The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on October 2, 1995, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 53 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 5, 1995, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   President’s Report
   Provost’s Report
   Vice President’s Report

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Presiding Officer

E. Reports from other Administrative Officers and Committees
   1. Ad Hoc Committee on Gay/Lesbian....-P. Wetzel
   2. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - S. Burns

F. Unfinished Business
   1. Election of Steering Committee Members
   2. SBA reorganization report
   3. LIB reorganization report

G. New Business
   1. General Education
      1a. Status Report - C. White
      1b. Discussion of Faculty Senate evaluation process

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
B Minutes of the June 5, 1995, Senate Meeting

The Secretary must have names of Senators’ alternates in order for them to be officially noted in your absence. Please submit your alternate’s name to the Secretary at the 2 October Senate meeting or by mail (SF) or e-mail (bobL@po.pdx.edu) by October 6, 1995.
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The Faculty Senate Minutes of May 1, 1995 were approved.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

HALEE thanked the Senate, and particularly Committee Chairs, for moving ahead with decision making in a difficult year. He thanked the Secretary to the Faculty, Sarah Andrews-Collier, for her help.

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADDED TO TODAY’S AGENDA: Item G.1 Early Intervention Licensure - Goslin for Graduate Council and Falco for program.
Copies are available at the front table of Agenda item E.5., Semi-annual report of Faculty Development Committee, and the 1995-96 Faculty Senate Roster.

Summer Addresses - Senators are reminded to leave alternate summer addresses with the Secretary to the Faculty, in the event an emergency summer term Senate Meeting needs to be called.

President Ramaley, in accordance with normal governance procedure, approved the motions to approve the Environmental Science Program and the Community Development Program.

ELECTION RESULTS

During the meeting, elections for 1995-96 PSU Faculty Senate were held with the following results:

Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Pro tem: Ulrich Hardt
Steering Committee: Steven Brenner, Elaine Limbaugh, Leslie McBride, Oren Ogle

Also serving, will be the new Secretary to the Faculty and the incoming Chair of the Committee on Committees (ex officio)

2. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Robert Liebman has been appointed Secretary to the Faculty for 1995-96.

The Athletic Director Search Committee have selected three finalists, who will be visiting the campus in the next month.

Budget Hearings will be routine. There are several long-standing structural problems, not resolved in the restructuring of the last biennium, which we hope to address in the next. They include such "across the board" items as supplies, budgets for graduate assistantships, and budgets for student wages. Last week a bipartisan leadership group in the Legislature met with the Governor to discuss higher education, and committed to protecting the State System from further cuts with "lottery futures," as it is being called. PSU should fare well due to our productivity and the quality of programs.

The President concluded by thanking faculty and staff for the work all have done this year in instituting curricular reform, enhancing research productivity, and increasing community involvement, while balancing budget and time constraints.
3. Provost's Report

There was no Provost report.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for Administrators or the Chair.

HALES announced that a Marion County judge overturned Measure 8. DESROCHERS stated the State has already diverted the savings from retirement contributions into other budgets, so it will have to find $60 million to continue payments. There are also two other lawsuits pending.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

• OSU FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS ENDORSEMENT BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE

A. JOHNSON/BOWLDEN moved "to endorse the OSU resolutions(E) forwarded by the Steering Committee."

BRENNER expressed the concerns that the resolutions are still timely, and it is not appropriate to rewrite them on the floor. COOPER asked if the Steering committee endorsement was forwarded to the Legislature. HALES stated no, the Steering decision was to forward it to the Senate.

OSHIKA stated the resolutions were originally distributed to IFS members by e-mail, and notice of their subsequent vote to support the resolutions, in principle, was forwarded to the Legislature. BOWLDEN stated his concern the press might misconstrue the section regarding "K-12" funding at this point. COOPER asked to hear supporters defend the motion. HALES iterated that many of these issues are still not completely resolved, except possibly that cited in the first paragraph. RAMALEY stated that issues in the middle section are still timely.

A. JOHNSON/KOSOKOFF moved "to delete first and last paragraph."

DESROCHERS stated it is possible that deliberations with OPEU have not definitely concluded, due to Measure 8 appeals.

HALES requested a friendly motion to separate the first and the last paragraphs.

