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MEMORANDUM

TO Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Senate

FROM Jim Heath, Acting Secretary to the Faculty

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 10, 1983 at 3:00 P.M. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA:

A. Roll
B. Approval of the minutes of the December 6 and 13, 1982 meetings
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
D. Question Period
E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
F. Unfinished Business
G. New Business
   * 1. Ad Hoc Committee on Constitutional Revision
       -- Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Constitution -- Abbott
   * 2. Curriculum Committee
       -- Proposed Computer Engineering Program -- Tang
   * 3. Graduate Council
       -- Graduate Policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity -- Bolton
H. Adjournment

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

* The following documents are included with this mailing:
B. Minutes of the December 6 and 13, 1982 meetings.
G.1. Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Constitution
G.2. Proposed Computer Engineering Program
G.3. Graduate Policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 1982
Presiding Officer: Frederick Waller
Secretary: Jim Heath
Parliamentarian: Larry Steward


Alternates Present: Aguirre for Boyle, Tocher for Forbes, West for Goslin, Bates for Heath, Frey for Holloway, Koroloff for Pinamonti.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Corn, Dobson, Erzurumlu, Forbes, Gruber, Harris, Howard, Leu, Morris, Nicholas, O'Connor, Paudler, Pfingsten, Rauch, Ross, Schendel, Todd, Toulan, Trudeau, Williams.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate meeting of November 1, 1982, were approved as presented with the following correction: under Members Present, add Martinez.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

WALLER reminded Senators that they were invited for a sherry hour at the Campus Ministry at the conclusion of the meeting. He then announced certain rules that he proposed to follow during the meeting in order to expedite the business of the Senate: no repeating speakers on any subject until all who wished to speak on the subject had been heard and a 4 minute time limit on the remarks by each speaker. He also stated that if it appeared that the Senate could not complete all of the business on its agenda by 5:00 p.m., he would entertain a motion to adjourn and reconvene at 3:00 p.m. on the following Monday, December 13, 1982. The Presiding Officer then reviewed certain parliamentary rules regarding motions to table and Faculty Senate rules regarding who is eligible to speak during Senate meetings. He announced that he would allow any non-Senator to speak during the meeting if a Senator asked the privilege of the floor for a guest.

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

In response to the question posed to him by BJORK (see Agenda), ANDERSON, Director of Financial Aids, confirmed that some students are not eligible for work study jobs because they do not meet the financial need criteria established by the federal government. However, many students who do not qualify for work study do hold student jobs on campus. A Department, if it wishes, may hire non-work study students. In response to the question posed
to him (see Agenda), CORN, Assistant to the President for Legal Affairs, said that to his knowledge no person has filed a legal challenge to the CWSF rules charging discrimination. BJORK responded that faculty would be furious if they were told that similar rules applied to their hiring and declared that he believed that PSU should remove CWSF eligibility as criteria for student employment.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

The Senate approved by individual voice votes the Annual Reports from the Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Library Committee, and SSC.

Highlights from discussion about the Annual Reports included: In reply to a question from JOHNSON, TANG (Curriculum Committee chair) replied that the ROTC proposal came from the Office of Academic Affairs. BOLTON (Graduate Council chair) said that the Council will present a proposed policy on academic dishonesty to the Senate in January. GRIFFIN (Library Committee chair) expressed relief that the budget this year for new books was larger than last year's. BENSON (SSC chair) expressed the Committee's special thanks to Penny Jester of the Registrar's Office for her exemplary assistance in managing the SSC's paperwork.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Curriculum Committee--Course and Program Proposals

TANG, chair of the Curriculum Committee, referred Senators to Document Fia, the Committee's Course and Program Proposal Report, in the December Mailing and to Documents G1b (Summary, 1983-84 Proposed Changes in Existing Programs) and G1c (Summary, 1983-84 Proposed New Courses and Changes in Old Courses) in the November Mailing.

By a hand vote of 26-24 the Senate voted to reverse a Curriculum Committee recommendation regarding WR 227 and to accept the limitation on use proposed by the English Department that WR 227 "May not be used for the non-major distribution requirement."

Highlights of discussion re WR 227: WILLIAMS, who teaches the course, described it as a practical, trade-school class not suitable to meet liberal arts requirements. WOLK explained that the Curriculum Committee worried that students who needed the course to improve their writing skills might not take it if they could not count it for distribution credit. COOPER argued that students from the professional schools would relate the course to their major area of study and thus receive no real value in a liberal arts sense. McINTYRE stated that Engineering preferred that students be allowed to count WR 227 for distribution credit.

By a voice vote the Senate approved the recommendation (as amended on the floor) of the Curriculum Committee that the English Department NOT be allowed to add the following prerequisite for WR 323: "satisfactory completion of WR 121 and junior standing (90 credits or more)."

