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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on April 6, 1992, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA
A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 2, 1992, Meeting

President's Report

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

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. Annual Report, ARC--Millner
   *2. Annual Report, Committee on Effective Teaching--Tama
   *3. Annual Report, General Student Affairs Committee--Rhyne
   4. IFS Report--Enneking
   5. Spring Term Registration Report--Tufts

F. Unfinished Business

G. New Business
   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1--Moor
   *2. Proposal for PSU Center for Science Education--DeCarrico
   *3. Proposal for Name Change of Latin American Studies Program--DeCarrico
   *4. Resolution Congratulating Student Athletes, Coaches, and Trainers--Kosokoff

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B. Minutes of the March 2, 1992, Senate Meeting*
E. Annual Report, ARC**
E. Annual Report, Committee on Effective Teaching**
F. Annual Report, General Student Affairs Committee**
G. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1**
G. Proposal for PSU Center for Science Education**
G. Proposal for Change of Latin American Studies Program**
G. Resolution Congratulating Student Athletes, Coaches, and Trainers**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 2, 1992, meeting were corrected on p. 28, three lines from the bottom to read "elections" in place of "interviews." With that change, the minutes were approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY gave an update regarding the budget process. We are awaiting final word about a special session. We will probably be asked to build a budget on an 80 percent base and propose a 10 percent addback for special program development and 10 percent for linking programs to the Oregon Benchmarks. RAMALEY has been appointed to lead a team that is examining the benchmarks; more new benchmarks may be nominated, and Ramaley is welcoming ideas. She briefly discussed the higher ed/benchmark fit and reported that Roger Bassett had said that the Oregon Benchmarks are mostly short-term goals while education focuses on long-term goals.

RAMALEY reported that all campuses are doing the same general things regarding budget cutting; however, each school is also thinking about its own cuts for the 1993-95 biennium, and some schools (e.g., OHSU) are further along in the process than PSU. Deans will be sent instructions in about two weeks, but the President urged faculty to be thinking about critical questions
like: What really matters to PSU? What gives us a unique role? What must we protect? What makes PSU the place it is? How should faculty be involved? When? Should we hold a general convocation? Should there be small-group meetings?

BEESON asked what plans are being made with the administration. RAMALEY said there were no plans in mind but a process. REARDON added that departments will be asked to respond to proposals such as the use of academic service centers vs. departmental offices. RAMALEY reminded Senators that we are waiting for specific instructions from the chancellor; at the last budget cuts those instructions included the cutting of HPE and the serious reductions in Education (except at PSU). BEESON, BOWLDEN, LENDARIS and WEIKEL all urged that faculty should be involved in meetings because these are serious cuts. Departments are asking what they should be doing. BOWLDEN suggested small-group meetings while WEIKEL thought an augmented Senate with proportional representation might be better.

RAMALEY predicted that OSSH will look much more critically at professional programs this time, especially to determine where there are no unique offerings. The signals are not clear at this time. DESROCHERS said it is possible that the 80 percent budget will be due September 1, and the more detailed internal budget planning may have to be moved up.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. WARD reported that four provost finalists will be on campus during the next two weeks. He encouraged faculty to attend sessions that have been organized for each candidate and to provide Ward with feedback.

2. A. JOHNSON announced that Governor Roberts and Chancellor Bartlett will meet with AOF and AAUP on April 18 at OSU. Faculty were urged to give Johnson questions to be taken to the meeting.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. MILLNER presented the annual report of the ARC. He said that the waiver of WR. 323 for block transfer students will be proposed at the next Senate meeting. Writing across the Curriculum will also be encouraged.

2. TAMA gave the final annual report of the Committee on Effective Teaching; the committee has been merged with Research and Publications to form the new Faculty Development Committee.

3. RHÝNE presented the annual report of the General Student Affairs Committee. During spring they will be involved in the interviews of the Dean of Students. BRENNAN asked if there
had been any disciplinary issues or policy revisions this year. Disciplinary issues are handled by the Student Conduct Committee. There was some input on policy revisions regarding the dean's search.

4. ENNEKING gave the IFS report (see attached). Chancellor Bartlett is frustrated with higher education having to play only a supporting role because it is not large enough to influence events. Higher ed has to sell itself and develop models for that.

5. TUFTS reported that all registration figures were up for spring term from a year ago: Headcount + 14%; SCH + 6%.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

DECARRICO reviewed the actions of the UPC regarding the reorganizations of the School of Business Administration and the Library. SBA has given a great deal of information to UPC and has answered most questions. SBA is now writing a new charter and will submit that to UPC to help answer the two remaining questions.

The Library reorganization is in limbo. Departments have been eliminated and associate directors were appointed (not elected). The UPC has recommended that an advisory body be formed to advise the Director and associate directors.

KARANT-NUNN said she and other faculty continued to be concerned about the disregard of procedures outlined in the faculty constitution.

KARANT-NUNN/WRIGHT moved

"that the 1991-92 Faculty Senate instruct its 1993-94 successor, however this may appropriately be done, to carry out a full review and evaluation of the effects of the 1991 reorganization of the School of Business Administration and of the University Library;

that the review and evaluation include at the minimum a confidential inquiry of every tenured and tenure-track SBA and Library faculty member as to faculty roles in governing their school/library, in particular but not confined to faculty influence in selecting administrators and faculty participation in promotion and tenure decisions;

that the result of this study be reported to the 1993-94 Senate so that it may then decide whether the SBA and Library reorganizations should be modified or invalidated."

LENDARIS asked if the Senate could impose its will. KARANT-NUNN said the Senate had that right. GILLPATRICK said that 27 SBA
faculty voted on their reorganization last year, 4 to 23; could the Senate vote against that? KOSOKOFF said Gillpatrick's question implied the problem. The Senate has authority to act. KARANT-NUNN responded by asking if the rest of the faculty would allow the SBA to unilaterally relinquish their right regarding promotion and tenure.

