There are about 300 P/N courses (or sections of courses) currently offered at OSU, and having just completed my first (and possibly last) experience in instructing such a course, I am compelled to comment openly. I had a group of honors students in UH 111 Colloquium, of which six hours credit is required of those who wish to graduate with honors, so all my students were in the Honors Program. The advertised topic for this course was centered on a recent book that dealt with a new concept of the origin of life, regular assignments were made, and the class meetings centered on discussions of the assignments along with related topics occasionally introduced by the students.

Attendance varied from perfect to as low as 50%. One student revealed in the last week that he hadn't yet obtained a copy of the book, hence could not study. A short essay assignment was fulfilled by only 60% of the students on time. I judge that $\frac{2}{3}$ of the group came to class unprepared, even though rather sharp and clear directions were made that contributions to the class discussions were expected. There was no authorized final examination for the course.

I was faced with the problem of assigning grades of P/N when I really had sufficient information to assign P+, P, P-, N+, and N grades. I'm sorry, dear inventor of P/N grades, I simply found more than two levels of performance. Since I would be embarrassed by assigning any N grades to honors students (less than 0.2% of P/N grades are reported as N grades at OSU), this means that all students, according to their records, performed equally well. This, to me, is an insult to the conscientious student.

The inventors of P/N grading must have had something in mind other than the grading of courses aimed toward any particular level of achievement. Or, is P/N grading intended primarily for courses that have little or no content, or to avoid embarrassment to the instructor of evaluating student achievement? A P grade for a student who attends only half the time, and who obviously hasn't done any assignments, implies that he is learning as much or more by not doing these things. This further leads to the conclusion that the student can essentially buy a portion of credits needed for graduation without even attending class. And this, I'm told, actually occurs at OSU. Does this eventually lead to the prompt payment of tuition as the only requirement for a bachelor's degree? This concept of a college education has already been formulated, known as Baxter University in Florida, wherein a student takes no courses (why bother with any grading, let alone instruction) but graduates if he pays tuition regularly for four years. This arrangement, of course, obviates the need for classrooms, library, administrators, and most of all faculty.
My conclusion from this experience is that P/N grading is a cop-out on the parts of both students and faculty. In our efforts to insure a maximum of happiness for both, the onus of having to measure up to a respectable level of academic achievement and to measure that level itself has been removed.

The proponents of P/N grading, no doubt, have advanced sufficient arguments in defense of this sort of procedure, but my actual experience with such a course leaves me academically distressed. My heart goes out in gratitude to the inventors of quantitative evaluations of academic performance. I am fully aware that tradition has become a naughty word, but what has happened to academic excellence and its identification?

December 26, 1973

W. H. Slabaugh
Department of Chemistry
Professor Warnath on Collective Bargaining

I welcome Professor Warnath's contribution on collective bargaining. Understandably, he as an officer in A.A.U.P. wishes to sell his organization. I wish him luck because I am a member of his organization too. But I am also a member of O.S.E.A. and see its advantages even more clearly.

Professor Warnath objects to O.S.E.A. because its membership includes non-academic people in state employment. What he does not say is that we would be in entirely separate bargaining units. Faculty input would determine our bargaining objectives. As in any democratic organization the quality of the people participating is crucial.

As Professor Warnath states, our negotiators must "be both knowledgeable about and sensitive to the priorities of faculty concerns." The bargaining committee would include the best faculty members we could find, plus some professional negotiators. Without some professional guidance faculty negotiators would find themselves at a severe disadvantage when facing professionals.

The O.S.E.A. has professional negotiators and a staff. More would be needed if we faculty would use O.S.E.A. as our bargaining agent. However, the additional expense would be considerably less than for an organization which at this time lacks such a staff. O.S.E.A. is more likely to be able to finance collective bargaining for faculty without an increase in dues than any other organization.

The state will continue to bargain with O.S.E.A. for classified employees no matter which organization is chosen by the faculty to represent us. If we are in entirely different organizations the divide and conquer technique can be used against us. If we are all in O.S.E.A. an impasse in either bargaining unit would pose a political threat to any governor.

Collective bargaining will come when one organization wins a certification election. Such an election may be for one campus or for the entire system of higher education. To secure such an election some organization must petition the Public Employees Relations Board and furnish signatures from 30% of the potential bargaining unit members. Once one organization has fulfilled this requirement, other organizations may present petitions signed by 10% of the bargaining unit in order to gain a place on the ballot.

