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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 1, 2007
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Rueter for Balshem, Borkan for Collins, _______ for Hook, _______ for Khalil, Pejcinovic for Morris, George for Medovoi.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 4, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Morris was present; Nishishiba was present for Gelmon.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda:
President’s Report
Discussion Item: Committee of the Whole to discuss items of concern to the Senate.
E-1 Motions regarding June 2007 EPC Recommendations – Flower.

The 2007-08 PSU Faculty Governance Guide is now available at oaa.pdx.edu, in “Reference Documents.”
Changes in Senate/committee appointments since June 4, 2007: Committee on Committees Chair: Judy Patton; Budget Committee Chair: Cheryl Livneh; Senate replacements: Andrew Tolmach replaced C. Brown (sabbatical); Jennifer Welnick has replaced Santen (PSU resignation), A0; Agnes Hoffman has replaced Cardenas (PSU resignation), A0.

Item G-1, ACAIT Annual Report to the Faculty Senate was emailed to members last week. Copies are available at the front table.

The Presiding Officer reminded that a meeting of the Committee on Committees would follow immediately after the Senate meeting, in CH 53.

The Presiding Officer reminded that Senators are invited to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Coffee with members of the State Board of Higher Education on Friday, October 5, 8-9 a.m. in the Browsing Lounge.

President’s Report

REARDON noted that he briefly wanted to address issues around the Oregon University System based on the last legislative session. The Chancellor employed a strategy to span the next 2-3 sessions that we all need to participate in. In the last session, we began with an emphasis on building back, and in the next session we want to continue that approach. We will continue to work for full funding for enrollment, new and continuing. We will also work on future developments, to enhance higher education and research in the Portland area. The State Board of Higher Education (http://www.ous.edu/state_board/) has created the “Portland Agenda” subcommittee, chaired by J. Francesconi, that is scheduled to forward proposals as soon as the January meeting. There are several other sub-committees of note, one addressing access and serving under-represented populations, chaired by Dalton Miller-Jones, another on governance of the state system, and another on portfolios, the latter overlapping the “Portland Agenda” group.

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that he wanted to thank those who attended the convocation, and hopes it will be a good year. He noted that he has laid out several priorities in his Welcome Back letter, as is optimistic about them based on the improvements in this budget.

KOCH noted that the Board has passed five new PSU degrees since June, including the BS in Environmental Engineering, the Urban Design Graduate Certificate, the PhD in Chemistry, the MM in Music/Jazz Studies, and the BA/BS in Film. He also noted that the BA in Social Work is scheduled to go before the board this week, and that the PhD in Mech. Engineering has been approved by the Provosts Council to undergo the external review stage. KOCH noted that he takes these events and others in the last 4-5 years, as a signal that there has been a clear change in how PSU is being perceived at the system level. We are clearly on a whole different course, and we look forward to continuing on that course with more strategic additions.
KOCH noted that on the subject of Academic Priorities, we have made progress. Regarding improving student success, we are working on improved student completion rates and improved advising, and we are moving forward on developing common learning outcomes. Regarding enhancing education in the Portland area, we will start that project this fall. Regarding the third priority, to expand innovative research, scholarship and creativity, we want to implement a process for advancing selected programs, which will also impact building fulltime faculty at the institution.

KOCH noted that the Search for the Vice Provost for Student Affairs is coming to a speedy conclusion, with candidates scheduled to visit campus this month.

RUETER asked if there is an organized resistance to the U of Oregon having new programs in Portland. KOCH noted that the only resistance is from all the components that go into running a program complicated by distance, etc. REARDON noted that the production of PhD’s in the system has remained flat, however PSU’s have gone up, and there is a message there in what needs to be done in the metropolitan area.

DESROCHERS noted that the work on the Portland Agenda committee would be very important with respect to university collaborations and also the relationship with community colleges. The governance committee is chaired by John Von Schlegell, who hasn’t called a meeting but has done several interviews with key people at the university and chancellor’s level.

BURNS asked Desrochers to review changes to the Motor Pool, including the move to Swan Island, the price hikes, and the reduced hours that would additionally inflate costs. DESROCHERS noted that a meeting is planned to work on this, the Motor Pool having been moved precipitously as a result of the timing of the PCAT demolition.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Educational Policies Committee Recommendations of June 2007

FLOWER/KETCHeson MOVED “following upon the recommendations of the Educational Policy Committee in its June 4, 2007 report to the Senate, the Committee on Committees reevaluate the roles of faculty on those Senate committees that deal with such issues as student petitions and minor course changes, the aim being to determine whether those sorts of tasks are an appropriate use of faculty time on such committees, and to report their findings and recommendations to the Senate.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER/RUTH MOVED “following upon the recommendations of the Educational Policy Committee in its June 4, 2007 report to the Senate, the Committee on Committees evaluate membership on curriculum-related committees to determine whether a majority of instructional faculty are in place
to inform decisions regarding academic issues and then to report their findings and recommendations to the Senate."

__________________ queried if this isn’t just counting; the motion should address objectives.

BARHAM stated that many committees already have divisional representation and can’t always fill it. _______________ stated that the motion should address that. RUETER stated that the Committee on Committees does what they want, so a combination of the two motions sends a message to them about these issues.

BLEILER urged that this is just asking a committee to count noses, therefore an ineffectual motion. JHAJ stated he agreed with Rueter, noting that petitions reflect instructional issues, and passing them off to staff blinds faculty to the important issues.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by 44 in favor, 18 against, 10 abstentions.

E. NEW BUSINESS

None.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

SMALLMAN presented the report for the committee (attached). The bulk of their work last year had to do with transitioning from WebCT 4 to new iterations for web curriculum support. FLOWER asked how large the pilot would be in fall 2007. SMALLMAN noted that it would be very small.


LABISSIERE presented the report, in “G-2” for the committee, noting that they are committed to university-wide sustainable assessment practices. He summarized activities to date and discussed next steps, which are summarized on page 4.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:40.
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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 5, 2007
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Garbarino for Baccar, Pejinovic for Chrzanowska-Jeske, for Farquhar, Bodegom for Jiao, L. Mercer for Medovoi, for Ramiller, Chang for Works.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Christine Cress was in attendance; Shearer was in attendance for Khalil; Jones was in attendance for Hook; p. 4, Para. 2 and 3: Lafferrière was the speaker.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Corrections to the Faculty Governance Guide: The January Senate Steering Committee Meeting is January 14, 2008 at 3-5 p.m. The Chair of the Academic Requirements Committee is Martha Hickey. The Chair of the Library Committee is not Lisa Zurk.
Changes in Senate representation since October 1, 2007: E. Gilliland, ED has resigned eff. November 5, 2007. Kathi Ketcheson has been named the interim chair of the Faculty Development Committee.

Changes in the day’s agenda: The President’s Report is cancelled. President Reardon sends his regrets; he has been called away to another meeting.

**Provost’s Report**

KOCH noted that at the State Board meeting last week, the BA in Social Work and the BA/BS in Arts Studies were approved. The Provost Council approved the Cert. in Turkish Studies, which will go before the State Board presumably at their next meeting in January.

KOCH noted that he wanted to spend the bulk of his time talking about academic investments for this biennium, and referenced the draft document sent to deans on Oct. 30, 2007, that was distributed to Senators electronically. He reminded that when our priorities were being developed we had no idea what the fiscal climate would be like, and we thought it was going to be worse not better. The directives of the Board and the legislature for this biennium include two items, reducing the student/faculty (tenure-related) ratio and improving student success. He reminded that with respect to the latter, campuses were previously charged solely with increasing student credit hours. The board and legislature have now transitioned their charge to us to performance-based funding, which includes student retention and completion as two measures of performance. Serendipitously, that was a goal we had already identified and begun work on.

KOCH continued, with those performance measures in mind, we have identified approximately $2 Million in ongoing investments to enhance student success and research. The majority of these funds are intended to be used to enhance the ranks of tenure-related faculty, as we all know well that this is a key factor in student success. This is the first time we have had funding directed at precisely that use. With respect to student success, about half of the funds will be used to build capacity, based on the proposals that deans forwarded during the budgeting process last winter, of which you are aware. Now that we have been through the process of identifying academic priorities and institutional themes, we will also ask for more supportive justification around investments in those two areas. The other half of the funds will be dedicated to building our capacity in the area of sustainability. Although we had a directed program development process last year, there isn’t enough time to implement the full process and still encumber the funding that has been allocated. We have to worry in this biennium that we are not able to spend the funding quickly enough.

KOCH noted that the argument for selecting sustainability is that as it is broadly define, it has been a growing area of strength at PSU and it is likely to be one of the areas that would come out of the program development process anyway. There are a large number of faculty who participate across a broad array of units. The city of Portland is strongly committed to it, and is using sustainability as a key component of its economic development strategy. Similarly, with the State of Oregon, it appears
that sustainability is emerging as a key theme in deliberations of at least two of the State Board’s planning subcommittees, the Portland higher ed sub-committee and the portfolio subcommittee. The State is also putting considerable funds into developing sustainability research. We can have a significant jumpstart on all these activities.

KOCH urged that Senators comment on the memo through their chairs and up through their deans. He stressed that we have moved beyond the point of selecting the two categories, but that we can still argue about what goes into each of them. We need to build capacity and strength in an area that will command national and international recognition. We have seen that from working with the community to date. Next fall, we do intend to set in place the program development process that we crafted last year, to identify programs for investment with the anticipation that there will be another significant investment in higher education in the next biennium. The Governor has said that he is committed to further investments in higher ed and the legislature is on board with those investments; we will need to be prepared to make those investments in a timely manner.

FARR asked if it is worth arguing about sustainability being selected as the focus area. KOCH reiterated that our experience has shown that if we want people to pay attention to us as an institution, we have to develop some real strength and capabilities in a few areas at least, so that they have regional and hopefully national recognition. If we look around the institution, sustainability is the area we have the greatest combined strength in, and that fits directly with all the criteria that the program development effort came up with last time, and we need to build on a strength. We do not want to peanut butter the resources across the institution.

