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The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 2, 1994, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA
A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 4, 1994, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. President's Report
   2. Provost's Report
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   1. Spring Term Registration Update—Tufts
   2. Annual Report, Budget Committee—A. Johnson
   3. Annual Report, Intercollegiate Athletics Board—Kosokoff
   4. Annual Report, University Honors Program—Goucher
F. Unfinished Business
   1. Constitutional Amendment—Beeson
   2. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Straw Poll—Cooper
G. New Business
   1. Curriculum Committee Motion—Bulman
H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

B. Minutes of the April 4, 1994, Senate Meeting
   April 1994 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
   English Department 4-credit Pilot Project
E2. Budget Committee Report
E3. Intercollegiate Athletics Board Report
E4. University Honors Program Report
F1. Constitutional Amendment
   Unranked Faculty Detail
G1. Curriculum Committee Motion
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 1994
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika
Secretary: Alan Cabelly


Alternates Present: Robertson for Krug, King for Potiowsky.


APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Faculty Senate Minutes of March 7, 1994 were approved with the notation that Barna and Raedels had been present.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT—RAMALEY made the following comments:

1. Several people (Ramaley, Reardon, Desrochers) attended the American Association of Higher Education meetings last week. The PSU model of institutional rethinking received much positive interest/support. She attempted to develop better measures of what an institution attempts to accomplish. For example, graduation rates assume that all students have this as a goal, and do this within 5 years, which is when the system stops counting. She will present a report soon, and asks UPC to read a draft of this.

2. The Campus Compact was formed eight years ago to support university service goals. We have joined this group this year. The Compact is now attempting to create learning entities/communities. The leadership of CC is asking us if we want to participate, so we now have an additional opportunity for nationwide work.

3. The Governor wants meetings with its stakeholders, including faculty, student leadership, staff, economic constituencies, etc. We will distribute names within each category to the chancellor’s office, so they can have input for the 1995-97 biennium.
4. By Friday, April 8, she will be able to give information to the faculty regarding issues of the public corporation. This will open the question of the role of a statewide board of trustees. The public corporation will control all personnel decisions; it will continue PERS; collective bargaining for faculty will not change, but other units will then bargain with the Chancellor’s office, not through the state; ORS 279, regulating purchasing, will also be impacted. Tuition issues are unknown. The conclusion is that as much as $10,000,000 might be saved statewide (conservatively). Campus effects at PSU are unknown.

5. Budget information is still unclear/vague. About a 14% cut is forecast, but this is speculative. Stay tuned.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee—WINEBERG noted two important items of their business: the number of petitions has been relatively normal, although the success rate has been slightly lower than usual. Secondly, committee members are disturbed at lack of input in institutional planning, especially at the General Education Proposal. The ARC does not want to be seen simply as a petition reading committee.

OSHIKA then noted that the Senate Steering Committee recommended that General Education speak to ARC on an informal basis, although a formal contact was not necessary. A. JOHNSON thought that other items are falling through the cracks; in particular, some omnibus courses are approved for distribution requirements without going through ARC, while other departments are doing everything by the book. DIMAN noted that 199, 299, 399 courses will count for General Education requirements, and a memo from him stated that. A. JOHNSON thought that this must go through ARC, or it cannot be used. OSHIKA asked if OAA has discretionary power to allow omnibus number courses to fulfill distribution requirements. The Steering Committee will study this. MOOR suggested that this more correctly should go to the Advisory Council, and OSHIKA agreed. BOWLDEN thought that the Advisory Council has already sent letters to the Provost’s office, because this seems to run counter to past practices. WINEBERG concluded the discussion by noting that this letter never came to the ARC. Oshika accepted the report for the Senate.

2. ARC report on credit hour requirement—WINEBERG summarized the report, stating reasons why there is no need for significant change at this time.