Addressing the motion, REARDON pointed out that the administration of an evaluation could not be kept confidential. KARANT-NUNN explained that only the questionnaire was to be sent back confidentially to the Steering Committee. The results of the evaluation would not be secret.

TOULAN commented that the severe budget cuts we are facing may force many schools to reorganize. The tone of this discussion may be sending the wrong message to creative reorganizations that may become necessary. FARR, however, pointed out that the motion on the floor redresses a procedural problem, not a substantive issue. MCKENZIE agreed. In the Library reorganization, no faculty was allowed to vote. There had been no discussions of the proposal. It is not a question of whether the reorganization is working or not. No constitutional or democratic process was followed; it was a "coup." Something as drastic as this should have a full faculty vote and be recorded as a majority vote. KARANT-NUNN thought the effect of all faculty filling out a questionnaire would constitute a vote, not based only on theoretical outcomes but on what they had experienced.

J. BRENNER said governance is the appropriate role for the Senate; it is mandated by the constitution. HARMON wondered if a comprehensive review of all units on campus should be undertaken. LANSDOWNE asked if the Senate had that kind of authority. LENDARIS thought that the Senate's role was to be advisory to the president.

LENDARIS/SCHAUMANN proposed to amend the last sentence of the motion to read "...may then decide whether to advise the SBA and Library reorganizations be modified or invalidated."

There was no vote on that amendment.

J. BRENNER/CUMPSTON moved "to table the entire issue pending a review of the constitutionality of it by the Advisory Council."

The motion to table was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. MOOR introduced a constitutional amendment to Article III, Section 1. He emphasized that the main purpose of the amendment was that the Senate should consider reorganization proposals before the changes occur. OSHIKA didn't think the Senate could block executive action, even though the constitut-
tion seemed to favor shared responsibility. MOOR said that if this amendment were passed and agreed to by the president, she would indicate her willingness to share responsibility. She would be bold to concede this much authority, and MOOR thought that sharing authority would be healthy and appropriate, and those who have authority should periodically be invited to share it.

Various attempts were made to change "approval" in the amendment. Suggestions included "action," "review," "consultation," and "consideration." Finally, the following two amendments were passed:

"...of departments or of programs, including those of more than one department or academic unit, without prior...."

"...without prior action by the Faculty Senate...."

2. DECARRICO/WEIKEL moved "the approval of the proposed establishment of the PSU Center for Science Education."

The motion was passed unanimously.

3. DECARRICO/WEIKEL moved "approval of the request for a name change from Latin American Studies Program to Hispanic and Latin American Studies Program."

The motion was passed.

4. DECARRICO/CUMPSTON moved "acceptance of the recommendation of the Majority Report by the ad hoc committee on the relocation of the Department of Health Studies." DUNNETTE, director of the Center for Public Health Studies, said the minority report addressed some crucial issues, and it is important for CPHS to maintain strong ties to CLAS. He recommended that the principals get together and talk about what dual affiliation means. He recommended that the Senate approve the motion, contingent on the successful outcome of such a meeting.

DECARRICO and SVOBODA explained that it would be disastrous to delay the decision any longer. Matters like the selection of a department chairperson and the scheduling of classes cannot wait any longer. SVOBODA pointed out that centers are not technically affiliated with one school or department anyway, only budgetarily. REARDON observed that the Senate minutes ago approved the Center for Science Education which is affiliated with CLAS and ED.

The motion to house Health Studies in UPA was approved unanimously.
5. BURKE presented the resolution congratulating PSU student-athletes in basketball and wrestling and their coaches and trainers for their outstanding seasons. The resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:59.
During the 1991-92 academic year the ARC has worked on the following issues:

1) Student Petitions - The ARC has processed 187 total student petitions from 09/01/91 thru 03/10/92. 134 petitions were granted while 53 petitions were denied.

   The Committee has explored ways to reduce the time taken between when a student files a petition and when a decision from the Committee is made. The Committee has also discussed revisions and modifications of the petition form to increase clarity. The Committee plans to create a guideline information sheet which will be made available to students considering whether to file a petition, which will explain the process involved. Neither of these projects has yet been finalized by the Committee.

2) HPE 298 - Numerous students have come forward this year with petitions concerning the HPE 298 requirement. The ARC, at the request of HPE, established a policy that PSU's HPE 298 requirement could be satisfied by HPE 250 courses if taken at another valid institution of higher education in the last 10 years. Subsequent to this decision it has been pointed out that this creates an inequity for students who have taken HPE 250 here at PSU but cannot use it to meet the HPE 298 requirement. The ARC will address this issue during the coming term.

3) Block Transfers and English Comp 323

   PSU is the only school in the state system with a writing requirement at the upper-division level. This has created certain "difficulties" in our relationship with the "Block transfer" students coming to PSU from state community colleges. A request has been made that "block transfer" students have the English Comp 323 requirement waived upon admission to PSU. Block transfers have taken 9 hours of lower-division composition before transfer. The ARC consulted with the English Department to determine their position on the issue. The English Department was willing to conditionally support a waiver if implementation of the "Writing Across the Curriculum" Program (adopted several years ago but never put in place by the Faculty Senate) was also put in place. The ARC decided not to waive 323 for block transfers and to request that the Senate review its Writing Across the Curriculum Program.

   Further meetings are scheduled between the ARC, English Department and Office of Academic Affairs.

