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MEMORANDUM

Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Senate

DATE: April 20, 1977

FROM: Jim F. Heath, Secretary of the Senate

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 2, 1977 at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall. Senators are invited to attend the Sherry Hour at the Koinonia House immediately following the Senate meeting. In the event the business of the Senate is not completed, the meeting will be continued on Monday, May 9, at 3:00 p.m.

A. Roll
*B. Approval of Minutes of April 4, 1977 Meeting
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 Officers of Administration and Committees
  *1. Budget Committee--Interim Report; Joseph Kohut, Chairperson
  *2. "Project Ahead: University Equivalent Courses"--Tom Buell, Acting Dean UGS
  *3. Teacher Education Committee--Annual Report; James Hale, Chairperson
  *4. University Athletics Board--Annual Report; James Kimball, Chairperson
  *5. University Scholars Board--Annual Report; Howard Westcott, Chairperson
F. Unfinished Business: None
*G. New Business
  *1. Academic Requirements Committee--Proposal to change rules and procedures on "overloads;" Leonard Swanson, Chairperson
  *2. Academic Requirements Committee--Proposal regarding competence in English Composition; Leonard Swanson, Chairperson
  *3. Consideration of Ad Hoc PSU Admissions Requirements Committee Report; Leonard Swanson, Chairperson

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
Regarding Agenda Items:
B - Minutes of the April 4 meeting
E1 - Budget Committee Interim Report**
E2 - "Project Ahead" Report**
E3 - Teacher Education Annual Report**
E4 - University Athletics Board Annual Report**
E5 - University Scholars Board Annual Report**
G1 - Academic Requirements Proposal regarding "Overload"**
G2 - Academic Requirements Proposal regarding English Composition**
G3 - Ad Hoc PSU Admissions Requirements Committee Report**

**Sent to Senators, Alternates, and Ex-Officio Members Only
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 1977
Presiding Officer: Frederick O. Waller
Secretary: Jim F. Heath


Alternates Present: Grams for Butler, Tuttle for Cooper, Lockerby for Kohut, Eileenchild for Porter, Smeltzer for Reardon, Rubin for Ryan, Nussbaum for Sommerfeldt.


APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
The minutes of the March 7, 1977 Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR:

Hardt informed the Senate that the School of Education was hosting 26 headmasters and headmistresses from English schools and introduced one of the guests, Mr. Morris.

The Presiding Officer reminded the Senate that the agenda for the next three meetings would be rather full, since this was the period during which most committee reports would be presented. He urged Senators to remain until the business of the Senate was completed, so as to avoid the necessity of continuing the meeting next Monday because of the lack of a quorum.

QUESTION PERIOD: None

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES:

1. President Blumel called the Senate's attention to the agenda item contained in the follow-up mailing concerning the proposal to change the designation of the Department of Health and Physical Education to the School of Health and Physical Education. He noted the favorable report of the Educational Policies Committee regarding this proposal and asked for Senate approval. He added that the Department of HPE has been functioning as a School in every way except name for several years.

Motion: Blankenship moved (seconded) that the proposal to change the designation of the Department of Health and Physical Education to the School of Health and Physical Education be approved.

Discussion: None

Action: By voice vote the Senate unanimously approved the motion.
2. Annual Committee Reports:

The *Presiding Officer* reminded the Senate that although no formal action was required for committee reports submitted by inclusion in the Senate mailing, the chairpersons of the committees were present to amplify their reports and answer questions.

a. Leonard *Swanson*, chairperson, Academic Requirements Committee noted that ARC will be considering general distribution requirements this spring. He invited the "input" of faculty about the requirements, preferably in writing.

*Moor* asked if Swanson could give any hint about proposed changes in the English composition requirements. *Waller*, speaking for the English department, explained that English would prefer to wait for the ARC report. *Moor* then asked if ARC was contemplating radical or modest changes. *Swanson* replied that the committee was not thinking about radical changes but would consider radical proposals if such were submitted to the committee.

*Wilson*, referring to the ARC Annual Report ("Matters Referred" - item #1) asked if the AUDIT question would be reported on by ARC or Scholastic Standards. *Carl*, chairperson of the Scholastic Standards Committee, replied that it would come from his committee.

b. Norman *Rose*, chairperson, Committee on Effective Teaching, provided a list of the six proposals funded from the Annual Fund for the Advancement of Teaching during 1976-77:

- Registration Fees for Newberry Library Conference--Gordon Dodds
- Construction of an Index and Glossary for the Russian Reference--R. E. Steussy
- Conic Sections: A Computer Graphics Approach--Gavin Bjork
- Decision Analysis--Kostas Darvitsiotis and Barry Anderson
- Toward a Community of Writing Teachers--Shelley C. Reece
- Media Perspective of the Presidential Inauguration--Rich Meyers and Robert W. Vogelsang

*Rose* added that funds provided for the individual proposals ranged from $70 to $750.

c. Gavin *Bjork*, chairperson, GSAC, noted a number of typographical errors in the General Student Affairs Committee report. There were no questions regarding the report.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Second Reading--Proposed "Housekeeping" Amendments to the Faculty Constitution. Presented by the Senate Steering Committee.

The *Presiding Officer* reminded the Senate that the amendments had been approved at the March meeting and subsequently reviewed by the Advisory Council for form and numbering. The proposed amendments could be debated but not modified.
Motion: Diman moved (seconded) to approve the proposed amendments.

Discussion: None

Action: By roll-call vote the Senate unanimously approved the "Housekeeping" amendments.

The approved changes to the Constitution read as follows:

1. Article IV, 1, 2): Delete the last sentence: "records of meetings shall be made public only upon authorization of the President or the Senate."

2. Article IV, 3, 3): Delete the 4th paragraph in 3): "Meetings of the Faculty shall be open to the press unless declared closed by a two-thirds vote."

3. Article IV, 4, 4), f) (Elections Committee) Change the 1st paragraph, which now reads "This committee shall administer the annual elections for the Senate and the Advisory Council as described in Articles V and VI."

4. Article IV, 4, 4), n) (Committee on Effective Teaching) Replace 1st paragraph "This committee shall consist of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (consultant) or his representative, one member from each of the instructional divisions or units, and voting student members one less in number than the total of faculty members from instructional divisions. This committee shall:"

5. Article V, 3, 3): Add the word underlined to the existing wording: "Regular meetings shall normally be held during the academic year on the first Monday of each month at 3:00 p.m. Special meetings may be held at the call of the President or upon written petition to the Secretary by any five members of the Senate."