Highlights of the discussion re WR 323: TANG explained that the Curriculum Committee believed that some students should be allowed to take the course before their junior year. COOPER warned that deleting the proposed
prerequisite would allow even freshmen to take the course and would increase significantly enrollment pressure on WR 323. The Department of English had moved towards a vertical composition program in an effort to spread the load on writing instructors. CHINO termed ridiculous the practice of allowing students to put off taking WR 323 until the junior or senior year; they need work in writing earlier. COOPER pointed out that the change in the prerequisite was an attempt to bring the description of the course into compliance with current practice, since the English Department's present practice is to restrict enrollment in WR 323 to juniors or above. After the vote on the motion, COOPER asked if the Department was to take the Senate action as an instruction to admit those not juniors to WR 323? TANG replied yes.

By a separate voice vote for each, the Senate approved without change the Curriculum Committee's recommendations for the Departments of Economics, Psychology, History, Political Science, Accounting, Finance and Law, Management, Administration of Justice, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Dance and for the School of Business Administration, School of Health and Physical Education, School of Urban Affairs-Undergraduate Program, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

Highlights of discussion re the above: Regarding the change in prerequisite for HST 491, JOHNSON emphasized that students need a background in algebra more than knowledge of statistics for the course. Regarding the Dance proposal, TANG replied to a question from KIMBRELL that all courses being proposed to be offered under the Dance prefix are presently being taught under an HPE prefix except D 297.

TANG referred Senators to Document File in the December Mailing, the proposal to offer ROTC courses at PSU through an arrangement with the Army ROTC unit at Oregon State University. She stated that the Curriculum Committee had endorsed the proposal by a 7-2 vote and that the Educational Policies Committee had also reviewed and approved the proposal. WALLER reminded the Senate of the rules for debate he had outlined at the start of the meeting and announced his intention to have a roll call vote on the issue.

Highlights from the discussion about ROTC included: KOSOKOFF read a statement from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom opposing ROTC at PSU as inconsistent with free inquiry. He added that the income figures for PSU presented in the ROTC proposal were very misleading. NUSSBAUM read a statement against establishing a ROTC unit at PSU, criticizing ROTC as antithetical to critical thinking. He proposed that PSU offer the Army an officer training program taught by qualified PSU faculty in History, Speech Communications, Management, etc. TANG noted that the ROTC program at OSU does use some OSU professors for some ROTC courses. BATES observed that much of the argument for the program seems to revolve around the opportunity for financial gain for students and for PSU. He criticized the program because PSU had no control over the faculty teaching the courses or the course content. BATES called ROTC a training function not really suitable to a University. He would support the program only if PSU can review course content and faculty in the same way it does other University offerings and if academic credit for ROTC is for plus credits—i.e., over the 186 credits needed for graduation. MOSELEY commented that the Educational Policies Committee had approved the ROTC proposal on the grounds
that public universities should support public policy; in a word, the EPC believed that we should try to "universitize the military," not vice-versa. MARTINEZ lamented that 39 credits for military training are proposed, but that the University has "no credit hours for peace." HAMMOND said the ROTC issue was parallel to church-state separation. He then submitted a petition signed by approximately 160 members of the "PSU Community" stating that "The undersigned are opposed to the presence of an ROTC program at our university. We urge that ROTC not be instituted for any reasons." O'CONNOR, President of the Associated Students of PSU, sharply criticized the legislative committee headed by Wally Priestly (D, Portland) for trying to intimidate PSU by holding a "hearing" about the ROTC proposal. O'CONNOR appealed for support for the program on the grounds that financial aid available to students in the program would assist them to stay in the University. KIMBRELL reminded Senators that this same issue had been fought over some 15 years earlier. He argued that ROTC is not suitable to a University and that "a good liberal education is the best defense." CEASE expressed hope that the Senate will vote on the merits of the proposal without being influenced by those outside the University. He added that educating military officers in public institutions made good sense in many ways. SCHEANS objected to homosexuals being excluded from the ROTC. MORRIS, the PSU Affirmative Action Officer, responded by reading from an Army information statement that while Department of Defense policy prohibits homosexuals from participating in active military units, ROTC courses are part of college and university curriculum and are thus open to all students enrolled in an institution; homosexuals can take ROTC courses. A separate issue is whether a homosexual can receive an Army commission. BEAN (student) said he could agree with some of the arguments advanced by both sides, but that the bottom line is "power and greed" versus the moral questions involved. WALDROFF related that he had turned down an Annapolis appointment and stayed in a Naval ROTC program at a public university because he preferred a liberal arts environment. STALLINGS (former PSU student) declared that ROTC classes are different because students enter into a contractual obligation which may lead to a person being inducted as an enlisted person or even imprisoned if the contract is violated. POOL (ROTC instructor at OSU) replied that only 4-year scholarship students enter into such a contract, and that such students have a one year grace period to decide if they wish to continue in the ROTC program. If they do, they must complete the three years remaining on their contract. They are then obligated for a 6-year reserve or 6-year reserve and active duty combined period of service. If a student under a contract obligation flunks out of college, the student must pay back the scholarship money or go into the military service for two years as an enlisted person. RANSOM (student) explained that he had recently gotten out of the military and was attending PSU because he liked the broad cross-section of people who are students here. However, he cannot continue in school unless he is able to obtain the financial assistance available through an ROTC program. WEST stressed that both supporters and opponents of the ROTC proposal have patriotic and moral feelings. However, he opposed the ROTC proposal because he believed it was inconsistent with the University's actions to eliminate programs such as Journalism and CMI. PSU faculty and students have been told by administrators that PSU cannot afford a smorgasbord of professional programs; thus it would be inconsistent for PSU to offer a professional ROTC program. On a motion by JOHNSON, the Senate moved to ADJOURN at 5:05 p.m. and to reconvene at 3:00 p.m., Monday, December 13, 1982.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 13, 1982
Presiding Officer: Frederick Waller
Secretary: Jim Heath
Parliamentarian: Larry Steward


