

June 5 - Joint meeting in Corvallis with OSU, PSU & UOHSC reps. (minutes taken by OSU)  
July 5 - Meeting of old and new A.C. members (no minutes)

Advisory Council

Minutes of Special Meeting, May 30, 1978

11:00-12:15, Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Barbara Caulfield, Edwin Coleman, Richard Littman (Chair), Michael Posner, and Norman Sundberg (Secretary)

Others Present: John Baldwin, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences  
Robert Berdahl

Agenda: Discussion of the Ethnic Studies Program

Littman indicated that the Advisory Council was disappointed that so little progress had been made this year on the continuing problem of the Ethnic Studies program, set up by the Faculty several years ago. This Advisory Council would like to convey a sense of the problem to the new AC. He noted the report of Toll at the last College meeting as a partial summary of the situation.

Baldwin reviewed the history of the Ethnic Studies program, which he saw as one of boom and decline. During the first two years under George Mills as director, there was much interest, but Mills died in August, 1975, and a stopgap program covered the 75-76 academic year, after which Madronna Holden assumed the directorship. Baldwin said there were three problems with the program: linkage with the departments and need for more advanced courses, a small number of certificate seekers in Ethnic Studies reflecting limited interest, and a vague concern over quality. He noted that student enrollment this last year was only 20% of what it was at its peak, which results in high program costs. By way of contrast, he pointed out that Women's Studies, the only other funded interdisciplinary program, costs one-third as much. Ethnic Studies has a budget of \$31,000 per year. The staff-student ratio is 1 to 14 student FTE. He noted that the program was originally intended to relate to three audiences: the non-minority, largely white middle class students who needed to learn about ethnic history, etc.; the minority students who wanted to learn more about their "roots" and culture; and minority groups off campus. It was also mentioned in passing that the Ethnic Studies program covered more than the four major minorities, but also ethnic groups such as Scandinavian, Jewish, and Polish peoples. There was some discussion about the appropriateness of the director's distribution of time over these various audiences.

Posner raised the question about whether the issue was a problem of adequate financial support or a problem of program quality. He noted that faculty legislation had set up the program and a minimum budget was necessary to maintain it. Baldwin raised the question of interpretation of faculty legislation. Faculty legislation also endorsed other programs, such as regular departments. He said that Ethnic Studies had not received worse cuts than other departments, and pointed out that the academic salaries in 78-79 must total \$300,000 less than in 75-76. Baldwin said that if the program is being threatened, it is because of decline in student interest. Ethnic Studies programs may be on their way out nationally; one consequence is a lowered ability to recruit faculty for such programs compared with regular departments. Baldwin asserted that he has a firm conviction that Ethnic Studies subject matter has an enduring place on campus, but he doesn't believe in a firm commitment to a particular organization; for example, for the same money more assistant professors could be hired. Some departments offer ethnic courses in competition with Ethnic Studies courses; there are ethnic interests on campus outside of Ethnic Studies.

(OVER)

Coleman stated that he does not believe the Ethnic Studies program has been supported adequately, and national trends need not happen here. The program does not have visibility to students, partly because of economics. Cultural pluralism must be on the forefront. He indicated that it is not fair to compare Ethnic Studies with Women's Studies; there are more white women on the faculty to serve as volunteer resources than minority faculty members and there is a large part of the student body naturally concerned with women's problems. Coleman attributed the enrollment drop in recent years to a decision a few years ago to up the quality and avoid the "Mickey Mouse" label.

Posner asked what was necessary to obtain a good Ethnic Studies program, perhaps with a changed structure, and if larger enrollment is the aim, how that might be accomplished. Baldwin said that some plans are afoot to get some outstanding people to help in the program, such as to develop a course for non-lawyers taught by a Law School authority on Indian affairs, Charles Wilkinson. Also some people have proposed that there be a curriculum requirement in Ethnic Studies, but that seems unlikely. Bob Berdahl added that none of the interdisciplinary programs are well supported and it is necessary to persuade people in regular departments to contribute. He noted that there is a swing in student interests to Indian studies now; earlier it was Black studies. Baldwin noted that among interdisciplinary program in the College only Ethnic Studies and Women's Studies have a budget. He added that, in any case, the Ethnic Studies budget will not be cut next year.

