

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

March 6, 1978, 2:00-5:00 p.m., Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Exine Bailey, Barbara Caulfield, Edwin Coleman (Recorder, 2-2:45),
Richard Littman (Chair), Michael Posner, Norman Sundberg (Secretary, 2:45-5),
Sanford Tepfer

Others: (2:00-5:00) Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow
(2:45-3:40) Robert Freelen, VPPS Candidate
(3:45-5:00) William Boyd, President; Paul Olum, Provost

1. The meeting was called to order at 14:13.
2. Caulfield asked for a review of the proposal on non-tenure review from Olum.
3. Discussion of letter received from candidate Simic.
4. Discussion of letter from AAA librarian about storage and expressing concern about a memo from H. Paul about policy for incomplete journal sets.
5. Chancellor's review of President Boyd. Caulfield suggested that visit with Chancellor should be preceded by a statement from us; there was agreement.
6. Post-mortem of discussion with Dick Hill re CSPA. Suggestion that Hill meet with next year's AC to report developments. Littman shared conversation with Olum about Olum's positive opinion regarding possible reinstatement of social work program and his feeling of no necessity for continued oversight by forceful committee with Hill as dean.
7. Brief discussion of plans for imminent meeting with V.P. candidate Freelen.
8. Reminder to President Boyd to follow-up on legislator's meeting with AC.
9. Next meeting. There will be no meeting next week unless there is a special call since several will be gone. The next scheduled meeting will be March 27.

(2:45 p.m.)

10. Meeting with third VPPS candidate

Discussion with Robert Freelen from Stanford University.

(3:45 p.m.)

11. Discussion of VPPS candidates

Boyd would like soon to check his perception and obtain AC reactions after he has information from several sources. Meeting set up for 10:30 Friday, March 10, in Boyd's office. Title of V.P. of Public Services could be changed after the position is filled.

12. Anonymity of student evaluations of faculty

Boyd reported an older student's objection to anonymity of evaluations; she had indicated surprise that anyone could take them seriously. The regulations seem

(OVER)

to be that any unsigned evaluations can be seen by proper authorities. (Simple ratings need not be signed and are available.) Olum believes that unsigned comments should not be available for unfair use; it is a civil liberties question. Tepfer reported that student evaluations are read by the department head but are not put in personnel files unless they are signed; unsigned ones are given to professor, who may if he wishes return them to the head. Olum will obtain more information from Frohnmayer on legal status and may consider a motion. Regulations regarding who reads evaluations should be made clear to students and faculty; perhaps two different forms should be used--one unsigned for simple ratings and another signed for narrative impressions.

13. Boyd's meeting with Lane legislators

Following up on recent meeting, Boyd is planning to set up a meeting on the budget.

14. Presidential review

Littman reported that it might be useful for the AC to meet with the Chancellor. Boyd will send a note, and the AC will follow-up.

15. Fixed term faculty appeal process

Olum reported continued discussions including meetings with AFT members. One good suggestion is that faculty members should also have a chance to write to Provost; another one was that faculty members need improved understanding of expectations. Tepfer suggested that non-tenured faculty meet annually with department head in presence of a faculty personnel committee member. Boyd suggested we should note the Bert Lance dictum: If it ain't broke, don't fix it. (But look what happened to Bert Lance!)

16. Duplication of statistics courses

Olum reported complaints about expensive duplication of courses, statistics being a prime example. Olum thinks we may need an "Educational Policies Committee" to establish ground rules. Olum indicated that duplication must be limited, not abolished, because there are different needs for different students and areas. One criterion for judging duplication should be the amount of commonality vs. specific content. Question of whether the University Curriculum Committee or a specific sub-committee should look into duplication. Olum will consult with that Committee. Enrollment and possibilities of re-organization should be checked. Improvement of quality should be a purpose as well as saving money. After the statistics course problem is solved (!), other areas to investigate are duplication of administration and management courses, law courses, etc.

