

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate  
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

---

2012

## Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2012 - June 2013

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2012 - June 2013" (2012). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 7.  
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/7>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only) by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

## **PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, October 1, 2012

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Beasley, Berrettini, Beyler, Brown, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flores, Flower, Friedberg, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Harmon, Hart, Holliday, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, Jones, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Meekishko, Medovoi, Mercer, O'Banion, Ott, Palmiter, Pease, Recktenwald, Reese, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Talbott, Tretheway, Weasel, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Perini for Boas, Rissi for Gelmon, McLaughlin for Luther, Hu for Meekishko

**Members Absent:** Dill, Hansen, Kennedy, Newsom, Pewewardy, Pullman, Wendl

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Alymer, Balzer, Beatty, Cunliffe, Davis, Dawson, Dollar, Everett, Fallon, Fink, Flower, Gould, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, MacCormack, Mack, O'Banion, Reynolds, Rimai, Sestak, Shusterman, Wakeland, Wallack, Wiewel.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 4, 2012, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following correction: RIGELMAN was present.

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

Hail and Farewell: Presiding Officer Rob Daasch led the Senate in a spirited triple "hip hip hooray" for the 19 years of exemplary service from the out-going Secretary to the Faculty Sarah Andrews-Collier.

#### **Announcements**

DAASCH requested that Senators say their names and departments before speaking, sit below the railing boundary so that the microphone can pick them up, and notify the Secretary after the meeting in case of a late arrival. He announced the site visit of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) with an open Q&A session 10/2 at 1pm (MCB127) and preliminary findings 10/3 at 9:30 am (MCB651).

*Parliamentary Procedure and Faculty Governance.*

LUCKETT reviewed two key procedures for Faculty Senate—methods for closing debate and amending a motion following *Roberts Rules of Order*. *Roberts Rules* offer a detailed and distinctively American approach to parliamentary procedure and deliberately make it difficult to cut off debate:

- Motion to “call the question” is frequently misused; it cannot be called out from the floor. Senators must wait until recognized by the presiding officer. The motion, which is not debatable, is then seconded and the Senate moves immediately to a vote on whether to close debate.
- More typically, if the presiding officer sees that debate on the main motion is ready to stop he can simply ask, “Is everybody ready for the question?” If there are no objections, the presiding officer can move to a vote on the main motion; but if there is even one objection, this method doesn’t work.
- Motion to postpone to a specific future assembly or indefinitely; the motion to postpone is itself debatable.
- Motion to “table” should be used rarely and only to set aside a debate when some more urgent business has to be dealt with. The intention is to return to the question once the urgent question has been decided. The motion to table is not debatable and passes by a simple majority.

There are some pitfalls to watch out for when amending a motion. Under *RRO* there is no “friendly amendment.” Once a motion has been moved and seconded it belongs to the whole assembly and only the whole assembly can amend it. Changes can only be introduced by a “motion to amend” submitted in writing. Amendments can pass by consensus if the presiding officer is convinced that s/he can ask if there are any objections to the amendment, but with even a single objection this won’t work.

LUCKETT also shared some general rules of decorum: Debate issues, not personalities; stick to the subject; do not raise your hand while others are speaking. “Point of Order” can be spoken without recognition and the presiding officer has to make a decision on the point. Senators should not address other senators or refer to them in debate by name. Questions should always be addressed to the chair. The purpose of these rules is to ensure that debate does not generate antagonisms that we will carry outside the assembly.

DAASCH welcomed the new Provost Sona Andrews to the Senate, and new Secretary Martha Hickey, identified by a search process led by the Steering Committee over the summer, and Leslie McBride as presiding officer elect. He then introduced the 2012-13 Senate Steering Committee: Amy Greenstadt, Robert Liebman, Gerardo Lafferriere, Lisa Weasel, and Michael Flower (*ex officio*, Committee on Committees). He reported that the Steering Committee had a very successful September retreat and he looks forward to working with them this year.

By way of introduction, DAASCH offered his view of governance based on the idea that faculty build and enact the regulations for educational policy, there being no more solemn work than educating our students. Shared governance, or figuring out the possibility for action “in tandem” with the Administration, is one of the things that attracted to him to Senate. Senate ratifies the establishment, elimination and modification of academic programs. He hopes to continue the example set by his

recent predecessors of working together in a shared, collaborative environment. Faculty will find many opportunities to serve on committees that extend the work of the Senate.

DAASCH turned to a description of Senate districts, developed and deployed for the first time last year. This year senators will be assigned a district with 20 faculty from their division. The idea is to provide a point of contact between represented faculty and senators to increase the dialogue. The districts are assigned mechanically, based on the spring 2012 election, and names are distributed using a round robin approach, so senators won't just represent faculty in their own departments. Senators will receive a formatted list of email contacts.

Lastly, DAASCH shared his view of how decision-making occurs in the Senate contrasting curriculum items that arise monthly with the opportunity for the Senate to reserve time on its agenda for discussions that look at broader issues, like the questions raised by the Provost at Convocation. These discussions will help Senate decide whether there is a need for an established or ad hoc committee or other forum to craft recommendations for Senate action. He offered the example of how Senate considered the question of an institutional governing board for PSU last year, and the motion it framed. Issues this year might include the next round of constitutional changes, the new budget model, or the fact that research is becoming a greater and greater component of faculty status and work.

MCBRIDE gave an overview of the Senate's committees, reviewing the distinction between constitutional committees appointed by the Senate that report back to it, and those administratively appointed that report to the President or Vice-President and that may or may not report back to the Senate. She recommended consulting the Faculty Governance Guide; it has everything faculty need to know about the Senate, its committees, basic functions and procedures. She reminded committee participants about the need for ample lead time to prepare an annual report that must first be vetted by the Steering Committee a month before it is scheduled for the Senate. She encouraged senators to consider service on the Steering Committee—a fascinating opportunity that will give them a real sense of ownership and involvement in the various activities of the University. The Steering Committee makes sure that the most cogent issues are surfaced in Faculty Senate.

### **Announcement – Draft preliminary recommendations for ORP and PEBB**

KENTON, OUS Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, reported on the implications of Senate Bill 242 for OUS health care coverage and its Optional Retirement Plan (ORP). SB 242 established two labor-management committees charged with reviewing and considering changes to these plans. In response to shortcomings identified by the IRS, the ORP Committee has prepared draft recommendations to reduce administrative costs, to maintain member eligibility regardless of numbers of hours worked in a given plan year, and to establish a new tier after July 1, 2014 with a guaranteed 8% contribution with up to an additional 4% match (slide 5, attached). The committee is seeking faculty response.

The PEBB labor-management committee studied health care in Oregon, looked at options for the OUS system, and developed an OUS Benefits philosophy statement (slide 8, attached). KENTON disclosed that OUS contributes 67 million dollars over its actual costs to the PEBB system (thanks to our lower health risk pool and healthy life style choices). System costs grow 5-10% a year and these increases have to be recouped, in part, through tuition increases. Although an OUS survey found a strong consensus that options other than PEBB should be evaluated, the Governor is currently looking to control costs by aggregating all plans. KENTON encouraged faculty to offer feedback on the committee's recommendations (slides 11 & 12, attached), commenting that if OUS stays in PEBB, it needs to have more of a voice in the sculpting of the plans and a reduction of its subsidy. The final committee reports are both due to the Legislature on Dec. 1, 2012.

#### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

##### **1. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on IST Courses**

GOULD offered an update on the committee's written report submitted in June (D-1 attachment). The committee felt it was a good idea to keep the IST designation as an option, although with better oversight and supervision. The report suggested two models, but players have changed in the interim, and there appears to be a new model emerging. It has been suggested that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies could administer these courses with a small sub-committee that would report to the UCC and on to Faculty Senate. There is now an effort to revive Chiron Studies in the Graduate School of Education, where it is under review; however, its funding is set to end in December 2012. The committee intends to return with a report as soon as it has a crystallized model to put before the Senate.

#### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda** - deferred until reports from Administrators

DAASCH explained the use of the Consent Agenda, adopted to move the curricular business of the Senate forward more efficiently. The process requires senators with questions or concerns about individual items to request that these items be removed from the reports of the Curriculum Committee and/or Grad Council (i.e. the Consent Agenda) before the conclusion of Roll Call in Senate for a separate discussion.

LAFERRIERE/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular proposals as listed in E-1 (the Consent Agenda).

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote (at 4:30 pm).

DAASCH reminded senators that detailed information on the courses and programs under review by the Curriculum Committee and Grad Council are on the Curriculum Wiki. The address of the Wiki is on the front page of the monthly Senate Agenda.

#### **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None.

## G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

### President's Report

WIEWEL welcomed the new officers and senators on their return to campus. He remarked on the link between rising PEBB costs and rising tuition and the implications of PSU's share of the subsidy to PEBB (7 to 10 million dollars) in terms of rising student loan debt. His updates included: The University's growing success in fund-raising, US News and World Reports ranking PSU as one of the top ten up-and-coming and innovative universities, PSU's participation in Portland State of Mind events in October, the new Life Sciences Building is progressing to completion of its exterior, and faculty member Ivan Sutherland (ECS) was awarded the Kyoto Prize. WIEWEL noted that enrollment will be a little bit lower than the 2% targeted, but a new Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management will help PSU improve its systematic efforts to maintain a 2 to 3% annual growth rate. Next year he plans to look at whether the current strategic plan still captures what we want it to capture. This year he will be working with his new nine-member executive leadership team to bring the new budget model closer to conclusion and dealing with the issue of institutional boards. He commended the Senate for its motion last year outlining the conditions of its support for the latter. He concluded by expressing his strong support for the themes that the Provost introduced at Convocation and their importance for the future of the institution. Entering his fifth year at PSU, he looks forward to melding his leadership team and being PSU's number-one cheer leader and salesman, a job that he does with ever more relish and pride.

DAACSH announced the deferral of the consent agenda until after the Provost's remarks.

### Provost's Report

ANDREWS had five specific items that she wished to share with Senate:

- On the current budget: She is very optimistic that reforms accomplished will help deans and departments really plan for what they will do this year. She said to look for FAQs on the FADM web site about budget numbers and definitions so that we can all be speaking the same language. She plans on working directly with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee on a planning/budget process that will begin in January 2013 for FY14.
- On remarks at Convocation: She shared her amusement at the *Vanguard* headline ("Provost has lots of questions and no answers"). She plans to engage the campus in discussion about these questions through conversations with Senate committees, bringing in outside speakers, hosting a January Forum, and providing department level grants for exploring ways in which to re-envision the curriculum and the student experience.
 

A video of the Provost's presentation is available on web at  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJJ4odN3hYY&feature=plcp>
- On the merger of the COL and CAE: She has shared a draft for a new entity with the Academic Leadership Team and Senate Steering Committee—a new "Center for Learning and Teaching Innovation." This entity will go through the established shared governance process for the creation of new programs.

- On the NWCCU Accreditation: This review is the third-year review and focuses on the institution's core themes and indicators for what the accreditors are calling "mission fulfillment." The commission will drop the five-year review visit.
- On the Survey on Faculty Satisfaction and Career flexibility (fall 2011): The survey was conducted of tenure-line faculty at all OUS institutions with the exception of U of Oregon. The report will provide benchmark data that is national in scope and should allow the University to consider what improvements might be needed. ANDREWS proposes to review survey results and bring items back to the Senate. (For example, one question asked is: Does the institution have a tenure-clock extension policy? The institution may have one, ANDREWS commented, but if not many know what it is, or use it effectively, this prohibits things from happening.)

### **Report from ASPSU University Affairs director Thomas Worth.**

WORTH outlined the process by which students are appointed to serve on University Committees, including review by ASPSU and the Dean of Student Life. (See attachment.) New this year is the expectation that students will be required to provide committee reports to track their attendance, generate institutional memory for ASPSU, and give students with the opportunity to consult with ASPSU. He requested that Committee chairs let him know if there are breakdowns in communication or if vacancies should arise during the year.

O'BANION asked how students are vetted. WORTH replied that students have to submit an application with information about their experience, interest and commitment. MERCER asked what should committees do when students just stop coming? WORTH asked that committee chairs email him or 'cc him and he will follow up with the student. CUNLIFFE noted that the Curriculum Committee has some areas in the Curriculum Tracker Wiki where comments are exchanged that are not public, and parts of meetings where individuals presenting proposals are not invited to stay for deliberations. She asked about the expectations for the summary reports student members will write and how they will respect the confidentiality of these deliberations. WORTH referred to state open meeting law that allows for executive sessions where information shared is not reported on, as opposed to public sessions. REESE asked whether the vetting process verifies students' enrollment status or looks at their ability to take on roles that won't hinder their success academically. WORTH answered that the Dean of Student life verifies enrollment and has a benchmark GPA; students have to assess whether they can handle it. STEVENS applauded ASPSU's efforts to implement a fair process and stressed the importance of mentoring and providing students with an understanding of faculty governance.

DAASCH called for SW, LAS-A&L and LAS-Sciences to caucus after the meeting to elect their representatives to the Committee on Committees.

## **H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, November 5, 2012

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Beasley, Berrettini, Beyler, Boas, Burk, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Flores, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Harmon, Holliday, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jivanjee, Jones, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Luckett, Magaldi, McBride, Medovoi, Miller, Newsom, O'Banion, Ott, Palmiter, Pullman, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Talbott, Tretheway, Weasel, Wendl, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Rupley for Brown, Cruzan for Eppley, Bacaar for Jagodnik/Hart, Hu for Meekisho, DeVoll for Mercer, Hines for Reese,

**Members Absent:** Agorsah, Burns, Hansen, Hunt-Morse, Luther, Ott, Pease

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Balzer, Beatty, Worth (for Dollar), Everett, Faaleava, Fink, Flower, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, Mack, O'Banion, Reynolds, Rimai, Sestak, Teuscher, Wakeland, Wiewel.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2012, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Hu, alternate for Meekisho, and Pullman were present; and added to the membership of 2012-13 Steering Committee, Gwen Shusterman (*past Presiding Officer*)

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

DAASCH announced that Steering Committee will meet on Tuesday, November 13, due to the Monday holiday, and that all senators should have received an email with contact information for the represented faculty of their Senate district. Because the districts were derived from the faculty certified for the 2012 election, some faculty on the contact lists may no longer be present at PSU. DAASCH also announced that this year's agenda would include monthly reports from the University's Vice-President for Research and Strategic Partnerships Jonathan Fink.

### **Discussion item: New OUS Faculty Ranks.**

DAASCH explained the presiding officer's role as manager of discussion and the procedure for convening a "committee of the whole" for the purpose of holding an unreported and more freewheeling discussion to inform and guide the Senate in its



future actions (see attachment). Discussion may foster motions or committee assignments but these will be accomplished outside the discussion process, after a vote to return to the regular form of business. The Chair of the New Academic Ranks Task Force Michael Bowman and task force member Patricia Schechter have agreed to provide a summary of the committee's work and recommendations to inform the discussion.

### **1. Report of the PSU New Faculty Ranks Task Force**

BOWMAN said that the Task force was charged with figuring out how to implement the new titles and ranks adopted by the State Board that now define some as restricted to tenure-related faculty and others to non-tenure-related faculty. (See attached slides.) Instructor has been defined as non-tenure-track and involving primarily undergraduate education. The task force recommended against using the titles of Librarian and of Lecturer as a non-tenure-track position primarily involved with graduate education. BOWMAN described the current employment landscape at PSU as a complex one, with instructors with and without terminal degrees teaching at all levels. Department chairs polled and the AAUP fixed-term faculty caucus did not see the Lecturer title as beneficial. The Task Force Report recommended that Instructor and Senior Instructor be open for all levels, except where the rank of Clinical Professor or Professor of the Practice might apply.

BOWMAN noted that each non-tenure-related title would have three promotional opportunities. The Task Force recommended a fairly aggressive implementation of the new ranks for non tenure-track faculty during the next review period. Each department should evaluate its non-tenured faculty members with the option for current faculty (numbering about 1200) to "stay where they are" or to accept the new classification system, with the exception of Senior Instructors or Senior Research Assistants and Associates, who will have to be shifted to either Senior level 1 or 2.

### **2. Minority Report on New Faculty Ranks**

Summarizing the Minority Report, SCHECHTER stated that the Report contends that the charge the Task Force was given was impossible to execute fully and fairly because the revised Oregon Administrative Rules introduce new ranks and titles without any satisfactory rationale or clear connection to overall instructional, research and service objectives. Some Task Force members saw the work as defined by an effort to systematize the promotion of fixed-term faculty, others viewed the guidelines of the charge as inadequate. Due to the lack of consensus on the basis and implications of the committee's work, the Minority Report urges a delay in the implementation of the new ranks and a more encompassing reexamination of University ranking and promotion policies and practices.