Sundberg made the point that psychological support by administrators is necessary in addition to budgetary support, especially for an interdisciplinary program. Higher level commitment to program development is especially needed when people from different areas must work together. Littman asked if resources from common programs might be pooled. Administrative sharing has been explored but has been rejected by Ethnic Studies as diluting their independence. Posner said that a department might be talked into offerings in ethnic areas in clusters within departments in accordance with Berdahl's proposals for curricular revision. Baldwin stated that he does not believe there is an absolute need to present courses through a specific entity such as Ethnic Studies.

Coleman stated that the program needs community support to allow students to do research. He added that a half-time position is needed to get grants. Negotiation is going on with the music school. Littman noted that in order to get more cooperation and contribution from departments, aggressive administrative action is required to implement what, after all, the faculty voted for.

The meeting ended inconclusively. It was acknowledged that the problems are complex in the face of economic stringencies. The hope was expressed, however, that a more vigorous approach would emerge.

Chris

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

July 24, 1978

2:15 - 5:20 pm., Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig

Others: (3:15 - 5:15 pm.) William Boyd, Paul Olum, Ralph Sunderland

1. Minutes

The minutes of the July 17, 1978 meeting were mailed to AC members. Two corrections were cited. The first line in Item seven, "Merit recommendations", should read: "Olum feels that merit recommendations should originate with the Department Head with the Dean reviewing all recommendations before they are submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. Only in rare cases will the Office of Academic Affairs change a merit recommendation and that is generally when service at the University level does not seem to be recognized at the departmental level.

Item nine should be labeled "Willard Law Suit" so future AC members know which law suit was discussed. (A sad commentary.)

2. Items from the floor

W. Johnson shared with AC members data on the number of Ph.D.'s granted over the past few years.. The drop in graduate Ph.D.'s does not seem to be as substantial as that reported in the Register Guard. The time period for each of these figures is from Summer through the following Spring term.

<u>1973-74</u>	<u>1974-75</u>	<u>1975-76</u>	<u>1976-77</u>
255	275	234	230

3. Election of Vice Chair

A. Zweig moved that in the absence of the chair, the secretary should function as chair pro tem of the AC. Povey seconded the motion and AC members voiced approval.

4. Council involvement in Willard suit

As discussion on this topic occurred, it became clear that members were unsure of what involvement would be appropriate. A number of alternative courses of action were identified and discussed, e.g., a) to invite Myra Willard in and talk with her; b) to not be involved in the case at all; c) to defer any action until Fall

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE  
University of Oregon

JUL 27 1978

and at that time provide some recommendations to the University administration if there are concerns from the faculty that need to be addressed; d) to recommend to the University administration that a statement be sent to the faculty and press.

Some faculty members have talked with AC members about two concerns. First, they want to know if, in fact, the office is going to be eliminated because of statements in the newspaper. Second, there is concern about how the Affirmative Action function is going to be carried out.

The general consensus was that we should defer any specific action until Fall and at that time see whether or not we need to develop a specific statement. The AC also decided to talk with Boyd and Olum on the degree to which information of personnel matters is considered confidential and cannot be shared with faculty members who individually indicate a desire for more information. Finally, it was decided that the AC would like to discuss further with Boyd and Olum the concerns which have been raised by faculty members on how the Affirmative Action function is going to be carried out.