4) Diversity Requirement - The ARC completed a lengthy process of information gathering, public and university testimony, review and modification to create a criteria statement defining the expectations for courses which can be used to satisfy the Diversity Requirement for graduation beginning with the catalog for Fall 1992. The ARC is now designing the process thru which courses will be submitted for review and approval. A list of courses will be presented to the Senate for approval during Spring Term 1992.
Since the last annual report, 17 funding requests have been received by the Committee and 15 have received at least partial funding. All of the Committee’s $4635.00 has been allocated. The grants were awarded to:

1. $ 500.00 Bennett, Mildred, Mathematical Sciences
2. $ 300.00 Danielson, Susan, English
3. $ 325.00 Dolan, Thomas, Speech Communication
4. $ 200.00 Fischer, William & Rees, Earl, Foreign Language
5. $ 250.00 Fullerton, Ann, Special Education
6. $ 325.00 Hien, Jim, Computer Science
7. $ 250.00 Klebba, Joanne, Business Administration
8. $ 320.00 Levinson, Alfred et al., Chemistry
9. $ 198.00 Lippert, Byron, Biology
10. $ 250.00 Rosengrant, Sandra, Foreign Language
11. $ 495.00 Schaumann, Rolf, Electrical Engineering
12. $ 475.00 Sestak, Barbara, Art
13. $ 300.00 Sherman, Douglas et al., Education
14. $ 237.00 Steward, Larry, Speech Communication
15. $ 210.00 Vistica, Rita, Foreign Language

As a result of a proposal made to the President of the Faculty Senate and the Senate Steering Committee, Judith Ramaley, PSU President, requested the implementation of a coherent faculty development program that would both organize the diverse facets of faculty development into a coherent program and redefine and add categories in this area. As a result, the Committee on Effective Teaching has been consolidated with the Research and Publications committee into the Faculty Development Committee. This proposal was voted on and passed by the Faculty Senate, February 3, 1992.

The members of the Committee on Effective Teaching will serve the remainder of this academic year as members of the Faculty Development Committee. In addition, they hope to propose to and strongly urge the Committee to increase the level of funding to stimulate effective teaching and contribute to the professional development among faculty in line with the PSU’s Strategic Plan and Mission.

The Committee until its consolidation consisted of:
Elliot Benowitz, Joan McMahon, Tom Chenoweth, Harold Gray, Jeanette Palmiter, Richard Sapp, Carrol Tama, Chair. Student representatives included: Jennifer Pennell, Kelly Strand and John Pellett.
Proposals Funded:

1. Bennett, M. *Math Suitcases*
2. Danielson, S. *The Immigrant Experience and American Literature*
3. Dolan, T. *Demonstration of Calibration Procedures*
4. Fischer, W. et al., *Listening Tests in Proficiency-Oriented Foreign Language Classes*
5. Fullerton, A. *Mediated Learning and Cognitive Education*
6. Hein, J. *Programming Laboratory: Discrete Structures, Logic, and Computability*
7. Klebba, J. *Case Analysis Pedagogy*
8. Levinson, A. et al., *Auto-Tutorial Study of Spectrometry/Spectroscopy*
9. Lippert, B. *PSU Herbarium Computer Program*
10. Rosengrant, S. *Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature: A Reader*
11. Schaumann, R. *Restructuring Sophomore and Junior Electrical Engineering Laboratories*
12. Sestak, B. *Setting up a Computerized Art Slide Library*
13. Sherman, D. *Integrating Personal and Academic Writing for Effective Teaching at the University level*
14. Steward, L. *Computer Mediated Instruction*
15. Vistica, R. *Effective Testing Tools for Proficiency Oriented Language Learning*
The General Student Affairs Committee's charge is to serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs and student discipline. Thus far, we have had no student discipline issues brought before the Committee. We will be reviewing the Student Code for possible revision.

The Committee has worked with the Office of Student Affairs during the resignation of Morris Holland and through the reorganization of the Office of Student Affairs. Input from the Committee was requested prior to the implementation of the new management structure. Currently, a member of the Management Council is slated to rotate through our meetings in an effort to keep the membership abreast of current issues. The Committee will be engaged in the interview process of the candidates for the Dean of Students position.

One of our major tasks this year has been to increase student involvement on the Committee. Through active recruitment efforts with the Office of Student Affairs we now have five students on the membership rolls.

Tasks to be undertaken in the spring term include participation in organizing a response to the issue of free speech on campus, and continuing efforts to increase the Committee's visibility within the campus community by taking a more active role in consultation with the Office of Student Affairs. The Committee will be meeting with members of the Student Affairs administrative team to brainstorm ideas for increased participation and representation of faculty in decision making.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene Rhyne, Chair
Friday, April 3, 1992

Welcome to UO campus by President Myles Brand.

The IFS was welcomed to the University of Oregon campus for its April 3-4 meeting by President Myles Brand. President Brand’s message to the IFS was one of deep concern. He stated that Higher Education was facing critical times in view of projected 20% cuts toward the 1993-95 biennium. Particular issues noted by President Brand included

1. UO is experiencing a drop in applications as recruiters are finding that students don’t think programs will be in place.

2. Community College populations are being displaced by the 18 year age group at a time when the number of high school graduates are increasing.

3. An elite Higher Education system is being created with access problems for many students. Tuition could increase with associated increased contributions to Financial Aid.

4. The Governor is not optimistic about a Special Session—problems with House leadership during an election year.

5. Public anger at cuts will not be effective. Need to talk about consequences now and in the future.

6. The Portland area was identified as a target for sensitizing business leaders for support of Higher Education. Other regions seemed much more supportive.

Chancellor Thomas Bartlett

Chancellor Bartlett expressed the frustration of everyone in Higher Education at having to play a supporting role as the events of the past several months have evolved. We are not large enough to influence events, issues have provided great stimulation, but the System was unable to comment being cast in that supporting role. He expressed a view that we are now moving to another stage. Signs now indicate that there will not be a Special Session in May and chances are 50-50 in the Fall. Some tax proposals may emerge in the next three weeks or so and it is unclear how they will come together. He cautioned that it is tempting but unwise to try to find a solution too soon—Chancellor cautioned that it is coming but still not desirable. If we plan downsizing, we may as a result solve other people’s problems.

