

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

July 5, 1978

1:30 - 3:45 pm., Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present: (1978-79) Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard
Littman (Chair), David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Shirley
Wilson, Arnulf Zweig

Donald Tull

Others: (1:30 - 3:00 pm) Michael Posner, Norman Sundberg,
Sanford Tepfer

1. Purpose of Meeting: 1977-78 A. C. members met with new members in order to provide an orientation to the issues that surfaced last year and to suggest possible agenda items for the coming year.

2. Review of topics:

A. Ethnic Studies Program

Last year's A.C. members seemed dissatisfied with the progress made on this problem. The Ethnic Studies Program was initiated by the faculty and is perceived to be seriously underfunded. 1977-78 A. C. members feel support for the Program by the current A & S Dean is not present. The new A.C. will undoubtedly continue to be involved throughout the coming year. Background information is available in the files.

B. Minority Council

It may be useful for the A.C. to also examine the activities of this Council.

C. Library

This was a topic that received considerable attention last year. Paul Holbo is currently chairing a committee charged with answering all the questions of storage, book shredding, etc. (and in his spare time . . .). The membership of the Library Committee has been strengthened for the coming year since there was some concern that faculty input was not aggressive enough about policy development activities.

D. Admissions

Raising the admission standards for the U of O was discussed. Efforts to include OSU have failed as MacVicar is more "open admissions" oriented. Boyd and Olum appear to favor the idea but are concerned about impact on enrollments and the associated allegations of being an elite institution.

E. Advance Registration

This topic has been raised and raised and raised. 1977-78 A.C. members do not quite know why this idea has not been implemented.

F. Enrollments

This problem will surely be a continuing one next year. The Dollars for Scholars program was used as a way of increasing enrollments.

G. Budget Recommendation

The degree to which the A.C. members were involved last year and advice on our involvement this coming year were discussed. There is some disagreement among members on what the appropriate role should be regarding budget review. Some felt a comprehensive review of all budgets was appropriate while others encouraged the A.C. to concentrate on budget policies since there was some concern that policies on retrenchment are needed, but not available.

H. Communication

Communication between the University Administration and Department chairs was identified as a problem. Therefore, the A.C. recommended meetings that have been held with Boyd and Olum and Deans and Department Heads once a quarter. These meetings appear to be helping the communication problem.

I. Inter-Institutional Meeting

The June 5 meeting was briefly discussed. The major topic for next year will be whether or not we wish to recommend hiring a lobbyist with OSU and PSU and HSC to represent faculty interests. It was pointed out that Stoddard Malarkey is a lobbyist for the University Administration. However, there was concern expressed about the degree to which faculty interests of these institutions are sufficiently similar.

J. Inter-Institutional Senate

The manner in which we select our representatives needs to be examined since the Chancellor sometimes uses this group to obtain faculty views.

K. Baskets

It is unclear whether or not the current A.C. should be doing anything more with the delineation of faculty authority within University Administration.

L. Legislative Relationship

The meeting of the A.C. and Lane County legislators was discussed. A similar meeting is suggested. Advantages and disadvantages of having the meeting before or after the elections were identified. The role of the University in lobbying against the property tax limitation referendum was discussed. Apparently a group of faculty members was very actively anti the last time a limitation was proposed.

M. Retirement

A.C. recommended formation of ad hoc Committee. At least one member, however, is very dissatisfied with Committee report. More attention by the A.C. this coming year may be needed.

3. Process to be used

The A.C. last year met at 2 pm every Monday. Usually, they were joined at 3 pm by the Provost and President. 1977-78 A.C. members present indicated that both Boyd and Olum are open to discussing issues. The new A.C., however, needs to be assertive about topics to be discussed and follow-up.

The A.C. members encouraged continuation of the coffee hours since faculty need to be reminded that faculty interests are to be served through this Council.

4. Election of 1978-79 Chair and Secretary

Paul Holbo nominated Richard Littman as Chair and Diane Reinhard as Secretary. Nominations were closed and the membership voiced approval of those nominated.

5. Future Meetings

It was decided to meet during the summer. The next meeting is scheduled for July 10 at 2 pm. A complete file of minutes from last year will be available from Chris Leonard in the President's Office.

Agenda for coming meeting: Names of persons to meet with A.C. as part of orientation.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

July 10, 1978

2:00 - 5:00 pm., Johnson Hall Conference Room

Members present: (1978-79) Paul Holbo, Wanda Johnson, Richard Littman (Chair)
David Povey, Diane Reinhard (Secretary), Donald Tull, Shirley Wilson,
Arnulf Zweig

Others: (3:15 - 5:00 pm.) Paul Olum, William Boyd

1. Minutes

The minutes of the July 5, 1978 meeting were reviewed by AC members. Donald Tull's name was added to the list of persons who attended. No other corrections were made.

2. Announcements

A. Littman distributed a list of on-going problems identified by the 1976-77 AC as well as background materials on the "basket" topic, i.e., the role of faculties in institutional governance.

B. Sunderland, Civin and Boyd will be asked to provide an orientation to the University budget. A top-down approach (starting with the U of O budget within the State System) was thought to be a useful way to proceed. The role of Civin in the budget process and the administrative placement of the Budget office was discussed.

3. Littman indicated that topics of interest to AC members which are not on the agenda can be discussed after announcements as "items from the floor".

4. Potpourri

No specific agenda was set for this meeting. However, a number of topics and questions were raised.

