Faculty Senate

Document is 37 pages. Use caution when printing.

Please note that some links go to websites not managed by the Faculty Senate. As such, some links may no longer be functional or may lead to pages that have since been changed or updated.

1975 Agendas

Agendas for Faculty Senate meetings can be accessed by clicking on the desired date. Contact the Faculty Senate Office via e-mail for more information.

- October 9
- November 6

Faculty Senate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6203 · 541.737.4344
Contact us with your comments, questions and feedback

Sick leave 9-5

Reports to the Faculty Senate — October 9, 1975

A. Agenda for the Senate Meeting on Thursday, October 9, 3:30 p.m., Withycombe 101

As published in the October 3 issue of the Staff Newsletter the agenda will include the reports and other items listed below. To be approved are the minutes of the June 5 Senate meeting as published in the June 6, 1975 issue of the Staff Newsletter Appendix. (Corrections to these minutes are noted in the Faculty Senate Minutes Index - 1974-75 which are enclosed with this mailing.)

1. Postponed vote on R. J. Zaworski's Motion 75-317-5 (pp.6-9)

On June 5, 1975, the Senate voted to defer action until the first fall meeting on the following motion made by R. J. Zaworski on April 10, 1975 (motion 75-315-5): "That beginning in fall 1975, admission of post-baccalaureate students to Oregon State University for purposes of pursuing a second undergraduate degree be the function of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee and that performance standards required of post-baccalaureate students in their work toward a second undergraduate degree be those normally applied to undergraduate students." Consideration was given to this motion on May 1 and June 5 and the decision by the Senate to defer action followed the executive committee's recommendation to seek further information from the Graduate Council.

Attached is a report from Dean Castle dated September 29, 1975 with recommended policies for post-baccalaureate students. The Senate's attention is also called to the Graduate Council's report of May 28, 1975 and the report of the Graduate Admissions Committee of May 6, 1975 which were presented to the Senate on June 5 (and included in the Senate mailings for that meeting).

2. Report of the Curriculum Committee - B. H. Arnold

Two documents have been mailed previously to Senators:

a. Curricular Proposals of the Colleges and Schools for 1976-77, Category I (cover memorandum dated September 2, 1975)

b. Course Requests of the Colleges and Schools for 1976-77, Category II (cover memorandum dated September 11, 1975)

To be reported are the status of the review of these proposals by the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council and the schedule for the presentation of approved proposals and requests to the Faculty Senate. In keeping with the Senate's action of February 6, 1974 (see motion 75-315-1), the Curriculum Committee aims to present Category I proposals to the Senate at its regular meeting on November 6. Following consultations with the Chancellor's office, it appears that only 2 or 3 of the Category I proposals would require formal review and approval by the Board.

Minutes of the Curriculum Committee meetings will be mailed to all Senators to keep them informed of actions by the committee. Minutes of the Graduate Council are available from each department head. Any questions regarding actions on the proposals should be referred directly to the appropriate department or dean or to the Curriculum Committee's executive secretary, J. F. Ligon (ext. 3711).

3. Report of the Committee on Fiscal Priorities and Long Range Planning - E. E. Easton

On May 1, 1975 the Senate endorsed the committee's recommendations presented in its report dated April 21, 1975 (see motion 75-318-1). The status of these recommendations and plans for the committee's activities for 1975-76 are to be reported.

B. Reports from the Executive Committee

1. New or Updated Materials

Enclosed are the following documents for the Senate's information and use:

a. Faculty Senate Minutes Index - 1974-75.

b. Faculty Senate Committees and Councils - Membership for 1975-76 (some students are yet to be appointed)

c. OSU Faculty Records Policy dated June 30, 1975.

d. Faculty Senate Bylaws (as last revised 3/6/75).

2. Vice Chairman's Report of Summer Activities (pp. 10-14)

Attached is R. W. Newburgh's memorandum dated September 29, 1975 which reports two principal activities in which he and the executive committee participated during the summer: Faculty Records Policy and Board's Periodic Review of Institutional Executives. (The vice-chairman is scheduled to be off-campus on October 9 but other members of the executive committee may comment or respond to questions on this report.)

3. Personal Health Requirement (pp. 15-16)

On September 9, 1975 the executive committee received the attached proposal from Solon A. Stone. One term of Personal Health is currently a General Institutional Requirement for undergraduate students (see Academic Regulation 26). Attached to Professor Stone's memorandum are background statements and his proposed motion. Three institutions, EOSC, SOSC and OCE no longer have a requirement in Personal Health.

The executive committee has referred this proposal to the Curriculum Committee and to the Academic Regulations Committee and has suggested they review this matter jointly. They are also encouraged to report their recommendations on this proposal to the Senate in sufficient time to be included if approved in the Category I curricular proposals for 1976-77.

4. University Exploratory Studies Program (UESP) (pp. 17-23)

On October 5, 1972 the Faculty Senate received a proposal (dated September 15, 1972) for an Exploratory Studies Pilot Program to be established on a three-year trial basis. The proposal was recommended jointly by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Curriculum Committee. The Senate voted to approve the establishment of the program (see motion 289-6).

Attached is a memorandum dated September 25, 1975 from Dean Stuart Knapp regarding the status of the UESP and recommending its continuation (the attachments include summaries of student evaluations but their written comments are not included). The executive committee encourages the Senate's favorable consideration of this report and has also forwarded copies to the Curriculum Committee and to the Academic Advising Committee and invited their recommendations.

5. Reporting of Grades for Graduating Seniors

On April 10, 1975 the Senate voted to take from the table and refer to the Executive Committee the motion introduced by Peter Anton on March 6 (see motion 75-316-2TR). This motion provided that "the date specified for report of final grades to the registrar applies to all grades, including those of graduating seniors." On May 1, the executive committee reported to the Senate its decision to postpone further action on this matter until summer or early fall. On June 5, the executive committee reported receipt of ASOSU Senate Bill 34-SA-48 which (1) recommended that OSU's present Commencement policy be retained and (2) offered ASOSU's assistance to the Faculty Senate in efforts to minimize disruption in classes at the end of Spring Term resulting from the current policy.

On August 11, the executive committee met with the Commencement Week Committee to review the advantages and disadvantages in scheduling Commencement before or following final exam week. The executive committee plans (but has not yet scheduled) a meeting with participants of the student-faculty conference at Waldport who were reported as recommending that the current policy on early senior grades be repealed. The executive committee will report later on this matter to the Senate.

6. Student Grievance Committee - ASOSU Senate Bill (pp. 24-25)

On June 5, 1975, the executive committee reported to the Senate its receipt of ASOSU Senate Bill 34-SA-45 that "Student Grievance Procedures" be approved by the Faculty Senate as a new Academic Regulation. The recommended procedures included the establishment of a student-faculty Grievance Committee in each school or college to review "any student grievance concerning human rights or academics" if such grievances could not be resolved at the level of instructor, department chairman or dean. A copy of the ASOSU bill is attached.

The executive committee intends to bring this matter to the attention of the University Cabinet and to recommend the appointment of an ad-hoc committee to review this proposal. Membership on this ad-hoc committee should include representatives of the Faculty and Student Senates and of appropriate committees and councils (such as the President's Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities, the Student Conduct Committee and the Council of Deans).

