

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

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

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

JAN 19 1978

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

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 it

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



Advisory Council Minutes  
and  
Notes on Open Meeting with Faculty

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
FEB 1 1978  
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

30 January, 1978 in Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present(2:00-4:00): Exine Bailey, Edwin Coleman, Richard Littman (Chair),  
Michael Posner, Norman Sundberg (Secretary) Absent: Barbara Caulfield

Others present: William Boyd, President; Paul Olum, Provost; William Axford, Dean  
of Libraries; Charles Duncan, Journalism; Robert Albrecht, Vice Provost.

1. Minutes  
Approved as distributed.
  2. Ethnic Studies  
Coleman reported various proposals of Ethnic Studies in cutting down administrative overload. The committee will meet in two weeks with Baldwin; Coleman will attend. Ethnic Studies is another example of problems in multidisciplinary programs.
  3. Tri-university Ed.D. degree proposal  
Littman stated that the proposal is being revised and mentioned a letter from Novick. One question is whether it should go to the Curriculum Committee and faculty. Littman distributed copies of the proposal.
  4. Fixed term appointment appeals  
Discussion planned for AC; the AC decided to invite Duncan. Duncan favors using the existing grievance procedure, rather than an appeal procedure through the FPC.
  5. College of Business Administration enrollment  
Littman referred to the memos of Posner and Reinmuth. Restrictions in enrollment, if decided by individual units, are examples of the "commons dilemma"-- i.e., individual preferences may work against the good of the University.
- (After 2:00 p.m.)
6. Financial matters  
Boyd mentioned that the additional monies allocated by the Emergency Board were helpful, but the "slow slide" is still a problem. It doesn't look like the student-driven model will be changed this decade, and we must adjust by increased enrollment or other means. Also got some financial aid money released.
  7. Library personnel--Criteria for tenure and promotion  
Duncan reviewed the problem of judging Library personnel by regular University criteria. Axford mentioned the general goals--what librarians are becoming. Since 1973, there have been 3 denials for promotion and tenure and 2 acceptances. About 25 of the 45 librarians are tenured; about 8-9 of them continue their scholarly productivity. Changes in the Library in recent years encourage scholarship. Axford has rated 19 of the untenured librarians on possibility of tenure (including administrative officers); only 31% rated above 3 (average). Axford stated that in terms of long-range development, it would be wise to keep faculty status (which has been in existence since 1932). Librarians now do more teaching than in the past, and in the summer of 1979, they will have a summer librarianship school. A different type of University librarian is

(OVER)

emerging. Axford believes other Oregon state colleges and universities might take a change in faculty status as an opportunity to raid the faculty here.

If salary is not an issue would regular faculty status vs. the administrative officer (with the rank of) appointment make a difference? Axford mentioned "costs" and faculty members' objections. If they can't maintain current status as teaching faculty, can librarians be asked to do the additional teaching and scholarship they are being asked to do? Littman mentioned two problems raised in AC discussion: The likely decrement in service if more demands are made, and the morale of librarians by continued uncertain status. Axford responded that he tried to clarify status years ago—the requirements for tenure—and faculty members should have been chosen with that in mind. Axford believes service is highly related to budget. Tepfer asked Duncan to identify other parts of the University where special criteria are brought to bear; Duncan did so.

Olum stated that, in his view, the Library is quite different from other areas of the University; librarians are generally not expected to demonstrate impact on the national scene, and their service is important. He finds many things wrong with a two-tier faculty appointment system (i.e., some appointments on the regular faculty track, and others "with the rank of" on continuing 3 year contracts). Albrecht said that you may destroy a unified faculty. Littman said that clear specification of functions is very important in making the distinctions. Axford said that, if you're going the two-tier route, it would be better to use the "senior instructor" but there have been University objections in the past and the title may not be appropriate to the Library. Several people said the senior instructor rank is now accepted. Tepfer reported there are 6 senior instructors in Biology and the title is used for technicians. Boyd asked, are we concerned about providing non-regular faculty promotion and tenure channels because of humanitarian consideration or worry about service? A recent survey of freshmen and seniors showed the Library provided good service. After further discussion, Axford and many of the people at the meeting agreed that the alternative of the senior instructor position was better than the administrative officer appointment. Axford will write up a statement covering this possible solution. The FPC will continue to use regular criteria for regular appointments, but treat the recommendation for senior instructors by special criteria.

8. College of Business Administration enrollment

Various professional schools have been using special enrollment standards. Catalog deadlines are close. Olum will talk with Boyd about the CBA decision. It was generally agreed that a quota with a floating GPA was not desirable.

9. CSPA deanship

Boyd reviewed the search committee recommendations and got the AC impressions.

