

ADVISORY COUNCIL
University of Oregon
Minutes

January 9, 1978, 2:00-5:00 p.m., Conference Room, Johnson Hall

Members present: Exine Bailey, Barbara Caulfield, Edwin Coleman, Richard Littman (Chair), Michael Posner, Norman Sundberg (Secretary), Sanford Tepfer

Others: (2:00-5:00) Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow
(3:00-5:00) President William Boyd, Provost Paul Olum
Dean James Reinmuth, College of Business Administration

1. Minutes

The December 5 minutes were approved as distributed. The minutes of the Dec. 14 meeting with the OSC Senate EC have been sent in draft to Warren Hovland for checking and will be distributed later.

2. Committee appointments

Littman announced appointments representing the AC: Bailey to the Space Allocation Committee and Posner to the Ersted Award Committee. (Posner is a former Ersted awardee.) Letters requesting these appointments were distributed by Littman.

3. Meeting with Lane legislators

Littman reported results of the survey of times available for the meeting and will inform members soon about the exact time; Thursday, February 16 is the most likely evening as of this date.

4. Payment for luncheon with OSU

Members were reminded to pay Chris Leonard for the Dec. 14 lunch at the EMU.

5. Appeal procedures for fixed term appointees

Posner pointed out that there is a need for an appeal procedure for faculty members on fixed term appointments. For example, a person may be originally appointed for a three year fixed term, which is potentially tenurable. At the end of two years (before June 15) s/he may be given notice of termination, though the position may be continued and a search instituted for someone else. At the present time there are appeal procedures if the person believes s/he has been discriminated against because of sex, minority or other status (per AR 16.110); the university Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is the committee to which appeals go. However, if s/he believes the decision was unfair because of an inadequate or biased professional review, there is no adequate process. On the other hand, there are grievance procedures for denial of tenure and promotion (as per AR 16.140) but they do not apply in this case. After considerable discussion the AC members agreed that an appeal process for fixed term appointees should be developed. The AC also agreed that the appeal should go to the Faculty Personnel Committee, since it handles professional reviews rather than be treated as an ordinary grievance. This matter will be discussed with the administration.

6. CSPA report

Sundberg noted that all AC members have received copies of the Povey Committee report entitled "University of Oregon Faculty Committee Report on CSPA" and dated December 16, 1977. He stated that there was a great deal of work that went into the report, and that he would give it a "B+" grade, but there was also a great

(OVER)

deal left undone and complex problems were far from solved. He stated many of the ideas proposed are appropriate for the mission of the School and desirable. However, in reviewing the general recommendations (pages 12-23), several places were noted in which the responsibilities put on CSPA for initiating and carrying out organizational and program changes were very heavy, and there was little or no recognition of the administrative costs and the effect of such responsibilities on faculty members' careers. It was also noted that the dean, now being sought, would have many difficulties in obtaining cooperation across the University from people not under his or her control. In the limited time only a short discussion of incentives took place. Also, there was a brief discussion of issues brought up by the minority report by Gall regarding potential re-distribution of programs in the University. The AC decided to invite the following people to meet with the Council two weeks from today: David Povey, Dean James Kelly, Bryan Downes (who heads the CSPA instructional program and has led the internal curriculum planning program), and Meredith Gall (who wrote the minority statement).

7. Several items about the Library

Littman mentioned three items that need AC discussion in the future: storage policies; how general Library policies are formulated and whether there should be more review and input from faculty and the central administration; and personnel standards for librarians (note Dec. 12 memo to Olum from FPC).

8. Faculty legislation to establish University budget committee

Littman asked Caulfield to prepare a brief memorandum about such a committee that would consider such things as: need for such a committee; whether it should be ad hoc or standing; whether it should review or scrutinize procedures or participate in budget reviews, etc. On the basis of the memo the Council will decide whether to propose legislation and what form it should take.

(After 3:00)

President Boyd indicated that he expected to represent the Presidents and accompany the Chancellor to meet with the EEC on Friday in connection with the request for relief to the legislature's Emergency Board.