7. Student Prerogative for Space in a Course (p. 26)

On June 5, 1975, the Registration and Scheduling Committee presented its report dated May 2 to the Faculty Senate. One recommendation, later approved by the Executive Office on a one-year trial basis, was as follows:

Student Prerogative for Space in a Course:

A student's registration in a course may not be cancelled nor the student forced to drop the course except for cases of emergency, as recommended by the academic dean. Otherwise, once a student has been sectioned into a course, only he/she may terminate his/her registration in accordance with the University's Academic Regulations. This does not preclude the cancellation of a course due to low enrollment in accordance with President MacVicar's directive on course size.

A few faculty members have raised questions regarding this rule and these were brought to the attention of the executive committee. Attached is a memorandum dated September 26 from the Dean of Faculty regarding this matter.

C. Reports from the Executive Office

1. Carlson's Motion (75-317-6) on Promotion or Tenure Decisions

On June 5, 1975, the Senate approved the recommendation of the Faculty Status Committee (motion 75-319-3; note the corrected number of this motion) that "In the event of any unfavorable promotion or tenure decision of non-renewal for a tenure-track faculty member on annual tenure, the faculty member involved should be informed of such decision in writing; and, if he or she so requests, should be advised in writing of the reasons which contributed to that decision." This motion was presented to the Senate on April 10 by Professor Carlson (motion 75-317-6) with the request that it be reviewed by the Faculty Status Committee.

Institutional policies regarding these matters are stated in Section III-E of the "General Instructions - Annual Review and Recommendations for Promotion and/or Tenure." These statements reflect the belief of the Executive Office that the most appropriate and sound personnel policy should provide opportunities for the department chairman (or immediate supervisor) to report decisions directly to the faculty member and to review fully all matters affecting the faculty member's status. In this way, favorable actions can be reinforced with additional comments and unfavorable decisions placed in context by suggestions for improvement and encouragement for continued efforts to achieve desired goals and standards.

Each year before the "General Instructions" for the annual review are distributed, the Executive Office has sought the assistance of the Faculty Status Committee in recommending revisions to improve this document. In the very near future, the continued assistance of the Faculty Status Committee will be solicited to prepare revisions of the "General Instructions" for the 1975-76 annual review. At that time, further consideration will be given to the Senate's action of June 5th.

2. Status of Sick Leave Policy for Academic Staff

On July 22, 1975, the Board adopted a temporary rule, AR 41.061, to provide to academic staff members the benefits of Chapter 203, Oregon Laws 1975 (HB 3206). The 1975 Act amends the statute adopted in 1973 which provided that any public employer may "...request that its employees be compensated for accumulated unused sick leave (with pay) in the form of

increased retirement benefits..." The Department of Higher Education made such a request.

Details of the new sick leave policy will be published in the Staff Newsletter or receive full dissemination by comparable means. The principal provisions of the new policy are as follows:

Full-time academic staff members employed during the period February 1, 1936 through June 30, 1973 are entitled to be credited with 2.675 hours of unused accumulated sick-leave for each full month (or major fraction thereof) worked during this period. Such work is to include employment on academic salary and academic wages, and part-time employment on 0.50 or more will receive prorata credit. (No credit is earned by those on sabbatical leave or on LWOP.) The Office of Budgets and Personnel Services will prepare for individual staff members employment records for this period and calculate the unused sick leave credit which may have accumulated for this period. Such records will be distributed for review and verification by the individual faculty members and their departments.

Commencing July 1, 1973, all full-time staff members will be credited with eight hours of unused sick leave for each full month of service (or major fraction thereof) and part-time staff employed on 0.50 FTE or more will receive prorata amounts. For the period starting July 1, 1973, similar records will be prepared centrally or by the department for the employee's verification.

The Board's temporary rule (AR 41.061) also provides that academic staff members who have less than 520 hours of earned unused sick leave may be advanced the difference between earned unused sick leave and 520 hours when the need arises. As sick leave is earned, the amount shall replace any sick leave advance until all advanced time is replaced with earned time. The purpose of this provision is to assure academic staff members of at least 90 calendar days of sick leave with pay at all times.

3. Faculty Salary Data Placed in Library

As reported in the October 3 issue of the Staff Newsletter, the Dean of Faculty has placed data on faculty salaries for 1975-76 in the Reserve Book Room of the Library. This practice has been followed for several years in accordance with the Senate's request of March 2, 1972 (motion 284-1) and in consultation with the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee.

Other information in the form of reports and statistical data relating to budgets and salary distributions will be placed in the Library as such material becomes available. The selection and preparation of such material will be made in consultation with the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee and the Committee on Fiscal Priorities and Long Range Planning. The executive office will make available to these committees all of the data relating to operating budgets including salary adjustments and seek the advice of the committees as to the form in which such information would be most useful to them and to the faculty.

Graduate School Oregon State University Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503) 754-1881

September 29, 1975

MEMO TO: Executive Committee, Faculty Senate

FROM: E. N. Castle

SUBJECT: Post-Baccalaureate Student Policy

Background

During spring quarter, 1975, the Executive Committee received memoranda from both the Graduate Admissions Committee and the Graduate Council concerning post-baccalaureate student policy. At the time these reports were received, a motion was pending before the Senate which also pertained to post-baccalaureate students (Zaworski-Stone).

The Executive Committee recommended to the Senate that action on the above memoranda and motion be postponed until this academic year and requested that the Graduate Council bring forth recommendations which would provide for a consistent post-baccalaureate policy at Oregon State University. This report is written to that end.

The State Board of Higher Education has adopted a policy that any individual holding a baccalaureate degree will be considered a graduate student for admission, tuition, and fee purposes. The Board has further established priorities for admission to Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon. The policy gives first priority to upper division students, second priority to graduate students (including post-baccalaureate students), and the lowest priority to lower division students.

Post-baccalaureate education has become increasingly popular in recent years. The following data permit a comparison of graduate student numbers in different categories:

Spring Quarter Enrollment
OSU Graduate School

	Post-Bac	Special	Masters	Doctors	Total
1972	206	81	1014	734	2035
1973	232	125	1004	719	2080
1974	315	248	1067	627	2257
1975	353	331	1205	582	2471

September 29, 1975

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: R. W. Newburgh, Vice chairman

Subject: Status Report on Faculty Records Policy and Board's Periodic Review of Institutional Executives

Faculty Records Policy

After the passage of Senate Bill 413 (Chapter 317, Oregon Laws 1975) two developments occurred that necessitated some action on the part of the Executive Committee. These were proposed changes in the Administrative Rules (AR 42-700) of the OSBHE and a proposed OSU Faculty Records Policy.

The current status of AR 42-700 is that changes to conform with Chapter 317, Oregon Laws 1975 (SB 413) were reviewed by the Board on August 26 and September 23 but formal approval of such changes is pending further review. Although all of the changes are important, it is likely that the change of most interest to OSU Faculty is the delegation "to the chief executive officer of each institution the responsibility for the development of institutional regulations governing the form and variety of faculty records to be maintained in the institution, the nature of the information to be collected, the way in which such faculty information is to be recorded, maintained and used, and eventually disposed of." It is important to note that these regulations shall be consistent with the laws of Oregon. Further, it is to be expected that faculty will be provided an important voice in the development of these regulations. The vice-chairman of the OSU Faculty Senate participated in hearings on the changes in AR 42-700 on July 8 and 24 and August 26, 1975 after consultation with the Executive Committee.