UNFINISHED BUSINESS (Continued from December 6 Meeting)

JOHNSON moved to change the order of the agenda to consider the graduate program and course proposals before continuing with the ROTC proposal. The motion failed by a hand vote.

WALLER thanked the Senate for maintaining a high level of decorum at the previous Monday's meeting. He announced that he planned to use the same ground rules for debate that he had announced at the last meeting.

MARKGRAF referred the Senate to Article V, Section 3, 2) a) which specifies that voting may be by secret ballot if requested by any five voting members of the Senate. Speaking on behalf of the required number, he requested a secret ballot on the ROTC proposal whenever debate on the issue was completed.

TANG repeated the motion that she had made at the previous meeting: that the Senate accept the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to approve the proposed ROTC courses. The effect of such approval would be to establish an Army ROTC program at PSU as a branch of the Army ROTC program at Oregon State University.

Highlights from the continued discussion regarding the ROTC proposal included: GOULD (PSU student and an employee of the American Friends Service Committee) read a prepared statement from the AFSC opposing the establishment of a ROTC program at PSU. The statement charged that the military taught authoritarianism and was dangerous. If PSU rejected an ROTC program, it would send a message to the government that other means of
financial aid to college students should be provided. UNDERHILL (student) argued that ROTC courses should be available for students to take. He stressed that ROTC was financially beneficial to students. URIS (PSU graduate) emphasized the divisiveness that ROTC would bring to PSU. It would inevitably cause dissension, conflict, and perhaps even violence. The world-wide peace movement is clearly gaining popularity and momentum, and those favoring establishing ROTC should keep that fact in mind and not feel bullied by the argument that students should be free to choose to participate in ROTC. BRENNER said he seemed to be hearing those opposed to ROTC saying that a "no" vote would lead to peace and that allowing the ROTC program at PSU would be a surrender of academic curricular control. Those favoring the program were arguing that it would aid students financially and that liberal arts education would make military officers more humane. He noted that the University teaches many things which describe past horrors or may make future horrors possible. For example, Physics classes provide training which could enable a person to build an atomic bomb; History classes teach about Hitler and his attempt to exterminate the Jews. Teaching such matters is, nevertheless, proper, because the University's business is enabling persons to learn about society and the way it functions. Thus, a "yes" vote on the ROTC proposal would be the best way to protect academic freedom. NEWHALL countered that ROTC is closer to an indoctrination program than an education program. The key issues in deciding about ROTC are educational issues, not financial ones. Many faculty object to allowing 27 credits for ROTC to count towards a degree and to not following normal approval channels for ROTC courses. NEWHALL also objected to rules excluding gays from military service, arguing that that reason alone was sufficient to reject ROTC. LUTES stated that his job is counselling 600 veterans at PSU. Many students, including many veterans, want to take ROTC courses. He noted that we accept ROTC credits transferred from other schools, so we would be consistent if we were to allow ROTC credits taken at PSU to count for graduation. SIMON (student) declared that there are many connections, such as research contracts, between the military and the academic world. He objected especially to the fact that ROTC courses are not subjected to the same review and screening by faculty as other courses. GATZ, a member of the Curriculum Committee, responded that the ROTC courses had met the same scrutiny as other proposed new courses. VATTER declared that he viewed the decision about ROTC as symbolic. He stressed the "ideological lag" which existed; nuclear weapons have made war obsolete, but ROTC symbolizes war and war would be nuclear. Unfortunately, the population at-large is not aware that the armed forces are an historical anachronism. CONNOLLY (student and chair of "Students for ROTC") said that ROTC trains men and women to lead and stressed that ROTC-trained officers have the opportunity to be educated - unlike officers trained at OCS or at a military academy - in a regular college environment. ROTC-trained officers are the best way to prevent the potential for a military takeover of government. He also questioned whether troops would follow the lead of a homosexual officer. JOHNSON challenged the idea of the University putting in a new program costing money right after dropping a program such as Journalism. LEU said that he believed all cogent arguments for and against the ROTC program had been made; honorable people with different values clearly have different views, but he saw no reason to delay the vote on the issue. He then moved the previous question. By hand vote the Senate approved the motion and closed debate.

