incumbency. Therefore, he felt that the original intent of the Constitution was probably that a department head can serve limited number of consecutive terms.

Bennett countered that the original intent of the Constitution was that there be no limitation imposed either by the department or by another University office; however, past practice has shown that several departments have imposed limitations which have been approved. This fact illustrates that the Constitution can be misread, misinterpreted or misunderstood at that point, and that an amendment is in order. Corn said that it was his understanding that an exception had only been made with one department, that exception coming at about the time collective bargaining was initiated, when there was a question on whether the department head was in or out the unit. For that reason the incident may have slipped through without being monitored. R. Nussbaum said that Corn was wrong; there are currently four departments that have guidelines with limited terms, and there were five until fairly recently. Enneking said that he read the Constitution to mean "without prejudice to re-elect" and indicated that he interpreted the wording differently than the Advisory Council did.

Beeson indicated that the Advisory Council would be happy to rework its contradictory interpretation. White urged the Council to do some research on the original intent of the Constitution, either through contacting its framers, or by going to the records of debates. Scheans and Moor replied that even historians' memories fade, and Moor's that he examined the minutes of the discussion and they are far from clear, not measuring up to the current standards. Beeson wondered if perhaps someone other than the Council should propose an amendment. Hales thought that if the Council proposes an actual amendment, rather than rendering an interpretation, the Senate then could either accept the Council's view or propose a different amendment. Chino also urged that the ambiguity of the language in the Constitution be clarified through an amendment. At this point the Nussbaum motion was passed unanimously.

3. The proposed name change from the Department of Mathematics to Department of Mathematical Sciences was presented by Moseley and the Educational Policies Committee. He indicated that many universities have moved to the new names for the department because the new designation more accurately reflects what the department is doing. He also emphasized that the approval of the new name would not imply approval of additional courses or the desire of the department in their five-year plan to become the centralizing point for courses in mathematics, statistics, operations research or computer-related courses. The proposal was put on the floor as a motion.
Chino was concerned about the disclaimer and said that the history of other departments and other programs has been that you start with a name change which then makes any additional changes later on almost automatic. He stated that the two issues should be discussed simultaneously and that a careful examination be made of the implications of the name change in terms of program. Enneking commented that the new name would reflect more accurately what the department is already doing, namely offering courses in mathematics, computer science, and statistics. The Mathematics Association of America has also just come out with a proposal of programs appropriate for Departments of Mathematical Sciences which is very similar to PSU's offerings. He viewed the change as an effort of consolidation rather than expansion.

Gruber supported Enneking, recalling that in the three other institutions he has served the name change of the Mathematics Department was approved because it reflected from the professional point of view what the departments were doing in terms of applied mathematics, business and computer science. The disclaimer in the motion indicates in a straightforward way that there is no intent to redistribute the present arrangement of courses on campus.

The motion to approve the name change was approved.

4. Moseley presented the request for the change of the name of Section to Department and Section Head to Department Head in the Division of Engineering and Applied Science. He assured that approval of the change of the name of Division to any other designation was not implied by this approval. Waller/Brenner moved the request. Moseley described this change primarily as a housekeeping matter, because the sections are now functioning as departments.

Beeson asked why the names of Section and Section Head were ever used. Erzurumlu explained that in 1975 Engineering and Applied Science was a department in the College of Science, hence the sub-units in the EAS Department could not also be called departments. In June 1980, EAS was given the status of Division and the accreditation team recently on campus has inquired about the progress of the departments in that division. L. Nussbaum pointed out that sections and section heads were not an anomaly on campus and that foreign languages were functioning that way. R. Nussbaum asked why the division head was not also called dean, since he acted and earned like a dean. Nussbaum stated that we were obviously going to have a School of Engineering of some sort and asked about the logic of this cat-and-mouse game.

Blumel commented that in most institutions this sort of organization would indeed be called a School of Engineering. However, there has been a long-standing issue in the state system about the concept of a School of Engineering implying a much fuller development of engineering than what is contemplated in the foreseeable future at Portland State. What is contemplated and explicit here is the establishment of accredited degree programs in the three basic engineering disciplines and post-baccalaureate professional advancement opportunities in at least some of those basic disciplines for practicing professionals in the area. A careful look at the engineering opportunities around the country suggest that Portland is one metropolitan area which is manifestly underserved by public engineering education opportunities. Blumel regarded it as a very important agenda for this University to move along with that development when resources permit. Personally he had no problem with the designation as a School of Engineering, but it would not be politically wise to propose at this time. He believed that his thinking also reflected the thinking of the professional community.
Bunch wanted to know what the budget implications would be. Harris said that there were none. Blumel added that the section heads are now on 12-month appointments and that there would be no change in the budget as a consequence of the change in title.