6. Article VI, 1: Add at the end of the 1st paragraph: "Names of current Advisory Council members are to be excluded, since no member may succeed himself or herself." Delete the 1st sentence of the 4th paragraph: "No member of the faculty shall be eligible to serve on the Advisory Council in any three successive years."

NEW BUSINESS

1. Academic Requirements Committee--Proposal Regarding Catalog Requirements for Transfer Students; Leonard Swanson, chairperson.
Swanson referred Senators to the document marked G1 and moved approval (seconded) of the proposal with the following change to the printed motion: in the second sentence of the motion, insert the underlined words: "Transfer students may choose to be graduated under the Portland State University catalog in force at the time they enrolled after admission at the regionally accredited institution from which they transferred to Portland State." Swanson explained that the second sentence of the motion constitutes the only change to existing PSU policies. The reason for the insertion of the words "after admission" is to insure that transfer students do not have an advantage over PSU students who might take courses here before they are formally admitted.

Swanson added that some community colleges have no admission policies. The AEC interpretation of the above motion in the case of transfer students from such community colleges is that the date the student first enrolled at the community college is the date of the student's admission.

Discussion: None

Action: The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

2. Graduate Council; Richard Halley, chairperson.

a. Proposal for Dual Master's Degrees. Cease moved (seconded) approval of the proposal.

Discussion Highlights: Halley answered a number of questions regarding the proposal and explained that it would allow a student to apply 1/3 of the credits for a first degree towards a second degree in a complementary discipline (thus, if 45 credits were needed for each degree, the student could secure the two degrees by taking 75 credits); that "complementary" disciplines would be determined by agreement between the two participating departments; and that the proposal was for two degrees, not a single degree in two fields as was common at the undergraduate level. Rauch noted that the program would enable a student to secure a second degree with one additional year of work in most cases. He also explained that the program could not be used by transfer students; it was intended only for students who enrolled in a planned dual degree program at PSU.

Action: The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

b. Proposal for Experience Equivalency of Baccalaureate Degree. Tuttle moved (seconded) approval of the proposal.

Halley explained that the purpose of the proposal was to make it possible for persons of exceptional ability, who were highly qualified by experience but who had no baccalaureate degree, to be admitted to graduate programs.

Motion to Amend: Brown moved (seconded) to add the underlined words to the next to last sentence in the first paragraph: "OGSR will schedule an interview to evaluate the applicant by a panel of faculty, including one member of the Graduate Council and at least one member of the department involved."
Action on the Motion to Amend: The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Highlights on the Motion as Amended: Henry and Moseley questioned the use of the phrase "partial completion of the requirements of a baccalaureate degree." Rauch replied by citing the case of a student now seeking admission to a graduate program who had completed several years of work at a university in Holland but who had not actually graduated; the student appears to be exceptionally well qualified for graduate work. Rauch emphasized that the proposal was really quite conservative; the Graduate Council chose not to ask for too much latitude in admitting exceptionally well-qualified students and preferred to consider each case on its own merits. Roe, former chairperson of the Graduate Council, stressed the importance of negotiation between the Graduate Office and the particular department sponsoring an exceptional student for admission to graduate work. Chino questioned the use of "shall" and "will" in the proposal and asked which are "wills" and which are "shall". Halley answered that most should be "shall". Rauch explained that "shall" is implicitly understood throughout. The Presiding Officer asked the maker of the motion to approve the proposal to accept the use of "shall" instead of "will" throughout; the maker of the motion agreed. N. Rose challenged the right of the Graduate Office to make decisions regarding experience as being equal to a baccalaureate degree. He also asked why the proposal should apply only to those who apply to Graduate School; why not also to those with suitable experience but no baccalaureate degree who do not apply for graduate work? In reply, Halley emphasized that the proposal did not suggest that a baccalaureate degree was being awarded but only that the requirement for a baccalaureate degree was being waived for admission to Graduate School. Dittmer asked if the Graduate Record Exam could not be used to determine if a person should be admitted for graduate work without holding a baccalaureate degree. Rauch answered that the GRE was not a satisfactory gauge for the type of persons the Graduate Council had in mind when it prepared the proposal. Roe added that the GRE had been considered but that information was lacking for interpreting the results of tests taken by the type of mature persons that would apply under the proposal. Richelle observed that the GRE is usually required by a specific department; here the issue is admission of a person to graduate studies. In reply to questions about the number of students this proposal would likely affect, Rauch estimated about a half-dozen per year. Halverson noted that the situation arises mostly in the case of foreign students. N. Rose and Chino worried that admitting students under the proposal would mean that PSU would have students who had not completed distribution requirements, thus weakening the liberal arts tradition. Rauch responded that there are no distribution requirements or liberal arts requirements set by the Graduate Office for admission to graduate studies. Richelle again reminded the Senate that the proposal does not suggest awarding a student a baccalaureate degree but only admitting a student to the graduate program.

Swanson asked if the proposal did not in fact call for a student to petition for admission to graduate studies. If so, the Faculty Constitution clearly empowers only the Academic Requirements Committee to act on student petitions regarding "degree programs and new admissions." Brown agreed with Swanson and argued that the proposal did indeed imply that a student would petition for admission.
Blumel suggested that a Constitutional amendment might be necessary to clarify the situation. Rauch responded that he did not regard the proposal as suggesting that a student must petition for admittance to graduate work. Toulan concurred and declared that all the proposal did was to say that in some exceptional cases a baccalaureate degree is not a requirement for admission to graduate studies. The proposal did not say that a student must petition for admission. Cease supported Toulan's position, noting that the proposal provided an additional route to graduate studies. And, Cease added, in all cases a department must recommend and sponsor the student for admission to its program.

Pierson moved (seconded) the question; the motion passed (voice vote) by the required two-thirds.

Action on the Motion as Amended: The main motion, as amended by the Brown amendment, passed by voice vote, not unanimously.

The Presiding Officer adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m.
In consultation with the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate it was decided that the Budget Committee Annual Report would best be submitted early fall term. There are several reasons for this change, paramount among which is that final budget figures for next year will not be known before the last Faculty Senate meeting this academic year. According to the senate resolution of last year certain budgetary data must be reported to the Faculty Senate each year. These figures will be submitted with the annual report early fall term.

In carrying out its charges as outlined in the Faculty Constitution, the Committee and its consultants have held numerous working sessions since 5 November. The following are salient points re. our deliberations:

I. The Budget Committee unanimously supported administration action on part-time faculty appointments; that is, the steps taken to regularize some part-time positions and lay ground rules for future faculty appointments.

II. Early this calendar year it appeared that there would be a shortfall in the current operating budget of some $65,470. Proposals were presented to the Committee involving adjustments of $30,844 (non-instructional) and $34,626 (instructional). The Committee reviewed the proposals, agreed they were reasonable, and recommended their approval by the President.