Likely of more importance is the OSU Faculty Records Policy. At the present time a document dated June 30, 1975 from the executive office is the current policy. (A copy of this policy is enclosed.) This policy was approved by the Chancellor on August 7, 1975 with the understanding that a hearing is to be conducted during the Fall Term (1975-76) at which faculty or others are to be provided the opportunity for further input before complete acceptance of the document by the Chancellor. The major part of the document is from an OSU Faculty Records Policy developed by the Faculty Status Committee and accepted by the Faculty Senate November 1, 1973. The required open hearing should probably be postponed until after the Board adopts the proposed revisions in AR 42.700.

A meeting was called by a faculty organization on July 14, 1975. On the basis of this meeting and after discussion with the Executive Committee, the vice-chairman submitted to the Chancellor certain suggested changes in the OSU Faculty Records Policy. These changes follow:

tion again to the fact that the Graduate Council believes that post-baccalaureate students should maintain at least a 2.5 GPA in order to remain at this University.

Summary of Recommended Post-Baccalaureate Student Policy

1. Admission - 2.5 GPA on last 90 hours of undergraduate work. Those with a GPA between 2.25 and 2.5 will be reviewed by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee (admission requirement re-affirmed by the Graduate Council, spring term, 1975).

2. Performance - 2.5 GPA generally required, except that a student is permitted a 2.25 GPA on the first quarter of work (Graduate Council re-affirmed in spring, 1975).

3. Processing of Admissions - Undergraduate Admissions Committee rather than Graduate Admissions Committee (Graduate Admissions Committee, Graduate School).

4. Reclassification to Advanced Degree Status - the same as for special students (Graduate Council, spring term, 1975).

5. Administration

   a) Admission, re-admission, and transfers will be through the Graduate School.

   b) Registration, petitions, and advising will be in academic schools and colleges.

   (Graduate School)

ENC:df

(You are referred to the June 30, 1975 OSU Faculty Records Policy from the executive office for the original. It should be noted that these suggested changes have not been incorporated.)

2. "and related purposes" to research, and service functions (This defines the purposes other than educational more clearly than "related purposes")

4(b) ". . . One file of personal records shall be kept by the College or School or Department in which the faculty member is employed. One additional file may be maintained which shall be confidential and shall contain only confidential information and material excised from other records as permitted by the policy." to. . . one file of personal records shall be kept by the Dean of the College or School, and one by the chairperson or head of the department or equivalent administrative unit. In the event that a confidential file is maintained as permitted under 6(a) and (b), the nature and text of all materials in this confidential file is to be included in all open files. It is understood that except as provided in item 6(d) no anonymous evaluations are to be included or retained in personal files including confidential files. (It is believed that this more clearly defines the location of files and the responsibile administrator. It also assures that the presence, nature, and location of confidential materials is known to the faculty member. It also eliminates anonymous evaluations or comments).

5(b), (3) This should be deleted unless substantial legal reasons are provided.

6(c) Change . . . "with the names of the conversants identified" to, with the names of the conversants, the dates, the purpose of the conversation identified, and the questions and answers included.

6(d) Delete that contained in the June 30, 1975 document and replace with: Classroom survey evaluations by students of a faculty member's classroom or laboratory performance shall be anonymous. A classroom survey evaluation is defined as one in which all students in a particular class are provided the opportunity to evaluate the faculty member. The record of tabulated reports shall be placed in at least one of the files designated in 4(b), (excluding the confidential file). All survey instruments used to obtain evaluation data shall be returned to the faculty member.

7(c) "where the faculty member believes the evaluative statement is incorrect or incomplete". . . to, where the faculty member believes the evaluative statement including that permitted under 6(d) is incorrect or incomplete. . . (this permits rebuttals to student evaluations to be entered and may include student evaluations solicited by a faculty member).

11. The following is suggested as an alternative to this paragraph:

11. Permanence, Duplication and Disposal of Faculty Records.

(a) The individual faculty member's record shall be maintained only for the minimum period of time required to serve the basic official functions of the office which generates and maintains it. In the event all or part of the record is to be disposed of, the individual faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to object. If the objection is not sustained, the matter shall be referred to the Faculty Reviews and Appeals Committee for final disposition. Any materials will be disposed of in a manner to protect their confidentiality.

(b) The permanent retention of faculty records shall be limited to those which the institutional executive or the State Archivist shall determine to be of long-range value to the individual faculty member, to the institution, or to the public. The individual faculty member shall be informed of the contents of such permanent records and shall have the right to include materials considered of value to that member. (ORS 351.065 provides that access to personal records more than 25 years old may not be limited).

(c) In the event that the faculty member is unable to exercise the prerogatives under 11(a) and (b), a committee appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall exercise these rights for the faculty member.

(d) Duplication of permanent faculty records shall be kept at a minimum. A log shall be kept in each file of every duplication and include the date, purpose and to whom provided. On the conclusion of the purpose for which the permanent faculty record was duplicated, all of the duplicated materials will be returned to the office that provided them and they will be disposed of in such a way to protect the confidentiality.

(These changes permit input by the faculty member. Item 11 was included in the Faculty Status Committee report of April 6, 1973. However, this was developed prior to SB 413. It is believed that the suggested changes are more nearly in compliance with SB 413).

Action. It is recommended that if the Senate agrees to these changes that they be forwarded to the executive office and be presented at the anticipated open hearing.

Evaluation of President MacVicar

On July 16, 1975 the vice-chairman received a letter from Chancellor Lieuallen requesting the submission of six names as candidates for a committee to assist in the evaluation of President MacVicar. From the six names three were to be chosen by the Chancellor. Since that date the Chancellor agreed that eight names would be submitted from which he would select four.

Department of Mathematics
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503) 754-1686

May 22, 1975

ANNUAL REPORT

The Faculty Economic Welfare Committee wishes to review some of its activities during the past year and present certain resolutions to the Faculty Senate for its consideration.

1. Sick Leave Records, Academic Staff (See Appendix I).

In a letter from Dean Nicodemus, dated October 1, 1974, the Executive Committee requested the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee "to seek available information regarding the status of sick leave policies and provide the Faculty Senate with appropriate information and recommendation on these matters".

A subcommittee of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee was organized and their report, including recommendations is attached. The report was approved by the full membership of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee on Dec. 6, 1974.

2. Portland State University Faculty Senate Resolution

On April 7, 1975 the Faculty Senate at Portland State University unanimously passed the following resolution:

> WHEREAS, PERS retirement fund investments have produced losses reflecting badly on the prudence and skill of the present management and upon the justification for the state to exercise a monopoly over the investment of these funds; and
>
> WHEREAS, widespread insecurity exists among State System (OSSHE) faculty as to the future value of the investments under the Investment Council and the present money managers; and
>
> WHEREAS, individuals will find far more advantageous terms fitting their individual needs with other management

than under the present PERS monopoly which results in the least benefits at the highest cost among comparable retirement funds: Now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, We urge immediate amendment of the law to provide that each public employee may select either PERS or any other financially responsible retirement fund or account as recipient for both his own payroll deduction and the public employer's 7½% contribution based on his gross pay, both remitted monthly as earned during the employee's service with the state; and be it

RESOLVED further, That these remittances are to be considered tax-free intead of current taxable income, with also a period annually when the employee may transfer all of his previous payroll deductions plus the employer's contribution (either actually paid or due but not yet remitted) to the fund he has selected for current deposits of his retirement funds; and be it

RESOLVED further, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of Portland State University, to the Governor of the State of Oregon, to the Chancellor and Members of the State Board of Higher Education, to Members of the Legislature, to the Chairpersons of faculty Senates of the OSSHE Schools, and to the Academic Personnel of Portland State University.

