

Advisory Council
MINUTES

13 February, 1978, 2:00-4:30 p.m., Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

Absent: Michael Posner

Others present: (2:00-4:30) Gerry Tyler (ACE Fellow)
(3:00-4:30) Paul Olum (Provost)

1. Minutes

Approved as distributed.

2. OSU meeting

February 27 meeting cancelled. Meeting to be held in Corvallis on April 10. Some discussion of salary improvements for the April 1 increase; OSU increase will be across the board. W. Hovland of OSU estimates that for the biennium their increases will be about 60% across the board. It is estimated that at U of O the final figure for the biennium will be over 50%, so that merit increases here are greater than at OSU.

3. A.C. interview for Vice-President of Public Service, 1:30 p.m., February 14.

The A.C. members are scheduled to meet with the first visiting candidate tomorrow. Coleman, who is on the search committee, reported 800 applied. The number was narrowed down to nine well qualified people, of whom four are being brought to campus. A.C. members discussed questions to ask. Some relate to the importance of seeking financial resources and establishing closer relations with the people of Oregon. The A.C. members expect they might be asked to give a report or use a rating sheet. There was discussion about the questions of justifying a vice-presidential rank for this position. A description of position was distributed.

4. CSPA Oversight

The A.C. members thought it would be good to meet with the newly appointed Dean. Sundberg will invite Dick Hill to attend. We will ask him to talk about his aspirations for the School, and we will discuss with him the criteria for "monitoring" its reformation, the nature of the CSPA advisory committee, etc. (Subsequent note: Hill will meet with the A.C. at 2:00 p.m. on February 27.)

5. Admissions Change

Littman reported a discussion with von Hippel. He will not plan independent action. A.C. members noted the President's wish not to move unless OSU does.

6. Library Committee

Littman reported a note from Gene Barnes suggesting a change in the Library Committee membership. In order to increase information and power of members, he suggested longer, overlapping terms. Such a change would require faculty legislation. A.C. members suggested such legislation be reviewed with regard to the whole issue of increased responsibility for the committee.

(OVER)

7. Eviction of undergraduates from the Law Library and classrooms

The A.C. members discussed the propriety of other students using departmental or school facilities. Questions were raised about the process used in establishing restrictions. Dean Clark's statement restricted use of the building only to those who have legitimate business in Law. It was suggested that some rooms might be set aside for study.

8. Overview of OSU budget planning by G. Tyler

Tyler, as part of her ACE fellowship, is looking at budgeting at U of O and OSU. She passed out a description of the OSU Fiscal Priorities and Long-Range Planning Committee, which she visited for one meeting. She also passed out a brief proposal (entitled "Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee") for a change by Kenneth Patterson. Tyler reported their discussion of issues. The OSU Senate keeps better tabs on the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate than we do here. They discussed activities of the Chancellor's Office and recommended that all formulae for allocations be made public, in fact they already are. The OSU committee also recommended the discarding of the underfunding procedure. (Note handout.) The OSU committee suffers from lack of direct access and communication with the OSU chief administrators apparently, a condition they are trying to change.

(After 3:00 p.m.)

9. Faculty Directory

The lateness and poor quality of the directory was mentioned. Olum noted that things generated by computer often have problems initially. Tepfer questioned whether the computer has to print the directory in the poor way it was done. It was suggested that complaints be addressed to the President's Office or Muriel Jackson.

10. Non-traditional learners and credit for prior learning

Sundberg distributed a set of statements from Dick Fehnel and a recent Chronicle article on an ACE report. He mentioned that Fehnel heads a project supported by the Educational Coordinating Commission for training academic people in granting credit for prior learning; among representatives from several colleges and universities, OSU faculty members and administrators are involved, but not U of O faculty other than the trainer, Fehnel. From the ACE report and other sources it appears that new ways of granting credit and of encouraging "life long learning" are developing around the country. Over 300 colleges and universities are now either granting credit for prior learning or gearing up to do so. Olum cautioned that there is quite a bit of danger of lowering quality of credits. He questioned whether there should be credit given except by use of examinations. Sundberg pointed out that there are three kinds of credit for prior experience: (1) through use of standard examinations, such as CLEP and course challenge exams, ~~such as we~~ have had at the University since 1972, (2) by granting credit for non-academic courses, such as those offered by labor, industry or the military, for which there are some national standards being set (through ACE?), and (3) by using experts' judgments about the academic equivalence of learnings reported and demonstrated in interviews and portfolios of creative products produced, evidence of mastering certain skills, reports of field work combining theory and practice, etc. One A.C. member said he felt granting credit for creative products might deserve special consideration. It was also mentioned that certain skills we teach might be acquired outside academic situations. The discussion also brought out the