SCHECHTER noted that report spotlights the ways in which the new OARS brush over an ambiguity simmering in faculty promotional policies regarding academic freedom and delineate job duties that blur historic distinctions between tenure-track faculty and instructors newly designated as non-tenure-track faculty. SCHECHTER offered examples of contradictions created by the new OARs. According to their new job description, non-tenure-track research faculty are expected to perform research at

professorial levels and non-tenure track lecturers mentor and advise graduate students, while at the same time the description of traditional tenure-track responsibilities lacks substance and definition. New non-tenure track positions absorb traditional tenure-related responsibilities with none of the protections of academic freedom or the support of vigorous peer review as imbedded in tenure. The Minority Report sees the slippage as especially acute in Task Force recommendations defining Instructor as accommodating graduate education and its definition of service and governance responsibilities. The Minority Task Force recommends that non-tenure faculty should not be involved in curricular questions and decisions that have the potential to affect their job security. The Minority Report suggests that new policy documentation for faculty rank and tenure eligibility is needed at PSU and should result from an extended deliberative process where the central participants are PSU faculty who fulfill the teaching and research mission of the University.

*Supplementary materials posted online:* <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials>

3. Non-Tenure Track Faculty: U of O Document on Policies, Procedures, and Practices
4. Appendix I - Minority Report: Excerpt from a Document Previously Submitted to the Task Force during its Deliberations Regarding the Rank of Instructor
5. Bibliography of Research on the Effects of Contingent Academic Labor on Student Retention and Outcomes

The Presiding Officer moved the meeting to a committee of the whole.

LAFFERIERE/SANCHEZ moved to return to normal rules and proceed with the regular meeting.

#### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

#### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

#### **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None.

#### **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

##### **President's Report**

WIEWEL yielded the floor to VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs Jackie Balzer, who introduced the new Associate VP for Enrollment Management Dr. Cindy Skaruppa. BALZER thanked faculty for their support for PSU students and offered a progress report on enrollment (attached), highlighting the fact that

recruitment and retention has become a more purposeful activity at PSU. Despite projections, undergraduate enrollment for Fall 2012 remained essentially flat; while there was an uptick in the number of PhD students, Masters level enrollment declined 3%.

SKARUPPA reported that Enrollment Management has been reviewing both local and national data for explanations as to why the current trend looks the way it does. She highlighted demographic trends and the decline or stagnation of state and federal grants in aid, decreasing students' buying power as tuition and fees increase. Under new restrictions graduate students are no longer eligible for subsidized Stafford loans and undergraduate loan eligibility has been capped at six years. She noted that PSU students who file a FAFSA after February 1st find that the Oregon Opportunity Grant pool has already been exhausted. The fact that PSU implemented a higher entering GPA admission requirement (3.0) has also depressed Freshmen enrollment. SKARUPPA also noted significant points of light in line with the PSU mission: Latino student enrollment has nearly doubled, international student numbers have grown by 35%, and retention of first-time full-time Freshmen has increased by 5% over the last five years. PSU admitted more than 50 Oregon high school valedictorians and the Honors Program expanded by 89% this year.

Outlining next steps for Enrollment Management, SKARUPPA cited the collaboration between multiple units at PSU and continued intentional focus on the diversity plan, recruitment in international markets, and increasing partnerships with community colleges, particularly regarding transfer students. She complimented Dean Jhaj and Dan Fortmiller for strategic initiatives partnering Academic and Student Affairs, noting both the increase in retention and in the six-year graduation rate (up 3.7% since 2005). SKARUPPA added that efforts are underway to build a model that will allow PSU to better leverage existing scholarship and remission dollars and to study the financial and academic profile of PSU students and to track "lost admits" to determine if admitted students who have failed to enroll can be re-recruited.

SKARUPPA and BALZER invited faculty to contact them with further questions, or thoughts and ideas.

WIEWEL noted that in earlier years we simply opened the doors and students came flooding in, but now the University has to be more precise in its approach to enrollment. Although we won't fully understand the implication of the .8% decline in enrollment until the year progresses, so far no cuts in allocations are anticipated. The fund balance will cover short falls for this year. WIEWEL noted that not unrelated to these questions was the main topic of the recent Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) conference—how higher education is changing and how it will deal with the enormous pressures it is under. The general sense at the meeting was not one of panic, but certainly of great urgency. For PSU the question is how do we structure the university, how do we conduct our business so that we can continue to provide and enhance access? He recommended the Provost's approach, recognizing that this *is* the discussion that we are having and that it needs to involve a lot of people. Standing still is not an option.

WIEWEL announced Fred Granum's selection as the new President of Portland State University Foundation and PSU's receipt of the Sloan Award for Excellence in Workplace Effectiveness and Flexibility for the second year in a row. He will also accept the first Presidential Leadership Award given by the U.S. Green Building Council in recognition of PSU's role as a national leader in sustainability.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS reported on the NWCCU accreditation visit and announced a forthcoming "challenge" to PSU faculty to respond in innovative ways to the dramatic changes in higher education and rethink the curriculum. The NWCCU preliminary report included no concerns and four commendations recognizing: PSU's deep engagement with the community and the wide recognition of its mission; the collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs and visible commitment to student success; PSU strategies for enriching the student experience through links to the community; and its commitment to sustainability. The report recommended improvement in three areas: the need for a more selective set of indicators that are better aligned with the institutional mission and its core themes; the need for strengthening policies and practices for post-tenure review so that all faculty are evaluated once every five years (a requirement for accreditation); and the need for PSU to implement a system of program review to demonstrate the effectiveness of all undergraduate and graduate programs.

BEASLEY asked whether the NWCCU document is available. ANDREWS replied that it will be posted in a few weeks on the OAA website once the NWCCU draft report that PSU reviewed for errors is returned. The report does not become final until the Commission of NWCCU meets to act on it in February 2013.

ANDREWS previewed the competitive "Provost's Challenge" awards. Resources will be provided for departments and groups of faculty. Three million dollars will come from restricted money—a reserve of on-line fees collected both to cover support services and to develop the next set of courses. The time line includes using the winter symposium as a forum for faculty to present their ideas and work before a final decision is made in February. The three categories are intended to create space for faculty to have the opportunity 1) to accelerate work developing programs in an online format, 2) to re-imagine their curriculum and make significant changes, and 3) to develop ways that technology can be used to enhance student success. Risk taking is encouraged as long as students are not harmed in the process. ANDREWS requested that everyone be flexible, tolerant and a little more nimble in doing the exciting, if possibly messy work of rethinking the PSU degree.

DOLIDON asked if consideration will be given to professional development needed to implement the technology projects. ANDREWS answered that the grants all deal with technology because that is the restriction on the fee, but if the work proposed needs instructional designers, participation in a conference, by out of faculty time, or developing skills in a particular area, those things will be available. The two-page concept proposal will not require a detailed budget; it will be up to the unit to spend within the parameters of the award. LIEBMAN's question clarified that the Provost's second category invited re-framing (not re-training). TALBOT commented that she

appreciated the questions and invitation at Convocation to think about how it makes sense to go forward, but didn't see how the challenge helped that process. ANDREWS described opportunities for public discussion, noting that the work has to happen at department level, but with wide ability for the Portland State community to comment. The process will allow a number of ideas to come forward at the same time, as opposed to a stepped process. It has to be a group of faculty, because unless faculty work collectively in groups or as departments, it is hard to move the curriculum forward in a meaningful way and change programs.

### **Report of the V.P. for Research and Strategic Partnerships**

DAASCH welcomed Jonathan Fink to his first presentation as a regular report to Faculty Senate.

FINK reported that a series of consultants have helped his office (RSP) prepare for changes intended to reduce the complexity of the research application and support process at PSU. Tracking research expenditures, he enumerated several spurs to growth in research from 2008-2011 and reasons for last year's slow down. (See attached slides.) He noted that the fact that awards rates for federal support went up during the recession helped institutions like PSU that may have a difficult time competing. PSU also benefited from the support of the Oregon congressional delegation for OTREC and ONAMI. However, earmarks have gone away and there has been no repetition of the historic investment in research hires that was undertaken by CLAS in Chemistry and Biology. FINK also suggested that some faculty may have become discouraged by the demands of managing large grants and the lack of support for their activities and that there may be a lingering mismatch between research load and teaching expectations at PSU generally. His office is focusing his attention on making the research process less onerous and has allocated funds to provide additional research support staff for CLAS.

FINK addressed additional initiatives to upgrade research support across campus in coordination with the deans of each unit. New ISS director Jennifer Allen is being very intentional about aligning awards from ISS with campus goals. Erin Flynn, new Associate VP for Strategic Partnerships, expects a productive partnership on the new urban-renewal district that includes PSU. RSP will work with University Advancement to push for more engagement with foundations as a way for PSU to overcome its competitive disadvantage in the peer review process. Finally he described the re-organization and training that is underway in RSP that will support the implementation of the new electronic research-administrative system over the next few years that was announced to the campus in October.

JAEN-PORTILLO asked about the position of the humanities where historically securing grant funding is more challenging. FINK agreed that is difficult to get large federal grants, but noted that faculty at PSU in the humanities have been successful in getting grants from foundations. One strategy for getting more funding is to try to align a humanities faculty member with a larger disciplinary activity that has a clearer path to federal funding. ZURK wondered what his thoughts were on the place of research activities in a new budget model that seems very SCH centered. FINK commented that it was a good time to bring that up and he is committed to making

sure that whatever comes out of the budget planning process has research as a significant priority. RIMAI added that the question is worth a longer conversation, but stated that PSU does not have a new budget model; the steering committee worked to create a tool to reflect what it costs to generate the revenue that we do generate, and the decision was to base this on student credit hours, since that is how we generate revenue, but it is not the model. She has initiated a conversation with this year's Senate Budget Committee and looks forward to reporting on its progress. HANOOSH asked for examples of successful collaborations on interdisciplinary grants from foundations and the initial steps. FINK acknowledged successes of faculty in World Languages and Literatures in getting grants and mentioned eclectic mixtures on some grants obtained by Arizona State. He saw this as a direction for the future, but noted it will take creativity to find the opportunities. STEVENS complimented Fink on the improvement in the IRB approval process and the work of new compliance staff.

### **Internationalization Council Report**

SHANDAS reported that the Internationalization Council has created a document that outlines a strategy for comprehensive internationalization that has been officially adopted by PSU. (See [http://oia.pdx.edu/intl\\_council/year\\_end\\_strategy\\_reports/](http://oia.pdx.edu/intl_council/year_end_strategy_reports/).) It outlines six priority areas. The Council, working in collaboration with the Office of International Affairs, is working with all units to implement those six priorities. This academic year the Council wants to focus on three areas related to student learning outcomes, engaging faculty across campus in international research and teaching and service, and leveraging efforts currently underway at PSU in terms of internationalization.

DOLIDON asked whether the Council was the source of an email asking faculty to get involved to help “faculty of color” coming from other countries. ANDREWS answered that the Office of Diversity and Global Inclusion sponsored the email.

### **H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 2012

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Beasley, Berrettini, Beyler, Boas, Burk, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Flower, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Hansen, Harmon, Hart, Holliday, Jaen-Portillo, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, Jones, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Meekisho Mercer, Miller, Newsom, O'Banion, Ott, Palmiter, Pullman, Recktenwald, Reese, Rigelman, Ryder, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Tretheway, Weasel, Wendl, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Johnson for Agorsah, Ellis for Flores

**Members Absent:** Brown, Eppley, Friedberg, Hunt-Morse, Kennedy, Medovoi, Pease, Sanchez, Talbot, Taylor

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Cunliffe, Everett, Faaleava, Sytsma for Fink, Flower, Gould, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, Mack, O'Banion, Reynolds, Sestak, Su, Wiewel.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2012, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved as published.

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

DAASCH invited continued comment regarding the use of the new Senate districts or list serves, recommended a December 3 broadcast of OPB's Think Out Loud featuring PSU Capstone students reporting on a plan to reduce student debt: <http://www.opb.org/thinkoutloud/shows/paying-college-without-going-debt/> and requested further input from Senate committee chairs on student participation. He also thanked Michael Bowman and Patricia Schechter for leading off discussion of the new OAR faculty ranks at the November Senate meeting and noted the need for a decision regarding new hires and further consideration of the implications for P & T practices. DAASCH announced the December 4 special meeting of the OUS Governance and Policy Committee to consider P-20 integration ([http://www.ous.edu/state\\_board/meeting/notices](http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/notices)).

### **Discussion item: The Provost's Challenge**

DAASCH introduced the two presenters invited to provide background information for the open discussion: Karla Fant (Computer Science) and Rachel Cunliffe (Conflict Resolution), both with many years experience teaching with technology and on line courses at PSU.

FANT described some of the risks, solutions, and opportunities with online instruction for creating classrooms that engage students and minimize instructor overhead. She noted that not every web-based tool is right and considered student readiness and how to communicate clearly, assess student productivity and manage student correspondence (see attachment, slides 2-4). She noted that synchronous online tools can now give remote students the opportunity to interact together, and faculty can observe student learning "live." But, FANT queried, should individual faculty members have to figure out what tools to use, as seems to be the case now? What other technology is out there that will promote effective communication? Can we learn from Facebook? Could instructors have some say in the timing of the updates of current web tools or get feedback from a knowledgeable group on the navigability of their online designs?

CUNLIFFE discussed her own course management strategies that aim for simplicity and a consistent routine. She prefers to put her time in participating in discussion rather than complicated course building, and limits time-consuming email correspondence by making students take responsibility for answering each other's questions about posted course information. Having discovered the limitations of online learning by taking an online course herself, she strives to cultivate a supportive relationship with her online students. Sharing students' comments, CUNLIFFE highlighted the fact that because more members of the class must participate, students actually get the opportunity to see the full diversity of the group of people in the learning community and it stretches them (see attachment, slide 5). Students' written responses also give the instructor a very interesting opportunity to support their playing with concepts in a way that differs from their talking about them, or writing for an essay. Past discussions can be reexamined, which facilitates integrating knowledge. CUNLIFFE advocated for the distribution of the online learning fee across all students since all students benefit from the infrastructure that is built as a result of having good online learning options and service. She concluded by noting a number of institutional obstacles to effective on line practice (slides 6-7).

BURNS/BEASLEY moved the meeting to a Committee of the Whole.

FLOWER/\_\_\_\_\_ moved to resume regular session.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**



LUCKETT/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular proposals as listed in “E-1.” The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

#### **F. QUESTION PERIOD.**

None.

#### **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES.**

##### **President’s Report**

WIEWEL recommended the Provost’s Challenge RFP as an opportunity to implement or experiment with the ideas phrased as questions or comments during the Committee of the Whole discussion—to find out if students really do have resistance to technology, or embrace it through their life styles.

WIEWEL applauded the additional \$50,000 grant from the PGE Foundation in support of a power engineering teaching laboratory and a one million dollar grant to support the Leite-Palleroni portable, smart classroom recently on display at the Greenbuild Conference in San Francisco, an example of the public interest design focus in the School of Architecture:

<http://www.rethink.pdx.edu/?q=news/pge-foundation-awards-50k-grant-psu-power-engineering-teaching-lab> ; <http://www.pdx.edu/ces/news/psu-professors-unveil-new-affordable-green-portable-classroom-greenbuild-2012> . He noted that PSU has signed a reverse transfer agreement with Portland Community College (PCC) that would allow credits accumulated at PSU to apply retroactively towards an Associates Degree at PCC for students who earned credit there before coming to PSU. This may incentivize students to come to PSU earlier. WIEWEL also announced that Tom Brokaw would be keynote speaker for the 2013 Simon Benson Awards and the beginning of long-range planning for University Place.

In WIEWEL’s estimation, the Governor’s budget signals a comprehensive restructuring and integration of all Oregon education. The Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB) is given a significant amount of coordinating power over early learning through college; achievement compacts are its key mechanism of authority. The Governor’s proposal gives PSU the choice of an independent governing board, but implies that separation of governance and service functions now shared might be voluntary. PSU will be competing in an even more clear way for funding with early learning, K-12 and community colleges. For the first time in his five years, the budget proposes an increase in Higher Ed funding, although the increase applies only to the 1/6 of the cost of general education funded by the state and depends on implementing PERS, health care, and prison reforms. Other proposals could increase support for students, teacher training, IT, STEM education, and capitol construction, possibly underwriting the Viking Pavilion and School of Business project.