In a letter dated April 10, 1975 from the Presiding Officer of Portland State University Faculty Senate asked for support of this resolution.

The OSU Faculty Economic Welfare Committee was asked to consider the request for appropriate action.

At its meeting on April 17, 1975 the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee met and unanimously voted against any support of the resolution. The committee's general feeling was that the "whereas" preambles are not entirely accurate and the "resolutions" are unsound and non-operative.

3. Faculty Salary Considerations (See Appendix II and III).

The major portion of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee's time this year has been spent on faculty salary

considerations. Early in the academic year a report was given on the "Comparison of OSU Faculty Salary Statistics". This report (Appendix II), dated November 18, 1974, has had wide-spread circulation

(a) to all OSU faculty
(b) to members of the State Board of Higher Education at its meeting in Portland on November 26, 1974.
(c) to members of the Joint Ways and Means Committee of the legislature at its public hearing in Salem on April 8, 1975.

The committee hopes that the information in this report has had some favorable influence on the persons to whom it has been presented.

A second document, "Position Paper on Distribution of Faculty Salary Adjustment Funds", has been prepared by a subcommittee of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee. This final draft was adopted by the full Committee on May 8, 1975 and is included here (Appendix III). It is labeled, "Preliminary Draft for Discussion", since it is being presented to the Faculty Senate for its consideration and, hopefully, its adoption.

Copies of this Position Paper were presented to members of the State Board of Higher Education when they met on the O.S.U. campus on May 9, 1974.

Sincerely,

W. H. Simons

William H. Simons
Chairman
Faculty Economic Welfare
Committee

Enclosures.

Appendix I

Faculty Economic Welfare Committee

Report on Sick Leave

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has requested that the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee "seek available information regarding the status of sick leave policies and provide the Faculty Senate with appropriate information and recommendations on these matters." This request is an outgrowth of administrative moves to develop records on sick leave benefits associated with retirement benefits.

At present the only formal statement on sick leave is found in the Administrative Rules of the State Board of Higher Education:

> 41.060 Absence Due to Illness
>
> "Arrangements to care for the work of a staff member incapacitated by illness over a period of longer than one month must have the approval of the executive head of the institution."

Present procedures and policies on short-term sick leave:

At present there is considerable variance in policies and record keeping procedures among the schools and colleges. This, of course, reflects the differeing roles and activities of these units. Several units indicated that no procedures have been established, or are in preparation, for recording sick leave. Others have developed a variety of methods, including reporting forms, for maintaining a regular faculty record. (See attached forms for examples.)

Recommendations:

Based on a review of the statement of Dean Popovich (memo of July 31, 1974) and information received from various deans and directors, recognizing the variety of staff appointments and responsibilities, and with concern that staff receive maximum retirement benefit with a minimum of regimentation, the following policy is suggested.

> Sick leave policy:
>
> Sick leave should reflect instances when, for medical reasons, the academic staff member was not able to be present to meet scheduled classes or perform other duties that require the staff member's presence on regular working days within the term of the appointment. Responsibility for reporting days of used or unused sick leave lies with the individual staff member. The means of reporting is dependent upon procedures and forms within individual schools or operational units.

Appendix III

Preliminary Draft
for discussion
May 8, 1975

POSITION PAPER ON DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY SALARY ADJUSTMENT FUNDS*/

Planning any program to distribute salary adjustment funds should begin with thoughtful consideration of long-run, as well as short-run needs and objectives. Concern should be given to problems and inequities needing solution, detrimental consequences of past procedures, and possible future implications of present actions. It is believed that there may now be an opportunity to give attention to salary adjustment problems which should not be lost.

Given the limited resources usually allocated for salary increases, it is impossible to deal satisfactorily with all categories of need in a given year. Unfortunately, this means that efforts to deal with one category of need in any year may result in a compounding of problems in the future. For example, in recent years with limited salary increase funds, maximum dollar limits were often placed on across-the-board salary increases, and increases to those receiving promotions were minimal. The allocation of the scarce dollars was biased towards lower ranks and salaries, where, it is commonly argued, inflation hits hardest. The consequence of this action, however, has been salary compression among ranks and continuing low salaries for those promoted in lean years.

Unless a long-range policy is prepared, anticipating remedial action for these consequences in subsequent years, salary problems may become significantly compounded. In this context, it is proposed that any decisions to allocate funds should be viewed as but one step in a long-range program.

Classification and Rationale for Salary Adjustment Needs

The following is a classification of salary adjustments, with the rationale or content of each. In any given year only a portion of these can be dealt with, and then perhaps only partially.

---

* Prepared by the OSU Faculty Economic Welfare Committee (FEWC), May 1975.

I. Across-the-board adjustments[1/]

Recognition of:

A. Inflation

B. Acceptable (satisfactory) performance of faculty members.

C. Disparity with other universities.

II. Discretionary adjustments[2/]

Recognition of:

A. Compressed salary differentials among ranks.

B. Salary inequities carried from past years.

C. Outstanding performance and participation.

D. Individual recognition for other performance or need.

E. Promotion in rank or responsibility.

I.A. Inflation

This inclusion is recognition that inflation erodes the purchasing capacity of all faculty (see Exhibit 1). Recognition of inflation as a category of salary adjustment does not imply that the annual increase in salary will or should be proportional to the increase or decrease in the CPI. Rather, it is acknowledgement that some adjustment might reasonably be expected. No maximum dollar limitation should be attached to this category. Adjustments should be on a percentage basis.

The apparent justification for fixed or maximum dollar adjustment formulas is that those with lower salaries are hit hardest by inflation. However, there is no evidence to support this. In fact to the contrary, in a recent analysis of hypothetical family budgets, the Labor Department reported that from autumn 1973 to autumn 1974, the average cost to support a high-budget urban family of four increased at a higher rate than for either a low-budget or intermediate-budget family.[3/]

1/ Salary adjustments received by virtually all faculty on a uniform basis.

2/ Salary adjustments varying among individuals based on the discretion of unit administrators.

3/ "Cost of Supporting a Family in U. S. Rose Record Amount in 1974, Labor Unit Says", Wall Street Journal (April 9, 1975).

I.B. Acceptable (Satisfactory) Performance

This recognizes that all individuals who, through time, provide consistent and acceptable performance for the University should anticipate a recognition of this performance by advancement upward in salary. In addition to this are discretionary adjustments (see below) which result from outstanding performance, promotion, etc. Those faculty not providing acceptable performance, it is assumed, should be terminated.

I.C. Disparity With Other Universities

This inclusion is recognition of the well-documented lag of OSU salaries relative to the 19 institutions selected for comparison by the OSSHE. FEWC study particularly highlights the disparity at Associate and Full Professor ranks. Adjustment here is recognized as being a university-wide problem, calling for a university-wide effort to reconcile disparities between universities. Efforts to reconcile disparities within the university are considered under II below.