A. Is the AC involved before or after decisions are made? Appears to depend on topic.

B. Need to define what is "program", particularly in light of Eastern Oregon's recent decision.

C. What is the relationship between Deans and Department Heads? Should a personnel concern about the process a dean used to relieve a department head be discussed by the AC or the FPC? How should the AC and FPC work together? (See K below)

- D. How are merit recommendations determined? Do we need to be concerned about discrepancies among department?
- E. What is the status of post-tenure review? Do we have sound practices and policies for schools and colleges to use? The Business School and AAA have been involved in post-tenure review for several years.
- F. Need for orientation to the Provost's office (discussed later).

(3:15 - 5:00 pm.)

- G. Orientation to Office of Academic Affairs' reorganization. Paul Olum provided an orientation to the way in which his office is structured.
 - 1. Two Vice Provosts (Albrecht and Wattles). They share responsibilities for relationships between professional schools/library and office of Academic Affairs. Dean of Arts and Sciences reports directly to Paul Olum. Albrecht is working on some long-range planning topics while Marshall Wattles has recently been assigned Affirmative Action.
 - 2. Associate Provost for Student Services (Mosley) assumed most of responsibilities previously held by Bogen, plus academic advising.
 - 3. Associate Provost for Planning (Civin) provides projections on enrollment, budget analysis etc. Serves as information provider for Office of Academic Affairs.
 - 4. Assistant to Provost (Carlson) provides general assistance to Olum. One-third of her assignment will remain in Office of Federal Relations in the Graduate School. (Functions of the Graduate School will be examined this year.)
 - 5. Data Processing and Director of Computing report to Paul Olum.
 - 6. All T/P cases go directly to Provost's office for decision.
 - 7. Two and one half secretaries provide clerical support.

The office has assumed more responsibilities than it has had in the past while being understaffed (Mohr and Dahle have left). With the addition of Carlson, it is hoped that this situation will improve.

H. Legislative Relationship

Discussions included the following: the role of Stoddard Malarkey as faculty liaison; a progress report on what is being done to inform persons of budget constraints of the University; ways in which the

faculty can be a resource to legislators while in session; ways in which the faculty can respond to the property tax limitation referendum; the role and limitations of the Policy Council at PSU. It was suggested that Boyd meet with a select group of faculty to develop a plan of action for faculty involvement.

I. Graduate Enrollments

Reference was made to an article in the Register Guard on graduate enrollment decrease. More information on the topic will be provided to the AC since the paper seemed to be in error on the level of decrease.

J. Freeze on Out-of-State Travel

Implication of the Governor's freeze on Out-of-State travel was discussed. Approximately \$100,000 of State dollars are used for out-of-State travel by the University. The need for more than one faculty member to attend a professional meeting, e.g., APA and the need to find other means of financing travel for persons delivering papers was discussed. Olum will investigate what percent of the State's out-of-State travel budget is allocated to institutions of higher education.

K. Department Heads

The relationship between a department head and his/her dean and faculty was discussed, e.g., term of appointment, removal from responsibilities. Past practice has been based upon administrative tradition and decency. If a decision was questioned, grievance routes were available. A need does seem to exist for some general policy statement that protects the department head against the caprice of the Dean and/or the conspiracy of the faculty so that the true best interests of the department can surface. Does the department head serve at the pleasure of the Dean? What is the "normal" length of appointment? Olum will draft a statement on terms of appointments for deans and department heads. Related issues will also be discussed.

Agenda Items: Schedule of orientation meetings.

Coming Events: Meeting with Lane County Legislators on Budget August 2, 6-9:30 pm.
Meeting with OSU, PSU & HSC on October 9, 1978, here.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

July 17, 1978

2:00 - 4:45 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 - 4:45 pm) Paul Olum, (3:30 - 4:45 pm) William Boyd

1. Minutes

The minutes of the July 10, 1978 meeting were distributed, reviewed and approved by the AC.

2. Announcements

1. Littman has scheduled several meetings to prepare the AC for the August 2, 1978, budget meeting with the legislators: a) Sunderland, July 24, at 3 pm; b) Civin, July 31, at 2:15 pm.

2. The following materials were distributed:

a. Report of the Chancellor's Fact Finding Committee regarding Eastern Oregon president's recent decision affecting tenured positions.

b. Notice of a series of TV programs on graduate education in the State.

c. Guidelines for processing Out-of-State Travel Requests.

3. Merit Recommendations (Also see #7 below)

The need for some general guidelines led to a discussion of the University Tenure and Promotion statement that is being finalized in the Provost's Office. The incentives that exist for faculty to become involved in University committee work as well as concerns about the current committee structure were also discussed, e.g., unwillingness of faculty to serve; obsolete, inappropriate and/or inefficient committees. Discussion on these topics did not result in any resolution or consensus. These concerns need to be discussed further by the AC.

4. CSPA Liaison

The appropriateness of the continuation of an AC member to

serve as a liaison with CSPA was discussed. The consensus of the AC was that the liaison function is probably no longer necessary. However, we would like to have oral progress reports from Dean Hill during his coming year on the progress of the newly defined mission of CSPA.

5. Graduate School Review

The review will not take place until Winter Term and Olum would welcome AC involvement.

6. Mission for Year

Whether the AC would like to define long-range missions for the year was discussed. Topics could have been defined by previous AC members or could be concerns of interest to current members. Tull indicated an interest in the area of recruitment and retention. Povey and Reinhard indicated an interest in looking at institutional support for securing research funds, e.g., educating younger faculty on how to secure grants/contracts, provision of incentives in form of returned overhead.

(3:15 - 4:45 pm)

7. Merit Recommendation

Olum expressed his views that merit recommendations are primarily the prerogative of the Dean. The problem is that some department heads do not see the merit of faculty participation in the affairs of the larger university. The forthcoming distribution of the University statement on tenure/promotion may be helpful. Preliminary plans for distribution of the December salary improvement allocation were discussed. Serious equity concerns exist within University, e.g., law school.