STEVENS asked whether there have ever been thoughts of having a program in hotel management? WIEWEL responded that it is an idea that should be explored: Although the purchase of the University Place hotel was purely “land-banking,” if PSU does wind up with a permanent conference center (his personal hope), then there are things that could be done in conjunction with it.

WIEWEL closed with the hopeful prognosis for a modest tuition increase next year and wishes for a happy holiday season.

### **Provost’s Report**

ANDREWS provided updates on the Year-3 Accreditation Site Visit, the move of the Centers for On Line Learning and Academic Excellence (COL/CAE), and the Provost’s Challenge. The final accreditation evaluation report that will go to the NWCCU Commission for review by February 2013 is posted at <http://www.pdx.edu/oaacc/accreditation-documents>. She explained that work will be needed to refine qualitative metrics for mission fulfillment and strengthen policies and practices regarding required post-tenure review and systematic program review. As faculty issues they will require a joint effort.

DAASCH inquired what sort of a time line is being contemplated? ANDREWS observed that in one sense we have four years, the date of NWCCU’s next review; but PSU has to be able to demonstrate not just that we have a plan but processes in place that we are implementing, so we have something to show for it.

ANDREWS announced a reversal of the decision to remodel space in the Library to house COL/CAE. This was done to allow time to figure out what this new unit will do in terms of serving faculty and allow for response to ideas that might come from the Provost’s Challenge. For now, students will be able to use the space cleared in the library for needed work and study space. The Library will submit a formal request to the Space Committee for the long term use of that space and the University will find a temporary location for COL/CAE, once their current lease expires.

STEVENS expressed gratitude for the Administration’s willingness to reassess decisions and be flexible. ANDREWS replied that it was input from faculty that led to questioning whether the move was best for students and faculty.

Thanking the Senate for its discussion of the topic, ANDREWS concluded with the announcement that the Provost’s Challenge website is live: <http://rethink.pdx.edu/>. It has the RFP, FAQs, a link to library resources and the concept submission form. She reminded the audience that the Challenge is not just about on line courses, but about re-thinking the curriculum and using technology to enable our work. The Challenge grants are open to graduate and undergraduate programs. She met with the Senate Educational Policy Committee to discuss ways that we, collectively and in the spirit of shared governance, can fast track items and streamline processes to help departments get something done.

GREENSTADT said that she was curious about the issue of credit for prior learning that is mentioned in the Challenge. The issue doesn't seem to have anything to do with on line instruction or technology, but does seem to be coming out of online learning with institutions deciding to award credit for things like MOOCs (massive open online courses). ANDREWS replied that a number of components of a Challenge proposal might not use technology directly. She gave the example of a Geography department deciding to use technology to deliver its introductory Physical Geography class in such a way that freed up a faculty member's time; i.e. there would be a downstream effect on something (faculty time) that didn't use technology.

McBRIDE commented that reading the recommended article by George Mehaffey posted on the Library reTHINK resource site (<http://guides.library.pdx.edu/rethinkpsu>) about reframing higher education helped her think more broadly about the Provost's Challenge—beyond the on line. ANDREWS noted that Mehaffey will be the keynote speaker at the January OAA Symposium (RSVP required to attend).

GELMON observed that the Challenge is exciting, but expressed a common concern about timing, with the web site going live during exam period and the comment period overlapping University closure, limiting the possibility for feedback. ANDREWS apologized for the short time frame, citing the difficulties of fitting initiatives into the academic calendar. She noted that the concept statement required (due 12/16) is very brief and vowed to very flexible in working with faculty over the next couple of months on proposals.

#### **VP for Research and Strategic Partnerships – Mark Sytsma for Jonathan Fink**

SYTSMA offered updates on three items: the calendar for implementing a new electronic research administration system (eRA) that is an open source system called Quali Coeus, the formation of a new Student Research Advisory Committee (RAC), and a student research conference planned for May to promote greater recognition for PSU's research efforts.

SYTSMA announced that phasing in the eRA will require a major commitment of personnel and resources, taking about 18 months for each stage: first getting relevant databases and personnel set up to talk to each other (to start late spring 2013); second, building the proposal development module that PIs can use to develop and track proposals; and third, adding the IRB and other compliance modules. In the end PSU will have a much clearer, easier, paperless system.

SYTSMA explained that RSP and the Graduate Dean had solicited nominations from chairs for a joint undergrad-grad student RAC to get their feedback on how research is happening at PSU. Two issues emerged from the first meeting related to the terms of GTA appointments. One, related to student food insecurity and rooted in the requirement for a 20 hour work-week to qualify for food stamps, led to a quick and positive outcome—confirmation from Dean Everett that if appointment

letters for GTAs say that 0.49 FTE is equivalent to 17-20 hours/wk this will be sufficient for students to access federal food assistance. A second concern arose because appointment letters written by some departments have prohibited grad students from taking on other positions. Within the university, a student appointed at .49 cannot take another position that would put the student over 0.5 FTE. RSP suspects that restrictions cannot be put on student activities outside of PSU and has asked the General Counsel's Office to investigate the question. SYSTMA concluded that in the future the Student RAC will discuss ways PSU can foster a research culture among students, look into differences in what is required of teaching assistants, and future employment and entrepreneurial opportunities for students wanting to start their own business.

### **Quarterly Report from EPC (Attachment G-1)**

GOULD summarized the work of the EPC and the Ad Hoc Committee on the use of the miscellaneous IST prefix. He offered a memo from EPC to clarify policies for ensuring faculty oversight of courses using the IST prefix (see attachments to the minutes).

O'BANION asked if those in Student Affairs who have regularly taught under the IST prefix in the past will now have to find a home for courses that they teach? GOULD answered yes, and that this will likely happen as a result of negotiations in progress between Student Affairs and Public Administration. On behalf of faculty who regularly work with Chiron Studies, WENDL asked if the EPC was recommending that Chiron Studies continue offering classes for credit; and if so, was it with the understanding that each class must have a faculty adviser who is willing to take that class to their home department and see it through the outlined process? GOULD answered that EPC is giving Chiron Studies this opportunity to come under faculty governance and departmental curricular review, if it does continue. WENDL then asked whether it would be the home academic unit's responsibility to fund the proposed Chiron class? GOULD said the EPC took no position on this, but that at present it is not the responsibility of the faculty adviser's department to support the class financially. He acknowledged that current Chiron funding is scheduled to end in December, but thought that there were some negotiations underway. WENDL said that at Chiron Studies meetings she had attended it had been suggested that an expression of support from Faculty Senate for continuing to offer Chiron Courses for credit was needed. GOULD replied that moving that question had not been a mandate of the IST review. WENDL suggested that Rozzell Medina, Coordinator of Chiron Studies be consulted. DAASCH recommended reviewing the spring Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Review Committee Report (disseminated with the October 2012 Senate Agenda, item D-1). GOULD added that there was general support for Chiron Studies among IST Committee participants and EPC.

## Report from IFS

HINES introduced herself as the IFS representative to the Senate Steering Committee. She explain her participation as an IFS effort to become a more representational and effective body, and to improve communication between IFS and local University Senates. As a result, she was able to bring the topic of implementing the new OAR faculty ranks to the November IFS meeting and IFS has formed a sub-committee to look at the issue. It is clear that the effects of the OARs differ vastly on each campus.

HINES reported that IFS is seeking a voice at OEIB (Oregon Education Investment Board) meetings, and considering how to mobilize campuses around the issue of the Achievement Compact's concentration on output metrics and less on quality assessment. Vice-Chancellor Melody Rose reported that the relationship between the OEIB, the OUS Board, and the HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission) is still in flux, but HECC will be looking at three issues: 1) textbook affordability, 2) credit for prior learning, and 3) the Western Governor's University.

LIEBMAN asked if there has been talk of how IFS might be involved in OEIB. HINES answered that the Governor has not yet allowed for any IFS representation; IFS is arguing that it is a body that represents all the universities in the OUS System. (See <http://www.oregon.gov/Gov/Pages/oeib/OregonEducationInvestmentBoard.aspx> )

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

## **PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 2013

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Berrettini, Beyler, Boas, Brown, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flores, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Hansen, Harmon, Hart, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, Jones, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Meekishko, Medovoi, Mercer, Ott, Palmiter, Pease, Recktenwald, Reese, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Smith, Stevens, Talbott, Taylor, Tretheway, Weasel, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Bowman for Beasley, Greco for Hanoosh, Bajore for Hunt-Morse, Holt for Jaen-Portillo, Hatfield for O'Banion, Hellerman for Santelmann

**Members Absent:** Greenstadt, Holliday, Liebman, Lubitow, Miller, Newsom, Pullman, Wendl

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Aylmer, Brown, Cunliffe, Everett, Faaleava, Fallon, Fink, Flower, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, Mack, Reynolds, Rimai, Sestak, Shusterman, Su, Teuscher, Wiewel.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2012 MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The minutes were approved as published.

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

DAASCH reminded senators that an email to the Senate list serve goes to everyone. He encouraged all senators to take advantage of their individual district email list to communicate with constituents.

Vice President for University Advancement Francoise Aylmer and Assistant VP for Advancement Services Amanda Jarman presented an update on plans for the PSU capital campaign and potential faculty roles. JARMAN described progress in fund raising and planned allocations. Giving to PSU is ahead of last year and overall has increased 35% over the last two fiscal years, due in large part to major gifts (\$100,000 or more), a new focus for PSU (see attached slides). Funds raised have an impact all over campus (slide 5). AYLMEER reported that PSU has decided that it will focus on three lead campaigns to get ready for the big campaign to come (50 million for scholarships, and capital projects for the School of Business and the Viking

Pavilion). The big Campaign will aim higher, and AYLMER noted that a large percentage of its proposed fund-raising goals have still not been prioritized, so there is still much work to do. JARMAN described lead campaign activities (slide 7), noting that the scholarship campaign is closest to its goal. They have reviewed PSU data bases and identified a “discovery pool” of 43,000 potential donors, including a significant number with high “capacity” and high affinity for PSU (slides 9 & 10). AYLMER stated that the priorities of the Campaign are set by the academic side of the University and by faculty working with their chairs, and chairs with the deans and provost. She believes that PSU has the capacity to reach 300 million or more. She invited faculty to help make the case for PSU’s efforts to transform the institution, to talk with donors about the great things they are doing, and engage in the priority setting process. AYLMER thanked PSU faculty and staff who are already engaged as donors to PSU (slide 13) and would welcome their continuing participation and questions because PSU is now in campaign mode.

WEASEL asked how faculty will go about helping to establish priorities for the distribution of funds.

AYLMER responded that priorities are published before donors are approached and the donors will decide how they want to restrict their support. Input to the process must come prior to solicitation. The Provost is working now with deans and colleges to identify priorities; faculty should mention their interests to their chairs. FINK added that Research and Partnerships Office can work with research-active faculty to define what is nationally distinctive and to elevate those programs in the Campaign process. MERCER noted the unassigned dollars and asked whether the University could say that a certain percentage of dollars raised beyond specific priorities could go to scholarships. AYLMER replied that donors are asking why PSU has not set its lead target higher for scholarships; scholarships are important but there are many needs. BURNS commented that departments can take it upon themselves and start with grass roots fund-raising activities. Geology contacts its alums through a newsletter that identifies program needs and gets contributions every year. AYLMER agreed, noting that the Annual Fund Drive has confirmed that this can be effective.

KENNEDY asked if PSU is doing anything focused on international alumni.

AYLMER said that this has not been a focus in the past, but there is an effort now to demonstrate that the University wants to engage with international alumni. JARMAN noted the difficulty in tracking international alums post graduation and she would welcome any information that faculty might contribute to update their database.

DAASCH asked if there were fund-raising scale that suggested what dollar amount might be transformative for an institution like PSU. AYLMER said not so much in terms of dollars, but in terms of ranking. They are working to increase the University endowment.

#### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

The curricular proposals as listed in “E-1” were approved by unanimous voice vote.

### **2. Proposal to allow Bachelors + Masters Degree Programs**

Margaret Everett, Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, outlined a proposal to allow PSU programs to launch Bachelors + Masters Degree Programs under a new model developed by Graduate Studies in collaboration with UCC, Grad Council, ARC, Steering and OAA (see attached slides). The proposal would allow students to begin taking graduate-level course while still registered as undergraduates. Benefits might include attracting high-achieving students, recruiting graduate students to PSU, and accelerating the time to completion of a Masters degree.

EVERETT shared examples of institutions with existing programs (slides 5 & 6). The proposal defines the minimum criteria or “floor” for such a program at PSU. A key policy change is needed to allow graduate courses taken while a student registered as an undergraduate to count simultaneously for undergraduate and graduate credit, up to 15 credits. If establishing such a program requires any changes to requirements or existing courses, or the addition of new courses, these will go through the faculty governance review process. Proposals with no curricular changes or changes to requirements would only undergo a review by the Dean, Office of Graduate Studies, and the Provost. The OGS role would be to help with the logistics of implementing new programs.

DAASCH and BURNS/LAFERRIERE MOVED to approve the proposal.

BURNS asked when undergraduates would apply and sign up for 500-level courses. EVERETT said students would typically apply in their junior year and take courses in their senior year, when they would earn 500-level credits that could be carried into a Masters program. REESE asked if the 3.3 GPA had to be established before a student applied and if the requirement for continuing should be higher than a 3.0. She also observed that such programs could generate an additional wave of graduate applications that might overwhelm faculty. EVERETT stated that students whose GPA was below 3.3 would not be accepted and the GPA would have to be re-verified at the time the Bachelors degree was completed. She also noted that the cumulative 3.3 standard was fairly typical for this kind of program at other institutions, but emphasized that departments could require a higher cumulative GPA or higher GPA in the major. Departments will have questions about capacity and whether this is a good fit for their programs. It might not be for everyone. BEYLER asked if graduate credits earned before acceptance into the Bachelors + Masters could be applied retroactively. EVERETT replied that this question was discussed with Senate committees and they concluded yes, a course could count retroactively, if a department would like to see an undergraduate student who has done well in a graduate course move into a Bachelors + Masters program; but the student would need to be admitted before s/he graduated. MEDOVI wondered if Bachelors +



Masters programs typically entailed any reduced course requirements. EVERETT said degree requirements would not change, but students would come in to the Masters with a head start. Departments can still make changes to degree requirements through the faculty governance review process. As she envisions the OGS review process, a good advising plan will map how the Bachelors and Masters articulate and what specific courses can double count.

ZURK noted that Masters requiring a research component and thesis can take longer than 4+1 years. EVERETT replied that she specifically did not call it a “4 plus 1” program because for some programs it might be more like a “4 plus 2.” But, even a thesis program would have the benefit of students coming in with advanced credit. SU asked whether accepted undergraduates were wholly admitted into their graduate programs and if they could finish the Masters degree before the Bachelors. EVERETT characterized the proposal as a program of guaranteed admission to a graduate program, if certain criteria are met; she confirmed that students would remain undergraduate students until completing the Bachelors.

HART noted the financial incentives and the fact that undergraduate students in the program would be paying undergraduate tuition. EVERETT replied that this was a benefit of the program for undergraduates. She did not foresee a large financial impact on the institution, noting that the number of students would be limited and retention rates might also improve. BROWN noted that the 15 credit limit seemed to penalize programs with predominantly 4-credit courses. EVERETT reported that this issue was also extensively discussed; the initial assessment had been 12 credits. BEYLER asked if the rule of thumb might not be a limit of 1/3 of the total credits, like the current admissions rule. EVERETT said that she was working to stay within national parameters, and more than 15 was difficult to justify.

STEVENS complemented Graduate Studies on the quality of the proposal, noting that advising would be critical, and asked if OGS would share models of emerging programs. EVERETT noted the intent to require advising plans as part of the review process and agreed it would be beneficial to make models accessible.

DAASCH called for a vote. The MOTION WAS APPROVED by a definitive majority voice vote.

### **3. Proposal to revise the description of the University Writing Requirement**

ARC Chair Alan MacCormack briefed Senate on the circumstances leading to the request for clarification of the language of the writing requirement. The University Writing Council did not anticipate the range of courses that transfer students, in particular, would bring for consideration. The proposed new language maintains the intent of the Council, restating the 8-credit requirement as a requirement for two lower-division composition courses and adding a more specific list of options (E-3).

MACCORMACK presented the options. He stated that ARC has reviewed and supports the modifications and is introducing a motion for Senate to approve the changes.