17. Library administration

Littman reported a set of complaints. Olum mentioned possible needs for broadening the required consultation and reporting by the Library dean, and the possibility of the Library Advisory Committee reviewing all policies and bringing disagreements to the Provost. Boyd suggested broadening the charge of the Library Ad Hoc Committee to include looking not only at the storage problem but also at the organization of the Library.

18. The Ad Hoc Library review committee

Boyd, Olum and the AC went over suggested names for the committee and made recommendations.

Ad hoc meeting with President Boyd, 10:30, Friday, March 10.

No meeting, unless called, March 13.

Next meeting, March 27.

Agenda: Plans for meeting with OSU and PSU; follow-ups on Library; presidential review; student evaluations; fixed term appeal; duplication of courses.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

April 3, 1978

Present: Caulfield, Coleman, Littman, Posner, Tepfer

The council came to order at 2:10 p.m.

1. The first order of business was the discussion of the final report of the Advisory Council for the 1977-78 academic year. An initial version will be prepared by council chairman Littman; it was agreed that it should be less lengthy than more recent reports.
2. The Museum of Art Advisory Committee was discussed.
3. The Vice President of Public Services. The council discussed briefly various negotiations that have taken place so far and is favorable to the development of actions leading to the appointment of Mr. Simic.
4. The council read Provost Olum's policy draft on non-reappointment policy. After some discussion several members focused on key wording to be taken up with the Provost for clarification.
5. Meeting with President Boyd, Provost Olum, and Vice Provost Albrecht, to discuss report on the library situation. He met with the library's Promotion and Tenure Committee and also with the Library Advisory Committee. He reports that both groups strongly feel that the library staff should be of the highest academic caliber, with promotion and tenure based on faculty status; recourse to the lower rank of senior instructor should be reduced or eliminated. He also reported that staff morale appears to be at a very low level, because of their exclusion from the decision-making process by the Dean. It was Albrecht's recommendation that the Administration can help by leading them to become more faculty oriented. Further, there should be an increased reliance by the library staff on relations with the regular library committee. The regular library committee must, therefore, become well-versed and knowledgeable and particularly concerned with library affairs.

General Discussion:

The Provost announced the request for Program Improvement. Proposals so far have proved to be disappointing; there are, however, some interesting proposals that had come through earlier which will be submitted. The Advisory Council will meet in special session on Tuesday, April 11 at 12:30 in the Conference Room to review the improvement proposals that are to be submitted.

Administrative Rules:

The Provost informed the council that a request for changes in the administrative rules had been made by Norma Paulus. This extensive work has already been undertaken by the administration. The Provost also states that they are mainly concerned with the request for more time to review the procedure. Caulfield will read the changes and respond on behalf of the Advisory Council.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

April 24, 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 (Secretary), Sanford Tepfer

Others: 2:00-5:00, Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow
2:30-3:00, Stoddard Malarkey, English
3:00-5:00, William Boyd, President; Paul Olum, Provost

1. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting (April 3) were approved.

2. Ethnic Studies

Coleman reported that the E.S. budget was delayed and there were other problems. There was discussion about whether E.S. leadership was assertive enough and about the lack of impact the AC has had on the problem. E.S. is on a shoestring budget and has little clout. Some discussion about whether E.S. should be moved elsewhere in the University.

3. Announcements

a. Littman announced that the Tri-University proposal to the State System was being changed to two programs; he has drafts available.

b. Littman called the Council's attention to the report on Profile of Students.

4. Faculty Lobbyist--Discussion with Stoddard Malarkey

Malarkey mentioned a recent visit to OSU during which he had learned that the three universities had been having meetings considering the hiring of a faculty lobbyist, who would present faculty needs and information (regarding salary, fringe benefits, etc.) to the legislature. Malarkey has been asked by the University administration to serve as an "unofficial" half-time lobbyist for the University starting this term. AC members noted the favorable remarks about Malarkey's assistance last session made by Lane legislators at our meeting with them. There was considerable discussion about the pros and cons of separate faculty lobbyists for each university, versus one representing all, and about a faculty member vs. a professional lobbyist. Malarkey believes that a lobbyist for the three universities might generate ill-will with other parts of the State System; that a professional lobbyist would have a difficult time representing the complexity of the System; and that one lobbyist for all 3 universities might run the risk of being accused of favoritism for one versus the others. He thought that a retired faculty member who had knowledge and respect across several campuses might be a good choice. In the discussion it was noted that we need to invite the Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate representatives (B. Fagot, C. Patton, R. Searles) to meet with the AC. It was planned that they and Malarkey would come to the next meeting, May 1, at 2:30.