The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Benson presented two motions from the Scholastic Standards Committee. They were that the catalog reflect changes in the academic warning policy. Benson reported both motions were prepared in cooperation with the Office of Student Affairs and were designed to warn students in academic difficulty at an earlier stage.

The Senate unanimously approved the following catalog change:

**Academic Warning**

(Present wording)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Credits (Including Transfer Credits)</th>
<th>Minimum PSU GPA Warning Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-89</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 or more</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Proposed wording)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Credits (Including Transfer Credits)</th>
<th>Minimum PSU GPA Warning Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chino supported the motion, but he pointed out that it had implications for the structure of the University, and he feared that PSU would become a more and more elite institution. Blumel added that the recent increases in tuition may have the same results.

Forbes felt that having the students on warning a little earlier would help them, especially those who are seeking admission into programs which have now a junior level admission requirement. If we wait until students have accumulated 90 hours, it does delay the possibility of raising the GPA enough to get into the program or even to graduate.

Benson presented the second motion which involves the academic disqualification policy.

The Senate unanimously approved the following catalog change:
Academic Disqualification

(Present wording)
A student with 30 total credits enrolled at PSU while on warning will be disqualified automatically at the end of the term, if the student has not:

1. Raised cumulative PSU GPA above the warning level
   OR
2. Earned a GPA for the given term of 2.30 or above.

(Proposed wording)
A student with 20 or more total credits who is enrolled at PSU while on academic warning will be disqualified automatically at the end of the term, if the student has not:

1. Raised his/her cumulative PSU GPA to or above the warning level
   OR
2. Earned a GPA for the term of 2.25 or above.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.
The Ad-hoc Committee on Instructional Media made its report to the Faculty Senate on Nov. 2, 1981 (item E-2). The Senate referred the motion as originally proposed back to the committee for fuller development. The Ad-hoc Committee, therefore, now proposes the following expanded motion:

That the Faculty Senate recommend to President Blumel a faculty advisory Committee on Instructional Media be established by administrative action with the following charge:

The Committee on Instructional Media aids in the coordination of information concerning the availability of equipment, services, and training in the use of existing media; recommends possible improvements in equipment and facilities, or in the delivery of services, to the appropriate service units and the administration; and insures faculty involvement in the planning for the introduction of new forms of media or technology that have a bearing on instruction and/or professional training.
Article VI. Advisory Council.

Section 1. Election.

Substitute:
"Names of current Advisory Council members, with the exception of interim appointees having served one year or less, are to be excluded, since no member may serve two consecutive regular terms."

In place of:
"Names of current Advisory Council members are to be excluded, since no member may succeed himself or herself."

Section 3. Vacancies.

Substitute:
2) "Vacancies occurring on the Advisory Council shall be filled, through appointment, by the Secretary of the Faculty who shall designate that nominee not elected who in the immediate past Advisory Council election had the greatest number of votes. An interim appointee shall complete the regular term of office. An interim appointee having served one year or less shall be eligible for election at the end of his or her term."

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

At the direction of the Faculty Senate (12-14-81), the Advisory Council proposes the following amendment to the Constitution:

A. Article III. Faculty Powers and Authority.

Section 4. Faculty Authority in the Selection of Department Heads

Paragraph 4

SUBSTITUTE "The Department Head shall serve a stated term of three (3) years. Eligibility for re-election or re-appointment shall be determined by department procedures."

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

B. RATIONALE

Given the diverse nature of University Departments, it is unreasonable to expect that a single rule fixing the eligibility of a Department Head to re-election would be suitable for all departments. This is why a number of existing departmental procedures and practices have modified the current constitutional statement under discussion. The Departments involved have, in fact, simply carried out their responsibility for determining the method of selection for their Head. The fact that the University administration must accept or reject such procedures as well as those nominated via those procedures seems safeguard enough against administrative chaos.