REARDON reminded the Senate that two significant items have occurred since 1955: dropping three hours of the writing requirement, and dropping a requirement of five hours of HPE. COOPER asked if UO was considering this, and REARDON stated that they have passed this, while OSU and WOSC are
currently considering this change. WINEBERG thought that UO moved from 180 to 186 in about 1920, and are only now moving down to 180. SVOBODA, looking at the ARC report that showed comparator institutions requiring 183–192 credits, asked if we are away from the norm by comparing ourselves with the UO, or wondered if the data are not correct. REARDON said that the data are not correct. The Peterson guide shows a range of 176 to 191 hours. WINEBERG, using the list provided from Mary Ricks in OIRP indicated that we are moving away from the norm. The list of institutions on the quarter system included Cleveland State (192), Southern Illinois/Edwardsville (192), University of Toledo (186), Wright State University (183), and University of Cincinnati (185). REARDON, however, reminded the Senate that this list is used primarily for fiscal and not academic reasons. WAMSER clarified that 120 semester credits equals 180 quarter credits.

LALL suggested that we take a leadership role on this question. If this is the right thing to do, if it responds to academic and student needs, this should be done. OSHIKA thought that this should be referred to various committees. She said that the ARC has responded to its charge. Now this issue can be referred elsewhere, cohesively, in concert with other curricular changes. Thus, this is unfinished business.

BRENNER noted that when one reduces hours, we must also study implications on transfer students and how many credits they take here. The mix of PSU and non PSU credits is another vital issue. REARDON said that students need 45 credits in residence at PSU. BJORK asked about block transfer requirement of 107 hours, but DIMAN said that these are usually about 90 hours, and TUFTS said that the average transfer student brings in about 82 credits. The most allowed is 108; this number might move to 90. FORBES wondered if we would still require 72 upper division credits. WINEBERG concluded by stating that the ARC simply stated that all these issues should all be looked at together; OSHIKA then accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee—ZEIBER noted that the committee accomplished three major activities in the last year: It revised the Student Conduct Code, reviewed petitions as noted in the report, and is actively reviewing student policies. It is an active committee, meeting regularly. Oshika accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Spring Term Registration Report—TUFTS noted that headcount is down 5.2% from last spring; this is similar to the fall and winter decline. Credit hours are down 4.3%. COOPER asked about our policies for targeting out of state enrollment. RAMALEY noted that other universities are looking for this, but that we are not in the process of doing this. At the undergraduate level, we may do this after we implement our general education requirements. At the graduate
level we cannot compete with the grants students need. For foreign students we need greater infrastructure and support. We are therefore not supporting this strategy, but will try to maintain at short, middle, and long ranges. Further, to be designated as an urban/metropolitan institution, we cannot have more than 15% out of state students.

A. JOHN SON asked if our dropoff is not a reasonable one, based upon our faculty cut of 15%. We have increased our productivity by 10%, so this dropoff should be okay. RAMALEY thought that we would look at these issues. LIEBMAN asked if the shift to community colleges would help us as they become juniors, potentially transferring to PSU. TUFTS was uncertain about these implications, and RAMALEY noted that Wamser would make a report on enrollment planning at the next Senate meeting.

5. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate—COOPER's report is included in its entirety in the minutes. At the conclusion, he asked for a straw poll at the May meeting, voting on whether each institution (university and regional college) should have parity of representation (at either two or three for EACH of the eight campuses, or differential votes as is the current policy? The PSU Faculty Senate will vote in May, so Senators are asked to read the report closely before the Senate meeting. Senators should ask Cooper, Oshika, or Scott Burns for information regarding context.

In response to DIMAN's question, COOPER and OSHIKA noted that not much actual voting takes place. They said that there is not a traditional split between colleges and universities. The feeling is that bringing this up now might create divisiveness; however, this was "tabled" many years ago, and a resolution is desired at this time. COOPER also noted that this arose several years ago. IFS representatives are asked to get a sense of their campuses. The IFS has been typically non-parochial, except for athletic funding issues.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Manufacturing Engineering Masters Degree Proposal—FROST noted that the Graduate Council approved this joint 45 credit PSU/OSU program, primarily delivered using ED-NET facilities, with full budget. FROST/KOCAOGLU moved acceptance of the proposal.