It was his view that we will be facing an 80% base budget toward 1993-95 (20% cut from 1991-93) with the possibility of two 10% addback packages. In summary form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1993-95 Base budget:</th>
<th>80% of 1991-93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addback #1:</td>
<td>10% decision package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addback #2:</td>
<td>10% toward meeting Oregon Benchmark goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All campuses will prepare 80% budgets with Chancellor’s office being more directed toward forming or maintaining a System of Higher Education. Plans need to be approved by the State Board (likely in July) and the Executive Department with some fine tuning still taking place in the Fall. Campus differentiation will evolve due to program shifts. Timely notice for faculty may require application of the Hosticka bill, which would permit continuance of employment until the second year of the biennium if necessary.

Roger Bassett

Roger Bassett outlined his perspective on the current state of movement toward a Special Session of the Legislature.
1. The Governor is sensing movement at the community level toward a recognition for tax reform. Her choice would be to have a vote on a tax plan in June.

2. The Legislature is currently not convinced. It is unclear that anything is close enough to agreement that a Special Session could be convened, a measure agreed upon, and put to the voters.

3. Special interest groups including OEA, AOI, AOF, OBC, Labor, School Boards, and others are working together to put an agreeable tax plan in place.

4. Student leaders are working to get students registered. They represent a potential voting force.

5. The IFS through Jim Pease has been effective on the Athletic funding issue. The IFS numbers on costs of the bailout have been accepted and are now a part of the Task Force on Athletics discussion.

Vice-Chancellor Weldon Ihrig

Vice-Chancellor Ihrig reported that the Board Administration Review Committee (BARC) is hard at work working on cuts in Support Services in conjunction with institutions and the Chancellor's office. He simply stated that it's a 'whole new game' and administrative staff are looking at new ways of doing business. There will be less data gathering, less multiple approval processes, less report generation, a hard look at the financial information system, more centralized administration, support services, academic support, student affairs and support services staff.

Vice-Chancellor Shirley Clark

Vice-Chancellor Clark reported on current discussions within Academic Affairs including

1. Results of Assessment Task Force. Institutions must develop implementation phase of the process. A copy of the Assessment plan is going the independent colleges in conjunction with their interest as a possible model for them as well.

2. President Ramaley is working on developing a set of Benchmarks to be included in the Oregon Progress Board's set of Benchmarks for the 21st century. Higher Education is conspicuously missing in the current set of Benchmarks.

3. Academic Affairs is currently working closely with School districts on structuring projects meeting HB3565 goals. Planning is currently underway on developing funded coordinated proposals involving teacher-education programs, counselling programs, secondary schools, course development, and special programs to move students smoothly through Certificate of Advanced Mastery on to College.

4. A joint articulation committee has been established to better coordinate community college and higher education common interests.

5. A proposal for joint graduate programs among institutions is being developed.

Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice-Provost for Planning and Resources, UO.

Gerald gave a presentation on his article "Investing in Oregon's Future" presented to the OSSHE on November 15, 1991. He stressed the important of reinvesting in our schools
and colleges just as reinvestment is essential in business, roads, parks, ports, etc. Current education policy in the State will result in a highly trained blue-collar work force with management positions filled with persons trained outside of Oregon. Without expansion, it may be that one out of three (possibly one out of two) will not be able to get into a public institution of Higher Education in Oregon by the end of the century.

Dave Conley, Associate Professor of Ed Policy & Management, UO.

Dr Conley, currently working with the Chancellor's office, gave a progress report on the "Implications of HB 3565 for Higher Education Institutions in Oregon". He noted current committee efforts as well as efforts to involve local school districts in progress toward meeting goals of the legislation.

Senator Marie Bell, Republican, Eugene.

Senator Bell gave a strong endorsement to Higher Education, articulating its value to her personally and to her constituents. In her view some important issues or values for IFS to consider included

1. Need for a vision for Higher Education in Oregon.
2. Need to develop a strong Alumni advocate system.
3. Higher Education should reflect a 'family' orientation within Oregon. How does education better students, better companies, support infrastructure?
4. Legislative Education Committee Chairs need to be stronger advocates of Higher Education.
5. As individuals, faculty should identify those Legislators to whom campaign support has been given and press for assistance with Higher Education issues.

Saturday, April 4, 1992

During its regular business meeting on Saturday morning the IFS agenda included

I. Athletic funding.

President Bonnie Staebler updated the IFS on communications between the IFS, the Chancellor's office, the Board, and the Governor's office in connection with the Athletics funding issue. Jim Pease, OSU and a member of the Board's Task Force, reported that conflicting deficit costs were presented at meetings of the Task Force with those that accurately show deficit costs were finally being accepted. In addition, statistics reported to show continuing support for intercollegiate athletics were inaccurate. It now appears that there may well be continued meetings extending beyond the June target date for completion of the committee review.

Jim felt that the next meeting to address the value of high level sports to an institution would be critical. Studies have shown that there does not appear to be any correlation between intercollegiate sports and donations supporting academic programs. Many within IFS expressed the concern that State funding for intercollegiate athletics be approved in the face of 20% cuts to the rest of the Higher Education the result would be unconscionable.

Members of IFS expressed continued support of its original statement that no monies that could be used in support of programs be used to support intercollegiate athletics. The IFS provided Jim with proposals to take to the Task Force to support the IFS position. These included the following possible actions...
1. Place Athletics in the same planning process as academic programs with respect to impending 20% cuts.