The MOTION "to delete the first paragraph" PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
The MOTION "to delete the last paragraph" FAILED by unanimous voice vote.

The MOTION "to endorse the OSU resolutions(E) forwarded by the Steering Committee, as amended," PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

• ANNUAL REPORT, INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC BOARD

Brenner presented the report, contained in the May Senate mailing.

A. JOHNSON asked for a clarification of the federal gender representation regulation. Brenner answered that as he understands it, the first test is that scholarships, accommodations, etc. must be equivalent. Another test is that the campus is meeting the desires of all groups represented on campus. A third is that the campus has a plan to move towards full compliance during a finite period of time. HALES accepted the report for the Senate.

1. INTER INSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE

Scott Burns, IFS Senator, presented his report(attached), and an analysis of OSSHE faculty salaries he derived from the March, 1995 issue of ACADEME. (attached).

2. ANNUAL REPORT, TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE

William Tate reporting for Emily Young, Chair, presented the report(E2), and highlighted its contents. Tate called the Senate's attention to the T.S.P.C. proposal for a new design of Oregon Licensure, which the committee opposes. HALES accepted the report for the Senate.

3. ANNUAL REPORT, ADVISORY COUNCIL

OSHIKA presented the Annual Report(E3), and announced the names of the new Chair, Alan Cabelly, and new members, Johanna Brenner, Marjorie Burns, and Mary Kinnick.

BOWLDEN, the 1993-94 Advisory Council Chair, described progress on unfinished business from 1993-94 regarding the status of fixed term faculty. BOWLDEN, with the help of Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP is conducting a survey of this group of faculty, and will present a report in Fall 1995. The findings so far indicate that intentions of departments and the administration are very good, but budget constraints have prevented the university from assisting these faculty. BOWLDEN has communicated this to AAUP, and the issue is being addressed in collective bargaining.
OSHIKA commended Steven Brenner, Ansel Johnson, and Thomas Potiowsky for their service on Advisory Council this year. HALES accepted the report for the Senate.

4. **ANNUAL REPORT, COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

A. Johnson presented the report (E4), and the committee’s suggestion that, were OIRP able to manage the additional workload, the Senate consider two Faculty Preference Surveys per year to allow for changes between Spring and Fall quarters. HALES accepted the report for the Senate.

5. **SEMI ANNUAL REPORT, FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Bleiler presented the report (E5) and next year’s program announcement. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted the announcement did not contain the dates when awards could be spent. Bleiler stated it is specified in the award letter, but could also be included in the announcement. HALES accepted the report for the Senate.

6. **QUARTERLY REPORT, UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL**

OSHIKA, reporting after E, 3, presented the Quarterly Report (F2). HALES accepted it for the Senate.

7. **SCHOOL OF EDUCATION P&T GUIDELINES**

OSHIKA, reporting after E, 6, presented the reviews of University Planning Council (E7a) and Advisory Council (E7b). Since the reviews were concluded, the vote on reorganization in the school has concluded and it was passed. OSHIKA stated that both committees emphasized that they were not commenting on the merits of the revision.

F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, Article V. 1.1. Ex-officio Membership**

OSHIKA reported for Advisory Council that a clarification of job titles in the amendment is recommended. The amendment is tabled until the October 1995 Senate meeting, pending that information.

2. **FOUR-CREDIT COURSE SYSTEM INTERIM REPORT, UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL**
OSHIKA, Chair, presented the report (F2), including draft guidelines. This is a working draft which the new UPC membership will carry forward next year. These will not interfere with curriculum conversion activities taking place this summer, whether or not they are eventually implemented.

BOWLDEN/________ moved (F2, p. 1, "Policies re Credit Load/Requirements") "the Senate recommends OAA coordinate a process with the academic deans and officers of Admissions and Registration to ensure that a uniform and equitable policy is in place with respect to various credit load issues, including: -definition of full-time (currently >=8) load for purposes of financial aid, tuition, assistantships, work study, etc.; -limit on credits/term for unadmitted students (currently=7); -transfer and advanced placement issues(much of the wording currently involves units divisible by 3)."