REESE referenced the suggestion in the memo of dispersing University Studies faculty across academic programs, and expressed concern about the particular area needs in her department and the way these proposals do not address those needs. KOCH noted that there is a draft proposal circulating about transitioning the University Studies faculty that could increase the number of tenure lines added, and we can have a substantive discussion about that item.

MAIER noted, regarding legislative budget priorities, moving someone from a fixed term to a tenure-related line doesn’t necessarily change the average number of students in a class. KOCH concurred, but noted that we aren’t just talking about that. For example, tenure line faculty have responsibility for scholarship and research, which is another strategy for doing this.

JHAJ clarified that he is meeting with the deans and the chairs about the University Studies proposal, and if anyone has any questions about the proposal, faculty are urged contact him. Additionally, he noted that the proposal is not prescriptive although it does specify specific areas of agreement to be decided upon.

REDER asked for a clarification about the impact of these investments on our priority of internationalization. KOCH noted that we could make significant contributions at the international level around sustainability particularly with our Asian connections. We want to imbed internationalization in all the recommendations for faculty lines.
that come forward around both agendas. If internationalization isn’t strongly reflected in these criteria, he would appreciate receiving comments and suggestions to make it so.

TALBOTT asked how these decisions relate to PSU-AAUP contract negotiations. KOCH noted that he used the word “approximately” and that funds will come out of one side or the other. To be definitive about all of this, negotiations will have to be completed.

BLACK noted he loved the proposal to hire a large number of faculty in sustainability, however, that would have to be done at market rate salaries. Concurrently, the people here for the last five years have been told to hold on, “we can’t pay you a market rate, but when the legislature gives us money we will make it good,” and our salaries are now about 20% behind. He asked, how this is going to impact the morale of the existing faculty that you are trying to strengthen. KOCH noted that aside from saying that he is committed to raising faculty salaries as much as possible, he is not able to comment. He noted that both are important but there is a tradeoff we must recognize if we are to keep moving the entire institution forward.

FARAHMANPUR requested the Provost elaborate regarding “performance-based funding.” KOCH explained that the board/legislature have identified a pot of money for performance based allocation, by which they meant retention and completion rate improvements. We are working now on a set of metrics and targets for each institution in OUS going forward into the next two biennia, by which we will be judged and by which a portion of the higher ed budget will be allocated. They are getting serious about outcomes as well as numbers.

RUTH asked for a clarification regarding funding for improving student/faculty ratios versus funding for advancing selected programs. KOCH noted that there wasn’t a pot of money that existed before; previous to the unanticipated gains in our budget we were strategizing how to go forward with what we had even if it meant cutting in places. However, we didn’t have to go there due to improved budget outlook.

**Discussion Item**

The presiding officer moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for twenty-five minutes, to address the discussion item.

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty – Art. IV, 4). h)** *Teacher Education Committee.*

   The Presiding Officer noted that the Advisory Council has returned the proposal to the Senate with no comment.

   THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote, with no nays.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Curricular Proposals, New Courses and Course Changes

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the council.

______ / ________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in ECE and EMGT, Engineering & Computer Sciences, as listed in “D-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

BODEGOM/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes in EMGT, with a correction in the title of EMGT 547 Engineering & Computer Sciences, as listed in “D-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Program Change Proposal

GOULD presented the proposal for the committee.

WATTENBERG/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the change in the requirements for the B.A. (only) in Art History, School of Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meetings of June, and October 5-6, 2007 at PSU [http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html]

BURNS presented the report for Wollner, who was out of town. He noted in particular, that Kirby Dyess is the new board chair and that the board is very engaged. There will be no higher education items at the February 2008 legislative session. There is a new comparators committee, and faculty are encouraged to review the “LEAP” report, as we (the OUS) are going to be part of a LEAP trial project.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 2007
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Coller


Alternates Present: Clark for Medovoi, Pejcinovic for Morris, Ceppi for Reese, Perkowski for Sheble.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Luther and Livneh were present; Shearer was present for Khalil; Sobel was present for Farquhar.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The President’s report is cancelled. The Provost’s Report is cancelled, but the Presiding Officer has requested the Vice Provosts to share a few brief items in his stead about reinvestments and university studies faculty lines.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since November 5, 2007: Nate Angell, AO resigned from the university eff. 11.9.07. He will not be replaced until the 2008 election. The new Senator from ED is Christine Chaille. The new chair of the Faculty Development Committee is Candyce Reynolds. The new chair of the Library Committee is Evgenia Davidova.
DESROCHERS announced that President Reardon is in the hospital recovering from pneumonia, and noted that get-well cards, etc. may be forwarded to the President’s Office for delivery.

MACK presented updated budget information for the Provost. She noted that the Provost’s memorandum is available at http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/priorities.html. With regard to the first phase of the funding, the deans have forwarded their proposals and decisions will be made before the end of the year. She reminded that a major component of that effort has to do with reducing our reliance on fixed-term faculty, including in university studies. The Provost has commenced the second phase, including sending invitations to a small group of faculty to serve on the Sustainability Advisory Group.

HICKEY asked who would be on the advisory group. MACK stated the list isn’t finalized yet, but representation is broad and expertise-related.

BRODOWICZ asked what is the source of money for faculty salaries, in particular if the targeted $2.2 Million relate to the budget for faculty salaries that is bargained at the table. MACK stated that there is targeted money specifically to address the student-faculty ratio, and we have to report to the Legislature as to how we accomplished that charge. RUTH noted that she was told by the Budget Committee that the Provost had funds from elsewhere that he was adding to this project. MACK stated that these strategic investments would impact student-faculty ratios. RUTH stated that the point is to reduce class size. MACK stated that phase one includes looking at areas where there are large numbers of SCH not generated by tenure-related faculty. RUTH queried if the relationship between student success and expanded research requires a change in the P&T guidelines. She continued, someone hired this year got stuff from OAA that said, “publish, publish, publish, that’s all you need to focus on to get tenure.” The model would appear to be that fixed term faculty support students and tenure-related faculty support publishing. MACK stated there is not a dichotomy between research and working with students.

SMALLMAN discussed the University Studies staffing proposal for 25 positions, 17 searches and 8 internal hires over three years, with 10 searches this year, 8 searches in year two and 7 searches in year three. This activity is moving forward and documentation is available on the University Studies website.

SUSSMAN asked what are the criteria for the 8 internal hires. SMALLMAN stated that the process is still being developed. The rationale will have two aspects, fairness to people who have been in the program a long time, and fairness to departments who have contributed and/ or need more faculty.

WALTON yielded to Michele Gamburd. GAMBURD asked if job advertisements would reflect the university’s position at the bargaining table, that benefits be deducted from salary. SMALLMAN stated no, jobs are traditionally advertised by salary. JHAJ stated that the salary amounts are not included in the ads.
D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. University Curriculum Committee Proposals

GOULD presented the proposals for the committee.

WETZEL/BARHAM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE program changes, Environmental Science and Environmental Studies, and new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1,” with correction to the ASL 103 pre-requisite prefix, of ASL for SPHR.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a new course in Education, Graduate School of Education, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Theater Arts, School of Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

CLARK noted that the English department offers History of Cinema and asked if it is anticipated that these courses will be replaced. GOULD stated no, and continued that the proposal was reviewed by the English Chair. CEPPPI stated to the contrary that she didn’t recall the proposals, but that she had no objection to these courses.

ACCETTA stated that this interaction signals a potential problem, and that he would be hesitant to endorse without clarification. CEPPPI noted that there is a place on the proposal form to indicate the person to be contacted in the event of potential overlap but the form doesn’t provide a signature line for approval.

CLARK asked if the course would be cross-listed. GOULD stated he didn’t know. HICKEY reminded that a course could only be cross-listed if there are faculty in both departments who teach the course.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

2. Graduate Council/University Curriculum Committee Curricular Proposals

OSTLUND/GOULD presented the joint proposals for the committees.

MacCORMACK/MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Education, as listed in “E-2.”
BRENNER queried if this course duplicates a course in Psychology. OSTLUND stated that the committee noted this and looked into the matter, and concluded that it has been satisfactorily addressed.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Music, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Curricular Proposals

PALMITER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a course change in Education, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes, Business Administration, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

TALBOTT/COLEMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Social Work, as listed in “E-3,” with corrections.

BLACK/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a new course, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE/MAIER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Engineering and Computer Science, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal for Consent Agenda

WETZEL/KETCHESON MOVED the Senate adopt a Consent Agenda for curricular proposals forwarded by the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for a trial period of one year, January through December 2008, as described in “E-4.”

AMES indicated his support for the motion, noting that he presided over an organization where a Consent Agenda worked very well.
JHAJ questioned if this action would cause additional work for the Steering Committee. WETZEL responded to the contrary, no, as the committee currently reviews the curriculum carefully.

SUSSMAN asked what would be substituted for the time we take now. ANDREWS-COLLIER reminded that the Senate is often rushed in its business. KETCHESON concurred, citing as examples from her term as Presiding Officer, items which could have benefited from more time such as the Advising Initiative, Classroom Space, and University Studies. Senators will need to review the items in advance in order to make this work, and provide the time we need to give the important items more attention. CARTER concurred, noting that he had a similar experience to Ketcheson when he was presiding officer.

PAYNTER noted that her agenda didn’t arrive through campus mail and queried if agendas could be distributed electronically. CLUCAS noted that the staffing, etc. doesn’t currently exist, but as part of this process Senators will still have time at the beginning of the meeting to set an item aside if they need more time to review it. RUTH noted she supported this request, and urged that the Senate have a complete website. GOULD noted that curricular proposals, are getting very close to being entirely on-line, the UCC is now at a Web CT site, etc. and we really do want to streamline things, but not everything is quite ready yet.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None

2. Questions from the Floor to the Chair

BRODOWICZ asked if the faculty senate is going to discuss faculty morale. CLUCAS stated that a variety of people have mentioned several items recently, this one included, but haven’t proposed any shape to a discussion topic. Regarding morale as an example, would the senate propose outcomes? It is preferable that we just didn’t complain, but created some direction for the discussion. BRODOWICZ noted that we have had the Campus Climate Commission and the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, but it feels like we never follow through. CLUCAS reiterated that the faculty needs to use a constructive approach to such items.

