

MINUTES
ADVISORY COUNCIL
JULY 1, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull,
Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Faculty Meeting Plans. Aaron has sent out the invitation to faculty and has reserved rooms in the E.M.U. The plenary sessions will be held in the Dad's Room with other rooms reserved for the small group discussions. It was agreed that Aaron will outline the problem(s) to be addressed and will explain the format and process to be followed during the afternoon. The schedule will be as follows:

2:00 - 2:30 p.m. -- plenary session
2:30 - 3:45 p.m. -- small group discussions
3:45 - 5:00 p.m. -- plenary session

Council members will chair the small discussion groups and choose reporters from among the group. Aaron will arrange to tape record the plenary sessions and a written report of the meeting results will be prepared for distribution to the faculty.

Council members will meet at noon Wednesday, July 7th to receive last minute instructions and updated information on the budget. It was agreed that any discussion of "exigency" was beyond the scope of this meeting with the faculty. The possibility of borrowing money against the property owned by the university was raised. This idea will be pursued with the president and provost at a later date.

The president and provost joined the council at 10:00 a.m. The minutes of the last meeting were reviewed, corrected, and will be re-distributed.

The Budget. The president reported that the deans would support further postponement of faculty salary increases to meet budget deficits. The president will ask Chancellor Davis to announce the possibility that tuition from enrollment in the fall may be adequate to meet part of the University's projected deficit. If at all possible, such an announcement should be made prior to the July 7 meeting.

The problem of discussing ways to meet the potential budget deficits without giving out a message that the university can make more cuts without serious damage was considered. It was agreed that further budget cuts be discussed only in general terms. Any further cuts will seriously hurt the university. Given that knowledge, faculty can discuss how that serious injury could best be met:

- 1) Further postponement of faculty salary increases.
- 2) Serious cuts in library acquisitions, supplies, services, faculty travel, TBA's, etc.
- 3) Program elimination.

Advisory Council Minutes
July 1, 1982
Page Two

Financial exigency cannot be an option unless we can demonstrate that we cannot meet our current bills. Aaron will prepare a summary of today's discussion for council members to use in the small discussion groups on Wednesday.

Internal Program Review and Planning. There was discussion of the kind of budget cuts that have been effected thus far. The president and provost indicated that programs have been reviewed and priorities set and adhered to in cuts that have already occurred. Cuts have not been made across the board but rather, "targets of opportunity" have been seized and decisions have been made on the basis of departmental strength.

The topic of planning and the future shape of the university were explored and it was agreed that this would be a primary focus of future council meetings after members have had an opportunity to read the Albrecht Planning Report. The question of who should decide the configuration of the university will have to be addressed. Some concern was expressed that those departments with more faculty turnover were providing a disproportionate share of savings. The provost offered to present and discuss the list of cuts that have been made thus far but the council thought that was unnecessary.

Second Annual Fall Convocation. The president announced that on October 4th, 1982, Don Kennedy, president of Stanford University will give a major address on the impact of the sciences on other academic disciplines.

MINUTES
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JULY 7, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 12:15 p.m. (at the Faculty Club).

Faculty Meeting Plans. Aaron distributed and explained an outline of information to guide the discussion during this afternoon's meeting with the faculty. Council members contributed their ideas on what should be included in the small group discussions. The timing and format of the meeting were confirmed and it was agreed that written summaries of each small group session would be submitted to Aaron who will prepare a combined report for the council's review.

Next Council Meetings. It was agreed that the council meet Monday, July 12 at 2:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room to review the report of today's faculty meeting and decide what distribution should be made of that document. It was further agreed that the council will convene only on call for the rest of the summer. Any council member may ask Aaron to convene us should the need arise.

Council Agenda Items. Don suggested, and the council agreed that each member should submit agenda items to Aaron and at an early meeting priorities be established for the discussion of each of these agenda items. Agenda items already agreed upon are:

1. Faculty governance
2. Undergraduate education
3. Long range planning

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

MINUTES
FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Monday, July 12, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:30 pm and outlined the main items for consideration: 1) what recommendation, if any, does the council wish to make to the president as a result of last Wednesday's faculty forum; 2) should the president hold a general faculty meeting and if he does, should he make a recommendation to that body on how the \$388,000 deficit can best be met?

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS. Members shared their perceptions of faculty sentiment at last week's forum. There was consensus that the feeling expressed in all small groups was that faculty members see no realistic alternative to a further salary cut, but as much as possible should be taken from other sources and high visibility should be given to the cuts (i.e. reduced school year or reduced services). Further, contingency planning should make available cut-back options other than faculty salaries in the event of future higher education cuts.

After much discussion, the council adopted as its recommendation to the President a variation of the plan voted on in Don's small group: three-fourths of the money should be taken from faculty salaries and one-fourth from other sources, excluding the library. (Aaron will send summaries of the small group sessions to all council members.)

ANOTHER MEETING OF THE FACULTY. The council agreed to recommend that there not be a faculty assembly to consider the \$388,000 deficit.

PLANNING. Some members of the council expressed concern that the university is over-extended now with little hope for restoration of funds, let alone the acquisition of new funds. It seems desirable therefore to have some clear policy for retrenchment which is generally understood by the faculty and within which planned changes can occur over time. If we agree that we have to cut back to improve the quality of the university, we have to seriously consider alternatives for reducing size and the implications of these alternatives.

Some council members feel that although the president and provost reassure us that planning is taking place all the time, there is a perception among the faculty that planning is not occurring. A visible planning effort seems desirable. The suggested role of the council in this planning was to advise on broad policies concerned with the shape of the university, criteria for evaluation of programs, and a planning process to be followed. There was more discussion of what we mean by planning and Don Tull agreed to provide the council with a working definition of planning.

President Olum and Provost Hill joined the council at 3:30 pm.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION. Aaron reported the council's recommendations: 1) three-fourths of the needed funds should be taken from faculty salaries and one-fourth from other discretionary sources; and 2) there should not

be another faculty meeting now to discuss how to meet the \$388,000 deficit.

RETRENCHMENT AND PLANNING. Concerns were expressed about the perception of the faculty that we are recocheting from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, the feelings of the faculty that they don't want to be asked in September how to make further cuts and therefore there should be contingency plans, the likelihood that base budget losses will not be restored and thus the need for retrenchment soon to maintain quality, and the need for a visible planning process.