III. The Governor has recommended a capital outlay (equipment and library books) for 1977-79, which consists of $1,000,000 recurring and $5,000,000 non-recurring for the OSSHE. Portland State's share would be $619,810 (non-recurring) and $114,200 (recurring). The Committee discussed administration proposals for allocating these funds. (It now appears that only a portion, perhaps none, of this money will be forthcoming.)

IV. Of major and on-going concern is the preparation of next year's budget. Plans for the next biennium must be based on a reallocation of resources due to an anticipated shortfall in funding. The Budget Committee supports the concept of resource reallocation. Furthermore, it recognizes that the reallocation of resources is the principle concern regardless of the final budget figure; that is, reallocation will proceed even if the shortfall in the budget is much less than the worst possible case (-$350,000).

V. Three issues that we believe represent specific and legitimate faculty interests received repeated attention during winter term. Our discussions resulted in recommendations that we believe should be considered in the process of resource review and reallocation.

1. The concept of partial/early retirement. Portland State may derive important benefits from a voluntary program for partial/early retirement. These include:
a. providing a device for reducing or reallocating staff and budget.

b. increasing staff in areas of demand without an increase in the budget.

c. providing a transition period in a department during which young staff can be hired and assimilated before the full retirement of senior staff.

2. The principle that all basic instructional costs should be included in the base budget. This recommendation, though dealing with an operational budget problem, was offered as a means to augment the reallocation process. It includes the following points:

a. all predictable instructional needs (e.g. recurring extra wage sections) should be incorporated into the base budget.

b. a reasonable reserve should be set aside to cover unpredictable enrollment fluctuations.

c. indirect cost recoveries are, in fact, "soft" money and should not be unduly relied upon to support basic instructional programs.

3. Additional support for faculty research and development. It was noted that support for faculty development, research, and scholarly activity is only one of many demands made on the budget. However, while many of these needs have been strongly advocated by the Academic Deans, faculty R & D support has traditionally had no vigorous champion. The following objectives are noteworthy:

a. to provide "seed" money for pilot projects that may ultimately generate increased indirect cost recoveries.

b. to upgrade faculty skills/scholarship, thereby improving the overall quality of the institution.

11 April, 1977

Submitted by:

J. Bierman
R. Carruthers
J. Dart
E. Hoogstraat
G. Kilgour
J. Kohut (C)
C. Nichols
M. Thomas
R. Wininger
Progress Report to the Portland State Senate--Pilot Project:

University Equivalent Courses

(North Clackamas School District #12: "Project Advance")

April 20, 1977

In the Fall of 1976, the Portland State Senate endorsed a project to initiate on an experimental basis collaboration with North Clackamas School District #12, which would earn Portland State credit for university equivalent courses, at the same time satisfying high school graduation requirements.

Prior to final agreement with North Clackamas, the selected high school courses were carefully reviewed by Portland State faculty to ascertain academic content, student skills and instructional credentials, with approval by departments and by the Colleges of Arts and Letters and Social Science for the following courses:

- Principles of Economics 201/2/3
- Survey of English Literature 101/2/3
- Arts and Ideas AL 199/SSc 199
- Writing 121

The Portland State faculty most directly involved (J. Lill, A. Lyons, M. Reardon, E. Limbaugh) have visited and conferred with counterpart high school faculty at Clackamas, Milwaukie and Rex Putnam and report with confidence their satisfaction that the pilot project has progressed successfully and that the high school courses are equivalent to introductory courses offered on this campus. The high schoolers enrolled (they have 3.0 GPA's or better) are achieving at least at the college level, here or at comparable institutions.

To date, approximately 180 students have been enrolled, the large majority successfully, though those who could not meet the standards mutually agreed upon have withdrawn from university credentialed enrollment without prejudice.

The Clackamas School District wishes to continue the project under similar arrangements to include essentially the same courses, with the possible addition of mathematics, pending the Portland State Math Department's approval. Senate endorsement for a second year is therefore sought at this time in order to facilitate necessary planning. Endorsement is also sought for including those other school districts which have expressed interest in participating, most recently the Tigard School District.
In a time of budgetary uncertainty, it should be stressed that the project would continue to operate under the following restraints:

1. all courses and instructors to be approved by the University departments involved
2. enrollment to be limited to approximately 100 students per high school in participating districts
3. instructional cost to be borne by the high schools
4. total enrollment in program not to exceed 800

Further, the progress of the program will continue to be monitored -- according to Senate mandate, with careful consideration for the following concerns:

1) that the program should continue to be limited in size and scope until its impact can be adequately determined
2) that University resources (staff and faculty time; library facilities) are not unduly strained
3) that ongoing amicable relations with community colleges are not jeopardized

To date, the program has moved along well, with great satisfaction expressed by participants--students and collaborating faculty and staff.

Concerns originally expressed by certain community colleges are far less acute. Adverse impact is less of an issue. The High School Relations Council has recently introduced a motion to endorse the sort of program modeled here on the plan pioneered in New York State (Syracuse).

Thanks to the pilot project, students enrolled in North Clackamas/PSU classes (avoiding senior doldrums) have had a chance to get a taste of college equivalent study without leaving their campuses, the high school teachers (several are PSU graduates) have renewed or established ties with Portland State, and our own faculty are well satisfied that the program merits extension for at least another year.

Tom Buell and Roy Pierson
Portland State Coordinators
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
1976-77
Teacher Education Committee

The Committee:
Whitney Bates
Marjorie Enneking
James Hale, Chairman
Carol Healy
Leonard Robertson
Lila Scheer
Hugh Smithwick
Denis Wichar

Social Science
Science
Education
Arts and Letters
Business Administration
Student
Health and Physical Education
Student

Ex Officio
Kathleen Greer
Ronald Petrie
George Timmons

Library
Education

The Committee advises the School of Education Faculty and the School of Education Curriculum Committee on substantive curricular matters affecting professional certification in education or related program concerns.

The Committee meets regularly on the third Tuesday of each month if there is business to transact.

Summary of activities since the report to the Senate May 3, 1976.

Recommended "do pass" on the New Procedures for Formal Admission to the Program of Studies in Education as amended.

Recommended that a broad-based committee be appointed to construct proposed undergraduate aptitude examinations.

Received a report from Dr. Timmons on the preparations for the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission visitation.

Met with and responded to questions from the TSPC visitation team.

Received the "Report Regarding Employment of 1975-76 Graduates" from Drs. Carl and Duncan.
Received a report from Dr. Timmons on the preparations for the NCATE visitation.