5. Eastern Oregon - "What is a program"

A discussion of the report that investigated the removal of three tenured faculty members at Eastern Oregon as a result of budget problems led to a discussion on the definition of "program". Clearly, the definition of program is seen as a factor in the process of releasing tenured faculty members. According to the report, the Chancellor is developing a statement that defines more precisely "program". The advantages and disadvantages of leaving the definition loose were recognized by AC members. Apparently, the State Board regulations make the AAU financial exigency guidelines for nonrenewal of tenured faculty members inappropriate for the University of Oregon. As this matter was discussed, it became clear that council members do not have a sufficient understanding of all the issues that relate to the process of non-retention of tenured faculty members. It was suggested that a future meeting with Boyd and Olum be devoted to clarifying the relation between "program" and personnel actions. The chair asked Tull and Holbo to meet and determine the specific agenda items that could be used.

6. Individual faculty lobbying

The pros and cons of having individual faculty members lobby for specific projects were briefly mentioned. AC members feel a need for an orientation to specific projects for which we should be lobbying prior to the August 2 meeting with legislators. This item should be on the agenda for the AC meeting on the 31st of July.

3:20 - 5:20 pm, Boyd, Olum and Sunderland

7. Legislative Liaison

Boyd indicated that the Chancellor has hired Stoddard Malarkey as the State System legislative liaison beginning December 1. Boyd will be requesting suggestions of faculty names to fill the vacancy left by Stoddard as University of Oregon faculty legislative liaison.

8. Budget Orientation

Ralph Sunderland provided a hand-out which contained FTE and fund comparisons from 1977-78 and 1978-79. The hand-out also included the categories used in the budget office. During the process of discussion of budget, we were provided a description of terms and a brief overview of the budget and some indication of budget development.

Some of the highlights of the discussion were as follows:

- a. In response to the question on what kinds of decisions Sunderland makes, Ralph answered that he monitors the decisions made by others and he makes judgments on the need to involve others, but major decision making authority does not exist in his office. Boyd indicated that in the past, Sunderland made decisions in a very direct way when there was a problem of others not engaging in appropriate decision making behavior. This has changed but Sunderland continues to influence decisions in an indirect way in that budget facts help define the options available.
- b. Sunderland indicated that during past administrations, there have been shifts in movement from more decentralized budget to more centralized arrangements as the budget situation began to become critical. He felt that the current status is more centralized but centralized in the Vice President's office (Olum).
- c. Olum expressed great satisfaction with the working relationship that has developed between Sunderland's office and his office.
- d. In the early 70's, the method of entitlement was based on the student/faculty ratio which was then compared to State Board standards. The computation that is most frequently used right now is the cost per student. The State moved to this system because it was more reflective of the true cost.
- e. A committee on resource allocation was formed several years ago to try to identify a different formula for entitlement that would be more reflective of the financial burden of providing quality graduate education.

- f. The need for the University of Oregon to utilize a "constrained" student credit hour driven model internally was emphasized. If we simply allocate internally, based only on the student credit hour, then it is difficult to fight the external mode of entitlement that is based solely on that factor.
- g. In general, in areas where student credit hour generation is high, less budget cuts are made.
- h. What are the convincing arguments on budget that we should use with the legislators next week? Boyd indicated that a number of these arguments are within the budget preparation itself. It was decided that at next week's meeting a dry run of the budget presentation will be provided. Some of the standard arguments used, for example, that we are not reimbursed for the high cost of graduate education are not persuasive since university salaries are at the mean of salaries of other AAU institutions and faculty of the University of Oregon really have one-half of the teaching load that faculty in the other institutions in the State have. A politically effective argument is to show that higher education's share of the State appropriation over the last four bienniums has really been substantially lower than for other areas, e.g., two and one half times increase for Higher Education; five and one half times for Welfare. The level of support for higher education is low for the University of Oregon when compared with other modestly funded institutions in the AAU.
- i. There is a need to provide a budget orientation to the ECC as well as to the Legislature as both of these bodies seem to gain respect from peers and their constituency if budgets are cut.
- j. Sunderland defined a number of categories in his hand-out. He differentiated between variable costs (those costs that will be affected by the increases and decreases of enrollment) and fixed costs (costs that would not be affected by enrollment fluctuations). He also indicated then the reimbursement from the State for FTE lower division students is \$1658, for one FTE upper division \$2190, and for one graduate FTE \$3078.
- k. If AC members wished to learn more about budget development, they should consult with John Lallas to see if the seminar that was provided for Deans several years ago can be adapted to serve that need.