MERCER/BURNS MOVED to approve the revision and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

## F. QUESTION PERIOD

Vice President of Finance and Administration Monica Rimai spoke to the question posed by Senator Luckett regarding the unanticipated budget cuts for FY13 in August 2013 and implications for the future (F-1). RIMAI stated that she respectfully disagreed with the conclusion that fiscal year (FY) 2012 ended with a relatively small cut that then turned out to be much higher, but acknowledged that a lot was happening over the summer that made it feel as if the institution, and particularly academic units, were taking a more significant cut.

RIMAI introduced Alan Finn, the new Associate VP for Budget and Finance, as a resource for answering questions about the budget. She presented a series of slides recently shared with the Senate Budget Committee that model the way the University will display its Education and General Fund (E&G) financial information in the future (attached). The first chart represents the *base case scenario*, what the world looked like in January-February 2012, assuming no increases in revenue or decreases in expenditures. In building a model for FY 2013, the University pulled moderately on all three of its major levers affecting the financial scenario: tuition, student credit hour production, and reducing expenditures. Questions were asked to try to understand the impact of different choices on programs, and deans were asked to respond to a hypothetical four percent reduction exercise. RIMAI acknowledged that the exercise did not go well in terms of how its goals were communicated or its timing, and apologized, but stated that a lot of important information was gleaned. The University ultimately issued a request for an overall 2% budget cut in April, less in revenue generating units, and higher for revenue supporters (slides 7 & 8).

RIMAI stated that, in fact, things changed for the better between April and May (revenues were a little higher from OUS, and expenditures were less than forecast, slide 9), and the University elected to take somewhat less of a cut. The charts with the distinction between preliminary and actual budget amounts tells the story: Most units got more than the previous year, but less than what they asked for, and that experience felt like a budget cut (slides 10-12). That is where the disconnect landed. RIMAI also noted that there were investments in a couple of areas (university advancement and research), adding that strategic allocations of cuts and investments to support the core is typical for institutions like PSU. Where we have gotten off course is that our enrollment numbers haven't played out. That issue will have to be considered next year. She explained that the 1% shortfall in tuition revenues this year will be managed by drawing on the fund balance.

RIMAI outlined changes to the budget process going forward: It will start with actuals, splitting out one-time and recurring dollars in separate budgets. Staffing plans have been cleaned up, to track *all* of our employees. We have learned that we need to start earlier, and work on a common language and have more question and answer opportunities in small groups. Her office has already posted FAQs, a glossary, and begun to work behind the scenes on the next budget process, looking carefully at

overhead and fees. They have published a new planning cycle integrated with enrollment planning (slides 16 & 17).

See also <http://www.pdx.edu/budget/university-budget-process>

LUCKETT: In any given year you expect certain portions of a budget to go unspent because of savings or deferred costs, and this year colleges also had to set funding aside to cover negotiated salary increases. If you base each year's budget on last year's actuals, isn't that a recipe for declining actuals?

RIMAI: In budgeting, you start with where you ended, then you have a conversation with each unit about what is going to change, what we need to account for. If you don't start here—as opposed to this is what you had last year, and we'll start with what you had last year—then you are not factoring in what you actually did and year over year your budgets are inaccurate. The goal of budgeting is to get better at forecasting both revenue and expenditures.

Offering the unexplained growth of PSU's fund balance as a case in point, RIMAI stated that, in part, it was because we didn't build our actual experience into our budget process. As a result, each year we were getting increasingly inaccurate, but didn't know why. To be good stewards of our resources, knowing why things are happening is a really important starting point, she concluded.

DAASCH reminded the Senate of the on-going discussion between Finance and Administration and the Budget Committee if senators have additional questions.

STEVENS brought a question from the floor: Given the tragedy in Clackamas Town Center and Sandy Hook Elementary, the four senators from the Graduate School of Education, Pat Burk, Michael Smith, Nicole Rigelman, and myself, would like to ask the Senate to consider a resolution banning assault weapons and high-capacity ammunition magazines and present it at the next meeting.

DAASCH announced that the group will provide the Steering Committee with the resolution and the Committee will consider it for the February Senate meeting.

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **President's Report**

WIEWEL observed that investments in University Advancement are truly paying off and every year PSU is coming to greater understanding and transparency around its budget. He acknowledged that the capital funding process may be more complicated with OEIB weighing in on both university and community college projects, giving us new competitors for state funding. He recently attended a meeting on Islamic Finance in the Middle East, where the University also did some recruiting and did hold alumni events. He noted that winter-term enrollment is roughly flat or slightly down, as expected; and he congratulated Director Ann Marie Fallon for her

role in securing a million dollar gift from the Rose E. Tucker Charitable Trust for the Honors Program. WIEWEL also mentioned noteworthy contributions to scholarships for STEM students, the recent efforts of PSU students on an Engineers without Borders water quality project in Nicaragua, and gratifying news from a study by PSU transportation faculty that demonstrates that bicyclists, pedestrians and TriMet riders outspend drivers at local small businesses.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS announced that the OUS Faculty Satisfaction Survey questions and results for tenure-line faculty at PSU, along with the American Council on Education report, have been posted on the home page of the OAA web site:

<http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/sites/www.pdx.edu.oaa/files/OUS%20Faculty%20Satisfaction%20and%20Career%20Flexibility%20Report%20by%20ACE.pdf>

She identified two of the report's most striking findings as revealing a disconnect nationally between existing policies and faculty knowledge about them, and the fact that PSU has fewer policies that impact faculty career flexibility than its peers. PSU will be working to make its policies more visible and will look at what other institutions are doing to identify where it has those policy gaps.

ANDREWS reported that the ReTHINK PSU Symposium was at capacity for the opening session in the SMSU ballroom, but the event was to be streamed live. One hundred sixty-two proposals were submitted to the Provost's Challenge. She also announced forthcoming news about a reorganization of the Provost's Office and a cumulative reduction of over \$250,000 in personnel costs. The goal of restructuring is to increase the level of service that the Provost's Office provides.

### **Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

FINK reported progress in the OHSU-PSU Implementation Committee around the joint School of Public Health and on space allocation in the collaborative Life Sciences Building for inter-institutional partnerships. Discussion is moving beyond having to justify why OHSU should be interested in PSU to concrete discussion about what the partnership implies for each institution ten years out. FINK also noted that the Research Advisory Committee met and talked about how to raise the profile of research at PSU and he advocated for faculty playing a role in the PSU Campaign and becoming involved in defining a vision for the future of PSU.

MERCER took the opportunity following the reports to request a round of applause for the accomplishments of Ann Marie Fallon and the Honors Program.

## **H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, February 4, 2013  
**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch  
**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Berrettini, Beyler, Bowman, Brown, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hansen, Harmon, Hanoosh, Hart, Holliday, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jivanjee, Jones, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lockett, Magaldi, McBride, Meekishko, Medovoi, Mercer, Miller, Newsom, O'Banion, Ott, Pullman, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Taylor, Tretheway, Weasel, Wendl, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Erskine for Boas, Baccar fo Jagodnik, Kahn for Lubitow, Brandt for Luther, B. Lafferriere for Palmiter, Walton for Pease, Hines for Reese

**Members Absent:** Flores, Sanchez, Talbott, Works

### Ex-officio Members

**Present:** Andrews, Brown, Cunliffe, Faaleava, Fink, Flower, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj MacCormack, Mack, Reynolds, Shusterman, Su, Teuscher, Wiewel

### A. ROLL

### B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 7, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The January minutes were approved with the following correction: LIEBMAN was present.

### C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

DAASCH noted that the comparator institution discussion to follow in committee of the whole ties back to a Senate resolution from April 2011 recommending "A Holistic Approach to Strategic Institutional Development"—

<http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/additional-resources>

### PSU Faculty Ranks

DAASCH introduced Steering Committee member Amy Greenstadt to describe plans for motions on faculty ranks forth-coming at the March 4, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

GREENSTADT provided an overview of the committee processes that have informed Steering Committee recommendations on implementing the changes to faculty ranks

incorporated in the OARs in January 2012 (see attachment B-1). She noted that changes enacted are not aligned with current practice at PSU and outlined six motions to address the use of new titles and ranks and their designation as tenure-track or non-tenure track for current PSU faculty (slides 5-10).

DAASCH asked if there were any questions or observations that could help the Steering Committee in formulating the motions for consideration in March.

JONES recommended expediting the distribution of copies of the motions. HOLIDAY expressed concerns about implementing the new Clinical track ranks. DAASCH noted that the majority of the motions planned address the position of current faculty, deferring questions about the new ranks to a proposed task force. MERCER asked if the promotion process for the new split ranks Senior I and II would follow the P & T Guidelines. GREENSTADT said that guidelines for Senior II would have to be worked out, but should follow current P & T practice. STEVENS requested a demographic summary of the distribution of current faculty. HANSEN wondered whether the new ranks would lead to the demotion of current instructors. GREENSTADT said no, we would just be going from a two-rank to three-rank system. BURNS asked if librarians were in support of a motion to reject the "Librarian" title. GREENSTADT confirmed that they were. NEWSOM asked whether the OAR list of titles was exhaustive, and if the Research Associate rank still existed. GREENSTADT said yes to both questions. BEYLER asked if faculty grandfathered under the proposed motions who chose to retain their current professorial rank title would be setting a future path for promotion through the professorial ranks. GREENSTADT said yes, but that they did have a choice to opt for a new non-tenure-track rank. LUCKETT asked if salary equivalents for Senior Instructor II had been considered. DAASCH said that the motions are not trying to anticipate the outcome of the collective bargaining process.

BRANDT asked if the two-year limit on appointment as "Visiting" would create a limit for visiting international faculty. DAASCH observed that Brandt had identified a gap in the motion's formulation and GREENSTADT requested that International Affairs forward more information about the issue. MEDOVOI suggested that since international faculty come in summer, the two-year count could be cumulative; and he asked for confirmation that after guidelines for existing faculty are put in place, no new fixed-term hires could move to the professorial ranks. GREENSTADT confirmed that this was correct as defined by the OAR. MEDOVOI asked if questions regarding the implementation of the other new ranks would be deferred to the proposed committee. GREENSTADT said yes, adding that the issue of how to define currently existing ranks would also be taken up there. ERSKINE expressed concern about the limit on visiting faculty as her unit currently offers visiting contracts renewable up to four years. SANTELMANN asked if the title of Clinical Professor will be voted on; departments like Speech and Hearing were in desperate need of something to distinguish clinical professor from basic instructor. GREENSTADT said use of the Clinical ranks would be a task-force question, but the title of Visiting could be used in the meantime. CHZANOWSKA-JESKE asked if the two years of a visiting appointment would have to be consecutive. DAASCH stated that this question remained to be hashed out. GREENSTADT added that previously no distinction was made between people were hired "fixed-term" for a short period of time and people

who have a longer career at Portland State. BERRETTINI asked for clarification in light of the current use of the Visiting Adjunct rank. GREENSTADT reiterated that the motion on “visiting” would leave open the possibility of making short-term fixed-term appointments at the professorial ranks; the OAR now excludes the possibility of hiring full-time long-term fixed-term appointments at professorial ranks.

## IFS

HINES reported on the January 25-26 meeting of the OUS Inter-institutional Faculty Senate. (See agenda: <http://pages.uoregon.edu/ifs/ifs.html>) Discussion focused on the instability of the current OUS governance structure, planned revision of IFS by-laws to assert the independence of IFS as a body representing all of Oregon’s higher ed campuses. The Chancellor’s office flagged legislative interest in the granting of dual credit for high school and online courses. HINES proposed that IFS request faculty representation on the statewide STEM Council.

MERCER asked if there was something Senate or IFS might do to recognize the service of former PSU VP for Finance and Administration and departing OUS Chancellor Pernsteiner, who steps down as of March 1. HINES stated that there are plans to invite the Chancellor to an emergency meeting of IFS that has been called for February to be held at the University of Oregon.

DAASCH introduced Kathi Ketcheson, Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP), to offer background on the question of peer institutions.

### **Discussion item: Comparator Methodology: Search tools, data bases**

KETCHESON outlined OIRP’s approach to the question of peer comparisons, citing the work of D. J. Teeter and an article by Weeks, Puckett, and Daron on the process that led to the development of the OUS Peer list in 1998 (see attachment B2). She summarized the purposes that often call comparison data into play (slide 3) and noted that the validity of the comparisons can be called into question by the different strategies that institutions use for reporting their data and factors unique to each institution. The numbers live in a context and the data are influenced by institutional choices at particular times in an institution’s history. KETCHESON went on to describe types of data and peer groupings, and some commonly used sources of data and methods of selecting comparators (slides 5-8). As an example of how researchers’ choices and interests can have an impact on the selection of peers, she noted that in 1998 the OUS Board directed that attention be paid to data from specific states (New York and Wisconsin). In sum, KETCHESON observed that the choice of peers is as much a political process as a statistical one (see slide 10).

LAFFERIERE/FLOWER moved the meeting to a committee of the whole.

HINES/HOLLIDAY moved to return the meeting to regular session.

## **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

BROWN/FLOWER MOVED the curricular proposals as listed in “E-1.”

The motion PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

### **2. Asian Studies Certificate**

BURNS/JONES MOVED approval of the Asian Studies Certificate as listed in “E-2.”

CLUCAS asked how new courses could be added to the list of approved courses for the Certificate. CUNLIFFE advised speaking with the director of the program.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Resolution on Gun Violence.**

MEDOVOI/HOLIDAY MOVED approval of the resolution listed in E-3 proposed by the four senators from the School of Education (Burk, Rigelman, Stevens, Smith).

STEVENS provided a handout with background information (B-3, attached).

TRETHEWAY asked for clarification of the term military-style assault weapon used in the resolution. BURK responded that it is an automatic or semi-automatic weapon with a large capacity magazine. DAASCH asked if the intent of the resolution was to use PSU as rallying point for further action. BURK replied that it is the first resolution of its kind from an OUS institution, but that other OUS faculty senates had expressed interest. MCBRIDE asked if there were a plan to move the resolution out to its target audience. BURK said yes, although it remained to be discussed whether the School of Ed or the Senate leadership would provide the agency. LUCKETT affirmed support, but wondered whether the resolution didn't focus on the wrong issue, since assault weapons account for only a fraction of violent gun deaths. STEVENS stated that the authors recognize that the resolution could be cast more broadly, but it was offered as a first step in support of measures currently under consideration and taken in solidarity with their K-12 partners and colleagues. KENNEDY expressed support for the resolution and asked if concealed weapons were allowed on the PSU campus as a matter for later consideration. DAASCH suggested the question be deferred to legal council David Reese. MERCER argued that whatever way we can lift our voices to counter the sense of a monolithic gun lobby makes this resolution against one of the most egregious instances of gun violence important. CLUCAS added that a door



seems to have opened politically and one of the concerns of some Oregon legislators is that too expansive a focus could actually dilute the possibilities for action. BURK agreed, adding that they were not intending to take on the second amendment and that the safety of our students and schools was their primary concern. MEDOVOI noted that the resolution also calls for strengthening background check criteria. DAASCH called for a vote on the resolution as listed in E-3.

THE RESOLUTION PASSED by a majority voice vote. DAASCH said that he would report back on next steps to the Senate

## **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None.

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **President's Report**

Commenting on the proceedings, WIEWEL noted that he and many other university presidents had signed a similar anti-gun violence resolution and he reinforced the message that the quality of the data is an important issue for peer comparisons. He reported that for the first time that he could recall, the seven OUS university presidents would meet together on February 6 and then meet with the Governor's education advisers (Cannon and Donegan) to talk about the whole structure of higher education in the state. He provided updates on university development and issues before the Oregon legislature in the 2013 session, mentioning, in particular, the All Hands Raised project, tuition equity for undocumented youth, and a proposal for a joint board for OHSU and PSU. He invited faculty to attend the March 6 PSU rally day in Salem.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS pledged that PSU would continue to work for a stable environment for online courses, acknowledging the recent problems with Desire to Learn (d2l) that had had national repercussions. She announced that additional instructions and "Guiding Principles" for the Proposal Review Process for the Provost's Challenge have been posted: [http://www.pdx.edu/oa/sites/www.pdx.edu/oa/files/reTHINK\\_EP.pdf](http://www.pdx.edu/oa/sites/www.pdx.edu/oa/files/reTHINK_EP.pdf).

Welcoming the opportunity to have a conversation with senators about reTHINK PSU and the proposal review process, ANDREWS stated that there were a range of options, elaborated on the website, for faculty, staff, and students to provide input, in particular, the online Comments option. She reiterated that the Challenge would be awarding funding and support, but would not be making curricular approval decisions that were the prerogative of shared governance.

DAASCH introduced senator Bob Liebman, who had submitted a question to the Provost on the subject of the review process.