The president believes that the base budget funds will be restored, that the university is about the right size now, that projecting further cuts could easily become a self-fulfilling prophecy, and that contingency planning for future budget deficits is already taking place. The political implications of making contingency plans known were acknowledged, but the president was asked to consider announcing the criteria being used in making such plans.

The president re-asserted his strong belief that any major changes in the shape of the university must come after full faculty discussion. He also questioned the belief that "major surgery" is necessary in order to maintain the quality of the university. The current vacancy in the vice-provost position provides an opportunity to re-evaluate administrative priorities and the planning processes, according to President Olum.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Shirley Wilson, Secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Monday, August 16, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 3:00 pm. The council agreed that the next meeting would be Monday, August 23 at 2:30 pm.

OBJECTIVES FOR THE COMING YEAR. Aaron listed the agenda topics for the coming year which he has received from council members:

- Planning
- Governance
- Undergraduate education
- Malaise in the humanities
- Need for minors in the professional schools
- Semester system for all of OSSHE

- Possible management economies
- Recognition of research as part of faculty work assignment

It was agreed that the council should involve other faculty in working on each of the agenda items but that a council member should serve on each of the first three groups (planning, governance, undergraduate education). Aaron asked that all council members let Shirley know their preferences for the problems they wish to work on. Barry said he is interested in planning and governance and will sketch out a plan for consideration. Carolin is interested in the undergraduate education issue. We need to discuss Don's paper on the definition of planning as soon as feasible.

DELEGATE TO INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COUNCIL MEETING. It was agreed that we should be represented at the inter-institutional council meeting in Corvallis on October 28-30, 1982. Aaron will suggest the following agenda items:

1) institutional governance, 2) institutional planning, 3) admission requirements.

President Olum and Provost Hill joined the council at 3:30 pm.

NEW ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR OSSHE. The council members expressed their reservations about the revisions in admission requirements being proposed by the State Board: 1) no time for involvement of the faculty, 2) students would not have enough time for electives, 3) unevenness in the quality of teaching in high schools in some of the required areas, 4) the effect of the language requirement on University of Oregon enrollment.

The council recommended that more time be allowed so that faculty could carefully consider the suggested revisions. If this request cannot be met, the council recommends four years of English, three years of mathematics, two years of laboratory science, two years of social science, two years of language that can be waived and made up in the first two years at the university. The provost will convey the council's recommendations in the State Board's office.

REVISED SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY. The provost explained that the new sabbatical leave policy ^{proposed} ~~is in effect and available to faculty.~~

- Full year leave: 60% of salary (formerly 50%)
- Two term leave: 75% of salary (formerly five-eighths)
- One term leave: 85% of salary (formerly 100%)

The president read a letter from Dean Gilberts which presented a number of objections to the new plan. The council reaffirmed its support for the new leave policy.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION FOR MEETING THE \$388,000 DEFICIT. The president explained that he could not follow our recommendation that one-fourth of the deficit money come from sources other than postponement of faculty salary increases. His reasons were threefold: 1) this would not be keeping faith with his agreement with the classified staff; 2) the one-fourth amount from other sources would cripple the university (increased teaching loads and loss of supply and services money); 3) it was probably not understood that the one-fourth represented only one more week of salary increase postponement.

EXECUTIVE SESSION was asked and granted.

HI-TECH PROGRAM. Great concern was expressed by all for the role of the Educational Coordinating Committee in promoting and negotiating the Hi Tech Program.

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Monday, August 23, 1982

Present: Carolin Keutzer, Barry Siegel, Shirley Wilson

Shirley convened the meeting at 2:45 pm in the absence of a quorum.

We discussed the advisability of forming faculty task forces for each of the closely-related agenda items as soon as possible so that reports and recommendations can be reviewed and integrated in a timely manner. Names of faculty who would be good members for these task forces should be submitted to Aaron.

The remainder of the time was spent discussing planning and governance issues. Several examples of problems were listed:

- 1) Changes in curriculum are sometimes legislated too fast (i.e. environmental studies and the new clusters).
- 2) A department will use a course in another department as a requirement for its majors, but will not inform the other department of this requirement.
- 3) Departments can change course content without informing or involving other departments who require these courses for their majors.
- 4) Departments can discontinue courses that are in high demand by the general undergraduate population (i.e. College of Business Administration courses). This brings up the issue of the degree to which a college or department can ignore the curricular needs of undergraduates who are not majors.
- 5) Maintaining a balance between strong professional schools and a strong liberal arts emphasis within the university is a problem, in this period of declining resources.

We agreed that there should be a council meeting at 2:30 pm on Monday, September 13. (Following the meeting, Shirley learned that Aaron had called a meeting for 1:30 pm on September 13.) Members should leave a message for Shirley at ext. 3211 as to whether they will be at the council meeting on Monday, September 13 at 1:30 pm in the Johnson Hall conference room.

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

September 20, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES. The September 13 minutes were corrected as follows: page one, paragraph three, line one, substitute "August" for "September."

REORGANIZATION. Issues of reorganization were briefly discussed: implications of re-establishing the title of Vice-President for Student Affairs; the composition and role of the budget committee, the reporting-line of the budget office; the need for President Olum to meet with state opinion leaders and to be able to attend to the urgent problems of the University that are caused by external forces.

PLANNING. The council had received Don Tull's paper on planning through the campus mail.

President Olum, Vice Presidents Hill and Hawk, and Vice Provost Holbo joined the council at 3:00 p.m.

REORGANIZATION. The president explained that the final decision on reorganization would be his but that he wanted the views of the council members on three major questions:

- 1) To whom should the budget officer report?
- 2) Should the Vice President for Administration position be continued after Ray Hawk's retirement?
- 3) Should there be a Vice President for Student Services?

Olum indicated that the first two questions were the most urgent in terms of timing.

Vice President Hawk presented his suggested reorganization chart and outlined the most important features of his job: management of a \$100 million business enterprise with all the attendant internal personnel and management needs and all the external relationships that must be maintained. The council suggested that more internal management analysis was needed (exploring advisability of secretarial pools, contracting outside for services, etc.). Ray agreed.

There was a discussion of the role of the provost and academic vice president. President Olum explained that the function and authority varies from campus to campus but that at the UO the academic vice president acts in the absence of the president, is closest to the president in all decision-making, and has a central role in the operation of the university.

