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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 5, 2009
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Eckhardt for Farquhar, Feng for Hook, Shearer for Khalil, for Murphy, Raffensperger for Paschild, Tarabocchia for Webb.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1/8, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: p. 45, item. #2., para. #3., “proscribed” corrected to read “prescribed.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LAFFERRIERE reminded that membership is being sought for the Ad Hoc Committee to Recommend Amendments to the Constitution, as described in the 5 October Currently.
President's Remarks

WIEWEL reminded that a record of the Fall Symposium is available on the web for those who missed it. He continued, the Board last week made the final budget determination for the year. The system is keeping a reserve that could absorb the first part of a potential cut in 2010. Two key factors in this are the January referendum and the economic recovery. The Board also decided not to take funds from the larger campuses to support the smaller campuses as previously proposed, but took them from reserves. WIEWEL continued, Board members are pushing hard for renormalization of the RAM model, in other words giving PSU the state money for our actual enrollment. As you will recall, from 2002 to 2006, we received no additional funds for increased enrollments, and from 2006 to 2008, we received 50% of those funds. The change could result in a net gain of as much as $3 Million. The campus most hurt by this change would be the University of Oregon, which could lose $3 Million. The Board also authorized the bonding and the ground lease for the next student housing project at 6th and Broadway, so that it would come at no eventual cost to PSU.

WIEWEL noted that the Board and others are having some discussions about the structure of the OUS system, its relative autonomy from the state, the role of individual campuses, etc. WIEWEL requested that the Senate Steering Committee determine how best for him to communicate this issue with the Senate, above and beyond simple communication. This might require for example, a special task force, a charge to the Educational Policy Committee, or that the Steering Committee itself take on the dialogue.

WIEWEL noted enrollments are up about 5% on headcount and about 7% on student credit hours. It is noteworthy, in this time of downturns, that we raised our price by 8% and demand is up by 7%. He also noted that PSU and the Miller Foundation received the 2009 Cecil Andrus Leadership Awards for Sustainability and Conservation, that we are appointing John Gordon the interim director of Center for Sustainable Processes and Practices, and there is a $1 Million earmark for our Green Building research lab on the federal energy appropriations bills. WIEWEL concluded that later in the fall we will be holding forums and events related to our increased activities in metropolitan K-12 education, and he introduced Pat Burk who will steward this activity.

DAASCH asked for additional information on the potential restructure of OUS, specifically how is PSU represented in these discussions. WIEWEL stated the Governor’s Reset Committee has a Higher Ed Committee, with no PSU direct representatives but it includes President Ray, Chancellor Pernsteiner, and board member David Yaden so we have good representation. We’re also in the process of putting together a PSU white paper on the issue.

WIEWEL lastly introduced Lois Davis, Chief of Staff, who comes to us from OHSU.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, October 9, 2009
1. Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV, 4, 4), g)
   Faculty Development Committee

   WAMSER reported for the Advisory Council that their review of the motion
   as described in "D-1" evinced no comment. There was no further debate.

   THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

   BURNS/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1,” as published.

   THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

   There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND
   COMMITTEES

Report of the Provost

KOCH commenced by introducing Renjeng Su, new Dean of the Maseeh College,
KOCH continued, reviewing Board actions and other items. Board meetings have been
reduced in number, and program, etc. approvals will be delegated to their new
standing committee, Academic Strategy Committee chaired by Jim Francesconi. The
moratorium period has ended and that group is reviewing proposals. Regarding the
Program Approval process, the Board has prescribed that proposals include a business
plan. In response to this charge, we are developing an internal process, including
questions. Additionally, the entire process will be electronic. We have also developed
a pre-approval process, not to lengthen the process, but so that new academic
programs can be folded into the planning processes. Regarding the Academic
Strategies Committee approvals, they have approved the Undergrad Certificate in
Revitalizing Indigenous Languages, and will review in November the BA/BS in Earth
Science.

KOCH continued, in response to a previous Board charge, we have finalized our
Minimum Enrollment Policy and will use it as a template this quarter to look at
enrollment across campus before formal implementation. The intent of the policy is to
be prospective, not for course cancellations, although that is an option in the policy.

SCHECHTER requested the Provost provide more context for the new Board standing
committee and the business model requirement. KOCH noted that it is important to
measure how new programs affect existing activities. Also, the Board and the
Chancellor’s office are very aware that our budgets will not increase in this or the next
biennium, and there is serious concern about continuing to grow programs on campuses in relation to the resources available to do that, the relationship of student/faculty ratios, etc. Also, many of the other campuses have more rigorous fiscal analyses than we, and this will bring us in line with those. Lastly, it will give us collectively better information when proposals are being reviewed.

CARTER noted that as long ago as Governor Kitzhauber, there has been a concern about "nimbleness." As far as this goes, it already takes us a year to get one course in the bulletin and more like two years for a program. It seems that this is just making these processes more complicated. KOCH noted that he did not see the addition of a business plan as more complicated, in that we are just asking an additional set of questions that address the fiscal aspects of the program so that we know how to pay for it. Regarding the pre-proposal process, he acknowledged Carter's concern, however he noted that with the exception of certificates, any degree program is a major resource issue in the current fiscal climate.

ARANTE asked a question about faculty lines being an item in pre-program proposals and business plans. KOCH yielded to MACK who stated that there are.

1. Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

SPALDING reported for the committee and took questions. HICKEY asked for clarification regarding resources for developing on-line courses. SPALDING noted that new distance learning fees were already in place, and course development would be one of the ways they would be expended, in addition to infrastructure costs. BURTON stated that $1500 is available for new course development, each. For large classes, there would also be funding for TAs and office support. SPALDING stated that there is a new committee being formed on on-line teaching, the Collaborative On-Line Learning Team (COLT), to include Spalding, Burton, Blanton, and Balzer, and faculty. BURTON reminded that his office represents on-line services, and that departments generate the courses.

SCHECHTER noted that this is all very vague and asked if there is a statement of goals, etc. anywhere. BURTON noted this is a deliberative matter in the domain of the academic departments, from one course through a degree program. SPALDING reminded that distance learning courses save classroom space, and currently all distance learning courses are filling immediately, even with the added fees. SCHUSTER asked what committee would consider such items as the cost of proctored testing.

RUETER noted that there is a disconnect between what is being presented here and what the faculty understand to be policy, for example, Spalding stated that ACAIT is appointed by the Senate, but it is appointed by OAA. SPALDING noted that ACAIT has a narrow charge and certain of these items are being directed by OAA.

The Presiding Officer accepted the committee report for the Senate.
2. H1N1 Flu Virus Procedures

DESROCHERS AND BALZER presented information and procedures developed in response to the potential for H1N1 Flu Virus outbreak on campus (http://www.pdx.edu/hr/prevention_handling_H1N1). BALZER noted that we are asking that faculty request ill students to leave the classroom, just as they can ask a student to leave a classroom for other reasons. She also noted that, on recommendation of CDC, ill students should not be required to provide a doctor’s note. We hope students will rise to the occasion, but if there are concerns, they should be referred to the Student Conduct Committee. She reminded that students would be under a great deal of pressure if they do become ill and are missing all their classes. She yielded to Mary Beth Collins, SHAC. COLLINS noted that numbers are up somewhat but that SHAC is no longer testing for H1N1 on recommendation from CDC. Right now, we are so far, so good. We expect receipt of H1N1 vaccine staring in November. LUTHER reminded that International Students would need notes eventually to protect their residency status.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2/3 October at OIT

RUETER reported for the Senators (attached), noting that the full report is available at (http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html). He noted that

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, November 2, 2009

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 5, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

- P.4, item #1), para.4, line #2, change “Spalding stated...” to “Spalding stated that ACAIT is appointed by OAA, but solicits member recommendations from the faculty.”
- P. 5, item #2), para. #1, line #7, add “GEORGE asked whether or not students will be required to have a doctor’s note in order to receive a medical waiver of tuition. BALZER replied that a
...doctor's note would not necessarily be required. Waivers will be determined on a case-by-case basis."

- P. 5, item #3), para #1, line #2, delete “He noted that....”
- Attendance - Stedman for Murphy; Burk for McKeown; ________ for Anderson; Jiang for Bleiler.