9. CSPA planning

Littman reported that the AC wished to delay discussion of CSPA for two weeks and to discuss the matter with some of the main persons involved. Olum stated that he thought that the dean search will be finished by the end of the month, and not much could be done before the new dean is chosen anyway. In response to a question, Boyd stated that he had a commitment to preserve CSPA as a unit and that decision meant having a dean.

10. Proposal by the College of Business Administration to limit enrollment

Dean Reinmuth passed out memos to Provost Olum and the Council of Deans explaining the proposed admissions policy for CBA. He explained that CBA has had a growth of 12-15 percent each year for about five years. This is a national phenomenon in business (though not at OSU). CBA resources are thin and the College either needs additional assistance or must cut back its enrollment. The future of professional education in business lies more at the graduate than the undergraduate level. The University of Washington has had a policy comparable to the proposed one for five

years; it admits one out of three applicants for its undergraduate program. The proposal is to set the major at the junior level and require application; admission would be based on a GPA of at least 2.5 and a quota of 900.

Discussion centered around several points: Suggestions for modifications in the proposal, questions about effects on general University enrollments and subsequent effects on budget, possibilities of offering a business "minor" to students majoring in other areas, and questions about fluctuation in popularity of various University programs.

Several people made suggestions for changing the proposal, e.g., in figuring the GPA only use selected courses relevant to business; keep a number of "wild cards" that would permit admitting students from high quality schools though the grades were borderline; raise the GPA level slowly and conservatively since it is easier to go that way than drop requirements. Olum presented the dilemma of using a fixed GPA vs. a fixed quota. Several suggested that a fixed GPA is easier for students to understand and accept.

President Boyd pointed out that studies show (and a recent memo from Dean Baldwin confirms) that students are much more vocationally oriented these days than previously. They are particularly interested in business. Students also seem to be firmer about their choices. The ability to get a job on graduation is very important, even for students in the liberal arts. So the UO does poorly compared with OSU. Boyd also presented the tension regarding quality; raising standards is intended to improve quality but loss of money because of enrollment decline hurts quality too. CBA's attractiveness to students helps the whole University because those students also take courses in other units, especially Arts and Sciences. When CBA restrictions become known in the state, it is likely that business programs will expand at PSU and OSU (as happened with the Law School, Caulfield pointed out later, leading to the Lewis and Clark school). There was considerable discussion about effects on enrollment and a number of expressions of need for more information. It was suggested that it is unrealistic not to expect losses at the junior level. Olum suggested that enrollment losses will depend on how the change would be publicized and handled; perhaps if there are losses they could be offset by increases at the graduate level. Boyd also said that there is danger that people on the outside seeing the UO's declining enrollment will say the University is of declining value; so even less money will be provided. He also pointed out the declining need for advanced degrees in many areas. He noted that putting more money into a CBA program might instigate a general UO increase in the long run and give confidence.

Reinmuth discussed the proposal for business "minors" for non-business majors. If students want jobs there may be creative ways that other departments can develop cooperative programs with business; for instance, a major in Asian Studies might take some business courses so that s/he could work with international firms. In passing, Reinmuth pointed out a criticism of the Povey report on CSPA; it did not take a look at the outside, the needs of the community or society. He said the University needs to do market surveys; we may be "putting our money into buggy whips and horse collars." He also pointed to the importance of the CSPA effort as an example of work across departments, which would be needed if minors are to be developed. At the present time the University does not have a formal

(OVER)

mechanism for minors but certificates or other procedures might be instituted. Questions were raised about the ability of CBA to offer many courses for minoring students. Posner emphasized the need for having someone responsible for carrying out the minor program.

Boyd pointed out that some fields are projected to shrink considerably in the next 10 years; there will be no new jobs. U.S. higher education has to contend with fluctuations and perhaps must reorganize. Reinmuth noted that the business occupational interest is projected to continue through 1985. Olum stated that if we do support an expansion of CBA, it should be on the basis of non-tenured positions. Several noted that there are fluctuations in the University all the time, and some part of the University must be "carrying" other parts; earlier, Liberal Arts might have been carrying Business.