II.A. Compressed Salary Differentials Among Ranks

This inclusion is recognition of the narrow difference between salaries of lower ranks (Assistant Professor) and higher ranks (Professors). This compression is a reflection of at least two causes. First, starting salaries at OSU have remained relatively competitive with those of other institutions as OSU has hired new people at the starting ranks. Because of insufficient funds, however, salary increases for faculty who have been at OSU for a number of years have generally been minimal, and their salaries have not remained competitive. Thus, the salaries at lower ranks tend to remain competitive while those at higher ranks lag behind.

Second, salary increase monies in recent years have often been allocated on a fixed dollar, or maximum dollar basis, with the result that upper ranks have commonly received small percentage increases, and promotions in many years have been accompanied by only modest increments.

II.B. Salary Inequities Carried From Past Years

This inclusion is recognition of individual inequities, generated by considerations such as mistreatment due to personality conflicts, lack of recognition of service, promotions during lean years, changing priorities, etc.

II.C. Outstanding Performance and Participation

This inclusion is recognition that a substantial number of faculty members consistently perform their responsibilities in a manner beyond that indicated in I.B. above. These individuals should be rewarded for this extra effort, although the percentage increase would be expected to vary according to individual circumstances.

II.D. Individual Recognition for Other Performance or Need

This inclusion is recognition that certain individuals may, in certain cases, be characterized by unusual contributions or needs which are deserving of special recognition.

II.E. Promotion in Rank or Responsibility

This inclusion is recognition that promotion in rank usually should be accompanied by a salary increase. The magnitude will be expected to vary, depending upon the individual, present salary, etc.

Problems and Recommendations

Salary Differentials Among Ranks

This problem is illustrated by the data in Exhibit 2. Compared to the averages for 19 other universities, at OSU the relative salary differences between ranks are compressed. Furthermore, in recent years it appears that the relative differences have decreased at OSU while remaining constant for the 19. As mentioned previously, salaries at OSU have remained relatively competitive at the lower ranks, but this has not been the case for Associate and Full Professors.

When salary adjustment funds are insufficient to compensate for the impact of inflation, there is pressure to allocate relatively more to Instructors and Assistant Professors. When this is done, the University faces the critical problem of losing its productive faculty in the upper ranks to higher paying positions elsewhere.

Recommendations: The Faculty Economic Welfare Committee (FEWC) recommends that the Executive Office, in developing guidelines for across-

the-board faculty salary adjustment, use straight percentage increases rather than maximum, minimum, or fixed dollar formulas. It is also recommended that administrators, in allocating discretionary adjustment funds to administrative units and individual faculty, give attention to correcting these relative differences between ranks.

Salary Scales in the Various Administrative Units

Questions continue to be raised regarding the relative salaries of individuals in different administrative units of the University. While the removal of any inequities is a laudable objective, equality of salaries is not the proper goal to be sought, and hence the establishment of appropriate criteria and guidelines for such a program is not a simple matter.

It is recognized that there will be variations among units in starting salaries. An Assistant Professor in one administrative unit may be hired at a higher salary than a starting Assistant Professor in another unit. This generally reflects the competitive situation in the various disciplines. Once at OSU, however, the University becomes the more important frame of reference.

Recommendation: The FEWC intends to study this matter further and makes no specific recommendations at this time.

Salary Increases for Promotion

It is important that an amount be set aside to recognize and reward employees receiving promotion in rank and/or responsibility. This would appear to be consistent with the current policy of not granting a promotion without a simultaneous financial reward.

Recommendations: The FEWC recommends continuation of the current policy of normally granting an additional salary increase to faculty receiving promotion in rank.

Across-the-Board (Percentage) Versus Discretionary Adjustments

The purposes of across-the-board salary adjustments are to help compensate for the impact of inflation (see Exhibit 1), recognize continued satisfactory service, and to adjust for disparities with other universities. Discretionary increases, on the other hand, are to adjust salary differentials among ranks, remedy past inequities, and reward individual accomplishments.

Higher across-the-board increases leave less money for discretionary allocation. The committee feels that the most beneficial effects on faculty encouragement and incentive can be achieved by a formula which provides substantial funds for discretionary increases. A system of rewarding individual achievement and providing incentive for continued improved performance is a prerequisite to high faculty morale and low turnover.

Recommendation: The relative allocations of salary funds for straight-percentage across-the-board versus discretionary adjustments should depend on the total amount of salary funds available. Therefore, the FEWC will reserve a specific recommendation until this information is available. The same holds for a recommendation regarding the percent of faculty which warrant receiving discretionary increases.

It is recommended that administrative units (e.g., schools, colleges, and departments) need not necessarily share discretionary funds in proportion to their salary base, but rather that these funds be distributed according to the documented justification of unit administrators.

Salary Review

The preceding brings to light the need for a comprehensive university-wide salary study at OSU.

Recommendation: The FEWC recommends the funding of such a study to be conducted by an ad hoc committee working in conjunction with the FEWC.

EXHIBIT 1

Average OSU Academic Salaries (9-month) by Rank and State of Oregon Per Capita Income
Percentages of Incomes Required to Maintain 1970-71 Purchasing Power. a/

Fiscal year	Full Professor (%)	Associate Professor (%)	Assistant Professor (%)	Instructor (%)	All ranks (%)	Oregon Per Capita Income (%)
1970-71	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1971-72	100.0	99.8	100.2	102.5	100.4	105.3
1972-73	97.3	97.2	98.8	101.5	98.5	112.2
1973-74	93.3	92.9	95.2	96.2	94.2	113.4
1974-75	88.0	87.6	87.9	90.7	88.2	No data

a/ Incomes adjusted for Portland CPI on fiscal year (July-June) basis. CPI for 1974-75 assumes prices for January 1975 hold constant for remainder of fiscal year.

Source: Division of Analytical Services, OSSHE; U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; and U. S. Department of Commerce

Because of inflation, the purchasing power of the average Full Professor's salary in 1974-75 is only 88 percent of that which he had in 1970-71 despite salary increases in the intervening years. In contrast, the purchasing power of the average Oregon resident has continued to increase significantly during this period.

EXHIBIT 2

Average Academic Salaries (9-month) by Rank,
OSU and 19 Other Universities

Fiscal year	Full Professor as percent of Instructor		Full Professor as percent of Assistant Professor		Full Professor as percent of Associate Professor	
	19	OSU	19	OSU	19	OSU
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
1969-70	209	187	164	147	135	126
1970-71	209	190	164	144	136	124
1971-72	204	185	163	144	135	124
1972-73	206	182	164	142	136	124
1973-74	208	184	164	142	136	124
1974-75	204	184	164	145	136	124

Source: Division of Analytical Services, OSSHE.

The ratio of salaries for the average Professor and Assistant Professor at OSU is 145 percent in 1974-75. For the other 19 universities the ratio is 164 percent. Over the past five years, the compression of salaries among ranks at OSU has not improved and appears to have worsened.

Office of the
Associate Dean

Oregon State University

219 Covell Hall
Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503) 754-3001

May 13, 1975

Memorandum

To: D. B. Nicodemus, Chairman
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: W. L. Schroeder, Chairman WLS
Faculty Status Committee

Subject: Summary of 1974-75 Activities - Faculty Status Committee.

I have summarized the Committee's activities for the year to make them a matter of record for the Senate. The results of our deliberations have been reported in various memoranda as they were developed and are available, if needed. I suspect it would serve no purpose to reiterate them here.