2. Invite a high level member of the NCAA to meet with the Task Force to explore the possibility of moving to a State System Division I level with less duplication of deficit generating sports still meeting Title IX requirements. Explore with the NCAA other possible ways of reducing costs.

3. Drop intercollegiate athletics altogether and expand a system of club sports.

Administrative costs.

The IFS is in the process of completing a ten year study (1980-81 to 1990-91) of institutional budgets. What is the nature of budget growth during that period with Academic departments, Administration, Support Services, Research, the Library and Physical Plant? Once project (phase I) is completed results will reviewed by campus IFS representatives and covering statements relevant to their campus structure or environments would be included. Phase II would involve distribution to chairs of planning committees or similar planning groups on individual campuses for their planning needs, Roger Bassett, and Weldon Ihrig with whom IFS has worked on this issue.

Questions being considered by the IFS include

What is the role of faculty in governance reflected in the relative support for administration and teaching? How can it play a role in the BARC committee deliberations?

as it they relate to the findings of the administrative cost study.

Other issues.

IFS Task Force reports were received on

Educational Reform and Articulation--preliminary. The IFS would seek to have input or work with President Ramaley on developing Benchmarks for Higher Education as part of this Task Force.

Differentiation among institutions and student access--written report. No specific discussion of this report due to limited time.

Teaching and Governance--very preliminary except for overlap with administrative costs committee work and discussion of faculty role in governance and budget cuts.

Information Distribution (Getting the message out)--preliminary. UO has a campus group working with Roger Bassett toward 'marketing' the UO.

Herb Jolliff, OIT reported briefly on potential negative changes to PERS.

Representatives from EDSC expressed concern over the issue of timely notice to faculty and what implications were for the system. This is a matter that AAUP would likely actively pursue.

Lief Terdal, representative from OHSU, reported on budget cutting deliberations already underway on the OHSU campus and noted possible severe impact on some programs. Campus representative sketched what they knew were occurring on their campuses. OHSU was much deeper into the process than any other institution.
Proposed Constitutional amendment

Add as a final paragraph to Article III, Faculty Powers and Authority, Section 1, Faculty Powers:

The University shall not establish, abolish, or effect major alteration in the structure or educational function of departments or of programs which include more than one department or academic unit of the University without prior approval by the Faculty Senate upon advice of the University Planning Council.

Rationale:

The Constitution now assigns to the UPC and the Senate authority to act on the matters in question. The proposed amendment makes explicit the requirement that Senate approval precede changes being made effective, in order to forestall the Senate's being faced with faits accomplis.

C. Verne Smith
Eugenie McKenize
Margery J. Burns
Robert C. Westover
Shelby C. Peice
Sue Danielson

Michael Bjelke
Donald K. Moore
Gordon B. Moore
Susan Karant-Nunn
A. E. Ogle
Kathleen Fan
"
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE: UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL
March 16, 1992

Summary: Action taken by UPC regarding (1) the review of PSU Center for Science Education Proposal and (2) the review of Request for Name Change: Latin American Studies Program to Hispanic and Latin American Studies Program.

At the meeting of March 16, the UPC passed the following motions:

(1) Recommend approval of the proposal for establishment of the Portland State University Center for Science Education.

Rationale: The proposed Center would be a vehicle through which the university and the community could address many of the critical issues in science education, such as the inadequate education of students in this area, including those preparing for careers in elementary education. For those who are currently teaching, the Center would provide continuing education and professional development opportunities. It would also design and coordinate grant-funded research projects in science and technology education. (For a brief overview of these and other objectives, see p. 2 of the Proposal.)

(2) Recommend approval of the request for a name change from Latin American Studies Program to Hispanic and Latin American Studies Program.

Rationale: The new name is intended to be representative of cultures of a broader geographical area, to include those of Mexican-Americans, Hispanophone and Francophone Caribbeans, as well as Central and South Americans. Students of Hispanic and Latin American origin are a part of PSU's multicultural and diversity commitment; the current program offerings reflect this broader commitment; and thus the name of the program should also be more inclusive of this diverse geographical area.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette DeCarrico, UPC Chair
Numerous publications appearing over the last decade provide a clear, strong, and urgent message that the quality of science education is inadequate to meet the nation's future needs (see Attachment I--Selected Readings). Enrollment projections predict that the workplace soon will experience large shortfalls in the number of college-trained science and technology professionals. Science illiteracy is commonplace among the general public. Institutions of higher education have perpetuated these problems by graduating students who lack basic understanding of key concepts and principles of science. Virtually all students, science and non-science alike, lack an awareness of the historical development and intellectual and cultural contexts of science and its place in today's society. Students who aspire for careers in elementary education are especially affected by inappropriate undergraduate education in this area. Because of their inadequate preparation, these teachers do not include science as an integral and vital component of their classroom instruction.

The proposed Center for Science Education (CSE) will be a vehicle through which the university and the community can address many of these critical issues in science education. The Center will operate within the formal Portland State University (PSU) structure, and serve the university as well as the regional education community. The academic areas of the proposed Center encompass undergraduate and precollege education in the sciences, and involve university faculty as instructors, collaborators, and consultants. Center coursework will carry credit through appropriate academic areas. (The PSU School of Extended Studies is the unit on campus through which community outreach courses and workshops may be offered.)

**Locus Within Institution's Organizational Structure**

The Center for Science Education will be physically housed in Science Building I. All units within the Center will maintain their affiliations with the respective college or school units, (see Attachment 2--Affiliation Schematic). William Paudler, Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences will be the acting Dean of Record for the Center.

Governance within the Center for Science Education is to be established under guidelines proposed by the Office of Academic Affairs.