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LENDARIS asked for comment of the issue of student hours of activity per credit, which both Curriculum and UPC are reviewing. A.JOHNSON stated it was his understanding that three hours activity equals one hour of credit. BULMAN stated that the committee reviewed the UO guidelines, which are the same. LENDARIS stated that at the graduate level, he considers the ratio to be one hour in class and three hours outside of class for one credit.

KOCAOGLU asked for comment on the recommendation that evening classes meet two nights for four hours credits. BULMAN stated the English Department had commented that 4-hour meetings were only working in a few instances, with very good students. HOLLOWAY stated they work for advanced seminars, but not lecture classes. KOCAOGLU stated that graduate students overwhelmingly want a class to meet only once a week. OSHIKA stated that UPC representatives who were familiar with four credit courses felt that four clock hours in one night was too demanding.

3. FOUR-CREDIT COURSE SYSTEM INTERIM REPORT, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

HOLLOWAY presented the report(F3), which the committee recently forwarded to departments so they could move forward with conversion activities before the 15 June deadline.

HALES stated there were no recommendations in the Curriculum report that required Senate approval, and polled the Senate for consensus. By unanimous voice vote, the Senate concurred.
SVOBODA stated that it is his department’s impression that many issues are unresolved, and asked if others agree that this has been a "chaotic" process. KOSOKOFF stated that, in spite of the rush, most CLAS departments will convert to four credit courses and meet the 15 June deadline. He stated he agreed implementation would have been preferable Fall 1997. He suggested that this opinion, held by many, be inserted in the Curriculum report, but that it was up to that committee. HOLLOWAY stated he felt the English Department experiment should have been concluded first; the timelines have been very tight. SVOBODA stated that the "Pappas Report" indicated that PSU is user unfriendly, and suggested that the hurried conversion is an example of that. BULMAN stated that the 1994 Curriculum Committee opposed the conversion effective Fall 1996, and that a number of faculty agreed with that recommendation. HOLLOWAY stated that Curriculum streamlined where they could.

LENDARIS asked if the hours of credit versus student activity could be considered a liability issue. CABELLY suggested there is disagreement between Curriculum and UPC, but they could get together and review their data. A.JOHNSON stated that there is an obvious distinction between the graduate and undergraduate commitment. LENDARIS suggested that "at least" be inserted in the report. BULMAN stated she preferred Cabelly’s suggestion, that the two committees investigate the issue together. HOLLOWAY stated there was not time to research such issues.

HALES polled the Senate for endorsement of Lendaris’s suggestion to insert the words "at least" in Interim Protocols for 4-credit conversion (F3), page 2, General Guidelines, 1. Purpose of credits, before "3." By unanimous voice vote, the Senate concurred.

4. FOUR-CREDIT COURSE SYSTEM INTERIM REPORT, ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

MERCER for Rosengrant, presented the committee’s recommendation for the General Education Requirement in the four-credit course system(Minutes of the May Senate Meeting, p. 55), forwarded at the April 1995 Senate meeting.

A. JOHNSON/MANDAVILLE moved "the Senate approve the General Education Requirement in the four-credit course system."

LENDARIS asked for a clarification of why it is necessary to revise the General Education Requirement. A. JOHNSON stated that many students will be continuing under old catalogues for several years to come.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
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G. NEW BUSINESS

1. EARLY INTERVENTION SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM LICENSURE.

FALCO represented the program for Graduate Council and Education. A. JOHNSON/KOSOKOFF moved "the Senate approve the Early Intervention Special Education Program Licensure."

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. and those present were invited to "K" House.
May 31, 1995

To: Faculty Senate
From: University Planning Council
       Beatrice Oshika, Chair (bea@cs.pdx.edu  x5-4141)
Subj: Draft Guidelines re 3-to-4 credit conversion

These guidelines should be considered to be in draft form, to be reviewed and re-worked by UPC in discussions with the Faculty Senate, relevant committees such as the Curriculum Committee, ARC, Graduate Council and other members of the campus community. The UPC addresses four major issues in these draft guidelines:

a) the process of reviewing course and curricular changes driven by the 3-to-4 credit conversion;

b) university policies re credit loads/requirements affected by conversion

c) class scheduling

d) impact of conversion on 400/500 courses

COURSE AND CURRICULAR CHANGES

The UPC reviewed the May 3, 1995 interim protocols developed by the Curriculum Committee and lauds the committee for its efforts to expedite changes associated with the conversion while maintaining appropriate faculty governance and adherence to curricular standards. UPC has two main comments (details will be submitted directly to the Curriculum Committee):

