

Minutes

Faculty Advisory Council
January 4, 1982

Members present: F. Andrews, M. Gale, C. Keutzer, L. Pierce, S. Pierson,
S. Tepfer

1. Stan made several announcements. The joing UO/OSU faculty council letter requesting a chance to meet with Chancellor candidates received a favorable response from Louis Perry, chairer of the Search Committee. A meeting is scheduled in room 310 Allen Hall at 3:30 p.m. January 5 with representatives of AOF and IFS to discuss legislative strategy. The FAC is concerned about likely program cuts which might result if AOF is successful in defeating the salary cut proposals in the Governor's budget.
2. There will be an evening meeting on Wednesday, January 13, at 7:30 p.m. at the Pierce's (2066 University). The propose of the meeting is to review the Council's work to date and to plan an agenda for the remainder of the year. Among the items to be discussed are:
 - Nomination procedures for Senate and University Committees
 - Undergraduate education (Jim Buch's concern about structure)
 - Finals week
 - Reorganization
 - Differential fees and credit-for-sale problems
3. The Council agreed that memorials should take no longer to read than five minutes, but that remarks could be extended for the minutes of the General Assembly. This statement agrees substantially with a proposal by Keith Richard to limit memorials to two double-spaced pages. The Council there-fore later endorsed the Richard proposal.
4. The Council is still concerned about alternatives for cutting the University budget. It feels that all options should be considered including a "buy-out" approach, cuts across the board, cuts of schools, and salary cuts.
5. The Council discussed revisions in sabbatical policy. It agreed to discuss further the pros and cons of abolishing one-term sabbaticals. Most members supported the changes proposed by the Chancellor's office which would dis-courage short sabbaticals and provide a strong incentive for year-long sabbaticals.
6. Paul Olum joined the Council at 3:00 p.m. We first disposed of the memorials issue. Next we turned to the budget situation. Paul has prepared a state-ment on the budget which will be distributed along with the minutes of the meeting. He expressed some concern with one of AOF's arguments for opposing salary cuts, the argument that program cuts are necessary in order to make the State System more viable in the future. Paul opposed salary cuts and program cuts. We discussed efforts within the administration to fight the Governor's budget proposals. We also discussed how salary cuts would actually be administered at the University. At some point, answers to the questions coming from faculty about salary cuts, whether in the form of a furlough or reduced FTE need to be spelled out.
7. The next meeting of the Council will be Monday, January 11, at 1:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Minutes

Faculty Advisory Council

January 11, 1982

Present: Andrews, Gale, Jacobson, Keutzer, Pierson; Pierce came in at 3:30

1. Review of FAC and AOF/IFS meeting on January 5: Pierson felt that it was a useful meeting, resulting in better understanding on all sides and general agreement that there was a danger in speaking too strongly only on the issue of faculty salary cuts.
 2. Discussion of Olum's letter to Senator James Gardner stressing the unacceptability of any faculty salary cuts.
 3. Andrews -- two concerns:
 - a) faculty concern expressed for clarification of the meaning of "furlough": when would it happen? how would it happen?
 - b) meeting sponsored by AOF Political Action Committee to acquaint faculty with committee's activities: January 20, 3:30 pm, Dad's room, EMU.
 4. Carolin Keutzer presented a statement of concern about the manner in which the Council's meetings have been conducted and the directions in which the Council has (or has not) been moving. Her concerns center on both conduct and substance. There followed a general discussion.
 5. Esther will get up-date on International Studies Program.
-

Hill and Olum came in shortly after 3:00 pm.

1. Discussion of sabbatical leave policy: issue apparently temporarily tabled in Chancellor's office. Hill and Olum continue to favor it since it would encourage longer leaves for a more productive period. Olum observed that the new policy would probably cost the UO more money. He also confirmed that sabbatical leave requests are, in fact, carefully scrutinized and even, at times, refused.
2. Olum referred to Hersh report (being prepared) on the economic impact of further University cuts. The report is intended, in part, to correct data disseminated by McLaughlin. There followed a general discussion on the budget.
3. Hill reported on his and Olum's meeting with Shipman and the Library Committee, in the wake of the latter's concern regarding perceived cuts in the Library budget. Hill indicated that there was to be \$24,000 restored to the Acquisitions budget, and that the Library Committee seemed to have uncalled for concern that the Administration was not being supportive of the Library. A question was raised about the wisdom of exploring the sharing of some journal resources with OSU. Hill expressed concern that the only beneficiary of such a plan would be OSU.
4. Olum raised the issue of UO's career training: about 56% of UO graduates come out of professional programs, and about 19% from career preparatory programs in CAS, for a grand total of about 75% of UO graduates.

5. Regarding the OPEU article in the Emerald of January 11: Olum expressed concern that Becky Bragg's comments might appear to be devisive. Stan agreed to call her and speak with her about her comments and concerns.
6. Regarding the OSU computer course at Eugene's Radio Shack (reported in a recent Emerald): Should the issue of such courses and other "off-campus" efforts be raised with the State Board office? General agreement that Olum and Hill should consider so doing.
7. Olum continues to feel that any public discussion of faculty furloughs would be premature. Hill insisted that he and Olum should not be present at any Advisory Council discussion of the matter. Furloughs would be as follows, according to State analysts: 1½% salary cut = 4 days during 1981-82; 6½% salary cut = 16.5 days during 1982-83. It is unknown if these were work days or included weekends.
8. Hill assured the Council that the 10% cut which the Deans have been asked to "prepare" was only to graphically show what would happen.

4:20 - Olum and Hill left. The Council stayed and discussed Larry's proposal that there be an Advisory Council resolution to the faculty against further tuition increase. In discussion, plan was amended to have the Council write a letter to the Emerald, to be read as a "statement of concern" at this week's Assembly, making note of the unacceptability of salary cuts, etc., but focusing on the destructive effects, specifically, of tuition increases. Stan will write, consulting with others.

Esther Jacobson
1/11/82

Minutes

Faculty Advisory Council

January 18, 1982

Members present: Andrews, Clark, Gale, Jacobson, Keutzer, Pierson, Tepfer

Meeting convened at 1:30 in the President's office.

1. Stan reported discussion with Becky Bragg: she believes that her remarks were distorted by being taken out of context. She feels that staff and faculty are very much together in the salary cut issue.

Stan will send the Advisory Council Statement of Concern (read at the last faculty assembly) to the Emerald and to legislators.

Stan will ask Jim Buch to come to the Council meeting next Monday, 1:45.

2. Esther: update on the International Studies Program. UO has proposed to the Chancellor (letter from Olum of December 29) a plan to split the administration of the foreign language programs with OSU. Students would register with their home institutions, pay a \$500.00 administrative fee, and institutional faculty would be used for directorships, or shared directorships would be explored. The Board is to consider the proposal at its January meeting. (See letter from Olum for further detail).

Esther reported on AAA exploration of 1) studio fees and 2) fee differential. The former would revert to the School, in support of essential teaching supplies (furniture, etc.). The latter would ideally be used to offset the costs of expensive professional programs. AAA has been frustrated in the exploration of both added fees, with Administration doubtful such suggestions would be entertained in the Chancellor's office. The discussion raised a number of points: that a studio fee might be related to any studio course, while a fee differential might be levied only against the majors of a professional program. A number of the Council members expressed reservation about levying different tuition on students just because they are majoring in one program rather than another. It was also restated, however, that the studio or lab fee does not address the basic cost problem of the programs. Chapin explained that the library fee, first allowed on a three year basis, was intended primarily for library use in response to accrediting problems due to library funding; the Dean has discretionary use of the fund and it is also used to support some teaching positions. Problem is that the fee (raised to \$400 last year by legislative action) is not subject to inflationary increase.

Esther was assigned to develop a position paper on the studio fee/fee differential subject during the next few weeks.