LIEBMAN observed that input is most informed when faculty are looking at a finished piece of work and this work was probably not going to be available until the final proposals were due on February 15. He asked why cut off faculty comment on the day of the proposal deadline. LIEBMAN also posted an overhead illustrating email exchanges around his initial question – Will faculty will be part of the selection process for Rethink PSU awards ? – which had been answered but raised the concern that many faculty might not feel comfortable giving frank comments online through the ReTHINK website and that there was uncertainty about the role of chairs and deans in the review process, as well as the criteria to be used in evaluation of the proposals.

ANDREWS noted that chairs and deans were encouraged to comment after February 15; though an opportunity for an open input period had not been planned, she added that they could create a space to allow for open further comment. HINES asked if comments made after February 15 would also be taken into account. ANDREWS said yes, but recommended the sooner the better, since the evaluators needed time to read everything. SUKHWANT wondered if faculty required a hi-tech solution to communicate their comments. NEWSOM stated a preference for university-wide commenting, with DAASCH noting that dissemination of comments was then the purpose of a high-tech solution. ANDREWS agreed, stating that she wanted to keep the process as open and transparent as possible. MILER argued that open comments would further stimulate reTHINK PSU conversations. SANTELMANN thought that one powerful advantage of a more public process was that individuals could join with others having similar ideas. ANDREWS expressed appreciation for the comments.

### **Report of the Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

FINK reported that RSP is working with OHSU, U of Oregon, and OSU to lobby for upgrades to university information technology infrastructure as part of an effort to plan for the next decade of signature research centers like OTRADI, Oregon BEST, and ONAMI; and that federal Sustainability Center funds have been reallocated for a 1.5 million dollar upgrade of HVAC in the South of Market Eco-district which includes PSU.

### **Quarterly Report of the Faculty Development Committee**

DAASCH accepted the report and thanked Committee members for their work.

### **Semi-Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board.**

DAASCH accepted the report and thanked Committee members for their work.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, March 4, 2013

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Beasley, Berrettini, Beyler, Boas, Brown, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flores, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Hansen, Harmon, Hart, Holliday, Jaen-Portillo, Jagodnik, Jones, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Medovoi, Mercer, Miller, Newsom, Palmiter, Pease, Pullman, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Talbott, Taylor, Tretheway, Wendl, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Bradley for Jivanjee, Hatfield for O'Banion, B. Lafferrier for Palmiter (second half), Hines for Reese

**Members Absent:** Hunt-Morse, Meekisho, Ott, Weasel

### Ex-officio Members

**Present:** Brown, Crespo, Cunliffe, Everett, Faaleava, Flower, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, Mack, Rimai, Wakeland

### A. ROLL

### B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m. The February minutes were approved with the following correction: LEIBMAN noted BERRETINI urged that feedback from faculty be taken into account (prior to NEWSOM's request for university-wide comment on completed reTHINK proposals, see Provost's Report, p. 33)

### C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

DAASCH announced that in order to accommodate travel schedules and to maximize time for discussion of action items on the agenda, reports from administrators would be postponed and the EPC report would precede new business. He noted that Provost has emphasized that the recent accreditation report has identified a need to implement an inclusive system of post-tenure review at PSU. To begin consideration of the topic, he welcomed Sy Adler, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, and Gerardo Lafferriere, Professor of Mathematics.

**Discussion item:** How to Make Post-tenure Review Work for PSU?

ADLER recalled that in the late 1970s, early 1980s PSU-AAUP and PSU administrators crafted a peer-based review process through collective bargaining in response to concerns emerging in the Oregon legislature about so-called “dead-wood” tenured faculty. The contract (current Article 16) acknowledged that there were cases when tenured faculty ought to make a transition in their objectives in teaching or research and that a positive, peer-based process could facilitate that transition. Over time, funds were added to facilitate that transition. In the mid 1980s, PSU-AAUP began to advocate for a system that would link significant salary increases to post-tenure review in order to address salary compression and inversion aggravated by the lack of ways for advancement once the rank of Professor has been achieved. ADLER also noted the existence of Article 27 in the PSU-AAUP contract outlining progressive sanctions for those who are not doing their job adequately.

LAFFERIERE described how the Math Department has implemented post-tenure review, so that each faculty member is reviewed every three-years. It created its own process for constituting review committees called for in Article 16. (See attached slides, B-1.) Each faculty member can choose one of the three review committee members. The first of two meetings is an open discussion without minutes or notes about the faculty member’s interests, prospects, and activities. The second, more formal meeting aims to help faculty craft their development plans to make the best case for support for redirecting their efforts. The committee reports to the Chair who attaches comments and forwards the plan and report to the Dean. LAFFERIERE also shared a numerical summary of the time and effort involved in this year’s review in their large department (slide 2). He observed that although the process requires an investment of time, it inspires a sense of camaraderie in the department.

DAASCH moved the discussion to a committee of the whole.

DAASCH entertained a motion to resume regular session.

### **Quarterly report of the Educational Policy Committee (see G-1)**

GOULD updated the Senate on the implementation of the EPC memorandum requiring an academic home and departmental review for the use of the IST prefix. The review is an example of recent EPC efforts to balance administration and faculty governance. Chiron Studies participated successfully in the transitional 2013 spring term process.

EPC is crafting an approval process for centers and institutes that is symmetrical with the one for new programs; proposals for new centers and institutes will now be posted online: <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/19621708/FrontPage>.

GOULD also announced that the EPC’s review and approval of the name change from School of Fine and Performing Arts to College of the Arts had been completed in June 2012, after the last Senate meeting. (See June 2012 EPC memo, B-2.) Two additional name changes were announced (see G-1).

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

SANCHEZ/BURNS MOVED the consent agenda.

The curricular proposals as listed in “E-1” were approved by unanimous voice vote.

### **2. SBA Masters of Science in Global Supply Chain Management**

DAASCH announced that if approved, the proposal would pass to the OUS Provosts’ Council for review. WAKELAND, Grad Council chair, noted that it was a proposal for an online degree with a cohort model with a fairly significant synchronous component. WAKELAND MOVED the program’s approval.

KENNEDY asked if the entire program was on line and if the class would be taught by PSU professors. WAKELAND answered yes, noting that the program is to begin with a three-day on-campus orientation. The program is very similar to an existing SBA undergraduate program. LAFFERIERE noted that Grad Council had raised the general question of verification of who is participating online, since PSU does not seem to have a system currently in place. WAKELAND noted that SBA planned to closely monitor the synchronous activities and that it would be necessary to look for evolving technologies to assist in verification.

The Masters proposal listed in “E-2” was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Resolution to support the ASPSU "Tuition Equity" Resolution as listed in E-4**

HINES MOVED THE RESOLUTION, and explained that it endorsed ASPSU’s resolution of support for a bill before the Oregon legislature to give the children of undocumented residents who have gone to Oregon high schools in-state tuition. MERCER commented that the measure was long overdue.

The resolution as listed in “E-3” was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **4. Motions regarding Faculty Rank as listed in E-3**

DAASCH noted the unusual interest that motions responding to the changes in OAR 580-020-0005 on Academic Rank seem to have generated. Explaining the goal of each of the five motions relating to fixed-term faculty on contract through June of 2014, he emphasized their status as recommendations to the Administration. (See attached slides, B-3.) Motions 1 and 2 are coupled. DAASCH expected additional motions on the use of faculty ranks proposed in the OAR to come before the Senate in future and emphasized the need to account for new ranks in the P & T guidelines before they are adopted. He recommended that senators confine their remarks to one minute and allow others to speak before requesting the floor a second time

**DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE Motion 1**, as listed in E-3.

FLOWER asked if procedure allowed him, once recognized, to yield the floor to a visitor to speak. DAASCH said he would allow this, after establishing that there were no senators who wanted to speak.

HINES asked what opportunities current P & T Guidelines offer fixed-term faculty with the title of Assistant Professor and whether the new recommendation in Motion 1 would freeze them into their current title. DAASCH said that his understanding was that current and future practice would make advancement to Associate and full Professor available. BOWMAN (chair of the Faculty Ranks Task Force) agreed this was an option for those who fulfilled their department's existing criteria for promotion for tenure-line faculty. GREENSTADT added that Motion 1 precludes the option of fixed-term faculty currently holding the Assistant or Associate title voluntarily shifting to Instructor ranks.

TAYLOR noted Motion 1 affected 75 current instructional faculty. DAASCH shared the numbers of faculty in fixed-term ranks at PSU (see B-3, slides 13 & 14).

MACCORMACK recalled the work of a joint AAUP-Administration Fixed-term Task Force that had prepared a consensus document recommending a parallel process for promotion for fixed-term faculty across all ranks to be aligned with position duties and responsibilities—something lacking in the current motions to grandfather. DAASCH said that the Steering Committee would be keen to hear from that group. GREENSTADT observed that the Faculty Ranks Task Force understood the addition of a second level to the Senior Instructor rank as creating a three-tiered system in which people are promoted based on teaching. She commented that the motions basically replicate a letter sent by AAUP to OUS asking for grandfathering, but was concerned that grandfathering (in preserving 5 tiers of promotion, Instructor through Professor) would create a new inequity for fixed-term faculty hired after 2014, and inhibit the evolution of parallel three-tiered tracks with more equal status.

LAFFERRIERE asked if fixed-term faculty could still elect not to retain their current rank and if so, when. DAASCH said implementation of the OAR would be at the Administration's discretion; individual faculty would be free to negotiate. The motion was intended to express support for allowing current faculty to retain their rank and a more flexible implementation of the new ranks

BEASLEY asked for an example of how the new system would be more flexible. DAASCH said that instead of a single fixed chain, there would be branching parallel paths. Responding to Greenstadt, ZURK observed that the AAUP salary minimums are all based on ranks, so that faculty who are grandfathered in will have different salary considerations than those doing identical jobs who are hired later. LUCKETT thought it was unlikely that a three-tiered instructor track would become comparable in terms of salary with the three professorial ranks, and new hires could be locked into a lower set of salaries. Currently, the Senior Instructor minimum is about \$10,000 less than that for Assistant Professor.

LIEBMAN advocated for Motion 1 because overturning past practice would create an opening for grievances and be a huge burden. He observed that the OAR sows further confusion because it explicitly associates Instructor with

undergraduate instruction. The heart of the question is what is appropriate to PSU's institutional mission and people who make careers at PSU. MERCER asked if these new ranks are not the best fit for PSU what would happen next? LUCKETT advocated for asking OUS for a new set of ranks and rules, if we find the proposed ones inadequate. DAASCH noted that the likely response would be that we have to demonstrate that we have tried to make the new ranks work and fail, before appeal is possible. TAYLOR argued that after years of discussion we at least have the OAR to react to in the Senate as a way to effect change for fixed-term faculty; he would not favor forming a new committee. NEWSOM asserted that a vote in favor of the proposed changes, if deemed reasonable, would not be an expression of agreement with the OAR, or a vote to ratify the OAR. MEDOVOI hypothesized that if we can vote to recommend that the OAR not apply to current faculty, we could vote to recommend that it not apply to new faculty, if the OAR does not serve our needs. Grandfathering tacitly excludes new faculty hires.

GREENSTADT asked BOWMAN to confirm whether the OAR mandates compliance on two points—that the state will not allow new fixed-term hires to be placed in professorial ranks, and that the state mandates the division of fixed-term “Senior” instructional and research ranks. She stated that where we have flexibility is in grandfathering and in selecting titles from the menu of options. BOWMAN replied that the OAR is a state regulation; at some point we can only do what is listed there.

MILLER offered that the motions for grandfathering presented an opportunity to recommend that the Administration move current full-time fixed-term faculty with professorial titles to tenure-track positions.

BRADLEY expressed concern that Social Work Instructors who teach graduate students would be prohibited from doing their job under the new OAR, and that titles like Lecturer or Clinical Professor were not being offered as remedies. DAASCH replied that to have ranks for which we have no definition is problematic. \_\_\_\_\_ asked if people are hired directly into Senior Instructor positions. BURNS expressed support for the adoption of the Clinical titles and suggested that the current Motion could be addressed and another motion could be offered to address the valid concerns of the School of Social Work and Speech and Hearing. Carol Mack was queried about hiring policies and MACK answered that a hire could be made at the Senior Instructor rank, if the qualifications and job description matched. LAFFERRIERE raised a point of order about whether there would now be a vote on Motion 1.

TAYLOR MOVED THE AMENDMENT of Motion 3 with the addition of:

“NO FACULTY MEMBER SHALL RECEIVE A PAY CUT AS A RESULT OF RECLASSIFICATION.”

LUCKETT MOVED the amendment as proposed.

The AMENDMENT TO MOTION 1 FAILED: 17 for, 27 opposed.

LAFFERRIERE called the question.

MOTION 1 as listed in E-3 PASSED by majority voice vote.

**DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE MOTION 2** as listed in E-3, recommending continued access to existing promotional paths for fixed-term faculty under contract through June 2014.

GELMON noted that the category of Distinguished Professor should be deleted from the Motion, since PSU does not have that category. DAASCH agreed.

BURK argued that this motion would also create inequities, since new people at PSU would not have access to the promotional path through Professor that current faculty have. HINES noted similar disadvantages created by tiers in PERS. LAFFERIERE and DAASCH emphasized that Motion 2 preserved the terms and conditions under which current faculty had been hired. SANTELMANN wondered where the greater inequity lay, pointing out that if people are not grandfathered in, then we take away a path that they thought had before. LIEBMAN thought Motion 2 needed to clarify what the “or” pathway in point 2 for steps to Senior Instructor II or Assistant Professor were. DAASCH agreed that currently there was no description for Senior Instructor II; Senate is obligated to come up with a definition. MILLER thought that the motion to carry forward the terms of hire for current faculty had more merit, since new faculty will know the new terms of their hire. DAASCH confirmed HANSEN’s understanding that Motion 2 preserves an existing path. MACCORMACK asked what was the existing path from Senior Instructor to Assistant Professor, noting that new faculty with terminal degrees would now be hired as Instructors. MACK said criteria would vary by department and current P&T guidelines. BOWMAN added that the Task Force Report was premised on the understanding that existing promotional guidelines and criteria would remain in place.

FLOWER yielded the floor to Anmarie Trimble, speaking for fixed-term faculty in University Studies. TRIMBLE expressed the concern that compliance with the new OAR would create second-class colleagues and impact their careers outside of PSU; the OAR excludes teaching faculty from “Professor of Practice” ranks and implementation would remove expected promotional opportunities.

DAASCH called for a vote, stating that he was striking “Distinguished Professor” from the wording of Motion 2.

MOTION 2 as listed in E-4 PASSED by majority voice vote.

**DAASCH/MILLER MOVED APPROVAL** of Motion 3.

MERCER expressed concern that contingent issues being raised were not being addressed. DAASCH reiterated that new ranks were not going to be ignored, but today’s focus was on issues for faculty currently under contract.

TAYLOR stated that faculty in his district had convened three meetings of faculty of all ranks and distribution. A majority of the faculty and senators in Social Work, with additional support in the School of Education, and Speech and



Hearing, feel that now is the time to address at least one new title, Clinical Professor or Professor of the Practice. On behalf of Senators Mindy Holliday, SSW, Sarah Bradley, for Pauline Jivanjee, SSW Michael Taylor, SSW, Maria Talbott, SSW, Pat Burk, ED Nicole Rigelman, ED, and Dannelle Stevens, ED-CI, TAYLOR introduced an amendment to Motion 3 (in BOLD):

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that fixed-term faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above who currently hold the ranks of Senior Instructor, Senior Research Assistant, and Senior Research Associate to be mandatorily reclassified as, respectively, Senior Instructor I, Senior Research Assistant I, and Senior Research Associate I.

**FIXED-TERM FACULTY EMPLOYED AT PSU FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR ENDING IN JUNE 2014 AT .5 FTE OR ABOVE CAN REQUEST THAT THEIR UNITS RECLASSIFY THEM AS EITHER A CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OR AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE, IF THEIR POSITION MEETS THE CRITERIA IN OAR 580-020-0005 AND THE FINAL REPORT OF THE NEW ACADEMIC RANKS TASK FORCE. THIS RECLASSIFICATION IS AT THE PREROGATIVE OF THE UNIT.**

This reclassification is to leave room for future promotion. No faculty member shall receive a pay cut as a result of reclassification.

BURNS expressed strong support for the amendment to introduce a rank recommended by the Faculty Rank Task Force Report.