Paul Holbo presented his reorganization chart and discussed its primary features. He explained that his role in the administration is to provide short- and long-range planning and help with priority-setting. He said that his definition of planning is in harmony with that presented in Don Tull's paper as "comprehensive" planning. He also feels that it is his

responsibility to provide accurate and timely information to the president and provost. For this reason, he feels that the budget office should report to the Office of the Provost, thus giving the provost access to the budget information necessary for planning. The president needs to be free to attend to pressing matters outside the university, Holbo observed.

Don Tull agreed that there was a compelling need to know financial information but questioned that this meant that the budget reporting-line needed to be to the provost.

Dick Hill said that he felt his office was unduly burdened because of the lack of accurate and timely budget information. There was considerable discussion of the budget information problem and the cast of characters who play roles in budget matters. The council urged that the budget committee be inserted on any reorganization chart and be used to deal with major budget questions. The president said that the problem with a budget committee is that too many persons want to be on it and it becomes unmanageable. (He said he would distribute to new council members the paper on the budget process that he prepared last year.)

Concern was repeatedly expressed that budget problems would involve the president's time to the exclusion of important advocacy activities outside the university. Conversely, there was a strong argument made for the need for the president to be fully informed on every aspect of the budget in order to effectively seek funding. It seemed to be the president's view, shared by most of the council, that the budget reporting-line should be to the president and that the president should chair the budget committee which would be only advisory in nature.

After more general discussion, the council agreed that there should be a vice president for administration because of the importance of titles in dealing with the public and the need for an adequate span of control within the administration.

NUCLEAR FREEZE. The president said he intended to make a personal statement supporting the nuclear freeze. The council affirmed his right, as an individual, to do so.

Shirley J. Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes
Monday, September 27, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Shirley convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES of the September 20 meeting were distributed but not acted upon.

AGENDA. Shirley listed the following agenda items:

1. Formation of task forces on planning, governance, and undergraduate education
2. Final report of the Governor's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies
3. Setting the date and time for the next council meeting

Carolin asked that "process" for council meetings be added to the agenda.

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES. The council members read a letter from President Olum requesting that Bob Wilner (of the Commission) be allowed to make a presentation of the Commission's recommendations to the University Assembly. After a hasty review of the report, the council agreed to leave the matter with the president to do what he thought best but if Wilner makes a presentation to the Assembly, it should be limited to 15 minutes.

NEXT COUNCIL MEETING. The next meeting of the council was set for 10:00 a.m. on Monday, October 11. The president will join the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

PROCESS. Council members expressed their frustration about recent meetings; i.e., more advance time is needed to consider agenda items, a mechanism is needed to know what we have (or have not) agreed to in the meetings, all council members' views are not being heard, visitors are brought to the meeting without invitation from the council.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that we advise the chair that we wish to have a written agenda before each meeting, that we wish to vote on major policy issues brought before the council, and that the chair survey the opinions of all council members prior to that vote. (The council asked Shirley to inform them of the agenda for the October 11 meeting.)

Time allotted for private deliberations by the council was discussed. It was agreed to start the meetings at 2:30 p.m. and invite the president to join us at 3:15 p.m.

REORGANIZATION. The council would like to hear both Curt Simic's and Gerry Moseley's views on reorganization before considering the matter further. They will both be invited to the October 18 meeting but will each be asked to meet separately with the council.

ENROLLMENT AND BUDGET. The council will request that the president ask Paul Civin for an early evaluation of enrollment figures and the monetary implications for the university. The budget projections for 1983-85, as

they are now known, should be included in this report if at all possible. The council would like the opportunity to study and discuss such a report at the earliest possible time.

TASK FORCES. Council members will be regular members of task force groups but will not serve as chairpersons. All task forces should complete their initial work by the end of fall term 1982. A faculty convocation should be held to discuss all task force results.

GOVERNANCE. Council members: Fred and Barry. Barry will draft a charge for the committee by the October 11 meeting.

PLANNING. Council members: Don and Fred. Don suggested that we ask Paul Holbo to prepare a diagnosis or audit (as defined in his planning paper) and perhaps prepare some goal statements to be discussed at a faculty forum. It was learned, during the meeting, that the Albrecht planning committee is no longer in existence. Therefore, the council will proceed with the task force on planning. Don will draft a charge to the committee by the October 11 meeting. The committee will be composed of those already involved in planning and nominees from the council.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. Council members: Carolin, Sandy, and Mike. Carolin will check on the status of the "blue-ribbon" committee on undergraduate education and will make recommendations on the formation of the task force on undergraduate education at the October 11 meeting.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR. Fred noted that the state board had given permission to institutions to set their own academic calendars. He would like the president to explain what this means for the university and its continued interest in the semester system.

CURRICULAR CHANGES MANDATED BY THE LEGISLATURE. Council members would like to have a report from Mike on the effect of the change of physical education classes from the regular curriculum to self-support, and would like to discuss the implications of such curricular actions by the legislature.

SUMMER SESSION FACULTY SALARIES. Barry would like the council to be made aware of the salary schedule for the summer session faculty.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Planning
2. Governance
3. Undergraduate education
4. Malaise in the humanities
5. Need for minors in the humanities
6. Semester system for all of OSSHE
7. Possible management economies
8. Recognition of research as part of faculty work assignments
9. Classroom scheduling: scheduling of large classrooms
10. Curricular changes mandated by the legislature
11. Summer session faculty salaries
12. Reorganization

Shirley J. Wilson, secretary
SJW:att

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

Monday, October 11, 1982

Present: Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

MINUTES of the September 27 meeting were approved as corrected: page 2, line 8, replace "Fred" with "Sandy."

PROCESS. Aaron raised a number of questions about the discussion on process which took place at the September 27 meeting. He raised the issue of the appropriate role of the council and said that it should perhaps be discussed at a later meeting when there was more time.

UNIVERSITY SENATE. Aaron explained that Gerry Bogen, chairer of the University Senate, has asked that the council designate a representative to attend all Senate meetings to provide a communication link between the two groups. It was felt that it wasn't necessary for a council member to attend every meeting, but that the two chairpersons could discuss business of mutual interest. Aaron will ask for Gerry's ideas on task force membership.

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNANCE. Barry distributed the committee charge and it was approved by consensus after one addition.