Some other ideas that came out were the following: The possibility of developing a 3-2 plan (3 undergraduate years and 2 more years for a masters); the possibility of trying out the minor program experimentally; the problem of transfer students from community colleges; the need for the University to establish a greater concern for jobs for students in general and making this known in the state; the effect of the current heavy load on faculty morale in CBA. At the end, the AC members did not express any clear sense of closure or consensus, but wanted to see if more information about effects of various policies could be determined.

Unfinished agenda items: Plans for meeting with legislators; CSPA monitoring and the role of the AC; follow-up on fixed term appeal processes; library items; faculty legislation on a University budget committee; clarification of "baskets" item before next OSU meeting; follow-up on CBA admissions policy.

Scheduled events:

- January 16: Meeting with Aaron Novick on graduate education and other matters at 2:15 p.m.
- January 23: Start at 1:30. From 1:30 to 2:30 discuss CSPA reformation and AC role in monitoring changes and advising the administration with Povey, Kelly, Downes and Gall; from 2:30-3:00, other business.
- January 30: At 4:00 open meeting in Faculty Club with faculty.
- February 16: Probable date for evening meeting with legislators.
- February 27: Lunch and discussion in Corvallis with OSU and possibly PSU representatives.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

January 16, 1978, (1:30-5:00) Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present: Exine Bailey, Barbara Caulfield, Edwin Coleman, Michael Posner, Richard Littman (Chair), Norman Sundberg (Secretary)

Others present: (2:15-3:00) Aaron Novick, Dean of Graduate School
(2:30-5:00) Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow
(3:00-5:00) Paul Olum, Provost, and William Boyd, President
(4:00-5:00) Robert Albrecht, Vice Provost

1. Minutes

Approved as distributed.

2. Announcements

- a. Open meeting with faculty, 4:00 p.m., 30 January, Faculty Club
To be announced by Littman at Wednesday faculty meeting.
- b. Meeting with legislators, Thursday, 16 February, in evening.
- c. OSU and PSU (?) meeting in Corvallis for lunch, 27 February.

3. Legislative meeting--should the President and Provost attend?

After considerable discussion no disadvantage was seen to having University administrators attend, especially since the legislators already knew that was to happen. Littman mentioned Dave Frohnmayer and other faculty members saw no problem.

4. Fixed term appeal

Provost Olum, in discussions with Littman, indicated a positive attitude toward moving ahead with establishing administrative regulations. Agreed to take matter up at future meeting, perhaps with proposed changes from administration as basis.

5. Library items

a. Storage issues

Sundberg reported preliminary information about a survey Dean Baldwin is conducting. He has asked all A&S department heads to poll faculty on their ideal arrangements, since some construction money may be available in the next biennium. The results are to come back at the end of January. Littman reported considerable distress on campus among humanists and scholars, particularly with antiquarian interests, e.g., rare books, original manuscripts, etc. Olum is concerned that a careful review be made and wishes to organize a meeting of interested parties.

b. General policy formation

The question is whether the Librarian should make policy alone. The Library Committee is only advisory. The question is how the administration and further faculty voice may be brought in so that the needs of the whole University may be brought to bear on decisions.

c. Personnel standards

In general, librarians were reported to want to have regular faculty appointments, but for years the librarians have run into trouble with promotion and tenure. One question is whether they should be on the regular ladder of advancement. Or should they be clearly service personnel? Considerable discussion identified several kinds of library appointments: (1) civil service, (2) senior instructor, (3) regular titles with specialized job descriptions emphasizing service and not research and publication, or (4) regular appointment and expectations about research and teaching in their special areas. It was suggested that the Library should be responsible for developing a plan placing people in various categories.

(OVER)

6. Ethnic Studies

Coleman reported on Tull's impressions of developments; he is not sure the proposed changes would work--namely, in order to protect the director for promotion and tenure the person would be hired full-time or almost in a particular department. Posner mentioned we should push for the \$45,000 budget; nothing yet indicates the dean has improved the budget. How is a change effected? Littman had offered to meet with Baldwin and the committee as a representative of the AC, but he was turned down, at least so far as any initial meetings were concerned. In any event, only one meeting has actually taken place.

The Advisory Council sees its role as expressing the voice of the faculty--and judges that a budget must be at a certain level for the program to be viable. The comparison with Women's Studies that Baldwin makes is not quite appropriate, since there are few minority faculty to work on the Ethnic Studies program, whereas Women's Studies has been able to recruit successfully among women faculty.