Senate and/or Committee changes since October 5, 2009: Wollner is elected Chair of the Institutional Assessment Council. Jhaj is appointed to the Academic Requirements Committee. Poracsky replaces Carey as Chair of the Student Conduct Committee. The membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on Constitutional Revision is Liebman (Chair), Adler, Butler, Mark Jones, MacCormack, Enders, Barham and Sarah Andrews-Collier and Duncan Carter, ex officio. D. Johnson, his name inadvertently dropped from the last roster, is however a Senator (2010).

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Postponed to December: G.2. due to illness.

Robert’s Rules of Order

LUCKETT conducted a brief review of Robert’s Rules of Order as they apply to the usual activities and practices of the PSU Faculty Senate (attachment).

1. Discussion Item: Updating the University Writing Requirement

JACOB, University Writing Committee Chair, made a 5-minute presentation based on their most recent proposal and report as documented in “C.I.” He emphasized that over time, the financial burden of the proposed changes would shift considerably to the community colleges as students entered having met the proposed revised requirement. He also emphasized his preference for Writing Across the Discipline (WID) course option at the upper division level. HICKEY, Academic Requirements Committee (ARC), made a 5-minute presentation. She stated that ARC has been unable to pin down the actual numbers involved, whether during the transition or following, because the system doesn’t allow harvest of the appropriate data. She also stated that the proposal needs to address support at the Sophomore Inquiry level, that the Writing Center is already overloaded, and that a test-out option hasn’t been fully developed. She continued, the committee questions whether we would still need an upper division requirement if the lower division requirement changes, and whether WIC and WID courses can be developed in sufficient numbers to meet this plan.

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for fifteen minutes.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, 4., 4) m. Educational Policy Committee
There was no further debate.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Faculty Senate Agenda Setting Discussion

HINES moved the body to a committee of the whole for 40 minutes, to discuss agenda setting for the year.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost's Report

KOCH reported on development of infrastructure for expanding on-line education, noting it is based on understandings and recommendations solicited recently from the Office of Information Technology and Finance & Administration. He noted that the Oregon University System (OUS) has obtained authority for the universities to assess on-line learning fee for students at their individual campuses, and PSU has implemented that fee for $15.00 per credit for hybrid courses, and $30.00 per credit for fully on-line courses. The revenue would be cover library support, support for faculty teaching on-line courses, support for faculty to develop on-line courses, and other costs related to the on-line instruction. KOCH noted that he is forming a committee, the Collaborative On-line Learning Team, comprised of administrators responsible for Information Technology and interested faculty, who would advise with regard to a program for faculty development and allocation of on-line learning resources. We have already instituted a 24-7 help desk for people who are partially or fully on-line, and OIT is also increasing server support for Blackboard. The “ACAIT” Committee has also been charged to review RFPs for a new learning management system, which would be the primary platform for on-line learning. Therefore, in addition to developing additional resources, we may be migrating to a new environment. Those are the two major efforts underway around distance learning.

SHUSTERMAN reminded that she previously urged that on-line testing needs to be supported, and that the faculty need to take charge of curricular policy for introducing and evaluating courses taught on-line. RUTH urged that this be an activity of the regular faculty, not a self-support effort. KOCH noted that we don’t want to have a random set of on-line courses, of which we can only cite the percentages, rather we want to begin by working at the department level to gauge the interest and what kind of support is needed. The intent is that the courses developed are in-load and part of what we do. Obviously, there are limits relative
to pedagogy, etc. This effort is not intended to enlarge existing courses, but to expand the variety of our delivery methods and of course, to relieve pressure on classroom space.

KOCH noted that the recently passed Senate Bill 442, largely directed at regional colleges, also directs a study of the effectiveness and potential financial impact of a conversion to semesters. President Wiewel has discussed the issue with PCC President Preston Pulliams, who is the only community college president in the state who is willing to consider it. The Chancellor thinks that if an experiment were to be conducted, the metro area would be a reasonable location, and discussions will continue with other community colleges to see what would be involved. KOCH noted he has alerted the presiding officer that together we will continue to examine both the long-term savings and short-term costs associated with such a transition. Presumably, we will create a plan for this transition, which will provide the costs involved, and presumably these costs would be funded in order for us to go through this transition.

DESROCHERS noted that the bill sponsors intended this action to generate cost savings, but as we are at 50-60% of our need for administrative funding, it is difficult to imagine how we could save anything. We need to know that we really want to do this for the other reasons, if we are going to undergo the change.

2. Report of the Associated Students of PSU

SANFORD discussed the ASPSU initiatives for the year. The first is the Vote campaign, to register new voters, and students are requesting visits to classes to get the word out. Then, there are two initiatives coming up for a vote in the new year, which ASPSU will be conducting an information campaign on. SANFORD continued, his administration is working to improve student participation on all-university committees, and that they are working on ways to support faculty in any way they can.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:08.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 7, 2009
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Geiger for Gamburd, A for Gelmon, Gerwing for Jhaj, Shearer for Khalil, Reese for L. Mercer, Knox for Neal, Marrongelle for Palmiter, Raffensperger for Paschild, Perkowski for Zurk.


Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved as published with correction of the spelling of Farahmandpur.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda: F.1. Question for President Wiewel

Deleted from the Consent Agenda: E.1.c.2

Changes to Senate and Committee memberships since November 2, 2009

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, December 7, 2009
Candyce Reynolds replaces McKeown, ED, in the Faculty Senate. Grant Farr is appointed chair of the Intercollegiate Athletic Board, Rachel Hardesty replaces Tom Hastings on the University Curriculum Committee for the remainder of the year.

President’s Remarks

WIEWEL responded to G.1 Question for Administrators (see "G.1.").

WIEWEL announced the gift of $3.9 Million to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics for support of computational science. Applause. He continued, this includes the renaming of the department to the Fariborz Maseeh Department of Mathematics and Statistics, and endows a chair and two professorships. This gift symbolizes the collaborative nature of the sciences, and our relationship to the community.

WIEWEL noted that work continues with our consultants on the university district framework plan and next term, those results will be rolled out in meetings. One part of the plan already underway, the College Station housing project, is scheduled to open 2012 and will include 2 lecture halls, ground floor retail, and over 900 beds. The Student Recreation Center will have formal opening ceremonies on February 22, and parts of the facility will be open on 3 January. We are in the second phase of planning on the South Waterfront project, and April will mark the final decision point on plans to proceed. Regarding other matters, we now have over 6000 on-line courses and we will shortly institute the 24-7 help desk to support that activity. The OUS board retreat in December included the formation of a committee to examine the proposal to restructure the system, and here at the university our white paper has been published and committees have been formed at various levels within the university, including faculty, to provide feedback. The search for the Vice President for University Relations continues to move forward with campus visits scheduled for late January and early February. The search for the Vice President for Research and Partnerships will commence soon. We intend to announce the search for the football coach tomorrow.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students – Postponement Notice

HINES read a memorandum from Janine Allen, Co-chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, requesting a postponement of their report until Spring 2010.

1. Discussion Item – University Initiatives

HINES introduced the item, following up on the conversation begun in November, regarding the faculty’s role and accountability in the arena of the university’s planning (see Convocation 2009: http://www.pdx.edu/president/speech-archive), and she moved the meeting to a committee of the whole. HINES noted in conclusion that we will act on the suggestion that department chairs be requested to report on their experiences at that level of administration with respect to these issues.
D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOK/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda, as listed in “E-1” with the exception of “E.1.c.2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GEORGE/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course listed in “E.1.c.2.” SySc 346 Exploring Complexity in Science and Technology.

RUETER requested clarification on three questions, 1) why an undergraduate course would be offered by a graduate school, 2) how a course can have a different number if it the same as another course, and 3) how there can be a course change if it isn’t in the catalog in the first place. BROWN noted that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee asked the same questions, and yielded to System Sciences Chair George Lendaris. LENDARIS noted that the course was passed last year although it didn’t make catalog deadlines. He continued, it is deliberately interdisciplinary including the fact that the instructor has a joint appointment in Computer Science and Systems Science. The differing numbers are a branding thing, so that students can find courses they may be interested in. LUCKETT added that it isn’t without precedence for a graduate program to offer an undergraduate course, see for example, courses in the Graduate School of Education. In response to a question, LENDARIS noted that Systems Science is an interdisciplinary field and is therefore located in Graduate Studies, however students will find these courses through University Studies Clusters.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Question for President Wiewel submitted November 20, 2009

*Given that the $4 Million budgetary shortfall that the faculty pay cut was to cover has now been made up by increased enrollment, why are we still taking a pay cut?*

WIEWEL responded to the question (attached).
WALTON noted her astonishment that faculty will not have access to their offices during the furlough. WIEWEL responded that the hope is that there will be significant savings in this activity, thus the only exceptions will be for certain labs.