8. Out-of-State Travel Memo

AC members reviewed the memo prepared by the Provost's Office. It was suggested that a specific time of 2 months be cited instead of the statement "well in advance."

9. Law Suit

A briefing on the specifics of the law suit recently filed was provided by Boyd. The process of review used in making the decision regarding tenure was also discussed. The role of the AC in this matter will need to be discussed.

Agenda: Committee Structure, definition of "program," mission for

Scheduled events:

- Budget meeting with legislators; August 2, 1978, 6 pm.
- Meeting with PSU, OSU, HSC; October 9, 1978, here.

Minutes
Faculty Advisory Council
July 18, 1977, Johnson Hall Conference Room, 3-4 p.m.

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

Others: President William Boyd and Vice President Paul Olum

1. President Boyd stated that he called the meeting primarily to discuss the establishment of the Labor Education and Research Center and the appointment of Steven Deutsch as Acting Director. He stated that a national search will be conducted for the regular director, but for several reasons it was important to get started as soon as possible and make an impact with the program in educational workshops and research. He anticipates it will take six months to a year before the regular director can be appointed. Dr. Deutsch has worked with Miles Romney in the planning and lobbying for the Center and is ready to assume responsibilities. President Boyd has cleared the acting appointment with Myra Willard for Affirmative Action requirements. Letters are going out to fifteen unions for a statewide advisory board to the center. (AFT and OSEA are included but not AAUP, because only organizing unions having contracts are included.) Deutsch has stated he will not be a candidate for the permanent directorship in order to avoid charges of special interests or bad faith on the part of the University. There was some discussion about how to word the statement so that the decision might be reconsidered if the search committee is unable to recommend an equally qualified person. The Advisory Council agreed unanimously about establishing the Center soon with Steven Deutsch as acting director.
2. In the second half of the meeting there was brief discussion of several topics:
 - a. Regarding salary improvement, Sandy Tepfer suggested that a move from 3 increments to 2, with the second one starting in September, 1978, might be investigated.
 - b. Regarding Development Fund appointees, the President indicated the importance of having people who are willing to work and are comfortable with soliciting contributions themselves. He had no objection to emeritus professors, but thought that there was value to rotation. Carlisle Moore and Lloyd Staples, the present members, are emeriti.
 - c. Provost Olum noted that the Advisory Council is responsible for setting up two hearing panels, if cases come up against faculty members. Exine Bailey noted that the preceding Council had set up such panels, and it was agreed that there would be a need only for replacing members that may not be on campus.
 - d. The President indicated that new state auditing procedures will require a more steady rate of expenditures in departments in the future. Monitoring will be conducted to avoid the holding of "reserves" until the last quarter of the biennium.
 - e. In response to a question about Amazon housing, the President said there was nothing new. The new director was trying to meet with 12 randomly chosen tenants. There is a lower occupancy rate in Westmoreland. The possibility of a needs test for setting priorities for tenancy at Amazon was discussed.

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

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
September 11, 1978

2:00 - 5:00 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room.

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

Members Absent: Donald Tull

Others: (2:10 - 2:45): Richard T. Scott, OCE and Fred Waller, PSU;
(3:15 - 5:00): William Boyd, David Frohnmeyer, John Lallas and Paul Olum.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the July 31, 1978 meeting were mailed to Advisory Council members and were approved on September 11, 1978 without corrections or additions.

2. Interinstitutional Faculty Lobbyist (also #5)

Dick Scott and Fred Waller from the IFS met with the AC to discuss the merits of having the University of Oregon join the other institutions in the state in the hiring of a lobbyist for faculty concerns. The participation of the University of Oregon is viewed as critical according to Waller and Scott. Phase I of implementation includes the naming of a University of Oregon faculty member to serve on the Lobby Activating Committee. Members of this committee will oversee the publicizing and pledging of \$36 by each faculty member. When \$20,000 is pledged, Phase II of the plan will proceed i.e., the hiring of a lobbyist and the formation of a Steering Committee to develop priorities. This group would be separate from the IFS.

A number of questions were raised as this topic was discussed. First, are the institutions so diverse that faculty concerns would differ from institution to institution? If the concerns were agreed to, would priority ratings differ from institution to institution? Would it be better for us to have our own lobbyist? Does the University of Oregon lobbyist act as an advocate for University of Oregon faculty concerns? How can we be assured that the interests of the University of Oregon faculty are served in the setting of priorities for the lobbyist? Will our lack of participation seriously affect the relationship we have with other state institutions?

The need for strong advocacy of faculty concerns, especially in light of propositions 6 and 11, was acknowledged. Members decided to seek council from Olum and Boyd on the value of this idea.

(3:10 - 5:00 pm.) William Boyd, David Frohnmeyer, John Lallas, and Paul Olum.

3. Legislative Session Briefing

David Frohnmeyer provided a description of the seven sections of Proposition 11 and also cited the following preliminary figures on the effect of

this proposition on state revenue.

	<u>HIGH</u>	<u>LOW</u>
1979-81	+44M	-108M
1981-83	+190	-388M
1983-85	+380	- 62M

These figures are based on a 8% growth rate. Although troublesome, these figures are lower than some have predicted.

4. Budget Preparation

Olum indicated that his office will not be approving position authorizations for Fall, 1979 until more is known about our level of funding. Olum also indicated that it is clear that budget cuts will be made and the AC should be thinking about the "process" that should be used.

5. Faculty Lobbyist (continued)

The advantages and disadvantages of having a state faculty lobbyist were reviewed. Major advantages were as follows: a) The need for advocacy of faculty concerns is even greater now with 6 and 11, b) there is concern over the degree to which the Chancellor's Office is an advocate for faculty, c) a state faculty lobbyist would help offset the state student lobbyist, and d) it may be politically embarrassing for us if we do not participate.