By the secret voting method requested earlier, the Senate voted 30 Yes to 29 No (with one additional Yes vote not counted because of improper marking of the
ballot) to accept the Curriculum Committee's recommendation and approve the
ROTC courses.

ENNEKING asked if the vote taken at the meeting on December 6 which accepted
the limitation that WR 227 "May not be used for the non-major distribution
requirement" did not fail to accept proposed changes in title, description, and
prerequisites for the course. To clarify the matter, TANG moved, and the
Senate approved by voice vote, to accept the other proposed changes as well as
the limitation.

BOLTON, chair of the Graduate Council, referred Senators to Document F2, the
Council's Course and Program Proposal Report, in the December mailing and to
Documents Glb (Summary, 1983-84 Proposed Changes in Existing Programs) and
Glc (Summary, 1983-84 Proposed New Courses and Changes in Old Courses) in
the November mailing.

By an individual voice vote for each, the Senate approved the Graduate Council's
recommendations (see Document F2) for Economics, History, Political Science,
Public Administration, the School of Social Work, the School of Urban Affairs,
and the School of Engineering and Applied Science.

Highlights of the discussion concerning the Council's recommendations on the
above included the following: HOWARD asked if Public Administration and
Urban Affairs had dropped any courses to balance the new courses proposed.
BOLTON noted that both programs were relatively new and were converting many
courses offered in the past under omnibus numbers to discreet numbers.
BRENNER declared that PA570 and PA576 appeared to be moving into the Public
Health area. He wondered if there had been coordination with the Public
Health Program. He added that he could support courses in Public Health
Administration as long as the courses did not gravitate towards hospital
management. If they did, that would be a move into the private sector, and
he would view that as treading on the turf of the Department of Management.
BOLTON responded that there had been consultation and coordination with the
Public Health Program and there was no conflict. CEASE, Head of Public
Administration, said that although he did not know if the private and public
sectors could be precisely separated, he could say that the courses in
question dealt with "health planning, policy, and administration" and not
with hospital management. He added that the courses have been offered at
least three times each. BRENNER stated that he had no negative feelings
about the courses but did want his concerns on record. Regarding the Social
Work courses, BOLTON advised the Senate that Social Work's proposal to assign
numbers to new courses which had previously been used for different courses
would likely cause some confusion. However, the Registrar had reluctantly
agreed to the proposal, and the Council accepted the fact that there were no
unused 500 numbers for SSW to use. BRENNER wondered if the Graduate Council
had reviewed the Social Work courses carefully to make certain that there was
no duplication with other PSU courses. BOLTON answered in the affirmative.
He said the Council had some concerns but recognized that each academic area
has some unique needs.

The Senate voted by voice vote to approve all course proposals submitted by the
School of Business Administration except Mgmt 500C and 500D.

Highlights of discussion on the above motion: ENNEKING objected to the
courses on the grounds that there was evident duplication and that there
were substantial changes in the courses from the way they are presently described in the catalog. BRENNER responded that the courses have actually been taught the way the proposed new description reads; furthermore, the accrediting agency for the MBA requires graduate level courses be taken by MBA students. OH stressed that BA courses 500A, B, C, D are preparatory-type courses and do count towards the total credits required for the MBA. These preparatory courses provide work at an accelerated pace, so that the same material is covered in one term that often takes two terms in undergraduate courses. ENNEKING noted that Math offers a graduate level statistics course. DOBSON advised the Senate that even if the changes proposed for Mgmt 500C and 500D were not accepted, the old Mgmt 500C and 500D courses could still be offered. ENNEKING agreed but argued that rejecting the proposed changes would prod Math and Business Administration to work together to reconcile their differences.

WALLER thanked the Senate for acting as a deliberative body should and ADJOURNED the meeting at 4:25 P.M.
Introduction:

In June 1982, President Blumel appointed an ad hoc committee on constitutional revision, to consider and recommend changes to the Faculty Constitution necessitated by the recent academic reorganization. In particular, we have been concerned with the question of representation in the Faculty Senate and with the composition of the fourteen Standing Committees specified in the Constitution.

We have tried to follow several principles in developing proposed amendments. One is to offer the minimum constitutional amendments required for smooth functioning of the university. Another is to reduce the size of committees, and possibly the Senate, in order to allow more efficient operation and to reduce the burden on faculty time. A third is to allow greater flexibility in Senate representation and, where possible, in committee structure. A fourth is to balance the sometimes conflicting claims of representativeness and proportionality in the composition of committees.

It is important to emphasize that each faculty member serving in the Senate or on a university committee represents all of his or her colleagues in the university and is responsible for considering the interests of the entire university in every decision. By way of reminder, the Constitution in Article IV, Section 4 (3), requires that all committees "consult with administrative officers, with the Faculty, with individuals, and with the Senate whenever pertinent information or counsel is needed."

