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


Members Absent: Agorsah, D. Brown, Cabelly, Carter, Caskey, Curry, Dill, Johnson, Keller, Kwong, Lang, Latiolais, Leite, Maier, Mathwick, McBeath, Miller, Nash, O’Halloran, Oschwald, Ott, Pierce, Reynolds, Rogers, Tarabocchia.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 7, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

CHANGES TO SENATE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 4, 2010:

CHANGES IN SENATE AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS SINCE JUNE 2010:
Molly Griffith was elected in the XS runoffs; Serge Preston replaces L. Mercer; Michel Clark replaces Wamser; William Fischer replaces Ceppi; Karen Karavanic replaces Sailor; Doug Siegler replaces Webb. Committee appointment changes are
reflected in the 2010-11 Faculty Governance Guide, 1st Ed, published Sept. 17, 2010, except for the following: Babcock replaces Meadows on Budget Committee; Darrel Hackworth, Tammy Hooper, and Jonathon Uto have been replaced by Mark Russell, Kristin Smith, and Jason Mitchell, and Mike Holt has been added to Campus Safety; Richard Beyler replaces Geiger on EPC; James Nash has been appointed to the Graduate Council.

SENATORS were reminded to complete caucus elections by the end of the meeting.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: HINES introduced the agenda of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate. She reminded of the contents of her recent Senate letter and requested members to continue to submit ideas and concerns. She also requested that members remember to report the proceedings back to their units. HINES briefly described the Steering Committee annual retreat and the agenda they developed. Lastly, she noted that committee reports will be treated in the manner of a consent agenda, and will not be reviewed in the meeting unless senators request it. JONES provided a brief introduction to PSU Faculty Governance and the Constitution. LUCKETT provided a brief overview of Robert’s Rule’s and practice at PSU. He reminded that Robert’s Rules and PSU practice have differed in several ways: PSU Faculty Senate abuses the tabling of motions, which should only take place if an item of urgency intervenes; there is no such thing as PSU’s “friendly” amendments (a side effect of poor decorum); PSU Ex officio members have no vote; PSU motions have been introduced by non-Senators; and, PSU violates the required 2/3 vote to pass a motion not originally placed on the agenda.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS


The Presiding Office introduced members of the committee who were present and thanked them for their service. Applause The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate, after “D.2.”

2. Proposal to Amend the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4). o Honors Council

LUCKETT/MacCORMACK moved the following motion, submitted to the Secretary with signatures on 27 September 2010:

**ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY. 4) Standing Committees and Their Functions. o) Honors Council.** This council shall consist of six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other divisions, one from the University Honors Program, two upper-division undergraduate students and, as consultants, the following or his/her representative: the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the director of the University Honors Program, and a member of the University Studies Council. The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees from among faculty members with an involvement in department honors tracks, department honors societies, and the University Honors Program. As best as possible, the
student representatives should be drawn from students participating in the University Honors Program or a departmental honors track. The Council shall:

1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish general procedures and regulations for the University Honors Program and departmental honors tracks.
2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or its appropriate committees and to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies suitable policies and standards for Honors courses, programs, and tracks.
3) Coordinate with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to review recommendations to the Senate for new courses in the University Honors Program and for substantive changes to the Honors Program with regard to quality and emphasis.
4) Coordinate with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to review recommendations to the Senate regarding the creation of new honors tracks or for changes in the requirements of existing tracks.
5) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, campus-wide resources, practices, and services for and practices in regard to high-achieving students, and suggest needed changes to the appropriate administrators or faculty committee.
6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.
7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, including a list of courses and program changes reviewed and approved.

BLACK asked for clarification of the term “division.” The Presiding Officer explained that the Constitution, Art. V. defines each representative unit of faculty governance as a “division.” Additionally, as of June 2010, CLAS is also likewise divided into three divisions (academic distribution areas) for the purpose of Senate and committee representation, Arts and Letters, Sciences, and Social Sciences. ALLEN concurred, noting that CLAS would have 6 representatives, three from each distribution area. PALMITER expressed confusion. ANDREWS-COLLIER explained that this roster closely parallels those of the other constitutional committees with divisional representation. LUCKETT concurred. ________ proposed we spell this out more clearly, unless we have to be consistent with the other descriptions. WETZEL proposed that we trust this language, and next month come in with a list of who these people are. BROWN cautioned that detailed descriptions are not normally used in Constitutions. KOCH noted that this description mirrors the other descriptions, totaling 12 divisional representatives in all on each “distribution” committee, but that as of September, we have no Dean of Undergraduate Studies. REESE suggested adding “the following:”

___________ queried if “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” was obsolete. KOCH replied that the responsibilities of that title now fall to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Instruction. ________ yielded to Jhaj. JHAJ queried of the Ad Hoc Committee for High Achieving Students considered expanding the scope of the UNST Council to take responsibilities for these duties. LUCKETT stated no.

REESE/PALMITER MOVED “the following:” be inserted after “consist of” in line #2.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
RUETER yielded to Jhaj. JH AJ reiterated his query about why a single committee to oversee University Studies and High Achieving Students was not recommended. HICKEY responded for Academic Requirements, that high achieving students include major tracks as well as general education students. The committee supports this being a separate committee to address this separate agenda, how we can more broadly promote and support the Honors College concept.

RUETER queried if there was a tie between the amendment and the ad hoc report. LUCKETT noted that no, the intent is to begin here. ARANTE proposed listing every representative.

BURNS/BLEILER MOVED TO AMEND to motion, adding “faculty” after “one” in line #3 and “one” in line #4.

ANDREWS-COLLIER recommended that the change be left to another day, when all committee can be changed to match. REESE agreed.

THE MOTION TO AMEND FAILED by majority voice vote.

Hearing no further discussion, the Presiding Officer noted the proposed amendment to the constitution would be forwarded to the Advisory Council for comment as prescribed by the Constitution, and returned to the Senate for an up or down vote in November.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HINES/SHUSTERMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.” as listed.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. E-1, a. Proposal for Master’s Degree Name Change

RUETER/SHUSTERMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.a.” as listed, with the correction that the degree is the M.S not “MA” as listed in the proposal.

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 introduced new members of the administration, Vice President Françoise Aylmer (present), Dr. John Fink, VP for Research and Strategic Partnerships, and Jilma Meneses, JD, Chief Diversity Officer (absent). Applause. WIEWEL noted that arguably, Meneses’ job will be the most difficult as it is the newest.

WIEWEL noted he would not repeat any remarks made at Convocation, as a video is available. He reminded that the strategic work plan, including 83 action items and outcomes, is also available on his website.