Major disadvantages center around nagging concerns about the diversity of institutional priorities and lack of information on how the plan will be implemented. It was decided that the chair will talk with Scott and Wallers about who they had in mind for a lobbyist. He will also speak with the OSU representative about our concerns.

6. Admissions

John Lallas provided a summary of the Board meeting. The recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee of the OSSHE to increase admission standards by 1983-84 was discussed. This topic needs to be discussed further by the AC.

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, Moseley, ^{Sumic Cloin} presentations; roll-call voting on AC matters.

Meetings: October 9, 1978 joint meeting with OSU, PSU and HSC.

DLR/sb

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 12, 1978
September 13, 1978

5 - 5:45 pm. September 12, 1978 - President's Office

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

Others: William Boyd, Paul Olum

1. Factfinders Report

This special meeting of the AC was called by the President. At this meeting copies of the Factfinder report were distributed. The AC was asked to advise the President on the following: 1) whether or not the report should be accepted, 2) if accepted, where should the money come from within the budget, 3) if rejected, how to deal with the political backlash.

Since time was a critical factor, AC members agreed to review the report and meet on Tuesday at 8:30 am. to formulate a position.

8:30 - 10:00 am. September 13, 1978

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

Member Absent: David Povey (sent written comments)

1. Factfinder Report

Before discussing whether to accept the report, the financing of the proposal was discussed. The following alternatives were identified:

- a. Faculty salary allocation
- b. inflation S & S
- c. appointment of fewer GTF's
- d. elimination of faculty positions
- e. some combination of a-d.

Only a and b of the alternatives were seriously considered as viable. By a vote of 5 to 2, alternative b (S and S inflation funds) was selected to be recommended to the President.

Whether to accept the factfinder report was the next topic of discussion. Arguments for acceptance included the following: a) rates

for GTF's maybe high but total dollar amount at .30 FTE is difficult to live on, b) health insurance is important, c) a strike would be extremely damaging.

Arguments for rejecting the proposal included the following:
a) fairness for faculty to have a 13% increase while GTF's had 20%?
b) University simply does not have the funds, c) some members of the AC were also concerned about the Workload and Appointment-Reappointment sections of the report.

After considerable discussion, the AC voted 5 - 3 for recommending the rejection of the Factfinder report. It was decided prior to any discussion that roll call votes would not be taken but that the value of using this practice on future issues would be discussed at another meeting.

10 - 11:15, William Boyd, Paul Olum

Before the recommendation of the AC was made known, Boyd shared with the group his tentative decision and associated rationale. The press release, indicating that the report was not being accepted, was reviewed and suggestions were made.

The AC recommended that negotiations begin as quickly as possible and that the relationship between the administration and students be more collegial.

Reinhard

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 18, 1978

2:00 - 4:30 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 11, 12 and 13 meetings were distributed and reviewed. The names of Civin and Simic were added to the list of persons to meet with the AC.

2. Items From the Floor

a. Newsletter.

The meaning of a section of a newsletter from the College of Business Administration was discussed.

b. Committee Assignments

It has come to the attention of one AC member that persons who are asked to chair committees are not called in advance which is a common courtesy to faculty members. The extent of this and other problems dealing with committee assignments will be determined and discussed at a future meeting.

3. Interinsitutional Lobbyist

The discussion continued from last week's meeting.

Hesse, a retired Political Science Professor from O.C.E., is the person being considered as the lobbyist. No one has heard of him. The pros and cons of participating were again identified but there was a lack of enthusiasm for active AC involvement. The value of putting the question before the faculty was, however, recognized. Therefore, the AC decided to ask Beverly Fagot to identify faculty members who support the idea (as determined from her questionnaire results) and submit those names to Waller and Scott as potential University of Oregon contact people for the solicitation campaign.

4. Retirement

Boyd has asked the AC for advice on whether the University has a moral right to extend the retirement age to 70 even if they are legally not required to do so. The AC discussed this matter briefly. These initial discussions seem to indicate that AC would clearly prefer a policy that provides for decisions on a case by case basis. However, since that is not possible, it was tentatively agreed that the advantages of retirement at 65 outweigh the disadvantages when the total interests of the University are considered. This topic needs to be discussed further at a future meeting.

5. Schedule of Presentations

At next week's session, Ray Hawk will meet with the AC at 2:15 pm. The AC identified a set of questions which Hawk will address. Simic and Moseley will also be scheduled for presentations.

6. Joint Meeting with OSU, PSU, HSC

This October 9 meeting will be held at the Collier House (Faculty Center). A list of agenda items were identified. The AC agreed to ask President Boyd to meet with the group for a part of the scheduled meeting time. A meeting of this group with the Chancellor is scheduled for later in the quarter.

7. Faculty Open House

The AC agreed to continue the practice of having Faculty Open-Houses during the academic year. The first one is scheduled for October 23 at 4 pm. at the Collier House (Faculty Center). The AC secretary will see that an announcement is made at the University Faculty Meeting and that notices are put into the Emerald and Oregon Week. A letter to the faculty will also be developed.

8. Legislative Meeting Debriefing

The value of scheduling another meeting between Lane County Legislators and the AC was discussed. These meetings are designed to foster the development of personal relationship between University of Oregon faculty members and legislators. There was some concern for the busy schedules of legislators after the election and during the session. A decision on whether to schedule another meeting was postponed until the next meeting.

9. GTF Debriefing

The AC indicated a need to check on the status of the Faculty Advisory Committee. The position of the University on other items such as workload and appointment-reappointment should also be reviewed.