3. Regarding concerns about upper level administrative personnel. Maradel will continue to pursue the problem of finding a context within which to consider the issue.
4. Fred and Sandy: no report yet on faculty governance matter. Discussion on the extension of voting rights to non-teaching faculty: Stan and Chapin expressed concern regarding withdrawing such rights at this point in time. Sandy suggested a compromise: that only tenured non-teaching officers retain voting rights. To be further explored. . .
5. The Council decided to wait until the meeting with Buch to discuss the issue of undergraduate education. Stan would like to see the Advisory

Council urge Olum to appoint a blue-ribbon committee to consider the whole range of issues associated with the subject. Chapin would like such a committee to be treated as a prestigious, working committee, with staff and the expectation of publishing and disseminating a final report. The committee would also be involved with such practical issues as advising, as well as with larger, more general issues. Each Council member should think of names of people who might be recommended to Olum.

3:00 p.m. - Olum came in briefly. Hill and Pierce in Salem. Olum reported on the general agreement between the University's position and that of Gardner's subcommittee. Meeting dismissed at 3:15.

EJ

Minutes
Faculty Advisory Council
January 25, 1982

All members present

I. Larry gave a report on efforts underway to organize the University's science faculty in support of economic development in Oregon. He also reported on the chancellor's search process.

II. The Council endorsed an AAUP letter addressed to our congressional delegation objecting to cuts in student financial aid.

III. Jim Buch described some of his observations about the University's image in the state. According to Jim, the University is still perceived as a very liberal place in a conservative state. Many people do not believe our claims about quality at Oregon. Some parents remember the demonstrations of the 1960's and regard the University as an unsafe and unwholesome place to send their children. Jim went on to describe how his office is trying to overcome some of these perceptions. The Council was interested in ways we could improve the educational program which would attract more students. Jim commented on problems with registration, advising, large classes, etc. He suggested that the faculty could do more by insisting that people in administration get the registration and advising systems reorganized. The Council agreed with Jim that the University could do a better job of articulating its goals and its plans for achieving them. We need a more consistent approach or strategy for selling the University to the citizens of Oregon. Something has to be done to convince Oregonians of our stature and to elicit more pride in their major state university.

IV. Dick Hill discussed the latest developments in Salem regarding both the budget and the budget notes. He also reported on the State Board meeting in Portland.

V. Chapin presented a vigorous complaint on the treatment of the Law School in discussions of budget reductions. He objected specifically to the fact that the Law School has been discussed in the press in examples of the effects of program cuts, yet apparently is not intended to be cut. He implied that the administration should either put schools on the chopping block or say nothing.

VI. Members of the Council discussed with Dick their concerns about undergraduate education. Several proposed the appointment of a Blue Ribbon Committee (perhaps including outsiders) which would study and propose a plan for improving undergraduate education at Oregon. Dick thought such a plan would have to come from the faculty. The Council felt the faculty would not act without strong leadership from the President's office. We all agreed that the idea would have to be discussed at a later meeting with the President.

VII. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, February 1, in the Johnson Hall Conference Room at 1:30 p.m.

FRED ANDREWS
MATHEMATICS

Minutes of the Faculty Advisory Council Meeting

February 15, 1982

Present: All members but Larry Pierce

1. Reports from Stan Pierson: on the planning committee which is now considering how to handle the material it has received -- proposals in terms of function and in terms of impact on (modifications to) the existing structure of the University. Stan also reported on meeting with Chancellor candidates. He indicated that Dean Tollenaar of CSPA had expressed an interest in meeting with the Advisory Council to discuss his School: where it is, where it's come from. There was some expression of reservation that one dean, from all, should have such an opportunity, but the majority of the Council agreed to invite Tollenaar to come to the meeting on February 22. On that day, the Council will try to meet early (1:30) with Paul Olum, and conduct its own meeting later. Stan reported that Barbara Edwards had agreed that Jerry Medler would be an acceptable appointee to the Committee on Public Access to T.V., on recommendation of the Council.
2. Fred Andrews reported on nomination proposals: proposed a process for nominations to major University committees which would allow the Committee on Committees to nominate candidates for all positions, and to reduce the number of names required for a petition to 10. Carolin and Esther objected to the need for any supporting names; Sandy suggested a return to the "old" system. The result of the discussion was that Fred would offer a notice of motion in his own name, and that Carolin would offer a substitute motion from the floor.
3. Regarding the finals week problem: the Council agreed that the student motion regarding dead week would complement its concern with finals week. They accepted Stan's written statement to Dick Hill with the following change of wording:
". . . will require all faculty members giving final examinations, who plan to depart from the printed exam schedule, to report and justify that departure in advance."

Dick Hill and Paul Olum came in at 2:30

4. Paul Olum discussed his recent meeting with the Chancellor regarding the budget note requiring cut proposals. (Proposals due to the Chancellor's Office on February 24). There was some discussion regarding the necessity to make pay cuts less "painful," i.e. through not opening the University until October 1, or closing it earlier in the spring term. There was also some discussion about the use of a "graduated" pay cut. Paul feels that until the budgetary situation is clarified, there is not much use in developing specific plans.
5. Dick Hill accepted the Council's proposal regarding finals week.
6. Stan proposed that the Journalism School make increased efforts to reach the Oregon press, particularly The Oregonian, in order that there might be better understanding of the University. Dick and Paul both feel that there has been good progress made in the University's relations with the press, but agreed to get together with Everette Dennis to develop a new strategy (Olum, Simic, Dennis).
7. There was a discussion regarding reinstatement of the early-retirement plan, rechristened "tenure relinquishment" plan: the same, just maybe a little different?

The meeting adjourned at 3:19.

EJ for LP

Minutes

Faculty Advisory Council

February 22, 1982

All members present

1. The Council agreed to meet on Mondays from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. during the Spring quarter.
2. Fred proposed a shift of classes to the even hours as a way of increasing the number of instructional periods during the day.
3. Larry reported on recent legislative developments and the progress of the chancellor search.
4. Ken Tollenaar and Bryan Downes joined us at 2:00 p.m. to discuss recent developments in CSPA. They described the history of CSPA, the evolution of its programs, and its recent metamorphosis. There is a new CSPA. Faculty members are committed to applied social research. The curriculum focuses on management, policy analysis, research methods and service delivery with an emphasis on experiential learning. They admit it has been difficult to convince colleagues on campus that the quality of its programs and faculty have improved. The faculty of CSPA hope to keep their independent school status while pursuing possibilities of greater coordination and cooperation with other areas of Arts and Sciences as well as other professional programs.
5. Paul and Dick joined the meeting at 2:45 p.m. There was more discussion of the legislative action increasing higher education cuts by \$5 million. Alternatives for managing the cuts were discussed. It was agreed that a special meeting would be held to discuss budget reduction alternatives. Paul continues to insist that salary reductions not be imposed on faculty and staff without their full consultation.
6. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, March 1 at 1:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall conference room.

FRED ANDREWS
MATHEMATICS

Faculty Advisory Council

FRED ANDREWS
MATHEMATICS

Minutes - March 1, 1982

Members present: Andrews, Clark, Gale, Jacobson, Pierce, Pierson, Tepfer.