Constitutional Committees (Article IV, Section 4 [1] and [4]):

The committee established the following principles as guidelines in considering the composition of individual committees:

- University committees are working bodies that consider information and advise the Faculty Senate, which is the university's major representative body. Small committees tend to work more efficiently than large.

- Committees have an obligation actively to seek out information and advice relevant to their deliberations.
We propose specific language for the composition of all fourteen constitutional committees. At present, the Constitution specifies the composition of ten of these committees.

- As a basic pattern, we propose that university committees have a maximum of seven faculty members, of whom three shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as a general practice. We think that it would be appropriate for the Committee on Committees to consider the same composition as the norm for administrative committees.

- In coordination with the Committee on Committees and the Educational Policies Committee, we are suggesting that student membership on committees be reduced. This proposal has the most marked impact on the Educational Policies Committee and the Effective Teaching Committee, which are now required to include student members one fewer than the number of faculty members. In recent years, student appointments in the required numbers have not been made.

- We suggest that the Senate adopt a revised set of Guidelines for Constitutional Committees (see pp. 16-17 in the Faculty Governance Guide).

The committee gave special attention to the composition of the Graduate Council, Curriculum Committee, Budget Committee, and Educational Policies Committee, in response to the Senate's resolution of May 17, 1982 asking for consideration of "unit representation proportional to faculty FTE on policy-shaping committees." We have received suggestions from the Committee on Committees, from the chairs of the "policy-making committees," from administrative officers, and from other faculty.

We have found it impossible to structure these committees in such a way as to be simultaneously manageable, representative, and proportional. The following table shows the basic alternatives considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Structure</th>
<th>Committee Size</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) 3 members from CLAS 7</td>
<td>proportional manageable</td>
<td>not representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 members from remainder of university</td>
<td>consistent with other committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 3 members from CLAS 12</td>
<td>representative manageable</td>
<td>not proportional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 member from each of the other divisions</td>
<td>conservative/ least change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2-
Committee Structure  Committee Size  Advantages  Disadvantage

(c) 8 members from CLAS
1 member from each of the other divisions
proportional representative
not manageable

Although there is sentiment in the university and within the committee itself in favor of option (b), the committee's consensus is to recommend option (a), in accord with the basic guidelines that we established for the composition of committees.

Senate Elections (Article V, Section 2):

The committee recommends that seats in the Faculty Senate continue to be allocated by divisions, as defined in Article V, Section 1 (2). We also recommend that the faculty of each division determine whether its own Senators are elected by departments or at large within the division.

The committee recognizes several advantages to representation by departments:

- Departmental representation could expedite the work of the Senate. As issues arise that impact specific departments, that department's representative would be able to respond immediately to those issues.

- Large divisions may be unwieldy for the election of senators at large. Faculty members are unlikely to be informed voters when the potential candidate pool is nearly 300 as with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

There are also several points in favor of retaining representation by divisions:

- Several units have no departmental structure (Social Work, HPE, DCE, All Others).

- The definition of "department" is unclear. The Schools and College contain a number of independent, permanent research units, as well as academic programs that do not grant degrees (such as Women's Studies, University Scholars). The university might find itself drawing an unwarranted distinction between recognized and non-recognized departments.

- A requirement for departmental representation would place a burden on the faculty of small departments.

- Representation by divisions may be more likely to promote attention to the needs of the university as a whole.
o Divisional representation is used at a number of comparable universities such as Cleveland State, University of Louisville, University of Toledo, George Mason, and Nebraska-Omaha.

The committee finds some merit in each form of representation. However, departmental representation would be a major alteration in the basis of faculty governance. Because the committee believes that the burden of argument must be on the advocates of a major change, we are unable to recommend that the university as a whole shift to departmental representation.

At the same time, we recognize that departmental representation may make Senate elections more meaningful in some divisions of the university. It is for this reason that we recommend that each division define its own voting units. The total number of Senators allocated to each division under V: 2 (1) is not affected by that division's internal decision about voting units for nominations and elections. We anticipate that in many cases, the voting unit will continue to be the division, as at present.

Carl Abbott, Chair
Colin Dunkeld
Eugene Enneking
John Hammond
Jay Shimada
Charles R. White
Jim Heath, Consultant

December 13, 1982
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Proposed Change, Art. IV, Section 2, Paragraph (1)

Current Wording:

The members of the Committee on Committees will normally serve two years and must be members of the Senate during their tenure as members of the Committee. The following divisions shall elect members in even-numbered years:

- All Others
- Business Administration
- Division of Continuing Education

The following divisions shall elect members in odd-numbered years:

- Arts and Letters
- Engineering and Applied Science
- Health and Physical Education
- Library
- Science
- Social Science

Proposed Wording:

The members of the Committee on Committees will normally serve two years and must be members of the Senate during their tenure as members of the Committee. The following divisions shall elect members in even-numbered years:

- All Others
- Business Administration
- Division of Continuing Education

The following divisions shall elect members in odd-numbered years:

- Arts and Sciences (three members)
- Engineering and Applied Science
- Health and Physical Education
- Library
- Performing Arts
REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES

Proposed Changes, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph (4)

Current Wording

Pages 5-10 of the Faculty Governance Guide specify representation on the following committees: University Athletics Board, Library Committee, Teacher Education Committee, University Scholars Board, Graduate Council, General Student Affairs Committee, Budget Committee, Committee on Effective Teaching, and Educational Policies Committee. No representation is specified for Academic Requirements Committee, Scholastic Standards Committee, Curriculum Committee, and Research and Publication Committee.