10. Library Committee

Paul Holbo provided a progress report on his Library Committee work. Apparently the OSBHE has approved \$50,000 for a volunteer storage facility at Camp Adair. This is troublesome to the Committee for a number of reasons. Currently, the Committee is formulating a response to this action. The full report of the committee deliberations should be available sometime Fall quarter.

X

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
September 25, 1978

2:00 - 4:50 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

Others: (2:15 - 3:05): Ray Hawk
(3:10 - 3:30): William Boyd
(3:10 - 4:40): Paul Olum

1. Items from the Floor

Wanda Johnson indicated that SCH for Fall will probably be down by about 3%. The number of freshmen has increased. Housing requests are up and the University had to turn students away from the dorms.

2. Announcements

Curt Simic will meet with the AC on October 2. The joint AC's meet on October 9 and Jerry Moseley will meet with the AC on October 16. The AC chair also distributed the following items: a) a draft of a letter regarding the joint October 9 meeting, b) copies of letters he wrote to Waller and Scott and to University of Oregon faculty members who may be interested in participating in the faculty lobby solicitation campaign and c) a draft of proposed legislation for IFS representation.

3. Ray Hawk's Presentation

A list of seven questions was presented to Hawk prior to the meeting. A summary of the presentation is as follows:

- a. Currently, Hawk supervises the athletic department, museum, physical plant, housing, health services, budget and personnel. Many of the support services of the University are under his direction. Before Simic's arrival, Hawk also assumed day-to-day management supervision of the University Relation's office.
- b. The lack of computerization of some of the business functions limits what can be done. The University is in desperate need of funds for both hardware and software. With the exception of a modest request within program improvement, there are no other plans to increase our computer capability.
- c. Distribution of funds derived from indirect cost credits was discussed. A large portion in the past has been directed to the improvement of our computer facilities. Recently the funds have been used toward the under-funding problem. The overhead rate is determined by the "feds" and is

a provisional rate that is later checked to see if it was a "true" rate. Problems of audits and some units dissatisfaction over the lack of rewards (i.e., a returned portion of the overhead funds) were briefly discussed.

- e. Hawk indicated that he influences academic matters in a number of ways. First, he is a part of the central administration team and therefore has input into budget reduction decisions as well as other decisions. Second, he has direct responsibility for the environment within which faculty, staff and student live and interact.
- f. Hawk pointed with pride to the Physical Plant and its director Harold Babcock who has been very creative about implementing cost saving devices in this area.

3:10 - Boyd and Olum

4. Assembly Room Change

The question was raised as to whether it would be appropriate to change the room where faculty meetings are held because of the small number of faculty members who attend. Boyd indicated that unless the AC formally makes a recommendation, he was unwilling to make the change. Council members disagreed on the value of changing the room assignment.

5. GTF Strike Concerns

A number of concerns regarding the GTF strike were raised. First, some faculty members were concerned that pressure would be put on them or on the non-striking GTF's to assume more work responsibilities during the strike. The AC was assured by the University administration that this would not occur and that any additional workload would be strictly on a volunteer basis.

Second, some faculty members were concerned about a rumor that GTF's would not be allowed to register or have offices. The AC was told that nothing would be denied GTF's in their role as student e.g. registering. However, office space is provided in their role as employees and would not automatically be available to them if a strike occurred.

The third concern was that a number of faculty members and GTF's are ill informed of the legal ramifications of certain actions under strike conditions. e.g., state law against any state employee who participates in an illegal strike, potential loss of tuition waiver for .15 GTF if they honor the strike. All AC members recognized the need to educate faculty and GTF's, however, there was some concern that a fact sheet distributed by the University would be viewed as a propaganda document. After reviewing a number of alternatives such as involving the University legal counsel or the Lane County Lab Council, the AC recommended that President Boyd provide the answers to the seven questions that AC members identified at the first University Faculty Meeting.

The Final concern that was raised and discussed centered around some faculty members' concern that the University was unwilling to do some serious negotiating in order to avert a strike. The University position on sections of the contract was discussed. The AC recommended that Olum and Boyd meet informally with the GTF's and also encourage the negotiating team to return to the bargaining table as soon as possible.

6. Review Process for Creation of New Department and Degree

The Office of Academic Affairs has a request for the creation of a new department and degree in the area of Gerontology. Advice from the AC on the appropriate review process was solicited. Three alternatives were identified. First, the Office of Academic Affairs could make a recommendation and forward the proposal to the State Board's Office. Second, the proposal could be sent through the Curriculum Committee and eventually to the entire faculty. Third, a notice of motion could be made at the next University Faculty Assembly which would result in the review process being recommended by the faculty Senate. The Senate could recommend creating an ad hoc committee to study the proposal, could refer the proposal to the Curriculum Committee or could send it directly to the University Faculty Assembly with Senate recommendation. The AC advised the Provost to use the third alternative, i.e., present a notice of motion before the faculty assembly.

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements; Retirement; rock concerts; budget planning; carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, committee on committee appointments, I.F.S. appointments, Amazon Housing Policy Board replacement.

Meetings: October 9, 1978, 12 pm. joint meeting with OSU, PSU, and HSC.
October 23, 1978, 4 pm. open house Faculty Meeting. ✓

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 2, 1978

2:00 - 5:00 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

Others: (2:20 - 5:00): Curt Simic
(3:30 - 5:00): John Lallas, William Boyd

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 18 and 25 meetings were distributed. Members were asked to read them and identify any corrections at the next AC meeting.

2. Items from the Floor

The state of our computer facilities needs to be discussed at a future meeting.

3. President's Evaluation

The AC chair indicated that the Chancellor would like to meet with us on Thursday October 5 regarding Boyd's evaluation. He was unclear about whether the meeting was to be on process or substance or both.