Before the Board sets a date for an election it must decide several questions. What should be the extent of the bargaining unit? Should it be campus-wide or system-wide? Who is eligible to vote? For example, should department chairmen be considered members of the bargaining unit? The Board then decides these issues and determines which organizations have met the requirements to be placed on the ballot.

At the election the outcome is determined by a majority of those voting. On the ballot there are two issues to be decided: (1) whether or not the majority voting wish to be represented by some organization and (2) which organization should be given certification. If two or more organizations are on the ballot, the first issue is likely to be decided in favor of collective bargaining. Forty per cent of
the total membership in the bargaining unit is likely to be a majority of those voting if all who sign make it to the polls. (O.S.E.A. policy is to require signatures from a majority of the bargaining unit before it seeks an election.)

If a majority vote decides that there will be collective bargaining, the votes for particular organizations are counted. The one receiving a majority is certified as the bargaining agent. If no organization has a majority, the Board conducts a run off election between the two organizations receiving the highest number of votes in the first election.

Once an organization has been certified, it has a status that no faculty organizations have had so far. Those with whom we would bargain must do more than listen to us politely. They must bargain with us in good faith. If we achieve system-wide bargaining the Chancellor and his negotiators will bargain with us. However, they will not bargain over their recommendations to the Governor. Instead they will serve as the Governor's agent and possess the power to complete agreements with us. They must make offers and counter offers. The negotiations may continue for months always under the possibility of reaching an impasse.

What happens if we reach an impasse? In the first place, the newspapers would publicize the event with speculation as to what the result might be. The first step is mediation where a third party tries to aid both parties to reach a settlement. If mediation fails, a prestigious fact-finder is appointed. He hears both sides and makes a recommendation. In case either side rejects his recommendations, he publicizes his findings.

After all attempts to resolve an impasse, public employees are permitted by law to strike unless their strike would create a danger to health, safety, and welfare of the public. For those employees not permitted to strike compulsory binding arbitration is provided. Someone like the fact-finder is given authority to make the decision after listening to both sides.

It is doubtful that the process would proceed through all the steps outlined. Most of the political leaders of this State would insist that the Governor bargain responsibly with us. His budget is not the last hurdle but it is the crucial one. The legislature must fund the budget. They sometimes cut it but seldom add something more for us. The last legislature was more sympathetic to employee interests than any in a generation, but we lost out anyway. They would not change the Governor's budget. Instead, they said we should have bargained with him.

The process of collective bargaining can be long and involved. The Chancellor and the Governor are exposed at each step. Any impasse, unless obviously caused by our unreasonableness, reflects unfavorably on their public image as to how well they are doing their jobs. We can not expect miracles, but we should receive better treatment than what we have been getting.

Collective bargaining will take more than good will. It will require staff work, professional negotiators, and an involved faculty. No doubt other organizations like A.A.U.P. could serve us after they have raised their local dues and built a competent staff. We in O.S.E.A. are ready any time a majority of faculty members wish our services.

Lafe Harter
Department of Economics
January 1, 1974
A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENT --
THE CHOICE IS STILL YOURS

OSSEA has not been designated as the bargaining agent for the O.S.U. faculty -- or for any other state system faculty -- as implied in local newspaper articles. The fact is that the "ballot" referred to was simply a survey to determine whether enough interest existed at the present time among faculty for collective bargaining to make an effort by OSEA or any other group a worthwhile investment of time and energy. The results are obviously not entirely conclusive. Only about one-half of the state system faculty responded and no breakdowns of returns from the different institutions was offered. An informal inquiry among faculty on other campuses indicates that some did not receive the survey. Part-time people are to be excluded if OSEA does become the bargaining agent (a factor not publicized prior to the survey); so we do not know how the results were affected by the votes of people who did not realize that they would be excluded from an OSEA bargaining unit.

One fact is perfectly clear -- the OSEA State Executive Board has decided to proceed with a formal election on the O.S.U. campus. The question facing O.S.U. faculty is whether it will allow itself to be organized by default by an organization which, with the considerable resources available to it from a large classified membership, can undoubtedly mount a very professional campaign. The O.S.U. faculty should ask itself whether it is willing to cast its lot with an organization whose orientation has been to the problems of clerks, typists and custodial staff and whether, being in the minority in such an alliance, its particular needs and special working conditions can be adequately served.