1. The minutes of the previous meeting were distributed along with a memorandum from Mordechai Kreinin on the Michigan State approach to financial crisis.
2. Larry reviewed developments in the search for a new chancellor. He also reported for the fourth consecutive week that the legislature was close to adjournment. There was also a brief review of recent enrollment projections by the State Board staff and their implications for the University.
3. Most of the Council's discussion centered on budget cuts imposed by the Oregon legislature. The Special Session reduced the Department of Higher Education, Education and General Service Budget by \$16,171,755 from \$322,966,405 to \$306,794,650. This is a 5% cut in the State System's biennial budget. In effect, it is a 10% cut in the 1982-83 budget, since almost all of the reductions were made in two parts. The first cuts, amounting to \$10,692,073, were made before the Governor announced that the State was short an additional \$99.8 million dollars. These cuts were to come largely from program reductions. The second group of cuts amounting to \$5,479,702 came after the Governor's announcement of the additional revenue shortfall, and were tentatively identified by the Governor's recommendations and the Ways and Means Committee as salary reductions.
4. The University of Oregon's share of the program cuts assigned by the Board is \$1,300,000. Its share of the additional program or salary cuts is \$1,400,000. The Council discussed with Dick Hill the alternatives for implementing these cuts. The Council was also concerned with faculty involvement in the decisions about these cuts and whether the proposed meeting of the University faculty and staff on Wednesday, March 3 would provide a useful forum for faculty participation.
5. At 3:00 p.m. the Council was joined by representatives of other faculty groups on campus. Present were Carl Hosticka, Nat Teich, Tom Brady, Paul Civin, Barry Siegel, Jack Sanders, Kappy Eaton, Randy Moore and Judy Merkle. Dick Hill set forth the options available to the University to meet the cuts in both parts of the budget reduction proposal. Barry Siegel argued for a more decentralized approach, one similar to the social contract approach advocated by Kreinin at Michigan State. Others felt that the Administration needed to have some figures on paper so that the faculty and staff would have something to look at during the discussion. Dick Hill suggested that the Wednesday meeting would be an informational meeting and would deal mainly with faculty reactions to various proposals for reducing salaries to meet the second budget cut, the \$1,400,000. Hill thought that

there would have to be a second meeting to discuss program cuts required by the first part of the budget reductions.

6. The Council was concerned about the difficulty of explaining the current budgetary situation and options to the faculty and staff. It encouraged the Provost to prepare tables and outlines for distribution at the meeting. Several members suggested that the Wednesday meeting be postponed until the President returned to campus and had time to develop a specific proposal. The Council agreed, however, that the timing of the next State Board meeting required the Administration to go ahead with the Wednesday meeting.
7. The next regular meeting of the Advisory Council will be on Monday, March 8, at 1:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - March 8, 1982

Members present: Andrews, Clark, Gale, Jacobson, Keutzer,
Pierce, Pierson

1. The Council agreed to hold a meeting next week at the regular time to consider the idea of a university convocation of some kind on the prospects of the University of Oregon in the 1980s. We also agreed to hold a special evening meeting of the Council on Wednesday, March 31 at 7:30 p.m. Fred Andrews has offered to host the meeting at his home at 2705 Emerald.
2. The Council spent much of its hour and a half discussing reactions to the President's convocation on the budget crisis. It is impossible to summarize the various reactions with any accuracy. Most seemed to agree that Paul did a good job of presenting information and handling comments from the floor. There seems to be broad support for Paul's leadership in this situation, and broad but not unanimous support for his proposal to delay the faculty and staff pay increases. There were some faculty objections to the range of choices offered by the administration. There were negative reactions to the educational leave proposal. Individual faculty wrote in favor of furloughs, cutting administrators' pay, and planning.
3. The Council is somewhat divided on the issue of the need for contingency plans. Stan, Maradel and Chapin think we need a specific plan for making additional cuts that are inevitable. Larry, whose opinion is probably tainted by his partial co-optation by the administration, argued against pessimistic projections and taking actions that will reduce administration flexibility and that may even increase the chances of additional cuts. There was some agreement on a compromise idea that the Advisory Council sponsor a meeting on how to preserve quality at the University of Oregon in the 1980s. This would permit us to discuss admission and tuition policies, program alternatives, and faculty salaries under various funding levels. The Council agreed to meet again in the hope of developing a specific proposal for a university meeting.
4. After Paul and Dick joined the Council at 3:00 p.m., we continued our weekly discussion of budgets. Paul and Dick reported that progress was made last week in getting the Chancellor to reduce the amount to be taken as program cuts. At this time, we are required to come up with approximately \$304 thousand of program cuts, of which \$75 thousand are for Board options. Dick reviewed in some detail what programs and approaches were under consideration. The Council seemed in agreement with the administration's general strategy for handling the cuts still required in the "so-called" package 1. We will try to take \$480 thousand of cuts required because of the withdrawal of our enrollment increase

money and the underfunding savings, from additional salary savings. The administration will give the Board about \$229 thousand in program cuts. It will request that the \$75 thousand for Board options consist of selected soft money cuts.

5. Paul discussed the Chancellor's search and his concerns with the current frontrunner. The Board has not made a decision yet. There is time to raise issues with the Board members.
6. There were a variety of other issues: Dick asked us for an opinion on Bingo to help finance some special programs on campus. He also reported problems that the cluster requirements are posing for community college counselors. Finally, Stan was asked to draft a letter to Ed Harms supporting the administration's position on delayed salary increases but decrying the selective tax on faculty and the deterioration of faculty salaries. We agreed that the letter should be couched in terms of the ultimate impact of these trends on students and the quality of life in Oregon.
7. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, March 15 at 1:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - March 15, 1982

All members present

1. Announcement: Stan issued a call for items to put on the agenda of our Spring evening meeting on March 31. He reported that despite doubts about its efficacy, the Planning Committee is beginning to move ahead. He encouraged Council members to submit their own views on University reorganization.
2. Carolin reported on the "rooms" problem. Having been ignored in previous weeks' minutes, she dramatized the issue by presenting several startling points:
 1. There is no room allocation czar to arbitrate assignment disputes.
 2. Rooms are currently underutilized because:
 - a. Hoggers in Biology, Humanities, as examples, use large rooms for small classes.
 - b. Too many primadonnas teach only during prime teaching hours.
 - c. Many large rooms are used for only 5 hours a day.
 3. Some department heads manipulate the informal allocation mechanism to their advantage.
 4. Many rooms are allocated for three terms based only on fall term requirements.
 5. The Albrecht memo does not speak to the real problems which are a need for more information and a firm room allocation policy. Instead it deals with a previously unworkable proposal to spread courses throughout the day and evening hours.

Carolin was rewarded for her brilliant job of investigative reporting by being asked to look more deeply into the problem.

3. Esther asked that the idea of differential fees be tabled for lack of interest in the University and the State System. Larry is looking for a guinea pig to try out an alternative early retirement plan designed to actually save the University some money.
4. Discussion of the convocation continued. Letters from Al Urquhart and Gus Alef were reviewed briefly. Several points seem to be repeated in various communications about the convocation. Most accept some sort of salary reduction for handling the short term problems. Educational leaves do not have much support outside of Economics. Many faculty want to see more planning. A discussion ensued about the meaning of planning. Some seem to want rationalizations for cutting

someone else's budget. Others want more information about the University budget, programs, policies, etc. Several issues seem present: Are long range plans better than short range plans? Are plans helpful or hurtful? Do they result in a better allocation of resources or self-fulfilling prophecies?

5. The Council seemed to agree that the proposal for a university forum was a good one. Fred Andrews suggested that the Council select a representative group of no more than 100 persons to set an agenda. This group's deliberations would be followed by meetings at department and college levels. Each of these discussion groups would then report back to the initial representative body which would presumably present the report. No decision was reached on the forum, and discussion of its organization and purpose was moved to the agenda of our next meeting.
6. Dick Hill and Paul Olum joined us at 3:00 pm. We began a review of the cuts proposed by the administration to meet the Package 1 cuts. The Council gave support for the proposal but encouraged the administration to explain the extent to which consultation with the faculty and deans helped shape the proposal and also to explain what things were not proposed and why.
7. Other issues were mentioned. Paul mentioned his letter arguing against our \$475,500 enrollment increase cut. Dick brought us up to date on discussions with GTFs and classified employees about salary cuts. The actions of the Chancellor in transferring the International Studies program to OSU were carefully discredited.
8. The next meeting of the Council will be March 29 at 2:30 pm in the Johnson Hall Conference Room. Remember, we have moved the meeting time back one hour Spring term.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - March 29, 1982