4. \$25,000 for Health Emergencies

The advantages and disadvantages of offering this proposal were discussed. There is some confusion about whether this service would just be for dependents or for both GTF's and dependents.

2:20 - Curt Simic

5. Curt Simic's Presentation

Simic described his position and identified the following needs:

- a. A need to strengthen the development fund. Last year \$100,000 was raised in unrestrictive funds; Simic hopes to have \$500,000 in this category in three years. We need personnel in this area to act as fund raisers. Currently we are recruiting for a Director of Development. The Development Fund has been renamed the University of Oregon Foundation.
- b. The need for a creative writer--in order to better present the University to the public, alumni student/faculty, legislators, etc.

- c. The need to strengthen use of radio and T.V. in our public relations efforts.

Simic and his staff will be moving into the first floor of Susan Campbell. Other activities cited included: the development of a student recruitment film (10 minutes) that alumni could use and the meetings that McVicar, Blumel and Boyd are holding throughout the State.

3:30 John Lallas - later William Boyd

6. President's Evaluation

The schedule and criterion for evaluating the Presidents at Oregon Institutions of Higher Education were described by Lallas. The AC was asked to review a list of persons that the Chancellor had planned to interview. Suggestions included more persons from Student Services, and someone from the Minority Council. It was also suggested that persons at the national level who are familiar with Boyd's work should be contacted.

7. Faculty Meeting

Boyd shared with the AC the focus of his opening remarks for the Faculty meeting on Wednesday.

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 16, 1978

2:00 - 4:45 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: (2:30 - 3:05): Jerry Moseley
(3:10 - 3:50): William Boyd
(3:10 - 4:45): Paul Olum

1. Minutes

The minutes of the September 18 and 25 meetings, distributed at a previous meeting, were approved as written.

2. Announcements

The meeting with Miles Romney has been postponed.

3. Items from the Floor

At least one member of the AC expressed anxiety about the large number of agenda items that are not being addressed. One alternative is for each member to take a few topics to investigate and bring back the results to the full committee. This approach and others will be examined at a future AC meeting.

4. Jerry Moseley's presentation

After sharing some experiences from his past administrative positions, Moseley described his current position as Associate Provost. His responsibilities include supervision of admissions, registration, financial aid, Dean of Students, data reductions, athletic liaison, student union, academic advising, student services, career planning and placement, counseling center, and international students.

The major problem he has is outdated computer hardware and personnel that were not involved in the original programming for the model we have. Other points made were as follows:

- a. 360 model 50 is 8-10 years old.
- b. Administrative data processing personnel are demoralized because of past funding arrangements (user generated solely) and obsolete equipment to work with which limits the professional experiences they are able to have at this institution. Turn-over of personnel has been great.
- c. There is a need to take data off the 360 files and transfer it to mini equipment because the information may eventually be lost or become difficult to retrieve.
- d. A pre-registration system demands better equipment as well as sub-

stantial initial development cost.

- e. A request has been submitted to the legislature for additional support (see #5).

Time ran out so the AC needs to decide whether they wish to have Moseley return to talk about student recruitment, retention, etc.

3:10 - Boyd and Olum

5. Computer Needs

Boyd indicated that he testified at an interim committee of the legislature recently and found some support for the condition of computer hardware and software from Jack Ripper, the Committee Chair. The replacement schedule for hardware is usually 6 - 7 years. A number of faculty members have written to the President about problems with our computer capabilities. The University administration is currently thinking about leasing the needed equipment which will cost about \$400,000. Some of the financial support will hopefully come from the legislature but some of the funds will have to be diverted from other uses within the University.

6. GTFF Briefing

The negotiators, the faculty advisory group plus other faculty members meet with the University administration in order to brain-storm on possible positions the University could take in the GTFF negotiations. Various positions on the workload issue were identified. The GTF's plan an intent to strike vote on October 19, 1978.

7. Budget Plans

Olum provided a progress report on the budget planning process. The target figure now looks like 5 - 7.5%. The administration will present a proposed budget to the Council when it is prepared. AC members encouraged the administration to provide the information sufficiently in advance to actual submission dates.

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, Retirement, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, committee on committee appointments, I.F.S. appointments, Amazon Housing Policy Board replacement, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, *encore for presenters? committee structure, research support,*

Meeting: Open-House with Faculty, October 23, 4-6 pm., Collier house.

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 23, 1978

2:00 - 4:00 Johnson Hall Conference Room
4:00 - 5:15 Collier House

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

Others: (3:20 - 4:00): Paul Olum
(4:00 - 5:15): Approximately 10 faculty members.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the October 2 and 16 AC meetings were distributed for review. Members were asked to read them and identify any corrections at the next AC meeting.

2. Items from the Floor

- a. Registration seems to be down in headcount by approximately 245.
- b. It was suggested that the University Administration make available the data upon which they identified those schools/units e.g., Law School that are below the average salary levels in comparable AAU institutions (see also #9).
- c. The question of whether it is possible to eliminate a house from assets so financial aid can be granted will be investigated with Jerry Moseley by Arnie Zweig. This policy (perhaps a federal guideline) has implications for women primarily but also impacts on males.
- d. A perceived change in disability insurance was investigated by Paul Holbo. However, benefits have not decreased according to Osibow.

3. Committee on Committees

The following persons were nominated to serve on this committee: Jan Breckhoff (suggested chair) Carmichael, B. Crasemann, Lucille Aly Gunilla Finrow, Ken Ramsing, Peter Swan; alternates are Lew Ward, James Hoard, Robert Hurwitz and Mimi Johnson.