7. Discussion with Aaron Novick, Graduate School

Dean Novick has never in his 6½ years in the Graduate School met with the AC. He stated the most important thing at this moment is the budget note problem; the note calls for justification, graduate program by graduate program, of work offered in higher education in terms of contribution to Oregon and the nation. The Chancellor needs to make more vigorous use of a citizen's group, and his office needs to speak out more strongly for graduate education. At present he is working through a committee that is preparing materials for a report from Romney that will be the SSHE's response; however, the committee members have different viewpoints: one wants easy access for students; another is worried about low quality. The response to the legislative budget note goes first to the Educational Coordinating Committee for analysis.

Novick reported employment rate of Ph.D.'s is over 90%, but the stereotype in the legislature and the ECC is that we are turning out too many. Departments have been reducing students by 10% over the last 5 years. The legislature several years ago imposed quotas on graduate students, but this is removed now.

Novick would like to see more involvement by administrators with political savvy. Boyd could get together with McVicar and Blumel to support graduate developments. Novick says the earlier Bureau of Labor statistics reports of job surpluses till 1985 in many fields has been reduced. Bailey mentioned that the Music School had 100% placement of graduate students last year. Littman mentioned high quality of programs leads to job placements.

The Graduate School is reviewing graduate programs occasionally and informally (e.g., Librarianship), but a systematic review of all would take much time and energy and result in little. But Romney would like to have each program state objectives and show how they are being accomplished.

PSU has gone to Board for a Ed.D. degree, but against some opposition; they have proposed a tri-university degree, in which UO will have some control. A final draft will come out soon.

Novick said there is not enough long-range planning but that planning does not work well without dean's support. We seldom have time for anything but immediate problems.

The Graduate School has two major responsibilities--academic programs and research. On the research side, Novick reported the present administration goes with emphasis on relevance to University goals. Some areas of problems are use of overhead, rule-boundness at times, over-zealous human subjects review, status of secondary faculty (post-docs, research associates, etc.). Novick is proposing that a rank of Senior Research Associate (equivalent of Associate and full Professor) be created; they would have certain faculty perquisites and could apply for grants.

(After 3:00 p.m.)

8. Posner note on CBA program

Olum reported that Reinmuth will respond to Posner's suggestion (which was distributed to the AC).

9. Legislators' meeting

Littman noted that the Council had discussed Boyd's caution about his presence. They had expressed their appreciation for his sensitivity but concluded that they anticipated no problems; if necessary a demonstration of independence could be staged for the legislators' benefit to emphasize the Council's independence.

10. Budget-making process

Littman reported that OSU has a budget oversight committee and suggested that a faculty committee be set up here to provide faculty input. Boyd raised the question of the need for coupling faculty into the administrative process, since it is not now a faculty responsibility. Caulfield suggested that internally there is faculty expertise in administration that might be used and that externally faculty members would be educated for dealing with the legislature. Boyd said there are many emergencies and special circumstances that occur in the legislature--that's where the mischief occurs. The budget-making process also includes the Chancellor's Office.

If the AC is to advise on budget, how can it give proper input? How can it be informed? What evidence is there of priorities? How can priorities be established?

Olum said that budget-making is a complicated process. Sundberg added that it is just because it is complicated and time-consuming to master that consultation with the faculty is a problem. He stated that he felt he could not give adequate judgments about the proposed list of cuts presented to the AC recently; there was no set of priorities or criteria set up whereby to judge programs; there was no information about other cuts considered or other programs not cut, no context for the decisions. Sundberg said that administrators could not be assured of "informed consultation" when lists were presented like that. If the administration wants to have genuine consultation on budgetary priorities, a better system has to be developed. Littman mentioned that the AC has a responsibility to faculty members to provide assurance of reasonable consultation; this is important for establishing trust.

Boyd analyzed the budgetary consultation question to two aspects: (1) Consultation on the development of the budget and its follow-through into the legislature

(OVER)

and the pleading of the case and monitoring of progress there; (2) Consultation on the University response to required cuts and shortfalls. Later on, it was mentioned that an additional aspect is the cutting up of the OSSHE budget and the processes whereby the University gets its share. Questions were raised about the reported OSU budgetary committee, whether it really worked with the legislature and whether it was effective.