All members present

1. The agenda for the Council's special meeting Wednesday evening, March 31 at 2705 Emerald St. was the first order of business. Besides issues on our continuing agenda, members requested an opportunity to discuss problems and possible reforms of faculty governance at the University, the need for stronger administrative personnel, and relations with the new Chancellor. Stan agreed to prepare an agenda for the meeting.
2. Stan reported that the Albrecht Committee is making progress. Two particular issues were directed to the FAC for discussion. The first was whether the Council would support the Planning Committee's proposal to consolidate the teaching of statistics across campus. The Council agreed that some improvements could be realized by better coordinating our statistics programs. The main advantage was perceived to be in the quality of courses taught, rather than in the saving of resources. The second issue was the need to give priority to programs in computing science and geology. The Council was surprised that geology was singled out for particular attention. Several members felt that the growing pressure to increase the size of our computer science program was another indication of growing vocationalism in higher education. Computing Science is important, but it shouldn't be supported at the expense of the core of the liberal arts program of the University.
3. Questions were raised about the utility of having a spring forum given the administration's diffidence about its utility. The Council generally agreed, however, that it would be useful to go ahead with the planning of such a meeting, in order to give faculty a chance to voice their concerns about the future of the University. We decided to circulate a one page letter to faculty asking them for ideas to be discussed at a faculty forum. We would also ask them for ideas about the format of such a meeting and whether they would be willing to spend a day in such activity.
4. Council members were encouraged to bring the names of potential candidates for the Advisory Council and the Faculty Personnel Committee to the Wednesday meeting.
5. Dick Hill reported on the actions of the State Board last week. The Board reduced our budget by the full \$304,000. In addition to these cuts, the University still must save \$475,000 to cover the loss of the enrollment increase money. It may also be facing the loss of up to \$1.2 million of indirect cost credit funds. It is unclear how much of that loss was actually budgeted in 1982-83. The Council supports the administration's decision to make our funding problems public. It gave encouragement to Paul's decision to visit with the new Chancellor this week.
6. The question was raised as to whether the UO should challenge the State Board's decision when it is reviewed by the Emergency Board in April or whenever it comes up. No decision was made. Larry agreed to find out more about the review process, especially the role of the ECC and the Education subcommittee. When more information is available from these sources and the new Chancellor, Paul will decide whether it is worthwhile making a fuss over a few hundred thousand dollars.

7. Dick reported that some of Civin's functions will be returned to Ralph Sunderland's office when the new budget reporting system is in place and tested. The system was supposed to be up by March 1. Paul responded to a skeptic who wondered whether improvement in the budgeting system was imminent given the personnel responsible to implement the system by saying that Ray's replacement would be responsible for reorganizing the administrative side of the University.
8. The meeting was abruptly adjourned so that the chairer could catch the opening of the NCAA championship game.
9. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, April 4 in the Johnson Hall Conference Room at 2:30 p.m.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - April 5, 1982

All members present

1. Larry reported on the recent meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. The Joint Advisory Councils of the four state universities will meet in Corvallis on May 4th. The IFS is also taking steps to establish a working relationship with the new chancellor. A major issue discussed by the IFS concerned the role of the AOF in lobbying for faculties in the state system. A major complaint with AOF is that it has focused too much on cutting the size of the state system and not enough on raising funds to support it. The Advisory Council agreed to discuss this issue with local AOF representatives. Larry has been invited to address the AOF Executive Committee on April 10th in Salem.
2. The Council approved a final draft of a memorandum to be sent to all voting faculty on the proposal to hold a campus forum this spring. Faculty members are asked to return their responses to Larry Pierce by April 16th.
3. The Council agreed to invite Vice President Hawk to a future meeting to discuss the University's current state of disrepair. Among problems to be brought to his attention are leaking roofs, inadequate and excessive heating, peeling paint and missing grass, litter and filth, and inappropriate security.
4. Paul Olum gave an optimistic report on his visit with the new chancellor. Mr. Davis wants to reestablish the strength of Oregon's research universities and seems to have the experience needed to do it. It appears that the new chancellor will enjoy a political honeymoon at least in his relationships with the University of Oregon administration.
5. The Council offered its commendations to the Provost for his fine statement to the State Board of Higher Education at its March meeting.
6. The President distributed copies of a proposed salary statement to faculty. It called for a 5.3% increase on September 15 to be delayed until approximately March 7, and a 6% increase on May 1st. Several issues were discussed. Concern was expressed about reports that OSU would be able to give a 4% increase on July 1 because of its more favorable treatment in the latest round of budget cuts. The Council agreed that as much of the increase as possible should be announced by July 1st to limit the legislature's option of further reducing faculty salary increases. Several members argued for allocating a significant part of the 11.3 percent increase in the form of merit and equity increases. This is necessary to provide flexibility and to award excellence. There was some discussion of reserving a portion of the salary increase money to provide the Provost with a larger fighting fund reserve.
7. The Council plans to invite Gerry Moseley and Barry Savage to explain to the Council why we do not have a computerized preregistration system at Oregon. Both the President and the Provost asked to be included.
8. The Council presented the President with a letter urging him to begin the process of filling the Vice President for Administration position.
9. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, April 12 at 2:30 pm in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - April 12, 1982

All members present

1. Stan opened the meeting with announcements. Next week the Council will discuss the faculty responses to the proposed Spring forum. Wanda Johnson asked to be included in our discussion of preregistration.
2. The Council generally agreed with the proposal for improving parking area lighting by instituting a one-year increase in parking fees.
3. Vice-President Hawk joined the Council at 2:45 pm to answer questions about maintenance at the University. Many issues came up: the poor condition of roofs, problems of differentiating between rehabilitation and maintenance funds, cuts in the physical plant budget, and general management of the physical plant. A picture emerged from our discussion of an operation that is relatively autonomous from the rest of the University. Harold Babcock supervises about 200 employees, almost all of whom are classified, and some of whom are not very effective. Events have forced Babcock to give top priority to improving the efficiency of the University's heating plant. Progress has been made in this area but at the expense of maintenance and rehabilitation of other University facilities. The appointment of building managers may improve supervision of the janitorial personnel on campus. The Physical Plant has also been more flexible in allowing University employees to do more of their own work, such as painting. The Vice-President encouraged us to talk directly with Harold Babcock, since he is both in charge of maintenance and better informed about many of the problems we raised.
4. President Olum and Provost Hill joined the Council at 3:30 pm. Larry reported on his discussions with the Executive Committee of AOF.
5. The Council reported its support of the parking fee increase proposal and made several suggestions for changing wording in the new smoking regulation.
6. Dick reported on the administration's attempts to come up with a salary proposal for 1982-83. Consideration will be given to the OSU and PSU plans before further discussions with the Council and Deans on our own proposal.
7. Dick reported on the new chancellor's visit to campus last week. The report was very positive.
8. The next meeting will be on Monday, April 19 at 2:30 pm in the Johnson Hall Conference Room. The President will be attending the AAU meeting in Washington, D.C. and will not be present.