SUSSMAN suggested that the Senate receive a regular report from the AAUP. CLUCAS stated that if senators want it, there is a way for a motion to be made to change the agenda format to provide for such a report. SUSSMAN indicated that AAUP is a body of faculty, and they ought to be able to make reports if the Provost, etc. can. CLUCAS noted that the Steering Committee has continually
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endeavored to limit reports from administrators, and he makes every effort to enforce this practice.

RUTH asked if a motion could be made for a report. KETCHESON noted that someone would have to write up a motion to be submitted to the Steering Committee for placement on a subsequent agenda. ARANTE asked if the Senate could make resolutions. CLUCAS noted that it would be the same process as just described by Ketcheson. HINES asked, regarding the question of faculty morale, if one could put on the agenda to have a discussion about possible action items that the senate might address. CLUCAS stated yes, that he would encourage people to come forward with prepared items for Senate consideration, as it is not the Presiding Officer’s place to set what is of importance for the agenda.

GELLMON noted that a large number of past presiding officers were present. She urged new Senators in particular to consult the Governance Guide and these folks to learn how and when to propose items for senate attention, as the Steering Committee meetings follow soon on the Senate meetings and the agenda is mailed soon after. Almost anything of interest can be proposed to the Steering Committee, who have been elected to review items for the agenda in the same way they do for recurring curricular proposals. The Steering Committee is receptive to hearing almost anything and then will decide what fits within the context of the constitution and the faculty senate’s role.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

None.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 2007
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Nishishiba for Gelmon, Kindle for Hoffman, Shearer for Khalil, Kim, Knights, VanDyck for Luther, Clark for Toppe.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2007 MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

p.12, E.1, para. 7, line 2, correct to read, “GOULD asserted that the English Department Chair signed the course proposal, and CEPPI responded that she did not.”

p. 13, E.3., para. 5 and 6 (between), add “THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

• There will be no President’s Report.
• The Second Edition of the 0708 Governance Guide will be available on the OAA webpage after 15 January.
• Added to the agenda: F.1. Question to Administrators, Question #2
Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since November 5, 2007: Dan Johnson has resigned from the Senate, to coincide with his retirement this month. His replacement is Richard Weingrad, Judaic Studies.

Provost's Report

KOCH reported that the State Board approved the Turkish Studies program this month. Also, with respect to the Board, Koch described several other items. At their December retreat, they identified four items that will require campus responses, and six major board directions. Of the four items, sustainability, PreK-12 education, program review, and learning outcomes, PSU is already engaged in two. Of the six items, three are largely administrative and three have program implications for PSU, they being addressing barriers to student participation and success, state funding for graduate education and research, and the Portland higher education initiative. There will be more to come on these issues.

KOCH continued, regarding our proposal for academic investments, aka hiring new faculty, $3.4 Million in proposals have been received from the deans for building capacity. We have received $1.9 Million in proposals, less current UNST contributions, for building University Studies positions. We will try to respond to those proposals starting next week. Regarding sustainability positions, the ad hoc faculty group is concluding their work on criteria.

D. Unfinished Business

None

E. New Business

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

FLOWER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular Consent Agenda as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Scholastic Standards Comm. Proposal to Change Enrollment Deadlines

GOUGH presented the proposal for the Committee.

LAFFERIÈRE/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the four motions contained in “E-2”, with general discussion followed by a separate vote on each.

KOCH asked if these changes would have any negative impact with respect to Financial Aid. GOUGH stated no. HICKEY asked if the proposal provides any financial incentives. GOUGH yielded to Phillip Rodgers, Dir. of Financial Aid. He stated that the largest benefit is that by moving up the date, fewer students will have incurred debt after they drop a class. HANSEN asked how this would affect
the deadline appeals process. GOUGH stated that it is anticipated that petitions will increase in the short run but will diminish once knowledge of the policy becomes widespread.

CRESS asked if this would include dissertation credits, as those students are notorious for registering late. GOUGH noted this is an issue with By Arrangement courses in general, but offered that appeals from those students could be short-tracked. CRESS asked if there could be exceptions to the policy for internships and practica, which are mostly at the graduate level. BACCAR stated that if deadlines are not published, they should be handled administratively. LAFFERRIERE reminded that appeals are permitted.

FARR asked if these changes are being made largely to accommodate Financial Aid. GOUGH stated no, the change in Financial Aid only was only an incentive to review other policies. LAFFERRIERE noted that the general feeling of those involved was that students need to commit to their programs, as the quarter is only 10 weeks long. BARHAM added that we have been making changes piecemeal for a long time, which, in its own way, has been very difficult for students.

TALBOTT asked if the committee considered moving the Grade Option deadline forward. GOUGH stated that it just went from 5 to 7 weeks last year.

ACCETTA noted that as a member of Student Affairs he supports the motions, and queried if student government was consulted. GOUGH yielded to Phillip Rodgers who stated, yes, they met with ASPSU President Rudy Soto. TOLMACH asked if the International Student office was consulted. stated yes, that Cindy Baccar and Christina Luther are in conversations about this.

WATTENBERG queried why it is that students are allowed to enroll without faculty permission after classes begin. Once you have met the class, certain issues kick in and it is problematic, whether at the end of the 1st or 3rd week when I suddenly find out students have added who have missed the first week of class. What is the logic here? GOUGH noted that until last year, the enrollment period was a lot longer. LAFFERRIERE noted that students have some time to see if they can handle the class under the current system. WATTENBERG noted he agreed with that principle, but urged that the faculty do the admitting. HINES noted also that Wattenberg has an important point, it is not whether students can add but that faculty have to approve the addition, so that it is clear what work the students have missed, etc. REESE concurred, adding that this issue affects the ultimate class headcount and compounds the campus space problem. HINES added that she feels personally, she would feel more generous about adding people at the first meeting, if she knew other people weren’t simultaneously adding online.

CRESS noted she remained uncomfortable with this change, especially with respect to graduate students and urged that they have an exception, not necessarily...
noted in the catalog. The dissertation students in Education frequently miss deadlines. BACCAR stated that deadlines needs to be public for the students.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

MOTION #1 PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CRESS/BEILER MOVED TO TABLE MOTION #2.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 42 in favor, 16 against, 7 abstentions.

MOTION #3 PASSED by majority voice vote.

MOTION #4 PASSED by majority voice vote.

3. Motions Relating to Balance of Tenure and Non-tenure Faculty

RUTH/RUETHER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #1 as listed in “E-3” (attached).

WATTENBERG queried if this proposed ratio isn’t a one-size-fits-all concept, and doesn’t serve the faculty well. RUTH stated she feels no, the task could be enormous, but we have gotten out of whack between tenure versus non-tenure faculty, and it’s not good. Passing this motion would put Senate weight behind a remedy for this issue.

BROWN questioned the use of the term “regulative” in “(B).” RUTH replied that this refers to setting a goal, or regulative ideal, something we should be working for, but not dictated.

OSTLUND stated that she understands why the Graduate Council is included for participation in this committee, but they are too busy, especially during winter term, and she assumes that University Curriculum Committee would have the same response. RUETER acknowledged that that is an issue. OSTLUND suggested broadening the motion to include anyone who has served on Graduate Council.

asked how this motion relates to financial realities. RUETER stated that that is a good question, and this motion doesn’t relate to that. It introduces the problem and it would be a good challenge for this committee to develop this issue.

KOCH noted that there is no distinction made in “(A)” between fixed-term and adjunct faculty, and requested clarification. RUTH stated that it is inappropriate regarding certain issues, but her goal is to address the ratio of SCH generated by non-tenure related faculty. RUETER stated that the intent is an inflammatory charge to the committee to get them sparked.
FARR stated he also objects to the word “regulative” in “(B)” and to the subsequent implication of “negative” only consequences. What is the most bothersome is language in the second sentence in “(B)” which denies that we already have hiring and review policies. You must mean something different than that, because there are guidelines and policies. RUETER urged that the point of the motion is to establish a task force. FARR stated that the Senate is passing words, not just a concept, and the second paragraph is contradictory. RUTH stated that “regulative” can be dropped, and that with respect to hiring and reviewing of adjunct faculty, whatever the rules, she feels that the common practice around here is that the chair has total discretion in hiring. She would like to see Senate get involved if the union hasn’t been effective in enforcing more rigorous kinds of reviews. FARR stated a lot of the items being brought into question have been previously negotiated in collective bargaining, including a goal for the ratio. FLOWER urged that even if policies are in place, new fact-finding and discussions might lead to the modification of such guidelines.

CEPPI noted that whether or not people have concerns about what the recommendations might be, we should still recommend establishing a task force because it can come up with data and actual facts about procedures, so that when we have a discussion about the recommendations, we have more than anecdotal evidence or common wisdom. Perhaps AFT should be included as well.

DILL and RUETER described hiring variations in their departments. HANSEN noted that adjuncts and fixed terms are under two distinct unions.

WETZEL stated she didn’t think we could ask the task force to hone these and determine what the agenda is. What we would want the task force to do is answer some very specific questions that we have, for example, what is the historical trajectory of the use of tenure versus non-tenure lines at PSU. This could be worded better and she would volunteer to assist in that project.

WETZEL/FARR MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 40 in favor, 22 against, 5 abstentions.

RUTH/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #2 as listed in “E-3.”

OSTLUND stated that the Graduate Council already does this, so this is redundant. Additionally, she urged that a blanket policy is not possible. RUTH stated that she understood that there is a policy, and that it allows for exception. OSTLUND stated she disagreed. RUETER noted that after a course is approved, there is no oversight of faculty by the Graduate Council.

ARANTE asked for a clarification between motion #1 and #2, as they are vastly different issues. RUETER stated that motion #2 is about who is currently teaching the courses. UCC doesn’t track who is teaching a course after it is approved. It isn’t the competency issue; he trusts his colleagues with those hires, however,
there is overall fiscal pressure to hire the least expensive contingent labor, for example, some courses are being taught by grad students.

JHAJ asked if the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee employs criteria for evaluating a course based on who is teaching it. MUSSEY stated that it has happened, citing a set of courses in Women's Studies.