RUTH asked for a clarification regarding the statement that there are political implications to not implementing salary cuts. WIEWEL noted that the legislature and the students also have positions we must take into account, for example, students do not want their tuitions to increase. The intent is that this is a temporary measure and we want to get salaries back to the previous level as soon as possible. LUCKETT asked if these remarks would be available. WIEWEL stated, yes, he would provide a written copy for the minutes.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

There were no questions from the Floor for the Chair

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported after G.4., noting several items. The five closure days in December will make it extra important that final grades are submitted on time this term. Regarding OUS board actions, the BA/BS in Earth Sciences has been approved. Also, the working group addressing general education for the system and the community colleges have after two years developed an agreed upon set of requirements. Regarding the possibility for semester conversion, an OUS committee will be formed to evaluate the potential impact, and Koch will represent the Provost Council and PSU on this committee.

1. Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report

BOWMAN presented the report for the committee in “E-1” noting that one student committee member has been added, Frederick Long.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Educational Policy Committee Review of Minimum Class Size Policy

BOWMAN presented the report for the committee in “G-2.” He reminded that last year the OUS system requested the universities each provide campus policy, which the PSU administration developed, with subsequent input from EPC and the Budget Committee. He described some of the pedagogical considerations reviewed by the committee with respect to determining a policy, and reviewed the survey that the committee executed. He noted that with regard to the subject of last month and today’s discussion item, as the committee reviewed the policy they also discussed the degree of engagement of the faculty in the process. Lastly, he offered
five options for a policy in the form of hypothetical motions, the first endorsing the policy as it currently stands, and the next four having alternate options.

AMES requested that "Motion 5" be changed to read, "makes no recommendation regarding..." to clarify the intent. SCHECHTER queried why we would do this, noting that if classes are cancelled due to size, what then happens to her time. KOCH noted that this is an attempt by the Board to set a floor at what faculty do. He continued that in the interim they decided to keep the minimum at ten, but this gives them a feeling for what happens across the system so that they are meeting their responsibility. He also noted that PSU classes are on the whole, smaller than our sister institutions.

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of a whole for 15 minutes.

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting 4/5 December at PSU

MERCER in the interest of time, noted that the report will be available next week in the minutes of the IFS, at [http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html](http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html)

4. Interim Report of the University Studies Council

CRUZAN presented the report for the committee as discussed in "G-4" reminding that the renovation of the clusters is in response to the advanced age of the program and the numbers of student petition, the broader outcome being fewer, larger clusters. HICKEY noted that INTL is a pretty large stakeholder in this program so this is an important issue. They have been pleased with the cooperation and facilitation of University Studies to reorganize clusters around the new fewer potential themes, and responsiveness to the perceived need for greater support at the sophomore inquiry level.

SMALLMAN reminded that this activity is focused on student success, and congratulated the faculty driven process.

5. Office of International Students & Scholar Services Report

LUTHER presented the report as discussed in "G-5" noting the steep increase in international students at the university, and the fact that PSU has the most of any school in the state. C. BROWN commended the office on their good work.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:10.
**PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, January 4, 2010  
**Presiding Officer:** Maude Hines  
**Secretary:** Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


**Alternates Present:** ________ for Gamburd, Reese for L. Mercer, Thomas for Toppe.


**Ex-officio Members Present:** Andrews-Collier, Beyler, Burton, Desrochers, Hickey, Knight, Koch, Mack, Sestak, Smallman, Spalding, Su, Wallack, Wiewel.

**A. ROLL**

**B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2009, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 15:10. The minutes were approved with the correction:

President’s Report, p. 11, para. 3, line 8: "Regarding other matters, we now have over 6000 on-line courses....", replace 6000 with 615.

**C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

BLEILER announced that the Faculty Development Committee has reviewed and extended the travel application deadlines to one year in advance. He noted however, that only one application per item would be reviewed.

HINES announced that with respect to the proposal to reorganize the OUS system as a public corporation, the Senate webpage would be providing a Wiki for discussion.
purposes. It should be ready in approximately two weeks, thanks to the generous assistance of Steve Harmon.

1. Discussion Item: Shared Governance & Engagement (cont’d.)

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for fifteen minutes.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

MURPHY/COLLIER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda as listed in “E’1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council Certificate Proposals (MCECS)

BEYLER presented the proposals for the council, and solicited questions. RUETER asked why the proposals contain no business plan, a recently added proposal requirement. MACK stated that the form is still under development. LIVNEEH noted that the Budget Committee did in fact review them. JHAJ stated that the committee is using the OUS guidelines in the interim. SCHICKTER asked what is the intended audience for these programs. ANDERSON stated they generally would appeal to metro area professionals.

JACOB/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the certificate proposals, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Academic Requirements Committee: Proposal for ESL Standard

HOFFMAN/HOOK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Academic Requirements Committee: Proposal for Writing Requirement

HICKEY introduced the proposal for the committee, noting that there are questions regarding adequate infrastructure. JHAJ noted that the Budget
Committee was requested to report on the issue, but as they discovered the actual fee structure, they need more time for review.

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for five minutes.

REESE/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as listed in “E-4.”

LUCKETT noted concern regarding the statement in para. 2, ...“once there is assurance that adequate institutional support is in place...” and how that would work. JIAJ noted that the Budget Committee is not ready to comment on this point.

KOCH reminded that budgeting is an ongoing process, with deadlines in early winter through spring for the subsequent year’s budget. There is nothing in the pipeline this year regarding this project. The issue is who will do this, to cover the additional program costs.

MURPHY queried if this requirement were added, would something else be removed, noting that adding requirements cramps other activities. BLEILER queried if #3 is overly vague, noting that the wording is sufficiently imprecise to make a decision.

CABELLY/HOOK MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 41 in favor, 13 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported after C.1. He noted that during his December break activities he encountered very positive perceptions of PSU. He continued, that a memorandum would be issued later this week regarding reallocation of additional tuition revenues, to include 70% of those resources for permanent positions.

WIEWEL notes that the PSU OSU Task Force, to review the proposal for OUS reorganization, has held its first meeting. There is a question of how shared governance works, and how well faculty represent their peers and how the feedback loop is managed. In what areas, for example, do we have to trust that a committee is taking care of our best interests? We have formulated 5 shared principles with the other presidents, based on our PSU principles, and they will be published shortly. One of the issues for us is the development of a local revenue source. The more we project
ourselves as a major civic institution that is critical to the future of this region, and the more clearly the state seems to be less able to solve its revenue challenge, we must look locally.

MURPHY asked for an update on the south waterfront project. DESROCHERS noted

LATIOLAIS remarked on PSU’s public relations problems, in that coverage by The Oregonian appears to contradict Dr. Wiewel’s impressions. WIEWEL noted that he doesn’t have an answer for why their coverage is not as good as the television coverage we receive.

Provost’s Report

KOCH briefly reviewed the new federal textbook requirement, which goes into effect fall term, which translates to mean that there is an April deadline for book orders. He directed senators to the Reference Documents pages of Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate, for complete details.

KOCH noted that he would be chairing the search for the Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships. He urged senators to forward nominations immediately, as solicitation of committee appointments would conclude on Friday. MURPHY commented that the position is broadly defined, and KOCH concurred, noting that his position, for example, is also.

KOCH noted that two finalists have been identified for the new learning management system, and they are Remote Learner and Desire to Learn. There will be January sessions for faculty to meet with both prospects.

KOCH noted that as he described in December, a committee has been formed, the Collaborative Online Learning Team (COLT), to deal with on-line learning. The initial charge is to recommend: the appropriate organizational structure/location for instructional design and support; the appropriate faculty development program in support of the expansion of hybrid and fully online course and the improvement of the quality of existing courses; and, to the initial distribution of course fees. Appointments for the initial membership, made in consultation with the Senate Steering Committee and Advisory Council, will be announced shortly.