Minutes - April 19, 1982

All members present

1. There is a concern that the Register-Guard does not adequately announce or cover important lectures on campus. Some felt that the News Bureau is negligent while others thought the Guard itself is to blame. Stan agreed to raise the issue with Curt Simic.
2. Much of our time was spent debating the pros and cons of holding a forum this spring on the plight of the University. 102 of the 130 faculty that responded to our questionnaire on the subject favored such a meeting. Some faculty objected to another meeting, preferring instead to concentrate on their teaching and scholarship. Others thought that a large fall meeting early in October would be more appropriate. Such a meeting would be a celebration of the University's commitment to the State of Oregon and would be directed at the political leaders seeking votes in the November election. A subcommittee consisting of Stan, Larry, Fred and Carolin was appointed to bring a specific proposal to the next meeting. The subcommittee members agreed to circulate the faculty questionnaires and to meet at 2:30 pm next Monday to formulate a position. Council members not on the subcommittee do not need to appear before 3:00 pm on Monday.
3. Chapin reported on proposed changes to the University's Administrative Rules. He thought most of them were fine but agreed to check with AAUP and some other groups that had reservations about specific points.
4. Dick Hill joined the Council at 3:30 pm. He reported on the ECC meeting of April 18 which approved the ECC staff report on the 1982-83 Higher Education Budget. Dick was the only institutional representative at the meeting. A copy of his remarks are appended to these minutes. Three copies of the ECC report will be available next Monday. There are a number of objections to the ECC report. The report implies that higher education cannot expect better treatment from the Legislature in the future. It also adopts pessimistic assumptions about future enrollment. Equally damaging, the report implies that the Legislature should intervene directly in educational decisions traditionally left to the State Board of Higher Education. Dick encouraged members of the Council to review the ECC report.
5. No decision has been made on whether the University will actively seek to have the Emergency Board change the budget recommendations of the State Board when the budget is reviewed on April 29th. The ECC report complicates that decision.
6. Dick reported that his office has made progress in coming up with the \$475,000 needed to fund the enrollment shortfall rollback. Much of this comes from next year's equipment budget and savings of soft money in the schools. The extent of the indirect cost credit shortfall will not be known until our new indirect cost credit rate is negotiated later this year.
7. The Council decided to postpone a decision as to whether to invite Harold Babcock to a meeting of the Council. There was also some indecision on whether to go through with our meeting on pre-registration.
8. The Council agreed to draft a letter to the Chancellor on our concerns for the University of Oregon. The draft would also be used as an agenda for the May 4th meeting of advisory councils in Corvallis.

9. Sandy has invited Council members and spouses to an end-of-the-year social event, the date of which has not yet been set.
10. The next meeting of the Council will be April 26 at 3:00 pm in the Johnson Hall Conference Room. The Forum subcommittee will meet at the regular 2:30 pm hour.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - April 26, 1982

All members present except M. Gale

1. Carolin outlined the major themes mentioned on the faculty responses to our questionnaire on a spring forum. These were: planning, money getting, money woes, governance, quality of education and other miscellaneous concerns such as tenure, collective bargaining, and free tuition for faculty children.
2. After some discussion, the Council agreed to go ahead with a limited faculty forum on Tuesday, May 18th from 2 to 5 p.m. Approximately 60 faculty who responded to our questionnaire will be invited to participate. The topics for discussion will be limited to governance of the University, the shape of the University in the years ahead, and the quality of education at the University. The format will include a 30 minute plenary session during which Council members will outline major questions in each of the three areas. The participants will then be divided into small groups to spend the next hour and a half discussing these topics. A recorder in each group will prepare a report of the group's discussions to be presented to a second plenary session following the group meetings. Hopefully, common approaches or recommendations will emerge from the group and final sessions. The forum will end with a wine and cheese reception. Carolin is exploring possible sites for the forum and will report on her findings at the next meeting. Final arrangements and details will be worked out next week.
3. The Council also supports and will cooperate in organizing a fall convocation. Many ideas were suggested and discussed. Some favored having an academic procession, emphasizing the ceremony and tradition of a fall convocation. Others suggested using the time before the fall election to celebrate the University's contributions to the state and to elicit support from state and legislative candidates. Paul indicated that he would like to use the occasion to make a statement about the nuclear freeze issue. The Council will continue its discussion of these and other proposals in subsequent meetings.
4. Members attending the Joint Advisory Council meeting in Corvallis on May 4 should meet in the Johnson Hall parking lot at 10:45 a.m. next Tuesday. The following items were suggested for the Joint Advisory Council Agenda:
 - ECC Report and Emergency Board action on the 82-83 budget
 - The implications of the Attorney General's opinion on allotment control
 - Political action on campus for primary and general elections.
5. Several Council members complained about the cost of distributing the Linguistics Ph.D. proposal to all members of the General Assembly.
6. Paul Olum joined the Council at 4 p.m. He reported on the recent State Board meeting. The highest drama surrounded the distribution of the \$120,000 to enhance technology programs. The UO finally got a pro rata share of the funds but not without challenging a discriminatory proposal from the Chancellor's Office. Paul also reviewed the Board's reaction to the ECC Report. It looks as if there will be a substantial debate on issues raised in the ECC at the meeting of the Education subcommittee of the Emergency Board on April 29th.
7. Finally, Paul distributed a copy of a memorandum on the distribution of salary improvement moneys at the eight institutions in the State System. The University will be the only institution unable to provide some salary increase on September 15th. It appears as if a history of discriminatory treatment toward the University of Oregon accounts at least in part for our relative poverty.
8. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, May 3rd at 2:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council -- Agenda -- May 3

2:30

1. Announcements: Corvallis meeting (May 4); Meeting on pre-registration on May 10 at 2:45; Faculty governance (Senate discussion and talk with Lois Youngen); others, ?.
2. Planning the forum: (a) arrangements
(May 18) (b) invitations
(c) format and agenda
3. Letter to new chancellor re faculty concerns (Esther)
4. Fall convocation
5. Continuing concerns: Faculty governance
Undergraduate education
Rooms
Others? Implications of ECC report.

3:30 (With President Olum and Provost Hill)

1. Fall convocation plan
2. Period for tenure decisions
3. Adjusting teaching loads to 'work loads'
4. Plans for periodic meetings with CSU administration
5. Letter to faculty concerning salary increases
6. Implications of ECC report
7. Others. ?

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - May 3, 1982

All members present except S. Tepfer

1. Announcements: A car will leave the Johnson Hall parking lot for the Joint Advisory Council meeting in Corvallis at 10:45 a.m., May 4th. Our agenda next week includes a special briefing on the perils of preregistration at 2:45 p.m. The Senate is considering its role in faculty governance at the University and may seek to broaden its responsibilities beyond that of responding to proposed faculty legislation.
2. Most of the first hour was spent planning the Faculty Forum on May 18th. Carolin negotiated the rent for space at the Hilton down from \$495 to \$125. She also arranged for the Hilton to host a wine and cheese reception after the Forum at reasonable cost to the Council. Plans were then made for the typing and distribution of invitations, for the assignment of Council members to various roles in the Forum, and for the preparation of reports. The Forum will focus on three issues: the shape of the University in the years ahead, the quality of education at the University, and faculty governance. Larry will introduce the first topic, Stan, the question on quality education, and Fred, issues affecting faculty governance. A meeting of 60 people would permit four discussion groups of 15 each. With this number we would hope to elicit suggestions which may influence policy in the coming years.
3. Esther distributed a letter to the new Chancellor. We are to review the letter and suggest changes if required next week.
4. Paul Olum and Dick Hill joined the Council at 3:30 p.m. Paul announced that Dean Berdahl and the Council for the Humanities would like to organize a fall convocation around the theme, Culture and Science in the University. The Council felt that the convocation should be well planned to include all elements of the University, particularly students and community supporters. We agreed the Council should keep its hand in the planning of the fall convocation.
5. Paul introduced a proposal from Stan Greenfield to extend the maximum probationary period for a tenure decision from six to eight years, with a serious pretenure review in the fourth year. We discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal and agreed that such a change should come from the faculty. The Council agreed to give consideration to the proposal.
6. Paul expressed some concern about inequities in work load especially within departments of the University. He sought our advice on the desirability of sending a memorandum to department heads urging them to adjust teaching and other responsibilities to provide for more equal work loads. Many problems were raised and Paul agreed to bring a draft of his memorandum back to the Council for further consideration.
7. Plans are proceeding to increase cooperation with OSU. Paul and Dick plan to meet monthly with President MacVicar. Dean Gilberts plans to make common cause with his counterpart in the School of Education in Corvallis, and Dick Hersh will pursue possibilities for cooperative economic development proposals with interested people on the OSU campus.
8. A letter explaining the University's 1982-83 salary proposal is being held up by difficulties in negotiating salary reductions with GTF and classified

Faculty Advisory Council -- Agenda -- May 10, 1982

2:30

1. Announcements: (a) Final report; (b) Planning Committee's request for a plan for a Statistics Faculty; (c) Appointment to Committee on Committees; (d) Report on Corvallis meeting and request from ACF; (e) Draft of 'Charge' for Committee on Undergraduate Education; (f) Sander's Proposal for new faculty committee; (g) Esther's ~~xxx~~ draft of letter to the Chancellor; (h) Talk with Berdahl about Fall Convocation; (i) Final arrangements for the Faculty Forum.