- Under the general guidelines for conversion, the relationship of required student effort to course credit should be clarified. It is stated that credit be assigned on the basis on 1 credit per 3 hrs of work per week required to satisfactorily complete course, including class attendance. Many faculty currently interpret the 3 hrs of student work to be in addition to class time. Also, the Curriculum Committee interim protocols suggests that generally 1 credit be given for each scheduled faculty contact hour (this is a paraphrase of the definition currently in the Bulletin). It is the understanding of UPC that more flexibility was intended in the Faculty Senate resolution and that assignment of course credit not be pegged to 'seat time.'

- Although the intent of the 'no net increase' suggestion for overall course credits offered per department and required for the major is clearly understood by UPC to result in fewer courses offered overall, the members felt the wording should be changed to reflect the notion of a goal rather than a strict cap on credits/courses, and attainment of that goal should be primarily the responsibility of departments and the college/school, rather than the Curriculum Committee.

The UPC notes that the David Holloway, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, has been working closely with CLAS chairs and the dean’s office on the interpretation of the interim protocols, and a process has been set up for department, college and committee review of changes by the end of Fall95.

POLICIES RE CREDIT LOADS/REQUIREMENTS

UPC recommends that OAA coordinate a process with the academic deans and offices of Admissions and Registration to ensure that a uniform and equitable policy is in place with respect to various credit load issues, including:

- definition of full-time (currently >= 8) load for purposes of financial aid, tuition, assistantships, work study, etc.
- limit on credits/term for unadmitted students (currently = 7)
- transfer and advanced placement issues (much of the wording currently involves units divisible by 3)
The UPC suggests that some status requirements might better expressed with a range of permissible credits, to allow for the transitional period when community college courses may not align with the typical PSU 4-credit course.

SCHEDULING
With background material from Registrar Bob Tufts, UPC considered various possibilities re scheduling of 4-credit courses. Although UPC clearly understands that 4 credit courses do not necessarily imply 4 contact hours per week, UPC acknowledges that many departments may, in fact, wish to structure their courses in this way. Therefore, it suggests some options, with the underlying assumptions that

- students should be able to choose courses and come to campus just two or three days per week, as they do now;
- a class ‘hour’ equals 50 minutes to allow time to go between classes, and that a two ‘hour’ session could equal 100 minutes total, with a 10 minute break and 10 minutes between classes, or however the class might wish to use the time.
- classes begin on the hour, and end whenever appropriate along the guidelines above. In other words, everything is scheduled in clock hours on the hour.
- classes offered in one hour blocks, five days a week, like foreign languages, or in 2,3,4, etc blocks of time like studio and lab courses, will be accommodated just as they are handled now.
- some notion of priority scheduling be maintained as practiced currently.

Options:
- Classes scheduled in 2 clock hour blocks from 7am-5pm, on a MW or TTH schedule. Evening courses could run in two or three hour blocks from 5pm on. There would be no courses that met for four hours in a single evening (there was consensus that would be pedagogically unsound). Fridays would be used for short courses, seminars, faculty and student meetings.

- Classes scheduled in 2 clock hour blocks as above, but on a schedule that spanned five days of the week, e.g., MW, TTh, MTh, WF, TF.

- Departments be allocated space, that is actual rooms, and use that space to support their departmental offerings throughout the day. Any ‘free’ hours would be returned to a general pool for reallocation. An advantage of this is that departments will have some ‘ownership’ of space, and can place their educational aids (maps, charts, etc) for ongoing use.