---

Agenda for next meeting: Follow-up on tri-university proposal, fixed term appeals, CBA enrollment.

## Notes on Discussions at Open Faculty Meeting

4:00-5:00 Faculty Club--Open Meeting

AC Members present: Bailey, Coleman, Littman (Chair), Posner, Sundberg (Recorder), Tepfer

Others present: 15

Topics and gist of discussion by faculty members:

1. Course evaluations: Some limit should be placed on use, e.g., not necessary with sequential courses taught by same instructor, perhaps those two years from retirement, visitors and those who will be terminating. Faculty legislation was suggested as the remedy.
2. Library: Concerns about service, storage, responsiveness, and accountability of the Librarian to the faculty. The planned colloquium, supported by the President's Office, will cover the storage problem. The University Library Committee has little power; terms need to be longer. Questions of effectiveness and usage of storage facilities such as those proposed in Oregon. Possibilities of moving some programs out of the Library, e.g., ERIC, instructional media, and the Douglas listening room. The Library is getting 40,000 volumes a year. In the long run we need increased space (in 5-6 years). One problem is how to influence the Educational Coordinating Council. The present plan is to send books to Camp Adair. What institutions have put into storage elsewhere are old journals and special collections; Axford's proposal is to keep only "the definitive edition." One person suggested that there may be a lot of unnecessary distress about which books would be sent to storage. This was countered by the charge that librarians should not be the persons to decide the manner in which books should be chosen for removal from the stacks. It was pointed out that the Library has had thousands of books in storage on campus for years with no complaints; they are in the card catalog. The open stack system, which uses a great deal of space, is still not used in many places. There are different uses that faculty members make of the Library. The Library Committee is receiving information from departments; this arises from Dean Baldwin's survey. Another problem (in addition to storage and the Dean's arbitrary decision-making) is the decision to move away from the card catalog to a microfiche and microfilm system. A number of other problems were mentioned. Acceptability to users is a major problem. It was reported that most librarians are opposed to off-campus storage; if it's away from Eugene they believe it will be disastrous as it will remove our institutional control over the holdings and leave them vulnerable to decisions by general government officials.
3. Development of non-traditional learning: One faculty member, unable to attend the meeting, urged the AC to encourage procedures for enrolling and facilitating study by older students and those with different backgrounds. One procedure is credit for prior learning. The University needs to relate to other developments in the State.

Advisory Council  
MINUTES

6 February, 1978, 2:00-4:15 p.m.

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

Absent: Barbara Caulfield

Others present: (3:00-4:15) Paul Olum, Provost

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

FEB 8 1978

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

1. Minutes

Approved as distributed.

2. Post-mortem of open meeting with faculty

- a. Library storage and other change. The colloquium planning is moving ahead, according to Baldwin who is on the committee along with Axford and Boyd. The AC members want data on usage and success elsewhere; anti-storage people to be included; and, broad consideration of future developments in Library processes. One important and thorny issue is how a new technology should be introduced so as to gain acceptance and support. The storage issue should not be permitted to overshadow other critical features of library organization and functioning.
- b. Librarian activities. Some librarians are concerned about diminishing services, partly due to their being "forced" to teach. There may be some real grievances developing rapidly. A question for the AC is how much it should become involved and whether we should talk with Albrecht, who is the liaison in the Provost's Office. Improved consultation in decision-making by the Library administration seems very important. There are charges that there is an attempt to get rid of people with an orientation to service, but a mix between service and scholarliness seems important.
- c. Non-traditional learners. These are students older and different from the typical 18 to 22 year old undergraduates. The question is whether the University should be doing more to recruit them since they provide a source for increasing enrollment in a time of decline of the typical age group. If so, there should be more facilitation for their starting, such as advising and timing of course offerings. Also credit for prior experience is being given in many places, but the University has little provision for this. It was decided that we talk with Olum later. Albrecht may be working on this.

3. Ethnic Studies

Coleman had no further report. Littman had talked with Baldwin, who wondered what was going on. Baldwin said he had expected some proposals from Holden and Toll. Further meetings of Baldwin with the committee will be planned.

4. Admission standards

Littman reported on inquiry from Albrecht, who had had several notes from von Hippel. He reported what we had done about admissions including our discussions with the OSU Senate. Some AC members mentioned that rather than raise GPA admission requirements that they would like admissions to be based on certain subject matter, a core curriculum. AC members suggested there might be a resolution proposed to the Assembly (to be passed on to the President and the Board for approval). Such a motion would get the issue before the faculty. It was suggested that von Hippel could make a motion soon.

5. Tri-university Ed.D. degree

Littman reported that Hynes stated the issue should go through the University Curriculum Committee.