WIEWEL noted that enrollment growth this fall is more modest - slightly below 3% - deliberately so, as a result of more rigorously enforcing our admission standards. We want to purposefully match the number of special admits to the number of people who can assist them. He also noted that WUE students are now being charged regular tuition. WIEWEL noted that today, he announced the Latino Student initiative to increase the future number of graduates in this underrepresented population. Concurrently, he noted the record number of Portland metro area valedictorians in the incoming class of 2014.

WIEWEL noted that a $400,000 gift for Lincoln Hall for solar roof panels would enable the university to apply for LEED Platinum status for the building. He noted that construction of the lobby on Broadway would get underway this term, and this leaves only $3.5 Million left to complete funding the Broadway pavilion. Wiewel also noted other grants received recently. WIEWEL concluded by noting that there would be a public meeting about the PSU-OHSU strategic alliance task force report on 2 November.

Provost’s Report

KOCH introduced the new Vice Provosts, Dr. Kevin Reynolds, Academic Fiscal Strategies and Planning, and Dr. Melody Rose, Academic Programs and Instruction. Applause.

KOCH extended his thanks to Janine Allen for her diligent work in chairing the Ad Hoc Committee for High Achieving Students, noting that there were spirited discussions to say the least. He reminded that our ability to attract and retain these students is a very important issue.

KOCH discussed topics related to Information Technology on campus. He noted that he very recently appointed Kevin Reynolds the new chair of “ACAIT” (Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology, and therefore Reynolds would give the annual report next month not this. KOCH noted that “COLT” (Collaborative On Line Learning Team) was given three specific projects last year, and he has accepted their recommendations on two of the items and dismissed the committee. We will still be working over time on the further development of on line education. The next step will be the formation of a single unit to support activities around on-line education, to report to Melody Rose, on the theory that this is an educational
function. There will be a search for the Director this year, and we will transition to one unit only. There are many policy related issues around this, and we will frequently engage the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to refine policy issues related to online learning in the coming year.

In last year’s budget we identified $70,000 for faculty expansion, and working with the deans we have tried to increase this. We have developed criteria for and requested from the deans, proposals to move instructional funding from adjunct sections to full-time lines. We are currently in the process of identifying staged allocations of those proposals.

The topic for the annual symposium in winter term will be based on meetings held to develop content. The meetings are upcoming and faculty participation will be solicited for these meetings.

KOCH noted that admission practices for freshmen have been reviewed, with respect to the specified number of students who would be able trade off GPA requirements with test scores. Proposals for revision will be presented and reviewed in three public meetings in October, so that everyone will be aware of the thinking that went into this decision.

SEPPALAINEN asked, regarding the new Chief Diversity Officer, if there are academic agendas. WIEWEL noted that her position combines the Affirmative Action office and the Office of Diversity and Equity. She will work with all units, academic and administration, to enhance diversity in the institution, including students, faculty and staff and how we do our business. The details of how she does that is what will evolve over time.

1. Update Report on PSU-OHSU Strategic Partnerships Task Force

GELMON reported briefly on the activities of the ad hoc committee. She noted that their draft report emphasizes strategic alliances, not merging, including recommendations in sub-areas.

KOHLES asked for clarification, with respect to the relevancy to legislative proposals in the upcoming session. GELMON stated that the task force’s findings are intended to educate legislators. BUTLER noted the tremendous work the committee has done, and asked if this effort will pay off. GELMON stated yes. KOCH noted that, with the exception of Public Health, many other relationships could be enhanced and this could occur without the need for additional funding. FINK noted that the relationship of PSU and OHSU already in place provides a terrific opportunity for the university, and commended the task force for getting this far.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

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


Alternates Present: Perkowski for Daasch, Rill for Kapoor, Shandas, Strathman,

Members Absent: Burk, Burns, Curry, Danielson, Farr, George, Glaze, Henning, Jagodnik, Kohles, Leite, Maier, Mathwick, McBeath, Medovoi, Miller, Nash, Neal, Oschwald, Rogers, R. Sanchez, M. Taylor, Wadley,


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

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

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to Senate and committee memberships since 4 October 2010: Greg Flores replaces Ostlund, AO in the Senate.

Discussion Item: Student Success

HINES reminded that the December discussion item would be Budget and Finance, and referred Senators to the FY10-11 Budget Plan By Function, included in the mailing for today.
HINES introduced presenters for the item, Fortmiller (introductions), Balzer (enrollment management), Jones (change in admission practices this year), Jhaj (overview of initiatives to improve student success), and Andrews-Collier (performance measures at the board and legislative level). FORTMILLER reminded that Student Success is everyone’s responsibility, it is one of President Wiewel’s five themes, and it is one of our most pressing concerns due to PSU’s low graduation rates. He briefly reviewed Aston’s model of inputs, environment and outputs, and described how each presenter would address this. BALZER reminded that enrollment management is the heart of our work, especially the balance between recruitment and retention, and noted that PSU is committed to five management objectives. She reviewed some of the work done on the front end to promote student success, and discussed the matching of various support efforts with newly admitted students, from financial aid to testing to advising to at-risk student support. JONES noted that forums were recently held to discuss changes in admission practices this year and next for at-risk students, in particular. He noted some of these changes and other impacts on student success. JH AJ described in more detail some of the initiatives we are using to improve student success, what they are intended to achieve, and what research is used to demonstrate success. ANDREWS-COLLIER gave a brief overview of student success in the context of performance expectations at the Board and legislative level, and demonstrated where that information on the Oregon University System webpage is available.

HINES reminded of the difference between the admissions requirements that the Senate approves and how students are actually admitted. She then moved the meeting to a Committee of the Whole from minute 39 to minute 102.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to Amend the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4), “o Honors Council”

LUCKETT briefly reviewed the history and substance of the proposal for the body. GAMBURD thanked the committee on high achieving students for their work on this project.

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

E. NEW BUSINESS

None.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Provost Koch

KÖCH directed senators to “F-1”, and noted that he and Mark Gregory would take questions. RUETER noted that the answer to this particular question is
sufficient but the subtext is the question of how our physical plant is going to be improved. GREGORY noted that our custodial and maintenance expenditures are considerably lower than other campuses, and to improve things we would need an infusion of several million dollars. KOCH noted that faculty are emphasizing tenure lines more than infrastructure improvements, but that it is the same pie. RUETER noted that to the contrary, faculty are not consulted about infrastructure but only about academic issues. BLACK noted that his classrooms have no clocks, broken furniture, and broken lighting, and fixing these things is much less costly than financing tenure lines. The question is how can we make something happen about these issues. GREGORY stated that faculty should file a facilities work request. LUCKETT noted that this is not a solution as departments are then charged for general use classrooms because an index code is required to file a request. KOCH concurred. GREGORY urged faculty contact him about systemic issues.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL spoke after the discussion item. He reiterated the importance of the student success and its complexity, reminding that we look worse than even our comparators. It is his hope that by utilizing best practices, we can improve the gap. He also emphasized the OUS performance framework, and the economic weight being placed on campus efforts to graduate students. WIEWEL also briefly discussed the relationship to the all-day meeting on Nov. 3, “Partnering for Student Success: Cradle to Career.”