TASK FORCE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. Carolin distributed the "Proposal for a Committee on Undergraduate Education" which was prepared by the 1981-82 council. She read excerpts of June 1982 council minutes which affirmed the commitment of both old and new councils to the formation of a blue-ribbon committee on undergraduate education and the president's and provost's assurances of some monetary support for such a committee. The council, by consensus, endorsed the proposal as an appropriate charge to the task force and recommended that Stan Pierson be asked to act as chairperson.

→ → TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP. Aaron asked that council members suggest faculty names in priority order for the task forces at the next council meeting.

→ → COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. Aaron explained that the council must name four to seven members to the Committee on Committees. Council members were asked to suggest names for this committee at the next council meeting. It was also agreed that the Committee on Committees be instructed to seek faculty who would have expertise to offer particular committees and not be bound to choose only those who have volunteered their services.

The president and provost joined the meeting at 11:06 a.m.

ROLE OF THE COUNCIL. Aaron stated that he viewed the role of the council as consultive and that all final decisions on matters brought before this body were clearly the president's decisions. Some council members observed that although this was the case, that there were times when the

advice given by the council to the president and provost would be made public in discussing the issues with the faculty at large. The president stated his view that the administration should seek all possible input on issues, make proposals based on its judgment and the input, listen to reactions to the proposals, and adjust proposals if the reactions and expressed views were compelling. There was some discussion of the task force on governance and the importance of the council as a direct communication link between the faculty and the administration.

COURSE SCHEDULING. The Albrecht-Moseley plan for more even distribution of courses over the day and evening hours was not advanced last spring because the 1981-82 council felt the faculty and departments needed more time to consider and react to the plan. The council affirmed that this was a managerial decision to be made by the administration and that the plan should now be presented and implemented. They also urged that some mechanism be put in place to monitor whether the policy was being followed by academic departments.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATION position has been announced and a search will be conducted. The job description includes these elements: chief contract officer for the university, responsibility for all outside business affairs of the university (including "trouble-shooting" activities), responsibility for housing, physical plant, management analyses, facilities planning, and campus security. Athletics, governmental relations and the museum will be in Curt Simic's portfolio, research support will remain with Dick Hersh, and computing with Provost Hill.

COMPUTING NEEDS. Finding a way to balance research and administrative data processing needs continues to be a major problem. Lack of money is a significant obstacle. Washington State University, for example, has two and one-half ^{times} ~~person~~ more staff to meet similar computing needs.

REGISTRATION. Council members cited serious problems faced by students in meeting their course needs during fall registration. A sizeable "provost's reserve fund" which once allowed us to expand departmental offerings "on the spot" during registration periods no longer exists. The need for course demand analysis has never been more urgent and the provost has instructed the Registrar's Office to have some kind of pre-registration process in place this spring to give us better course demand information for fall 1983. Lead time is needed to identify problem areas so that resources can be allocated accordingly. It is hoped that pre-registration can be started in a module way, doing what we can and gradually working into a satisfactory program. If nothing else, we need to define the magnitude of the pre-registration problem by getting something started.

GRANT INCOME. The provost announced that grant income is running 25% ahead of last year at this time.

→ → NEXT MEETING of the council will be at 2:30 p.m., Monday, October 18. Agenda items will be: appointments to the Committee on Committees and to the task forces, presentations on reorganization by Simic (2:45 p.m.) and Moseley (3:15 p.m.).

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
October 18, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES of the October 18 meeting were approved as corrected: page 2, fourth paragraph, fourth line: "one-half percent" should read "one-half times."

AGENDA. Sandy would like to add to the agenda the use of equity money: what policy, if any, is followed in its distribution.

PREPARATION FOR VISITORS. Shirley reviewed the history of the establishment of the position of Vice President for Student Affairs. The council agreed on questions to raise with visitors Curt Simic and Gerry Moseley.

REORGANIZATION REPORTS FROM VISITORS. Curt Simic joined the Council from 2:45 to 3:20 and discussed his ideas for reorganization. Gerry Moseley discussed his views on reorganization from 3:20 to 3:50 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. The following faculty were suggested as members of the Committee on Committees. Specific alternates were named for each person in case the appointment is refused:

ALTERNATES

Warren Brown
Esther Jacobson
Lou Osternig
John Baldwin
Kappy Eaton

Richard Steers
Arnie Zweig
Sally Fullerton
John Moseley
Russ Fernald
Ed Diller
Charlie Wright

(Warren Brown was designated to chair the committee.)

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNANCE. The following were suggested for membership: Bob Campbell, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Fred Andrews, Mick Rothbart, Jack Sanders, Bernd Crassman, Jim Lemert, Kappy Eaton, Gerry Bogen, Bob (Frank) Lacy, Roland Bartel, Bob Hurwitz, Lloyd Lovell, Peter Bergquist, Harold Hawkins, John Orbell, Keith Acheson, Dick Littman.

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. The following were suggested for membership: Carolin Keutzer, Sandy Tepfer, Mike Ellis, Stan Pierson, Mike Posner, Marion Walter, Alan Kimball, Dick Koch, John Nichols, Chaney Ryan, Emmanuel Hatzantonis, Don Lytle, Bill Cadbury, Marliss Strange, Gloria Johnson, Fay Haisley, Jack Powers, Clancy Thurber, K.J. Park, Ralph Barnhard, Ed Diller, Jan Broekhoff, Mel Aikens, Marion Walter, George Streisinger, David Soper, and Karen Sprague.

Members will consider all nominees for the task forces and suggest final committee membership at the next meeting.

Faculty Advisory Council
October 18, 1982
Page Two

NEXT MEETING: Monday, October 25, 1982, 2:30 p.m.

AGENDA:

1. Appointment of task forces on governance and undergraduate education
2. Planning
3. Malaise in the humanities
4. Semester system for all of OSSHE
5. Possible management economies
6. Recognition of research as part of faculty work assignment
7. Classroom scheduling: scheduling of large classrooms
8. Curricular changes mandated by the legislature
9. Summer session faculty salaries
10. Policy on use of "equity" moneys
11. Reorganization
12. Committee for Computer Center

Shirley Wilson, secretary

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
October 25, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick,
Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES of the October 18 meeting were approved as typed by Carolin on the word processor.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. Aaron announced that our first list of suggested faculty for the Committee on Committees had all accepted. Warren Brown declined the chairperson position. The decision of who should serve in that capacity was left with the committee. The new committee will be invited to meet with the council in the near future.