400/500 COURSES
Because of the interdependence of 400/500 courses, and their importance in the curriculum, UPC recommends

(a) Graduate Council report on the requirement that 400/500 courses carry the same credit for both the 400 and 500 versions;

(b) Graduate programs also consider moving to a typical 4 credit course base.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC EI/ECSE I (21 Credits Hours required by TSPC, designed to develop competencies.)</th>
<th>BASIC EI/ECSE II (45 Credits Hours required by TSPC, designed to develop competencies.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPICAL PLANNED PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>TYPICAL PLANNED PROGRAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 570 Child Dev &amp; Ed (3)</td>
<td>CI 570 Child Dev &amp; Ed (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 571 Play: Curric in ECE (3)</td>
<td>CI 571 Play: Curric in ECE (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 518 Survey of Excep Learners (3)</td>
<td>One of the following to meet individual need: CI 572 Lang &amp; Literacy: ECE (3) or SPHR 580 Normal Sp &amp; Lang Dev in Child (3) or SPHR 593 Survey of Sp, Lang, Hr Disor (3) or SPHR 584 Lang Disord in Child: Birth-5 (3) or SPHR 563 Modification of Sp and Lang Beh or SPED 570 Comm Sys: SHL or PSY 559 Infant Dev or PSY 560 Child Psych or (Similar elective, approved by advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 580 Accom Sp Needs: ECE (3)</td>
<td>One of the following to meet individual need: EPFA 529 ECE: Rel w/Home &amp; Society (3) or SOC 561 Sociology of the Family (3) or SPED 516 Consulting &amp; Team Planning or PSY/BST 510 Afr/Amer Infant, Fam &amp; Comm (3) or EPFA 510 Top: ECE Admin (3) or (Similar elective, approved by advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 510 Family Guided Early Intervention, 0-3 (3)</td>
<td>One of the following to meet individual need: CI 573 Assess in ECE (3) or SPED 532 Assess &amp; Plan: SHL (3) or SPED 512 Assess &amp; Plan: HL (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 510 Spec Techniques: EI/ECSE (3)</td>
<td>SPED 510 Spec Techniques: EI/ECSE (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (0 - 3)</td>
<td>Other Electives (0 - 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 509 Prac: EI/ECSE (3 - 6)</td>
<td>SPED 509 Prac: EI/ECSE (3 - 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPED 525 Student Teaching: EI/ECSE (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

To: PSU Faculty Senate
From: Scott Burns, IFS representative from PSU
Date: June 5, 1995

The IFS met on June 2 and 3 in LaGrande at Eastern Oregon State College. Most of the meeting dealt with strategic planning for the future to make the IFS more effective. The State Board is devoting their June meeting to planning, and we wanted to be part of that process. We asked the Board to have an IFS representative at the planning retreat; Sam Connell, our president was invited to attend. We were successful in presenting our ideas to the Board.

The purpose of the IFS is fourfold. First, we wish to partnership with the Board and the Chancellor's office to set and attain the goals of higher education in Oregon. In addition we would like to partnership with the legislature, business groups, students, and alumni. Second, we hope to be an important communication link between the faculty and OSSHE and OSBHE, between campuses, and between the faculty and the legislature. When the need arises, we hope to answer specific requests from the Chancellor, the Board, or the Legislature. Third, we are to be a watchdog on issues involving faculty issues. Lastly, we need to become more active with other groups of Oregonians to give more visibility to higher education in the state and convince them of the value of higher education.

With the above goals and purposes in mind, the IFS developed a list of projects to concentrate on for the 1995-1996 year. At the top of the list is the priority of faculty salaries. Other projects, in no particular order are: a studying distance learning, developing a strategy for the next legislative session, getting a faculty member on the board, developing more influence in presidential searches, helping OSSHE with its marketing plan, developing regular meetings with the chancellor, vice chancellor and the governmental relations specialist, reviving the newsletter to the faculty, promoting advisory groups to the faculty, supporting diversity initiatives, improving alumni relations, and investigating the proficiency based admissions standards.

Other items were also discussed at the meeting. The university center in Bend does not seem to be destined to become a new institution in the state, but a place where the other universities can operate their programs. BA, BS, MA, and MS programs will be offered there, but the degrees will be
awarded from other institutions. The school of social work already has a program operating there. The Educational Efficiency Act was finally passed in the legislature when the house voted 57-0 in its favor. It spent a lot of time in committee because of an anti-OSPIRG group trying to cut its funding through an amendment which eventually failed. It appears like there will be up to $25 million for faculty salary increases. The Board will be acting on this issue this month, and it looks like we will get 3% for the first year and that OSSHE self-generated funds could give us another 3% or more for the second year. A video produced by Gerry Kisler, vice-provost at University of Oregon, was presented. It covered Oregon's economy and its future. We are sacrificing higher education dollars to build prisons. We are trying to summarize these very interesting data from the video onto a page for distribution to faculty. The representatives from WOSC were very happy with the new president who was recently chosen. Faculty had an important voice in the process.