Collective Bargaining

We sponsored two sessions during Faculty Day to provide a forum for discussion of this important issue. Both sessions were well attended. None of the Committee's subsequent activities were related to collective bargaining.

Faculty Staffing Plan

The Committee reviewed the proposed policy statement and made recommendations concerning it.

Career Development Plan

The Committee reviewed the proposed policy statement and made recommendations concerning it.

Annual Reviews and Recommendations for Promotion and Tenure

The Committee reviewed the current Administrative Rule and expressed its satisfaction with it.

Evaluation of and Tenure for Administrators

The Committee initiated the question of the status of the policy which had been proposed earlier by the Senate. It met with the President concerning his views on that policy. Later, a proposed statement by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate was reviewed. A report was presented to visitors from the State Board of Higher Education.

applicants for admission to the graduate school requesting special student status be reviewed by the Graduate Admissions Committee, with the provisions of Group B above applying. At present, applicants in the special student category are admitted through the Office of the Director of Admissions without committee review

With the addition of two new members to the committee earlier this year, bringing our total membership to eight, we have been able to deal with the work-load reasonable effectively. I believe that, at the least, the difficult decisions are getting a more thorough review than in the past.

TABLE. APPLICATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY REVIEWED BY THE GRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE FROM JAN 1, 1974 THROUGH APRIL 30, 1975.

1974

(Jan 1 - Dec 31)

	Applications		Admitted	
	Grad.	Postbac.	Grad.	Postbac.
Domestic	844	62	440	27
Non-domestic	469	32	166	8
Total	1313	94	606	35

1975

(Jan 1 - Apr 30)

	Applications		Admitted	
	Grad.	Postbac.	Grad.	Postbac.
Domestic	529	26	208	13
Non-domestic	167	3	75	3
Total	696	29	283	16

Open Records Policy

The Committee initiated an inquiry into the status of a policy which had been proposed by the Senate, and met with the President to discuss the matter. The Committee members later individually commented on a draft policy statement prepared by the Executive Office.

Executive Office Decisions - Promotion and Tenure

The Committee initiated discussions with the President and Dean of Faculty concerning review procedures and University-wide criteria for decision making. It received data regarding past decisions on these matters. A proposal for a University level committee to review promotion and tenure recommendations was considered.

Sabbatical Leaves

The Committee initiated a study of sabbatical leave policies and procedures. The President met with the Committee to indicate his interest. A final report was prepared and submitted to the President and the Dean of Faculty.

Faculty Representation on Committees

The Committee requested a review of appointment priorities for University committees with faculty representation, with the intent of determining tendencies for appointments to come from faculty versus administrative ranks. The review was provided by the Dean of Faculty.

Review of Faculty Senate Motions

The Committee made recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning two motions by Professor David Carlson:

1. A motion requesting changes in Review and Appeals Committee procedures.

2. A motion requesting written reports on personnel actions concerning faculty.

Should the Executive Committee desire a verbal presentation of our report, or more thorough recapitulation of any of the matters, I would be pleased to respond. Speaking for the Committee, I would like to thank you personally for the interest you have taken in our work and the assistance you have so willingly provided.

WLS:pe

cc: President MacVicar

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT
May 20, 1975

Subsequent to our last annual report dated May 13, 1974, the Undergraduate Admissions Committee has considered carefully all cases brought before it by the appropriate university mechanisms. Some of these have been posed by the Admissions Office; others have been brought directly by student appeal.

A total of 170 individual cases have been considered during the 1974-75 academic year. Of these 139 were accepted and 31 rejected. There was a total of 28 Office of Educational Opportunity students, and a total of 12 Athletic Department sponsored students. There was also a total of 17 foreign students considered.

The Committee appreciate the cooperation and help of all concerned. For particular mention we cite Mr. Waldo Bowers and his staff in the Admissions Office, and Mr. Dave Valencia of the Office of Educational Opportunity.

Members of the Committee serving during this period were

Robert A. Short '75, Chrm	Computer Science
Lester M. Beals '75	Education
Kurt D. Philipp '76	History
Robert L. Jarvis '77	Fisheries & Wildlife
Marti Parkinson	Education, sophomore

Ex Officio: Assistant Director of Admissions, Waldo Bowers

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY Corvallis, OR 97331
School of Pharmacy
May 22, 1975

TO : Dean Nicodemus

FROM : The Classroom Television Committee

SUBJECT: Report of Activities During the 1974-75 Academic Year

The committee has met periodically in attempts to carry out its charge, which is understood to be the development and recommendation of policy and procedures for campus-wide usage of classroom television. A history of classroom television was prepared by Dr. Harold Livingston to acquaint the members of the committee with the rapid growth of classroom television services, and it was determined by the committee that both short-term and long-range planning and goals should be developed. Areas of immediate concern which have been considered by the committee include the severe space constraints under which classroom television is presently operating, and the need for written operating procedures and priorities for the day-to-day operation of classroom television. Within the area of long-range planning and goals it was established that it would be necessary to determine the expectations of the administrative branch of Oregon State University, the expectations of the faculty, and the expectations of the students in order to properly enter into long-range planning.

Actions taken by the committee this year include the discussion and consideration of the space constraints within which classroom television is now functioning. The committee has sent a letter to the Director of the Facilities Planning and Use Committee to urge that further space be made available for classroom television services. A copy of that letter is attached to this report. The committee has also requested from Dr. Livingston, and received, a written list of priorities and operational procedures which are followed by classroom television. While such priorities have existed in the past, they have been handled as established office protocol procedures and have not been available in written form. We believe that reducing such priorities and procedures to writing is a first step on the long road to establishing the proper long-term goals and objectives. A copy of the written operational procedures may be obtained from the classroom television center.

It has become apparent to the committee that the objective of establishing long-range planning and goals cannot be met during the current academic year due to the need to gather the following information on which to base such planning and goals: (1) In order to obtain an indication of faculty expectations of classroom television Dr. Livingston was asked to develop a listing of requests

for classroom television services. He is presently in the process of developing such a listing for the entire 1974-75 academic year. Until that listing is completed, a summary of classroom television services for 1972-74 has been made available to the committee and may be obtained from the classroom television center. It should be noted that classroom television provides a great deal of service on this campus, as well as satisfying some outside requests for maintainence and production services. (2) The expectations of students regarding classroom television services can be assessed through a questionnaire which has been developed in rough form by the committee this year. (3) Finally, Dr. Livingston was requested to provide the charge to classroom television services from the administrative branch of Oregon State University.

Unfinished business which should be considered by the committee next year includes the receipt from Dr. Livingston of the itemized requests for classroom television services during the 1974-75 academic year. This information will provide a basis for establishing a questionnaire to poll the faculty and determine the expectations of the faculty with respect to classroom television. It should be noted that this survey is to include both those faculty using the services of classroom television and those faculty who do not use classroom television. Other unfinished business includes a followup with respect to the space constraints in relationship to the services provided by classroom television. It will be important for the committee to be kept informed of the developments in this area. Further activities which should be considered by the committee involves some leg work to gain information from those people who are presently using classroom television to teach their courses. It seems likely that these people will have used questionnaires in the past or some method of gathering data to determine student expectations of classroom television courses and thereby perhaps, student expectations of classroom television. These teachers, then, who have that information, should be sought out and the information collected for use by members of the committee.