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNANCE. The following faculty were suggested as members of the task force:

Robert Campbell
Kappy Eaton
Gerry Bogen
Jim Lemert
Mary Rothbart
John Orbell
Barry Siegel
Fred Andrews
Sandy Tepfer

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. In discussing the composition of the committee, it became apparent that several issues needed to be better understood: representation from outside the university, breadth representation from inside the university, and financial support for the committee. It was agreed to raise the issue of financial support with the president and to invite Stan Pierson to attend the next council meeting to share his ideas on committee membership and purpose.

PLANNING. Don gave a brief report on the three and one-half day planning retreat held at the president's home. A list of problems was agreed upon, objectives established, and implementation discussed for two of the objectives. Another meeting is scheduled for November. Don said that there was a firm commitment to having the budget committee. Barry briefly discussed a planning document which was developed in 1979 by U.C. at Hayward. He will distribute copies for later discussion.

COMPUTING COMMITTEE. Fred is very concerned because only administrative data processing personnel are included in the document called "Committees on Computing." The council will raise the issue with the president and provost.

The president and provost joined the council at 3:28 pm.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION. Provost Hill asked for advice on what would constitute "faculty consultation" on the revised course requirements for admission which will be submitted to the State Board by the Chancellor. There was some discussion of the content and language of the document. The vocational-technical areas of study are included to accommodate OSU's agricultural students. It is anticipated that transfer students will also have to meet these requirements. Provost Hill said the document had been reviewed earlier by the Council of Deans and by the Faculty Advisory Council. The council recommended that the document be referred to the Admissions Committee for study. If that committee can make a report to the faculty before the November Board meeting, it would be desirable but not imperative. The faculty will have an opportunity to consider these matters further when the university decides on its requirements as permitted by the proposal. The council believes that there has been adequate faculty consultation at this stage of the proposal's development.

COMPUTING COMMITTEE. Provost Hill explained that the committee was formed specifically to address the problems of administrative data processing and is not a comprehensive "computing committee." The memo in question is being rewritten to clarify this and other points.

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. President Olum said that he believed a request for support money for this committee had been made to the UO Foundation but he did not know the outcome of this request. In discussing committee membership, the president warned against getting someone from the outside (or inside for that matter) who "has a particular horse to ride." The council will consult with the president before deciding on outside committee members. Other discussion on this committee was deferred until Stan Pierson could be present.

MANDATORY RETIREMENT. The president reported that mandatory retirement will be outlawed if the Claude Pepper bill passes Congress. This presents serious problems for universities since faculty are tenured and could, theoretically, continue working full-time well past age 70. This could severely restrict the hiring of young faculty members. The president urged faculty governance groups to express their views on this matter to members of the Senate and the House with copies to Claude Pepper. Council members agreed to look into the matter and consult with colleagues.

BALLOT MEASURE 3. The council will send a letter to faculty explaining the potential effect that passage of ballot measure 3 would have on the university. President Olum will contact the ASUO president and suggest a letter to the student body.

3

SUMMER SESSION. There was a general discussion of summer session which included: faculty salaries should be at the rate of 22% if feasible, this would give the university equity with OSU and PSU, our summer session must be self-supporting and is, our summer session money has been used in the past to support summer sessions at other institutions, perhaps the faculty should not be paid at the same rate in the summer session as they are in the academic year, perhaps we should divorce summer session from the regular academic year in every way possible. It was agreed that the council would like to have Dick Schminke attend the next council meeting to discuss these, and any other, summer session issues.

PLANNING. Don asked if the document on planning that came out of the planning retreat could be distributed to council members. The president agreed.

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
November 1, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull

MINUTES of the October 25 meeting were approved as circulated.

TASK FORCE ON GOVERNANCE. Siegel withdrew from the Task Force because of the heavy load associated with his assignment to the Budget Committee.

BALLOT MEASURE 3. Novick reported informally on the letter sent to faculty, indicating that he would collect shares in the cost when he receives the bill.

THE ECC ANALYSIS OF OSSHE BUDGET is available for perusal in the President's Office. It is based on four scenarios for budgeting. The ECC report concluded that FTE graduate student be modified to 12 rather than 15 hours. It also suggested tuition differentials for lower/upper division students.

PLANNING WORKSHOP REPORT. Tull presented a draft of the report resulting from the planning workshop for later discussion.

RETIREMENT UNCAPPING. Siegel reported on a variety of views that result from the proposal to uncap retirement. The ramifications of the process are not clear, and include: matters of tenure, transference of wealth, effect on promotion of younger faculty and early retirement and indexing of pensions. Careful actuarial analysis of the impact is necessary before immediate reaction is offered. Matter tabled for continued discussion.

SEMESTER SYSTEM. It was felt that the administration is interested in moving to a semester system. The discussion first turned to the council members' preferences, which were mixed. The council then turned to the issues to be weighed. The Gale Report did not, to some, seem to present a properly reasoned analysis of the three options: a) early semester, 2) late semester, 3) no change. Much of the data is still current. It was clear that the council believed that strong support from the faculty is necessary, and that the issues must be separated. It was agreed that the President be asked to clarify his intention regarding changing to a semester system.

BUDGET COMMITTEE. Siegel reported on the recent budget committee meeting. The ensuing discussion pointed up the connection between budgeting and planning.

PRESIDENT AND PROVOST joined the meeting at this time for discussion as follows:

ENROLLMENT. It was reported that the enrollment is down 7.4%. The budgetary effect is unknown since the projections of the OSSHE were for a loss of 5.8%.

SABBATTICAL LEAVES. Status of the new 85% full-time release for one term was discussed. Fear was expressed that it prices out younger faculty.

REALLOCATION OF RESOURCES. It was noted in the context of reduced enrollment, some parts of the university were turning away or restricting the entry of students.

THE PRESIDENT READ some elements of his Nov. 3rd State of the University address to verify his impression of the Faculty Advisory Council consensus on deferral of faculty salary increases.

MATH REQUIREMENT. The costs of implementing the math requirement in 1983 (\$76,000) were discussed. Alternatives for reallocation were sought. There was consensus to recommend postponement.

Ph.D. IN LINGUISTICS. The status of renaming the PhD in linguistics currently offered by the English department is that it is being held in abeyance in the Chancellor's Office. There is resistance to making a "new program" request at this time.