WIEWEL noted that next month’s discussion on Budget is be timely. He reminded that we have been asked to prepare for as much as a 25% cut in our state funding, and that we are definitely planning for upwards of 18%, with an increase in tuition being a major factor. He noted that the Fiscal Futures Task Force would also be holding hearings on these matters.

WIEWEL reminded that public hearings are scheduled for feedback on the PSU-OHSU strategic partnerships report during this week. He noted that we are airing a new series of television commercials about PSU. He noted our gratitude to the Foundation Board for their efforts in bringing about a successful Simon Benson Awards Dinner. He also noted his Op-Ed article in yesterday’s Oregonian.

Provost’s Report

KOCH responded to F.1. and continued that with respect to the discussion of Student Success, an additional piece of this issue is learning outcomes and
assessment. The Assessment Council is working to establish a set of outcomes based on learning objectives passed last year, that can be assessed across the institution and for programs, and these will be used to demonstrate performance measures as well.

KOCH reminded that he is hosting tailgates in November. KOCH noted that he received 200 responses to his invitation for 60 faculty to help plan the winter symposium, which will take place on January 20th.

1. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

REYNOLDS, the 2010-11 chair, presented the 2009-10 report for the committee, as Spalding is no longer at the university. He noted that a number of new members are being appointed this year and the committee will be working closely with Vice President Fink. SHUSTERMAN noted that Blackboard has been unstable this term, and faculty are having trouble getting training in D2L. REYNOLDS yielded to Sharon Blanton, who noted that OIT is trying very hard to keep Blackboard running and that Mark Jenkins is the lead contact for training in D2L. CLARK asked when Blackboard would finally go away. BLANTON stated that D2L will be available to anyone in Winter term, and the Blackboard contract ends with Spring term. SHEARD queried if there is a disconnect between the P.R. and the actuality, as one can’t have access to D2L unless s/he is currently teaching a hybrid course. SHUSTERMAN and BLACK concurred. LUCKETT noted that you are not allowed to use D2L unless you attend training. SHUSTERMAN concurred. BLANTON stated that this is accurate, as the product is so different that it requires training, however, she was not aware that people were being blocked from training. DILL noted that other communication about the training was also very unclear, and after plowing through it, she still thought she had only Spring term. BROWER noted that the failure of Blackboard this term is having a high impact on student satisfaction. CLARK noted that in the absence of contact persons in proximity to sites and disciplines, COLT noted that we would never be efficient with this. LATIOLAS noted that he has it from a reliable source that PCC has D2L training that we can access on their U-Tube site that is, additionally, better than PSU’s. C.BROWN urged that a more flexible policy about usage would be well advised. HINES noted that hopefully answers to these issues would be forthcoming within the week.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 16 October at SOU

RUETER reported for the Senators noting that the minutes would not be available on-line until December. He noted that the meeting focused on SOU because the Chancellor and Jay Kenton were not available. He noted that restructuring was a major discussion item, and that SOU’s president highlighted several of the serious problems that restructuring Would solve for them. He noted that the group, with the possible exception of U of O, felt that the concept of local boards is problematic as it could easily shoot down the proposal.

H. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Ruedas for Murphy, Baccar for Nixon, Lafferriere for Palmiter.

Members Absent: Beyler, Clark, Cabelly, Cummings, Curry, Elzanowski, Fischer, Glaze, Gray, Jacob, Johnson, Kapoor, Keller, Ketcheson, Kinsdla, Kwong, Leite, Mathwick, McBeath, Nash, O'Halloran, Oschwald, Preston, Raffo, Rogers, Schechter, Shandas, Strathman, Sytsma, Wendler,


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

The meeting was called to order at 15:03. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Burk, Karavanic, Taylor, Griffith were present in November.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

HINES called the meeting to a minute of silence in memory of our colleague, Craig Wollner, who passed away recently. Following, she noted that there would be a memorial service on 19 January.

HINES noted that the meeting order would be changed, and that announcements were moved to follow the President's Report. HINES noted that D2L training would progress with self-paced and guided training in winter 2011. HINES continued, the Steering Committee and the AAUP Council are preparing a resolution regarding the
university's comparators. HINES noted the January meeting would be taken up in almost its entirety with Senate Agenda Setting and would be held at University Place.

MACK reported that a fixed term faculty step promotion proposal, developed over the past 2.5 years by a labor (AAUP)—management (Associate Deans group) group, is ready for CADS and general review. LUCKETT queried if this has been discussed in the context of unfunded mandates. KOCH noted that the administration is in the process of moving fixed term funding o the same basis as other budgets. ARANTE queried if the proposal addresses the balance between teaching and service. MACK stated that there was no change.

JONES reported on the format for the January meeting. He noted that it would be directed like a planning meeting, with groups of 5-10 members with a good mix for each. The immediate purpose is to provide input for the President's Retreat and next year's Senate. He urged Senators to talk to constitute about topics, and use the Wiki to enter them.

Discussion Item: Budget and Finance

BINES noted that Koch (for Desrochers), Hillman, and Reynolds would present on the topic, and then she would move the meeting to a committee of the whole.

KOCH gave an overview of the university budget process, and academic budgeting. He noted that the process has been used for the last 5-6 years, and involves Desrochers, Fung, Koch, and now Reynolds. Desrochers will provide a context based on state-level demands, while OAA requests the academic units to provide credit hour projections, used to develop revenue estimates. There is a parallel process of establishing budgeting priorities, in the context of presidential initiatives, etc., via input from the Deans. Academic requests are then compiled in OAA, and requests and reduction proposals if required are prepared for the President. The President makes a tentative budget decision (as the appropriations are not know as yet) and seeks comments and input, campus-wide. He then makes a final budget decision, still contingent on appropriations. The timeline starts in fall so decisions can be made in winter, recommendations made in March, and consultation and open fora can be completed in April of the year. The FADM webpage provides a timeline and narrative of the activity.