(After 3:00)

5. "Open meeting" on miscellaneous topics with Boyd and Olum

a. Preparation of the budget. Topmost on the President's list of topics now is budget discussions with the State Board in late May or early June. This preparation will be useful for several presentations, especially one for legislators.

(OVER)

- b. Minimum wage issue. President Boyd presented different sides of the issue of requesting an exception for students from the federal minimum wage requirement. An exception would allow the University to pay 80-85% of the minimum wage, which will rise considerably in coming years. The primary problem is not with students doing academic work but with those doing unskilled labor, as in the food service. Boyd mentioned several arguments for exception--the need to spread available funds as far as possible; higher wages increase dormitory and other costs; students taking jobs are not comparable to those in the general public who use jobs as the sole and regular means of support; danger of employers preferring non-students if they cost no more, thus cutting out jobs for students. Olum reported there will be less work-study money available next year, but there will be more money for loans, etc. Boyd wishes to try out pros and cons of minimum wage exception with students groups and representatives of organized labor. AC members seem generally in favor of requesting an exemption.
- c. GTFF negotiation impasse. The discussions about Graduate Teaching Fellow contracts have been assigned an NLRB mediator, and GTF's now have a professional bargainer. The issue being discussed is what to "contractualize." The University is willing to put into contracts the items growing out of employment as a GTF, but the GTF Federation wants to contract regarding items related to graduate education, such as positions on curriculum and personnel committees. Arguments presented in the Emerald have been one-sided, and the administration is considering a public statement. The bargaining appears slow, but from experience nationally the time taken for first contracts is usually quite long. Bill Lemman from the Chancellor's office serves as this University's representative for bargaining.
- d. Library. The symposium last week seems to have been quite a success. The symposium being over, the ad hoc committee chaired by Holbo will move ahead quickly. The humanities seem most concerned about the storage problem, and other parts of the State System may be asked for support. It was noted that the regular Library Committee needs to be more assertive about issues before problems become crises. Boyd stated he does not take a position that is purely anti-storage; there may be certain things which would lend themselves well to storage, but the University must make the decision as to what it wishes to have in storage, not an outside agency. He believes a good case can be made for maintaining materials in our library, especially in the humanities. He speculated that perhaps the University could become a humanities storage center for the System. Tepfer raised the possibility of moving toward an undergraduate library, and Boyd was receptive to this idea. It was mentioned several times that the faculty must have lead time in discussing any moves toward storage. The AAU is talking of a national lending library also.
- e. Appointment of committees. In passing it was mentioned that there is a problem with appointment of committees by the Committee on Committees. (The new Council will have the responsibility of setting up the next C on C.) Committees need to solicit the help of experts and qualified people as well as those who happen to volunteer for committees. The instructions to the committees also need to be clear. Tepfer expressed disappointment with the retirement committee.
- f. Gerontology. Littman brought up the disappointment with the status of the gerontology program and support for it. Boyd noted that this is an important

area of study, and the University has the potentiality for strong development of the area. The questions of leadership and of placement in the University structure were briefly discussed.