risks of damage to quality from easy credits. Olum stated that if the A.C. recommends further consideration, the administration would either handle the matter (perhaps through Bob Albrecht) or appoint a special committee.

11. Faculty termination prior to sixth year

Olum summarized some recent thinking, mentioning items discussed last time. The letter of termination should come from the Provost not department head. One additional problem is whether and/or how one gives a reason for the termination. Some say the minute the administration gives a reason it opens the case for arguments and suits. Reasons must be given with sixth year people. Caulfield stated that the number of cases that go to court are very small and then usually for lack of fairness and discrimination. Olum stated that if we can guarantee fair procedures (including departmental votes and evaluation from inside and outside) then there is not much objection to giving reasons. Reasons can be broadly stated and relate to criteria and backup judgments, (e.g., votes and letters). Olum will write a statement which will be checked with Branchfield. The A.C. and Olum reviewed a letter dated February 3 to the A.C. from the Executive Committee of the U of O Federation of Teachers, distributed earlier in the meeting. The letter points to the problem of adequate early instruction about University expectations from appointees.

12. Eviction of students from the Law Center

Does the claim of openness of buildings to all people have a legal basis? This must be checked. Can any department or unit take an action similar to the Law School? Olum assumes the units have a right to restrict access for good reasons. Dean Clark did post a notice with reasons. Caulfield reported there were many prior notices over previous months. Does the University have a responsibility to provide good study space for students?

(4:00 p.m. Bailey assumed the Chair, since Littman had to leave)

Programs for keeping certain classrooms open for study have not gone well because the students leave litter, which janitors object to. Evidently the Law School is a prestigious and "neat" place to go to study. If the A.C. wishes to make a recommendation, it should be to the President, but the timing is too early. The issue still remains whether the University should provide a place to study and if so, how. Another question is that of enforcing quietness in the Library and dormitory study rooms.

13. Meeting with legislators

Bailey noted the revised handout from Littman and raised the question of how we might deal with the various topics. The first two issues seem most important-- as well as the last points. Olum mentioned the importance of the Educational Coordinating Commission. Olum reviewed briefly the problem of meeting the budget problems for next year. He is trying to avoid further program reduction.

14. Budget officer

Olum mentioned that a new position has been established and a search is going on. Sunderland will move to a broader position "upstairs" but another person will be added.

15. Recruiting and enrollment

In response to question about whether the University was doing enough to increase enrollment (since the student-driven budget model is unlikely to change in the near future), Olum reviewed several actions being taken: the "dollars for scholars" program for bringing science teachers to campus, more money into recruiting and the hiring of Mark Barwig to recruit. In response to a question about recruiting minority people, it was noted that the Council for Minority Education has occasional good proposals for the use of special money--including an interesting proposal from the Law School.

Agenda for subsequent meetings: Post-mortum on meeting with Vice President for Public Service candidate; discussion with Dick Hill (Feb. 27); non-traditional learners and credit for prior learning; post-mortum on meeting with legislators.

Advisory Council
MINUTES

20 February, 1978, 2:00-5:00 p.m., Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present: Exine Bailey, Barbara Caulfield, Edwin Coleman, Richard Littman (Chair), Michael Posner, Norman Sundberg (2:00-3:45, Secretary), Sanford Tepfer.

Others present: (2:00-5:00) Gerry Tyler
(3:15-5:00) David Frohnmayer, University Legal Counsel
(3:15-5:00) William Boyd, President, and Paul Olum, Provost

1. Minutes

Approved with addition of a comma in section 15 between "dollars for scholars," and "program for bringing science teachers to campus" and spelling of "post-mortem."