KOCH continued, academic budgeting begins the summer and fall before this to talk about the academic priorities of the institution, in an effort to have consistency as well as addressing immediate demands. Criteria are developed based on themes and academic priorities, for example student success>retention>advising, sustainability, K-20, our relationship with OHSU, on-line learning, curricular effectiveness, etc. Proposals from the deans are evaluated, and recommendations are developed for the president and executive committee. Again, SCH projections are requested, based on the prior year's budget and numbers, plus changes to the same, and enhanced budgets are developed.
HILLMAN provided an overview of the Budget Committee's fall activities. They have been briefed by FADM on a potential 25% E&G cut from the state, but as E&G is -7% of the budget, it is 3% of PSU's total budget. That is as far as the committee can progress until the legislative proposals start coming in. HILLMAN continued, the committee has spent most of their effort on agenda items generated in the Senate leadership summer retreat. Based on his work in his Financial Futures subcommittee, HILLMAN projected the university will have to go to a 'performance based" model. He noted that there needs to be coordination of self-support and summer school to standardize the cost of student credit hour. The committee as a whole has not agreed to a future funding model, but it is clear that there will be no state funding by 8-12 years from now. Other topics have included the cost of initiatives such as Advising and increasing the proportion of tenure lines, versus the outcomes. He noted that given the budget projections, it is hard to see how we can reduce the differential costs of instructional faculty. Another item is the issue of Facilities, in that 6-8 years ago, base budget facilities lines were cut, and the large proportion of support is now soft money driven (chargeable). Facilities has recently provided on their website what is broken out as baseline versus what is chargeable. Overall, this is not a healthy way to operate, and will continue to create tension and animosity. Distance Learning fees is another item. D2L total expense is being placed on distance learning, even though it is used elsewhere. This is also a potentially contentious issue. Finally, in the last several years, Budget Committee has been charged with the fiscal viability of new courses and programs. The overhead rate is about 70%, so that if a new program is to start, there is a significant investment.

SEPPALAINEN asked for a clarification regarding a performance based model for budgeting. HILLMAN stated the committee has not reached any final conclusions, but on average, for every dollar invested in a program there is almost another expended to make it happen. KOCH added that the beginning budget is currently historical only, it is not directly a function of prior activity. He also noted the 45% overhead is capped, one of the arguments for going to a public corporation.

REYNOLDS reported on the Financial Futures Committee. A committee charge is to look at our historic and future financial situations, and from that to model factors that can alter our financial futures. The second charge is to establish principles for future budget allocations, based on our goals and revenue bases. The committee met frequently to be educated on the issues, and more recently it broke into sub-committees, to each tackle smaller portions of the budget. Next quarter, the committee will break out to look at expenditures, and then move on to determining the budget allocation model.

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 15:47 to 15:59.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NOTE: There is no transcript of the meeting beyond this point.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BUTLER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Revised Graduate Academic Standing Policy

EVERETT presented the proposal for the Graduate Council.

FLOWER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal in "E-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

1) Question for the Provost regarding Digital Measures

KOCH noted that we somewhat overestimated what digital measures would be able to do and __________. The intent going forward, is to update faculty date only. The program is what it is. When we started, this was the only program, and the newer ones are no better. We will make it work or abandon it. It was undertaken as an element of the proposed new OUS compact with the state, but it does not have budget implications.

2) Question for the Provost regarding University Studies and tenure related lines

KOCH noted that the plan to convert twenty-five faculty positions to tenure lines is now complete.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL reported after the discussion item. He noted that many institutions are currently faced with the task of figuring out their real costs. He noted that we value all kinds of things
that do not generate revenue, but until we figure out what costs what, we can't properly budget. WIEWEL continued that Freshman retention has increased 3% over three years ago. He discussed progress on our strategic alliance with OHSU. Regarding restructuring, in addition to the bills (3) in process, there is a new lobbying group, chaired by Jim Francesconi, the Oregon Higher Education Alliance.

Provost's Report

KOCH noted that between new funds and reallocations we were able to leverage $800,000 for new tenure lines.

1. Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Report of the IFS Meeting of December at PSU

The Report was tabled until January.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:06.
BORUERTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 3, 2011
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Burgess for Ketcheson.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 6, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Present: Glaze, Rigelman.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to Senate and Committee Memberships since December 6, 2010 – Resigned from the Senate: Gamburd, Nixon, Zurk. Relinquished membership due to absence limitation: Curry, Rogers, Shandas, Strathman,

Discussion Item – Faculty Senate Agenda Setting

Hines described the format for the working meeting, noting that Presiding Officer Elect Shusterman would report on the proceedings in February. She referenced the discussion in the Senate Wiki page and distributed the question page to the
tables. She then moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for the remainder of the meeting.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

MOVED AND SECONDED AND 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 that Vice President Lindsay Desrochers will be stepping down from her position and joining the CUPA faculty.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, February 7, 2011

Presiding Officer: Maude Hines

Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Kennedy for Barham, Tu for Brower, Reese for Danielson, Elliot for Greco, Shrek for McBride, Blekic for Ryder, Holmes for R. Sanchez, Clark for Siegler, Wise for Tarabocchia, Tappen for Lang.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 3, 2011, MEETING

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

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in Senate and Committee appointments since January 7, 2011: Sytsma is appointed to Assoc. Vice President, therefore relinquishing his Senate seat.

Report of the Proceedings of the Senate Agenda Setting Meeting of 3 January, 2011. HINES introduced Presiding Officer Shusterman to give the report, noting that the reports from each of the tables are on the Senate website. SHUSTerman noted
that the information was very rich, and that the Steering Committee will need some additional time to complete the list of what the Senate wants to focus on for the next year and a half. She presented a summary she compiled of the topics and spoke briefly about each (slides attachment).

HINES noted that the Steering Committee would assess this feedback in depth at their March retreat. She continued, that the foremost issue appeared to be growth, but since the university focus is shifting from a growth to an enrollment management model, it seemed appropriate to ask the President and Provost to discuss the causes and how it will work. She concluded that the March Senate meeting discussion would focus on performance measures.

KOCH presented a history of Growth and described our transition to an enrollment management strategy based on the proceedings, per a request from the Steering Committee, after his usual report (slides attachment). He thanked Kathi Ketcheson, Dan Bernstine, Jay Kenton, Janine Allen and Agnes Hoffman, his primary sources, for their assistance. He gave a very brief history of enrollment and the underlying causes, with emphasis on the last two decades. He then discussed the next step – how to impact our next five years, according to according to Strategic Enrollment Management:

…an organizational concept and a systematic set of activities designed to enable educational institutions to exert more influence over their student enrollments. Organized by strategic planning and supported by institutional research, enrollment management activities concern student college choice, transition to college, student attrition and retention, and student outcomes. These processes are studied to guide institutional practices in the areas of new student recruitment and financial aid, student support services, curriculum development, and other academic areas that affect enrollments, student persistence, and student outcomes from college. (Hossler and Bean)

KOCH listed our Enrollment Management objectives:
1. Enhance the quality of the student experience by promoting academic success and program completion and key goals related to internationalization and diversity.
2. Support the University mission by responding to the Metro region’s need for educated workforce and civic leadership.
3. Maximize educational opportunities to higher education working with the network of higher education institutions within the Metro region as well as on-line delivery methods.
4. Build a stable and improved level of funding to support the strategic priorities of the institution.