This is an important committee which requires a certain knowledge of the total University community. The AC thought that a study should be conducted by this committee on a selected number of committees each

year in order to determine if the legislative mandate is still appropriate and also evaluate the committees' usefulness to its primary constituency. Dave Povey will draft a letter indicating the nature of such a study in greater detail.

4. Amazon Housing Board

The following faculty members are listed in priority order: Sally Fullerton, Rath Waugh and Marydale Gale to serve on the Board as a replacement for a resignation.

5. Ad Hoc Faculty Task Force on Retirements

At the joint advisory council meeting on October 9 we agreed to appoint a small group to work cooperatively with a group of faculty at OSU to examine an expansive set of issues related to retirement. D. Povey will develop a draft of a charge to this committee for the next meeting. This statement will then be shared with the following slate of faculty members to determine their interest, Eaton Conant, Lindstrom, L. Staples, Steve Keel and Esther Matthews. It was also suggested that the following faculty serve as a resource to the Task Force, Spence Carlson, Iven Niven, Henry Osibow and Paul Swadener (Chair of committee last year).

6. Early AC meeting on October 30

The AC will meet at 1:30 pm. next week in order to address more of the agenda items that remain.

3:20 Paul Olum

7. GTFF Update

The series of events for the past week were described. The offer of the 150 hours per quarter was offered prior to the authorization to vote. Again financial concerns were discussed. The administration was encouraged to release the fact sheet that addresses questions on strike ramifications. This will be done if negotiations break down and there is an affirmative authorization to strike vote.

8. Athletic Department Request

D. Littman will call Barb Nichols and indicate that closer involvement of faculty members with the athletic program is a good idea. However,

the particular request of honoring Ersted Award faculty during half time will probably not be well received by those faculty members.

9. Release of Comparative Data

Olum indicated that the data that compares faculty salaries of U of O units to comparable units in the AAU will be released. Preliminary analysis indicates that the Law School has the most serious inequities on salary levels. Other schools considered having equity problems include Business, AAA and Music.

4:00 - 5:15 pm. Open House with Faculty

10. Computer Inadequacies

A relatively new faculty member in HPER reiterated concerns we have already heard regarding the serious problems with University computers both for faculty research and for administrative processes.

11. Cooperative Education Program

Tina Knight (CSPA) described what a cooperative program at the U of O could be like and asked whether other schools and departments would like to become involved. It was suggested that this program be attached to the Career Planning and Placement Office. It was also suggested that models from other institutions be reviewed as program development proceeds.

12. Salary Schedule

A format request will be sent to the AC to review the step increase plans to determine the degree to which a salary plan is in existence and what is seen as satisfactory progress through the schedule.

13. Fixed-Term Appointments

Some problems associated with fixed-term appointments were identified: official timely notice, covert encouragement to some faculty, and confusion over tenure-track and fixed-term conditions.

14. Schedule for next open-house

It was suggested that we alternate the day of the week when open houses are scheduled in case some faculty always have a conflict with Mondays.

The Advisory Council
October 23, 1978, Minutes
Page 4

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, I.F.S appointments, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, encore for presentations, research support, appointment concerns.

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 23, 1978

2:00 - 4:00 Johnson Hall Conference Room

4:00 - 5:15 Collier House

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

Others: (3:20 - 4:00): Paul Olum
(4:00 - 5:15): Approximately 10 faculty members.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the October 2 and 16 AC meetings were distributed for review. Members were asked to read them and identify any corrections at the next AC meeting.

2. Items from the Floor

- a. Registration seems to be down in headcount by approximately 245.
- b. It was suggested that the University Administration make available the data upon which they identified those schools/units e.g., Law School that are below the average salary levels in comparable AAU institutions (see also #9).
- c. The question of whether it is possible to eliminate a house from assets so financial aid can be granted will be investigated with Jerry Moseley by Arnie Zweig. This policy (perhaps a federal guideline) has implications for women primarily but also impacts on males.
- d. A perceived change in disability insurance was investigated by Paul Holbo. However, benefits have not decreased according to Osibow.

3. Committee on Committees

The following persons were nominated to serve on this committee: Jan Brøekhoff (suggested chair) Carmichael, B. Crasemann, Lucille Aly Gunilla Finrow, Ken Ramsing, Peter Swan; alternates are Lew Ward, James Hoard, Robert Hurwitz and Mimi Johnson.

This is an important committee which requires a certain knowledge of the total University community. The AC thought that a study should be conducted by this committee on a selected number of committees each

year in order to determine if the legislative mandate is still appropriate and also evaluate the committees' usefulness to its primary constituency. Dave Povey will draft a letter indicating the nature of such a study in greater detail.

4. Amazon Housing Board

The following faculty members are listed in priority order: Sally Fullerton, Ruth Waugh and Marydale Gale to serve on the Board as a replacement for a resignation.

5. Ad Hoc Faculty Task Force on Retirements

At the joint advisory council meeting on October 9 we agreed to appoint a small group to work cooperatively with a group of faculty at OSU to examine an expansive set of issues related to retirement. D. Povey will develop a draft of a charge to this committee for the next meeting. This statement will then be shared with the following slate of faculty members to determine their interest, Eaton Conant, Lindstrom, L. Staples, Steve Keel and Esther Matthews. It was also suggested that the following faculty serve as a resource to the Task Force, Spence Carlson, Iven Niven, Henry Osibow and Paul Swadener (Chair of committee last year).

6. Early AC meeting on October 30

The AC will meet at 1:30 pm. next week in order to address more of the agenda items that remain.

3:20 Paul Olum

7. GTFF Update

The series of events for the past week were described. The offer of the 150 hours per quarter was offered prior to the authorization to vote. Again financial concerns were discussed. The administration was encouraged to release the fact sheet that addresses questions on strike ramifications. This will be done if negotiations break down and there is an affirmative authorization to strike vote.