**Board of Advisors**

The proposed Center for Science Education will have a twelve member board of advisors. The advisory board will convene annually to review the services and evaluate the programs of the Center, as well as to promote the linkages to other regional education efforts. Board members will be solicited from various educational, business, and community-based institutions, i.e., Portland Public School District, Oregon Science Teachers Association, Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, Metro Washington Park Zoo, Portland-area community colleges, Oregon Multicultural Association, PSU, regional private colleges, Oregon Graduate Institute, Oregon Department of Education, Battelle/Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Oregon and Washington classroom teachers, and regionally based business and industry. The President of Portland State University will be an ex-officio member of the advisory board, (as will the CSE Director and other appropriate PSU administrators).
Objectives, Functions, and Activities

The PSU Center for Science Education will address education, research, and community service as follows:

Education
- Coordinate, strengthen, and expand existing science education activities at Portland State University, by promoting undergraduate and graduate programs in science education
- Design science and technology coursework for undergraduate students in non-science majors, as well as coordinate multi-disciplinary science courses designed for both the liberal arts and non-science majors
- Establish a student assistance program to encourage enrollment and retention of under-represented groups in science courses. The university will develop a new support system to encourage and involve all students, particularly women and ethnic & racial minorities, in the study of science and technology.

Research
- Design and coordinate grant-funded research projects in science and technology education
- Provide an infrastructure on campus that will encourage increased faculty involvement in science education research (e.g., curriculum, teaching methods, evaluation and assessment, etc.)
- Serve to link endeavors in science education research among the departments at PSU

Community Service
- Provide continuing education and professional development opportunities for regional K-12 educators through research, coursework, and outreach programs
- Develop community-based, science and technology education outreach programs
- Furnish the university with a formal structure that will encourage leadership and professional development in science education among teachers
- Be the designated unit on campus to house community outreach and teacher enhancement programs in the science education area
- Represent PSU in regional and national science education coalitions
- Continue the tradition of PSU as a leader in the reform of science education in the region
Resources Needed

Personnel

The five categories of personnel appointments (academic and classified) to the Center for Science Education are:

* Faculty Appointments (2.00 fte): tenured, tenure-track, and fixed term appointments at the Assistant, Associate, or Professor level. Initially, .84 FTE will be distributed between W.G. Becker @ .51 fte (Center Director), University Honors/Chemistry, and D.C. Cox @ .33 FTE, School of Education. The remaining 1.16 fte will be split into various part-time appointments from CLAS, School of Education, School of Engineering and Applied Science, and/or School of Extended Studies.

* Visiting Faculty (varied fte--according to funds, availability, and need): academic term or annual appointments for PSU or other college faculty on leave from their regular departments or institutions

* Research Appointments: personnel who support CSE programs which are funded from sources outside PSU

* Adjunct Appointments: Usually, annual non-salaried appointments to members of the science education community who provide supporting services to activities within the Center. Initially, five adjunct appointments will be announced.

* Classified Support Staff (1.0 fte): 12 month appointment, Office Specialist 1

Facilities and equipment

* Equipped offices and reception space (to include six faculty offices)

* One personal MacIntosh computer

* One laser printer

* Access to: a conference room, a photocopier, and a FAX machine
Annual Funding Requirements

- 2.0 FTE Faculty Appointments (including Director) $80,000
- 1.0 FTE Classified Appointment $20,000
- Fringe Benefits at 37% of Salary $37,000
- Total Salaries and Benefits $137,000

Annual Services and Supplies Budget

- Total (estimated) Annual Budget $141,500 (plus first-year equipment costs)

Annual Funding Resources

The Personnel appointments of .84 academic fte (Becker & Cox), and a .50 classified fte will require continued funding through University resources. The remaining Personnel appointments, and other continuing expenses will be funded as follows.

On a regular basis the Center will sponsor both credit and noncredit courses and workshops offered through the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences and the School of Education in partnership with the School of Extended Studies. After all program and administrative expenses are covered for the School of Extended Studies, a portion of the tuition and fees may be used for program development for the Center. Apportionment will be based on revenue-sharing guidelines established with regard to the School of Extended Studies.

The Center Director, in cooperation with the PSU Foundation, will solicit private sector contributions on behalf of the Center through fund raising activities. When appropriate, CLAS will request institutional funds through the regular PSU biennial budget process.

Another avenue for financial resources will be indirect cost recoveries from the CSE grant monies generated.

Relationship to the Institutional Mission

PSU’s Center for Science Education will benefit both the university and the community it serves in many ways. The University’s mission, "...to provide excellent programs in teaching, research, and public service in Oregon’s major metropolitan area...", makes it the ideal place to further science literacy through education programs presented to both teachers and students at all grade levels. Through the Center’s programs, students in all fields will be introduced to the applications of scientific principles, the social, political, and economic implications of technology, and the impact of new discoveries on culture and society. The Center will further advance the University’s mission through stimulating science education research which addresses undergraduate, and graduate science and technology education. The Center, thus, will provide leadership and become an integral partner in the reform of science education in the state.
Long-range Goals and Plans

Education

* Establish a unit within the OSSHE for enhancing science and technology education, both at the precollege and higher education levels

Research

* Augment active research programs in science and technology education within the state

Community Service

* Maintain and establish science and technology education courses and programs designed to meet both the pre-service and in-service needs of regional teachers
* Sustain and support collaboration with regional schools and other educational institutions in the state

Relationship to Programs at Other Institutions In the State

Portland State University is committed to the provision of higher education in all its dimensions, with special attention to the Portland metropolitan area. The University has graduate degree programs in most of the natural and applied sciences—biology, chemistry, computer science, engineering, environmental science, geology, mathematics and physics, as well as outstanding elementary and secondary education preparation programs. This combination gives PSU the extended infrastructure and unique capacity to provide the type of service described to the largest and densest population cluster in the state.