BROWN asked if Rueter and Ruth envision the committee going through and actually reviewing who is teaching the courses, or do they trust chairs to hire competent faculty. What would one be looking for? RUETER stated he trusts individuals to make good decisions but not organizations this large, so his worry is that there is too much pressure. Who are these people that are actually teaching our courses in the catalog? FARR queried that if it isn't competency, then what is it. RUETER stated there is a credential issue that can be looked at without judging an individual’s competency.

WATTENBERG stated that this is another one-size-fits-all proposal. This proposal sounds like the institution will make a rule that all individuals have to have such and such. I take issue with that because various departments have various criteria for competencies and degrees required for different types of teaching. RUTH stated the motivation is to prod the senate to take authority over our jurisdiction, which is the quality of the education that we are offering here. WATTENBERG continued that the motion is worded in a way that suggests that there are certain department-specific issues, while at the same time suggesting that there is an absolute standard to fit every department.

SMALLMAN asked if Rueter talked to the University Curriculum Committee to see if they are willing to take this on. RUETER stated, no, he didn’t, but that is a senate committee and he feels that the senate needs to take responsibility for this. The UCC has new staffing and is moving forward with approvals, which should make this possible. LAFFERIERE __________. RUTH noted she is more interested in this issue with respect to undergraduate education.

ARANTE noted that the differing departmental cultures at PSU made it difficult to negotiate Article 18, and she feels many of the guidelines therein have fallen by the wayside. We have an increasingly large number of contingent faculty because decisions are put in the hands of individuals. Chairs all over campus have hired competent people, but cheaply, and the number of these appointments keep creeping up. A large number of faculty will never have tenure nor academic freedom and they are teaching huge undergraduate courses. Wages are more competitive in some areas but the people are still contingent faculty. These are employment issues that should be negotiated through AAUP. The spirit of these motions seems to be a valiant attempt on your part to involve the Senate in what AAUP has always tried to do. Regarding motion #2, I have watched the senate pass curriculum for six years without asking the question “who pays for this.”

REDER noted that Senate can maintain quality not just with course and program approval, but also with program review authority, which both Graduate and
Undergraduate curriculum groups have discussed. We could get the ball rolling here in the senate. HINES noted that motion #2 could have the effect of supporting department chairs by giving them more rigorous guidelines to work with.

JAGODNIK stated she is on UCC and it is the rare occasion that they look at a faculty member’s credentials. They are too busy and couldn’t take this on unless they knew staffing was in place. She also noted, that she sees a contradiction in stating that we don’t trust individuals and that we don’t trust institutions at the same time. If department chairs aren’t making appropriate decisions, then the deans should be held accountable.

BROWN queried if what are we talking about here is program review. RUETER responded that Brown’s area has it, and continued that Hines’s point is that in his area he doesn’t have the choice to hire the best person and/or for a full load. BROWN stated this doesn’t seem to be directed at programs, but at hiring. RUETER stated it is directed at UCC and Grad Council. WETZEL stated she supports this effort, but this motion seems like this is an audit. The best audits are external and most folks would welcome external review. She suggested that we have more opportunities for program review, rather than have colleagues evaluate colleagues. RUETER stated he didn’t like Wetzel twisting the word; this is not an audit.

BLELER noted he is very concerned with the language of the motion, in particular, “who is qualified to teach at this level” and stated that it explicitly asks the committees under this charge to perform a “checklist” for criteria for which they have no expertise. RUETER responded that the committee could do this. WALTON stated and she knows people in the institution teaching 300-level courses with master’s degrees. She objected to tabling the first motion and. RUETER stated he agreed. OSTLUND stated she agreed in terms of what the Graduate Council does in the proposal process, but this is a separate charge to go back and police whether individual departments are doing what they said they were going to do. This is too huge a charge, and Graduate Council is not the body to do that.

BLEILER noted that designating these committees to examine this issue is one way, but the Senate could decide other ways. The important thing is quality, whether it is program review or whatever, and we need to own responsibility for the quality of our instruction. HINES reminded that the language indicates the committees “consider ways to determine …”

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MOTION #2 PASSED by 37 in favor, 16 against, and 6 abstentions.

F. Question Period
1. Questions for the Administration

Questions for Provost Koch

Note: There is no transcription of the meeting from this point.

Provost Koch has provided his notes for these minutes.

Question #1. For the 2007-09 biennium, PSU received $1.5 Million to improve the student/faculty ratio, $0.5 Million for the first year and $1.0 Million for the 2nd year. The continuing funding for these positions is $1.0 Million per year. We have allocated $1.0 Million to the initiative to build capacity for student success and to expand innovative research, which directly addresses the objectives of the state board. The strategy here is to increase the numbers of tenure line faculty with a particular focus on those units that generate significant numbers of SCH either for their majors, as a “service” department or through UNST, and have low numbers of tenure line faculty. Unfortunately, this last criterion is not very useful in discriminating between departments at PSU since many have low numbers of tenure line faculty. We have precisely met the intention of the OUS Board and the legislature. We intend to insure that the $1 Million we have allocated to build faculty capacity in Sustainability will further address the issue of student-faculty ratios and building the tenure line faculty. Although the funding has been targeted there are many (in fact most) programs that directly address issues of sustainability that have low number of tenure line faculty.

Question #2. We have not one but three priorities, improving student success, expanding innovative scholarship, and enhancing opportunity for higher education in the metropolitan region. They are a small number in order to focus our attention on all of them, and they are not prioritized. With regard to the student success priority, we have always been committed to it. It is now made more explicit and we ask everyone to consider whether what he or she are doing in this regard and how they are doing it is effective in advancing this priority. We will evaluate progress and allocate resources accordingly. This is one of the reasons for the plan to increase the numbers of tenure-line faculty. Expanding innovative scholarship is another priority and is largely the responsibility of the tenure-line faculty. To my knowledge, OAA is not telling new hires that all that matters is that they publish. I am candid in discussing the fact that our expectations for scholarship are growing with the stature and aspirations of the institution and that new faculty need to be aware of this. We are also careful to point out that scholarship is the distinctive (but not the only) expectation for tenure so they need to pay sufficient attention to this aspect of their portfolio in order to achieve tenure. We also indicate that there is a clear expectation (it goes without saying) that they will provide effective instruction and related student support, in particular mentoring and advising. We make them aware of the support available through CAE in this regard. From the interactions I have had with new tenure-line faculty, it is clear to me that they come with a clear scholarly expectation of their own and none of this is a surprise to them.
Finally, as a comprehensive, doctoral granting institution, we have both instructional and scholarly responsibilities for tenure-line faculty like all other similar institutions. Historically, these expectations have been found to support each other and to enhance the educational experience of the students. At PSU, the P&T guidelines explicitly identify student mentoring and advising as part of the instructional responsibilities of tenure-line faculty and so this expectation is clear. We are also not alone in assuming that departments or programs will exhibit a balanced portfolio of faculty contributions that allow them, collectively, to address issues of student success (principally through effective instruction and advising) and contribute to scholarship. The contributions of individual faculty typically vary throughout the career but scholarship is an ongoing part of the expectation. There is no evidence that faculty scholarship needs to be counterproductive to either effective instruction or student success. To the contrary, where faculty are leaders in their fields as a result of their scholarship and students are engaged with faculty in scholarly activities, the students have been observed to be more successful. So I don’t believe that we need to revise the P&T guidelines for tenure line faculty as a result of an explicit priority on student success.

Question #3. This is the purview of the Faculty Senate, and he would be happy to work with the Senate leadership on this if it becomes an issue of funding.

Questions for the Administration (added to the agenda 12/31/07)

A number of PSU students had hold placed on registration for Winter due to changes in our account receivable policies and practices. For example, last year a registration hold was only placed for Winter if a student had past due of more than $100 from Summer and/or $1000 from Fall. This Winter a registration hold was placed if a student had a past overdue of $100 from any term. This is a significant shift but I am not aware of any discussion of this issue in faculty senate.

I have the following question(s) for administration:

As a result of a change in PSU's account receivable policies all students with a prior term past due of over $100 were placed on registration hold for Winter.

1. Please explain the change in policy to the faculty senate.
2. Provide the number of students who were placed on registration hold as a result of this policy.
3. Explain the number of students who were not able to register for classes as a result of this change.
4. Explain the impact of this change on student success and student retention.

Sukhwant Jhaj

Vice President Desrochers has provided notes prepared by Eric Blumenthal for these minutes:

1. Please explain the change in policy to the faculty senate.

There was no change in Portland State University registration hold policy. The policy of placing a financial hold on a student account is as follows:
1. Student owes a prior term balance greater than $100, or
2. Student owes a current term balance for resident greater than $1,000, for non-resident greater than $2,500, or
3. An account that has a written off amount greater than or equal to $25, or
4. An account that is currently at an outside collection agency, or
5. An account that has an unsettled return check or stop payment check.

The change at the end of fall term was that for the first time Business Affairs strictly adhered to policy which does not allow students to carry more than a $100 balance over from a prior term. The placement of additional holds did not occur until after the end of the fall term on December 10. Prior to the placement of these holds, letters were sent to all students outlining policy with an additional explanatory letter sent to students in danger of having a financial hold placed on their student account after the end of the fall term. For practical purposes, we did not place holds for prior balances less than $300 to account for unbilled or late charges, miscellaneous fees, etc.

2. Provide the number of students who were placed on registration hold as a result of this policy. Provide the number of students who were not able to register for classes as a result of this change.

The number of financial holds placed on accounts on December 10 was 2,555 students. By January 1, the number of "December 10" holds was down to 1,097 students. As of the end of business on Friday, January 4, 2008 the number of "December 10" holds was down to 975 with an additional 1,803 holds remaining from November. Students who did not have a hold placed on their account in November had the opportunity to continue to register for the winter term up until holds were placed on December 10.

3. Explain the impact of this change on student success and student retention.

The adherence to policy will allow for stronger fiscal control and reduce accounts receivables for the University. Additional detail is provided below on significant increases to receivables over the past three years. (see table) The adherence to policy will serve students better since it will not needlessly prolong lingering financial and financial aid issues and additionally prevents student debt from spiraling out of control and forcing students to leave the institution. In this way, students can be counseled early on financial aid options as well as payment plan options.