ADVICE ON COMMITTEES. It was recommended that the Vice President's Committees on Parking, Names and Keys ^{not} be sent to the Faculty Advisory Council for a review of their future.

SEMESTER SYSTEM. The President raised the issue of the semester system. The mandate to change to a semester system is not clear at this time. Yet to adopt a semester system, a clear faculty mandate will be necessary. The consensus was that further consultation was assumed and it was referred back to the President to facilitate a resolution.

Mike Ellis, recorder

ME:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
November 8, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Don convened the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

MINUTES of the November 1 meeting were approved with the following corrections: Page 2, fourth paragraph, second and third lines corrected to read: "Alternatives for reallocation were sought. There was consensus to investigate further." Page 2, sixth paragraph corrected to read: "It was recommended that the Vice President's Committees on Parking, Names and Keys NOT be sent to the Faculty Advisory Council for a review of their future."

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. Stan Pierson was present to discuss his views about the committee. He feels that a strong and visible commitment must come from the provost and/or president before faculty should be asked to undertake this study. Money to support the activities of the committee and perhaps having Paul Holbo as a committee member were examples of visible commitment. Stan feels that it is urgent that a systematic examination of the curriculum take place because we are going to become a smaller, tighter university and the study results should be considered in the reallocation of dwindling resources. Any study would certainly include an analysis of faculty teaching loads, ways to encourage innovative courses and methods of teaching, more interdisciplinary courses, etc. Stan believes that the university is less attractive as an undergraduate teaching institution than O.S.U. He feels that we have failed to be sensitive to and keep pace with changes occurring across the country. He believes the committee should bring to campus consultants from institutions which are doing exciting things in their undergraduate programs. Stan's advice was asked on committee membership composition. He thinks the size should be seven or nine. He doesn't feel strongly for or against outside membership. Stan indicated that his inquiries to the University of Oregon Foundation about money to support such a committee have thus far not yielded results.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE. Bob Campbell has agreed to chair the committee and joined the council at 3:05 p.m. The charge to the committee drafted by Barry was discussed. It was agreed that the role and composition of the senate and the assembly should be studied first, then the committee structure. Bob feels that the legislative role of the assembly must be preserved in any restructuring of faculty governance. Previous revisions that removed this element have failed to be adopted by the faculty. It was noted that the role of faculty in governance has been reduced because the timing of major policy issues has changed. Rapid responses are needed in these days of financial crisis and the governance structure is too slow. This need for rapid response has gradually changed the role of the Faculty Advisory Council. Shirley will send out the committee charge and the list of members to the newly-formed committee. Bob hopes to have the committee's report ready by the end of winter term.

FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL BUDGET. At the next meeting, Shirley will report on the amount of money available to the council for its activities.

RENAMING OF THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION. After a very brief discussion of the renaming of H.P.E.R. to the College of Human Development and Performance, it was decided to defer the matter to the next meeting. Council members would like to read some of the documents supporting the name change.

SUMMER SESSION. After a brief discussion the council went on record as supporting faculty summer session pay at 22% of regular salary and as being against payment on the basis of some flat fee per course.

Provost Hill joined the council at 3:45 p.m. and the council's view on summer salaries was shared with him. He said the summer session schedule and therefore the budget has to be prepared now based on estimates of enrollment, operating costs, faculty salaries, fee remissions for GTF's, etc. A faculty salary increase of nearly 6% is scheduled for June 1983 and will seriously affect the summer session budget, and therefore the course offerings. Moving to 22% would, in the provost's opinion, "put us out of business." The complexities of the summer session budget were discussed. The issues raised were: should courses pay for themselves, should departments or units pay for themselves, what happens to a faculty member's summer contract if the course doesn't meet its minimum number to be self-supporting, what happens if the summer session exceeds its total budget, what proportion of the summer faculty is made up of GTF's. It appears that a simple equation doesn't work so simply:

$$\begin{array}{l} 10\% \text{ increase in} \\ \text{faculty salaries} \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} 10\% \text{ decrease in course offerings} \\ \text{OR} \\ 10\% \text{ increase in fees} \end{array}$$

Fred and Sandy were designated to have a visit with Dick Schminke about our concerns and questions, and report at the next council meeting. Provost Hill will report on which departments need subsidizing in the summer session. The council went on record as still favoring movement of faculty salaries back toward the 22%, even if it can't be achieved all in one year. There is strong feeling among faculty about the issue of salary equity, especially since we are the only institution that delayed salary increases.

Provost Hill left the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES. The council would like Aaron to meet with the Committee on Committees at its first meeting and convey, for the council, the concerns that have been expressed about the committee system.

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. The council favors the appointment of Paul Holbo to the blue ribbon committee. Selection of other members was deferred until the next meeting.

BUDGET COMMITTEE. The council would like to hear a report next week from Barry on the activities of the budget committee.

AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 15 MEETING:

- How to make the council more effective
- Advisory Council budget
- Appointment of members to the blue ribbon committee
- Summer Session report
- HPER renaming
- Planning report
- Budget Committee report

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
November 15, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick,
Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES of the November 8 meeting were approved as distributed.

WILSON'S MEMBERSHIP STATUS. Aaron summarized a letter from Gerry Moseley asking whether Shirley could remain on the council should she be appointed half-time as Acting Dean of Students to replace Robert Bowlin for one year beginning in January 1983. After some discussion, consensus was reached that she could remain as a council member without seriously compromising the faculty legislation which excludes deans and associate deans from membership.

COUNCIL PROCEDURES. Aaron suggested, and the council agreed, that agenda items be categorized as "action" or "non-action" items. Action items will require that discussion continue until consensus is reached and a decision made. Non-action items will involve discussion only. All discussions should be well focused and non-repetitious.

Other suggestions to improve the meetings were: 1) be clear as to which issues the president and/or provost need formal opinions on and which are presented just to hear individual opinions of the council membership; 2) president and provost give as much advance notice as possible of issues they want the council to consider; 3) put agenda items in priority order, noting items as action or non-action; and 4) members raise their hands to be recognized.

COUNCIL BUDGET is \$1300. Of this amount, \$31.61 has been spent for travel to Corvallis by Mike and Fred.

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. Carolin reported on her conversation with Stan Pierson. Stan is willing to serve on the committee but not as chairperson. The council agreed that the committee should be formed before defining the role that Paul Holbo might be asked to assume.