2. Emerald letters regarding grievance procedures re fixed term appointments

It was noted that Posner and Olum have letters in today's Emerald responding to the letter from the UO Federation of Teachers last week.

3. Meeting with second VPPS candidate--Simic

Lunch will be held at the Faculty Center tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, at 12:30. Vitae were distributed. There will be one or two more candidates.

4. Meeting with Dick Hill

Aim is to get a sense of how he sees CSPA and how AC might relate to developments. We would like him to comment on recommendations of the Povey report.

5. Discussion of first VPPS candidate--Schmid

How to report AC member's impressions? We will convey them orally to the President.

6. Olum memo on grievance procedures for non-reappointment of untenured faculty members

The memo was distributed earlier for comment. Posner suggested (1) a revision of the sentence on reversing departmental decision, (2) an opportunity for the faculty member to submit a letter at the same time as the departmental or dean's letter. Others made suggestions for several other changes, and discussion centered around how the vote should be taken. Reference was made to the currently available procedures. Discussion concerned relative autonomy of departmental judgment regarding substantive matters, and importance of University-wide overview also.

7. Changes in administrative rules

Littman called attention to editorial review and "tidying up" of current AR's by Branchfield's office. A distinction has been made between AR's which have to go to the Board and internal University procedures which will hereafter be called "directives."

(OVER)

8. Discussion of meeting with Lane legislators on last Thursday evening, February 16, at Littman's house

All of the AC members, Gerry Tyler, President Boyd, and Provost Olum attended. Nine of the 11 Lane County legislators came: Clint Boehringer, Mary Burrows, Edward Fadeley, Nancie Fadeley, David Frohnmayer, Grattan Kerans, Ted Kulongoski, Bill Rogers, and George Wingard. The legislators expressed pleasure about the meeting and several stayed quite late.

What kind of follow-up should we have? Individually we could write more directly about topics. A group letter might also be sent. The major topic of the evening was the student-driven vs. the program model for financing. The legislators responded well to Boyd's talk and wanted him to follow-through with a meeting discussing University budget-making. It was suggested that a "circuit-breaker" be added to the student-driven model to ensure coverage of certain programs. They mentioned the problem of budget cuts in the next legislature falling primarily in the Human Resources vs. the Education budget. AC discussion raised problems about extent of legislative knowledge of details of University budgeting. It was recognized that there is a difference between program and line-item budgeting. Littman proposed that we draft a letter and ask particular Council members to complete a section specifically targeted for each legislator.

9. Spring open meeting with faculty

Discussion pro and con about another meeting. The consensus was that we should hold a meeting. Monday seemed best at 3:30 early in the quarter.

(After 3:15)

10. Policy on cases of non-reappointment of untenured faculty members

Frohnmayer expressed his reactions to the Olum draft: Faculty members may be given something more than necessary, e.g., the giving of reasons. He reviewed the decisions in the Roth and Sinderman cases and the danger that giving reasons may make it necessary for the aggrieved faculty member to have a hearing. Olum pointed out that at the tenure decision level reasons are given. However, the processes are well worked out; but dealing with a decision about renewing a 2 or 3 year appointment is quite different; there is no elaborate process with fixed term contracts. Frohnmayer said we do not give people up for tenure a statement of reasons, only a review process; this proposal implies greater procedural rights and protection to the short-term appointment. Frohnmayer does not object to the roll-call vote. The people writing such letters would have to write them very carefully. It is questionable whether department chairpersons could uniformly learn to write foolproof letters. Frohnmayer stated there is an administrative, legal and political problem here. It is likely that this procedure would buck all faculty decisions to the Provost's office. Politically, it is likely that we'll get tried in the Emerald; almost any statement of reasons can be provocative. Boyd pointed out that the tenure decisions are not just made at the departmental level, but are elaborately reviewed and finally decided at the level of central administration. Olum indicated that we are not giving an expectation or property rights to continuation; the question is what is the fair and moral obligation to assistant professors. Olum read the Stanford procedures, which include a transmittal of the grounds to the candidate.