Met with and responded to questions from the NCATE visitation team.

Received a progress report from Dr. Fiasca on the ad hoc Secondary Education Committee.

Received a preliminary report from Dr. Timmons on the findings and recommendations of the TSPC.

Recommended "do pass subject to satisfactory response to the Committee critique" on the course Behavior Management in the Classroom.

Recommended "do pass subject to satisfactory response to the Committee critique" on the course Clinical Evaluation III.

Recommended "don't pass" on the course Advanced Techniques in the Teaching of Reading: Disabled Learner. The Committee will reconsider the recommendation subject to satisfactory response to the Committee critique.

Recommended "do pass" on the request to add six omnibus numbers with a Lib (Library) prefix.

Submitted by: James R. Hale, Chairman
The University Athletic Board is composed of five faculty members, two student members, one community member, and seven ex-officio members, including: the Intramurals Director, the Faculty NCAA Representative, the Vice-President for Finance and Administration, the Intercollegiate Athletic Director, the Associate Athletic Director, the Department Head of H. & P.E., and the Student Coordinator of Club Sports. The board serves as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to, policies and budgets governing the University's programs in intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, club sports, and general student recreation.

In the past thirteen months the University Athletic Board has concerned itself with a number of tasks. The UAB has:

A. Prepared for the President a comprehensive report concerned with policy recommendations for sports and athletics at Portland State, including the following considerations:

1. What sports PSU should have
2. Level of competition for these sports
3. Conference affiliation
4. Impact of Title IX legislation
5. Post season competition
6. Budgetary procedures
7. Role of intramurals, club sports, and student recreation

B. Reviewed, recommended modifications, and approved the budgets for intercollegiate athletics, intramurals, club sports, and general student recreation for 1977-78.

C. Requested supplemental Incidental Fee funds for national tournament travel expenses for successful PSU athletic teams.

D. Requested supplemental Incidental Fee funds for program improvement requirements for sports and athletics when these were found to be inadequate.

E. Recommended the active seeking of conference affiliation for men's intercollegiate athletics (mainly football and basketball) with the Big Sky Conference.

F. Recommended a rule change in eligibility requirements for those student-athletes transferring from other four-year institutions to Portland State. (men's intercollegiate athletics)

G. Recommended not approving intercollegiate status for men's fencing, but further recommended the seeking of NCAA certification for the 1977 fencing team for the purposes of national championship competition.
H. Met with the three finalists for the position of Wrestling Coach vacated by Don Conway in August, 1976, and submitted impressions of the candidates to the President.


J. Approved the Oregon State Board of Higher Education funding proposal for non-revenue sports (including women's athletics) at the three major institutions, and continued to review the progress of this proposal.

K. Monitored the progress of the newly created Viking Athletic Association.

University Athletic Board Members

James Kimball, Chairperson
Charles Bolton, Subcommittee Chairperson (General Policies)
Gene Hakanson
Ansel Johnson
Andrew Kovacs
Frank Lagesen
Mary Mertens
Maxine Thomas

Library
Sociology
Counseling Center
Earth Sciences
Student Member
Community Member
Student Member
Education

Ex-officio members

Charles Becker
Intramurals Director
Scott Durdan
Faculty NCAA Representative
Roy Love
Athletic Director
Marlene Piper
Associate Athletic Director
Lee Ragsdale
Department Head, HPE
James Todd
Vice-President for Finance and Administration
Debbie Waples
Student Coordinator, Club Sports

Health & Physical Education
Business Administration
Athletics
Health & Physical Education
Finance and Administration
Health & Physical Education
The University Scholars Board is reporting activities in relation to actions taken during the 1976-77 academic year.

The first action of the Board was a welcome to two student members to the Board. These student members were selected according to PSU guidelines.

The second action was a careful perusal and analysis of the USP Program description. A number of minor changes were suggested and approved by the Board. Dr. James Hart, Director, made the necessary changes in the document. The senior essay was discussed at some length with several members indicating a need for changes in format and content. Although formal action approved the present concept, some members feel a change in this area is needed.

A number of courses were discussed and approved by the Board for the 1976-77 academic year. The intent of new course approval was to expand opportunities for students to select courses to improve their educational goals. The total number of courses for this academic year was 37.

A proposal of three new courses for summer term 1977 was approved by the Board. These courses are divided between academic emphasis and field work: Northwest Arts and Letters is offered by Don Kerr and Marj Burns; Northwest History and Culture by Dr. Charles White; Northwest Environmental Geology by Dr. Leonard A. Palmer. The entire block is sponsored by Special Programs with the approval of Dr. Charles White.

The Board has received word that Dr. James Hart has submitted his resignation as Director of the USP Program. The entire Board feels that Dr. Hart has done an outstanding service to the Program. The Board feels that substantial improvements have been made during Dr. Hart's tenure.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Brenner
Dale Courtney
David Cressler
Mary Lou Daily
Susan Enrich

George Guy
Margaret Palmer
Arnold Pickar
Emily Renfrow
Howard Westcott, Chairperson

4-8-77
April 11, 1977

TO: The Faculty Senate

FROM: The Academic Requirements Committee

The ARC recommends approval of the following motion:  

MOTION: Undergraduate students desiring to take over 18 hours in any one term must file an overload form which contains approval as follows:

Department or School majors
1. Approval by advisor
2. Approval by head of major department or school

General studies majors - Option I
1. Approval by advisor
2. Approval by dean of the designated college

Undeclared majors and general studies majors - Option II
1. Approval by advisor
2. Approval by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies

In addition to the above approvals, students desiring to take over 21 hours in any one term must petition the Academic Requirements Committee. All necessary approvals and petitions must be filed by the first day of classes.

RATIONALE: The fee schedule published by the OSSHE for 1971-72 designated full time as 12-21 credits, established an overtime schedule for 22-25 credits, and set a rate for each additional credit over 25. Students then felt that they should be able to take up to 21 credits without having to petition for an overload. On June 5, 1972, the PSU Faculty Senate rescinded its policy of a 19-hour maximum and established the university's current policy. The accompanying table, dealing with undergraduates only, shows what has happened at PSU in respect to overloads from 1970-71 to the present. Such figures are not available for years prior to 1970-71.

The current policy (see catalog, p. 28) requires that undergraduates wishing to take 22-25 credits need only to submit a form signed by an advisor and that those wishing to take over 25 petition to the ARC. The proposed change is one of process, not definition. By tightening the process whereby students can carry overloads, the proposed change seeks, first, to remove those doubts about the quality of education which must arise when a significant number of students can and do take an excessive number of credit hours, and, second, to ensure a heightened sense of awareness on the parts of both students and faculty as to the grave implications of overloads.