The council reviewed the charge to the committee and agreed that members should represent professional schools as well as the College of Arts and Sciences. Suggestions for committee membership were:

- Stan Pierson (history)
- Rich Stevenson (English)
- Esther Jacobson (art history)
- Barre Toelkin (English)
- Mike Posner (psychology)
- Steve Haynes (economics)
- Jean Stockard (sociology)
- George Streisinger (biology)
- Dick Koch (mathematics)
- Jan Broekoff (physical education)
- Karen Sprague (biology)
- Carolin Keutzer (psychology)
- Mike Ellis (physical education)

The council discussed financial support necessary for the committee's activities. Budget:

GTF (3 terms)	\$ 5,276
released faculty time	10,000
consultants/conferences	1,500
TOTAL	<u>16,776</u>

It was suggested that one course of action might be to ask Hope Pressman of the UO Foundation staff to help find a sponsor (donor) for this specific activity. It might be necessary to delay the formation of the committee until funds can be found.

SUMMER SESSION. Sandy and Fred reported on their meeting with Dick Schminke. Because faculty will be paid on the base salary increase effective in June 1983, and because the summer session must pay a portion of the 12-month institutional charges, moving to a compensation rate of 22% of base would "price us out of business." Schminke stated that the summer session was dedicated to two propositions: 1) all revenue garnered by the summer session shall be expended by the summer session; 2) planning for summer 1984 will have the clear intent to restore the former rate of compensation (22% of base).

RENAMING H.P.E.R. discussion was deferred until next week so that members can review documents supplied by Provost Hill.

PLANNING. Review of the planning report was deferred until next week.

THE BUDGET COMMITTEE report was deferred until next week.

The president and provost joined the council at 4:12 p.m.

BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE. Aaron explained the importance the council places on funding for the committee. Paul said that both he and the provost had indicated to Vice President Simic that this proposal had high priority. Provost Hill reviewed the use of foundation funds now available to him for assistance to faculty. The council agreed that the funds were modest at best and were meeting deserving needs.

The president suggested that the charge be rewritten to make the committee's purpose and its importance clear to someone outside the university. When that has been done, he suggested that he, Provost Hill, and two members of the council meet with Vice President Simic to go over the proposal. It was agreed that establishment of the committee, if appropriate funding can be found, should be no later than next fall. Carolin and Mike will prepare a draft of the proposal.

THE ROLE OF OUT-OF-STATE AND FOREIGN STUDENTS in funding was brought up. The president explained that the university would be interested in collecting out-of-state tuition directly because we could lower the rate (we now charge the highest out-of-state tuition of any western university except Colorado) and perhaps increase the number of students we attract. Out-of-state students currently are charged the full cost of instruction. In principle, we should get the full amount of tuition money collected from our out-of-state students.

It was stated that O.S.U. seems to be operating on some kind of plan whereby foreign students can significantly reduce their tuition by negotiating in-kind service. No one seemed to know what this arrangement might be.

PENDING AGENDA:

- Planning report
- Renaming of H.P.E.R.
- Budget Committee
- Undergraduate Education Committee

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
November 22, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

MINUTES. It was agreed to strike the last paragraph (page 3) from minutes of the November 15 meeting.

PLANNING REPORT. Don gave a brief summary of the series of planning meetings he has attended this fall with the president, provost, and their staffs. After some discussion it was agreed that there was a need for meaningful faculty consultation about the direction the university is going; that budget crises play significant roles in shaping the institution; that someone or group(s) in the institution needs to be constantly attentive to the future and projecting how developing knowledge, technology, etc. will (or should) affect the university; and that budgetary and academic planning should be separated. The major item of business for the next meeting will be discussion of a process for developing a planning mechanism. After an initial discussion within the council, Paul Holbo will be invited to meet with us. After next week's meeting the council may be able to respond as to the disposition of the Albrecht report.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE. Aaron announced that Curt Simic has submitted a request for \$6776 to the U.S. National Bank of Oregon to help defray expenses of this committee. Mike distributed the revision of the committee's charge which he and Carolin drafted. The draft was accepted and Aaron will take it to Curt Simic.

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT. Barry reported that President Olum is chairing the committee and Paul Holbo serves as secretary. The committee is dealing with budget problems as they arise and thus far everyone seems to be well pleased with the process. Barry clarified that there is no perception on anyone's part that this committee is a planning committee.

Provost Hill joined the committee at 3:40 p.m.

H.P.E.R. NAME CHANGE. Mike reviewed the reasons and rationale for the name change to College of Human Development and Performance. Don listed criteria that should be considered in the name change as follows: the new name should represent (or at least not misrepresent) the constituencies in the college; should not conflict with or duplicate names used in other colleges; should be clear and unambiguous; and should have a positive (or at least neutral) effect on the recruitment of faculty and students. Mike assured the council that he felt these criteria were met. It was the consensus of the council that the name change be adopted.

PENDING AGENDA:

Planning

Undergraduate Education Committee

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW;att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
November 29, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:35 p.m.

MINUTES of the November 22 meeting were approved as distributed.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE. Aaron reported that Curt Simic had not been successful in his request for \$6776 from the U.S. National Bank of Oregon. He said that the president and provost felt that the schools of business and education should be represented and also suggested adding Dave Curland, Gordon Murphy, and Ralph Barnhard to the committee. Aaron suggested that we consider forming a smaller committee that might be able to accomplish some things even as we await funding. The subject was deferred.

PLANNING. After a brief discussion of questions the members wished to raise about planning, Vice-Provost Holbo was asked to join the meeting. He did so at 2:50 p.m. He outlined the essential elements of planning as he views them: 1) a small committee chaired by the provost and composed of the provost's staff, one dean, and one member of the council; 2) the committee would develop a process to get faculty input; 3) would review two sets of already existing reports prepared for the Albrecht Committee and for the Chancellor's Office; 4) would interview deans and department heads about their planning ideas; and 5) would evolve a way to evaluate areas and make decisions that would then drive the budget process. Accomplishing this without serious negative psychological consequences is necessary and poses a very difficult problem. Any program reduction would occur within the guidelines set out in the Administrative Regulations and would probably also follow guidelines of the A.A.U.P. which call for extensive faculty consultation.