In summary, the committee has dealt with both short-term and long-term planning for the use of classroom television, has identified and supported a need for further space allocation to classroom television, has initiated the development of a listing of all services which are used by faculty on this campus and other campuses as provided by classroom television, and has stimulated the development of a written list of priorities and procedures followed by classroom television.

Respectfully submitted,

J. W. Ayres.

James W. Ayres, Ph.D., Chairman
Classroom Television Committee

jm
Attachments

A. Agenda for the Senate Meeting on Thursday, November 6, 3:30 p.m., Withycombe 101

As published in the October 31 issue of the Staff Newsletter, the agenda will include the reports and other items listed below. To be approved are the Minutes of the October 9 Senate meeting as published in the October 17, 1975 issue of the Staff Newsletter Appendix.

1. Reports of the Curriculum Committee - B. H. Arnold

a. Curricular Proposals for 1976-77

The Curriculum Committee's report dated October 23, 1975 has been distributed previously to all Senators. Where appropriate, the Graduate Council concurs with the Curriculum Committee's recommendations. The Senate will be asked to consider and vote on each of the Category I recommendations in the same order as listed in the October 23 report.

The Curriculum Committee will also report further on the status of Category II Curricular Proposals and may present those which have been reviewed and approved by the Committee and by the Graduate Council

b. Personal Health Requirement (pages 4-7)

At the October 9, 1975 Senate meeting, the Executive Committee reported receiving a memorandum dated September 9, 1975 from Solon Stone with a proposed motion to eliminate the institutional requirement of one term of Personal Health (see Academic Regulation 26a.) As reported, this proposal was referred to the Curriculum Committee and to the Academic Regulations Committee. (See Minutes 320, page II).

Attached are copies of Solon Stone's proposal and the Curriculum Committee's report dated October 31, 1975 which recommends approval of the proposal. By separate mailing, the Department of Health has distributed to Senators a memorandum dated October 30, 1975 with information in support of the current Personal Health requirement. The Academic Regulations Committee has also considered Stone's proposal and may wish to report on this matter at the November 6 Senate meeting.

2. Faculty Senate Apportionment for 1976 (page 8) - R. W. Newburgh

Attached is the table of on-campus FTE in the rank of instructor or above for Faculty Senate apportionment for 1976. This table has been prepared by the Executive Committee following the same basic guidelines used in previous years and reported to the Senate as outlined in the memorandum of October 14, 1975 to members of the OSU faculty. (See Minutes 311, pages V and VII. Also please note a typographical error in the 1975 apportionment table: for the School of Business, the instructional FTE should have been 57.27 instead of 52.27; the total FTE for Business was correct so the error did not affect the number of Senators elected from that school.)

The 1976 apportionment table reflects the establishment of the new School of Veterinary Medicine which accounts in part for the decrease in the number of

Senators to be elected in the School of Agriculture. A second factor in this decrease is an inadvertent error made in last year's apportionment table by failing to exclude the FTE of off-campus faculty whose positions are funded by research grants and contracts (such as those on the AID program in Turkey).

3. Reports from the Executive Committee and from the Executive Office

B. Reports from the Executive Committee

1. University Exploratory Studies Program

At it meeting on October 9, the Senate received a report dated September 25 from Dean Stuart Knapp on the UESP and recommending its continuation. Although the Senate defeated a motion to approve the extension of the program (motion 75-320-2), this action was taken with the understanding that Dean Knapp's report had been forwarded by the Executive Committee for review by the Academic Advising Committee and by the Curriculum Committee. When reports from these two committees are received, they will be presented to the Senate for consideration and appropriate action.

2. Reporting of Grades of Graduating Seniors

On October 9, the status of the Executive Committee's consideration of Anton's motion of March 6, 1975 (motion 75-316-2TR) was reported to the Senate (see Minutes 320, page III). Later in November, the Executive Committee intends to schedule an open meeting at which interested faculty and students will be invited to consider questions relating to the schedule for the reporting of grades of graduating seniors and for commencement.

3. Student Prerogative for Space in a Course

Following the Senate's action on October 9 (see motion 75-320-3R), the Registration and Scheduling Committee was asked by the Dean of Faculty to review the temporary rule on "Student Prerogative for Space in a Course" (for the text of this rule, see Minutes 320, page III). The Executive Committee has also asked the Academic Regulations Committee to review the same rule and related matters based on comments made by members of the Senate. Both committees have been encouraged to consider the following items and to make appropriate reports or recommendations to the Senate:

a. Academic Regulation 9 - Admission to Class describes the process of "official registration"; no differentiation is made between "registration" and "admission" and in fact, the word "admission" is not used.

b. The OSU Catalog contains the following statement as part of an explanation of course prerequisites: "...In addition to stated requirements, or acceptable substitute, consent of instructor is implied for admission to class..." (see page 31 of the 1975-76 Catalog). The Academic Regulations do not appear to include any statement regarding prerequisites for a course.

c. The Schedule of Classes lists prerequisites for some courses (and for some of these, "consent" is listed), but there appears to be no information or advice to students or faculty regarding what may or should happen if a student registers for a course without the stated prerequisites.

The above items relate directly to basic questions about student prerogatives and responsibilities and those of their instructors and academic departments. The Executive Committee believes that the policies and procedures for course registration and admission to class deserve careful study.

4. Review of Institutional Executive

The vice chairman's report on October 9 to the Senate listed the members of the committee appointed by the Chancellor to assist the Board in its review of the administrative performance of the OSU President (see Minutes 320, page II). This committee is developing guidelines and procedures for carrying out its responsibilities. A draft of these guidelines was published in the October 23 issue of the Barometer and copies have been distributed to members of the OSU faculty for comments and suggestions.

At the November 6 Senate meeting, T. Darrah Thomas, a Senator and member of the committee appointed by the Chancellor, will report on the status of the committee's activities and invite questions or comments regarding the proposed guidelines.

5. Faculty Records Policy

On October 28, 1975, the vice chairman attended the meeting of the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research and Public Service Programs. This committee approved an amendment to one section of the proposed revision in the Administrative Rules on Faculty Records which is still subject to review and approval by the full Board.

The amendment approved by the Committee is an addition to a list of types of information which may be released upon request and without the faculty member's consent (such as directory and salary information). The addition is "summary information contained in faculty/course evaluations made by students". This addition was requested by the Associated Students at the University of Oregon and was reported to have the support of that institution's University Senate.

The Executive Committee invites the Senate's advice regarding this amendment.

C. Reports from the Executive Office

1. Sick Leave Plan for Academic Staff

On October 28, the Board adopted a new Administrative Rule, AR 41.061, which is essentially the same as the temporary rule whose provisions were reported to the Senate on October 9 (see Minutes 320, page IV).

2. Rules for the Adoption of Rules

The University has been advised by the Attorney General's Office that before it can adopt the Faculty Records Policy or any other institutional rules, it is necessary to adopt a rule for the adoption of rules. Effective September 13, an amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act now requires that "Prior to the adoption, amendment or repeal of any rule, the agency shall give notice of the proposed adoption, amendment or repeal...in the manner established by rule adopted by the agency which provides a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to be notified of the agency's proposed action..." Rules for the adoption of rules must be approved by the Attorney General's Office.