How much planning and priority setting is there in the University? Can we plan? Boyd gave 5 examples of planning in recent years: (1) the recent decision about establishing the neuroscience program, (2) the discussion of the CBA admissions proposal and its potential impact on the University, (3) the reformation of CSPA and reallocation of educational resources in a new way, (4) the study of the Librarianship situation by a high level committee before the decision, and (5) the reorganization of the central administration, dropping the Vice President position in Student Affairs and adding Public Service. He states that planning is going on, but one cannot postpone decisions too long.

Olum and Boyd also said that consultation and planning were a matter of leadership style, and the faculty could see the problem as one of relying on the administration to make good judgment. If they did not think well of what happens over the long hall, they could move toward changing the administration.

The question also came up about whether there should be an additional budget oversight committee or whether the AC should play that role. It was recognized that one-term people unfamiliar with the budget are not in a position to make very adequate judgments. The election of the AC members for a longer term would help. The AC may also want to appoint a subcommittee of knowledgeable people to assist

Olum also mentioned that there are inevitable strong differences on issues in the faculty--for instance, on whether salary increases should be across the board or on the basis of merit. He mentioned in passing that there will be merit increases on April 1.

Posner mentioned that it was not fair for administrators to rebut faculty members' suggestions for budget improvements by saying "Then you find the money." Faculty members do not have access to the information that administrators have. Boyd agreed. He added that we must not think that administrators are great experts either. He said that we each have our role assignments and special access to information, and that in the academic community, many people could occupy administrative roles (on a non-specialty nature) on ninety days notice!

11. Library issues--Personnel

Olum suggested Bob Albrecht come and he was invited to join the meeting. The personnel issue was brought up first since the Faculty Personnel Committee is discussing the problem right now. Do librarians represent the same level or kind of excellences as the rest of the University? Should they be judged the same? Librarians here generally wanted to be accepted as full faculty members, judged by the same standards. Librarians are now doing teaching, too. Olum said that that nationally librarians often are on civil service, but the trend is strongly toward their wanting to be on the faculty. Their terminal degree is typically a master's. A recent decision has been made, that if they come here new, they will be instructors three years, before the clock starts running. Given that they have 40 hour a week assignments with no part of that time allocated to research

it is clearly difficult for them ordinarily to satisfy scholarship criteria. A solution is to provide term appointments "with the rank of...", to satisfy academic affiliation needs and job continuity rights but to be more realistic at the same time.

(Responding to a comment about our silly procedures at one point, Boyd said "It's not part of our job to purge this University of silliness.")

Officers of administration (who are appointed "with the rank of" assistant professor, etc.) now have choice of regular criteria or fixed term appointment; in the future they will be appointed only on fixed terms. Boyd suggested this system might apply to the Library, too. Under the tenure choice, there are three possibilities: (a) regular appointment and regular criteria, (b) regular appointment with specialized job description and criteria (as used with a few field instructors in CSPA and one or two in physics, education and other fields), and (c) senior instructor. Others appointed "with the rank of" are in student services and counseling. For a time, then, we would have two classes of librarians. In the future appointments would be all "with the rank of." There could be a series of fixed term appointments, and the jobs could be regular career positions. Exceptions could be made in immediately pending cases.

12. Library issues--Storage

Boyd would still like to have a colloquium on the state of the art before we make decisions. The University would set up a plan through the Provost's office to organize the colloquium and use the ex-President Johnson fund (discretionary with President).

13. Library issues--Policy formulation

Olum stated that the Librarian has an autonomy unusual in the University and reports on policy to no one. One possibility is a more powerful advisory committee. It could be required that any recommendation coming from the Librarian would also include a recommendation from the committee. We will have a follow-up on this topic later.

Agenda for subsequent meetings:

January 23, 1:30-2:30--Review of CSPA reformation recommendations and possibilities; the role of the AC in monitoring the "experiment."

Other items: Follow-up on fixed term appeal, library issues, CBA proposal; discuss AC role in budget oversight.