2:45

2. Pre-registration Discussion - (Mosely, Johnson, and Savage)
3. See items above under Announcements.
4. Continuing concerns: Rooms (fix date for a proposal)
Faculty governance (fix date for proposals)
Period for tenure decisions
Differential teaching loads
Implications of ECC report
5. Others?

3:30 (With President Olum and Provost Hill)

1. Salary increase plan
2. GTF problem.
3. Others

I move

that a Faculty Budget Advisory Committee be created that will make recommendations to the President regarding the budget and allocation of budget resources;

that the Committee be composed of eight persons elected (except as provided below) from the faculty at large in the same manner in which the Faculty Advisory Council is elected;

that the annual term of the committee begin 16 June;

that the Committee for 1982-83 be appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Committee on Committees and the advice of the Faculty Advisory Council;

that four persons be elected for two-year terms each year, and that, in the spring of 1983, four additional persons be elected for one year terms.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - May 10, 1982

All members present

1. Announcements: Stan is preparing a report of Advisory Council activities for the year to be presented at the June meeting of the General Assembly. Stan was asked to select a replacement for Diane Reinhard on the Committee on Committees. Diane has accepted a deanship at another university. Council members were asked to give Esther suggestions for her letter to the new Chancellor. Suggestions should get to her by Wednesday, May 12th. Stan gave a brief report on the Joint Advisory Council meeting in Corvallis on May 4th.
2. The Sander's motion to elect a separate Faculty Budget Committee generated considerable debate. Most Council members felt that the responsibilities of such a committee would overlap with those of the Council. Such a committee, in other words, would either be redundant and/or would undermine the effectiveness of the Council. No decision was made on how to proceed with this challenge. It is something the administration cannot oppose, so any opposition will have to come from the faculty, including those on the Council.
3. Much of the first hour was spent listening to a Registrar's report on pre-registration. The presentation was made by Wanda Johnson, Herb Chereck and Barry Savage. Gerry Moseley gave a brief summary of the presentation. For the past 14 years, the University has been trying to develop a computerized student information and preregistration system. At least four proposals have been made and failed to be implemented. Currently, a number of information systems need developing before a full-blown administrative data processing system and preregistration can be implemented. It appears that essential ingredients for making significant progress on developing such a system are still missing. Someone needs to take charge and develop a plan for solving the problems everyone seems to agree exist. A solution requires at a minimum, getting the computer center and the registrar's office working together. It may also mean adding new people and providing resources to develop a workable system.
4. The President and Provost joined the Council at 3:30 p.m. The President reported that there was nothing to report on the Governor's meeting with the institutional presidents. The Governor claimed he is a friend of higher education but made no commitments to improve its funding.
5. The Council agreed in principle to the proposal to defer until June 1, 1983, the second 6.2 percent pay increase in order to move the first 5.3 percent increase forward from March 8th to the end of January.
6. The University still has no agreement with either the GTFs or classified employees about a salary increase deferral. It appears that the GTFs will have their hours of work reduced. Classified employees will probably be given a temporary interruption of work. The University is still waiting for guidance from the Chancellor's office.
7. A subcommittee of the Council, consisting of Carolin, Stan, Fred and Larry, will meet at 3:30 p.m., Friday in Stan's office (471 PLC) to make final plans for the forum on May 18th.
8. The next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council will be at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, May 17th in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - May 17, 1982

Absent: Maradel Gale

1. Stan distributed a draft of the annual report of the Advisory Council. Members are to review the draft and bring suggestions to the next meeting of the Advisory Council. Esther deserves our thanks for drafting and completing a letter from the Advisory Council to the new Chancellor. Stan will continue his conversations with Curt Simic about the effectiveness of the News Bureau.
2. Final arrangements were made for the Faculty Forum at the Hilton Hotel on May 18th. We agreed that Stan will convene the first general session, that Larry, Fred and Stan will introduce the three major topics, planning, governance and quality respectively, and that the recorders for the four discussion groups will prepare a draft summary of the discussions which will subsequently be drafted into a Council report on the Forum.
3. The Council continued its discussion of Stan's paper on undergraduate education. It endorsed the idea of a Blue Ribbon committee to evaluate the quality of undergraduate education. It asked Stan to be more specific about the kind of resources needed to conduct the study and resources needed to implement the Committee's recommendations. The Council agreed that it should submit this proposal to the administration as soon as possible.
4. Council members were disappointed with the preregistration discussion. Little was accomplished besides a recitation of woes that we have heard before.
5. The Council was upset that the Moseley/Albrecht memo on the scheduling of classes was not brought to the Council before being distributed. Some Council members complained that the idea was a bad one. Others felt that it was too late in the scheduling process to implement the plan for 1982-83. The Provost listened with tolerance to our complaints and agreed to delay the implementation for a year. The delay will permit time for a reexamination of issues the new policy creates as well as time for implementation during the regular scheduling period.
6. Paul reported on the status of the study abroad program. In 1982-83 the program will be conducted in the old way. The UO will receive the headcount while OSU will receive credit for the student credit hours generated by our students in the program. We have complained about this procedure and been given assurance that alternative, less expensive approaches will be considered for 1983-84.
7. Paul reported that Bill Randolph in the Law School will replace Diane Reinhard as chairer of the new Task Force on Racial Harassment. Since the Council has never discussed this problem, the President reviewed the background leading to the creation of the Task Force.
8. Paul reported on the prospects of an additional revenue shortfall in the state. Facts are scarce about the severity of the shortfall or the actions which may result. A legislative session is anticipated between July 14th and July 15th. At this time the administration does not know how it could cut more from our 1982-83 budget. It is also unsure whether the retiring chancellor will adequately fight to avoid further cuts.
9. Paul and Dick reported on the status of negotiations with the classified employees and GTFs regarding a 3.05 percent salary cut in 1982-83. The Council agreed that professors who have agreed to retire early should be exempt from the proposed

salary cuts. Standards for the promotion and tenure of faculty in the professional schools are again being questioned. The administration feels that the current financial problems of the University have not had an appreciable effect on the quality of our faculty. Some good people have left but we have also been able to hire some good people. There is some uneasiness whether this balance can be maintained if there are further cuts or if restoration of competitive salaries in the State System does not occur soon.

10. The next meeting of the Council will be on Monday, May 24th at 2:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall conference room. We have also agreed to keep the evening of June 9th open for a Council social gathering.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - May 24, 1982

All present except C. Clark

1. The meeting began on a bright theme and ended in gloom. Satisfaction with the favorable faculty response to the Council's Faculty Forum was dissipated by the realization that much of the faculty's hopes for the University could be seriously threatened by further deep cuts in the University's 1982-83 budget.
2. The Council reviewed summaries of the four discussion groups at last Tuesday's Faculty Forum. We agreed that a report should be prepared highlighting the major themes of the forum and the process of faculty discussion that took place. Stan agreed to prepare a short statement describing the forum and its purposes. Larry, Fred, and Stan were asked to prepare summaries of discussions which related to their respective topics. These summaries are to be given to Stan by Friday, May 30, so that he can draft a report by early next week. Council members commended Carolin for the outstanding job she did in organizing the forum.
3. The Council reviewed Stan's excellent draft of an annual report. A few corrections and suggestions were made. We were unable to complete the section entitled continuing problems. Send Stan any suggestions for those last sections so that he can have the report prepared for distribution.
4. Paul and Dick joined the Council at 3:30 p.m. The next hour and a half was spent speculating on the possible consequences of the announced additional \$108 million state revenue shortfall. Various unthinkable options were outlined and discussed. Nothing was decided and nothing can be until additional information on how the Governor and Legislature propose to deal with the crisis is available. Efforts to preserve the University should be directed first to the Governor and the Legislature, and next to the State Board. Besides a few minor steps to preserve as much budget flexibility as possible, decisions about how to cut the University's budget must await actions by the Legislature and State Board. Paul will be discussing legislative strategy with a Legislative Planning Committee and later with President MacVicar.
5. The next planned meeting of the Advisory Council will be on Wednesday, June 9, at 2:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room. If a meeting is needed next week, Stan will arrange for a time and place.