8. Athletic Department Request

D. Littman will call Barb Nichols and indicate that closer involvement of faculty members with the athletic program is a good idea. However,

The Advisory Council
October 23, 1978, Minutes
Page 4

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, I.F.S. appointments, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, encore for presentations, research support, appointment concerns. *USIB or replacement*

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 30, 1978

1:30 - 4:30 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: (2:15 - 2:50 pm.): Victor Atiyeh, John Baldwin
(2:15 - 4:30 pm.): Paul Olum

1. Minutes

The minutes of the October 2, 16 and 23 meetings were approved as written.

2. Items from the Floor and Announcements

- a. The Affirmative Action faculty report, particularly the recommendations, needs to be discussed.
- b. President Boyd would like to discuss with the AC the possibility of having some students from the People's Republic of China attend the University of Oregon.
- c. Sally Fullington has agreed to serve on the Amazon Policy Board.

3. Ad Hoc Task Force on Retirement

The AC decided to replace Lindstrom with Barry Siegel who will serve as the liaison to the University Faculty Personnel Welfare Committee. Lindstrom will be used as a resource person. The draft of the charge to the Task Force developed by Dave Povey will be reviewed by members and discussed at the next AC meeting.

4. I.F.S. Representation

The notice of motion developed by Dick Littman was approved as written and will be presented to the University faculty on Wednesday, November 1.

5. Committee on Committees

The charge to the Committee on Committees was adopted as written by David Povey.

6. Victor Atiyeh

The candidate for governor pledged support for Higher Education and discussed other issues related to the welfare of the University of Oregon.

3:15 - 4:30 pm. Paul Olum

7. Salary Schedule

Faculty members from at least one department are confused about the salary plan. Paul Olum explained that a plan does exist, however, we cannot implement a one-step increase every year. Within this biennium we have had a cost of living increase, a step increase and a merit/equity adjustment in salaries. It was suggested that the Office of Academic Affairs draft a statement to faculty regarding the salary system and also indicate plans for implementation.

8. Research Support and the Graduate School

The problem of lack of support for doing research, particularly with Jo-Anne Carlson moving out of the Graduate School, was discussed. Although there are funds within program improvement for research support, the amount of state dollars for research is painfully small. There is a need to provide seed money, to orient new faculty members and in general to stimulate the development of research proposals.

The future role of the Graduate School and the Graduate Dean was also discussed. Dave Povey and Diane Reinhard will look into this issue and report back to the AC.

9. Hiring Procedure

The University has on an extremely limited basis provided a position for the spouse of a faculty member. Several conditions, however, need to be met; the pertinent department must find the spouses of high quality, there must be a need for additional staff and the personnel action must advance our affirmative action plans. Olum is aware of the delicate nature of these types of appointments and would only use this approach when it is absolutely necessary.

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, encore for presentations, research support, appointment concerns, Osibow's replacement.

ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
October 30, 1978

1:30 - 4:30 pm. Johnson Hall Conference Room

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

Others: (2:15 - 2:50 pm.): Victor Atiyeh, John Baldwin
(2:15 - 4:30 pm.): Paul Olum

1. Minutes

The minutes of the October 2, 16 and 23 meetings were approved as written.

2. Items from the Floor and Announcements

- a. The Affirmative Action faculty report, particularly the recommendations, needs to be discussed.
- b. President Boyd would like to discuss with the AC the possibility of having some students from the People's Republic of China attend the University of Oregon.
- c. Sally Fullington has agreed to serve on the Amazon Policy Board.

3. Ad Hoc Task Force on Retirement

The AC decided to replace Lindstrom with Barry Siegel who will serve as the liaison to the University Faculty Personnel Welfare Committee. Lindstrom will be used as a resource person. The draft of the charge to the Task Force developed by Dave Povey will be reviewed by members and discussed at the next AC meeting.

4. I.F.S. Representation

The notice of motion developed by Dick Littman was approved as written and will be presented to the University faculty on Wednesday, November 1.

5. Committee on Committees

The charge to the Committee on Committees was adopted as written by David Povey.

6. Victor Atiyeh

The candidate for governor pledged support for Higher Education and discussed other issues related to the welfare of the University of Oregon.

3:15 - 4:30 pm. Paul Olum

7. Salary Schedule

Faculty members from at least one department are confused about the salary plan. Paul Olum explained that a plan does exist, however, we cannot implement a one-step increase every year. Within this biennium we have had a cost of living increase, a step increase and a merit/equity adjustment in salaries. It was suggested that the Office of Academic Affairs draft a statement to faculty regarding the salary system and also indicate plans for implementation.

8. Research Support and the Graduate School

The problem of lack of support for doing research, particularly with Jo-Anne Carlson moving out of the Graduate School, was discussed. Although there are funds within program improvement for research support, the amount of state dollars for research is painfully small. There is a need to provide seed money, to orient new faculty members and in general to stimulate the development of research proposals.

The future role of the Graduate School and the Graduate Dean was also discussed. Dave Povey and Diane Reinhard will look into this issue and report back to the AC.

9. Hiring Procedure

The University has on an extremely limited basis provided a position for the spouse of a faculty member. Several conditions, however, need to be met; the pertinent department must find the spouses of high quality, there must be a need for additional staff and the personnel action must advance our affirmative action plans. Olum is aware of the delicate nature of these types of appointments and would only use this approach when it is absolutely necessary.

Agenda Items: Admission Requirements, rock concerts, budget planning, carrying load of graduate students, legislators meeting, affirmative action function, non-retention of tenured faculty, computers, AC long-range planning, academic long-range planning, encore for presentations, research support, appointment concerns, Osibow's replacement.