KOCH noted that we have begun an analysis of fiscal impact of enrollment scenarios over a 5-year period using a tool generated in OIRP, with regard to Enrollment Growth, Student Mix, and Student Retention. He concluded with example scenarios.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

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

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Change “X” and “M” Policy

OSTLUND presented the proposal for the committees involved. FORTMILLER presented an example of a student who attended for 20 terms and then became academically dismissed, with no warnings triggered.

DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Proposal, as listed in “E-2.”

CUMMINGS noted he needs a better understanding of whom we are trying to help, the student or the institution. OSTLUND reminded that students could run out of financial aide before they complete the degree. WETZEL asked if we have evidence that the transcript provided was an abuse of the “X.” OSTLUND stated, no. WETZEL stated maybe it was just abuse of the no show. OSTLUND stated it is not a major abuse across campus, but they are missing the safety net as things stand. LATICOLAIS noted he agreed with WETZEL, and continued he has a problem with the M and X grades, as they are qualitatively different. OSTLUND reminded that the petition process would still exist. REESE reminded that she didn’t think she has ever given an M, but doesn’t actually know. LUCKETT reminded that the chairs are charged with monitoring the faculty.

_________ stated it is unclear how the proposal would affect students. BACCAR stated that it would require another change next year, to make it entirely successful. This is a first attempt, to get clarity around the X.

KARAVANIC pointed out a correction, that the second policy should also read “and/or.”

C. BROWN noted that teaching large classes with many freshmen, she has noted that they are often mistaken. She continued, that she is not convinced by the argument that we are helping students, due to the punitive phraseology. Students are punished enough by loosing their tuition. OSTLUND gave an example of a student who begged the faculty member to change a grade to protect financial aid.

C.BROWN stated, more paperwork. SHUSTERMAN noted she has been a victim of a student who doesn’t have a life crisis but doesn’t like the grade being earned. DILL noted she agree with OSTLUND, but that changing the “and” to “and/or” would suggest you don’t grade a student who always attended but never did the work. She continued that faculty also could use Incompletes for this purpose.
ELZANOWSI suggested we get rid of the X. ARANTE reminded that the formal definition for the I is strict, and the student may get caught in the middle.

BUTLER noted that we’re not observing the policy we have now, and that is the larger problem. MEDOVOI suggested we alter Academic Standing instead. TRIMBLE noted that we need to be more consistent. ________ noted an X should become an F eventually. OSTLUND noted that the committee felt it was punitive.

TRIFILETTE asked if the committee discussed limiting the number of X grades. BACCAR stated yes.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by 44 in favor, 23 against, and 8 abstentions.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL noted that the Governor’s budget proposal for the biennium has been released, and that indicates an estimated $24 Million ($12 Million per year) shortfall for PSU. In order to fill the gap, there will be tuition increases, and we have asked units to propose reductions of an estimated 3% in permanent cuts. We also have instituted a hiring “pause” until budget plans have been submitted by the units involved, so we can see if they can fund the hires. Lastly, we have placed 45% of the fund balance from the last fiscal year in reserve, so that we can draw on it if need be.

WIEWEL reminded that the Fiscal Futures task force is working on how we should allocate funds in the institution, and urged that people check their webpage on the FADM site. He continued, that fundraising activities are on going, including the Simon Benson event next fall. He continued, that the system restructure proposal is being pursued, including the all campus forum tomorrow. The housing project and the waterfront life science project are also ongoing. The Cradle to Career initiative is also moving forward. Lastly, the CLAS dean search is starting, led by Dean Wallack, as well as the VP for Finance and Administration, led by VP Fink.

BUTLER stated that with all due respect, as a member of a search committee who has worked for hundreds of hours and engaged many participants, this is a crushing thing and it feels like being sucker punched. This is a very hard thing to swallow, and if there had been any hint that this would happen, it would have been better not to have had the searches. It would have been easier for everyone to have the appropriate
expectation. WIEWEL responded that we were trying to calibrate it the right way, and if you feel sucker punched, we did not succeed. We didn’t try to suck you in, but felt strongly last spring that we needed the positions in question and should take advantage of certain opportunities. There was word at the time that budget cuts could be as high as they have turned out to be, but it was the worse case scenario. We made the decision for the most likely case scenario, not the worse case. Planning for worse case is a recipe for disaster. As soon as you give tell us your proposal for a 3% cut, we will move those searches forward. The odds of any search not happening are relatively modest. This is a tough spot to be in. We don’t want unwarranted hope, but we believe that these are important positions, and hope that you can keep your candidates alive in the interim.

LUCKETT asked, if a search is cancelled, does that mean the line is suspended or eliminated from the roster. WIEWEL stated it depends on what the unit proposes. Nobody knows how long it would be before we can get the money back.

**Provost’s Report**

KOCH reminded of the Campus Wide Learning Outcomes forum upcoming on 21 February. He continued, that we are engaged a number of initiatives regarding International students and programs, and have begun a process for a holistic look at international academic programs. A working group has been formed including Dean Kaiser, VP Latz, VP Rose, Shawn Smallman (chair), Linda Walton, Patricia Wetzel, and Berol Yeselada to represent the major institutes and centers. We have asked each program to create a brief self study, and will eventually bring in external reviewers to assist in reviewing and refining our mission.

KOCH gave a brief presentation on PSU’s growth in enrollment and our recent transition to enrollment management (above).

1. **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Implementation of Changes to the Constitution**

   LIEBMAN and JONES distributed a survey (attached) and discussed the letter being distributed to all faculty about how the changes will be effected. They collected the survey, and expressed their thanks to all of the committee members who have been involved in the project.

2. **Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 4/5 Feb. at PSU**

   RUETER gave a brief summary of the recent meeting, and directed the Senate to the IFS webpage for minutes at [http://pages.uoregon.edu/ifs/ifs.html](http://pages.uoregon.edu/ifs/ifs.html). He noted that the brief being distributed is about the Oregon Idea, which was explained to the body by James Francesconi and Jim Bernard. Sona Andrews described the audit of faculty efficiency currently being conducted at certain of the campuses. Chancellor Pernsteiner discussed the legislative proposal for the new compact with the state, and his aspiration that all campuses ratify it this spring. He also noted that the changes to PERS wouldn’t happen for two years. At the Saturday
meeting, the body heard campus reports, and discussed IFS funding. He concluded that IFS is in the process of reviewing a brief on faculty work being prepared by the Chancellor’s office, and the performance indicators proposed in the contract.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 7, 2011
Presiding Officer: Gwen Shusterman
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Seitzman for Ingersoll.

Members Absent: Cabelly, Clark, Danielson, Farr, Gibson, Glaze, Jagodnik, Keller, Kominz, Munson, Neal, Pierce, Raffo, Welnick.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Griffith was present. Curry is not deleted from the rolls of the Senate.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

SHUSTERMAN noted she is presiding as HINES is making her way from the airport after an out of town meeting.