The need for stated and clear criteria for contracting and expanding programs was expressed. Vice-Provost Holbo stated that his review of documents thus far indicates that in the sixties and early seventies, our reputation was based mainly on the achievements of a relatively small group of departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. By the late seventies, most departments and colleges were measuring themselves against national standards. He wants to look more closely at these evaluations. He also stated that many more statistics are available than in H.P.U.P. years to help gain a picture of departmental activities.

The question was raised as to whether the provost or the committee would make the final decisions. It is hoped that decisions would be made by consensus. If the decision is one of resource allocation, the decision rests with the provost; if program closures are involved, the decision is the president's with full faculty consultation.

Council members expressed concern about the potential for severe budget cuts with little time for planful reductions in programs. If

the council is consulted on these kinds of decisions, they would like to have as much information as possible. Provost Hill stated that the council had been consulted on all budgetary-academic program issues and the reaction of council members played an important part in final decisions. Provost Hill also stated that the lack of public review of contingency plans for meeting budget cuts had kept programs from crumbling because of the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome.

Vice-Provost Holbo left at 3:26 p.m.

President Olum joined the council at 3:40 p.m.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION: P.S.U. vs. U. of O. The president described his view of the appropriate roles of P.S.U. and the U. of O. within the state system. Currently P.S.U. receives much more than its share of funding and we receive much less. Our enrollment decline has made the situation even more alarming (6.9% decline overall; 14% decline in freshmen).

STATE OF WASHINGTON SIX-YEAR PLAN. The president was favorably impressed by the report of Washington's counterpart to our E.C.C. He disagrees, however, with the recommendations for the University of Washington that it become primarily an upper-division and graduate student institution. He said we need to be alert to similar recommending activities from our E.C.C.

PLANNING. The president answered questions and expressed his views about planning: 1) not interested in planning for decline; 2) academic planning should not be tied to the budget; 3) should assume stable funding and then look at what the shape of the university should be; 4) in steady-state funding, money would/should be re-allocated and not simply returned to the departments and programs that were cut; 5) contingency planning is done -- the question is "what to do with this planning information?"; 6) if contingency plans are made public, you may create a cut that won't be necessary -- Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle that the observation changes the result (the old "measurement problem"); 7) Paul Holbo's committee should be addressing the large question of the general shape of the university for the future; 8) that which should be emphasized should be determined by the departments themselves because they are the only ones who know the direction things are going in their own fields.

AGENDA:

- Planning
- Undergraduate Education Committee
- Semester System for all of OSSHE
- Possible management economies
- Recognition of research as part of faculty work assignment
- Classroom scheduling: scheduling for large classrooms
- Policy on use of "equity" monies
- Reorganization: Vice-President for Student Services

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att

MINUTES
Faculty Advisory Council
December 6, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Mike Ellis, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Shirley Wilson

Aaron convened the meeting at 2:36 p.m.

MINUTES of the November 29 meeting were approved as distributed.

AGENDA. Shirley will list agenda items as they are known at the time of the meeting. Members should call Aaron with additional items that come up after the meeting. It was decided that the semester system had low priority for consideration by the council this term and that the matter of equity money should be discussed during winter term. Uncapping of retirement age and a memo from Dean Berdahl about paper grading in 400-level courses were added to today's agenda. Aaron will be meeting with Stan Pierson Tuesday to talk about the possibility of beginning to work on issues of undergraduate education even before funding is found for the "Blue Ribbon" committee.

UNCAPPING RETIREMENT AGE. President Olum asked that the council consider again whether it wished to send a letter opposing this legislation. After much discussion, it was evident that tenure and the uncapping issue are coupled; that mechanisms to insure that faculty retire at "reasonable" times are not in place; that the consequences of the legislation are potentially more troublesome for higher education than other professions; and that the council could not agree on the specifics of a letter to the federal legislature.

PLANNING. There was a general discussion of the problems we face (or could face) because of lack of planning, the role of administrators and faculty in the planning and action process of educational change, the fact that allocation of resources structures the university, and that there is no comfortable place either for systematic examination of changing economics, populations, technology, etc. or for the reception of creative/innovative/progressive proposals.

It was felt that the Albrecht report is at least a first attempt to look at the nature of the university a few years hence and deserves our study and discussion. It was also agreed that the university does not cope well with sharp shifts in student enrollment patterns. There was some feeling that planning doesn't come out of committees but must come out of the activities of the faculty in their various disciplines. Some felt that an aggressive faculty and responsive administration was the best planning formula for a university. Others felt that this model assumes that we are nothing but a group of departments loosely held together by a budget (or a football team). The discussion terminated due to entropy.

The president and provost joined the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

FACULTY ASSEMBLY. The president will announce the renaming of HPER as the College of Human Development and Performance, ask for faculty comment on the proposed admission requirements, and introduce Les

Anderson who will make a presentation on foreign languages and international studies. The president will explain that we will have enough money to cover our budget needs this year; however, we are still in trouble for the next biennium.

UNCAPPING RETIREMENT. The president feels that uncapping retirement might mean the end of tenure, for the AAUP is not willing to have tenure age-related. The combination of uncapping and tenure will shut off a significant source of refreshment in the university's intellectual life, viz., the hiring of young faculty. (The age discrimination law won't allow us to give tenure at 65 years of age unless Congress passes a rider on the uncapping legislation.)

BERDAHL MEMORANDUM. Aaron explained that the council was concerned about number 3 in the memo because it seems to abridge faculty authority and because it looks like a broad policy was created to deal with a specific problem.

MODEL PROGRAMS FOR FRESHMEN AND SOPHOMORES WITH 300-LEVEL COURSES. Provost Hill reported that a community college president has objected to some of the model programs listed in our catalog that include 300-level courses to be completed during the first two years of study. His contention is that this makes it difficult for a community college to prepare students for transfer to certain departments. Gerry Moseley will be asked to determine the extent of the problem (if there is a problem) before considering what action should be taken.

NEXT MEETING. The next meeting of the council will be Monday, January 3, 1983, unless the president needs a special meeting in the interim.

AGENDA:

- Course scheduling and classroom utilization policy
- Planning
- "Blue Ribbon" committee on undergraduate education (Aaron's report)
- Policy on use of "equity" monies
- Reorganization: Vice-President for Student Affairs
- Possible management economies
- Recognition of research as part of faculty work assignment

Shirley Wilson, secretary

SJW:att