- g. Problems of keeping faculty beyond six years. It was noted that in Education, some tenured people have been on grants for many years and do not teach; the result is some of the best young people are kept beyond six years, even though this action may violate AAUP guidelines. Tepfer noted that the purpose of tenure is related to teaching (Lehrfreiheit) though some believed it applied to research and scholarship as well. Perhaps some of the research professors need to be moved into a different status. This topic needs to be returned to later.
- h. High school reactions to University admissions changes. Boyd reported that in several meetings with high school principals and counselors, he found very little opposition to requiring courses or sequences for admission. He concluded that raising the GPA was not the solution; one high school representative said "You raise yours; we'll raise ours." Some seemed to welcome guidance on high school curriculum. It would be important to give considerable lead time to high schools for any changes in required sequences for admission. Boyd now believes we may need to move without OSU, since President McVicker believes a land-grant institution should not be restrictive. There was considerable discussion of the next move in the University; the use of the ad hoc faculty committee on graduation requirements was suggested, as well as the University Curriculum Committee and a special conference of high school and University people. The discussion ended with the idea that administrative assignments and perhaps an ad hoc committee be set up. A set of requirements should be tentatively outlined and tested against a sample of transcripts before public actions are taken. Also information about what is being done elsewhere should be gathered.
- i. Continuing education. The State Board is considering a proposal for regional limitations to continuing educational activities by each college or university. UO and OSU are opposed to limitations, though they would not object to checking with the local college when programs are set up.
- j. Joint programs with LCC, especially regarding broadcasting. Boyd mentioned the possibility of sharing equipment, especially TV. LCC's equipment is underutilized and better than the UO's. Lane could provide necessary technical teaching and support and UO could provide higher management, creative programming and research instruction. Both KLCC and KWAX programs would be continued. Also the UO needs to talk with LCC about taking over HEP and perhaps Upward Bound, though several AC members said the latter may be advantageous to the University to retain.
- k. Ethnic Studies. Brief discussion with Olum about need for investigation of what is happening and general inadequacy of present situation.
- l. Letter of condolence. Coleman suggested and the AC members agreed that a letter be sent to Jan Medrano about her daughter's death.

Agenda for coming meetings: May 1, meeting with IFS representatives and Malarkey to discuss faculty lobbyist; problems of faculty being here longer than six years, especially in regard to research positions; AC annual report.

Faculty Advisory Council
MINUTES
May 1, 1978

Members present: Bailey, Caulfield, Coleman, Littman, Posner, Tepfer

1. Minutes were accepted as distributed.
2. Follow-up items on the agenda were briefly discussed.
3. Institutional lobbyist discussion - 2:40 p.m.

Clyde Patton and Richard Surles were present as representatives of the University of Oregon to Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and Stoddard Malarkey as the University administration lobbyist to the legislature.

C. Patton indicated that the lobbyist will have more power representing all schools.

R. Surles indicated that there is no common interest for issues except for faculty evaluation and that there would not be appropriate representation of the U of O interest in governance of the lobbyist by the I.F.S.

S. Malarkey indicated that there were inevitable differences in priorities among campuses and questions of loyalty to one campus if the lobbyist came from one campus.

Other issues raised:

- a. There is a need for a consensus on the function of the lobbyist before financial contributions are solicited. A person who doesn't contribute may still resent the designation of someone as a lobbyist for them.
- b. There are problems in representation of various faculties who are represented by different bargaining units.

Meeting with President Boyd and Vice President Olum; Vice President Hawk attended discussion on Item 4.

4. Discussion of placement of prayer meeting during Athletes-In-Action.

The President wished the council to consider the propriety of the prayer meeting at the end of the game. The council saw no problem with a prayer meeting at the end of the game but was continuing its opposition to any solicitation at half-time.

5. President's report on the Board meeting.
 - a. Dismantling of Department of Continuing Education is being examined.
 - b. LaGrande was given permission for 7 students to receive an external degree (degree without a residency requirement) on an experimental basis. There is encouragement for other schools to move in this direction by examining any regulations which limit external degrees to see if they are absolutely necessary. We will reexamine residency requirements to insure that they serve quality control purposes. This assessment includes use of credit by examination.