KOCH concluded that he is reviewing data from recent class enrollments and then will respond to the informal vote by the December Senate with respect to the Minimum Class Size Policy document.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:52.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 1, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Fung, Knight, Mack, Smallman, Wiewel.

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

Farquhar, Geiger for Gamburd, and Shusterman were present January 4, 2010.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda:
F.1. Question for the President
G.3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of Jan 8/9
Deleted from the Agenda:
Provost’s Report
Other:
ARANTE spoke about changes to and encouraged faculty to join Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF).
FARR introduced and yielded to incoming football coach Nigel Burton, who
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spoke briefly about instilling integrity and responsibility in his players. Applause.

HINES announced the Steering Committee’s establishment of the Faculty Senate Discussion Forum (wiki) located on the Senate webpage, www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate with the aide of Steve Harmon, OAA. DAASCH led a brief navigation demonstration.

HINES announced that the March Discussion Item topic would be Online Learning, and directed the assembly to the Discussion Forum page provided for input before the meeting.

HINES listed other Discussion Item topics under consideration by the Steering Committee: OUS reorganization, student retention, erosion of tenure, proposal for administrative review, the library collection, establishment of administrative feedback, faculty participation in planning, Extended Studies.

HINES noted the Writing Committee does not plan to request their prior proposal be taken off the table. JACOB added that a revised motion has already been forwarded to the Academic Requirements Committee.

1. Discussion Item: Shared Governance

The discussion item was conducted in three parts, coinciding with three topics outlined by the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution (see attachment G-2).

Part 1. MacCORMACK introduced the Ad Hoc Committee and outline the issues in the report document, part 1, Agenda Setting.

BURNS spoke in favor of course release for the presiding officer. HINES noted that the Provost has funded course release this year, and MacCORMACK noted that the committee wants to ensure this is institutionalized. CARTER remarked that the union chief negotiator already has course release. C. BROWN spoke in favor, noting that these changes would make the Senate more effective, and the Presiding Office would take the lead in this scenario.

Part 2. BUTLER outlined the issues in the report document, part 2, Communications.

HOOK spoke in favor, noting that more faculty would become engaged if the agendas were set long-range. BROWER spoke in favor of increased reporting outlets to improve information dissemination. ________ also spoke in favor, as a way to increase communication effectiveness. HARMON spoke in favor of replacing truant senators sooner than the current rule of a three-quarter absence. BUTLER stated that improvement in communication should improve the transition into leadership roles by newer faculty. C.BROWN stated that a natural recruitment point is at the awarding of tenure.
Part 3. LIEBM AN outlined the issues in the report document, part 3, Eligibility. This portion was conducted as a committee of the whole, and is not recorded. There was general approval of the proposals.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HOOK/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricula Consent Agenda as listed in “E.1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for President Wiewel

“The draft whitepaper on "Restructuring PSU’s Relationship with the State" calls for a "Student-based funding model for state allocations," and asserts, "funding should be based on the number of students educated" (pp. 4, 13). Will PSU apply the same principle internally to guide the allocation of funds among academic divisions?”

Submitted by:
Martha Hickey, Chair, International Studies Dept.
Thomas Luckett, Chair, History Dept.
Jennifer Ruth, Chair, English Dept.
Tom Seppalainen, Chair, Philosophy Dept.

WIEWEL responded, after his regular report: “There will never be a direct one-to-one relationship between the student credit hours generated by a department and the funding received. There are at least two major reasons for this. First, while we are partly funded by the state on a per student-credit-hour basis, classroom teaching is only part of the mission we carry out on behalf of the state and region: we are also very actively involved in research, workforce development and other activities essential to address the economic and social needs of the region and the state. Second, while state funding is based on a model that acknowledges the differential costs of various programs, it only contributes a small fraction of the funding required to run the institution. Tuition, which funds the majority of our educational operation, is largely the same for most undergraduate and graduate programs, regardless of the program cost.

As a result, internal redistribution of resources is, and for the foreseeable future will be, required to meet differential program costs as well as the expectations of the external community, including the legislature.
There is a relationship between enrollment and the allocation of academic resources, particularly as relates to new faculty positions and resources to serve new students in the short term. Over the past few years, we have allocated a significant number of faculty positions to departments that generate substantial credit hours – either directly or through the UNST staffing initiative. There are never sufficient resources to fully staff every department with a sufficient number of tenure line, or even fulltime, faculty, but preference has been give to those units that contribute significant student credit hours and also those that graduate a large number of majors.

I agree with those who believe more needs to be done to ensure that our limited resources are allocated both equitably and rationally, however. Based on recommendations of the LTIFS committee and my own interest in more effective allocation of resources, we are forming a committee that will help develop a comprehensive set of principles for internal budget allocation based on an understanding of the financial structure of the institution and our expectations for state funding in the future. Certainly, productivity in terms of students taught will play a key role in the allocation scheme that is developed, but it will not be the only consideration given our interest in achieving a number of strategic objectives that change over time. Faculty will, of course, be represented and the Ad hoc committee process will be followed."

LIVNEH asked how this committee would relate to the Senate Budget Committee. WIEWEL stated that the Senate Budget Committee reviews budgets based on current criteria, but this committee’s charge is to determine changes in guiding principles. At PSU the current process is good, but the criteria may need change. BURNS asked how the passage of Measures 66 and 67 would affect the current budget. WIEWEL stated they would wait to see what the Legislature does before accessing the reserves that we have accumulated. LUCKETT noted that budget office internal reporting of SCH revenues versus cost indicate that CLAS and FPA are generally in the lead, producing about 170% of funds allocated, and some other professional schools about 160%, business about 135% and at the opposite end, MCECS is in the red at about 90%. He urged that the committee consider, while recognizing that there must be cross allocation of funds, whether these numbers aren’t too far out of balance. WIEWEL stated that yes, this is the kind of issues the committee will address.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported after “C.” He noted that Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) awarded PSU the 2010 Award for Excellence in Learning
Outcomes, recognizing work in University Studies and Honors. He noted that sponsored research awards are up 15% over last year at this date. He noted that the Student Recreation Center has won LEED Gold Certification. He discussed his recent trip to Washington with the mayor to secure funding for the proposed Oregon Sustainability Center on the block east of SRC. A direct result of the meeting is that the Secretary of HUD will be coming to PSU to make the announcement about a new competitive program for sustainable communities. For energy efficiencies in the Fourth Avenue Building, the university was awarded $313,000 by Portland’s Energy Trust. At the January OUS Board meeting, they approved our request to purchase Market Center Building for $24 Million, they approved the BA/BS in Earth Sciences degree, and they authorized us to seek an additional $4.5 million in Other Funds expenditure limitation on PSU’s Lincoln Hall project expansion during the February 2010 Legislative Supplemental Session. Regarding, OUS restructuring, he recently met with faculty, student and alumni committees, and the Governor’s “reset” committee, but noted that nothing will really happen until the gubernatorial election is over. WIEWEL stated that restructuring could provide some possible opportunities for PSU, and there are no serious downsides. There are things we should be very careful of; for example, the Virginia model indicates certain negatives.

HINES asked Wiewel to discuss his views on shared governance, especially the issue of how to communicate faculty input in addition to the mechanism provided by the Educational Policy Committee. WIEWEL stated he has happily lived with many models of shared governance, for example, he was a member of a research institute that ran on a participatory democratic model and he has worked for a Chancellor where there was none. He continued, one of the frequent confusions about shared governance is the lack of clarity about layers, sectors, and forms of control. Faculty clearly control course content, but there are higher levels not subject to faculty control which may still receive faculty input, and other levels where there is no reasonable expectation of faculty consultation. The lack of clarity is one of the reasons why people get unhappy, because they feel that they should have been consulted, but someone else felt that it was out of their domain. Faculty may feel dissed and administrators may feel harassed, and in periods of growth and times of crisis, these misunderstandings may multiply. It is, for example, unclear how faculty relate to real estate issues. Another problematic issue involves representation and accountability, for example, who the individual or unit in question is representing, or accountable to. Lastly, universities develop individual cultures, and the changing nature of this university in recent times, for example, has not been matched by changes in governance structures, as witnessed by the work of the ad hoc committee of the Senate.

1. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students

ALLEN presented the report for the committee after G-3, noting that the charge to the committee is very broad and they have organized their work to date by formulating a list of questions(G-1 attached). She noted that the lack of data is hindering their effectiveness. She entertained comment via her email address: allenj@pdx.edu
2. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

LIEBMAN presented the report for the committee constructed in the form of three topics of discussion which were distributed across the course of the Senate meeting, each followed by a discussion period as transcribed in C.1. Shared Governance (attachment G-2).

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 8/9 January at PSU.

RUETER reported for PSU’s Senators, noting that the IFS spent the bulk of the meeting discussing the public corporation idea. He directed the Senate to the IFS minutes as well as the January 14, 2010 IFS Resolution regarding the proposal to reorganize OUS, e-mailed to the Senate membership last week (http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html). This resolution is on the Agenda of the Board Governance and Policy Committee, which meets Jan. 28, 2010. He also directed the membership to the PSU white paper, and noted that important factors for PSU are the ratio of our graduation rate versus those of UO and OUS, and the data provided by OUS indicates a doubling in size of the university.

RUETER yielded to Dalton Miller-Jones who noted that funding is the fundamental premise of the two reports, but that in the last two legislative sessions, the universities have achieved better funding than previously because we worked as a unified front instead of competing with each other. If we go to an independent board, there is a real concern about getting a base budget that would be anywhere close to adequate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:08.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 1, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Raffensperger for Bielavitz, Geiger for Gamburd, Tarrabochia for Toppe

Members Absent: Ames, Anderson-Nathe, Arante, Blanton, Cabelly, Coleman, Dickson, Fuller, Hagge, Hoffman, Keller, Johnson, Ketcheson, Koroloff, Kwong, Leite, Mathwick, Miller, Nash, Oschwald, Palmiter, Pierce, Raffo, Rogers, Sanchez, Smith, Strathman, Taylor, Wallace, Wamser, Weingrad, Wendler, Wetzel,

Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:06. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

Palmiter present, Kwong present, Taylor present. Taylor was present in January.

Senate and Committee replacements: Sytsma appointed to replace Balshem in Senate. Absher appointed chair of General Student Affairs Committee.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

HINES announced that discussion items for April would be about exploring PSU-OHSU Strategic Partnerships and the OUS Restructuring proposal. She encouraged Senators to provide input on these topics before then by way of the Senate “Wiki”.
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FORTMILLER noted that Senator Dee Thompson retires in March, and invited Senate acknowledgment of her service. Applause.

1. Discussion Item: Online Learning

BOWMAN provided a fact sheet summarizing preliminary research by the EPC on issues relative to Online Learning (attachment). HINES moved the body to a Committee of the Whole to discuss this issue.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HOOK/LAFFERIERE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL spoke after “G.3.” He noted that with regard to the College and University President’s Climate Commitment, we have devoted considerable energy to developing part one of a three-year/three-part internal plan. WIEWEL continued, in the recent Winter Olympics at Vancouver, a PSU alumna served on the bobsled team, and a faculty member served as a women’s hockey coach. He congratulated SSW and RRI for having recently received two large research grants totaling $5 Million. He noted that the city and PSU co-applied, with success, for $23 Million from U.S. Department of Transportation, for infrastructure improvements on the South Waterfront. He noted that regarding the proposal to restructure the Oregon University System, we are involved with six committees. He continued, the next phase in the proposal discussions will come with the reset committee reports in June or July, and the conversation will conclude with the 2011 legislative session. WIEWEL noted we have received the first naming gift for Lincoln Hall, of $50,000 from alumna Mary Tooze for the piano studio. He noted that searches for two Vice Presidents are in progress. WIEWEL concluded, now that the legislative session is adjourned, the administration and AAUP are reopening the collective bargaining agreement.
WIEWEL briefly discussed On Line Learning as requested in advance of the meeting by the Presiding Officer. He noted that On Line Learning is a fundamental element of our historical access mission, in this case to serve adult learners in the region and the state.

MURPHY asked for comment about the proposal to restructure the Oregon University System. WIEWEL noted there is a 'Wiki' on the faculty senate webpage through which the relevant documents and minutes may be accessed. He noted, most importantly, this is not our call, rather the issue was raised by several external parties. Obviously we are participants, but the Chancellor and the legislature are the key participants.

RUTH noted with regard to On Line Learning, that she needs funds for more hires. WIEWEL responded that on line courses are a part of a department’s menu of offerings, which is connected to enrollment and enrollment growth. We can’t hire faculty before the revenue comes in. MURPHY asked for a clarification of the previous remark. WIEWEL stated this is not a competitive strategy, it is part of our mission. Obviously we will continue to grow, but this is not viewed as an initiative to create new markets but to serve people better.

**Provost's Report**

KOCH reported after President Wiewel. He noted that with regard to the On Line Learning discussion, the Collaborative Online Learning Team (COLT) has been convened, and he briefly described their charge. “The initial 2009-10 charge for COLT is to recommend the appropriate organizational structure/administrative location for instructional design and support, to develop an appropriate faculty development program supporting the expansion of hybrid and fully online courses and the improvement of the quality of existing courses, and to recommend an initial distribution of the distance education fee to support online activities.” KOCH noted that the PSU/OHSU Strategic Partnerships Task Force meetings are underway, and the university will be convening a series of internal meetings on the subject in the near future. He noted he would be discussing semester conversion possibilities with the IFS on Friday, as part of his service on the system wide committee to respond to SB 442. A report on the topic is due on 1 June.

1. **Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report**

   BOWMAN presented the report for the committee, noting their report will be more extensive next term.

   The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. **Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report**
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FARR presented the report for the committee. He noted that with regard to the committee charge and duties, the NCAA re-accreditation and our internal audit would result in a proposal to amend the constitution in the next quarter.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

BUTLER, Robert Liebman (Chair), and Mark Jones presented the report (attached), after “E.” The committee reported that they recommend several changes, two large and others small. The large changes proposed are to articulate eligibility so that participation is delineated by duties as well as academic qualifications, and to revise Senate divisions, including the division of CLAS into three divisions, and the inclusion of XS into another division. In response to questions about who would be excluded under the refined eligibility definition, committee members noted that there would be in this category approximately 75 out of 1150 persons in non-academic or student services positions, for example clerical, accounting, campus security, auxiliary services, parking and transportation, etc.

HANSEN/__________ MOVED THE SENATE ENDORSE these general recommendations.

BROWER stated she did not think CLAS should be divided into three divisions. WALTON noted she disagreed and supports better CLAS disciplinary representation. BOWMAN queried how this would affect divisional representation on standing committees. It was noted that there would be some alteration of size, most likely increasing CLAS to a total of 6 representatives.

THE MOTION TO ENDORSE PASSED by majority voice vote.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Campus Climate Committee Report

The Presiding Officer directed Senators to the report, item “G-4.”

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:56.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 5, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Raffensperger for Bielavitz, Dinno for Carder, Reese for L. Mercer, Morris for Pejinovic, Meekisho for Sailor, Newlands for Trimble, Gough for Webb, Duncan for Zurk.

Members Absent: Accetta, Anderson-Nathe, Baccar, Bleiler, Buddress, Cabelly, Caskey, Collier, Curry, Danielson, Chaille, Fuller, Hoffman, Jacob, Johnson, Khalil, Koroloff, Lall, Leite, Murphy, Nash, Oschwald, Pierce, Rogers, Strathman, Taylor, Wallace, Wendler, Wetzel,

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Beyler, Davis, Hickey, Knight, Koch, Mack, Sanford, Smallman, Spalding, Su,

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:04 p.m. The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

THE MEETING OF MAY 3, 2010 WILL CONTINUE UNTIL 5:30. PLEASE BE PREPARED TO STAY THE ENTIRE 2.5 HOURS, IN ORDER TO CONCLUDE THE MAY AGENDA.

HINES noted that the Steering Committee has charged a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee to be developed to provide faculty response to the
proposal to restructure OUS. She noted that Michael Bowman will be a member, and the committee's report will be presented at the May meeting of the Senate. To volunteer, Senators may contact her or the Faculty Senate "Contact" at www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate. RUETER volunteered. (attachment)

I. Discussion Items

Faculty Committee on OUS/PSU Structure

BOWMAN presented background on the issue, including a description of the committees working on it. He described briefly the downward trend in public funding for higher ed, the general proposition to restructure in order to increase fiscal flexibility, and some examples of what this might include.