The Center for Science Education will introduce new partnerships as well as build on already existing partnerships and collaborative ventures with colleges and universities, school districts, professional associations, educational agencies, and private entities. The proposed Center will encourage recruitment and participation of faculty from its sister institutions when offering courses, programs, and workshops in areas of specialization not found on the PSU campus. Many of the Center's functions could serve as a model for other colleges and universities in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. This model in its approach is consistent with both the Governor's Commission on higher education, and the workforce principle "America's Choice."
Approvals:

Request prepared by [Signature] Date 11/1/91

Approved by Dean, School of Education [Signature] Date 11/7/91

Approved by Dean, School of Engineering & Applied Science [Signature] Date 11/12/91

Approved by Dean, School of Extended Studies [Signature] Date 11/8/91

Approved by Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences [Signature] Date 11/1/91

Approved by Provost [Signature] Date ________

Approved by President [Signature] Date ________

bc: W. Becker, HON
D. Cox, ED
P. Noone, CENWE
R. Anderson, MESA
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Sigma Xi, *Entry-Level Undergraduate Courses in Science, Mathematics and Engineering: An Investment in Human Resources*, June 1990, Committee on Science, Mathematics and Engineering Education


REQUEST FOR NAME CHANGE:

Latin American Studies Program to Hispanic and Latin American Studies Program

The Latin American Studies faculty members of the International Studies Program have requested that the name of the certificate program be changed from "Latin American Studies" to "Hispanic and Latin American Studies." This request has the endorsement of International Studies (see attached memo from Professor Gurtov), and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences hereby endorses and recommends it. The name change is based on the nature of the (inter-) discipline, the interests of an increasing number of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students, and members of the metropolitan community; and the stated purpose of certificate programs:

"Language and area studies programs focus on the study of a group of countries or a geographical area having common linguistic and/or cultural characteristics. The course of study is designed to broaden the student's understanding of a particular world area." (Bulletin, p. 228)

The United States is rapidly becoming a country with a substantial population of people whose cultural background is Hispanic or Latin, the difference being relative to individual semantic preferences. Included in this group most prominently are Mexican-Americans, Hispanophone and Francophone Caribbeans, Central Americans, and South Americans, both Hispanophone and Lusophone. Spanish and Portuguese, first and later generation add to this complex mix. The 1990 census report indicated that Oregon's own Hispanic/Latin population is not only the largest so-called minority in the state, but is also the fastest growing such group in the state. It is the largest minority group in the OSSHE student population. Hispanics and Latin Americans follow Asian-Americans as the second largest growth rate in the Portland metropolitan area. At PSU Hispanic and Latin American students constitute the second largest group of minority students, and are the most rapidly expanding group. In addition to Hispanic students from our own country, students from a dozen countries of Latin America have chosen PSU as their university. Students of Hispanic and Latin American origin are very much a part of Portland State's multicultural and diversity commitment; they are as well important to the international commitment of the University. The present program name does not speak to our multicultural commitment in other than its international dimension, nor does it enable us to take full advantage of present and future student population, public interest, or current or projected faculty expertise.

Hispanic and Latin American Studies responds to the interactive intellectual curiosity of both groups. At a time when the geographic areas of the Western Hemisphere, the U.S.-Mexico sociocultural region, Oregon, and Portland are all experiencing the great cultural awakening associated with demographic changes, economic reorientation, political change, and intellectual activity it behooves us to see things Hispanic in the broadest of perspectives, things Latin in the most specific, both as part of a greater whole. Multiculturalism and internationalism are present in both; artificial barriers representative of interdisciplinary studies of a quarter century ago need to be eliminated in order that they be seamlessly integrated for the benefit of our students and the public at large.

The renamed Hispanic and Latin American Studies Certificate program will be housed where it is at present, as a constituent part of the International Studies Program. No funds are requested. The long-range goal is to foster interdisciplinary teaching and research, and public service through the current structure and by working with student groups, citizen's groups, and state and national organizations. No program change is contemplated until resources and expertise fully justify such a venture.
To: Ansel Johnson & Rick Hardt
From: Steve Kosokoff

Here is a resolution I wish to introduce to the next Faculty Senate meeting under "new business."

The PSU Faculty Senate congratulates the student-athletes, coaches, and trainers of both the PSU wrestling team and basketball team for their outstanding accomplishments in their respective sports.
10 March '92

To: Ansel Johnson & Rick Hardt
From: Steve Kosoloff

Here is a resolution I wish to introduce to the next Faculty Senate meeting under "new business."

The PSU Faculty Senate congratulates the student-athletes, coaches, and trainers of both the PSU wrestling team and basketball team for their outstanding accomplishments in their respective sports.

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE: UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL
March 30, 1992

Summary: Action taken by UPC regarding the relocation of the Department of Health Studies.

At the meeting of March 30, the UPC (unanimously) passed the following motion:

Recommend acceptance of the Majority Report by the ad-hoc committee on the relocation of the Department of Health Studies.

Summary of the Majority Report recommendations:
(1) That the Department of Health Studies be moved to the School of Urban and Public Affairs, effective July 1, 1992.
(2) That the Center for Public Health Studies be moved with the department to the School of Urban and Public Affairs, but with an arrangement for dual affiliation with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Rationale for the UPC motion: Although a Minority Report (written by Drs. Gary Gard and John Reuter) recommended that the department move to CLAS, the main issue raised in this report is the relocation of the Center for Public Health Studies and its continuing affiliation with faculty in CLAS. However, the Majority Report addresses this issue by recommending dual affiliation of the Center with SUPA and CLAS, thereby fostering cooperation and interaction between various faculty of both SUPA and CLAS with faculty of the Department of Health Studies. Further, the faculty in the DHS voted unanimously in favor of the move to SUPA.

(NOTE: Dr. David Dunnette, CPHS Director, was in Europe on a Fulbright at the time of the DHS vote. Attached is his response to the Majority Report and the Minority Report.)