SVOBODA noted that the budget is approved through 1997-98, and asked how funding will proceed afterward. ERZURUMLU noted that the state legislature approved funding for faculty, and that these have already been hired. Approved monies are for start-up costs. After four years, these will no longer be needed, and the faculty funding is permanent. The startup costs are for equipment; additional ongoing costs will be minimal. OSHIKA asked if the ED-NET funding
is stable, and if good faculty get poor ratings on ED-NET. ERZURMLU noted that we already teach a number of courses this way, and that other technologies are evolving. We are on the right track. The 2010 committee advocates serving 30,000 students by 2010; this is a good pilot. It was also noted that PSU faculty are currently getting good reviews. KOCAOGLU thought that this requires more preparation, but the feedback suggests that students see no differences.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

OSHIKA then reminded the Senate that in extraordinary circumstances, additional agenda items are at the discretion of the Presiding Officer, and added the following to the agenda, to be discussed before G2:

3. Curriculum Committee—BULMAN stated that the Curriculum Committee met this morning to act on the English Department’s request to have a pilot program to move from 3 to 4 credits. This is in response to the State System’s request that each institution explore ways to increase productivity. The Provost asked the Faculty Senate to follow up on this, and this is one response from the Curriculum Committee. BULMAN/REECE moved acceptance of the proposal.

TALBOT asked if this were a true pilot, or would this become a fait accompli. REECE said that all have agreed that it is a true experiment, which could either succeed or fail. OSHIKA noted that the context of doing this is university-wide. TOULAN then asked about many other questions, such as whether a full-time student will need to take eight or twelve credits. This is a precursor to many issues. OSHIKA said that these will be addressed later. The Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council will look at this. BRENNER then asked if there is a proposal for OAA to address these. She wondered who will study this. OSHIKA said the Steering Committee would give direction to various committees. REECE then noted that this came from CLAS, not OAA.

BJORK was concerned about scheduling. Most math classes are 4-unit classes; his expectation was that 4-unit courses would be scheduled from 4:40–6:30 and 6:40–8:20. He was concerned that this would cause conflicts with students who want 4-unit calculus and English courses. REECE said that he received guidance from Bob Tufts. BJORK understood this, but still noted potential problems. TUFTS agreed on the need to keep the 6:30–6:40 time open to alleviate scheduling problems, and thought that there might have been a communication problem. REECE and TUFTS agreed to talk about solving the issue. OSHIKA asked that any consideration of the issue will be made based upon resolving these scheduling issues.
WAMSER raised the issue of efficiency and the faculty workload. REECE thought that the faculty members will teach 7 4-credit courses; this will be one more credit, but two fewer courses. WAMSER wanted to add up the total number of courses the department taught.

ERZURUMLU noted that the proposal excluded WR 121 and WR 323, but not other technical writing courses required for other majors. Should those also be excluded? This will create a mixed-mode of credits for some students. REECE said that the WR 121 and WR 323 could be changed easily, so should not be done now, especially with the new General Education requirements. He spoke with Morris and Harrison in CS and EAS; many of their courses are already 4 hours, so this should be no problem. Further, there should be no resource problem in the department.

TOULAN was concerned about making changes only after studying all the ramifications; e.g., non-admitted students can take no more than 7 credits. Therefore, most non-admitted students cannot take two English courses. This runs counter to some of our rules. TUFTS thought that we might want to consider moving the part-time student number to eight credits, especially if the 4-credit mode is a state policy issue.

LIEBMAN is in favor of this, but concerned about larger courses. It was pointed out that students will take fewer courses, so this will be evened out.

REECE requested the privilege of the floor for WESTBROOK, who noted that the department has studied this issue. To simplify the issue, if the majority of students move from four 3-credit courses to three 4-credit courses, then the faculty load, student load, and class size issues all even out.

LANSDOWNE asked about the impact this will have on education itself. REECE thought that many departments have changed from 3-hour/3-term courses to 4-hour/2-term courses, which is similar to two-semester courses. This should offer more pedagogical flexibility, improving the educational experience. WINEBERG asked how this fits in with the needed distribution requirement of 18 hours, where a student might take three 3-credit courses and two 4-credit courses for a total of 17 credits. REECE did not consider this, and ANDREWS-COLLIER asked how the ARC reviewed petitions of this nature. WINEBERG said that this was up to the people on committee; last year, they were quite picky, and turned many of these down.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

2. Constitutional Amendment—BEESON had been forced to leave earlier, so MIDSON presented the amendment. The goal is to give greater representation
from other academic sectors (research, student advising, etc.) of campus to the Faculty Senate, giving a broader focus.