An update on OSSHE Faculty Salaries was handed out. PSU salaries rank in the 6-9th percentiles of Category I universities nationally, and the compensation package ranks in the 2-7th percentile nationally after measure 8. To raise our salaries to the 50th percentile, the average faculty salary would have to be raised by the following: full professor by $14,500, associate professor by $5,100, and assistant professor by $5,300.
OSSHE FACULTY SALARIES
1994 - 1995 SUMMARIES

SOURCE OF DATA: "Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Professor, 1994 - 1995", Academe, March/April Issue, 1995. "Compensation" category listed below includes salary plus retirement, medical, dental and social security contributions by the state. Percentiles are listed as "%". Salaries are given in 1000's of dollars and are averages. Last year's values are listed in parentheses. Compensation values after Measure 8 are listed in the last column for campuses who have not included the effects in the data. Measure 8 does not affect salaries, but it reduces compensation by 6%.

CATEGORY I UNIVERSITIES: Below is information on Oregon's three universities listed in this category: Oregon State University, University of Oregon, and Portland State University. The data have been summarized and compared to the other 182 universities nationally in this grouping which includes 146,118 faculty members. This category includes all universities that provide bachelor, masters, and Ph.D. degrees and award more than 30 Ph.D. degrees per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV.</th>
<th>SALARY %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION % AFTER MEASURE 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Assoc.</td>
<td>Assis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofO</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV. SALARIES AVG.</th>
<th>COMPENSATION AVG.</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>(59.7) (47.3) (40.0)</td>
<td>(76.2) (61.5) (52.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.9 46.5 39.9 47.4</td>
<td>76.3 60.6 52.0 61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofO</td>
<td>(59.7) (44.6) (37.5)</td>
<td>(76.2) (57.9) (48.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.4 44.4 37.9 46.2</td>
<td>75.8 57.8 49.6 59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>(54.4) (43.7) (38.2)</td>
<td>(69.3) (56.4) (49.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.2 43.7 37.3 46.2</td>
<td>65.7 52.6 44.3 56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68.7 48.8 42.6</td>
<td>84.7 63.7 53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Compensation figures already reported with Measure 8 reductions.

(Compiled by Dr. Scott Burns, Dept. of Geology, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207; (503-725-3389), email: scott@ch1.ch.pdx.edu; 6/4/95)
**CATEGORY IIA:** Below is information on Oregon's two public colleges listed in this category: Western Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College. The data have been summarized and compared to 513 other universities and colleges in the U.S. with 104,676 faculty. This category includes all "comprehensive" universities and colleges that offer bachelor and graduate degrees, but award less than 30 Ph.D. degrees per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV. SALARY %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER MEASURE 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (20) (10) (10)</td>
<td>(30) (25) (25)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 3 4</td>
<td>11 5 3</td>
<td>10 10 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV. SALARIES</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER MEASURE 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (46.0) (37.1) (31.5)</td>
<td>(59.8) (49.1) (41.7)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC (43.9) (35.4) (31.5)</td>
<td>(57.5) (47.0) (41.7)</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Compensation figures already reported with Measure 8 reductions.

**CATEGORY IIB:** Below is information on Oregon's two public colleges listed in this category: Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology. The data have been summarized and compared to 840 other colleges and universities in the U.S. with 54,760 faculty. This category includes institutions that emphasize awarding the general baccalaureate degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV. SALARY %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION %</th>
<th>COMPENSATION %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER MEASURE 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC (60) (45) (40)</td>
<td>(70) (60) (60)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 33 21</td>
<td>63 45 35</td>
<td>65 80 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT* (70) (85) (95)</td>
<td>(75) (90) (95)</td>
<td>73 83 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIV. SALARIES</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFTER MEASURE 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
<td>Prof. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC (47.0) (36.3) (30.9)</td>
<td>(61.2) (48.2) (41.2)</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT* (50.0) (44.1) (39.1)</td>
<td>(64.8) (57.4) (51.2)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>