

Chair Betty Ruth Estes convened the meeting at 3:10 and established that there was a quorum. Wei Yaun, an adjunct faculty and MPA student newly-arrived from Peking, was introduced. The Chair moved Richard Jones' report from third to first item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Information on campus adjudication.

Richard Jones explained his role as campus adjudicator. When it is brought to his attention that a student is displaying unusual behaviors, he will contact that student's faculty. The faculty then usually assume the "helper" role. He also encouraged the faculty to contact him with reports of disturbing behaviors. To emphasize, he cited last spring's tragedy as possibly having been avoidable.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting.

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as read.

3. Agenda Committee proposal regarding nominations and elections for faculty offices.

Betty Estes discussed the following Agenda Committee recommendations: (1) that, as last year, nominations for the Chair of the Faculty Meeting be submitted in the time between the first and second faculty meetings, with the election to be held at the second faculty meeting; and that that same procedure be followed for (a) representative to the Board of Trustees, (b) 3 representatives to the Council of Faculty Representatives and (c) 2 representatives to the President's Council; (2) that the candidates for the Chair of the Faculty Meeting make brief presentations at the second faculty meeting about their qualifications for that office. Candidates for the other offices, however, should not expect to do so; (3) that the Agenda Committee membership will consist of the representatives to the Council of Faculty Representatives, the representatives to the President's Council, the Chair of the Faculty Meeting, and 3 persons elected from the general faculty membership. They further recommended that the first priority in selection of at-large members should be to ensure that if any of the five major faculty office areas is not already represented, an at-large member from the unrepresented area should be chosen; (4) that the Agenda Committee meet only once each month unless additional meetings are needed.

All four proposals were unanimously accepted.

4. New leave without benefits policy.

Patrick Hill referred to the new policy outlined in his 9/13/84 "What's Afoot?" memo, designed to assist faculty who feel the need for some professional time away from teaching. Restrictions are: the leave has to be used for professional purposes (broadly defined), the recipient must return to employment at TESC, and the number of leaves is restricted by availability of funds. Pete Henderson asked if the timing of such proposals could be more flexible/frequent than once a year. Hill thought yes; at least once a quarter. Ron Woodbury inquired about the length of such a leave. Hill suggested a maximum of two years (six quarters), but with preference to be given to new applicants (one year at a time).

Rudy Martin questioned if monies for this were taken from the Professional Leave fund. Hill explained they are not--they are taken from a faculty's salary allocation with the expectation that replacement hires would not be paid as much regular faculty. Mike Beug suggested that this leave option have a one-quarter maximum.

Patrick concluded the discussion by announcing that a formal proposal for the Handbook will be presented to the faculty in November.

5. Advertisement for John Perkins' replacement.

Patrick began by saying that the job description draft (shared with the faculty) was much the same as when John was hired. After some concern was expressed about the master's degree minimum qualification (Kaye V. Ladd, Kirk Thompson, Richard Cellarius, John Aikin, Jovana Brown), it was generally agreed to remove the "minimum qualifications" paragraph and state that "an earned doctorate or equivalent is strongly preferred."

(Note: the revised advertisement will appear in the Chronicle on October 24 and October 31.)

6. Report on the Presidential Search.

Ken Dolbeare reported that the search is going well. Approximately 200 applicants are expected, and the overall quality is very good. "But," he reminded the group, "nothing really matters until we have an outstanding person accept an offer from the Board of Trustees." A December appointment is expected. Ken asked for help from the faculty in the design of campus visits. The Committee will provide the campus community with information about and assessments of all the candidates, in the candidates' own words.

The Search Committee plans at this time to interview 7-8 semi-finalists off-campus and later 2-3 finalists on-campus.

7. Proposal regarding group to study distribution of merit pay funds.

John Perkins outlined his recent memo dealing with the question of whether there is a need to revise our policy on merit pay raises. He stated that the deans are "a little nervous" about having to award \$1000 bonuses. They are particularly concerned that evaluation letters are not suited to the task. He, therefore, asked for the original study group to reconsider their suggestions or that a new study group be formed to go back and consider some new options. John said that in discussions with legislators this summer, it began to seem possible that we may be able to structure our step increases to absorb all of the monies of the merit allocation.

Hill requested that a decision on the matter be made in October in consideration of the November 15 contract deadline.

Mike Beug moved that the original study group be reconvened. Ron Woodbury recommended that Byron Youtz be added to the group because of his experience and skill with numbers. Rob Knapp seconded.

Unanimously approved.

8. Faculty hiring report.

Barbara Smith began by announcing that one more student is needed for the Faculty Hiring DTF. The hiring strategy outlined in the biennial budget was basically a two-year approach to hiring. In the first year (85-86), we will look at some growth in the faculty with the main effort being to stabilize our current curriculum and fill it out in places for which we've had no faculty or continuous visiting faculty--and when possible, to fill out areas in which we've had almost no rotate-ability. The second year (86-87), we will focus on adding new curricular areas and filling in some of the areas in slightly new directions. Emphasis will be on building on our existing strengths. However, Barbara pointed out that the plan for 86-87 could very well change.

Of the proposed 20 new faculty hires, it appears that only 8 can be 3-year appointments. (Those numbers could go up or down depending upon resignations, etc.) A number of positions are not yet posted. For instance, if we do get funding for an Education program, those faculty positions will be posted in January.

Major issue: which positions will be 3-year hires? The convenors have recommended the following criteria for 3-year positions: (1) "tried and true," i.e., preference given to proven TESC teachers or teachers from a highly similar environment; (2) affirmative action considerations; (3) teaching slots in "key" places in the curriculum, e.g., computers.

9. Proposal on summer school.

John Perkins discussed his recent summer school memo. An issue which materialized over the summer during budget preparation talks is whether we should have a self-sustaining or state-supported summer school. Since 1982 we have run a self-sustaining summer school in which the tuition and fees' income is our only source of paying faculty salaries.

The deans identified three relevant points of view: (1) their construction and organization of the curriculum; (2) the fact that under the self-sustaining plan it is possible to lose money (although in three years we have not); (3) faculty point of view--i.e., under self-sustaining more can be employed, but salary is dependent on enrollment levels; under state-supported, fewer faculty can teach, but salary is guaranteed.

As it stands, our biennial budget does request a state-supported summer school, but there are two conditions under which we could withdraw that request: (1) if faculty have a very strong preference for self-sustaining; or (2) if taking out that request could result in the legislature's willingness to support TESC at a higher dollar level during the regular academic year.

John then asked for faculty thoughts on this subject; a lively discussion followed.

Beug liked the bargaining feature of our plan. Perkins added that self-sustaining allows more administrative flexibility; risks can be taken. Lovern King expressed concern about this past summer's out-of-state tuition costs and the impact that it particularly seemed to have on study

abroad programs. Mark Papworth shared his very sorrowful 1982 Israel experience. Jin Darney said that self-sustaining is problematic on the Vancouver campus. Powell was very opposed to self-sustaining. Bob Sluss asked if summer quarter teaching could be substituted for another quarter. No motion was made. Chair Estes asked for a straw vote. The results were: state-supported = 16; self-sustaining = 0; abstaining = 6.

Patrick Hill solicited participation in 1984-85 DTF's and study groups.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:00.