We propose to specify representation for each committee, as follows. In each case, the language is to be inserted in the proper sub-paragraph immediately following the name of the committee.

Proposed Wording

(4) Standing Committees and Their Functions

(a) Committee on Committees (defined in IV, 4 (1))

(b) Academic Requirements Committee. This committee shall consist of a maximum of seven faculty members. As a general practice, three out of seven members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. This committee shall:

(c) Scholastic Standards Committee (same as ARC)

(d) Curriculum Committee (same as ARC)

(e) University Athletics Board (no change recommended)

(f) Library Committee (same as ARC)

(g) Research and Publication Committee (same as ARC)

(h) Teacher Education Committee. This committee shall consist of two students recommended by the Student Senate, one faculty member from each of the departments of Special Education, Teacher Education, and Special Programs, and seven other faculty members, of whom three shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as a general practice. The Dean and Assistant Dean of the School of Education and the Education Librarian shall be ex-officio non-voting members.
This committee shall . . .

(i) University Scholars Board. This board shall consist of a maximum of seven faculty members. As a general practice, three out of seven faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In addition, one student shall serve on the board. The Director of the University Scholars Program shall be an ex-officio member. The board shall:

(j) Graduate Council. The council shall consist of a maximum of seven faculty members. As a general practice, three out of seven members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. It is desirable that all appointees to the council be selected from faculty members who are active and interested in graduate programs. The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Registrar shall be permanent consultants. Additional consultants may be appointed by the chairperson. The council shall:

(k) General Student Affairs Committee. This committee shall consist of a maximum of seven faculty members and three members of the Associated Students of Portland State University. As a general practice, three out of seven faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The chairperson of the General Student Affairs Committee shall be chosen from the teaching faculty membership. Consultants shall include, but not be limited to, one representative from the Vice President for Student Affairs Office. This committee shall:

(l) Budget Committee. (same as ARC)

(m) Committee on Effective Teaching. This committee shall consist of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (consultant) or his or her representative and a maximum of seven faculty members. As a general practice, three of the seven faculty members shall be from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In addition, there shall be one student member. This committee shall:

(n) Educational Policies Committee. (same as Effective Teaching)
CURRENT WORDING  Article V. Senate. Section 2. Election of the Senate.

1) Determination of Divisional Representation. By the first Monday in March of each year, the chief administrative officer of each division (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2) shall report to the Secretary of the Faculty the name of each faculty member, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned to each division. At the same time names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in academic programs not in any "division" shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer to the Secretary of the Faculty. These faculty shall be assigned by the Senate Steering Committee to divisions as prescribed in Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2. The Secretary of the Faculty, under the supervision of the Senate Steering Committee, shall then determine the number of senators to be allocated to each division, apportioning one senator for each multiple of ten full-time equivalent faculty or fraction thereof. A newly instituted division shall elect its senator(s) in the next regular senate election.

2) Nomination. Six weeks prior to the date of Senate elections, the Secretary of the Faculty shall obtain from each divisional administrative officer an approved list of the faculty members assigned to the division. This list will be circulated with the directions that any potential candidate may delete his or her name if he or she does not wish to be a candidate for a Senate position. No later than four weeks before the Senate election, the Secretary of the Faculty shall submit a list of eligible candidates to every faculty member in the divisions, and request the nomination of a number of names equal to twice the number of Senate vacancies occurring in that division at the end of the school year. The total number of nominees shall equal twice the number of senate vacancies in that division. Those persons on this ballot who are named the greatest number of times shall be the nominees. All persons tied for the final position shall be declared nominees.

3) Election. On the last Monday in April the Secretary of the Faculty, under the supervision of the Senate Steering Committee, shall mail ballots containing the names of final nominees for Senate election to faculty members of the respective divisions. Each divisional faculty member shall vote for no more than a number of candidates equal to the number of Senate vacancies occurring in his or her division for that year. The person or persons receiving the greatest number of votes shall be elected. In case of ties for the final position, run-off elections shall be held.

4) Terms and Limits of Membership. Senate members shall be chosen for three-year terms except when (1) senators are being elected to represent a newly created division, or (2) it is necessary to arrange terms so that approximately one-third of a division's senators shall be elected each year. In these two cases, faculty members in the said divisions receiving the largest number of votes will be elected to three-year terms, and those with the next highest numbers of votes will be elected to two- and one-year terms as necessary to provide that approximately one-third of the Senate shall be elected each year. The Secretary of the Faculty shall inform each division as to the number of vacancies and length of term of each position to be elected each year.