School of Engineering Oregon State University Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503) 754-1525

September 9, 1975

TO: David B. Nicodemus, Chairman
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Solon A. Stone, Member
Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Personal Health Requirement Elimination

The attached material I propose to bring before the Faculty Senate at its first meeting of the 1975-76 academic year.

I seek the advice of the Executive Committee relative to the motion. My feeling is that "time is of the essence" since the action proposed could be incorporated in the 1976-77 Catalog. This would be desirable and make for a smooth, early implementation of the change in graduation requirements.

I would be happy to meet with the Executive Committee or others if it is desirable to do so.

PERSONAL HEALTH REQUIREMENT

Background

I. During the 1969-70 academic year, more specifically on May 29, 1970, the Faculty Senate voted "that hygiene [personal health] be discontinued as a graduation requirement." The recommendation to change this graduation requirement came from the Council on Curriculum and Academic Policy and was considered during the same meeting in which changes were recommended in the English composition and physical education requirements.

II. The State Board of Higher Education at its July 27, 1970 meeting denied the hygiene requirement change. The changes in English composition and physical education requirements were approved on a trial basis for 1970-71. (They are still in effect.)

III. From fall term 1970 until now, no one credit-hour hygiene [personal health] courses have been offered. Previous to this, there were one, two, and three credit courses offered. No announcement, approval or hint that this unilateral increase in credit-hour requirement for hygiene [personal health] was forthcoming. Only the one term requirement remained after the Board action.

IV. The public school programs in hygiene [personal health] have improved considerably since 1970. Most children have been exposed to a broader, more in-depth treatment of this area at an earlier age than would have been contemplated previous to, say, 1970.

V. The State Board at its June 24, 1975 meeting approved the elimination of the hygiene [personal health] requirement at Eastern Oregon State College.

Motion

Considering the above and the questionable need which exists for the personal health requirement, especially at this time, or in the immediate future, the Faculty Senate votes

A. To terminate the personal health graduation requirement for students graduating after spring term 1976;

B. To require that the two or three credit-hours now used to satisfy the personal health requirement be changed to free electives in all university programs;

C. If possible, to have the approval for part A completed by the State Board, if approved, in time to be shown in the 1976-77 OSU Bulletin, and General Catalog (January 1976).

D. To prohibit any changes in personal health or hygiene courses which modify the present credit-hour requirements without the approval of the University Curriculum Committee should part A not be approved at a level above the Faculty Senate.

Curriculum Coordination

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331 (503) 754-3711

October 31, 1975

- M E M O R A N D U M -

TO: Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
David B. Nicodemus, Chairman

FROM: Curriculum Committee (University)
Frank Ligon, Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: Proposed Elimination of the
Personal Health Requirement

On September 30, 1975, the Executive Committee referred to the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Regulations Committee a memorandum from Faculty Senate member Solon Stone proposing elimination of the personal health requirement for graduation. The Curriculum Committee has completed its review of the proposal [Minutes #5, October 21, 1975], and now presents its recommendation.

Recommendation:

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve Professor Stone's motion, including clauses A, B, C, and D. If the Senate approves, the proposal will be included with the curricular requests for 1976-77 when they are forwarded to President MacVicar. Ultimately, action by the State Board of Higher Education will be required.

Discussion

The Curriculum Committee reviewed the proposal at some length with Professor Stone and with Professor Art Koski, Head of the Department of Health. It was pointed out that on July 27, 1970, the State Board had denied a request from OSU that the then current 1-hour hygiene requirement be discontinued. Instead, the Board affirmed the importance of health education and "challenged" OSU to seek to improve the quality of health instruction to insure that it be vital and relevant to the needs and interests of the students.

Professor Koski described the two-hour course, H 160, which the Department of Health has developed in response to the Board's request, as well as a proficiency examination which the Department has developed to provide students ample opportunity for challenge. He indicated that a relatively small percentage of students pass the challenge examination and urged that the 2-hour H 160 requirement be retained for at least three years, until the new high school "survival skills" graduation requirements have received a period of testing by one high school class in moving from its freshman through senior years.

Discussion (continued)

Pointing out that the State Board has now authorized EOSC, OCE, and SOSC to drop their personal health course requirement, Professor Stone referred to the increased attention given to personal health in the public schools and to the continuing complaint of students at being required to take material which they feel is a repetition of what they have already taken in high school and therefore an unproductive use of time. Professor Stone argued that the time of students and facilities of the institution should be used to better advantage and that the two freed hours should become available as free electives.

The Committee recognized in its discussion that the Health Department has made sincere efforts to develop an interesting and relevant course, in response to the Board's request, and to provide opportunities for challenge. On reviewing the proficiency examination, however, the Committee concluded that the test is oriented more toward specific text material than toward general health knowledge, and again noted the continued dissatisfaction of students with the course material as a requirement for graduation.

The Committee returned to the position it had taken in presenting the proposal to the Faculty Senate and eventually the State Board in 1970. Health education is important to everyone, but this information is being presented with increasing effectiveness in the public schools, which is the proper level of presentation. Furthermore, a substantial amount of the material duplicates information offered in greater depth to many students in college courses in psychology, sociology, biology, microbiology, genetics, and perhaps other areas. Students should be given every encouragement to take health courses to fit their needs or interests, but a specific course should not be a requirement for graduation.

Finally, the Committee noted the tendency of the Board in the most recent years to allow the institutions some leeway in establishing institutional graduation requirements, as evidenced by the authorizations to EOSC, OCE, and SOSC mentioned above.

FL:cjj

On Campus Academic FTE - Rank of Instructor and Above - for Faculty Senate Apportionment 1976
(Based on July 1, 1975 budget except Contract Research FTE is as of October 15, 1975)

College/School	Instruction	Research*	Cooperative Extension	Misc.** Budgets	Total	No. of Senators	Gain or Loss
Agriculture	47.74	159.21	63.40	15.39	285.74	20	-3
Business	59.61			3.65	63.26	5	+1
Education	54.86	12.03		11.26	78.15	6	
Engineering	80.90	15.60	1.85	8.92	107.27	8	+1
Forestry	28.63	46.83	7.60	4.16	87.22	6	
Health & Physical Education	43.96		.50	8.60	53.06	4	
Home Economics	39.90	6.79	11.12	4.45	62.26	4	-1
Liberal Arts	209.01	5.57		10.94	225.52	16	
Oceanography	11.49	33.31		7.59	52.39	4	
Pharmacy	19.95	3.42		4.05	27.42	2	
Science	186.84	31.59	2.32	7.41	228.16	16	-1
Veterinary Medicine	1.63	10.80		3.47	15.90	1	+1
Library		1.00		31.10	32.10	2	
ROTC	30.00				30.00	2	
TOTALS	814.52	326.15	86.79	120.99	1348.45	96	-2
(1975 Totals	806.15	359.58	87.20	121.30	1374.23	98	+5)
(1974 Totals	785.19	342.82	85.14	96.06	1309.21	93	-2)

*Agricultural Experiment Station, Forest Research Laboratory and Contract Research.

**Miscellaneous budgets include the Library and Museums, Tech. Advisory Services, and Other Instruction and Departmental Research (such as Summer Term, Honors Program, Women's Study, CTV, IRAM, International Education, Upward Bound, EOP, Curriculum Coordination, Radiation and Computer Centers, Sea Grant programs and other "unassociated" FTE; allocations are made to some or all units.)

10/28/75