SHUSTERMAN recognized Mary King, AAUP President, and previewed a resolution developed by the Steering Committee and the AAUP Council, which will be placed on the April Senate Agenda. She asked for feedback before the coming Monday, the date of the winter Senate Leadership Retreat. Questions and discussion followed, as to the criteria for selection of comparators.
Discussion Item: Academic Quality and Performance Measures

JONES, for the Ad Hoc Implementation Committee, reminded that this topic is based on input from one of the tables at the January meeting. He presented information on the OUS “Performance Compact” which is a draft proposal as a part of SB 242 (attachment). __________ inquired if of the seven targeted metrics, only one in the current draft includes a discussion of any kind of quality. JONES stated that that is correct. CURRY noted that retention is not a feature of the graduate rates. RUETER noted that the UO faculty leadership has taken the perspective that we acknowledge these, and then control the definition of quality ourselves. SHUSTERMAN noted that President Wiewel has expressed interest in the project of defining quality.

KOCH briefly reviewed the debate on accountability, nationally to locally (attachment). He reminded that it originated with the previous administration in Washington, DC, with regard to the concern for rising costs of education, particularly in contrast to low completion rates, and issues about student learning. The issue is how we, publics in particular, are accountable to both the students and our funders. To stay out in front of a number of federal acts then and now, the two largest organizations, APLU and AASCU founded the voluntary system of accountability (VSA) to create a template for institutions to display information about how much it costs, student success, and institutional excellence. The most controversial part was learning outcomes assessment. Specialized accreditation has also moved to outcomes assessment. KOCH continued, at the state level it has been about 14 years that we have pursued this path. There is a hierarchy from top to bottom, from the proposed Compact to the unit planning level. The quality issue has not been a part of that, and except for one year several years ago, funding has not been linked to performance outcomes. Regarding measures of quality, there aren’t any good ones because we haven’t done that work. However, there is a proposal to add two more metrics, Student Progress and Completion, and Academic Quality, and we will need in future to address them. We need to figure outcome measures that would represent how we are doing as an institution. As suggested above, we are now working on academic quality.

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

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

D. BROWN/LUCKETT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular changes as listed in “C-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
2. ARC Proposal to Allow Two Concurrent Degrees

BARHAM presented the proposal for Hickey who was called away. She noted that the current policy is historical, but following on UO’s lead, the proposal is a recognition that students be allowed with additional work, to pursue two different degrees before graduating while not curtailing financial aid.

DAASCH/HINES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-2.”

_______ spoke against the proposal if it requires 36 additional credits.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVED THE PROPOSAL PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

None. The president was out of town.

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that Social Work has received a $200,000 gift. He noted the search has concluded for the Assoc. VP for Development and Katherine Ferris, from UCSC was appointed, effective 1 March.

KOCH discussed the issue of new ranks for fixed term faculty, which has been a working group item between the university and the AAUP for some time. He noted that our work has been pre-empted by a proposal that has reached the Provosts’ Council for a revised OAR. There will be a new set of ranks in the general category of Lecturer and the clinical ranks. The proposal is being reviewed at the campuses and will have a reading at the Provosts’ meeting of 28 April.

KOCH noted that Dean Kaiser is stepping down at the end of the current week, and Dick Knight, past interim Vice President and interim Dean, will serve as Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences, until the search is concluded.
1. Semi-Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

BLEILER presented the report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 4/5 March at PSU

ANDREWS-COLLIER reported for Rueter, who was called away. She urged Senators to read Rueter’s minutes at http://pages.uoregon.edu/ifs/ifs.html. She also took a straw poll of the assembly regarding their approval of the OSBHE board’s endorsement of SB 742, and the vote was almost unanimously in favor.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 2011
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Feng for Feng, Gerwing for George, Blekic for Barham, Holt for Kominz.

Members Absent: Baccar, Carter, Elzanowski, Farr, Hagge, Karavanic, Keller, Latiolais, Maier, Munson, Preston, Pejcinovic, Rueter, Ryder, Sterling.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Burns, Danielson and Flores were present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Discussion Item: items in this meeting having to do with the proposed Steering resolution, VP Fink’s report and Provost Koch’s report, and the draft resolution, constitute this month’s discussion items.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda
JOHNSON/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular proposals as published “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposed Resolution of the Faculty Senate

HINES noted that the proposal was removed from the April Agenda. She explained that it would be returned to the Agenda in May, after Senate consideration of VP Fink’s report today, discussion with the administration, and further editing by the Steering Committee.

Comments followed VP Fink’s presentation. JOHNSON noted that inputs need to be balanced with outcomes and accomplishments. SCHECHTER requested elaboration on the resolution’s postponement. HINES noted that the original document was somewhat hasty and the Steering Committee wants to get this right, with respect to shared governance and communication. FINK noted that he encourages input into the results of the Research report, especially with respect to ‘stretch goals.’ C.BROWN noted that aspirational goals identified as such are very important, in order to make the goals obtainable. BUTLER stated that a baseline would be hard to establish because of the budget situation.

3. EPC Recommendation to Approve Department of Indigenous Nations Studies

JOHNSON/LUCKETT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the department name change to “Indigenous Nations Studies” proposal as published in “E-3” and the supplemental memo provided on 1 April (attached).

SEPPALAINEN queried, with respect to the justification, if he included in this department, since as a Finn he is indigenous and is a descendant of peoples who experienced colonization by Russians and Swedes for five centuries. JOHNSON indicated the committee did not discuss this aspect of the request. PIERCE asked if this would affect the name of the Native American Center, as student fees contributed to the construction and they had a voice in the name. HINES recognized Cornel Pewewardy who stated he would ensure the advisory committee of the center keeps this item in mind.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. EPC Recommendation to Approve Prefix for Library

JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Library prefix proposal as published in “E-4.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. EPC Recommendation to Approve Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling
JOHNSON/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling proposal as listed in “E-5.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

6. Proposal for the Minor in Medieval Studies

DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Medieval Studies proposal as listed in “E-6.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL noted that College Station Housing Project is underway and received some good press last week, reminding that we are leasing the land and we will own the building after 65 years. Princeton’s Guide to Colleges and Universities included PSU for the first time, which will contribute to our out of state recruiting efforts. Regarding OUS restructuring proposals, the bill is now in the Ways and Means Committee, progress probably helped by the withdrawal last week of the two U of Oregon bills relating to the issue. Ways and Means is also holding hearings on the budget, and heard testimony this week from Presiding Officer Hines. Ways and Means has reinstated some of the education items that the governor had cut from his proposal, which would help the universities indirectly. Regarding proposed tuition increases for next year, the new compact would include student input into the decision, and this activity was incorporated into this year’s proposals as well. Already this year we are at the level of philanthropy we reached last year, including gifts to Business and Social Work. As the economy slowly improves, we hope to see greater increases as a result of efforts by VP Aylmer.