OSHIKA said that as an Amendment to the Constitution, it is not debated today, but can be amended. It then goes to Advisory Council, which checks to see if it is appropriate; the Senate debates and votes upon it next month. This one arose from a joint meeting of the Steering Committee and Advisory Council.

FARR asked if a list identifying those positions to be included could be distributed. OSHIKA said this was possible.

WINEBERG asked about adding “public service” positions to the amendment. ANDREWS-COLLIER said that the AAUP Council discussed the Amendment, and is concerned about the budget office determining who is faculty, rather than using a definition including the bargaining unit.

WINEBERG/SVOBODA proposed an amendment, adding the words “or public service” in the unclassified members sentence, after “research.”

At that point it was determined that a quorum no longer existed.

A discussion involving MOOR, MIDSON, FARR, and OSHIKA revolved around the Senate being thwarted in its review process, the role of the Advisory Council, and the attrition rate at Senate meetings. OSHIKA said that this Amendment will be moved to the May Senate meeting in order to have the discussion it warrants; additionally, the attrition rate in Senate meetings will be discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:50 PM.
Report on the Meeting at SOSC Campus of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, April 1-2, 1994

On Saturday, the Senate was addressed by Sarah Hopkins Powell, the Assistant Provost of Southern Oregon State. She described developments at Southern Oregon State some of which would be of interest to PSU faculty, including, for example, Southern's way of meeting the fiscal crisis. Their current enrollment includes 19% California residents, who pay, of course, full out-of-state tuition. Since current applications from California are down, there is cause for concern. The school is currently replacing one faculty member for every two lost. The size of the faculty is being maintained with soft money, mostly California tuition money. They are considering an accelerated Bachelor's program, but the shape of it is still largely undetermined. They are planning on simplifying their general education requirements. Their experience with EDNET instruction has not been altogether happy. They have not always had the student enrollments that they had hoped for, and the costs of air time have proved to be very high. A round-table discussion group of faculty and students has attempted to plan for the next round of budget cuts. This group has recommended a number of devices to increase efficiency, for example, enforcing minimum class size, but they are also seriously considering increasing the teaching load.

We were next addressed by John Daggett, the Superintendent of Ashland Public Schools. He suggested that, as a result of Measure 5 and other legislation, the State Legislature has become, in effect, the School Board for the whole state, and he questioned its competence to serve in that way. He also addressed the role of CIM and CAM on the schools. He seemed optimistic about the schools' ability to adapt to the new standards, and he had high praise for the work of Dave Conley of the Chancellor's Office in explaining outcomes evaluation. Some accelerated students from Ashland schools are now enrolled at SOSC.

Next, Senator Len Hannon of the Senate Ways and Means Committee addressed IFS, presenting himself as a strong advocate of higher education. He said that he feels the pressure from parents among his constituents for access and predictability in the system. He is an advocate for replacement revenue. He believes it imperative that people of Oregon realize that, while prior to World War II the state funded 65% of the cost of state college tuition, now it funds barely 26-7%. He faulted the governor, the legislature, the Chancellor and the board for their failure to drum up support for higher education. When asked how we should respond to the next round of cuts, he suggested that a drastic action would get people's attention. Shutting down an institution might do it. He saw no hope of revenue replacement this year. He thought that Mark Nelson of the AOF has been the most effective advocate for higher education.
Our final speaker for Saturday was Diane Christopher, a member of the State Board. She said that the IFS proposed change of language for the Presidential Search process is on the agenda of the next Board meeting, with an implicit recommendation of passage. The 2010 Committee's recommendation that the state system become a Public corporation will be presented at the next Board meeting, in April. This change is perceived as primarily a means for greater efficiency, especially in purchasing, without great changes in internal policies. She said that the report will be very concerned that a State System bureaucracy not replace the state bureaucracy. Higher education would, in effect, contract with the state government to educate a certain number of students in exchange for an amount of general fund moneys.