No members shall be eligible for re-election until one year has elapsed following his or her term of office or resignation. No person shall be eligible to represent more than one division.

5) Interim Vacancies. Interim vacancies that occur in the Senate shall be filled by appointment by the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall designate to fill the unexpired term the non-elected nominees who in the immediate past Senate election had the greatest number of votes in the division in which the vacancy exists. An interim appointee shall be eligible for election at the end of his or her term.
PROPOSED WORDING

Article V. Senate.

Section 2. Election of the Senate.

1) Determination of Divisional Representation. By the first Monday in March of each year, the chief administrative officer of each division (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2) shall report to the Secretary of the Faculty the name of each faculty member, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned to each division. At the same time, names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in academic programs not in any "division" shall be reported by the academic administrative officer to the Secretary of the Faculty. These faculty shall be assigned by the Senate Steering Committee to divisions as prescribed in Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2. The Secretary of the Faculty, under the supervision of the Senate Steering Committee, shall then determine the number of senators to be allocated to each division, apportioning one senator for each multiple of ten full-time equivalent faculty with an additional senator for any remainder of 5.0 or more full-time equivalent faculty. Any division with fewer than ten full-time equivalent faculty shall have one senator.

2) Election. Elections to the Faculty Senate shall be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Faculty, following guidelines adopted by the faculty of each division for the definition of voting units and the allocation of seats within the division. Elections must be completed and results reported to the Secretary of the Faculty by the second Monday in May.

3) Tenure and Limits of Membership. Senate members shall be chosen for three-year terms except when (1) senators are being elected to represent a newly created division, or (2) it is necessary to arrange terms so that approximately one-third of a division's senators shall be elected each year. In these two cases, divisional guidelines shall provide a procedure to assure that approximately one-third of that division's senators shall be elected each year.

No members shall be eligible for re-election until one year has elapsed following his or her term of office or resignation. No person shall be eligible to represent more than one voting unit.

4) Interim Vacancies. Interim vacancies that occur in the Senate shall be filled by appointment by the Secretary of the Faculty, who shall designate to fill the unexpired term the non-elected nominee who in the immediate past Senate election had the greatest number of votes in the voting unit in which the vacancy exists. An interim appointee shall be eligible for election at the end of his or her term.
Guidelines for Constitutional Committees.

"The following recommendations are intended to be general, helpful guidelines, whose application in each committee is to be broadened or narrowed or otherwise varied according to that committee's particular needs and best judgment.

"Chairperson: The chairperson's chief function will be to bring out opinions by questioning, and then to develop a consensus statement. Formal votes need not be taken for every decision. The chairperson will ensure that the committee will establish working procedures, including agreement on a quorum and selection of a secretary to draft the decision statements and the working preliminary, and final reports. These should be presented in the agenda in print, so they can be discussed, amended, polished, and approved. Work will be facilitated if the chairperson will see that the agenda include as many preliminary decision statements as possible in the form of working drafts. At his or her discretion, the chairperson may call meetings of voting members in executive session.

"Secretary: The secretary will arrange meetings and schedule them at a time acceptable to all, if possible. He or she should notify all committee members of meetings. The minutes of each meeting should include a complete record of all decisions taken, not of the discussions and varied views expressed during the meeting. These minutes, and agenda for future meetings, should be duplicated and distributed not only to committee members, but also to other persons and groups who may be interested in the decisions, which in many cases will include the deans of colleges and schools.

"All Members: Committee members represent the student body and the faculty in general as they participate in the decisions and actions of the constitutional committees.

"It is recommended, when a committee member finds himself or herself unable to serve effectively for any reason, that he or she consider resigning from that committee. Official resignation consists of written notice to the Office of the President.

"Consultation: The Constitution, in IV: 4 (3), requires that committees consult with administrative officers, with the Faculty, with individuals, and with the Senate whenever pertinent information or counsel is needed.

"Reports: The committee's reports, although typically written by the chairperson, should represent committee consensus and should be prepared in time to allow committee consideration. When there is a division of opinion, the report should indicate the lack of consensus. If there is a strong division of opinion, the report should make room for a minority opinion, or at least be prepared in time for the minority to present its report at the same time as the committee report."
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: University Curriculum Committee  
     Nancy Tang (chair), Carl Abbott, Catherine Evleshin, Carole Gatz, Kathy Greeey, David Guzman, Nan Teh Hsu, Sheldon Maron, Helen Youngelson, and Anthony Wolk  
     Consultants: Forbes Williams and Don Gardner  

The Curriculum Committee has reviewed the proposed instructional program leading to the Bachelor of Science Degree in Computer Engineering and the related new course proposals for EE 170 and EE 270. 