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported on activity at the Board level having to do with definitions of faculty titles, noting that this is an item subject to the Oregon Administrative Rules. He continued that work done on this campus by AAUP and the administration in the last few years is informing his discussions with the provosts. A few additional faculty ranks have been proposed to underpin career advancement in the non-tenure related ranks, and the proposal includes renaming certain positions (attached).

MacCORMACK asked questions about current faculty holding the current ranks. KOCH noted that our intent is not to separate graduate and undergraduate instruction,
and that new hires would negotiate the new ranks. M.TAYLOR queried, given the discussions that took place here, if the administration is satisfied with the ‘lecturer’ title, and would we be amenable to propose something different. KOCH stated no. MURPHY asked if the issue of soft funding is incorporated into the proposal for research titles. KOCH stated yes. MARRONGELES asked if tenure is related to predominantly teaching lines. KOCH stated no, it would violate our promotion and tenure guidelines. LUCKETT asked for Koch to comment on the negative outcome of raises for fixed term faculty. KOCH stated that he has not seen anyone at PSU being fired for being paid too much. ARANTE asked if lecturers would have no scholarly agenda. KOCH stated that is correct. AGORSAH asked if the entry point would change for ranked faculty. KOCH stated no. SCHECHTER asked how “ABD” hires would be handled. KOCH stated it would be specified in the letter of offer. SCHECHTER asked for a definition of the ‘Distinguished’ rank. KOCH stated that we would define it. DAASCH asked if this would require revamping the P&T Guidelines. KOCH stated that we could conceivably do an addendum as we did for the research faculty, but this would require discussion.

Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships

FINK presented a report on the state of and next steps for research at PSU, based on a recent survey of research faculty (attached), He commenced by saying that the goal of his office is to: Make faculty research a more positive experience; Support established research agenda and develop new strategic opportunities (P-20, OHSU, Intel, PGE; new AVP); Make PSU’s administrative processes more supportive of research (self-studies, ERA deployment, communication); and, Help establish PSU as the Leading urban-serving university. ______ asked for clarification of “urban-serving.” WIEWEL noted that the term has evolved from “urban 13” to denote the nature of those universities that fit the characteristics of the setting we are in. He presented the survey of principle investigators. He concluded by discussing next steps: Develop transparent RSP processes and procedures; Define roles and responsibilities for research administration campus-wide; Move towards electronic research administration; and, Establish Strategic Partnership office.

SCHECHTER urged that the office use multiple strategies to urge and disseminate opportunities. ______ yielded to Mary King, who noted that turnover in the research office has been a major obstacle to effectiveness. Assoc Vice President Systma noted that the office has moved to a team approach in response to this problem.

1. Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE ACCEPT this report of the administration, published in “G-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
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BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE ACCEPT this report of the administration, published in “G-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:42
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 2, 2011
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Duh for Brower, Blekic for Ryder.

Members Absent: Cabelly, Carder, Carter, Elzanowski, Farr, Feng, Glaze, Greco, Hagge, Hansen, Harmon, Hatfield, Jacob, Keller, Kinsella, Lang, Marrongelle, Medovoi, Sheard.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:03. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Griffith was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Nominations for Presiding Officer Elect of the 2011-12 PSU Faculty Senate

SHUSTERMAN/FORTMILLER nominated Rob Daasch. Nominations will close at the June meeting of the Senate.

Discussion Item – Library Committee Draft Report

MERROW briefly presented the Library Committee’s draft report and visioning statement for the next 5 years, as listed in “G-3.” SCHECHTER thanked the library faculty and staff for their collaboration and contributions to the learning environment.
at the university. The meeting was moved to a committee of the whole for 15 minutes.

**Discussion Item – Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on On Line Learning**

BROWN presented an update on the search for the Director of On Line Learning. ROSE presented a brief update on online learning. The decision to reorganize the online presence was the result of a deliberative review that concluded online services need to be centralized in one location, in order to have ease of access for faculty. The two units with instructional designers, XS and CAE, will be brought together into one unit in a central location tbn. The budget was also carefully reviewed and will be revised. Hopefully the new director will be in place by July 1, and work with the committee can commence to update policy under the new structure. LATOLAIS asked Rose to elaborate on exam proctoring. ROSE noted that a compliance person would be added to the team to oversee this and other items, for example, ADA compliance. RUETER asked if there would be a testing location. ROSE said that it is under discussion. REYNOLDS presented the draft report as listed in “C.” The meeting was moved to a committee of the whole for 18 minutes.

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

   SCHECHTER/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE ITEM, AS LISTED IN “E-1.”

   THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposed Joint Resolution of the Faculty Senate and the AAUP

   BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-2”, after E.3.

   THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal from EPC to Change Department Name to Theatre and Film

   DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the department name change as listed in “E-3.”

   THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**F. QUESTION PERIOD**
G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported after item “C.” He noted that bonding for the life sciences building is moving forward. He noted that the legislative package is moving forward in Salem. He noted that the Fiscal Futures Task Force is working on general recommendations for restructuring our internal allocations with a report scheduled soon, and discussions of their proposals will take place early next year. He noted the dedication of the Confucius Classroom by the Chinese delegation. He commended FPA for their performances of “Street Scene” and “Oleanna” and noted there will be an invited performance of the latter later this month for administrators. He commended Patricia Schechter for her book with Avel Gordley, and faculty who have worked recently on the Japanese earthquake and tsunami. He noted that SB 242 is expected to pass at this juncture, and discussions regarding institutional boards may follow in the fall. He noted the OUS Audit of higher education institutions, OSU, UO, WOU and EOU, scheduled to be released in the next day in conjunction with hearings in Salem, generally faults the universities for not managing faculty time sufficiently. WIEWEL concluded by discussing his remarks at the recent Budget town hall. He noted that to some people it came across as insensitive and blunt, and he wanted to correct that impression. He noted that he appreciates that people work very hard at this university, that we have had great ambitions ever since our founding, and that it will always be tough for us.

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported after the annual reporting. He again reminded of the OUS audit and noted we will post it and our response addresses on the web. He noted that the proposed changes to the OAR regarding academic ranks will be much as the original, and is researching how faculty can comment before it comes before the board for approval. He noted that the Social Work Dean search is still underway, and that the CLAS Dean Search is on schedule.

1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee
2. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
3. Annual Report of the Library Committee - Tabled
4. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
5. Annual Report of the University Studies Council

The respective chairs presented the reports, and there was no discussion. The Presiding Officer accepted the reports for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:35.
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, June 6, 2011

Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Johnson for Agorsah, Ruedas for Murphy, Bleiler for Palmiter, Wise for Tarabocchia, Baker for Welnick, Holt for Wetzel.