Administrative definitions made in regard to fees should not be permitted to influence, much less to determine, academic standards. Undoubtedly, raising the number of hours in the definition of full time and granting easy access to overloads were well-intended attempts to make higher education more accessible than ever before. However, greater numbers of hours do not necessarily equate with a good education. As the catalog (p. 28) states, only "an average of 16 credits per term" is needed for graduation in the normal 12-term span, and it has long been felt that a load of 18 hours is as much
as even most of the best students should carry and that they should carry such a load only when they are relatively free of responsibilities other than academic ones. This historical attitude was based on a recognition of the proper quality of a university education and on an awareness of the study-time required for successful achievement. Excessive loads can only be detrimental to the quality of education: courses must require less preparation; their depth and scope must be curtailed; academic standards must be jeopardized if not lost. Instead of making a good university education more accessible, the well-intended present policy has the contrary result of making a good education harder to obtain.

At present, the form required for taking 22-25 hours means little more than a filing chore for a clerk in the registrar's office, and only the ARC has any responsibility for loads in excess of 25 hours. In addition, neither the catalog nor the time schedule stipulates a deadline for filing forms and petitions. Students, consequently, quite naturally regard overloads as of little importance and often have little sense of responsibility for the classes for which they register. Academic departments and schools, also consequently, have no awareness of the extent to which the fee definition of a full time student and the easy access to overloads are being exploited. At present, a student can readily obtain a signature for the form approving 22-25 hours. In practice, any faculty member can sign as any student's advisor, and no department or school is ever informed as to the number of hours their students carry. By requiring approval before a stipulated time by appropriate deans or department heads for all loads over 18 hours, the proposed change would ensure responsible faculty participation and awareness and could, therefore, contribute to improvements in standards and quality.

The proposed change should produce two desirable results for university management. The first concerns schedule forecasting. Many students who register for over 18 hours are shoppers who rely on a liberal use of the drop date, but computer runs made for forecasting purposes are done prior to the drop date. Such computer runs, therefore, are much less efficient than they should be. The second concerns university revenue. Contrary to what might be supposed, there is the very real likelihood that overloads result in a loss of revenue. In reviewing overload petitions, the ARC has noticed the frequency with which marks of I (incomplete) appear on the records. Through the use of overloads and incompletes, a student can actually take what would be a normal three-term's work for the cost of two terms plus overtime fees by using the third term to make up incompletes. For example, such a student taking a 24-hour load would pay $147 less than he would pay for three-term's tuition.
All figures are for 4th week Fall term. Figures provided by Institutional Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>edit Hrs</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>total UG</th>
<th>% taking 19+ hours</th>
<th>total UG (HC)</th>
<th>% taking 19+ hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>9788</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>10706</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>10555</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>11847</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>717</td>
<td>10914</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>10780</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This number signifies 24+ hours. The records kept for these academic years do not differentiate beyond this point.
2. This number signifies 23+ hours. The records kept for this academic year do not differentiate beyond this point.
3. This number signifies 30+ hours. The records kept for this academic year do not differentiate beyond this point.
TO: Leonard G. Swanson, Chairperson
    Academic Requirements Committee
FROM: Mike Carl, Chairperson
    Scholastic Standards Committee
SUBJECT: Proposal to change University regulations on overloads

The SSC discussed the overload proposal at length. The concern of the ARC for maintaining high standards within the University is shared and appreciated. However, the SSC has several concerns about this proposal:

1. The Committee fails to see how the proposed change will remove doubts about the quality of education. It seems to the Committee that approval of the proposal would not affect the quality of education in any appreciable way.

2. It is questionable that approval of this proposal would result in a heightened sense of awareness by the Faculty.

3. Approval of the proposal would seem to have several negative effects that are of concern to the SSC.
   a. Increased difficulties in administrative control due to the complexity of the proposal.
   b. Increased amounts of paperwork.
   c. The possible addition of a "rubber stamp" activity.

4. The statistics attached to the proposal do not indicate numbers of students significant enough to compel this change in regulations.

5. An alternative method for obtaining the same results would seem to be achievable through departmental advising procedures.

On the basis of these concerns the SSC feels that the proposal cannot be supported and urges the ARC to withdraw its consideration by the Senate.

The SSC will distribute this memorandum to Senators prior to the Senate meeting scheduled for May 2, 1977.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

April 11, 1977

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: The Academic Requirements Committee

The Academic Requirements Committee recommends approval of the following motion.

MOTION: A minimal level of competence in English composition be established for students entering WR 121 at Portland State University. (The Academic Requirements Committee recognizes that to implement this requirement it will be necessary (1) to establish appropriate testing procedures, and (2) to provide additions to the English curriculum. Therefore, the Committee urges timely adoption of such changes as are necessary to meet this requirement.)

RATIONALE: Development of the writing skills of undergraduate students is one of the few matters which concerns all branches of Portland State University, a concern which is embodied in the English composition requirement of the University. The proposed change is designed to complement the present undergraduate degree requirement, WR 121 and 323, by helping to ensure that those students enrolling in WR 121 will be adequately prepared for the course and will be, therefore, better able to develop their writing abilities in it (a less efficient alternative might propose, for example, the addition of a third term of composition to be required of all students).

The Academic Requirements Committee offers the above change in requirements as a necessary step towards improving the effectiveness of the writing program. We recognize the effort which the English Department has already invested toward this end and the number of questions, both operational and financial, which remain to be resolved.

English Dept now planning to use Test of Standard Written English. A credit course being proposed for students not prepared for WR 121.
April 14, 1977

TO: The Faculty Senate

FROM: The Academic Requirements Committee

ARC recommends acceptance by the Senate of the following report.

AD HOC PORTLAND STATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT
March 23, 1977

We have several suggested changes for 1978-79 admissions requirements, each of which is applicable to Portland State University and possibly applicable to other institutions in the State System of Higher Education. Our recommended changes are designed to eliminate arbitrary restrictions on admission for those in the Portland metropolitan area who are capable of benefiting from participation in courses and programs in higher education.

Central to metropolitan Portland and Vancouver, Portland State University is a major resource for professional growth and cultural enrichment in a region bounded by Salem, Astoria, Kelso-Longview, and The Dalles. The people living in this area represent a broad spectrum of interests and academic preparation.

Our concern at this institution has been and continues to be primarily one of meeting this region's needs for higher education, with emphasis on the upper division and graduate courses and programs relevant to our region. We have always been less concerned with keeping students out than we have been concerned with maximizing the educational experience of those students who are admitted. The changes in admissions requirements that we are recommending reflect our desire to enlarge student opportunity as well as student experience. To enhance student opportunity, it is essential that informed freedom of choice prevails--freedom in choice of the institution the student selects--in the metropolitan area or elsewhere in the State--and freedom of choice in the course or program he or she selects. We therefore recommend the following alternatives for qualification for admission. We believe that each of the alternatives represents the same level of minimum but acceptable competence.