9. Confidentiality

Concerns about the confidential nature of information provided at AC meetings were discussed.

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES  
JULY 24, 1978  
PAGE 5

---

Agenda Items: Dry run of budget presentation, items to lobby for at meeting, affirmative action function, nonretention of tenured faculty.

Meetings

- July 31 - AC Meeting
- August 2 - Meeting with legislators
- September 11 - AC Meeting
- October 9 - Joint Institutional Meeting

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

July 31, 1978

1:30 - 5:15. Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Members Present: Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson, Arnulf Zweig.

Others: (2:15 - 3:15): Paul Civin; (3:15 - 5:15): William Boyd, Paul Olum.

1. Minutes.

The minutes of the July 24, 1978, meeting were mailed to Advisory Council members and were approved on the 31st without corrections or additions.

2. Items from the floor.

The Chancellor's decision to recommend that institutional presidents not be provided housing was discussed. Advantages and disadvantages of this practice were cited. In any event, it was generally agreed that the sale of the University of Oregon President's house would seem to be unwise.

3. Questions from Civin.

A list of questions that were provided ahead of time to Civin were reviewed by Advisory Council members and several others were added.

2:15 - 3:15 -- Paul Civin

4. Projections.

Most of the projections Paul completes deal with enrollments and student plan by department and school. Financial data is not amenable to projections because so many variables are hard to predict e.g. the legislature. Therefore, income plan and dispersal figures are more a guess than a projection. Student enrollment projections, however, are quite accurate. Civin has enrollment data by department. He also has data on admissions and retention as well as detailed information on programs that have Dollars for Scholars funds. About 1/4 of his time is spent in projection activities with the bulk of his time spent on approving requests i.e. seeing if money exists in budget.

5. Carrying Load.

The general problems of budget decreases led to a discussion of students not carrying a full load (\$150,000 alone could be saved if GTFs took all the credits they could take according to their FTE assignment). Faculty should be aware of that problem and also of the need to have students sign up for all instruction they receive. This topic is to be discussed further by the Advisory Council.



6. Budget Reserves.

In answer to what is within the budget reserve category, Civin cited salary increases for December, indirect cost reserves, S & S inflation, Dollars for Scholars funds and Provost's Reserve, plus others.

7. Reflections.

There was not time for Civin to answer all questions on the list so he will return. In closing, however, he indicated: 1) that the University was better today in terms of quality of faculty; 2) that there is less innovation at the University of Oregon than in sister institutions partially because our programs are more stable; and 3) that the teaching load is better now with the enrollment declines -- it is down to where it should be.

3:15 - 5:15 -- Boyd and Olum.

8. Admission Requirements.

Advisory Council members were asked to provide advice on the desirability of increasing admission requirements. The increase will also be proposed by OSU. The Student Credit Hour (SCH) decreases projected should be nominal because of the high drop-out rate of students with lower grade point averages.

9. Budget Presentation.

Boyd conducted a dry run of the budget presentation he will make at our August 3rd meeting with Lane County legislators. Topics covered in the presentation included the following:

- a. A breakdown of income and expenditures by source for 1977-78 and 78-79;
- b. Program Reductions, 1977-78;
- c. 1978-79 Budget Problems e.g. underfunding, enrollment loss;
- d. A comparison of general fund expenditures and their growth over the last ten years.
- e. Results of Kansas Study that indicate the University of Oregon is 5 out of 6 institutions on a number of variables that are indicators of quality.

10. Priority Projects.

Boyd distributed a list of priorities that have been approved by the State Board. Items on this list will be lobbied for during the next legislative session.

---

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning (see information Lallas sent to Advisory Council members), legislative liaison, carrying load of graduate students, debriefing on August 3, session with legislators, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, Hawk presentation.

Meetings:

September 11 -- Advisory Council Meeting

October 9 -- Join Institutional Meeting

DR:srb