(OVER)

- c. Graduate Education Report. This report was required by a legislative budget note. Blue Ribbon Citizen Committee was appointed by the Chancellor; Ms. Mader was the chairer. The report was favorable to the University by saying that duplication is not necessarily all bad and that low demand should not cause programs to be dismantled. The report compliments the graduate programs for dollar efficiency and general quality. This committee will meet with the Board and will indicate a willingness to meet with ECC and with Ways and Means of the legislature. We need more information on whether the designation in the report of OCE as specializing in special education is in our interest.

P. Olum: The report gives support for expansion of graduate programs in other institutions, especially at Portland State.

President: There is a need for part-time graduate work in some geographic areas. However, the economic program proposal from Oregon State will be challenged as duplicative.

President: Favors becoming a smaller and finer institution. We should try to become a separate, different and more elite university. Use faculty resources where they are most expert. We should cut back in some areas; we should raise our entrance standards. John Lallas will be requested to review these documents and prepare summaries for the council.

The President reported on additional items from the Board meeting including physical plant rehabilitation and maintenance.

The session ended with a discussion of issues involved in the food handlers labor negotiations and strike as well as some aspects of negotiations with the GTF's.

Secretary, Barbara Caulfield

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

May 15, 1978

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

Others: (2-3 p.m.) Gerry Tyler, ACE Fellow

1. Minutes of May 1

Approved as distributed. No meeting was held May 8.

2. OSU-PSU joint meeting, June 5

AC members approved the inviting of newly elected AC members. The van will be leaving for Corvallis at 11 a.m.

3. Meeting with academic heads

Provost Olum has invited AC members to an open meeting with departmental and college administrators on May 30 (Tuesday), time to be announced.

4. Labor Center training grant

Steven Deutsch talked with Littman about a suggestion from Dean Novick that the training proposal in the field of industrial health be reviewed by the AC. It is possible that this was suggested because the Center reports directly to the President without other usual academic oversight. Littman discussed the matter with Provost Olum, and AC review seemed unnecessary. AC members agreed.

5. A particular personnel and administrative problem

Littman presented a procedures problem about which he had received a complaint, which may now be in the process of solution. Issues involved the right of the individual to see charges before action was taken and the degree to which students must stand behind charges they make against staff persons.

6. Gerontology program proposal

Sundberg reported he had talked with Fran Scott about a proposal for granting bachelor's and master's degrees in gerontology. She believed it was not necessary to go before the University Curriculum Committee and the Assembly. Questions were raised about the rules for faculty consultation and approval on programs.

7. Ethnic Studies

Coleman reported on a further instance of apparent lack of support for the Ethnic Studies program from the A&S administration. An apparently highly qualified volunteer for writing a relevant grant was turned down for a courtesy appointment; the same person was treated "royally" at PSU. AC discussion suggested this area was the greatest "failure" of the Council this year. Faculty legislation setting up the Ethnic Studies program is not being adequately executed and the program is being "starved." The AC agreed to try to have Dean Baldwin meet with the AC next week.

(OVER)

8. General Council role and responsibilities

The AC members noted their particular responsibility to the administration when there are complaints of a procedural nature from faculty members or when faculty-legislated programs are not being adequately carried out or supported and when they are in danger of being reduced drastically. This discussion led to questions about the best administrative procedures for faculty consultation. HPUP seems definitely in the doghouse now, though some members noted that it was systematically program-analytic and consultative. Some noted that the reaction to the time-consuming and questionable effectiveness of HPUP is a swing to acceptance of less system and less faculty consultation. It was suggested that Gerry Tyler might like to discuss different methods of program retrenchment and resource re-distribution in various universities--a special interest of hers.

9. AC plans

The remaining AC plans are as follows:

May 22 - Last regular meeting, May 29 being Memorial Day.

June 6 - PSU-OSU meeting in Corvallis.

On call for other meetings until July 1.

Chairman's meetings with new Council in summer and/or fall.

A party was discussed enthusiastically!

Agenda of May 22 meeting: Possible meeting with Dean Baldwin about Ethnic Studies; planning for Corvallis joint meeting; consideration of final report to faculty; suggestions of work (and unfinished business) to new Council; consultation on Gerontology or other programs.