ARANTE queried if we are paying enough attention to the activities of OUS around this issue, for example, see Jay Kenton's proposals of last month. BOWMAN noted that we are pursuing this activity because the financial impacts are the only ones that OUS and others are considering. SANFORD noted the students are working on this item. RUETER noted there is a tension between the system and this campus. We now hold some cards, for example the potential for local taxes, so we need to decide where we stand.

HOOK queried if the president is genuine, and requested more information. DAVIS noted that the six principles are the President's position.

JHAJ noted that funding is the reason for these proposals, and performance oversight will continue to increase regardless. SCHECHTER noted that these proposals do not address tuition increases, and graduation rates decrease as tuition rises. She queried if we can address not where the governance will reside, but the problem of costs.

PSU-OHSU Strategic Partnerships Task Force

GELMON presented background on the issue and described the people and committees involved, and DAVIS noted this activity is a result of the latest Greenlick effort.

BURNS noted that there are some obvious collaborations, but we are too different in other areas. ARANTE asked if there is literature regarding OHSU tenure and salaries. GELMON noted that anecdotal evidence indicates some obvious differences in cultures around tenure and salaries. R. MERCER asked if there have been discussions about trading students. KOCH noted that OHSU doesn't have the capacity to absorb additional students without funding. HICKEY commented on collaborations (inaudible). LIVNEH noted that there are several OHSU-GSED collaborations, but they are mostly "person dependent" e.g. if the person leaves, the collaboration ends. HOOK noted that there are collaborations in engineering that should be inventoried, and also cautioned that official or top down collaborations are not successful.
SHUSTERMANN noted there are collaborations in Chemistry, and queried if we are anticipating a merger. DAVIS noted that the charge of the House committee includes up-to investigating a merger, however that option is not popular with the participants. RUETER queried how this contributes to capacity. GELMON noted that the pie is finite, for example, what would this do to the two libraries. DICKENSON noted that he is involved with several entrepreneurial folks at OSHU who want to work with PSU.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOKS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular proposals consent agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council Proposal for Certificate in Service-Learning and Community-Based Learning in Post Secondary Education

BEYLER presented the proposal.

AMES/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the item, 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

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported after “G-3.” He noted that the search for the new Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships continues and the position profile is available on the HR page. As noted in the February announcement, faculty representatives on the search committee are Daasch (representing Faculty Senate), Powers, Jiao, and Dill, and the committee has commenced screening applicants. The intent is to have campus interviews scheduled in early June, or if there is delay, they will be conducted in the fall.
KOCH noted that after final consultations he has established the Minimum Enrollment Policy (3/31/10) available at http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/reference-documents. He reminded that Faculty Senators in December floor discussions were in the majority in favor of the draft proposal, or with modification that would add a minimum undergraduate seminar size of ten and a minimum graduate seminar of five, plus some refinements about how the dean and department chairs will respond and communicate regarding these situations. He concluded that he has also altered the past policy that a class may be cancelled at any time, to include cancellation only for financial implications. He concluded that data on enrollments with respect to class size for the past three years has been correlated by OIRP and this data will be forwarded to the deans, to use for schedule planning.

1. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

FORTMILLER presented the report. He also reminded that the new Advising Model requires advising and orientation and starts this summer. SHUSTERMAN asked how documentation for required advising would be documented. FORTMILLER noted that Banner would be used. She also noted that there is a problem with September advising, as it is very late for departments to be adding sections. She urged that Advisors need information from students for successful advising at orientation in summer. There were other questions about the change, and Fortmiller recommended faculty review the literature documenting the proposal.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report

GOUGH presented the report for the council.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

LIEBMAN and JONES reported for the committee with slides (attachment), noting that these proposal are all intended to respond to our growth and reinvigorate faculty governance in one way or another. He reviewed that the committee proposes amendments reiterating the criteria for membership in the faculty, reducing the size of the senate by one-half, establishing the position of President Elect, dividing CLAS into three governance divisions, and other miscellaneous related changes. The committee also will be proposing in their final report changes to the by-laws to establish agenda setting, improve communication, increase senator’s participation on committees, and improve committee support. He concluded, the committee feels strongly that it is important to restore university service to its former status on the tenure and promotion portfolio.
BROWSER and JHAJ spoke against decreasing the size of the Senate. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that research indicates that institutions of our size have Senates based on a ratio of half of our size. BUTLER noted that the large size has not fostered engagement. WALTON spoke in favor of decreasing the size of the Senate, noting her participation on a prior governance committee, and citing the recommendations of 2009 by the consultant on faculty governance. CARTER noted he thinks that to reenergize the senate, these changes are worth pursuing, and reminded that if they are not successful they can be rescinded. CUMMINGS queried if the membership is the same, senior players. HOOK disagreed, noting he became a senator upon his arrival and has learned a great deal. NEAL urged that we support the committee’s contention that faculty be given the credit due for participation in governance. SHUSTERMAN spoke in favor of sub-dividing CLAS. BROWSER queried if shrinking the Senate will cause exclusivity. RUETER queried if the decrease in All Others will have a negative impact on committee service.

4. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 5/6 March

RUETER reported after “B” and noted that minutes of the meetings are available at http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html. He emphasized in particular the value of the discussion by Tony Van Vliet about the history of the OUS system, the information provided by Provost Koch on semester conversion issues, and the discussion with Chancellor Pernsteiner regarding the negative impact of converting the system campuses to autonomous corporations. RUETER continued, Dalton Miller-Jones is working on a summary of all the proposed structural changes to the OUS, which will be posted when finished. Lastly, he noted that a proposal is also in progress to establish an Applied Bachelors degree at the community college level.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:53.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 2010  
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines  
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Ex-officio Members Present:  Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Beyler, Dawson, De la Cruz, Fung, Gregory, Hickey, Knight, Koch, Mack, Merrow, Miller, Nelson, Sanford, Spalding.

A. ROLL  
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 5, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:05. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

Caskey was present. Taylor was present.  
p. 30, item 1. para. 3, replace, “HOOK... etc.” with “HOOK requested the president’s government affairs staff provide more information.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The presiding officer reminded the senate of dates and times this week for the budget forum and the forum to discuss the OUS restructure proposal.
Changes to the Agenda:

Added:
C.2. Discussion of the Faculty Priorities Survey Preliminary Results
G.8. Report of EPC Ad Hoc Subcommittee on OUS Restructure Proposals
F.1. Question for Provost Koch - Excessive Noise in the Park Blocks

Tabled:
F.1. Question for President Wiewel - Athletes in Pre-season Games

Nominations for Presiding Officer of the 2010-11 PSU Faculty Senate:
Maude Hines

Changes to Senate and Committee Representation since May 3, 2010

Michael Cummings has been appointed to the Teacher Education Committee, to represent the Sciences.

1. Discussion Item: Library Funding

MERROW introduced the item in conjunction with the Library Committee Annual Report, noting that funding has been restored but not to the level of the cuts made last year. She continued, that the AAUP effort to increase funding is a measure of faculty support for improved Library funding. She reviewed the funding chart “University Growth Over Time” included in the report, p. 4 (attached).

MERROW/LUCKETT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the resolution proposed by the Library Committee on page 5, of G-4, Library Committee Annual Report:

*The university administration make Library funding one of its highest priorities, and that it strive to identify and allocate the resources needed to reverse the downward spiral of funding and thus to restore and improve print, electronic, and other collections, and to restore and improve librarian-student ratios.*

BROWN noted how much better our research could have been with the proper funding before now. SCHECHTER noted that faculty have already covered much of the research resource gap, often out of our own pockets. queried if research costs have been aligned to library costs. SPALDING stated yes. WALTON asked a question about indirect costs. HINES stated that the report is still pending, but that the provost may be able to make some comment during his report. WAMSER questioned the data points regarding the relationship of faculty to students to research. KOCH agreed.

KOHLES asked if other options have been explored. SPALDING stated yes, but that of the 36 ORBIS members, including the U. of Washington, there are 9 Million titles, but this is low compared to the 12 Million shared between only U. ILL, Chicago and Champaign-Urbana.