LINDSAY stated that that instructors in Applied Linguistics and others thought that the decision to place all Senior Instructors at level I seemed arbitrary and negated the rigor of the department's promotional process from Instructor to Senior Instructor. Many current Senior Instructors would request to be placed at Senior Instructor II. DAASCH said the placement at level I was to give maximum flexibility for future promotion.

TAYLOR/BURNS MOVED THE AMENDMENT to MOTION 3 to introduce the new clinical ranks.

LAFFERRIERE asked for clarification on the structure of the new ranks compared to existing ranks. DAASCH pointed out that the motion may recommend following the Task Force Report, but the Senate has to decide to include criteria in the P & T guidelines. \_\_\_\_\_ expressed support for the amendment but was concerned it would encourage action on Motion 3. TAYLOR said that the ranks would apply to individuals with significant professional field experience and licensed, who will be hired to teach their practice. BROWN noted we currently have nothing analogous and we do not have anything to make this apply after 2014. HINES said the amendment does not preclude post 2014 hires. GREENSTADT asked if there is a way to reframe the request to satisfy the need

to get the rank implemented soon, but thoughtfully. DAASCH asked if this were a request to withdraw the amendment. BURNS suggested tabling the amendment.

MEDOVI was very sympathetic to the purpose of the amendment, but it would implement a reclassification without having thought through the implications.

LUCKETT MOVED TO POSTPONE Motion 3 and the amendment to Motion 3 for reconsideration at the April Senate meeting.

The MOTION to postpone was PASSED by majority voice vote.

JONES noted the option to meet the second Monday of March to continue discussion of new business.

HINES MOVED TO POSTPONE DISCUSSION of Motions 4 and 5 until the April meeting.

The MOTION to postpone PASSED by majority voice vote.

LIEBMAN noted that the Minutes had not been approved and added the comment from BERRETINNI. The MOTION to approve the minutes as amended by LIEBMAN passed by majority voice vote.

## **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None.

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **President's Report**

None.

### **Provost's Report**

None.

### **Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

None.

### **Quarterly Report of EPC (given above, before New Business)**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, April 1, 2013

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Beasley, Beyler, Brown, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Flores, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hansen, Harmon, Hart, Holliday, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, Jones, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Luckett, Magaldi, McBride, Medovoi, Meekisho, Miller, Newsom, Palmiter, Pease, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Taylor, Weasel, Wendl, Works, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Blekic for O'Banion, B. Lafferriere for Palmiter (second half), Wagner for Pullman, Hines for Reese, Etesami for Tretheway,

**Members Absent:** Agorsah, Berrettini, Boas, Clucas, Eppley, Hanoosh, Kennedy, Luther, Mercer, Ott, Talbott,

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Brown, Cunliffe, Everett, Fink, Flower, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, MacCormack, Mack, Reynolds, Rimai, Seppalainen, Sestak, Shusterman, Wakeland, Wiewel

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 4, 2013 MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The March minutes were approved as published.

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

DAASCH noted that discussion of three motions on faculty ranks brought to the floor at the March meeting that were postponed (Motions 3, 4 and 5) would resume, and there was a also new, related motion in the April Agenda under New Business regarding Clinical Professor and Professor of Practice ranks (Motion 6), as published in E-4.

### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **1. Motions 3, 4 and 5 on Faculty Ranks**

**Motion 3 on Faculty Ranks**, as amended and published in the March 4, 2013 minutes.

DAASCH reminded senators that the intent of the motion was to recommend adoption of the Senior II level for fixed-term instructional and research faculty to allow for promotional opportunities. In the March meeting, a group of senators moved an amendment to include the option of reclassification at Clinical or Professor of Practice ranks. He asked TAYLOR/BURNS, who originally moved the amendment, if they wished to proceed with discussion on the amendment.

TAYLOR/BURNS withdrew their amendment in favor of advancing Motion 6.

DASCH asked for further comment on Motion 3, as originally moved:

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that fixed-term faculty employed at PSU for the academic year ending in June, 2014 at .5 FTE or above who currently hold the ranks of Senior Instructor, Senior Research Assistant, and Senior Research Associate to be mandatorily reclassified as, respectively, Senior Instructor I, Senior Research Assistant I, and Senior Research Associate I. This reclassification is to leave room for future promotion. *No faculty member shall receive a pay cut as a result of reclassification.*

DAASCH called for a vote. MOTION 3 PASSED: 30 in favor, 16 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

### **Motions 4 on Faculty Rank as listed in E-3 of the March 4, 2013 Agenda**

DAASCH MOVED Motion 4 to recommend against use of the Librarian title.

HARMON asked for the rationale and BEASLEY responded that it was the unanimous wish of the library faculty not to be differentiated from other tenure track faculty. BEYLER asked what the implications were for future hiring, given the new OAR. DAASCH asked Bowman to confirm whether for not faculty would be hired into the new OAR Librarian rank going forward. BOWMAN said no. LIEBMAN thought that this was a reason to be skeptical of the OAR changes, noting that the Librarian rank at other OUS campuses would be held without tenure, while PSU's practice would preserve tenure. BEASLEY clarified: librarians at U of O lack tenure, while those at OSU are tenured. GREENSTADT added that the Professor ranks are only used in the library for tenure-track librarians.

LUCKETT asked under what circumstances library faculty might elect to change their rank. BOWMAN said that hypothetically a librarian might opt for re-classification at an instructor rank, adding that there were some individuals at the senior instructor rank in the library. Their status would be more directly affected by motions 1, 2 and 3.

BROWN/HOLLIDAY MOVED to strike the second sentence of Motion 3, from the words "Library faculty will keep their current ranks..."

SANTELMANN asked, given the up-coming Motion 6, if there would ever be a time when a Librarian would request reclassification as Professor of the Practice. TAYLOR noted that the OAR limits use of the rank to those who are licensed.

DAASCH called for a vote on the amendment to Motion 4.

THE AMENDMENT to Motion 4 PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

DAASCH/\_\_\_\_ MOVED Motion 4 as AMENDED:

PSU Faculty Senate recommends that PSU does not use the new Title/Rank of Librarian. ~~Library faculty will keep their current ranks, except as adjusted by the previous motions.~~

MOTION 4 PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

### **Motion 5 on Faculty Rank as listed in E-3 of the March 4, 2013 Agenda**

DAASCH stated that the motion was intended to limit the use of the auxiliary titles “Adjunct” and “Visiting.” DAASCH/SANCHEZ MOVED Motion 5.

BEYLER thought that point 4 could be subject to a wide diversity of opinions. LUCKETT suggested that Visiting appointments could be stipulated as “non-renewable,” requesting official “Permission to Appoint” before a reappointment was made. BEYLER wondered what the impact would be for faculty visiting in the summer who have typically been offered repeat appointments. DAASCH said that Motion 5 was aimed primarily at limiting the use of “Visiting” appointments for faculty during the regular term. GREENSTADT thought that summer appointment would require use of “Adjunct,” being less than .5 FTE, adding that there had been previous objections to limiting use of “Visiting” to only two years; *temporary* non-tenure appointments at the Professor ranks could only be allowed in the future if they were distinguished from tenure track appointments. PALMITER recommended that the reference to ‘temporariness’ to should be eliminated or made more precise. LUCKETT noted confusion had arisen because fixed-term (i.e. limited) appointments had been made at PSU at Professor ranks to appoint on an on-going basis; we shouldn’t be abusing a “visiting” status to hire people who then visit forever. GREENSTADT asked if requiring that visiting contracts be non-renewable would solve the problem. BROWN didn’t think so for SBA. DAASCH encouraged further comment on Motion 5, to provide a record for the minutes of how it was being interpreted by the Senate. ELZANOVSKI objected to the vagueness of the words “truly temporary.” TAYLOR suggested a return to the OAR language regarding appointments of “limited duration.”

TAYLOR/SANCHEZ MOVED to replace “truly temporary” of point 4 of Motion 5 (referenced as the “third bullet point” in discussion of the motion) with the words “where the appointment is planned for limited duration.”

GREENSTADT argued for adding the “non-renewable contract” requirement. SANTELMANN argued that the words “planned for” conveyed the notion of a limit, and that there might be unforeseen implications if a type of contract were referenced. LUCKETT thought that the paperwork required to reappoint after a non-renewable contract would dissuade misuse of “Visiting.”

DAASCH called for a vote on the amendment. The MOTION to AMEND PASSED: 35 in favor, 4 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked why a distinction was required between Visiting and Adjunct. LUCKETT said that it was important to differentiate part-time faculty (less than .5 FTE) because their contract uses the term “adjunct.” BROWN asked if the Motion meant that a fixed-term hire made on a non-renewable appointment (for limited duration) would have to be called “Visiting” faculty. LAFFERIERE said no, but if you want to use the title, then you have to follow the guidelines. GREENSTADT stated the problem that the Motion aims to solve: the restriction that the new OAR places on the use of the Professor ranks for tenure-track faculty only. Motion 5 recommends using the Professor ranks for “Visiting” faculty not on tenure track. MEDOVOI made the point that we are again passing a motion that suggests that we do not have to follow OAR guidelines. It would make more sense for Senate to respond with its own plan for what works at PSU. BROWN stated that he was unwilling to vote in favor of the Motion, because it does not seem to solve the problem that GREENSTADT had described.

DAASCH called for a vote on Motion 5 as amended:

PSU Faculty Senate recommends the use of Auxiliary Titles for Visiting and Adjunct Faculty in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. The auxiliary titles *visiting* or *adjunct* shall be added to the titles of faculty members hired on a temporary basis.
2. Although OAR 580-020-0005 defines the ranks of Assistant, Associate, Full, and Distinguished Professor as tenure-track only, the terms *visiting* or *adjunct* may be added to these ranks for faculty hired on a temporary or part-time basis. *Visiting* will be used for faculty hired at 0.5 FTE or higher; *adjunct* will be used for faculty hired at less than 0.5 FTE.
3. The university should prioritize hiring permanent, full-time faculty wherever possible to promote student retention and healthy faculty governance.
4. Visiting faculty appointments should be reserved for those who are ~~truly~~ temporary WHERE THE APPOINTMENT IS PLANNED FOR LIMITED DURATION.

MOTION 5 FAILED: 18 in favor, 20 opposed.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

SANCHEZ/PEASE MOVED the consent agenda.

Curricular proposals listed in “E-1” were APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **2. Graduate Certificate in Project Management**

WAKELAND/SANCHEZ MOVED the certificate.

WAKELAND reported that Graduate Council found the SBA certificate proposal well-prepared and solid.

The GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT, as listed in “E-2,” was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Undergraduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry**

CUNLIFFE/SANCHEZ MOVED the Certificate.

CUNLIFFE reported unanimous support. UCC had questioned the use of 400/500 level courses for an undergraduate program and had been assured that there was no expectation that graduate students would be taking the courses (due to limits accreditation places on graduate enrollment in split courses). The intent was to expand to a graduate certificate, if the undergraduate program proves successful.

The CERTIFICATE IN ATHLETIC AND OUTDOOR INDUSTRY, as listed in “E-3,” was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **4. Motion 6 regarding PSU faculty ranks: Implement Professor of Practice/ Clinical Professor**

TAYLOR/BURNS MOVED Motion 6, as published in E-4.

TAYLOR noted that the motion had the support of all faculty in Social Work and senators from Education and Speech and Hearing Sciences and was consistent with the OAR and practice at OHSU.

DAASCH emphasized that the PSU P & T Guidelines have no descriptions for the new ranks and these guidelines will have to be revised, as stated in the motion.

GELMON asked if there was one slash title, or two separate titles—Clinical Professor or Professor the Practice. TAYLOR affirmed that **the titles represent two distinct options**, as well as three levels for each (Assistant, Associate, and

Full). SANTELMANN asked which departments are covered under the requirement to revise tenure guidelines. DAASCH said departments that choose to use the titles would fulfill this requirement, as needed. GREENSTADT questioned the reference to the OAR in the motion, because the OAR states that scholarly activity may or may not be required. This could put pressure on departments to hire non-tenure track and require scholarly activity, and was at variance with the Task Force on Faculty Ranks Report.

GREENSTADT/LIEBMAN moved to strike the parenthetical statement “As defined in OAR 580-020-0005.”

TAYLOR stated that those proposing the motion tried to align it with the OAR. SANTELMANN asked if Social Work and Education saw the option to require scholarly work as an advantage, so that the motion to strike would disadvantage them. TAYLOR replied that clinical faculty engaged in scholarly activity; the OAR itself did not require that activity. JIVANJEE yielded the floor to colleague Sarah Bradley, who noted her 15-year tenure in a ranked fixed-term Asst. Professor position that offered no promotional line that would recognize scholarly work. SANTELMANN asked if the new titles would offer a promotional path. BRADLEY said there would then be additional kinds of activities to assess promotion on in her field. BROWN pointed out that there was a prior reference to the OAR in the motion. BURK stated he would oppose any intent to circumvent the OAR. JIVANJEE noted that the OAR included criteria for the ranks. DAASCH reiterated that the Motion also referenced the need to develop PSU-specific guidelines. BEASLEY asked for clarification. DAASCH said the motion was specific to the second parenthetical mention of the OAR. GREENSTADT clarified that she opposed only the *requiring* of scholarly activity for these fixed-term positions, because that would cross a line that distinguished them from tenure-track positions. LIEBMAN reiterated that the motion referred specifically to the ranks and a promotional strategy, not to incorporating the OAR.

DAASH called for a vote on the amendment.

The MOTION to AMEND MOTION 5 striking the second parenthetical reference to the OAR 580-020-0005 FAILED: 13 in favor, 19 opposed.

MOTION 6 was then APPROVED by majority voice vote.

### **5. Motion from University Studies Council concerning reassignment of Student Credit Hours**

SEPPALAINEN/ELZANOSKI MOVED the Motion on student credit hour assignment forwarded by the University Studies Council listed in “E-5.”

SEPPALAINEN said that a proposal to change assignment of student credits hours (SCH) solely based on course prefix had alarmed the Council. He suggested that the Motion’s request for assignment of SCH on the basis of funding source reflected current practice. He noted that retention of SCH from s



hared University Studies lines followed a memorandum of understanding with the offering departments (see E-5). On the negative side, he noted that assigning SCH credit by prefix could undermine departments' willingness to support SINQ offerings and the departmental status of faculty on shared lines.

DAASCH asked the Provost what the implications were for next year.

ANDREWS stated that based on input received from chairs and faculty about the way that SCH was being attributed in the Revenue and Cost Attribution Tool (RCAT), a decision had been made to modify RCAT so that home departments would be credited for University Studies courses supported.

HARMON noted that currently there were also other department to department exchanges of SCH. WEASEL drew attention to cross-listed courses and suggested that allocation by prefix would be a disincentive to teach such interdisciplinary courses. ZURK asked why the vote was necessary if the revenue accounting tool was to be adjusted, and noted that the new policy had not been seen by Senate. DAASCH thought it would be valuable to collect a sense of where Senate stands on the issue. SEPPALAINEN stated that the new version of the policy does not adequately acknowledge the position of faculty on split appointments whose home departments, according to the MOUs, is not University Studies. In LUCKETT's assessment, the value of the motion would be to put the Senate on record as saying that, if we are eliminating the old system of adjustments of the SCH according to funding source at the front end (term by term), then we want to be sure that SCH adjustments are really getting done in the accounting tool at the back-end. ANDREWS stated that there had been no policy change; the Revenue and Cost Attribution Tool is still a work in progress and the administration welcomes suggestions for changes like this, so that the tool is effective.

DAASCH called for a vote on the Motion.

The MOTION from the University Studies Council, as published in "E-5," PASSED by a firm majority voice vote.

## **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None.

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **President's Report**

WIEWEL drew attention to the "PSU Progress Report" distributed to over 210,000 households in the metro area, and thanked PSU Communications and faculty for increasing the volume of media coverage of PSU's accomplishments. He noted the generous \$2.4 million gift from Arlene Schnitzer to the College of the Arts. He declared administration opposition to a legislative motion to restrict

employee participation on new institutional boards; these boards will report to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC). He also noted that the King-Dudley Capstone class will be testifying at a hearing in Salem on student financial aid about a proposal they developed based on the Australian model to fund education, that PSU had signed on to the 2013 Fresh Air Campus Challenge, and that *US & World Reports 2014* rankings mention 4 PSU programs in the top 50, and a number in the top 100.