Despite the fact that OSEA can make the point that it is already well organized and financed to represent other state employees, a faculty member must recognize that no blanket organization representing diverse groups can afford to lobby for some special or unique consideration for one of its units unless it can be balanced off against some special gain for the other groups which it represents. Logically, the power in a blanket group will flow toward the sub-groups with greatest membership and financial input.

OSSEA has pointed to the fact that its classified personnel received a slightly higher percentage increase than did the faculty at the last session of the legislature. This tends to obscure several relevant points: (1) OSEA has had faculty branches on state system campuses and was, in effect, committed to representing its faculty membership but was ineffective in its efforts, (2) classified salaries are embarrassingly low (ask your department secretary what she earns) and lobbying to pull people above the poverty level is simpler than making a case for a group which are perceived by the public (rightly or wrongly) to be earning substantially more money than the average worker, (3) the OSEA orientation to collective bargaining is essentially the traditional industrial model requiring the rigid lock-step system tied to seniority basic to most unions and antagonistic to the incentive systems
which professionals have used for motivation, and finally (4) although salaries must be a critical issue in any negotiations, faculty have much to lose in areas related to their working relationships and their current freedom to innovate and adjust to changing conditions within higher education if the bargaining agent is not sensitive to their unique situation.

Collective bargaining does not create money although it may force some immediate reallocations and insure that procedures are clear and that no one works below the scale for his/her position. Collective bargaining cannot insure that no one will lose his/her job as the inability of OSEA to prevent the current cut-backs in custodial staff on the O.S.U. campus should make crystal clear.

There are alternatives to OSEA but faculty must be willing to invest their time and energy to encourage those alternatives. AAUP is one alternative... It has a long history of defending the rights of college faculty and of formulating the statements used as guidelines by most administrators in colleges and universities. It has worked effectively for faculty but its quiet low-key style of operation now poses a problem in the face of the more militant confrontations of the unions competing for faculty allegiance. It has in the past waited for an invitation from the faculty member involved before stepping in on grievance matters. It has not sought to impose the values for which it stands on administrators or faculty. Where campuses have been quiet, AAUP has rightfully been charged with being simply another once-a-month luncheon club. However, AAUP is in the process of change. It has won virtually every college collective bargaining election which it has contested and recently succeeded in overturning the University of Hawaii collective bargaining agreement written by AFT which eliminated tenure.

Oregon AAUP does not have the financial resources of OSEA. Its leadership, with the exception of an Executive Secretary, is composed of volunteer faculty members. This weakness is, at the same time, its strength since faculty can be assured that their fellow faculty will work exclusively to meet their unique needs. Within the organization are lawyers, economists and labor negotiators. It does not lack professional expertise.

However, AAUP does need a significant increase in concerned membership. It needs substantially increased funds as well as a willingness on the part of faculty to devote time and energy to assure that when collective bargaining is voted in the bargaining agent will be the organization which has been working over the years to protect faculty interests. Without AAUP, for instance, the state system would very likely have had a tenure quota system and regular part-time people would probably not have been included on tenure lines. Much yet needs to be done, but AAUP will quite literally go out of business in Oregon if faculty do not become concerned about the present situation and support its efforts to make a contest of the upcoming collective bargaining election....

Charles Warnath
Psychology
January 31, 1974
Among the least popular pieces of paper crossing each faculty member's desk must be the quarterly Faculty Activity Report. While it is bad enough that one must go through the professionally distasteful task of formally accounting for one's time and effort, additionally there is the common feeling that the report takes more time to complete than should really be necessary. And overriding these undoubtedly minor annoyances is the frustration of not knowing who ultimately uses these figures, and for what purposes. These factors often result in a report prepared with a minimum of care and accuracy, and therefore possessing questionable validity. The following pages are an attempt to alleviate some of the above problems by explaining the uses to which the Faculty Activity Reports are put, and by indicating the steps being taken to reduce the effort needed to fill them out.

Five copies of the Faculty Activity Report are produced. One goes to the faculty member, and another is kept in the faculty member's school by either the Department Chairman or the Dean. Most schools make very minimal use of this data since they have access to resumes and other more appropriate personnel information upon which to base their decision-making. A third copy goes to the Office of Budgets and Personnel Services, where it is microfilmed and added to the faculty member's personnel file, with no evaluation of the data being made. The fourth copy of the Faculty Activity Report comes to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research, and the final copy is sent to the Chancellor's Office. It is at these latter two offices that various reports are generated from the data. To better explain the contents of these reports, it will help to briefly review the format of the Faculty Activity Report itself. The report is organized into five sections as follows:

Section I: Personnel Data -- this section contains data identifying the faculty member and his or her position.