The requirement currently in force for residents, which we wish to maintain at PSU, is:

1. Graduation from a standard or accredited high school with "a 2.25 grad point average or above, in all high school subjects taken toward graduation to enter"* any term.

For non-residents, we recommend reduction from a 2.75 GPA to a 2.50 GPA.

The following are recommended alternatives to the above requirement. If a student meets any one of the following, he or she is eligible for admission:

2. Residents: GED sub-test scores of 40 or above  
   Non-residents: GED sub-test scores of 45 or above

3. "...a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours of a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer school."*

4. "A minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT to enter any term."*

5. Designation under the 3% rule as admissible even though none of the above admission requirements are met.

*Vice Chancellor Romney's memorandum (November 1) to institutional presidents raises five general questions. These are considered in order below:

1. Current admission requirements as presently stated may exclude from PSU some individuals or discourage others who would benefit from participating in our courses and programs. On the one hand, high school diploma and high school grade-point average become less and less valid as predictors of college performance as the time interval between high school and college widens from years to decades. On the other hand, some high school sophomore and junior students are competent to start their college courses early.

We have no objections to our other state institutions changing their requirements for admissions to become either more stringent, or to changing requirements as we wish to do, to accommodate competent but presently excluded students.

2. We favor for all students and all our institutions a broad policy which permits and encourages informed freedom of choice, and no arbitrary regulations which exclude from our institutions competent persons of high school age or above. We believe this policy can best be implemented by having alternate but comparable criteria by which individuals may qualify for admission. Further, the requirements as stated should be easily understood, or at least interpretable to the students. Therefore, we do not favor a combination of criteria nor do we favor rank in class. Combining criteria is a sophisticated approach that is not readily understood or explained. Rank in class offers no normative base on which to judge the student's absolute level of performance. Please see our recommendations above for what we specifically suggest.

3. For those institutions which have to limit enrollment, the following procedure is suggested. Projections of numbers of bona fide applications should be made for each level of admissions requirements. That level which comes closest to predicting the number of applicants should be adopted. When students apply, they should be admitted on a first-come, first-served basis.

4. With respect to placement, our Department of Chemistry presently uses a standardized chemistry test (Toledo Chemistry Placement Examination). For placement in mathematics courses, we use a test developed by our Department of Mathematics. In English Composition we presently use a procedure by which students may challenge the first quarter of Composition by writing an essay test. The English Department is considering remedial courses for students identified by a standardized, objectively scored test. In our opinion, no such test presently exists which fully meets our requirements. The TSWE portion of the SAT may be a step in the direction we wish to go.

5. In our recommendations above we suggest two changes in non-resident admissions requirements for PSU. One is to reduce the high school grade-point average from 2.75 to 2.50. The other is to reduce the GED average score of 58 minimum scores of 45 on all the sub-tests. The committee feels the differential between requirements for residents and non-residents is excessive and may discourage students from applying who would widen Portland State perspectives in the same way international students do.

We have one final recommendation with respect to the statewide requirement of scholastic aptitude test scores from entering freshman who are new from high school. These scores are not useful for placement, being too general in nature and not sufficiently specific to subject areas. We suggest that those state institutions which wish to use one of these tests for placement may do so at their own discretion. We do not wish to maintain a particular testing requirement for our entering freshmen students at this time. If a single test is to be required for all entering freshmen, we recommend the SAT. We would prefer under a statewide requirement that either SAT, ACT, or the Washington (State) Precollege Test (WPCT) be acceptable.

Dr. C. Karr, Chairperson, Psychology  
Dr. T. Buell, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
Dr. T. Burgess, Counseling and Testing  
Ms. D. Dressler, Physics  
Dr. D. Holloway, Acting Director of Composition  
Mr. B. Preston, Graduate Student, Business Administration  
Ms. E. Rose, Director of Admissions  
Dr. L. Swanson, Mathematics, Chairperson,  
Academic Requirements Committee  
Ms. E. Taylor, student, Political Science  
Ms. R. Valentine, staff, EOP; student
Attached for your review and comment is a copy of proposed procedures for resolution of academic staff grievances. The procedures have already been examined by the Advisory Council and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. I hope you will examine them carefully and suggest any changes you believe would be appropriate.

An open faculty forum will be held for that purpose on Wednesday, May 25, 1977, at 2:30 p.m., in Room 327 Smith Memorial Center. Fred Waller has agreed to conduct the forum, and your comments and questions will be welcome.

Based upon comments received at the forum, a final version of the procedures will be prepared for submission to the Faculty Senate during fall term.

Because the grievance procedures envision the possibility of formal hearings, I have also attached a copy of the University's proposed rules of procedure for the hearing of contested cases. These rules are prescribed by the Oregon Administrative Procedure Act and are being adopted in conformity with that statute.

JCB.m
Enc.
ACADEMIC STAFF GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

I. Definitions

A. "Academic Staff Member" means any person within the University holding faculty academic rank, as defined in the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) Administrative Rules: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, instructor, senior lecturer, lecturer, research associate and research assistant. It also means any other person within the University who is in the unclassified service of the state, as designated in ORS 240.207(1). The term does not include an applicant for an academic staff position unless such person is already an academic staff member.

B. "Prohibited Discrimination" means disparate treatment accorded to a person because of such person's sex, race, handicap, age, national origin, marital status, sexual orientation or religion.

C. "Vice President" means any University officer with academic rank who reports directly to the president, whether or not such person holds the title of vice president. "Cognizant Vice President" means the vice president, as above defined, who is in the reporting line of a given academic staff member.

II. Termination Other Than for Cause*

A. Academic Staff Member With Indefinite Tenure

An academic staff member with indefinite tenure who receives notice of termination under the "Termination Not for Cause" provisions of the OSBHE Administrative Rules is entitled to a formal hearing if the member believes that inappropriate considerations have influenced the decision to terminate. To obtain a hearing, the member shall promptly submit a written bill of particulars and request for hearing to the cognizant vice president. The bill of particulars shall specify the inappropriate considerations, including any involving violation of academic freedom or denial of academic due process, that the member believes influenced the decision to terminate.