4. Explain how this policy serves PSU's mission and our commitment to provide access to learning.

The policy is not seen as an impediment to the institution's mission or PSU's commitment to access, rather prudent fiscal policy that allows parents and students to appropriately pay for their education in a timely manner without needlessly getting into dire financial circumstances. The goal is to work with students and their families early on so educational expenses are planned for and well managed so students can concentrate on learning and persist.

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 2008
The following table shows a significant 36% increase in accounts receivable over the past two years. Currently, accounts receivable balances (excluding 0-30 days and any winter term assessments) stands at $16,400,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portland State University</th>
<th>AKB</th>
<th>09/04/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable Aging Comparison August 2007, 2006, 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total AR</td>
<td>$20,663,512</td>
<td>$18,290,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body Headcount</td>
<td>25,013</td>
<td>24,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R as percentage of student body</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real dollar increase</td>
<td>$2,372,919</td>
<td>$4,991,113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Body Headcount source: 2007 Estimated Fall

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. Report of the IFS Meeting of December 7-8 at OHSU

The report was tabled until the next meeting.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:48.
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, February 4, 2008

Presiding Officer:

Richard Clucas

Secretary:

Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present:


Alternates Present:


Members Absent:

Agorsah, Balshem, Collins, Cotrell, Dickinson, Feng, Fuller, Knights, Korbek, Maier, R. Mercer, Messer, O'Connor, Padin, Powers, Rhee, Watanabe, Weingrad.

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews-Collier, Burton, Cornett, Desrochers, Feyerherm, Fung, Gregory, Hottel, Koch, LaTourette, Loney, Mack, McVeety, Ostlund, Reardon, Sestak, Smallman, Spalding.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2008 MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
Chaille was present.
P. 21, para. 5, sent. 4, Add, after LAFFERRIERE asked if the proposers considered this issue in relation to the graduate faculty.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

• DELETED: President's Report
• ADDED E.3 Motion: Strategy to Encourage Successful Conclusion of Bargaining
Distributed to the membership on January 31, 2008: E.2. Faculty Satisfaction and Empowerment.

The Presiding Officer reminded that a reception is scheduled to follow at Simon Benson House, noting also that this event speaks to the ongoing issue of enhancing community amongst the faculty.

Consent Agenda Items moved to the regular agenda: E.1.c.16, and E.1.c.4.

The Presiding Officer reminded the assembly that the VP for Finance has established an Ad Hoc Campus Committee for Public Safety, with Faculty Senate representation by Mark Chubb, PA. There is an Open Forum for faculty on Wed. February 6 from 12-1 pm.

Regarding the conversation in the last meetings about a Senate web page, the Steering Committee is working on realizing this project, and a progress report will be forthcoming.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since January 7, 2008: none.

Provost’s Report

MACK reported for Provost Koch who was unable to attend the Senate meeting, as he has been appointed to replace Scott Dawson on the Presidential Search Committee.

MACK reported on the progress of the Strategic Investments (new faculty lines). Decisions have been made and communicated to the Deans regarding Phase One. Using funds designated by the Legislature ($1M) and redirected funds from University Studies ($0.75 M), with the goal of increasing tenure-related faculty lines, 21 positions have been identified. Each unit received at least one new tenure-related line with CLAS receiving the most positions. With these hires are dedicated one-time setup funds including an increase in departments’ services and supplies, money to the library for support services, moving expenses, and in some cases equipment costs. Phase Two is also progressing. The ad hoc faculty committee on Sustainability has submitted its report to the Provost who will share it with the deans for comment. The committee recommended hiring ten new positions that contribute to four identified areas of strength that we already have at PSU: Coupling of Human and Natural Systems; Sustainable Urban Communities; Mechanisms for Change; and Measurement, Valuation and Evaluation. Rather than the proposed ten, using additional funds left over from enrollment growth ($1 M), we should be able to hire an additional 6-8 tenure related faculty members depending on costs of individual lines. In conclusion, this will number up to 29 new tenure-related faculty members over the next two years.

RUTH asked with respect to the sustainability positions, how would those faculty hires be handed at the department level? MACK stated that they are departmental as well as interdisciplinary hires, so we have to look at this hire process very carefully.

TAYLOR asked for a clarification on the number of the new hires in phase one. MACK noted that a few of the 21 positions are converted lines from the University Studies faculty, but the majority involve national searches.
D. Unfinished Business

1. LAFFERRIERE/FOUNTAIN moved the Senate take off the table, from “E-2,” January 7, 2008, the SSC Proposal to Change Enrollment Deadlines: “Motion 2) Move the Add w/ Instructor approval from the end of week four to the end of week two.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LAFFERRIERE yielded to Liane Gough, who briefly reviewed the committee’s proposal. ISAACSON stated that speaking for the faculty of the Graduate School of Education, while they understand the advantages of this policy for those who administer them, the problem this presents for students has possibly been overlooked. The first concern about the policy is about the paperwork and student confusion it will create. The issue for our graduate program is that because of budget cuts our electives have been reduced, and some of the students have a hard time finding the electives they need. In addition, there are those seeking dissertation, internship, by-arrangement, etc. hours that don’t start at the beginning of the term. There is also the financial aid impact on these students.

HICKEY noted that traditionally xxx 4/505 Independent Study courses have had no deadline restrictions for registration. BARHAM noted that Financial Aid census data is not related to this motion.

SUSSMAN stated that this sounds overly restrictive as many students may have holds on the registrations, etc. MacCORMACK urged that a student who is preparing a by-arrangement number or already attending the class won’t have a problem, as they are known to the instructor. The current problem is that students show up the third week having been able to register without the instructor’s approval.

MUSSEY asked how this change is policy would be communicated to students. GOUGH stated that all of these changes will be in the bulletin and Registration will do public relations around this.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

E. New Business

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1 Consent Agenda with the exception of E.1.c.16 SWAH 330, and E.1.c. 4 ART 312.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER/MAGALDI MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.c.16. SWAH 330.”
WALTON asked if there were tenure line faculty associated with this course, and if not, what is the terminal degree of the faculty member associated with this proposal. WETZEL stated that she believes the faculty member is neither tenure-related nor holds a terminal degree. WALTON stated that it was her impression that courses could not be proposed if they were not associated with a tenure line. If we are talking about the problem of not having enough tenure-line faculty then we should not be creating curriculum without having tenure line faculty. GOULD stated that there is no such policy. K. BROWN stated that it is important to know that there is a faculty member who can teach the course for the sake of the level of stability of the course. GOULD stated that the department makes that decision, not the committee. HICKEY stated that there is a contrary pressure, that courses numbered 399 can't be offered more than three times in a row. LAFFERERIERE stated that his recall of serving on the committee was contrary to what Gould has described, and queried how the policy is set. GOULD stated that the character of the committee could influence interpretations. TOLMACH asked what is policy as opposed to interpretation. GOULD stated there is no policy, and that the reality is that these decisions are influenced by the character of the committee in question. WALTON urged that the instructor's credentials are an issue irrespective of the policy. GOULD stated the committee takes up all the items on the proposal in the aggregate. RUTH stated that this discussion is related to the motion she successfully proposed last month about who should teach what courses. HICKEY queried, as a matter of policy, would we then no longer let people teach a 399 after the third time. GOULD stated that the course does not disappear after three years – there is not a policy. HOFFMAN noted that the Senate passed a policy that omnibus courses may only be offered three times. GOULD stated that there is no enforcement, however.

MUSSSEY stated that until we are able to rely more fully on tenure-related faculty, she would like to keep the decision-making at the local level and trust the chairs to make their best decision, or there is no way to keep programs running. Some people are saying that if we address faculty ratios through curricular approval then the faculty problem will be solved, but she doesn't agree. ARANTE stated that as long as we use non-tenure faculty the way we do, we wouldn't have a department if we were to have to use only tenure-related faculty.

SEPPALAINEN stated he recommends keeping the two items separate, new courses and existing courses. And if a causal connection develops, so be it.

WALTON/RUTH MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE FAILED by 26 in favor, 50 against, 4 abstentions.

THE MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE SWA 330” by 50 in favor, 22 against, and 5 abstentions.

FLOWER/PATTON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.c.4. ART 312.”
CHAILLE STATED that this places a burden on students by increasing the pre-requisite credit hours for the graduate teaching program, and would therefore appreciate more rationale. LEPORE stated that the Art department has moved to a 4-credit platform and the course content has shifted considerably. Personally, he doesn’t see one additional credit as a burden. BARHAM stated that using a 4-credit matrix makes it easier for students to complete their undergraduate degrees, and asked how many of those students do their UG degrees at PSU. CHAILLE stated that 30% of their applicants do their UG degree at PSU. LEPORE noted that students can also use 4 credits to fulfill the FPA bachelor’s requirement.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

2. Study of Faculty Satisfaction and Empowerment

LIEBMAN/HINES MOVED “E-2” (distributed electronically on January 28, 2008: We move to create an ad hoc committee to assess faculty participation and empowerment at PSU, and to come forward with proposals for reform of the system of shared governance. The committee will field a survey, hold focused conversations with faculty, staff, and administrators, and research shared governance at other institutions, with attention to how institutions have accommodated growth similar to ours.

On recommendation by the Senate Steering Committee, the committee will consist of representatives from the Committee on Committees, the Educational Policy Committee, the Advisory Council, Senate Steering Committee, and other faculty and administrators knowledgeable about university governance. The survey and conversations will be designed to determine faculty and staff satisfaction with participation and shared governance at PSU; what obstacles, if any, are currently in the way of faculty and staff involvement in governance; and ideas for increasing participation in governance.

A preliminary report of the committee’s findings and proposals for reform will be presented at the June 2008 senate meeting. The final report will be the basis for a campus-wide dialogue in 2008-09.

To complete the work, funds are needed for a part-time GSRA, for desk space, transcription, copying, and telephone. The budget for the work will be $11,500 to be requested from the Office of Academic Affairs.