At the Friday evening banquet, the speaker was Russell Sadler, the journalist. He gave figures to show that the hostility to taxes in the state results from a steady shift of the tax burden from business to private property and personal income tax. To illustrate this, in 1970, commercial property owners paid 67% of all property tax to the state and residential property owners 33%. By 1985, before Measure 5, the percentages had become 58% and 42% respectively. In higher education, the percentage provided by the state has dropped to 25%. The higher percentage of the cost of tuition paid by the student will, he judged, inevitably mean a loss of legislative control over higher education. It also means that fewer of Oregon's students will attend colleges and universities, and we already have seen how state institutions are maintaining themselves with out-of-state revenues.

The Saturday meeting was, as usual, our business meeting. Most of the business was more or less internal, but there is one matter that concerns us all here. The present representation on the IFS is three members from each University and two from each regional college. That gives something like proportional representation, since the University faculties are of course larger. It has been argued, by one faculty member from a regional college, that the regional college representation should be increased to match that of the Universities, so that the colleges would have an equal voice in the deliberations — with twelve University representatives and twelve college representatives. Your IFS representatives have been asked to get a sense of how our faculty feels about that, and we do encourage you to contact us. This will be an item of discussion at the next meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

John-R. Cooper
April 4, 1994

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The English Department
       Shelley C. Reece, Chair

RE: Emergency Approval of Pilot Project

The English Department has urgently requested and received emergency approval from the University Curriculum Committee to conduct a one-year pilot project in which the ordinary English Department course is changed from 3 to 4 credits. Wr. 121 and 323 would remain unchanged. Attached is a copy of information provided to both the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council; please refer to that packet for details of the project.

While the Graduate Council has not had a chance to meet because of the timing of this proposal, Dean Frost, Chair of the Council, has verbally agreed that the proposal may come before the Faculty Senate for consideration at its April meeting.

At this time, we seek the approval of the Faculty Senate to proceed with this one-year pilot project.
March 31, 1994

TO: Members of the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council

FROM: Shelley C. Reece, Chair, English
       Deeanne Westbrook, Assistant Chair, English

The English Department urgently requests that the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council recommend emergency approval of this one-year pilot proposal for 1994-95 to change the ordinary course in the department from 3 to 4 hours.

History: The State Board of Higher Education has asked each state college and university to discover ways of increasing productivity—that is, of doing more with less. In a letter dated a year ago, the Chancellor required each institution to produce a productivity plan which would be acceptable to the State Board; any institution that did not would begin to lose 2% of its annual budget each month until it produced such a plan.

Part of a CLAS response to this mandate was to consider teaching 4-credit courses. In brief, the plan on which this one-year pilot project would be based involves shifting a faculty member from a nine, three-credit-course load (27 credits) to a seven, four-course load (28 credits). CLAS department chairs, the CLAS Productivity Committee, and the CLAS faculty as a whole have discussed this idea. The Productivity Committee then included it as part of a productivity plan.

In response to the English Department’s advocacy of the idea, Dean Kaiser asked whether the Department would be willing to work out details for making the shift to four-credit courses for the academic year 1994-95, one year before an anticipated move by the University as a whole. Having a large department like English try the project will, we believe, provide a microcosm in which to identify to solve problems of the change-over—to work through the logistics of scheduling, to identify questions relating to instructors’ teaching loads, part-time faculty and phased retirees, and so forth. The experience of the English Department should make a University-wide change-over go more smoothly.
Members of the English Department gave their approval to this one-year pilot project, and in approximately the last two weeks, we have been working to make this change. We recognize that time is extremely short, but the Department is nevertheless seeking emergency one-year approval for the pilot project from the University Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, and Faculty Senate.

The change itself would affect most Eng. and Wr. courses; exceptions are Wr. 121 and Wr. 323 (the university’s required writing courses), and certain four- and five-credit courses already in the English curriculum.

PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED IN CONVERTING COURSES:

- Three-term sequences (of 9 credits) will be offered as two-term sequences (8 credits); faculty will divide the courses in order to offer the material in two rather than three parts.