The President stated his preference for procedure in these cases which would be prescribed by the Provost's office. He wanted to limit the ability of departments to utilize arbitrary procedures and believed that a uniform procedure is necessary for all departments. The President opposed the Provost's draft of the policy statement because he believed that the giving of reasons to persons with nontenured appointments would place the University in legal difficulties and because the University department should have the ability to non-renew a contract without any reasons. The limitations on a non-renewal decision which the President proposed were (1) arbitrary and capricious procedures, (2) academic freedom violation, (3) violation of a constitutional right, and (4) misinformation in the file.

Discussion of these positions ensued.

The final proposal offered by Provost Olum about the nature of a new statement that he will draft was:

- (1) A uniform procedure will be created by the administration for review of contracts of nontenured appointments.
- (2) Roll call votes will be required of the faculty committee within the department or those persons higher in rank than the professor under consideration.
- (3) Candidates should be informed of the procedure.
- (4) A grievance procedure will be created by administrative rule which allows for appeal by a nontenured faculty member for reasons stated by the President earlier.

The President added that he would favor developing a system in which each new assistant professor would have assigned to him a senior faculty person as an adviser and counselor.

11. Legislative meeting review

Both the President and Provost believed the meeting to be productive. There will be follow-up with the proposed budget review meeting for legislators.

12. The President announced he is being reviewed by the Chancellor's office.
13. The Provost announced that the proposed evaluation of Deans and Vice Presidents for this year will be conducted without benefit of the faculty committee report on the subject. The committee requires a job description for each position before setting criteria for review. This can not be done in time to allow for evaluation.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Agenda items continuing.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

27 February, 1978, 2:00-4:00 p.m., Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

Others: Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow

1. Discussion with Dean-Designate of CSPA, Richard Hill

In response to Littman's request to present his aspirations for CSPA, reactions to the Povey Report and impressions of the School so far, Hill indicated that his knowledge, like that of a 3½ week visitor to a foreign country, was limited but he had talked with most faculty and several student groups. Hill mentioned several things he would like to see happen by the end of the five years he has agreed to serve as dean--for one thing, a 15 FTE faculty of national renown who will be sought out by other University faculty members wanting to work with them. He considered several ways of relating faculty across the University. He is not opposed to joint appointments, but sees the administrative difficulties and extra personal burdens. When asked whether he has obtained any evidence of cooperation from other parts of campus, Hill stated he has received ^{many} encouraging notes and does not expect difficulty. Along with joint appointments he would also see cooperative work in programs and institutes. Tepfer later on suggested the possibility of courtesy appointments for CSPA faculty in other schools and departments without funds changing hands. Hill indicated that there were possibilities for genuinely exciting interdisciplinary programs, in which the University is lacking at present. Clancy Thurber from CSPA is working on international studies right now, and has had one meeting for which there was a surprisingly large turnout and show of interest from many sectors of campus. Hill would like to have an outline for an active international development and studies program a year from now. He sees the interdisciplinary programs as not necessarily located in CSPA, but the School can help serve as a catalyst.

Another aspiration of Hill is to broaden the "laboratory" of CSPA well beyond Lane County. He wants to have field placements in Washington, D. C. and elsewhere, noting that these often lead to jobs. He will explore additional fellowships and internships. He would also like to meet the challenge of education for working adults (non-traditional learners) by developing new models. He has been impressed by the success on a small scale of the New Careers program in CSPA. Hill plans to do research on the costs and benefits of field-based education; he believes it is a project that would be both intellectually and pragmatically interesting. His own belief is that the important questions lie in how to integrate field and classroom learning, rather than in questions about which one is better or more important.

Hill's short term aims include plain survival of the School. He believes that morale in CSPA is on the upbeat. He thinks that CSPA has been underestimated, that there are lots of ideas there, along with "lots of loneliness." He would like to see the decision to abandon the undergraduate social work program reconsidered and given another chance. He has authorizations now for one year term appointments for four in addition to the tenured faculty. He will institute national or international searches for some positions in the following year. Finally, he noted the Povey report recommendation of national searches for all continuing faculty; Hill emphatically rejected the proposal that faculty who have already gone through national

(OVER)

searches should have to go through a repeated national search; it is demeaning and demoralizing to suggest that they should be treated differently from any other faculty who have been hired after such a search.