Section II: Funding -- this section identifies the accounts from which the faculty member is paid and the percent of the annual salary rate provided by each account.

Section III: Activity Detail -- this section identifies the distribution of the faculty member's effort (measured by time spent) over specific categories of academic activity.

Section IV: Course Data -- this section identifies the teaching duties assigned to the faculty member, and the student enrollment and facilities use data corresponding to these courses.

Section V: Additional Activity Specifics -- this section allows the faculty member to identify other specific accomplishments or activities performed.
It should be noted that Faculty Activity Reports have been collected over the past 40 years at OSU. The format of this form, and the reports generated from it, have changed quite a bit during these years. Although each of the State institutions is required to submit Faculty Activity Reports to the Chancellor’s Office, the form distributed at OSU has been modified to present data in a more useful format. Following is a description of the reports which are currently prepared on a routine basis from the Faculty Activity Reports.

USE OF THE DATA

1. Computation of Average Faculty Workloads by Budgetary Unit

The average number of hours spent by faculty members in various academic activities, taken from Section III of the Faculty Activity Report, is aggregated and averaged for each budgetary unit (usually synonymous with department). The averages are then further broken down and displayed by rank within department. No finer level of detail is presented, and hours spent by individual faculty members are not considered. For the academic year 1972-73 the average workweek for full-time teaching faculty for various departments ranged from 45 hours to 64 hours, and the university-wide averages were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Service</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Advising</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsponsored Research</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Activities</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Activities</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Per Week</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is prepared by the Chancellor’s Office at several-year intervals. The principal reason for the report (as is the case for many of the statistical studies done by the Chancellor and by the University) is to maintain the ability to respond to questions or demands by external agencies. This Workload Report has been used to refute recurring accusations that a faculty member with, say, a nine hour teaching load is being paid by the State for only nine hours of work each week. Such reports are thus quite valuable, even though they may play no significant role in the administrative decision-making process at either the Chancellor's Office or the University.

2. Computation of Cost for University Programs

A second, and more important, use for the data in Section III of the Faculty Activity Report is in the calculation of costs for the programs of the University. The Legislature has mandated the use of a large computer simulation model (now being implemented at the Chancellor’s Office) to analyze program costs at each of the State institutions, and OSU is independently studying the possible use of
other costing models to aid in the resource allocation process. A major task involved in such models is that of distributing the expenses of the university over each of the instructional, research, and public service programs being carried out. Included is the task of distributing the salary paid to each faculty member over the programs to which he or she contributes. This may be accomplished in one of three ways:

(a) By assignment -- a faculty member's salary is assigned to various programs in proportion to that person's formal assignment in the program. For example, if an instructor teaches two 3-unit courses, the instructional wages would be equally divided between the two courses without regard to the time and effort put into either course.

(b) By supervisor's estimate -- a Department Chairman is asked to estimate the amount of time and effort his faculty members put into each of their activities. This allows for reasonably realistic cost allocations without the need to elicit large-scale cooperation from an entire faculty.

(c) By faculty questionnaire -- each faculty member is asked to estimate the amount of time and effort actually spent on each category of activity so that costs may be apportioned on the basis of this personal accounting. This method carries the greatest potential for accurate and meaningful cost distributions, but also can be susceptible to widespread abuse.

Section III of the Faculty Activity Report has been designed to furnish the information necessary to implement method (c) above. It should be noted that for these costing calculations the total weekly number of hours reported by a faculty member is of no interest -- all that matters is how these hours are distributed over the listed activities (and hence over the University's programs). However, it is generally much easier to estimate hours spent per week in a given activity than it is to state the percent of one's workweek devoted to that activity, so the average number of hours is requested as data from which percentages may be calculated. It is important to emphasize that no evaluation or analysis is made of an individual faculty member's distribution of effort; the individual distributions are automatically aggregated and then combined with many categories of support costs before a total program cost is reported.

The two studies described above are the only uses to which the information in Section III of the Faculty Activity Report is put. All other reports are based largely on the information in Section IV, and are described below:

3. Cost-Load Study

For each budgetary unit, the total number of student credit hours taught, the total number of FTE faculty members, and the total faculty wages are calculated. It is then possible to compute student/faculty ratios, costs per student credit hour, and student credit hours generated per FTE faculty member (called productivity ratios). Such calculations may be criticized in many regards, including the fact that all of a faculty member's instructional wages are credited to his classroom or course teaching alone, and that the productivity ratio may seem to be a rather meaningless concept. These criticisms are well-founded, and have prompted the current interest in the more sophisticated costing techniques.
described above. However, it should be noted that in the absence of a detailed Faculty Activity Report, the Cost-Load Studies currently used would remain the only source for such information. These studies are used by the Chancellor's Office to justify expenditures for funding purposes, so it certainly appears desirable to eventually implement the most accurate and valid costing model possible.