1:30 P. 10/11
Faculty Advisory Council -- May 24, 1982

2:30

(Announcements -- June 9; meeting next week?;

1. Developing a report on the Forum
2. Final version of 'charge' for committee on Undergraduate Education
3. Discussion of the Annual Report of the Council
4. Final concerns and actions??
5. Others

3:30 (With President Olum and Provost Hill)

1. State budget shortfall and its implications
2. Difficulty of finding an acceptable statement on 'sexual harassment'
3. Others.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - June 9, 1982

Members present: Andrews, Gale, Keutzer, Pierce, Pierson and Tepfer

1. The first meeting with the new members of the 1982-83 Advisory Council will be held on Friday, June 18th at 1:30 p.m. Legislative actions to deal with the latest \$101 million shortfall will be a major topic of discussion.
2. Carolin reported on a meeting she attended to plan a fall convocation at the University. The convocation will be held on October 4th beginning at 1:30 p.m. Classes will be cancelled. A processional will be followed by a major speech on the topic of science and culture. The list of possible speakers includes Lewis Thomas, Don Kennedy, and Thomas Kuhn. The planning committee is also trying to organize programs at the new Performing Arts Center the day before the convocation.
3. Minor changes were made to the draft report on the Faculty Forum. Copies of the report will be distributed to all faculty members.
4. The Council discussed a Mathematics Department proposal for a faculty of statistics which would coordinate the offering of statistics courses at the University. The proposal was sent to us by the Albrecht Planning Committee with a request for our advice. The Council endorsed the proposal and suggested that the next step must be taken by the Provost's Office. It was unclear whether the required changes could be carried out by the administration or would require faculty legislation.
5. Stan summarized the major points in the draft report of the Albrecht committee. Discussion of the report will be the responsibility of the new Faculty Advisory Council.
6. The President and the Provost joined the Council at 3:30 p.m. There was an extended discussion of the Council's proposal for a blue ribbon committee on undergraduate education. The administration supports our proposal but is reluctant to promise more financial support than is realistic given the University's continuing poverty. It was agreed that we should come forward with a proposal for modest resources and that discussions would then be held with the Oregon Foundation. The idea of reexamining the University's instructional programs received enthusiastic support.
7. Our weekly report on the latest budget crisis brought both good news and bad news. The good news was that the Governor has indicated that higher education would be exempt from further cuts. (This understanding was quickly reversed when the executive department announced on Thursday that the State System's share of the \$10 million program cuts would be \$2.7 million). The bad news was that classified employees would get a 10 percent cut along with other state employees. This is not only unfair, since other non-state public employees would continue to receive their salary increases, but also that the planned 3.05% cut of classified employees would have to be passed on to faculty in the form of additional delay in their already deferred increases. The President announced a last minute effort to persuade legislators and union leaders to spread the salary cuts evenly across all public employees. As of late Thursday (June 10) the proposal has received only limited debate in Salem.
8. The President made a request that we redraft the statement on undergraduate education to make it more positive. Additional criticism of our educational

program would only increase students' apprehensions about attending the University.

9. The next meeting of the Advisory Council will be on Friday, June 18th, at 1:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Faculty Advisory Council

Minutes - June 18, 1982

Members present: 81-82 Council: Andrews, Clark, Keutzer, Pierce and Pierson. 82-83 Council: Ellis, Novick, Siegel, Tull and Wilson.

1. Stan Pierson opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. with announcements. He read a letter from the AFT urging that faculty be consulted in any decisions about additional budget cuts. Stan acknowledged receipt of a report from the Committee on Committees and a response from the new Chancellor to an earlier letter from the Advisory Council.
2. Stan circulated a revised edition of the Council's proposal to establish a blue ribbon committee on undergraduate education. Details of the proposal were discussed and the new Council members were asked to see that the proposal is implemented. There seems to be general agreement within the Councils and the administration that it is time for a careful look at undergraduate education at Oregon.
3. Copies of the Albrecht Coordinating Committee report were distributed to new Council members. Stan reviewed the main headings of the report. While some members of the Albrecht Committee have expressed dissatisfaction with the report, members of the new Council, in particular, seemed to think that the report should be carefully studied and the task of planning be carried forward.
4. President Olum joined the meeting at 2:30 p.m. He reviewed events leading up to the Special Session of the Legislature and the actions taken by the Legislature which affect the higher education budget. He reported that he had no real choice but to announce what he would propose be cut if the Legislature cut our budget by \$650,000. The President plans to take his recommendations to the faculty and is prepared to be convinced of another alternative. Any decisions affecting the 82-83 budget will have to wait for action of the State Board on June 25th.
5. Two additional joint meetings are planned this month. On Monday, June 21, members of the new Advisory Council will hold an organizational meeting at 3:30 p.m. in the Johnson Hall Conference Room. The President and old members will join them at 4 p.m. for a briefing on a recent meeting of the institutional presidents. The second meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 28th at 1:30 p.m. The President and Provost will join the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

MINUTES
FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Monday, June 21, 1982

Present Fred Andrews, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Larry Pierce, Stan Pierson, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson

Stan convened the joint meeting of the old and new councils at 2:40 p.m. and after reading nominations submitted by Mike Ellis, called for other nominations for the positions of chair and vice-chair/secretary. Aaron Novick was elected chair and Shirley Wilson vice-chair/secretary.

Stan explained that the new council would need to select representatives to the University Budget Committee, the Ersted Award Committees, the Distinguished Service Award Committee, and the Advisory Board to the Amazon Tenants Organization. He then turned the meeting over to Aaron. The new council elected Barry Siegel as its representative to the University Budget Committee.

The remainder of the time was spent discussing the council's role, internal operating procedures, and future agenda items.

The Council's Role. The need for active outreach to faculty (both to inform them of important matters and to solicit their views on impending changes) was expressed by most. In addition, it was thought that the council needs to be alert to special "trouble areas" within the university (e.g. the Humanities) and, when appropriate invite direct communication with affected faculty members. It was generally agreed that the council should hold an open meeting early in the fall and continue to plan for the fall convocation.

Operating Procedures. The council will meet Monday at 2:30 p.m. The president and provost will join the meetings at 3:30 p.m. All members of the council should regularly submit agenda items to the chair. The council should collectively establish a priority order for the continuing agenda items. Council decisions will be reached by consensus when possible. The chair will meet with the President and Provost prior to each council meeting to review the agenda. Minutes should be consise and distributed promptly. A fund of money is available and earmarked for the council's use.

Agenda Items.

1. Improving undergraduate education.
2. Evaluation of the News Bureau's effectiveness in representing the University to the public.

Faculty Advisory Council
Monday, June 21, 1982
Page Two

3. Faculty governance and committee membership.
4. Time of day that large classrooms are scheduled.
5. The plight of flounders.
6. The Albrecht planning report.
7. The Tepfer plan for expediting campus mail.

The president was still unable to join the council by 5:00 p.m. so the meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting. Joint councils (old and new) at 1:30 p.m., Monday, July 28 in Johnson Hall Conference Room.

Minutes
Joint Faculty Advisory Councils
Monday, June 28, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Chapin Clark, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Larry Pierce, Stan Pierson, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson.

Stan convened the joint meeting of the old and new councils at 2:30 p.m.