*NOTE: "Cause" is defined, and termination and other sanctions for cause are treated, in sections 41.325-41.390 of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education Administrative Rules, and in Division 41 (Faculty Conduct) of the Portland State University Administrative Rules.
B. Academic Staff Member Without Indefinite Tenure

1. Appealability
An academic staff member without indefinite tenure may appeal a notice of contract nonrenewal, a non-retention or a termination before end of appointment period only if the member believes such action has been based on violation of academic freedom, denial of academic due process or prohibited discrimination.

2. Contract Nonrenewal and Nonretention

a. General Procedure
An academic staff member without indefinite tenure who receives notice that his or her contract of employment will not be renewed, or who is not retained after the expiration of his or her contract, may request a hearing if the member believes that inappropriate considerations influenced the action complained of. Such a request shall be in writing and shall include a bill of particulars specifying the inappropriate considerations alleged. The request and bill of particulars shall be submitted to the cognizant vice president. The vice president, after consulting with the appropriate school or college dean and the department head (or equivalent thereof), shall inform the member within ten days (twenty days if prohibited discrimination has been alleged) if the member's request for a hearing will be granted. If the vice President believes the request for a hearing should be denied the bill of particulars and hearing request shall be referred to the president for final decision.

b. Additional Procedures Where Prohibited Discrimination Alleged
When an academic staff member without indefinite tenure believes that prohibited discrimination was a material factor in contract nonrenewal or nonretention, and so states in his or her bill of particulars, the vice president to whom the bill is submitted shall first refer the matter to the University Affirmative Action Officer for investigation of the allegations of prohibited discrimination. The Affirmative Action Officer shall report the results of that investigation to the vice president, who shall then proceed in accordance with sub-paragraph (a) above.
3. Termination Before End of Period of Appointment

An academic staff member without indefinite tenure who receives notice that his or her contract will be terminated before the end of the period of appointment because of financial exigency, program reduction or program elimination (as provided in the OSBHE Administrative Rules) is entitled to a formal hearing if the member believes that inappropriate considerations influenced the decision to terminate. To obtain a hearing, the member shall promptly submit a written bill of particulars and request for hearing to the cognizant vice president. The bill of particulars shall specify the inappropriate considerations that the member believes influenced the decision to terminate.

III. Actions Other Than Termination

A. Right to Seek Redress

Any academic staff member may seek redress of a grievance arising from an administrative decision or other action (other than termination, or sanctions for cause), relating to the terms or conditions of the member's employment, by following the procedure outlined below. The grievance may involve the following matters, which are not an exclusive list: academic freedom, academic due process, promotion and tenure, granting of sabbatical leave, assignment of responsibilities, salary adjustment or participation in departmental governance.

B. General Procedure

An academic staff member who seeks redress for an alleged grievance shall submit promptly to the cognizant vice president a written bill of particulars and request for hearing. The bill of particulars shall specify the inappropriate considerations that the member believes influenced the decision in question, or specify the nature of the action complained of, and shall state the relief sought. The vice president shall review the bill of particulars and, after exhausting to his satisfaction the possibilities of mutual settlement, shall promptly notify the member whether the relief sought will be granted and, if not, whether he believes the request for a formal hearing should be granted. If the vice president believes the request for a formal hearing should be denied, the bill of particulars and hearing request shall be referred to the president for final decision.

C. Additional Procedure Where Prohibited Discrimination Alleged

An academic staff member who believes that an administrative decision or other action as described in subparagraph (A) above has been materially influenced by prohibited discrimination shall so state, as
specifically as possible, in the bill of particulars submitted to the cognizant vice president. The vice president shall first refer the matter to the University Affirmative Action Officer for investigation of the allegations of prohibited discrimination. The Affirmative Action Officer shall report the results of that investigation to the vice president, who shall then proceed in accordance with subparagraph (B) above.

IV. Grievances of Certain Academic Staff Members

Any academic staff member who is directly responsible to the president may bring a grievance by submitting a bill of particulars and request for hearing to the president. The disposition of such a grievance shall be governed wherever possible by these procedures.

V. Time Limitation

An aggrieved academic staff member's bill of particulars and request for hearing shall be considered only if they are submitted to the cognizant vice president within 180 days of the act or omission of which the member complains.

VI. Hearing

A. Hearing Committee

When a hearing has been authorized in accordance with the foregoing procedures, such hearing shall be before an ad hoc committee of five members. Committee members shall be selected in the following manner: The Advisory Council shall appoint one or more permanent panels each consisting of ten academic staff members. From one or, if necessary, two of the permanent panels, the advisory council will name five to serve as the hearing committee. Such committee, when the hearing is called to consider the appeal of an academic staff member with indefinite tenure, shall be composed entirely of members with indefinite tenure; when the appeal is by an academic staff member without indefinite tenure, the committee shall consist of at least three members with indefinite tenure and at least one member without indefinite tenure. The complainant and the University shall each be allowed one peremptory challenge; a committee member so challenged shall be replaced from the same panel or panels of ten by the Advisory Council. The committee shall be constituted promptly and shall complete the hearing and its report within thirty days of its constitution, if possible.
B. Preparation and Filing of Answer
The University shall be the responding party at the hearing. The vice
president who received the bill of particulars, with the assistance of
the department head or appropriate administrative officer or officers
concerned, shall file with the hearing committee a written statement
in answer to the allegations of the bill of particulars. The answer
shall be filed at least one week before the hearing, and the committee
shall forward a copy of it to the complainant.

C. Conduct of Hearing
The hearing committee and all parties shall be governed in the conduct
of the hearing, and of proceedings before and after it, by the University's
rules of procedure for contested case hearings.

VII. Appeals
Prior to pursuing any appeal provided by the Oregon Administrative Procedure
Act, an academic staff member aggrieved by a final decision or order of the
president under these grievance procedures, whether or not after a formal
hearing, may request review of such decision or order by the Oregon State
Board of Higher Education, as provided in the Board's rules for review of
academic non-disciplinary personnel decisions.

VIII. Informal Presentation of Grievances
Academic staff members may pursue the above procedures without intermediate
processes, but they are urged first to seek resolution of grievances informally
with department heads, deans or other appropriate administrative officers
wherever feasible.
RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR CONTESTED CASES

01-100 Contested Case Rules

Rules 01-105 through 01-120 may be referred to as the Portland State University rules of procedure for contested cases. They carry out the requirement of ORS 183.341 (2) with respect to contested case proceedings and are to be interpreted consistently with the Oregon Administrative Procedure Act (ORS chapter 183). Any situation not provided for in these rules shall be governed by the Act.

01-105 Applicability

These rules apply where the University
(1) is required by statute or constitution to determine the legal rights, duties or privileges of a party by means of a hearing, or
(2) provides in any matter for a contested case hearing.

01-110 Hearing Board

(1) Definition
As used in these rules, "hearing board" means any person or body of persons authorized by the University to hear a contested case.