Responding to a question about the Povey committee recommendation of an advisory committee, Hill said that he thought it was a good idea. It may help correct a lot of myths about the School; it can help with bridging to the larger community, locally, regionally and nationally; the committee could help check the accountability of the School and the dean; and, it could be a source of new ideas and serve as a validating body. AC members noted that the President wished the AC to be involved in the selection of members to which Hill responded favorably; however, he did say that he would like to have veto power over appointments.

Hill was asked about possible reorganization of the University to bring other units in, specifically Urban and Regional Planning. He responded that, if it comes, it should be a marriage of mutual satisfaction, and now was not the opportune time. He noted that Political Science has been quite friendly about cooperative relations in developing an international studies program.

Another decision Hill has made was to have no lower division courses in CSPA in 1979-80, eliminating the courses such as "Introduction to CSPA." Tepfer questioned whether this was a good idea, since many students like to get a chance early to try out a little involvement in the area. Posner noted the importance of a support function for working adults that goes beyond advising upon which Hill believes CSPA must rely very heavily.

Hill then went through the nine points of the Povey report. He noted that the time lines are unrealistic, but he agreed that the ideas mostly were good (with the exception of the suggestion of national searches mentioned earlier). He noted that the undergraduate curriculum has been almost completely reformulated in a thoughtful way by the CSPA faculty. Sundberg distributed a CSPA Graffiti newsletter which has information on the core courses and specialties. Hill noted that he would expect every full-time faculty member to teach at least one core course. He noted that there are not good incentives for faculty committees to work closely with the masters candidates; he will work with the Graduate School dean on re-evaluating and possibly expanding the masters programs; already CSPA has more interdisciplinary masters candidates than any other part of the University. On the Povey point about short courses, Posner noted that they could be used for recruiting purposes, too.

There was some discussion about the balance of undergraduate vs. graduate emphasis in CSPA. Sundberg mentioned the importance of graduate programs for faculty research, continued upgrading and stimulation, and the advantages for recruiting nationally. Posner pleaded for a continuation of concern for a good undergraduate program. Someone pointed out the importance of having the University administration and other faculty members see undergraduate work as worthwhile, and questioned whether that was the case. Bailey noted the lack of identity of CSPA to the rest of the University. Littman pointed out the importance of continuing work on the credibility of CSPA and the value of "public relations."

Several expressed the general feeling of strong support for Hill as dean of CSPA. He stated that he would like to be invited back to meet with the Council sometime in the future, particularly if there are any problems members wish to discuss.

2. Minutes

Approved as distributed.

3. 3rd VPPS candidate

Robert Freelen's vita was distributed: the AC will see him at the next regular meeting at 2:45.

4. Discussion of the first VPPS candidates

Schmid had sent a thank you note to Littman with more ideas; it was read to the Council. Comparisons of Schmid and Simic were made.

5. Amazon Family Housing Board

Littman announced that Jerry Finrow had some complaints about the way the University Housing Office is ignoring the Board and its policy-making function. Littman suggested that Finrow and others meet with Barnhart and seek thereby to minimize surprises by keeping up a more intensive relationship.

6. OSU reminder: Lunch in Corvallis on April 10

Barbara agreed to arrange transport.

7. President's review

Question of how the automatic three year review of the President should be conducted-- whether the AC should be involved, whether the AC should ask the Chancellor to appoint an external committee (e.g., university presidents, ACE people). Question of a mixed internal-external committee review. An external committee would set up the method of collecting information by questionnaires or interviews. Discussion of the problem of the OSU presidential review. Suggestion that Littman talk with President Boyd about an outside review process, perhaps with a mixed external-internal membership, and also find out just what was wanted of the AC.

8. Library matters

Coleman read a letter from a faculty member complaining of internal procedures. Morale seems low. Problem of recognizing importance of the service function. Discussion of the two-track promotion system. Several AC suggested continuing our oversight of the Library situation.

9. Letter to legislators

Littman has prepared drafts of follow-up letters, somewhat individualized, to each legislator.

Agenda for next week: 2:45 interview with Freelen; follow-up on review of President; note attached memo from AAA's Harris.