New Members Present: Jaen-Portillo, Jivanjee, Lafferriere, Magaldi, Rigelman.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:04. The minutes were approved with the following correction: HARMON was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Additions/Changes to the day’s agenda: G-12 should read “Year One Accreditation Report” – Ketcheson

Hail and Farewell: The Presiding Officer thanked outgoing Senators, in particular former Presiding Officer Cindy Brown, who is retiring, and welcomed incoming

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, June 6, 2011
senators. She also reminded attendees that a reception follows the meeting, hosted by the Provost and Scott Burns, GEOL.

New members of the Advisory Council: Linda George, Maude Hines, Robert Mercer

Election of officers of the 2011-12 PSU Faculty Senate: Gwen Shusterman, Presiding Officer, Rob Daasch, Presiding Officer Elect, Lisa Weasel and Gerardo Lafferriere, Steering Committee (2011-13). Cindy Baccar, Ex Officio (Chair, Comm on Comm).

Removed from the Curricular Consent Agenda, Item E-1.a. USP Course Proposals and Course Change Proposals.

Discussion Item: Agenda Setting for 2011-12 (attachment)

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on On-Line Learning

REYNOLDS presented the report for the committee, as included in the mailing.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

BURNS/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE ADOPT the recommendation in the last paragraph of the report: ”… the Faculty Senate continue the work of this committee in the form of a new Faculty Senate On-Line Learning Committee which works with the Director of the Center for Online Learning,” and continue the work of the ad hoc committee in the meantime.

RUETER noted he is concerned about transparency, with regard to who has a financial stake in this activity. We should be very clear about that when forming the committee.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO ADOPT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Annual Report of the Library Committee

MERROW presented the final version of the report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate, as added to the mailing.

3. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Implement Changes to the Constitution
JONES presented the report for the committee, and introduced “E.3., Proposal to Amend the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art., V, Sec, 2 Transition etc.”

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposals, excluding courses in the program proposal in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal for Master of Real Estate Development

JOHNSON/BROWN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Master of Real Estate Development, as listed in “E-2.” She noted it is an interdisciplinary program between CUPA and SBA, combining current and new curricula.

LUCKETT requested comment from the Budget Committee. HILLMAN noted that the committee were being asked to participate in a faculty governance charade because searches, etc. have taken place prior to approval, therefore the committee declined to review the proposal and left this program to the Graduate Council to review. EVERETT noted that prior to the process, the program has not admitted students to the program, however, having faculty in place indicates to Graduate Council that the program is sound. She added that the misunderstanding may also have to do with the fact that the program was underway before the new approval process. KOCH noted that the comments here are correct; the program was approved in CUPA but the decision arose to move the program to SBA, who then encountered an accreditation issue. This program is an example of why the more rigorous budget process has been established.

RUETER asked what is the budget model that was used to analyse the program. REYNOLDS stated a budget analysis was used, not a model. CARTER asked if the program had had an external review. HARMON stated it goes to the Provosts Council, where it will have an external review. CARTER noted that it would be more productive if the external review were done before a program comes to Senate for approval.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE PROGRAM WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

MAIER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the USP Course Proposals and Course Change Proposals.
MOVED that USP 624 Project Design be re-named Development Project Design.

THE MOTION TO RENAME USP 624 PASSED by majority voice vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE USP COURSE PROPOSALS PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal to Amend the PSU Faculty Constitution, Article V, Sec. 2, Transition to Appropriate Senate Size

JONES presented the proposal after “D-3.”

CARTER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT, AS LISTED IN “E-3.”

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for President Wiewel

HINES read a question regarding President Wiewel’s authority to reorganize administrative units, presumably Academic Affairs. She noted that this is one of eight anonymous questions she has received in her tenure as presiding officer, and the issue of verifying that it was submitted by a senator. She distributed the response to the question from university council (attached).

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL lauded recent campus activities, including the Allen Award, the Civic Engagement Award, and the completion of the Walk of the Heroines project. He noted several individual faculty achievements, and notable performance indicators attained this year. He commended shared governance for the contribution to these various achievements.

WIEWEL reviewed the final budget determinations for the upcoming fiscal year (http://www.pdx.edu/budget/2011-2012-academic-budget-process), noting that we must find $29.4 M to fill deficits. Most units must come up with a 3% cost reduction, tuition rates will increased, internal overhead rates were increased, savings were accrued in a few places, and $10.8 M will be raised by taking from fund balances.

BUTLER asked for a clarification of the Athletics budget. WIEWEL noted that the reduction is on the E&G funds. The increase in the budget that is listed, is related to the tuition of formerly WUE athletes.
MAIER asked what the future holds for folks who were frugal and then lost fund balances. WIEWEL noted that it is done only in extreme duress, because it undermines new initiatives, etc.

**Provost’s Report**

KOCH reminded that retention is 1% per each 13 freshmen, and that faculty connections are a very important part of this. He noted that research done by Professors Janine Allen and Kathleen Smith has also shown that student perception is strongly influenced by effective advising, etc.

KOCH noted that Dr. Gary Brown has been hired to direct the new On Line Learning Center. Nancy Koroloff will serve as Interim Dean of Social Work for the next year. Adrienne Lim is leaving the university, as will Gil Latz in December.

The revised faculty ranks document has been forwarded to the board and hearings will occur in late summer, or fall if possible.

GRECO noted that with respect to Koch’s remarks about retention, it may be ephemeral, possibly being due to the economy. KOCH noted that this issue is being monitored.

3. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee – Johnson
4. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee – Bleiler
5. Annual Report of the Graduate Council – Everett
7. Report of the IFS Faculty Senate Meeting of 2/3 June at PSU - Rueter
8. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee – De La Cruz
10. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees – MacCormack

The Presiding Office accepted the reports for the Senate and by way of their chairs, thanked the committees for their work this year. Applause for each

**6. Annual Report of the Honors Council**

LUCKETT presented the first annual report of the Honors Council.

LUCKETT/BLEILER MOVED THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION in “G-6, p. 3” outlining the process for establishing departmental honors tracks.

CUMMINGS queried what would appear on the diploma. LUCKETT stated it would read, “Honors in….” D.BROWN noted that this proposal would not work well in his school. LUCKETT disagreed, noting that the thesis is discipline-specific. CARTER referenced the current 8-year old policy, and asked why this must go through curriculum committees. LUCKETT stated it is a change to
degree programs. BUTLER noted that her department did not opt for the independent study path due to the added strain on faculty. LUCKETT disagreed that this is the case. BROWN reiterated that the thesis track as described doesn’t fit his discipline. INGERSOLL noted the typo with respect to the BA in Social Work.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED, by 40 in favor, 6 against, and 5 abstentions.


H. ADJOURNMENT

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