4. Course Size and Section Size Reports

The Chancellor's Office prepares two reports summarizing the data on the number of students enrolled in each course and section listed in Section IV of the Faculty Activity Report. The Course Size Report lists all courses with enrollments under 10 and all courses with enrollments over 100, and then displays the number of courses offered by each school for different levels of student enrollment. The Section Size Report details the number of students enrolled in each section of every course offered by the University. Both reports are used by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs to judge demand for various course offerings and to help evaluate requests for new programs and new campus units. This information must be obtained from the Faculty Activity Report rather than from the Office of the Registrar because certain data (such as the number of students in each lab or recitation section of certain courses, or the number of students handled by individual faculty members under the reserve course numbers) is not available from any other source.

5. Space Utilization Study

The Chancellor's Office prepares a report detailing the usage of each room on campus from facilities usage data in Section IV of the Faculty Activity Report. The number of students in each room during each hour of the day is displayed by type of room, and is compared to the capacity of the room. This report is returned to the University, where it is used by the Facilities Planning and Use Committee to help evaluate requests for additional space, or to reallocate space between departments or schools. The report is also forwarded to the Legislature in a highly summarized form.

The five types of reports described above are the studies routinely generated from the Faculty Activity Reports. Occasionally other special studies are undertaken upon specific request; for example, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research has collected information for some departments on their total number of FTE faculty. However, the use of individual Faculty Activity Reports for evaluative purposes at the University or State level has been almost nonexistent. In the past six years there have been only a few occasions when a Faculty Activity Report has been requested by the President's Office, and there has been an instance (in the mid 60's) when the State Ways and Means Committee asked the Chancellor's Office for all Faculty Activity Reports from a specified department on one of the State system campuses. With the exception of these quite isolated cases, all analysis and evaluation of individuals through their Faculty Activity Reports is done at the department or school level.
PREPARATION OF THE FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

For the past several quarters, filling out the Faculty Activity Report has been a painstaking process. In large part this was due to the physical change taking place in the Report; as it was changed to take up only one side of the paper there was insufficient time to arrange for the preprinting of data. The Office of Planning and Institutional Research is now taking steps to alleviate this difficulty. It is anticipated that the Faculty Activity Reports distributed Winter Term will have Sections I and II preprinted, allowing the faculty member to catch and correct errors on the University's faculty personnel file. Efforts are now underway to enable partial preprinting of Section IV, with Spring quarter 1974 as the target date for implementation. And finally, Section V of the Report has been eliminated entirely since there is no need for this information at any level higher than the individual school, and most schools have their own means of securing the same information.

When all of these procedures have been put into effect, the only work required of the faculty member will be the following:

(a) Read Sections I and II, and make corrections if necessary
(b) Fill in Section III in an abbreviated form to be specified at a later date.
(c) Fill in Column (11) of Section IV.
(d) Add to Section IV any teaching assignments not already preprinted. This will be necessary for some lab and recitation sections, team teaching activities, and individual instruction under a reserve course number.

In this period when the legislative buzzword is "accountability" and the resources available to the University remain severely limited, it is unthinkable that resource allocation decisions be made in ignorance of basic information on the costs and demand for the programs of the University. The new computer costing models now being developed are earnest attempts to supply comprehensive information realistically describing the consumption of resources on a programmatic basis. It is hoped that by making the data input process as efficient and painless as possible, and by keeping faculty members informed of the uses of the data they are asked to supply, that the faculty cooperation so necessary to this process will be forthcoming.

Stefan D. Bloomfield
Assistant Director
Planning and Institutional Research
February 5, 1974

(EDITORIAL NOTE: The above paper which provides information about Faculty Activity Reports might be considered more appropriate for an administrative memorandum than for a Faculty Forum Paper. However, the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee felt that the inclusion of this paper was appropriate because of the widespread faculty interest and concern regarding the form and use of these reports; additional justification for including this paper in the OSU Faculty Forum Papers is saving of the cost of a separate mailing. DBN.)