The Budget. Meeting the budget deficits was the main agenda item. It was the consensus of the councils that before the President meets with the general faculty, there should be an interim meeting of concerned faculty. There was considerable discussion of who should be invited to such a meeting. Consensus was reached that there should be a general invitation to all faculty from the council. The meeting was set for Wednesday, July 7th, at 2:00 p.m. and will follow the general format used in the spring Faculty Forum: a general session followed by small group discussions, and a final general session to hear reports from the small groups. Aaron will reserve rooms in the EMU and will send a letter of invitation to the faculty this week (draft to be reviewed by Siegel and Wilson). The purpose of the meeting will be to present the budget information and discuss a list of options to meet the budget deficits. The expectation is that this interim meeting will give faculty a chance to consider alternatives and help focus and sharpen the issues involved in making the budget cuts. Aaron will chair the meeting and the President and Provost will attend to answer questions and provide specifics about the various budget cut options.

The President and Provost joined the council at 2:30 p.m. The President presented the following budget information:

\$543,000 - 545,000	= U of O share of Higher Education cuts
388,000	= amount needed to fund classified salaries
<u>\$931,000</u> - 933,000	
\$700,000	= shortfall in indirect costs (money is already identified to cover this)
\$230,000	= amount needed to meet CIS and CBA salaries and support of certain science programs (money is already identified to cover this)

The President has been told by the Chancellor that money may be available from tuition to cover the \$543,000-\$545,000 amount, but we won't know about this until October, 1982. This leaves \$388,000 which must definitely be met by internal budget cuts.

The Provost presented a list of options to cover the deficits.

1. Closing units already identified by the President (i.e., LERC, Bureau of Governmental Affairs, KWAX, Marine Biology Center).
2. Postpone faculty salary increases to March 1983 (would provide the \$388,000 for classified wages).
3. Postpone salary increases until the end of 1983 (would cover the \$388,000 and the \$543,000-\$545,000).

Minutes/2
Joint Faculty Advisory Councils

4. Limit library acquisitions (maximum possible = ^{270,000}~~\$325,000~~). *exempt services*
5. Eliminate ^{1/2} faculty travel = ^{50,000}~~\$80,000~~ (exempts \$20,000 for student recruitment).
6. Eliminate one-half of ^{remaining} inflation allowance for supplies and services = \$190,000. *~ 5%*
7. Freeze administrative salaries = \$25,000-\$26,000.
8. Reduce summer session budget = \$27,000.
9. Freeze "late-developing" TBA's = \$164,000.

The council was reminded that the library now ranks 99 among 101 libraries in comparable institutions. Concern was expressed about not filling late-developing TBA's because of the immediate impact which that would have on the instructional program. Cutting faculty travel and supplies and services was also viewed as having a serious negative affect on faculty morale and functioning.

There seemed to be consensus that the best way to meet the mandatory \$388,000 amount for classified salaries would be to further defer faculty salary increases to March, 1983. The other options (with the exception of essential TBA's) would then be available if tuition funds don't materialize or if there is a new shortfall in September.

The council requested that the Provost be ready to respond in the interim faculty meeting as to how the \$190,000 cut in supplies and services would affect individual units.

National Student Exchange Program. The President distributed a letter from the Executive Secretary of the National Student Exchange Program asking that the University of Oregon be represented on October 13, 1982 at a meeting in Minneapolis (during the American Council on Education conference) to discuss the potential for a network of faculty/staff exchanges.

Sabbatical Leaves. Stan read a letter outlining new guidelines for sabbatical Leaves which are being considered by the OSSHE Board. He urged that those who wish to speak to the issue testify at the board hearing on this matter. It seemed to be the consensus that the council should formally express its support for the plan.

Proposed plan: 85% of salary for 1 term sabbaticals
75% of salary for 2 term sabbaticals
60% of salary for full year sabbaticals

The next meeting of the Council will be Thursday, July 1, at 9:00 a.m.

Minutes
Joint Faculty Advisory Councils
Monday, June 28, 1982

Present: Fred Andrews, Chapin Clark, Carolin Keutzer, Aaron Novick, Larry Pierce, Stan Pierson, Barry Siegel, Sandy Tepfer, Don Tull, Shirley Wilson.

Stan convened the joint meeting of the old and new councils at 2:30 p.m.

The Budget. Meeting the budget deficits was the main agenda item. It was the consensus of the councils that before the President meets with the general faculty, there should be an interim meeting of concerned faculty. There was considerable discussion of who should be invited to such a meeting. Consensus was reached that there should be a general invitation to all faculty from the council. The meeting was set for Wednesday, July 7th, at 2:00 p.m. and will follow the general format used in the spring Faculty Forum: a general session followed by small group discussions, and a final general session to hear reports from the small groups. Aaron will reserve rooms in the EMU and will send a letter of invitation to the faculty this week (draft to be reviewed by Siegel and Wilson). The purpose of the meeting will be to present the budget information and discuss a list of options to meet the budget deficits. The expectation is that this interim meeting will give faculty a chance to consider alternatives and help focus and sharpen the issues involved in making the budget cuts. Aaron will chair the meeting and the President and Provost will attend to answer questions and provide specifics about the various budget cut options.

The President and Provost joined the council at 2:30 p.m. The President presented the following budget information:

\$543,000 - 545,000	= U of O share of Higher Education cuts
\$388,000	= amount needed to avoid additional 3.05% cut in classified salaries beyond the 6% identified by the Governor
<u>\$931,000</u> - 933,000	
\$700,000	= shortfall in indirect costs (money is already identified to cover this)
\$230,000	= amount needed to meet CIS and CBA salaries and support of certain science programs assuming that it can be identified in salary savings).

The President has been told by the Chancellor that money may be available from tuition to cover the \$543,000-\$545,000 amount, but we won't know about this until October, 1982. This leaves \$388,000 which must definitely be met by internal budget cuts.

To cover the deficits, the following list of options were discussed:

1. Closing units already identified by the President (i.e., LERC, Bureau of Governmental Affairs, KWAX, Marine Biology Center).
2. Postpone faculty salary increases to March 1983 (would provide the \$388,000 for classified wages).
3. Postpone salary increases until June 30, 1983 (would cover the \$388,000 and the \$543,000-\$545,000).

Minutes/2
Joint Faculty Advisory Councils

4. Limit library acquisitions (maximum possible = \$270,000).
5. Eliminate one-half of faculty travel = \$50,000 (Exempts \$20,000 for student recruitment.) (Is roughly 60% of total.)
6. Further cuts in supplies and services = \$190,000 (roughly 5%).
7. Freeze administrative salaries = \$25,000-\$26,000.
8. Reduce summer session budget = \$27,000.
9. Freeze "late-developing" TBA's = \$164,000.

The council was reminded that the library now ranks 99 among 101 libraries in comparable institutions. Concern was expressed about not filling late-developing TBA's because of the immediate impact which that would have on the instructional program. Cutting faculty travel and supplies and services was also viewed as having a serious negative affect on faculty morale and functioning.

There seemed to be consensus that the best way to meet the mandatory \$388,000 amount for classified salaries would be to further defer faculty salary increases to March, 1983. The other options (with the exception of essential TBA's) would then be available if tuition funds don't materialize or if there is a new shortfall in September.

The council requested that the Provost be ready to respond in the interim faculty meeting as to how the \$190,000 cut in supplies and services would affect individual units.

National Student Exchange Program. The President distributed a letter from the Executive Secretary of the National Student Exchange Program asking that the University of Oregon be represented on October 13, 1982 at a meeting in Minneapolis (during the American Council on Education conference) to discuss the potential for a network of faculty/staff exchanges.

Sabbatical Leaves. Stan read a letter outlining new guidelines for sabbatical leaves which are being considered by the OSSHE Board. He urged that those who wish to speak to the issue testify at the board hearing on this matter. It seemed to be the consensus that the council should formally express its support for the plan.

Proposed plan: 85% of salary for 1 term sabbaticals
75% of salary for 2 term sabbaticals
60% of salary for full year sabbaticals

The next meeting of the Council will be Thursday, July 1, at 9:00 a.m.