The Curriculum Committee moves that the Computer Engineering degree program and related new courses be approved.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY  
December 14, 1982

To: Curriculum Committee
From: Margaret J. Dobson

Subject: PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF A NEW INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM  
LEADING TO THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN COMPUTER ENGINEERING

I. The School of Engineering and Applied Science proposes initiation, effective  
1983-84, of a new instructional program leading to the Bachelor of Science  
degree in Computer Engineering. The proposed program is concerned with the  
academic preparation of computer engineers. While the training of computer  
engineers in the basic sciences (Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics) is  
identical to that of electrical/electronics engineers, some of the tradi­  
tional subject matter is replaced by elements of computer science. The  
proposed program is designed with primary emphasis in physical/solid state  
electronics and microcomputer hard/software.

II. Course of Study. With the exception of EE 170, Introduction to Logic Design,  
and EE 270, Logic Circuits and Systems, which were recently approved through  
internal curricular committees and the Senate, all courses in the proposed  
program are currently authorized by the OSBHE and regularly offered in  
either the electrical engineering or computer science programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF REQUIRED CREDIT HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and Engineering Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS, WR, HPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed program is designed to meet both the ABET accreditation cri­  
teria and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Guidelines  
for Computer Engineering Programs.

III. Admission Requirements - Enrollment Limitation. Current admission and enroll­  
ment criteria for the School of Engineering and Applied Science (1981-83  
PSU Catalog) will be modified to accommodate the proposed program by the
addition of the following statement:

Computer Engineering EAS 211, EE 170, 251, 252, 270, CS 251, 252, or approved equivalents (25 credits) plus at least six credits in approved courses. Approved courses: EAS 112, 113, 215 and EE 265.

Enrollment limiting procedures currently in effect in the School will also be extended to the proposed program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Summary of Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>$ - 0 -</td>
<td>$ - 0 -</td>
<td>$ - 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other - Library</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical Facilities</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of Funds</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate Council

TO: Faculty Senate


SUBJECT: Graduate Policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity

GRADUATE POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY AND INTEGRITY

Graduate students have a primary, unique relationship and responsibility to the faculty of the academic departments, the faculty upon whose recommendations graduate degrees are awarded. A major feature of the graduate student’s responsibilities to the faculty is the observance of academic honesty. The Graduate Policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity assumes that the student is honest, that all course work and examinations represent the student's own work, and that all documents supporting the student's admission and graduation are accurate and complete. At Portland State University academic honesty is a requirement for all graduate activities. Any violation of academic honesty and integrity is grounds for dismissal.

VIOLATIONS OF THE POLICY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

1. Cheating in Examinations and Course Assignments.
   The willful use or provision to others of unauthorized materials in written or oral examinations or in course assignments.

2. Plagiarism.
   The appropriation or imitation of language, ideas and products of another author or artist and representation of them as one's own original work; failure to provide proper identification of source data; use of purchased or borrowed papers in graduate courses without complete identification of the source.

3. Selling or Offering to Sell Course Assignment Materials.
   Selling or offering to sell material to another person, knowing, or under circumstances having reason to know that the whole or a substantial part of the material is intended to be submitted in fulfillment of a course requirement.

4. Academic Fraud.
   Furnishing false or incomplete information to the University with the intent to deceive; forging, altering or misusing university documents or academic forms which serve as the basis for admission, course study, or graduation; misrepresenting a person’s identity to an instructor or other University official.
Allegations of violation of the graduate policy on academic honesty and integrity shall be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. If it is demonstrated that there is probable cause to believe that the allegations are well founded, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall refer the matter to the Graduate Council.

Following procedures established by the Graduate Council, the allegations and the student's response shall be considered. If the violation of the graduate policy on academic honesty and integrity is established, academic sanctions shall be imposed. The Graduate Council shall consider only supporting information gained from persons with first-hand knowledge of the allegations.

The decisions of the Graduate Council on violations of the graduate policy on academic honesty and integrity are final. If the above procedures are not followed, the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research shall report the procedural infraction to the Graduate Council if such action is deemed appropriate.

The following constitute academic sanctions which may be imposed as a result of violation of the graduate policy on academic honesty and integrity:

1. Denial of credit for the course in which the violation occurred.

2. Academic probation for a period of one calendar year. While on academic probation the student will not be permitted to apply for advancement to candidacy, to receive or continue to hold graduate assistantship, or to register for more than a total of nine graduate credits in graded courses.

3. Academic disqualification for a period of one to three calendar years. While on academic disqualification the student cannot register for any graduate courses at PSU, and no course work at PSU completed during the academic disqualification can be applied to any graduate degree or certificate program. The student's admission to any graduate degree or certificate program will be cancelled. The student must petition for readmission after the completion of the period of academic disqualification.

4. Denial or rescinding of the award of the graduate degree. In cases involved with a thesis, dissertation or other research submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements for an advanced degree, the graduate degree may be denied or rescinded. If a student is found to have committed academic fraud, the graduate degree may be denied or rescinded.

The Graduate Council may also refer a case in which a violation of academic honesty has been established to the Vice President for Student Affairs for such disciplinary action as presented in the University's Student Conduct Code.