HINES asked for comment on the future of OUS. WIEWEL replied that a portion of OUS will remain to service the four regional campuses, some functions will transfer to HECC, and it may be possible for the 7 campuses to elect to run their own shared-services organization, except for PEBB and PERS-related services. MEDOVOI asked if it was no longer necessary to seek OUS approval of new programs. WIEWEL said that HECC would review new programs, which PSU supported, if language could be crafted to prevent excessive intrusion, because this would restrain competition between the campuses. TALYOR asked if the new PSU board would operate under the OARs. WIEWEL thought that they would remain in place, initially; OUS Admin rules would continue to apply until the new board introduced changes.

DAASCH noted that the Senate resolution of June 2012 supported faculty participation on institutional boards.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS reiterated that it was beneficial to hear faculty concerns about RCAT, as it was still a work in progress. She requested nominations for student achievement awards by May 3 (<http://www.pdx.edu/dos/event/nominations-due-psus-student-achievement-awards?delta=0>), and announced changes in Commencement on June 16, with a separate morning and afternoon ceremonies (for CLAS, and for all other units), with faculty recognition awards conferred at a luncheon in between. She also drew attention to the implementation of recommended changes to Extended Studies, and noted that the EPC and Budget Committee were reviewing some of the changes proposed: <http://www.pdx.edu/oa/oa-newseventsmeetings-and-archives>.

ANDREWS invited senators to identify topics for conversation that could take place during the Provost's Comments time at Senate meetings.

### **Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

FINK announced that PSU and Intel have signed a master agreement to define gifts and grants, and that representatives of the Paul Allen Foundation had spent a day visiting PSU, which he hoped would be a prototype for future visits of this type. MCECS Dean Su is leading a multi-university team that is developing a proposal to compete for one of the proposed national "manufacturing institutes."

### **IFS Report**

HINES reported that IFS has issued a position statement on behalf of OUS campuses and OHSU supporting faculty participation on institutional boards, and making their availability as a representative body for consultation known to leaders in the House and Senate. OSU reported that its administration is acting to address salary compression and inversion.

**Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council.**

The report was accepted and committee members thanked for their service.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, May 6, 2013

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Beasley, Beyler, Boas, Brown, Burk, Carpenter, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Hansen, Harmon, Hart, Holliday, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jivanjee, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lubitow, Lockett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Meekisho, Mercer, Newsom, O'Banion, Palmiter, Pease, Pullman, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Taylor, Tretheway, Weasel, Wendl, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Barham for Flores, Baccar for Jagodnik, Huafen Hu for Meekisho, Schuler for Ott, Hines for Reese, Bulman for Works

**Members Absent:** Berrettini, Burns, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Jones, Kennedy, Medovoi, Miller, Sanchez, Talbott,

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews, Brown, Cunliffe, Everett, Fink, Flower, Gould, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, MacCormack, Mack, O'Banion Reynolds, Rimai, Seppalainen, Sestak, Shusterman, Su, Teuscher, Wakeland, Weiwel

### **A. ROLL**

HICKEY noted a correction to Consent Agenda item E.1.c.12 to state that the BA in Social Work is adding a BS option to the major.

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 1, 2013, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The April minutes were approved as published, with a subsequent clarification that Gould's comments on the ETM Project Management Certificate proposal (E2) were directed to MCECS rather than SBA.

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

DAASCH announced the discussion item on Institutional Boards and the formation of a Committee to Revise the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines related to the Senate Motions on faculty rank approved in March and April. A report is anticipated in November 2013, with a vote in December. He noted that he was particularly gratified to see the work/role of faculty governance acknowledged in the Administration's posting about the opening of collective bargaining, and he congratulated the Senate for their work on Senate reforms over the last five or so years.

GREENSTADT/FLOWER moved the meeting to a committee of the whole.

\*DAASCH introduced Patricia Schechter, History, who provided information on the history and status of Institutional Boards for the OUS system, and the current debate over faculty representation and a statement from Board Emily Pleck from Western Washington University. (Schechter's statement is attached in B2.)

MERCER/HOLLIDAY moved a return to regular session.

**DAASCH opened the floor for nominations for Presiding Officer Elect** to serve in 2013-14 with Leslie McBride (current Presiding Elect) and then as Presiding Officer in 2014-15. Bob Liebman and Sarah Beasley (who declined) were nominated. Additional nominations may be offered at the June meeting, before the election.

#### **D. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

#### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

TAYLOR/HARMON MOVED the curricular consent agenda.

Curricular proposals listed in "E-1," with the modification announced when role was taken, i.e. Social Work proposes adding a BS option, were APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

GOULD introduced the three motions from the Educational Policy Committee.

##### **2.a Center for Public Interest Design**

GOULD/HARMON MOVED the certificate listed in the Appendix as "E-2a."

LUCKETT asked if there were significant costs associated with the center.

GOULD yielded the floor to Sergio Palleroni (COTA) who reported a donation and existing and expected grant funding for the Center. HANSEN reported that the Budget Committee was satisfied with the budget projections of the Center Proposal. What seemed less certain was the 21% figure used for the University's cost recovery, upon which the projections were based. REYNOLDS replied that he believed that the 21% did not apply to this center proposal and new costs only involved space.

The CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST DESIGN, as listed in "E-2a,"(E.2b in the Agenda) was APPROVED by clicker-recorded vote: 92% in favor, 2% opposed and 6% abstentions (N=52 votes, see attachment B-3).

**2.b Center for Geography Education in Oregon** (numeration corresponds to appendix listing rather than agenda numeration)

GOULD/MCBRIDE MOVED the certificate listed in the Appendix "E-2b."

The CENTER FOR GEOGRAPHY EDUCATION IN OREGON, as listed in "E-2b (E-2a in the Agenda)," was APPROVED by clicker-recorded vote: 81% in favor, 6% opposed and 13% abstentions (N = 53 votes)

**2.c Motion to Eliminate the School of Extended Studies**

GOULD/BROWN MOVED the elimination of the School of Extended Studies, with a proviso added to the published motion in E.2.c as follows:

E2-c Motion 3: That Faculty Senate approves the elimination of the School of Extended Studies, WITH THE PROVISIO THAT CENTER FOR EXECUTIVE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION REPORT BACK TO EPC NEXT YEAR BY OCTOBER 1, 2014 ON ITS FIRST YEAR BUDGET PERFORMANCE, AND PROVIDE A FIVE YEAR BUDGET PLAN AT THAT TIME.

DAASCH explained the altered language arose as a result of conversations between EPC and the Budget Committee. GOULD reported that the EPC recommended the motion in order to deal with the transition of the remaining components of Extended Studies.

STEVENS asked what the consequences would be for the Professional Development Center (PC) if they did not have a good budget year. HANSEN stated that unlike other new Center proposals, the entity that was being rolled into the School of Business lacked five-year projections and only offered a breakeven scenario for the first year. Committee members had reservations about approving this aspect of the elimination because of potential adverse effects, if expectations were not met. The conditional language was offered to the EPC as a way to get consensus from both committees. GOULD added that one hoped-for consequence was transparency about outcomes. ZURK asked for clarification of the objections of those who voted against the proposed motion. GOULD said that the addition of the proviso raised some concern about whether the EPC should set conditions. BEYLER (EPC member) observed that many of EPC's questions were related to the way in which the termination of the School of Extended Studies had taken place—which had, in effect, presented certain conditions to departments. Do academic units and the Senate have a chance to weigh in? The termination does have implications for the way that certain departments or academic units run their operations. HINES asked what would be the practical vote of an overwhelming note vote in the Senate? GOULD replied that it would depend on the reasoning for lack of approval. DAASCH said that from his perspective the EPC would have to come back with a refined statement. LAFFERIERE observed that the current motion already stipulated further report. GOULD agreed that further action might be required in a year's time, based on the report. GREENSTADT asked what was eliminated; were adult education courses a component?

DAASCH invited Kevin Reynolds, Vice Provost for Academic Fiscal Strategies and Planning to respond to the question to administrators directed to him about Extended Studies and the elimination process at this time.

REYNOLDS summarized the two-year review and reorganization process leading to the proposed the elimination of Extended Studies, referring to documents posted by OAA: <http://www.pdx.edu/oa/school-of-extended-studies-review-process> (See attached slides, B-4.) He briefly highlighted the difference between the non-credit Professional Development Center (PDC) and the academic courses of Extended Campus, and explained the administrative actions taken based on the review (see slides 4 and 5). Summer Session and Extended Campus course offerings have been shifted to the oversight of corresponding academic units. Departments will negotiate hiring with their deans.

REYNOLDS stated that Extended Studies is being closed because there are no programs or administration left. The PDC move followed a year-long conversation with the Dean of the Business School. Starting base budget information for Summer Session and Extended Campus (ExtC), as well as lists of ExtC faculty (slide 8), was released to the Deans of affected units in December and January. Reductions in programming in Extended Studies was one of the strategies that allowed Academic Affairs to reduce its budget by the mandated 1.9% (see slide 9), therefore only minimal infrastructure remains. There will be some central support for Summer Session marketing. REYNOLDS acknowledged some departments will have a modest increase in workload due to the additional contracts to be written and OAA is working with CLAS on the impact of advising Extended Campus students (about 470). Faculty transitions are being handled through ad hoc conversations with program directors, deans, and chairs. A survey has gone out to Extended Campus students asking about their plans for completion; prioritized enrollment is guaranteed for the next academic year. OAA has not prescribed what course offerings departments should continue to support, but has requested a set of appropriate offerings.

STEVENS thought the Continuing Education in the School of Ed would be affected by a loss of marketing support. REYNOLDS replied that he believed that the Continuing Education had been operating independently for two or more years and the past modest help with registration accounting should shift centrally.

The MOTION TO ELIMINATE the SCHOOL OF EXTENDED STUDIES with the proviso was APPROVED: 76% in favor, 4% apposed, and 20% abstentions (N= 45 votes)

## **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

### **1. Question to Academic Fiscal Strategies and Planning:**

Why was the School of Extended Studies closed and what are the effects for SU's curriculum, faculty/staff, and students?

The question was answered by Kevin Reynolds during the discussion of E.2.c

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **President's Report**

WIEWEL suggested that the question of what an institutional board gets involved in could be more important than whether faculty representatives on the board can vote. He and University Counsel David Reese recently attended an Association of Governing Boards meeting to get schooled in how to deal with a board in ways that preserve management and faculty governance prerogatives. He anticipated discussion with the Senate Budget Committee about PSU's budget was, although there was still uncertainty in Salem about the general higher-ed budget. PSU will have to make tentative decisions regarding the distribution of allocations, tuition increases and cuts, and the use of the fund balance for 2013-14. He announced the long-awaited accreditation of the School of Architecture and the convening of a task force on campus safety issues that Jackie Balzer will chair. He also reported on the success of fund-raising campaigns that put PSU 50% ahead of last year and a coalition of urban-serving institutions meeting with the Gates Foundation to explore ways they might support re-thinking higher education in this domain. (WIEWEL chairs this coalition of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities.) ALPS, the Annual Leadership Planning Session, will meet May 20, to discuss moving forward with rethink PSU. He concluded with a reminder about the June 16 commencement.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS reiterated that faculty are expected to attend Commencement. She noted that she would circulate additional comments through the Senate list serve in order to address the request related to credit for prior learning (CPL) that has come from the OUS Task Force. PSU has a 2005 CPL policy in place, but the Task Force is looking for input on the policy framework that they developed in April. ANDREWS stated that she was seeking feedback from the relevant Senate committees as well as an opportunity to have a discussion with Senate about the draft document at the June meeting. She asked Gerry Recktenwald to provide some general information.

RECKTENWALD defined CPL as assessment that acknowledges that learning can take place outside the classroom, but it is not just credit for experience. The learning has to be demonstrated. (See attached slides, B-5.) There are many existing and emerging mechanisms, including MOOCS. CPL leads to degree completion and saves money. The Task Force mandate included making a policy recommendation; their proposed policy framework addresses 12 points (slides 10-14). The policy proposal (to be posted at: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate> )



includes examples of types of assessment and identifies questions regarding standards and who pays. The policy recommendation acknowledges that you can do CPL in a variety of ways. Slide 16 captures PSU's current policy. RECKTENWALD mentioned two approaches—at Marylhurst, where students pay for credit to work with a faculty member to develop a portfolio, and at Northern Arizona, where students pay a six-month flat subscription rate, receive mentoring and can test out of given lessons (slides 20-21). There are still questions to be resolved: What will be the PSU approach, open and experimental or protective? What administrative mechanisms and strategies will we use? Will we accept all CPLs from other accreditors?

DAASCH thanked RECKTENWALD and said that the Steering Committee would consider this topic as a discussion item for June. He asked Andrews if the timing would work?

ANDREWS said yes, OUS is consulting on whether there should be an OUS level policy that says that each institution has to have a policy that addresses all 12 items in the Task Force matrix. She wanted to allow faculty time to give input.

### **Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

FINK announced the May 8 Student Research Symposium in Smith Ballroom, and a meeting with President Wiewel and some local start-ups at the PSU Small Business Accelerator, a facility that is now being emulated by U of Oregon and OSU. He reported that the Health Science Implementation Committee that has identified three key collaboration interest groups in Public Health, Life Sciences, and Global Engagement and Entrepreneurship. He announced the RSP has negotiated an increase in indirect cost recovery rates for grants at PSU from 45.5% (2013) to 47.5 to 48.5 that will be helpful in providing better service to PIs and is a reflection of PSU's increasing significance as a research institution.

### **Annual Reports**

The Presiding Officer accepted the following reports for the Senate and acknowledged the service of faculty on all the following committees.

1. Annual Report of the Honors Council Report – G4
2. Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics – G5
3. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee Report – G6
4. Annual Report of the Library Committee Report – G7
5. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee – G8
6. Annual Report of the University Studies Council Report – G9

DAASCH stated that the reports and remarks from the Faculty Development Committee and General Student Affairs Committee would be offered at the June Meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, June 3, 2013

**Presiding Officer:** Rob Daasch

**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Agorsah, Berrettini, Beyler, Boas, Burk, Burns, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Daasch, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Flower, Friedberg, Gelmon, Greenstadt, Hanoosh, Hansen, Harmon, Hunt-Morse, Jaen-Portillo, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, Jones, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Liebman, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Meekisho, Mercer, Miller, Newsom, Pullman, Ott, Palmiter, Pease, Recktenwald, Rigelman, Ryder, Sanchez, Santelmann, Smith, Stevens, Taylor, Tretheway, Weasel, Wendl, Works, Zurk

**New Members Present:** Baccar, Bertini, Brodowicz, Brower, Carder, Cotrell, Daescu, De Anda, Farquhar, Hsu, Karavanic, Layzell, Lindsay, Loney, Luckett, McElhone, Padin, Sanchez, Skaruppa

**Alternates Present:** Bowman for Beasley, Buckley for Brown, DuPont for Hart, Hatfield for O'Banion, Wagner for Pullman, Hines for Reese.  
*New:* Ervin for Bluffstone, Beckett for Popp

**Members Absent:** Flores, Holliday, Lubitow, Medovoi, Talbott,

### Ex-officio Members

**Present:** Alymer, Andrews, Brown, Cunliffe, Everett, Fink, Flower, Gould, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, MacCormack, Mack, Rimai, Sestak, Wakeland

### A. ROLL

### B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 6, 2013, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The May 6, 2013 minutes were approved as published.

### C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

DAASCH invited all Senates to an end of the year reception following the meeting, thanking Scott Burns for his support of the event. He explained the voting process for new Senate officers for 2013-14 and announced that item E.3.a from the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) would be a report from Tim Anderson on new (program approval) Workflow Charts, with the vote to be scheduled in early fall 2013, and that

the motion E.3.b to Create the Center to Advance Racial Equity had been withdrawn. After reminding Senators of the need to elect representatives to the Committee on Committees after the meeting, DAASCH relayed a suggestion for an orientation for new Senators. Presiding Officer Elect MCBRIDE said the first Monday afternoon of fall term (Sept. 30) was being considered for the event.

DAACSH complimented current Senators for a job well done, noting the robust and thoughtful discussion over the past year, and the Senate's own efforts over the last 5 years to re-think how it operates. (Applause.)

DAASCH introduced the topic of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) for discussion. Gerry Recktenwald, PSU OUS-CPL Task Force member, was invited to provide further background. RECKTENWALD noted that the Task Force had largely focused on OUS policy questions, but it had prepared a framework with questions, issues, and examples relevant at the campus level (posted as C-2 CPL Policy Framework on the Senate website: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials>). DAASCH highlighted three topics considered in the Framework that seemed particularly critical for the Senate to consider and provide feedback to the PSU Provost: 1) establishing guiding principles 2) defining the types of assessment accepted, and 3) setting standards and criteria for awarding CPL.