- Two-term sequences (of 6 credits) will, at least for the one-year project, be offered in two terms (of 8 credits). If a permanent move to four-credit courses is made, the Department will re-examine two-term sequences to determine which, if any, might become single courses.

- One-term courses will move from 3 to 4 credits. Faculty will include additional material, widen the scope of the courses, and/or assign additional student projects. Some one-term courses, e.g., Eng. 448: Major Figures Courses, will be offered under titles that reflect a wider scope. For example, English 448/548, “Wordsworth,” offered for three credits, would become “Wordsworth and Others” and include works by Wordsworth’s literary antecedents and contemporaries. Or a course in “Whitman and Dickinson” would become “Whitman, Dickinson, and Frost.”

An appended list at the end of this document summarizes the effects of the overall change on the departmental curriculum. In brief, 1) although it increases the number of credits in 25 singly offered literature courses from 3 to 4, it also reduces twenty 3-term sequences to 2-terms and in one case, 1 term. 2) It reduces six 2-term sequences to 1 term. 3) It changes all writing courses to 4 hours except for Wr. 121 and 323. 4) Although this proposal does increase from 3 to 4 the number of hours in courses offered singly
(not as sequences) in the department, the number of courses does not increase. Quite the opposite. As a result of changes by which, for example, 3-term, 3 hour per term sequences become 2-term, 4-hour-per-term sequences, the number of courses in the department is reduced by 20.

**SCHEDULING GUIDELINES**

The English Department Chair, Assistant Chair, Dean Kaiser, and Robert Tufts met and agreed on certain guidelines for scheduling four-credit courses.

- Schedule each 4-credit course for four “hours” of 50 minutes each per week.

- Schedule TTH classes at 8:00, 10:00, 12:00, and 2:00.

- Schedule MWF classes that meet before 2:00 pm in a paired arrangement. For example, like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the English Department’s fall schedule, six pairs of classes would follow this pattern.

- Schedule most night classes for 100 minutes on two nights a week; exceptions for film and drama classes or other special cases should have a built-in break. The planned schedule, therefore, has most night sections meeting either from 5:00-6:40 or from 7:00-8:40 two nights a week. Courses meeting one night a week are scheduled from 5:00-8:30, a period of 200 minutes plus a 10-minute break.
ADVANTAGES

1. Students could take a full load (12 or more credits) in fewer classes, thus enabling them to focus their scholarly energies and permitting efficient use of their time. Students would need 46 courses, rather than 62, to earn the now standard 186 credits for graduation.

2. Faculty, their numbers diminished and faced with larger classes, increased duties in departmental and university governance, and continued expectations to serve the community and to publish, would teach two fewer courses per academic year. That reduction would actually increase productivity (from 27 to 28 credit hours) and would also permit a more focused, efficient use of faculty members' time.

Finally, while the timing of this proposal is awkward, the proposal itself is a request for an ordinary pattern of course offerings. Most American universities on semesters offer courses according to the pattern into which the English Department proposes to move in this one-year-pilot proposal. We urgently request your approval.
### SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON ENGLISH CURRICULUM OF SHIFT FROM THREE- TO FOUR-CREDIT COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE(S)</th>
<th>CREDIT INCREASE</th>
<th>CREDIT DECREASE</th>
<th>NO CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 100&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 104</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 105</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 106</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 107, 108, 109</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 201, 202, 203</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 204, 205, 206</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 253, 254, 255</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 256</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 260&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 300</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 306</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 307&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 308</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 309</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 311</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 312</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 313&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 314&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 315</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 316</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 317</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 318</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 319&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 320, 321, 322</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 364, 365, 366</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 371, 372, 373&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 384, 385, 386</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 407/507&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 410/510&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 411/511, 412/512, 413/513</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 420/520</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 421/521, 422/522&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 425/525</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 426/526, 427/527</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 430/530, 431/531</td>
<td>6 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 440/540, 441/541</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 443/543, 444/544</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 445/545, 446/546</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 447/547</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 448/548</td>
<td>3 &lt; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 450/550, 451/551</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 458/558, 459/559</td>
<td>6 &lt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 460/560, 461/561, 462/562&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 463/563, 464/564, 465/565&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 467/567, 468/568, 469/569</td>
<td>9 &gt; 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENG 474/574<sup>1</sup>  
ENG 475/575, 476/576  
ENG 477/577, 478/578, 479/579<sup>1</sup>  
ENG 480/580, 481/581  
ENG 482/582, 483/583  
ENG 484/584  
ENG 485/585<sup>1</sup>  
ENG 486/586  
ENG 487/587  
ENG 488/588  
ENG 490/590  
ENG 491/591, 492/592, 493/593  
ENG 494/594  
ENG 517  
ENG 532, 533, 534  
ENG 595<sup>1</sup>  
ENG 596