Respectfully submitted,
Jeanette DeCarrico, UPC Chair
Date: February 6, 1992

To: Michael Reardon, Provost

From: Jack Schendel

RE: Ad-hoc committee on relocation of the Department of Health Studies

The ad-hoc committee on the relocation of the Department of Health Studies includes the following persons:

Ron Cease, UPA
Gary Gard, CLAS
Margaret Neal, UPA
John Reuter, CLAS
Judy Sobel, HHP
Milan Svoboda, HHP
Jack Schendel, HHP, Chair

The committee met three times over a 10 day period (January 28, 31, and Feb. 6) to carry out its charge to produce a recommendation to the Provost for the relocation of the Department of Health Studies, including all of its elements, effective July 1, 1992. Following discussions of the recent history, reinstated academic programs, faculty and other resources in the Department, and the peculiar circumstances and potential of the Center for Public Health Studies as an element of the Department, the following recommendation was moved and adopted with a 4 yes, 2 no vote:

The committee recommends that:

(1) The Department of Health Studies, including all current faculty affiliated with the department, the service program (self support, Special PE Activities), and support staff be moved to the School of Urban and Public Affairs, effective July 1, 1992.

(2) The Center for Public Health Studies (CPHS), be moved with the department to the School of Urban and Public Affairs but a dual affiliation be worked out for the CPHS with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.* Administrative details for dual affiliation should be arranged by negotiation of the Provost and the Deans of CLAS and UPA.
The purpose of the dual affiliation recommendation is to encourage and facilitate projects/research which emanates from various disciplines in CLAS, including the Environmental Sciences and Resources Program, as well as from the Department of Health Studies and other units in the SUPA.

The two members of the ad hoc committee who voted "no" on the recommendation (Gary Gard and John Reuter) will submit to the Provost a minority report.

xc: ad hoc committee
    R. Cease
    G. Gard
    M. Neal
    J. Reuter
    J. Sobel
    M. Svoboda
April 1, 1992

To: Jeanette DeCarrico, Chairperson, University Planning Council

From: David Dunnette, Director, Center for Public Health Studies

Subject: Response to Majority and Minority Reports of the Ad-Hoc Committee for the Relocation of the Department of Health Studies (DHS).

The history of the Center for Public Health Studies, its programs and development, is very complex. However, in brief, the Center was established in 1965 by PSU, the Oregon Public Health Association, and the Oregon Health Division to provide undergraduate training in the existing critical areas of public health manpower needs, including environmental health and epidemiology. The program was science based with 90% of the course work in chemistry, biology and public health studies.

The undergraduate program was suspended in 1984 two months after I came to PSU. The center and I were transferred to HHP that year. Over the next few years I developed the M.S. in Public Health proposal after an exhausting series of surveys of prospective students, consultations, discussions with PSU faculty and other institutions. Results of all this indicated any M.S. program should focus on environmental and industrial health risk assessment and control and epidemiology, all of which are heavily science based.

In the development of the MSPH proposal it was clear that the close cooperation of the science departments with the center was essential for success of any MSPH. In this regard laboratory space will be required for several MSPH courses, and the chemistry department has agreed to provide laboratory space. In addition it is felt that close cooperation with the Environmental Sciences and Resources Doctoral Program will enhance both programs. It can be seen that the primary academic linkages of the Center must be with the sciences.

With respect to research, most public health related activity takes place in the biology, chemistry, physics and ESR programs although geology is also involved as is the health department in several areas.

It is my feeling that Center for Public Health Studies should be an entity which can be responsive to all initiatives and interests in public health at the university. Public Health is an element of the majority of courses offered at PSU (if the concept of well-being is included). Since public health is so universal, it is important that maximum opportunity be provided for interdisciplinary connections, involvement and activities in public health. In fact the university may want to consider an even broader administrative framework for research and academic programs when the MSPH and MPH programs are approved.

In short, the transfer of the Center for Public Health Studies to Urban and Public Affairs is not consistent with the Center's expected future role or promotion of public health research throughout the university community. Rather a dual affiliation is recommended between CIAS and U&PA whereby the Center remains at its current location in the Harrison building near the sciences but also within reasonable proximity to the Health Department. Additional rationale is available for this recommendation.

Apologies to the IBM Selectric.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 4, 1992, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll

B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 6, 1992, Meeting
   President's Report

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators

   Question for Nancy Tang: "What level of support was budgeted for the conversion of the SIS to the Banner system? What provisions were made for training of secretarial and administrative assistants to handle departmental services, and why were important reports (such as advising transcripts) not continued during the transition year? What can be done even now to remedy the situation?

   Question for Dalton Miller-Jones: "What is the status of the task force reviewing graduate studies, grants and research, the role of the Graduate Council, and the position of the vice provost? Please give a report of the progress and the types of recommendations that are likely to come from the group."

   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—Koch
   3. Annual Report, University Athletics Board—Kosokoff
   4. Annual Report, University Honors Program Board—Goucher
   5. Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee—Pollock

F. Unfinished Business
   1. Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1—Moor
   2. Advisory Council Interpretation of Faculty Powers and Authority—Moor
   3. Discussion of Tabled Motion from April 6

G. New Business
   1. ARC Motion re WR 323 and Block Transfers—Millner
   2. Progress Report on Writing Across the Curriculum—Reece/Carter
   3. Update on Review of Budget Allocation Criteria—Patton

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B    Minutes of the April 6, 1992, Senate Meeting*
E1   Annual Report, Budget Committee**
E2   Annual Report, University Athletics Board**
E3   Annual Report, University Honors Program Board*
E4   Annual Report, Teacher Education Committee**
F1   Constitutional Amendment, Article III, Section 1**
F2   Advisory Council Interpretation of Faculty Powers and Authority**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.