(2) Powers of Hearing Board
When a contested case is referred to it by the proper authority, the hearing board shall be empowered to do the following with respect to that case:
(a) Give notice of and hold hearings
(b) Issue subpoenas and order the taking of depositions
(c) Examine witnesses
(d) Hold conferences with all parties, before or during the hearing, to settle or simplify the issues
(e) Make proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition of the case

(3) Hearing Board Chairperson
One member of each hearing board shall be designated to chair the board and to preside at any hearings held. The chairperson, on behalf of the board, shall regulate the conduct of the hearing, shall administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses and may eject from a hearing any person who interferes with its orderly procedure. Subject to the board's approval, the chairperson shall rule upon admissibility of evidence and offers of proof.
Preparation and Hearing of Contested Case

(1) Notice
After referral of a contested case to it, the hearing board shall serve on each party, personally or by registered or certified mail, a notice containing the following:
(a) A statement of the time and place of the hearing
(b) A statement of the authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing is to be held
(c) Reference to the statutes or rules involved
(d) A short and plain statement of the matters asserted or charged

(2) Postponement
Upon motion of any party, for good cause shown, the hearing board may grant a postponement of the hearing.

(3) Counsel
Any party may elect to be represented by counsel, at the party's expense. The hearing board may be assisted by counsel on matters of law and procedure.

(4) Verbatim Record
A verbatim record shall be made of any motions, rulings and testimony at the hearing, but such record need not be transcribed unless requested by a party. The University may charge the cost of transcription to the party requesting a transcript.

(5) Evidence
Evidence of a type commonly relied upon by reasonably prudent persons in conduct of their serious affairs shall be admissible. Irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence shall be excluded. All testimony shall be upon oath or affirmation.

(6) Presentation by Parties
Every party shall have the right to present his or her case by oral, documentary or other satisfactory evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required, to the end that a full and complete disclosure of the facts may be made.

(7) Order of Hearing
At the discretion of the chairperson of the hearing board, the hearing shall be conducted in the following order:
(a) Statement and evidence of complaining party (e.g. the University in disciplinary matters; the complainant in grievance proceedings)
(b) Statement and evidence of responding party
(c) Rebuttal evidence of complaining party
(d) Closing arguments of complaining and responding parties

(8) Burden of Proof
The complaining party shall be required to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, any charges or allegations made by such party.

(9) Failure of Party to Appear at Hearing
Any party failing to appear at a hearing shall be deemed to have waived the right to a hearing. If one or more parties fail to appear, the remaining party or parties may present their cases to the hearing board.

01-120 Posthearing Procedure

(1) Duties of Hearing Board
After the hearing is closed, the hearing board shall prepare and transmit to the president the following:
(a) All pleadings, motions and other documents submitted by the parties
(b) A summary of testimony heard
(c) The verbatim record, whether or not transcribed
(d) All other evidence received at the hearing
(e) A statement of stipulations of the parties and of matters officially noticed
(f) Proposed findings of fact and, in the discretion of the board, recommendations for disposition of the case

(2) Review by President
The president shall review so much of the material transmitted by the hearing board as he deems necessary. If the president is unable to reach a decision from the evidence and findings presented, the matter may be referred to the hearing board for further proceedings or deliberations.

(3) Proposed Order
If the decision reached by the president concerning disposition of the case is adverse to any party other than the University, the president shall serve upon all parties a proposed order, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, and shall afford to each party adversely affected an opportunity to file exceptions and present argument to the president.
(4) Final Order

After exceptions and argument, if any, on the proposed order have been received and considered, the president shall prepare a written final order, accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law which may, in the president's discretion, be in the form of a narrative opinion. Copies of the final order and accompanying findings and conclusions shall be mailed to each party or, if applicable, to each attorney of record.
TO: Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Senate  Date: May 23, 1977

FROM: Jim F. Heath, Secretary of the Senate

The Senate will hold its regular meeting on June 6, 1977 at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall. Senators are invited to attend the Sherry Hour at the Koinonia House immediately following the Senate meeting. In the event the business of the Senate is not completed, the meeting will be continued on Wednesday, June 8, at 3:00 p.m. (not, as usual, the second Monday of the month) in 150 Cramer Hall.

A. Roll
*B. Approval of Minutes of May 2, 1977 Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications:
   President Blumel - "Rules of Procedure for Contested Cases"
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions for the Chair from the Floor
*E. Reports from Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. Advisory Council--Annual Report; Basil Dmytryshyn, chairperson
   *2. Committee on Committees--Annual Report; Eileen Rose, chairperson
   *3. Educational Policies Committee--Annual Report; George Guy, chairperson
   *4. Elections Committee--Annual Report; Mary Constans, chairperson
   *5. Research and Publications Committee--Annual Report; Pavel Smejtek, chairperson
F. Unfinished Business: None
*G. New Business
   *1. Election of Presiding Officer of the Senate for 1977-78
   *2. Election of Presiding Officer Pro Tem of the Senate for 1977-78
   *3. Election of four members of the Senate Steering Committee for 1977-78
   *4. Election of members of the Committee on Committees for 1977-78
   *5. GSAC--Proposed New Student Conduct Code; Gavin Bjork, chairperson
   *6. Proposed Constitutional amendments regarding charges of Academic Requirements Committee, Scholastic Standards Committee, and Graduate Council; Swanson, Carl, and Halley, chairpersons
   *7. Graduate Council--Proposal regarding Incompletes for 501 and 503 courses; Halley, chairperson
   *8. Graduate Council--Proposal regarding Ph.D. Language Requirements; Halley, chairperson
   *9. Scholastic Standards--Proposal regarding Audits; Carl, chairperson
   *10. Proposed Resolution regarding Semester System--Dan Scheans and Mike Reardon

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
Regarding Agenda Items: B-Minutes of the May 2, 1977 meeting
E1-Advisory Council Annual Report**
E2-Committee on Committees Annual Report**
E3-Educational Policies Annual Report**
E4-Elections Committee Annual Report**
E5-Research and Publications Annual Report**
G1,2,3-Roster of Senate Members for 1977-78**
G4-1977-78 Senate Members by Constituencies for Committee on Committee election**
G5-Proposed New Student Conduct Code**
G6-Proposed Constitutional Amendments regarding ARC, SSC, GC**
G7-Proposal regarding Incompletes for 501 and 503 Courses**
G8-Proposal regarding Ph.D. Language Requirements**
G9-Proposal regarding Audits**
G10-Proposed Resolution--Semester System**

**Sent to Senators, Alternates, and Ex-Officio Members Only