RUETER stated he supported the motion, irrespective of the questionable graph.
THE MOTION PASSED, by unanimous voice vote.

2. Discussion Item: Faculty Priorities to Present to the President’s Retreat

ANDERSON presented preliminary results of the Survey of Faculty, which concludes on 5 May.

BROWN cautioned that with respect to infrastructure, it might mean different things to different people. ANDERSON noted that items were listed with this category, and the text responses are being collected as well. RUTH asked who was surveyed and STOERING noted that the final results would be broken down by faculty groups.

REESE noted that the items near the end are as important as the top items. BROWN concurred that prioritization was difficult as all the items are high priority. TRIMBLE concurred. JHAJ concurred. SHUSTERMAN concurred, noting that item #11 may be the most important; we are constantly being consulted about items that are not accessible to us. STOERING reminded that at least 90% of respondents have said thus far that all of these are priorities. BLEILER noted, “the ones at the top are beating off the alligators, the ones at the bottom are draining the swamp.”

NOTE: There is no transcript of the proceedings from this point.

SMITH
BUTLER commended the effort and urged that the survey be enlarged for the next round.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

BLEILER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Writing Requirement Proposal

HICKEY reviewed the history of the item, a former version of which was tabled earlier in the year.

DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Writing Requirement Proposal, as listed in “E-2.”
RUETER questioned the number of sections expected to be needed to carry out this charge. HICKEY reiterated that it would address approximately 200 additional students. The most affected students would be those majoring in Liberal Studies. RUTH reminded that the committee has done a good job of maintaining transparency around this issue, including working with the English Department. JHAJ supported the 200-student figure, and stated 200. CARTER reminded that 200 students is only a little bulge for PSU, whereas the community colleges will be glad to teach these courses. He noted, the most important item on the proposal is the second bullet; this improvement is about all students, not just 200. RUETER reiterated that he has calculated 80 sections. JHAJ reminded that Frinq/Sinq students are not included. LIVNEH asked if placement exams would be introduced, and JACOB stated yes they are. MURPHY asked what happens to enacting the requirement if the funding is not forthcoming. RUTH noted that he and JHAJ would come back to the Senate with that issue. LIVNEH queried how we would measure effectiveness of the community college courses. MACCORMACK urged that there would not be a giant surge in numbers. JACOB noted that community colleges are doing good work on this instruction. GEORGE noted that the point is to improve the quality of instruction. HENNING

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by majority voice vote.

3. Credit Hour Limit Proposal

LAFFERRIERE/BUTLER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research Proposal

BOWMAN/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the center proposal, as listed in “E-4.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, Art. II., IV., and V.

LIEBMAN and Mark Jones presented the proposals.

LAFFERRIERE/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed amendments as listed in “E-5”, with final voting to take place article by article (including the correction of 2 typographical errors on p. 1).
HOOK asked if the three-year term of a Presiding Officer requires election in a senator’s first year. HINES stated no, as the proposal in “E-6” indicates that the Presiding Officer is a senator only during the year she/he is serving in that capacity. HOOK urged that as the Senate is only as effective as the Presiding Officer, and the pool should be as large as possible.

BLEILER/MOVED to amend Art. V, Sec. 3., 1) (end of page 4) by adding “/his” after her.

THE MOTION TO AMEND passed by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

JHAI spoke against reducing the size of the senate, noting that certain research indicates that the greater size of a body allows for freer dissent. WALTON noted that the research behind this proposal indicates the small size is more common. CARTER reminded that the consultant on the project also noted our overly large size. LIEBMAN reminded that dissent is also relative to other things, rather than size alone. He noted that the committee recommends being nimble, and that voices should represent the different point of view of groups, not individuals.

KERRIGAN asked a question about the committee’s research on size and distribution. MacCORMACK noted that the committee findings supported a smaller Senate in that it would demand more engagement by members. SHUSTERMAN noted that the smaller size would also make the dissent more meaningful. RUTH noted she agreed with the concept of a more active senate, and supported also the tightening of the absence rules.

CABELLY/MURPHY MOVED that in Art. V., Sec. 1, 3), “/is” be changed to “will be”, p. 4, para. 1, line 4.

BLEILER argued that the amendment is unnecessary.

THE MOTION TO AMEND FAILED by majority voice vote.

BLEILER/REESE MOVED that in Art., V., Sec. 1, 3.), “for one academic year or more” is restored, p. 4, para. 1, line 4.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

6. Proposed Changes to “Functions and Procedures of the Faculty Senate”

BLEILER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-6.”

BLEILER/DAASCH MOVED TO AMEND the proposal as listed in “E-6” changing paragraph 2 to read: “A senator who takes a leave of absence, or sabbatical leave for one academic year or more or is absent for more than three consecutive meetings must resign his or her Senate seat, which shall be filled in accordance with Section 2, Paragraph 5 of this Article.”
The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

Daasch/____ MOVED TO REPLACE “must be” with “is”, para. 3, line 4.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LUCKETTI/HOOK MOVED TO TABLE the motion until June.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

   Question for Provost Koch Regarding Noise Disruptions in the Park Blocks

   The corner area of the Park Blocks roughly between Neuberger Hall and SMSU is ever increasingly in use by bands, DJs and other apparent representatives of the entertainment industry or entertainment side of the College. The noise is regularly extremely disruptive for both classroom activities and office work - at least in NH sides facing the Park blocks. What can be done to remedy the situation and return this area to a noise level and protocol appropriate for a college campus? Submitted by Tom Seppalainen, Prof. of Philosophy

   KOCH responded to the question during his report. He noted that Park Blocks activities have positive purposes, including community engagement and student leadership. He advised that people should contact SMSU with issues regarding noise. SEPPALAINEN noted that the noise from the Earth Day events lasted for seven consecutive hours.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

   None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

   Provost’s Report

   KOCH reported after G.8. He noted that the policy for scheduling classes in Extended Studies has been revised. He noted that S. Jhaj has been appointed Special Assistant to the Provost for Student Success. He noted that Dean Nelson has given notice of retirement, and a search for her replacement will be conducted in the coming year. He noted that Academic Affairs is undergoing reorganization. Vice Provost Smallman is returning to International Affairs, and Vice Provost Feyerherm is returning to Social Work. There will be new positions and internal searches would be conducted for them. RUTH noted that Extended Studies needs to be moved back under the
academic side of the house from continuing education, to being part of degree programs.

1. Office of Sponsored Research Report on Library Funding/Indirect Costs

   The report was tabled.

2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

   HICKEY presented the report for the Committee.

   The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

   The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.

4. Library Committee Annual Report

   MERROW presented the report for the committee before “C.1.”

   The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.

5. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

   The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.

6. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

   The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.


   The report was tabled.

8. Report of the EPC Subcommittee on OUS Restructure

   BOWMAN presented the report for the sub-committee (slides attached).
   Applause.

   GAMBURD directed faculty to the AAUP position paper on the web page.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
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A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:03. The minutes were approved as distributed.
C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

**Election Results: Advisory Council and the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate**
- Advisory Council - Scott Burns, Leslie McBride, Linda Walton
- Interinstitutional Faculty Senate – Maude Hines

**Senate Election Runoffs:** AO – Barham; ED – Munson; OI – Flower; UPA - Gibson
- XS -- in progress

**Election for the Officers of the 2010-11 PSU Faculty Senate**
- Presiding Officer - Maude Hines
- Presiding Officer Elect - Gwen Shusterman
- Steering Committee Members - Rob Daasch and Tom Luckett (2011)
  Dan Fortmiller and Mark Jones (2012)

**June 7, 2010 Senate Agenda**
- E-3 Correction: Rename to “Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program”
- ADD: E-5 Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4b, Honors Council.
- ADD Report: G-9 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution
- ADD Report: G-10 IPS Report of the Meeting of May 7/8, 2010 at PSU
- ADD: G-11 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students
- REMOVED from E-1, Consent Agenda: E.1.c.6.

The Presiding Officer bid farewell and thank yous to outgoing committee chairs, outgoing faculty senators, and members departing Ex officio or the university this term, Feyerherm, Smallman, Spalding, Webb.

Reception - sponsored by Provost Koch and Scott Burns immediately following the Senate meeting in the Geology Office, CH117.