LIEBMAN stated that people have voiced various concerns over the years about governance. For example, people have stated they are unwilling to serve in the senate because the senate accomplishes little. There is also an important succession problem; young people don’t want to serve. Can people in the Senate mentor these people? They also say that there is a lack of information about who makes what decisions, see for example, today’s discussion. These are background questions for gauging satisfaction and it’s connection with participation. We anecdotally looked at what is done on other campuses, for example, the example distributed of the Mich. State Senate website which includes a series of on-going documents. Perhaps we need enhancements in this area as well.
ARANTE asked if the proposers considered including faculty release time or stipends in the budget, as faculty are too busy for this project. BLACK stated the budget doesn’t include a publicist, etc. to staff a website. KETCHESON asked if this includes a survey, and the resources that that would entail. LIEBMAN stated yes to the latter, noting that budget would be needed for that as well. RUTH stated that the motion is bogging down in these budget items. KETCHESON stated, to the contrary, we need to know what the scale of this project is. DILL noted that Web Surveyor would not cost much. KETCHESON stated that OIRP still has costs because they are obliged to mediate, to provide email, to consult with GTAs, etc. RUTH stated that this is similar to issues in her motion; it isn’t that they haven’t thought through a budget, but that they can’t know what it is until they get going. LIEBMAN agreed that there are a few loose ends, and queried if the ad hoc committee couldn’t return to the senate with a budget recommendation.

ACCETTA/BURNS MOVED TO AMEND by deleting the 4th/final paragraph.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION WAS PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Steering Committee Motion for a Strategy to Conclude Successful Bargaining

WETZEL/KETCHESON MOVED "Resolved: Because of the existence of collective bargaining at PSU, responsibility for negotiating work issues salary and workload is in the hands of PSU-AAUP, not the Faculty Senate. It is important for members of the Senate to understand the union’s authority to negotiate for faculty, and it is in this regard that we offer the following:

The Faculty Senate wants to acknowledge and voice the faculty's deep concern about the pace and substance of contract negotiations. The Senate requests that if a contract is not agreed upon by March 3, 2008, representatives of PSU-AAUP and the Administration come to the March Senate meeting to describe separately prospects for settlement."

(The format of this reporting will be as follows: AAUP and the Administration will prepare remarks totaling no more than five minutes each. A coin toss will determine which speaker goes first. After both speakers, there will be a question period of no longer than ten minutes.)"

WETZEL noted that the Steering Committee had a number of requests from around campus that we address the progress of salary negotiations. This motion is a rewrite of a strategy used by the 1999-2000 Steering Committee who forwarded a similar motion in March 2000, when contract negotiations also broke down.
asked how the time limits were decided upon. WETZEL stated they are the same as the previous motion. RUTH noted she didn’t like the preamble language. WETZEL reminded that the Senate is not responsible for negotiating, and that the intent is to press both sides to come and discuss the prospects for settlement. ARANTE asked if the phrase “work issues” could be changed to “salary and workload” and the proposers agreed.

SUSSMAN queried if the motion could be amended so that the AAUP would be scheduled to present monthly remarks to the Faculty Senate. WETZEL stated that Sussman’s suggestion is a different issue. CLUCAS noted that Sussman’s item could have its own motion, if it was formally proposed. FRITZCHE stated that if the motion were amended as Sussman proposes, then he would be inclined to vote against it. This is a separate issue from monthly reports; he would like to hear both sides address this body next month about the issue of why there is no agreement in particular.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. Question Period

None.

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. Report of the IFS Meeting of December 7-8 at OHSU

WOLLNER reported for Carter, noting that the IFS meeting minutes are published at the web address indicated. He also noted that Senators were reminded to respond to Carter’s message regarding the Essential Skills Task Force.

2. Semi-Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

KETCHESON reported for Chair Candyce Reynolds. In Fall Term, Ketcheson served as interim chair, and Candyce Reynolds is the chair, effective Winter 2008. A list of committee members appears in the Governance Guide, which is available on the OAA website.

$250,000 is available for Faculty Enhancement Grants. The deadline is February 15, 2008, for grants up to $10,500.

$90,000 is available for travel grants for fall 2007 and winter through summer 2008. In fall, the committee awarded $28,933; $61,067 remains. The committee will meet on Feb. 8 to consider applications for winter term. There were 32 applications totaling $32,413.
The ORSP website contains information and forms for enhancement and travel grants, as well as the deadlines for each.

Faculty are reminded that, if they have received enhancement awards from prior years and have not submitted a final report to ORSP, they will not be eligible for 2008-09 grants.

BLACK asked how the committee determined the deadlines for travel grant proposals. KETCHESON stated that the committee has made every effort to set a fair and timely deadline, without complete success because none quite works perfectly. They would welcome suggestions for improvements.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:42.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 3, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2008, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
• THE FEBRUARY 4, 2008 MINUTES ARE INCORRECTLY NOTED AS BEING FOR JANUARY 7, 2008 (Page numbers are correct).
• Rhee was present, Taylor was present for Jhaj.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

• DELETE from the March 3, 2008 Agenda: President’s Report.
• The Provost will fund a Faculty Governance webpage and the Steering Committee is proceeding with this project.
• Ad Hoc Committee to Assess Faculty Participation & Empowerment - The Senate Steering Committee has concluded selection, as charged by the Senate on Feb. 4,
2008. The members are: Joe Ediger, MTH; Michael Flower, HON; Maude Hines, ENG; John Rueter, ESR; Linda Walton, HST; Craig Wollner, UPA. Flower is charged to convene the first meeting and conduct the election of Chair. The Committee is scheduled to make a preliminary report on June 2, 2008.

Report on Prospects for Contract Settlement

CLUCAS introduced Provost Koch for the university and Jon Uto for PSU-AAUP and explained that each would have 5 minutes for remarks, to be followed by a question period of no longer than 10 minutes. Koch was the first speaker, by coin toss.

KOCH presented a brief overview of the university’s budget position (overheads attached). PSU, in sum, received a large legislative allocation in relation to historical patterns, however much of the increased funding is earmarked. Additionally, the legislature recently decided to hold certain funds in reserve, pending the June revenue forecast. PSU’s proposal improves salaries, increases the ratio of tenure-related lines and increases support services. Regarding salaries, PSU is trying to address inequities, support the increased cost of living, and address retention through a merit component. Regarding workloads, the issues are very complicated and will take some longterm effort to resolve.

UTO stated that the PSU mission statement is what faculty are fighting for, quality education, research and community service, and these all start with faculty. Labor relations is one of those shared governance processes at the university, and salary is an investment in human resources, and a retention method. The workload is getting out of control, and it should be part of bargaining. The last area of concern is fixed term and research faculty work issues and equitable treatment with core faculty. PSU-AAUP will be thrilled to settle when these issues are addressed at an adequate level.

TALBOTT stated she is concerned that negotiations will drag into summer with the administration will have nothing to loose, and queried what to do to prevent that. UTO stated that if negotiations go that route, PSU-AAUP will move to inform community partners about what is happening, see for example their activities planned for the State Board meeting on 7 March and the Simon Benson Award event.

BURNS asked how far apar the two offers are. UTO stated that the administration is saying $10 Million and AAUP is saying $18 Million, however it is actually about $12 million. KOCH stated, to put that in perspective, $12 Million is the equivalent of 120 new faculty members or a 12% increase in salaries. The administration doesn’t have this kind of funds available to commit.

ACCETTA queried, if the AAUP asks for so much and the administration says they don’t have it, how is AAUP proposing to find a middle ground. UTO stated that it is not AAUP’s job to find the funding and faculty don’t have the authority to make budget decisions; the money is there and faculty just aren’t being included in how it is spent. KOCH stated that this is the issue; there is only so much money and it matters where it is spent. PSU wants to invest in three things, salaries, tenure-line ratios, and
some strategic areas. If we want to move the institution forward, there continue to have to be tradeoffs. Unlike in the past when we missed multiple opportunities, we must be strategic. We are now well positioned in the state and the metro area, and we have a growing national reputation. We must be established once and for all as a peer colleague of the other two major institutions in the state.

WETZEL yielded for Steve Walton, FLL. WALTON asked when those here and now would be paid for the last 8-10 years. KOCH stated that a primary motivation behind this particular proposal is to concentrate raises for those people who have been here the longest and are the most underpaid. This proposal precisely addresses the fact that over the last 6-8 years raises have been non-existent or very low, and these people have carried the growth in enrollment in the institution. These people are senior faculty, full and associate professors, whose salaries lag well behind the market rate, and a fundamental component of the proposal is the market increase. The proposal can’t do everything; it will address compression between ranks, but there will still be compression in ranks and in departments because some salaries are so low for many senior faculty that they are being moved up only to the minimum. The benefit of these increases will be much more significant than if we spread them evenly between the entire faculty. It is in the best interests of this institution to show respect for people who have been here for a number of year, who took on the work, and who deserve a measure of appreciation for that effort.

UTO stated, actions speak louder than words. He continued, the administration keeps saying, we’ll get to you next time; this is next time and the money is here. KOCH stated, to the contrary the money isn’t here; there is nowhere, anywhere in the budget that there is a flexible $12 Million. The university put $6-7 Million on the table for this raise package, but to find another $12 Million, we would have to reduce the numbers of people at this institution.

UTO stated that the difference he wants to make is an investment in faculty, reasonable workloads and a commitment to research and fixed-term faculty that goes beyond what we have now. KOCH stated that the university proposal is precisely an investment in faculty.

BLAZAK stated that there is a perception that things like Athletics are valued more than faculty, and would Koch respond. KOCH stated that Athletics is not more important than faculty. $3 Million goes in support to Athletics by administrative decision, because as a large comprehensive institution, we have intercollegiate athletics, and we will continue to do so.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

OSTLUND/GOULD MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular proposals on the Consent Agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
2. EPC Proposals for Program Name Change: Environmental Science and Management Program, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

FLOWER presented the proposal for the committee.

MERCER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program name change, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

3. EPC Proposal for Program Name Change: Educational Leadership and Policy, Graduate School of Education

FLOWER presented the proposal for the committee.

CRESS/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program name change, as listed in “E-3.”

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION & COMMITTEES

1. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

FLOWER presented the report for the committee, noting that their work started late this fall because committee appointments were late in coming. He continued, the committee has decided that the focus of this year’s work would be in support of the ad hoc committee that has been formed.

ARANTE asked why there were no fixed-term, academic professional, non-ranked, etc. faculty on the ad hoc committee. FLOWER noted that of the six appointees, one is not tenure-related faculty. He continued, the ad hoc committee intends to draw on input from all facets of governance, irrespective of how many faculty groups are represented on the committee proper.