6. Honors College

AC members wondered how the search for director is going and what is happening to rejuvenate the program. There still seems to be interest on the part of high school students. This matter relates to recruitment of high quality students.

7. Meeting with Legislators, February 16, 7:30 p.m.

Planning for refreshments--dessert and sherry or wine. Attending will be about 15 people including Boyd, Olum and Tyler. Legislators probably coming are Nancy and Ed Fadeley, Kulongoski, Wingard, Rogers, Boehringer and Burrows; Frohnmayer is an improbable; Isham definitely not. Discussion topics (note Lallas notes and Littman letter) might be what the faculty are most concerned about: funding for University; faculty salaries, fringe benefits and retirement; autonomy of the University and building quality of the University; what might we offer the legislators.

(After 3:00)

8. Name change proposal

Olum mentioned the department of Japanese and Chinese wants to change the title to the Department of East Asian Languages. The change does not need to go to the faculty. The change reflects a tendency in other major universities. The AC had no objections to the change.

9. Preregistration

Olum reported that implementation of preregistration will need to wait. The head of Student Affairs, Gerry Moseley, is new and there is a search for a Registrar. Wanda Johnson, the Acting Registrar, does not want to move now. So preregistration will not take place next fall, but the University will move as soon as possible. Discussion suggested we should have a well developed system retaining some student sense of control and flexibility. Preregistration for fall will be in the previous spring (but not this spring).

10. Duck preview

Olum reported that parents were quite pleased with the results and compared it favorably with OSU's preview. The students assisting seem to have been well prepared and friendly.

11. Advising

Coleman mentioned importance of improving advising, especially for preregistration. Olum mentioned we have two main kinds of lower level advising--Oregon Hall advising about how to get around the hurdles, and the Office of Academic Advising. Advising by faculty is mainly for majors and upper division students.

12. Fixed term appointment appeal procedures

Littman reviewed the history and noted that Duncan persuaded Olum that we should not institute a general review process, except for procedural grievances (timely notice, discrimination, etc.). Do we really want someone outside the department to handle substantive complaints? Olum believes departments know substance best. Posner raised the question: Is it proper procedure for a department chairman alone to decide on termination for a person?

He also questioned whether there were good, careful procedures in each department. Olum noted that the regular appeal procedure through deans and the Provost is always available. He added he might not mind some kind of rule that in every failure to renew, he would receive a letter explaining reasons, confirming evidence and a roll call vote. An additional appeals procedure would "over-solve" the problem. There was considerable discussion of mixtures of procedural vs. substantive bases for decisions. A procedure such as Olum tentatively proposed would be only for regular appointments of .5 FTE or more for longer than one year.

There was discussion of the use of personnel committees and other procedures in departments. The AC seemed agreed that the proposed procedures would be desirable. Recapitulating, the proposal is as follows:

With failure to renew regular appointments of .5 FTE or more (for appointments of more than one year), department heads or deans would notify the Provost, with a copy to the person involved, citing reasons for non-renewal, confirming evidence, and a roll call vote of the accepted personnel body (probably including all faculty members of higher rank).

Olum will review this proposed regulation and present it to the Council of Deans.

13. Shift from tenure-track to fixed term appointments

Olum is moving to set the three year fixed term appointments on the same procedural basis as tenure-track appointments had been. Olum stated there are no more straight tenure-track appointments; from now on all are fixed term appointments. However, during the sixth year, people are considered for tenure. Littman raised the question about the attitude of AAUP toward making tenure dependent on positions available; there was some discussion of the use of finances as an argument for not giving tenure.

14. Library colloquium

April 20-21 is the proposed date with distinguished speakers--3 in favor of storage and 3 against on the first day. The second day there will be full discussions with experts as resource people on how we should house collections for the next 25 years. The six talks will be published as basic position papers. It has been suggested that the President appoint a special high level ad hoc committee to make a recommendation to him about Library matters in general. Several AC members also mentioned to Olum some Library personnel matters.

15. The law about lobbying

Olum asked if there were legal problems about meeting with legislators. Littman reported no questions from them about the propriety of such a meeting.

---

Agenda items for next meeting: Planning meeting with legislators on Feb. 16; discussion of non-traditional learners and credit for prior learning with Olum; new date for meeting with OSU executive committee--probably March 13, exam week.

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-Rang 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 was 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)

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

FEB 23 1978

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

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 of 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.

file

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 <sup>many</sup> 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

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
MAR 2 1978

(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 tim<sup>Q</sup>elines are unrealistic, but he agreed that the ideas mostly were good (with the excep<sup>Q</sup>tion 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.



Boyd

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

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.