<sup>1</sup>Course not offered in 1994-5.

<sup>2</sup>One course offered by English Department; one course cross-listed with Foreign Languages.

<sup>3</sup>Only one course in sequence offered in 1994-5.

**WRITING COURSES:**

ALL WRITING COURSES, WITH THE EXCEPTIONS OF WR 121 AND 323, WOULD GO FROM 3 TO 4 CREDITS.
Members of the University Budget Committee: 1993-1994: A.G. Johnson (Geol), Chair; Gerald Frey (SSW); Beatrice Oshika (LING); Anne Christensen (SBA); Kent Lall (CE); Burton Onstine (PS); Erik Bodegom (PHY); Joseph Kohut (LIB); Edward Schafer (UPA); Ann Weikel (HST) Chair UPC; Bruce Keller (TA); Carol Burden (ED); Jenifer Hilburn (2026 SE 35th Place PDX 97214); Jeffrey A. Gronlund (14800 SW Old Schools Ferry Rd, Beaverton, Or. 97007. Consultants: Lindsay Desrochers, (VPFA); J.Kenneth Harris, Director of the Budget; Michael Reardon, Provost

Charge: 1) Consult with President and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets. 2) Recommend budgetary priorities. 3) Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes. 4) Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared. 5) Review expenditures of all public and grant funds. 6) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency. 7) Report to the Senate at least once each year.

The Budget Committee will be examining the following topics: 1- The BAS Model for distributing funds from the State System; 2- the impact on departments from the lack of faculty replacement; 3- the potential impact of the new general education program on enrollment; 4- the potential impact of the governor's proposed cut for the next Biennium.

The Budget committee at the end of 1992-1993, participated in the budget reduction process, through membership on the "committee", and participating in the hearing process.

The budget committee has been briefed on Exhibit A, and the Provost presented to the committee the process for allocation of positions using input from programs and the Deans level. The budget committee was informed of the priorities and positions approved. The budget committee was informed of the allocation of the "non recurring" funds which the University received for the 93-95 biennium.

The budget committee would like to thank the administration for the way we have been kept informed of budgetary matters. It is hoped that the budget committee will be able to make recommendations in a timely manner in the future.
MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: Intercollegiate Athletics Board
Re: Annual Report

This year we have:

1. Interviewed all coaches using revised questionnaire with new questions about NCAA compliance (preparatory to NCAA-mandated Athletics Self-Study). PSU is doing well in compliance matters.

2. Discussed "gender-equity" issue with Athletic Directors (Randy Nordlof, Teri Mariani). Issue may become central for NCAA in upcoming years.

3. Reviewed athletics budget proposal before submission to Incidental Fee Committee. Athletics did well to hold the line and even reduced request after initial approval was given by IFC.

4. Interviewed Athletics Trainer (Jim Wallis) and Sports Information Director (Larry Sellers) about specific problems related to budget shortages. Both need more funding.

5. Interviewed athletics academic advisor (Zola Dunbar) about current issues of athletic academic progress and advising. Present system works reasonably well.

7. Received briefing on NCAA matters from NCAA Representative (Bob Lockwood).

8. Asked Athletic Dir. to survey women on campus to see which women's sports might be added.

9. Discussed issues of "sportsmanship" currently on NCAA agenda.

This year's committee had poor attendance. Many members did not attend many meetings. Some student members attended none. This is a sign that, for the moment, athletics is operating smoothly with no major problems other than very slim financial resources. In upcoming years, issues of gender equity, graduation rates, and finances will be major factors of concern.