GELMON reported briefly on the progress of the president's Ad Hoc Committee on PSU/OHSU Collaborations, which has extended their reporting deadline to fall 2010.

1. **Discussion Item: Senate Agenda Setting for 2010-11**

HINES solicited suggestions for Senate priorities for the upcoming year. SCHRECHTER recommended that the Senate should continue the good work started in the current year. GAMBURD recommended the Senate conduct an examination of the composition of the faculty with regard to balance and the effect of the changing ratio on workloads. She also recommended the Senate monitor development of online learning, and in particular, review it as it relates to workload. DAASCH noted that this latter item would be added to the Senate Wiki so that Senators can continue this discussion.

D. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. II, IV, and V.**
WAMSER reported for the Advisory Council, as required by the Constitution, noting that the Council advised a grammatical correction for clarity; the deletion of a comma, Art. V. Sec.1, 3) Alternates, after “A senator who takes a leave of absence...” The correction was noted for the record by the presiding officer.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Amend the Functions and Procedures of the PSU Faculty

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED TO TAKE THE MOTION FROM THE TABLE.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LIEBMAN and JONES reviewed the item, in light of the amendment in “D-1” passed above. WAMSER noted that the same correction should be made to this document as was made to Art. V., Sec. 1, 3) in the preceding matter. The correction was noted for the record by the presiding officer. HINES noted, for clarification, that election of 2010-11 Senate officers would follow the changes in D. 1 and D.2.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. University Studies Committee Annual Report

CRUZAN presented the report for the committee. BUTLER asked if courses could be listed in more than one cluster. JHAJ noted that they might, as long as the Learning Objectives are listed for each cluster a course is approved for.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Question to President Viewel: Athletics and Pre-season Games

FARR answered the question for the President, after the president’s report. He noted there is no evidence to show that these games cause more injuries, sometimes we win them, and the athletes want them. Regarding concussions, there are extensive protocols in place.

RUETER noted that if the NFL can’t handle the concussion issue, how could we, and that bodily harm violates the OAR internal management directives. FARR replied that there are ways to not use bodily harm. He also noted that scholarships and insurance are continued for athletes who do sustain injuries.

5. Report on Indirect Costs

FEYERHERM presented a report on Indirect Costs, as requested in October 2009 in conjunction with a June 2010 Library Committee Report requesting
increased funding from this account (attached). He noted that the administration is engaged in a full-scale review of how to distribute IDC recoveries.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOK/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposals listed in E-1, except, E.1.c.6.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE E.1.c.6.

JHAJ/WETZEL MOVED TO AMEND E.1.c.6, as follows:

- Delisting Professions and Power and Sciences – Humanities clusters - upon delisting the clusters, ARC has been requested to establish the following:
  - A student who has Professions and Power SINGQ can meet the cluster course requirements by taking one or more courses from Freedom, Privacy, Technology; Knowledge, Rationality and Understanding or Community Studies clusters.
  - A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses in Professions and Power but still needs to take the connected SINGQ may meet the SINGQ requirement by taking the Freedom, Privacy, Technology; Knowledge, Rationality and Understanding or Community Studies SINGQ.
  - A Student who has completed Sciences – Humanities SINGQ can meet the cluster course requirements by taking one or more courses from Knowledge, Rationality and Understanding; Science in the Liberal Arts; or Interpreting the Past clusters.
  - A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses in Sciences – Humanities but still needs to take the connected SINGQ may meet the SINGQ requirement by taking the Knowledge, Rationality and Understanding; Science in the Liberal Arts or Interpreting the Past SINGQ.

asked if this was a parliamentary procedural tactic to add a last minute item, rather than to make any significant change. JHAJ stated yes. HINES cautioned that this was not normal procedure. GEORGE asked for a clarification of the approval process for this proposal. JHAJ stated that Steve Harmon, OAA suggested this strategy. D. BROWN stated no, the committee had not discussed it. HINES cautioned that this was not normal procedure.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by majority voice vote.

THE MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE E.1.c.6 as amended, by majority voice vote.

2. Proposal for the Minor in Religious Studies

BROWN/CARTER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
3. Proposal to Rename Women's Studies "Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program"

BOWMAN/HOOK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the name change as listed in E-3, to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies Program. He reminded that the change applies to the unit, not the degree programs.

CUMMINGS asked for clarification regarding process. MUSSEY, for Women's Studies, noted that it was a 3-4 year consultative process, and brings the name up to date with current scholarship.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal for Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning

BOWMAN presented the proposal for the Educational Policy Committee.

BOWMAN/DAASCH MOVED the Senate establish the committee as specified in "E-4."

JHAJ queried why another committee was needed. BOWMAN noted that "COLT" was formed by the administration and is charged with infrastructure issues, whereas this committee is charged to conduct the Senate's priorities. HANSEN noted that the COLT committee has been suspended, and he recommended more detail be added to this motion. WAMSER stated that the requisite detail is there in the last sentence. RUETER asked for clarification as to how this relates to "ACAIT." KOCH stated that ACAIT has a broader scope than online learning, as opposed to COLT.

LIVNEH noted that there is no guarantee that appropriate units are represented. STERLING agreed. LAFERRIERE noted that there are only a few committees that represent all units, none of which are ad hocs. HENNING queried why the focus on online courses. BOWMAN stated that there is a steep increase in online instruction and it isn't clear how all policies apply online. D. BROWN spoke in favor of the motion. SCHECHTER concurred. RUETER concurred, noting that there are outstanding issues in spite of the number of years we have offered online instruction. BROWER concurred, noting that EPC worked on this for a full year and still had questions. JHAH noted that the committee should have a Budget Committee representative and should examine how this fits into Senate planning. SHUSTERMAN noted that this issue is singled out because it keeps coming up; we need to know if we have a role.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, Art. IV, 4, 4) Honors Council
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SHUSTERMAN/LIVNEH MOVED THE PROPOSAL TO AMEND the Constitution, Art. IV. 4., 4), "o) Honors Council" as listed in "ug-5."

MERCER queried if there were other representatives who should be named to the committee membership.

JHAJ/HOOK MOVED TO TABLE the motion, due to time constraints.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report at 16:30

WIEWEL presented the budget plan for new funds, one-time and recurring, by function (attached and http://www.pdx.edu/budget/2010-2011-academic-budget-process).

Provost's Report

KOCH reported briefly, noting that there are currently two searches for positions in his office, and that the Vice Presidential candidates will be on campus the week of 14 June.

1. Annual Report of the Advisory Council

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Annual Report of the Budget Committee

JHAJ reported on item #5) in particular, which addresses our ability to review the long-term impact of investments on items such as the ratio of contingent versus tenure-related faculty.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee
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The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

WALTON (for Bleiler) noted that the additional $34,111.00 allocated allowed the committee to make an additional six awards. She also reminded that incomplete proposals prevent awards.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Annual Report of the Graduate Council

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

8. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

9. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

LIEBMAN presented the report for the committee (attached) in conjunction with D.1. and D.2. He noted that the committee disbands with this report, and the recommendation to form a follow-up committee.

LUKETT/DAASCH MOVED the committee recommendation, "...the Senate establish an ad hoc committee for implementation of these constitutional and related nonconstitutional changes. The ad hoc committee will advise the Senate steering committee on implementation and track the progress and outcomes of implementation by gathering data for annual reports to the Senate on its effectiveness. The data should address changes in electoral participation, the representativeness, turnover, and absenteeism of Senators, and in the priorities and experiences of Senators and their leadership."

HINES reminded that the committee membership would be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/LAFFERRIERE MOVED the committee recommendation, "... that OAA provide funds for a daylong Summer 2010 retreat of the Senate steering committee and key committee chairs to consider implementation of non-constitutional changes listed in Appendices A & B."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

HOOK/BURNS MOVED the committee recommendation, "... that OAA allocate funds for a part-time research assistant for this purpose." (above motion)

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
The presiding officer thanked the committee for their service and accepted the report for the Senate.

10. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) Meeting of 7/8 May
http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html

RUETER presented the report for the IFS Senators (attached).

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

11. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students

Janine Allen, committee chair, presented the report for the committee, in conjunction with E.5. The item was tabled, in conjunction with the tabling of E.5.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:11.