SQUIRE presented the report for the committee, noting that PSU’s basketball team has been victorious this year, and is hosting the Big Sky tournament in the Rose Garden next week.

DILL queried, regarding “G-2,” page 1, final paragraph, if there is any actual data or have students been surveyed on claims such as athletics “helps builds …school spirit.” SQUIRE stated that her experience as Alumni Director clearly
indicates that graduates who participated in Athletics are much more excited about coming back to and supporting PSU. Additionally, her experience on the road with the teams indicates that they are outstanding representatives of PSU to those communities.

MUSSEY noted that Squire is citing personal experience, whereas those of us in the classroom are being asked to create data to express an assessment of the impact of our courses. She queried if there has ever been actual marketing research on the impact of student athletics. SQUIRE stated the committee would be willing to work on that with the Athletics department.

DILL reiterated that PSU is making a huge investment for 300 ambassadors and it is frustrating that the state places such emphasis on athletics with no proof of the impact on the community. Faculty want to see that this is a good investment. BLACK stated that if there are 300 athletes, that is the equivalent of about 1+% of the students being supported by the other 98.5%. SQUIRE noted that the Student Fee Committee just approved a budget for Athletics, confirming their support. Also, institutional support is being decreased this year to $2.5 Million and will continue to decrease.

3. Report of the IFS Meeting of 8/9 February at U of O

CARTER presented the report for the PSU senators, noting that detailed minutes are on the IFS website. CARTER referenced in particular an item called Pathway Oregon at U of Oregon. Also, new high school graduation requirements, called Essential Skills, would be put in place very soon and OUS universities are working on interface with that assessment. Comparator lists for OUS institutions are being revised. OUS is seeking Constitutional status for higher education. Lastly, the Bend campus has been told they must quadruple enrollment in ten years, or funding will cease.

5. Report of the Ad Hoc Copyright Working Group

SPALDING noted that the Copyright Working Group, made up of representatives of the Library, the bookstore, faculty, OIT, etc., has put together standardized procedures for permissions, etc. to be shared by these constituencies. Of particular concern to faculty is that over time, liability, author’s rights and “fair use” have changed. A resource page can be found on the Millar Library website at http://www.lib.pdx.edu/copyright/ and the Working Group is sponsoring a symposium on 25 April on current and future issues around copyright.

MUSSEY asked how these changes affect a faculty member bringing materials impromptu into classes that are not in the packet. SPALDING stated that spontaneous use is still acceptable if the source is properly cited.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:38.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 7, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Newsom for Farquhar, Garbarino for Hoffman, Bodegom for Khalil, Knights, Taylor for Meinhold, Paradis for Thompson, Teller for Wahab.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 3, 2008, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in the day’s agenda:
- There will be no President’s report.
- PSU Faculty are invited to the Board and IFS Coffee on Friday, 2 May 2008, at 7:30 a.m., location tbn.
- The Faculty Senate website will hopefully be in operation by the end of the year.
- Item E.1.c.1 is removed from the consent agenda and added to the agenda as E.2.

Provost’s Report

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 2008
KOCH noted that three PSU programs were approved by the Provosts’ Council meeting on Friday, April 1, including the Graduate Certificate in Infant and Toddler Mental Health, the BFA in Art and the Master of Architecture. The Master of Architecture is undergoing the external review and the results will be returned to the Provost’s Council May meeting, with the expectation that the degree will be approved and forwarded to the Board for their consideration in June. Applause. KOCH noted that in June 2002, as Chair of the Graduate Council, he offered this degree for the approval of the Faculty Senate. He continued that the approval coming as it does after a decade of delay, signals a new day in the ability of Portland State to influence events. He congratulated the School of Fine and Performing Arts and the Department of Architecture.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

OSTLUND and GOULD presented the proposals for the committees.

KETCHESON/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda” with the exception of “E.1.c.1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

DEVLETIAN/CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.c.1. Bachelor of Engineering in Engineering.”

BODEGOM queried if the appropriate units had been consulted regarding the general education curriculum, with regard to offering these courses remotely. GOULD noted that the committee reviewed this proposal over three different sessions and consulted with Computer Sciences and Engineering. They are satisfied that consultations regarding the major were broad enough, but they didn’t take up questions of general education. DEVLETIAN noted that the B.E.E. degree is intended to be a distance learning program in partnership with foreign or domestic offsite institutions. We are expecting that lower division courses in general education will be delivered as with current university practice, and major specialty courses will be provided by PSU Maseeh College of ECS. Courses can also be transferred in. BODEGOM asked for clarification regarding fulfillment of University Studies requirements. DEVLETIAN stated they would be addressed as they are with students coming from community college; they could be PSU courses or they could be streamed over as transfer credits. HICKEY asked how the University Studies upper division cluster and capstone requirements would be met. DEVLETIAN stated that practice would be the same as usual. MERCER clarified that there are now cluster and capstone courses available online. BODEGOM asked if tuition would be in or out of state. DEVLETIAN stated that
the tuition rate would be negotiated with the partner, depending on the locale, facilities used, etc. REDER asked what would be the minimum TOEFL score. DEVLETIAN stated it would be negotiated with the partner, and no lower than the PSU minimum standard.

JIAO noted that this program is a good idea, but is concerned about the language proficiency issue and program quality, as PSU student/faculty ratios are already very high. DEVLETIAN noted that the full proposal has all of the quality ingredients of an engineering ABET-approved proposal. The revenues will finance the faculty loads to support the programs, and ABET would prohibit faculty overload. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE stated that of course each individual department wants to maintain quality. She continued, the classes being delivered in Shanghai are monitored in-load by faculty in residence here at PSU, and they additionally travel to Shanghai to monitor the quality.

FOUNTAIN noted that there is an upper division Statistics course required and doesn’t see that addressed in the proposal, nor was Math & Statistics consulted about this. DEVLETIAN stated that it be the PSU course.

JHAJ stated that the UNST Council is contemplating change for some of the requirements and how students are placed based on prior coursework, and cautioned that this program approval not hold those changes hostage. DEVLETIAN stated that the program would have to adjust to the curricular changes as they happen.

CARTER asked for a clarification regarding why the program doesn’t have ABET accreditation. DEVLETIAN stated that ABET will not currently accredit an offsite program anywhere in the world, however many universities are interested in changing this.

BODEGOM stated that the Shanghai program sounds like moonlighting. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE stated that the courses are self-support. BODEGOM asked if Shanghai graduates are accepted into graduate programs at PSU. DEVLETIAN stated that most of the students get jobs at Intel in Shanghai. CHRZANOSKA-JESKE stated that regarding transfer, etc., students are looked at individually as with any student applying from anywhere in the world. A few of the Shanghai students have been accepted as transfers and graduate students. Regarding the accreditation question, there are currently seventy-five such programs who would like to secure accreditation and that the issue has to do with the insufficient number of reviewers.

PERLMUTTER queried if the program allows for the internationalization of PSU students from here, for example, the counterpart at the partner institute abroad could be made available to our classes. DEVLETIAN stated that an investment of the revenue generated from this program might be used for sending our students abroad. CHRZANOWSKA stated that the students in Shanghai are interested in being connected to the students here, although this hasn’t been acted on yet. Also, our students have already visited the Shanghai program.
HINES asked how would students be graded and who would be grading. CHRZANOWSKA stated that the grading practice is exactly like here. HINES asked if the testing was remote; CHRZANOSKA stated, no, an instructor tests the students in a room.

ARANTE asked if there are full-time faculty off site and if any category of faculty offsite are PSU faculty, The answer was no to both questions. CHRZANOWSKA stated that a faculty member here coordinates with the faculty member on site, receiving additional compensation for that assignment. MAIER reiterated that there are two faculty members for each class, one at PSU and one at the remote location.

TOLMACH noted that the Senate is being asked to approve a framework that could be used for other programs as well as this one.

REESE asked what is done to protect faculty workloads, and prevent proliferation of adjunct faculty numbers. DEVLETIAN stated the program decides whether to use adjunct and/or full-time faculty. He noted also that there is a three-person oversight committee for each program who write an annual report, make site visits, etc.

JHAJ asked if the degree has distribution requirements as with the B.S. DEVLETIAN noted that the degree would have the same distribution requirement as any other PSU program accredited by the NWASC. Hickey asked if the annual assessment would be available to the University Curriculum Committee to provide a feedback loop. DEVLETIAN stated that the curricular monitoring would be maintained by the oversight committee mentioned previously. LAFERRIERE asked who has the authority to approve the partnerships. DEVLETIAN noted it is at the Dean’s level, citing also the proposal statement that faculty agree or not to participate.

ARANTE noted that any department, then, might choose to go ahead with a program that we as a faculty senate would not want to approve if given the opportunity, because it might have something to do with, say, the country of the partnership’s human rights record, some things that might make us hesitate about China, for example, or other areas of the world. Therefore, we are asking what some of the other programs under consideration in the pipeline are, and are they places we in fact would not want PSU to have a program for reasons like that, rather than just to make money. DEVLETIAN stated he couldn’t answer the question.

BLACK noted that senators are being asked to give the executive the right to wage war whenever he sees fit. For all questions regarding the proposal in front of us. we are giving the engineering dean the right to make decisions that would otherwise be made by this body. The Shanghai program sparked this. We have had four years of experience with that program and it has hopefully informed this degree proposal, however, there is no evidence of that feedback in the proposal.
MORRIS reminded that the academic structure of this degree is identical to the B.S. in Engineering.

BODEGOM queried, how about the math class and the physics class. Physics didn’t want to partake in the Shanghai program because the caliber of the partner didn’t match our institution’s. There is so much talk about this because it smells like a diploma mill.

MORRIS reiterated that the academic structure is identical, and continued, if the course isn’t taken at PSU, the transfer course undergoes the same scrutiny as any other coming into PSU. BODEGOM queried who evaluates transfer courses. MORRIS responded that the university evaluates them as with all other transfer courses.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION FAILED, 13 in favor, 21 opposed, 20 abstentions.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council

WORKS presented the report for the council and urged Senators to forward feedback on the recommendations contained therein, as well as urging their colleagues to do so also.

2. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report

STEVENS presented the report for the council.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:20.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 5, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:08. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

- Welnick and Livneh were present; Sestak was not present.
- The IFS Report was omitted from the meeting; the minutes are available at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to the Day’s Agenda

Delete President’s Report. Add Provosts Report
Correction: Item G-6 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report, page 2, new para. 2 line 3, insert after “content knowledge to teach...” “dual credit high school/community college”

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported that three PSU programs were approved at the April 3, 2008 OUS Provosts Council Meeting, PhD in MME and Master of Architecture, and Graduate Certificate in Public Management. They will be placed on the June Board agenda.

KOCH reported that for faculty enrolled in the Optional Retirement Plan, there would be an adjustment in the contributions. From December 2007 through April 2008, the contributions were too large; therefore a letter is forthcoming, explaining this and how the adjustment will be made.

KOCH reported that the Chancellor made significant comments relative to the revised revenue forecast at meetings held in conjunction with the OSBHE meeting on Friday. He noted that a portion of the budget associated with salaries will continue to be withheld by the legislature until at least after the May forecast, and budget reduction scenarios have been requested of the OUS campuses for 2008-09.

Nominations for Presiding Officer of the 2007-08 PSU Faculty Senate:

WETZEL/FLOWER nominated Robert Mercer.

Hearing no other nominations, the Presiding Officer reminded that nominations will be closed at the June 2, 2008 Senate meeting, at which time elections will be conducted.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda – Ostlund and Gould


THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


MUSSEY noted she requested this item be excepted from the Consent Agenda because the program electives apparently recognizes racial and ethnic diversity but not other differences, for example, gender identity and sexual orientation.
MERCER stated that the main thrust of this minor, which is not required to enter a Secondary Education program, is around a few particular issues. Some of the goals of the minor are to try to strengthen the pre-service opportunities for students, and the primary motivation for the particular diversity electives included were mostly identified because as we see a changing demographic in Oregon students of struggling minority students. There are probably a lot of other things that could be part of this.

MUSSEY reiterated that particularly for students this age group, gender identity and confusion, and sexual orientation are important issues, for example, Portland has a notably visible urban Trans community. It would improve this program if courses such as Intro to Queer Studies were included as it would get people to look at the assumptions they have about who people are in terms of the sexual orientation and gender identity. It isn’t clear that these issues are being represented here, for example, do courses cover differential treatment around boys and girls - where we enforce gender roles in educational settings. Teachers need to deal with a wide variety of differences, not just different communities.

GOULD stated that he totally agreed, but reminded that there are only 2 elective classes in the minor, and noted the Electives list also cites in closing, “Or advisor approved electives.” He queried if this objection was sufficient to obstruct the proposal. MUSSEY stated it is important to list choices so that students will think about how diversity is being defined. MERCER queried if the senate could make an amendment to add some of these courses.

MUSSEY/BALSHEM MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, by adding to the Electives “WS 301 Gender & Critical Inquiry or WS 360 Introd. To Queer Studies.

THAO noted that there is no course in Asian-american studies. WETZEL queried if we have a course. MAIER noted that there is a Minorities course in the core listings.

THAO/SMITH MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, by adding a course in Asian-american studies is included.

CARTER reminded that this is a curricular matter and these items would have to be viewed as friendly amendments by the people who proposed this minor.

MERCER asked if there is a course that would satisfy this motion. ARANTE stated that two English faculty teach Asian-american literature. AMES noted that Anthropology has a course entitled “The Asian experience in America.”

HINES reminded that what we want to accomplish with this elective choice is to introduce in our students some idea of the variety of experiences that are different than our own, and listing categories rather than courses would help to define that diversity.
RUBEN reminded that this is a minor only, and the issues being addressed here are included in the graduate teacher education program.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE A COURSE IN ASIAN-AMERICAN STUDIES FAILED, by hand vote, 25 in favor, 9 against, 27 abstentions.

THE AMENDMENT TO ADD ELECTIVES. WS 301 or WS 360, PASSED by majority voice vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE E.1.c.1. AS AMENDED PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Motion to Form an Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Search Processes

BURNS withdrew the motion, stating that the Chancellor has requested the OUS Search Committee conduct their own review.

F. QUESTION PERIODs

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee

HICKEY presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.


FLOWER presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee

BLAZAK presented the report for the committee and described in brief the Campus Safety Forum scheduled for May 22.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Annual Report of the Library Committee

DAVIDOVA presented the report for the committee and took questions.
ZELICK queried if the committee would make a recommendation on improving the budget. REDER asked if data trends cited in the report could be compared with national data. SPALDING stated the Library would look into this. BRODOWICZ asked if the committee would make a recommendation on staff workload. DAVIDOVA stated, no, the comment in the report regarding workload was made with respect to security issues, not faculty/staff workload.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee

GOUGH presented the report for the committee and took questions.

There was some discussion about the change in the “X” grade policy. LUTHER commended the committee for changing the “X” grade policy, as it’s liberal application by some faculty has caused considerable problems for international students since the institution of Homeland Security regulations.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee

RUBEN presented the report for the committee and reminded of the addition to the report, cited in the announcement period of the meeting.

CARTER commended the addition of the language, citing the 700-800 dual enrolled students we have taught successfully for decades in the region, and accusations from other institutions, in particular UO, that these courses are not college level. He noted that a state task force has reaffirmed that they are, and the biggest obstacle is the licensure rules, which discourage teachers from acquiring the appropriate credentials. RUBEN added that dual credit courses tend to be richer in content than AP or IB courses, which are taught to a test.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting as adjourned at 16:14.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 2, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clicas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
• P. 44, header correction: “Nominations for Presiding Officer of the 2008-09 PSU Faculty Senate.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR
Election of Officers of the 2008-09 PSU Faculty Senate:
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Presiding Officer Pro tem: Maude Hines
Steering Committee Members: Linda George, Steve Harmon, Martha Hickey

Added to the Agenda

- E.4. Statewide Salary Pool Resolution – Clucas

There is a reception at the Simon Benson House immediately following the meeting hosted by Provost Koch and the Alumni Association, and presided over by Scott Burns.

CLUCAS noted that in concluding his term as Presiding Officer, he wanted to recognize certain faculty. He recognized Robert Dryden for his service as Dean of Engineering and Computer Science. He recognized Dan Fortmiller, for his service as Interim Vice Provost for Student Affairs. CLUCAS recognized and thanked Michael Reardon for serving as Interim President. Applause.

CLUCAS continued, thanking Scott Burns and Pat Squire for their work in executing the post-Senate receptions at the Simon Benson House. He thanked the outgoing Senate Steering Committee. He also thanked Sarah Andrews-Collier.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Preliminary Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation & Empowerment

FLOWER presented the report for the committee, noting that the committee has a website which includes a comment area on it.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Report of the Graduate Council and UCC on the January 7, 2008 motion regarding faculty qualifications to teach at the 500 and 600 level, etc.

OSTLUND/GOULD presented the reports for the committees.

BLACK queried if there were an assumption that a PhD is a qualification to teach a course, for example, being paper qualified versus the ability to teach a class is entirely different. Prospective instructors should be required to present a lecture before hiring.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
OSTLUND AND GOULD MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. **EPC Proposals for Program Name Change**

FLOWER/______ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program name change as listed in “E-2” to M.S. in Engineering and Technology Management.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV, 4, g)**

REYNOLDS/PATTON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, as listed in “E-3.”

BLACK/REDER MOVED TO AMEND the proposal, “to change in sentence #1, “his/her representative” to “their representatives.”

THE MOTION TO AMEND passed by majority voice vote.

The Presiding Officer noted that in accordance with the Constitution, the proposal will be forwarded to the Advisory Council for review, and it will be voted on at the October 6, 2008, Senate meeting.

4. **Statewide Salary Pool Resolution**

CLUCAS yielded to Flower to preside, and introduced the item for the Steering Committee, directly after C.

CLUCAS/PALMITER MOVED THE SENATE ENDORSE the state salary pool resolution, as cited in “E-4” (attached).

CLUCAS explained that both U of Oregon and Oregon State University have already passed a resolution on this item, and noted that if this funding remains frozen, the universities would have to undergo budget cuts in the upcoming academic year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**F. QUESTION PERIOD**

1. **Questions for Administrators**

None

2. **Questions from the Floor for the Chair**
TALBOTT queried why there have been no discussion items. CLUCAS noted that we did have a number of discussions, if not under the formal format. For example, certain discussion led to Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation.

CARTER queried if there could be a review of the Faculty Development Grant deadlines, as from the standpoint of the faculty, they are administered badly. Can the Senate direct the Committee to work on this? CLUCAS stated yes.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Budget Committee

LIVNEH presented the report for the committee. She noted the additional input the committee gave for 0809 allocations last week. She also noted that the role of the Budget Committee has transitioned considerable in the last few years with the new budgeting processes.

REDER queried, how often there is membership turnover. LIVNEH stated that a three year term is customary.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.


PATTON presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the Univ. Curriculum Committee

GOULD presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Annual Report of the Educational Policies Committee

FLOWER introduced the report after “D.I.” for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

REYNOLDS presented the report for the committee.

NOTE: There is no recorded transcript from this point.

CRESS - establish criteria for ______________________ (not just policies). Also, ______________________ professional development plan, like its flexible
but maybe too flexible. WALTON noted that a professional development plan is a necessity. We are pretty specific.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Annual Report of the Graduate Council

OSTLUND presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Annual Report of the University Studies Council

LATIOLAIS presented the report for the committee, with additional comments. Regarding the Mentor Advocacy Council, they are organizing, so the committee can't elaborate on that issue. Regarding the issue of a core faculty (next to the last paragraph of the report), the administration is moving away from this concept. In closing, he noted that 8 faculty have lost their positions because of the move to "shared" as opposed to core faculty. Two in particular, Victoria Pohl and Teresa Taylor had worked for the university for many years.

LATIOLAIS/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE thank these people formally for their contributions to the university and the university studies program.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER asked
HICKEY asked that he speak to the relationship of item #1 and #5.
LATIOLAIS
MERCER asked, regarding 3 and 4
FLOWER

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.


SQUIRE presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.