Faculty Members:
Steve Kosokoff, SP, Chair
Steve Brenner, SBA
Gary Nave, ED
Mary Gordon-Brannan, SpHr
Howard Wineberg, CENS

Student Members:
Caroline Jolles
Walter Borden
Jeffrey Gronlund

Community Member:
Steve Gimbol, Paulson Investment

Ex-officio Members:
Randy Nordlof, Ath. Dir.
Teri Mariani, Assoc. Ath. Dir.
Bob Lockwood, NCAA Rep.
Lindsay Desrochers, VP FADM
The University Honors Program Board is comprised of the following
faculty members: Debra Bokowski, Kathryn Farr, Candice Goucher
(chair), Joseph Poracsky, and Martin Zwick. Student members
include: Savvy Him and Jade Shiveley. The Acting Director,
Lawrence Wheeler, serves as ex-officio member.

The duties of the Board are described by the Faculty Constitution
and appear in the governance guide. They include formulation of
policy, program supervision, curricular proposals, and student
appeals. During 1993-94, no matters were presented to the Board.
No student appeals were submitted. No specific charge was received
by the Board. Currently, the program director reports directly to
the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The 1992-93 Annual report concluded that "given the fact that
program operations and policy are well-established, it is the
opinion of the current board that the Senate may wish to consider
whether the Board’s general charges are appropriate or whether a
different governing structure may better serve the program needs."
The Senate’s steering committee was to have addressed this issue in
the context of faculty committee review. The University Honors
Program Board once again urges the Senate to amend the constitution
either to eliminate the Board or to change its function to reflect
the evolved administrative and organizational structure of this
unit’s governance.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

We, the ten undersigned members of the PSU Faculty Senate, present to the PSU Faculty Senate the following Amendment to the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty.

Text to be deleted is struck out. Text to be added is written in bold italics.

Article II. Membership of the Faculty
"The Faculty shall consist of the Chancellor, the President of Portland State University, and all persons who hold State Board appointments with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, and whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University. Unclassified members of the School of Extended Studies Portland State University whose full-time equivalent (as defined by the PSU Budget Office) is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University shall also be included in the faculty regardless of title. The University Faculty reserves the right to elect to membership any person who is employed full-time by the Oregon State System of Higher Education."

[Signatures]

[Signatures]
**ACAD SUPPORT UNRANKED FACULTY DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Resource CTR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engin &amp; Appld Science</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Studies</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT UNRANKED FACULTY DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Office</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Office</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Office</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Office</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Services</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH UNRANKED FACULTY DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban &amp; Pub Affairs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SERVICE UNRANKED FACULTY DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland Educational Network</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT SERVICES UNRANKED FACULTY DETAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Affairs</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl Student Services</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity Prog</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info &amp; Academic Support Ctr</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Office</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial AIDS</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl Exchange Prog</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Office</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Teresa Bulman, Chair, University Curriculum Committee

RE: First and second-year land course credits, Foreign Languages and Literatures (FLL)

The motion is made that the following course credit-hour changes, recommended by the University Curriculum Committee, be adopted:

All year-long, first- and second-year language courses in FLL be changed from 4 to 5 credits, and all first-year intensive courses be changed from 6 credits to 7 credits for courses numbered 150, and to 8 credits for courses numbered 151.

The courses involved are:

- Arabic 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Chinese 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- French 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203; also 150, 151
- German 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203; also 150, 151
- Hebrew 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Hungarian 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Italian 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Japanese 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203; also 150, 151
- Korean 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Latin 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Persian 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Portuguese 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Russian 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203; also 150, 151
- Serbo-Croatian 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203
- Spanish 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203; also 150, 151
- Turkish 101, 102, 103; 201, 202, 203

FLL has been considering this change in credit hours for a number of years and would like to implement the change for F94.

These changes reflect the current number of hours for which these courses are scheduled and the changes make the FLL language courses equivalent in credit hours to the first- and second-year language courses at sister institutions in Oregon.