RECKTENWALD shared questions that had arisen on the assessment and transferability of CPL credits: Will each campus set its own limits and standards or should OUS policy try to reconcile differences that might arise between institutions regarding what kinds of activities and credit could be transferred, or limit the kinds of assessment that are used? What support or training will institutions offer for performing CPL assessment?

DAASCH opened the discussion to the floor, querying senators about using credit by exam as a CPL strategy. Raising a point of order, LAFFERIERE asked if the intent was to move to a committee of the whole. DAASCH suggested remaining in regular session, since no formal presentation had been made. Provost ANDREWS clarified that she was interested in hearing if any additional elements in the system-wide policy should be prescriptive beyond the requirement to have a CPL policy and a mechanism for awarding CPL, adding that PSU will need time to talk about the details. In particular, other OUS institutions are saying that it is the purview of the faculty to make the decisions around how to award credit. In response to Daasch's question whether the need for a CPL policy was a given, ANDREWS stated that the Higher Education Coordinating Committee was likely to require a policy for CPL, but that the Provosts are trying to make the system-level policy as generic as possible, so that each institution can make their own decisions on how to implement it.

MERCER asked if this policy would allow institutions to say that for portfolio-based credit, certain elements need to be in place, or to specify what courses or for which programs the option existed, and to determine if these credits would be identified as CPL credits in the transcript, or as lower, and/or upper-division credit. GOULD reported EPC concern that the CPL policy framework seemed to limit where work and life experience could count, even though it might be measurable. GREENSTADT asked how we decide which kind of learning deserves credit, and offered the example of placement testing, which assesses skill level but usually does not award credit for

"testing out" of a required subject. DAASCH said that the question would be decided by the PSU campus, adding that he had seen no evidence of a loss of distinction between testing for CPL and placement testing. BEYLER emphasized importance of the faculty's prerogative as well as its responsibility for determining what work deserves or constitutes credit. MACCORMACK reported that the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) discussion had raised the question of whether a CPL policy would also cover PSU students midway through their degree who wished to propose a contemporaneous, or over-the-summer non-PSU, non-traditional learning experience for credit. DAASCH reiterated that these are decisions that we would like to be making on this campus. MACCORMACK added that in an environment where campuses may be vying for students, there may be some advantage in having some minimum state standards, to avoid policies that are too generous. STEVENS suggested that the immediate focus ought to be on the question of whether we accept any impediments to making our own decisions about awarding CPL, although bearing in mind questions that students might raise about why one campus awards credit for certain activities and another does not, or how we determine whether CPL credit is coming from an accredited institution.

DAASCH asked, taking a straw pole, whether anyone believed that the Oregon University System should be making the decisions on awarding CPL. [Secretary note: Laughter and no hands raised.] BURK cautioned against overlooking the Governor's and Legislature's attempts to align the Higher Ed system more efficiently for students; the fact that many PSU's students do not start here makes the question of CPL transferability less exclusively a local issue and one of student service needing transparency. LAFFERRIERE argued that individual institutional policies within the System also need to be transparent. DAASCH stated that PSU would certainly reserve the right to evaluate courses transferred. PALMITER added that our ability to evaluate transferred courses was already challenged and offered the example of University of Phoenix courses transcribed by another OUS institution and then transferred through that institution to PSU. BACCAR noted that PSU would have accepted the original U of Phoenix credit, as it is an accredited institution, but it was true that CPL credit granted by other institutions was not always transcribed in a way that differentiates it from regular courses.

DAASCH asked if there was concern about the transferability of CPL credit. A show of hands registered some concern.

ANDREWS stated that one of the items suggested for system-level policy was a requirement that transcripts denote CPL credit. BACCAR said that current policy required PSU to accept any transcribed course for evaluation, including CPL credit, which might be assigned generic lower-division credit; however individual departments were not required to accept the transferred credit towards the degree. SANTELMANN echoed concerns that there be minimum standards for what is acceptable for credit. DAASCH noted that this concern could be voiced regarding all transferred credit. SANTELMANN noted the difference between course credit and credit granted based on an exam. CLUCAS said that he was less concerned about transferability than the increasing number of credits that might come in this way, potentially turning PSU into an institution that anoints rather than educates. DAASCH suggested that the question of credits taken in residence might have to be revisited. HINES said her concern was one of workload. Although she believed that

one could acquire the knowledge and experience to qualify for a university degree outside the university, as valuable and interesting as it was, it would still take time, effort and expertise to evaluate it. Noting that Shelly Chabon was initiating a reTHINK project that might propose ways to efficiently grant CPL, she was still looking for a way to honor that diversity of learning that would also allow her to do her job. LUCKETT asked what granting "credit for life experience" does to the reputation of a university. It might not be sufficient to say that faculty or departments can decide when to award credit, because differences will arise; if the faculty are going to decide CPL criteria, it should be at the university-wide or Senate level. DAASCH asked Recktenwald if credit for prior learning could be distinguished from credit for life experience. RECKTENWALD offered the example of someone who has read widely on history but who has not participated in discussions with peers and/or teachers to develop information acquired within a theoretical framework, achieving a level of understanding that met some academic standard. In light of evolving circumstances, he advocated for a system-wide approach that allows for continued discussion and inter-institutional dialogue.

DAASCH opened the floor for nominations for Presiding Officer Elect to serve in 2013-14. Bob Liebman was nominated at the May meeting. There were no additional nominations. HICKEY explained the procedure for using the clickers.

LIEBMAN was elected as Presiding Officer Elect.

DAASCH opened the floor for nominations for three positions on the Senate Steering Committee for 2013-15, one to replace Bob Liebman. Gary Brodowicz (CUPA), and Karin Magaldi (COTA), Lynn Santelmann (CLAS) were nominated. STEVENS asked for clarification of the role of Steering Committee, which DAASCH supplied. Recktenwald, Luckett, and Beasley declined nomination.

BRODOWICZ, MAGALDI, and SANTELMANN were elected to Steering Committee by clicker ballot.

## **D. OLD BUSINESS**

### **1. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC), submitted May 6, 2013 (see G-2, May Agenda mailing)**

TEUSCHER, chair of FDC, explained the challenges that FDC faces with \$1.8 million in requests and funds of \$750,000. He presented the results of an FDC survey of faculty opinion regarding four alternative proposals from FDC for distributing FDC funds more simply and equitably (see slides 6-9 of D-1 attachment for responses). The survey went to all AAUP bargaining unit members; 25% responded, over 90% of whom had been funded at least once. The data from the survey is available on the OAA website: <http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/faculty-enhancement-grants>. Support for the changes proposed was positive. There were many comments appended to the survey, most advocating for increased funding.

In response to Daasch's question, TEUSCHER said additional comments on the report would be appreciated. LIEBMAN thanked the FDC for conducting the survey. He

pointed out that of the surveyed group of about 1250, only 750 were teaching faculty, so there was a significant proportion not likely to apply for FDC funds. The door for non-instructional applications had only been open for two years or so. An additional 100 research faculty were mostly funded directly. His conclusion was that the 25% figure representing those who had never applied for a grant (slide 4) was an overstatement.

## **2. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee (GSA)**

MILLER, GSA chair, reported that the Steering Committee suggested that GSA look for ways to improve student participation on Senate committees. GSA's efforts and recommendations are stated in the annual report (G-2). As the current system is broken, the intention is to propose a detailed plan for increasing student applications for and appointments to all-university committees that will involve coordination with SALP (Student Activities and Leadership Programs), the Student Affairs office, ASPSU, and the Senate. MILLER invited suggestions, comments and concerns.

DAASCH commented that he had learned how uneven student participation is currently, and looked forward to recommendations from GSA that might foster more consistency.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Curricular Consent Agenda**

SANCHEZ/LAFERRIERE MOVED the curricular consent agenda.

Curricular proposals listed in "E-1" were APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

*Secretary's note:* After the meeting UCC announced that item E.1.b.1 (Comm 447) had been previously withdrawn; the course is to be removed from the list.

### **2. Proposal for a PhD in Community Health**

WAKELAND/LAFERRIERE MOVED TO ACCEPT the PhD in Community Health as approved by the Grad Council and listed in E-2.

MERCER inquired whether the funding would be adequate given potential impending budget cuts. CRESPO noted that the proposal responds to institutional interests in health and complements plans for a school of public health; it draws on an existing Masters program that has recently added four new faculty. A market survey indicates that student credit hours generated should make it sustainable. LIEBMAN asked if changes outside of campus were likely to affect enrollments, noting the creation of a separate school of public health at OSU. CRESPO said the proposal was for a stand alone program; if a school were to emerge, the PSU program would fit accreditation requirements. WAKELAND asked for clarification on how competition between institutions might play out. CRESPO acknowledged the College of Public Health at OSU, but said that the existence of two vibrant schools of public health would be a benefit to the state.

The Proposal for a PhD in Community Health was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

### **3. Educational Policy Committee (EPC) Report and Resolution E. 3.c**

#### **a. Report on Changes to the "Process for Creation, Alternation, and Elimination of Academic Units"**

DAASCH introduced Tim Anderson from the EPC to provide background on a new process for reviewing Centers and Institutes that will be included in a revised work flow chart for the existing "Process for Creation, Alternation, and Elimination of Academic Units" to be submitted to the Senate for approval in the fall, as recommended by the EPC (see Appendix E-3.a).

ANDERSON reported that the Provost had convened a task force in fall 2012 consisting of Mark Sytsma, Steve Harmon, and himself to review the work flow for various units at PSU in light of issues regarding the status of the Writing Center and organizational changes at PSU. They worked with an EPC sub-committee including Richard Beyler, Michael Bowman, Rob Gould, Steve Harmon, and Jennifer Loney, to update and revise the existing work flow chart (see attachment B-1). One goal was to adapt the chart to the needs of different types of units on campus and help some of them to move through the Process more quickly. They are proposing three categories, each with its own work flow chart: (1) academic units, (2) public service or general support service centers, and (3) membership/research centers. (See slides 5-10 for examples.) ANDERSON noted that recognized public service centers would not require Senate review, but membership-research centers would be reviewed if EPC deems them a significant academic unit. Addition or alteration of those units would be decided by the relevant budgetary authority. WAKELAND asked if having teaching responsibilities was the main distinction that would push research centers into the category of academic units. ANDERSON said yes.

LIEBMAN asked where the decision-making authority rests for centers and what the state's role was. ANDERSON replied that the OARs give decision-making authority to individual campuses. ANDREWS confirmed that OUS now requires only that campuses each have their own policies for the approval, assessment and sunset of centers.

NEWSOM asked what defined the start point for initiating a change in a center's status. ANDERSON replied that it could start with a faculty member or an administrator, but would then have to have a Proposal created that would follow the channels outlined. The new chart tries to define the decision-making points; although faculty at the department level can make recommendations, they do not have an absolute veto. EPC would certainly take all the accompanying information into account in its review. HINES asked if a research center defined as a non-significant academic entity would by-pass Faculty Senate to go to the budgetary authority and Vice-President for Research and Partnerships, from here, if rejected, it could then come to the Senate? ANDERSON said yes, the intent was to allow for a broader discussion in the case of controversy. DAASCH

encouraged senators to share concerns about the new work flow design to the EPC prior to the fall vote.

**b. Motion on the Center to Advance Racial Equality withdrawn.**

**c. Motion to eliminate the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) and the Center for Online Learning (COL) and create the Office of Academic Innovation (OAI),**

GOULD/SANCHEZ MOVED to recommend the MOTION, as stated in Appendix E-3.c.

GOULD stated that the EPC had wanted to determine whether the new “Office” would fall under faculty governance and discussed the issue at length with Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success Sukhwant Jhaj, who had agreed that OAI was to be a significant academic entity and would fall under faculty governance and follow the work flow charts that are intended to cover units with a significant academic function. On that basis, EPC believes Senate can feel comfortable that it will have on-going input into any future changes in OAI.

HINES asked where the new Office will be identified as an academic unit for future reference, since it is not visible in the Work Flow Chart. DAASCH and GOULD affirmed that this was stated in the OAI Proposal. BOWMAN stated that the footnotes on the back of the Chart lists sorts of units covered, and that “office” could be added there. GOULD said EPC would bring a work flow chart in the fall that included that language.

ZURK asked for clarification of how the merger will affect the activities supported by the two entities being eliminated. GOULD said he understood that the services provided by the new entity would not differ radically from those provided by the old entities (CAE and COL), and he invited Vice Provost Jhaj to comment. JHAJ asked the interim director of Teaching, Learning and Assessment Janelle Voegele and interim Director of Pedagogy and Platform, Johannes De Gruyter, to respond. VOEGELE stated that they envision the same activities that were at the heart of CAE and COL would continue when they merged, and that they saw the potential for even greater support and collaboration in the synthesis of the two. ZURK asked if OAI would have the same number of personnel and be in one location. VOEGELE and DE GRUYTER said the plan was to move to one location on the mezzanine of Smith Center. MCBRIDE asked for explanation of the shift in discussion from “merger” in 2012 to “elimination” and “creation” of new entity in 2013. JHAJ responded that in January 2013 the staff of CAE and COL began a review process, conducting about 80 cross-campus one-on-one interviews and two brain-storming sessions with faculty, and soliciting web-based feedback. As a result, a new mission, vision and values document was prepared that proposed functional design and process changes for a new entity that was submitted to EPC. The goal is not just to place two entities together in a single space, but to look at unmet needs and gaps in the previous configurations.

STEVENS asked what the difference was between a “center” and an “office.” JHAJ acknowledged that the question had been much debated by EPC. He stated



that the designation “office” is more appropriate and essential to the goal of building a unit with a service mind set. Noting that CAE had been an academic unit, while COL was an administrative unit, LIEBMAN asked what kind of faculty oversight there would be for the new unit. He offered the example of the advisory committee for the Writing Center, whose role it is to look broadly at cross-campus issues, and noted Steering Committee’s recommendation for keeping in place something like the former CAE’s advisory body. JHAJ asked that the record reflect that OAA accepts the recommendation for an advisory body.

ELZANOVSKI asked what Senate was approving, if decisions had already been made and steps taken to create a new unit. DAASCH emphasized that the proposals had been working through a number of Senate committees, one of which, EPC, was bringing a recommendation forward to the Senate, where the new unit’s significance as an academic unit would be documented going forward. JHAJ rejected the notion of a request for rubber stamp, noting that the actions taken up to this point concerned space, because the COL’s lease in MCB was up. The process for proposing a new unit was being followed. LAFFERIERE did not object, but suggested that it would be good for the Senate to know when issues are being brought to the EPC for discussion. DAASCH noted that EPC has an opportunity to make quarterly reports. LUCKETT seconded the concern about belated consultation, and recalled moves taken to alter Extended Studies that Vice Provost Reynolds reported in May, which could have come forward as a discussion item six months earlier. We should try to find ways to keep Senate informed so we can weigh in on the process.

DAASCH called for a vote on the recommendation from EPC:

*That Faculty Senate approve the proposal to terminate the Center for Academic Excellence and the Center for Online Learning and replace them with the Office of Academic Innovation.*

The MOTION was APPROVED by majority voice vote.

## **F. Question Period**

### **1. Questions for Administrators**

Respectfully submitted to Vice-Pres. for Finance Monica Rimai by Senator Bob Liebman, in reference to the Annual Report of the Budget Committee:

*Why is the Budget Committee only provided the E&G budget and not the full PSU budget?*

RIMAI responded at the conclusion of her budget update (see G. Reports, below).

## **G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees**

### **President's Report**

President Wiewel was out of town. Vice President for Finance and Administration Monica Rimai offered an update on the University budget and planning process.

RIMAI reported that the University started the biennium with a \$31 million reduction in support and experienced flat or declining enrollment, counter to projections. (See minutes attachment B-2, slide 4.) To deal with the anticipated structural deficit of \$18 million in a *measured* way the University is planning for a \$5.8 million permanent cut in fiscal year 2014 (2.3%), with additional cuts in 2015. PSU will also draw from its Fund Balance, maintaining a 10% cushion, and implement a limited tuition increase (3%) along with a reduction of the on-line fee. The latter is based on the recognition that PSU students are price-sensitive across all categories.

RIMAI shared the updated Budget Forecast document in its standard format, including estimated year-end Fund Balances and increases in PERS and personnel costs (up 2%; see slide 11). While the University is hopeful that state appropriations may increase somewhat, anticipating cuts still needed in the second year of the biennium, it will have to ask what we are not going to do anymore.

ZURK asked if the administrative cuts would be considered if costs are higher than at comparable institutions. RIMAI said that nothing was off the table, noting that the new revenue-cost attribution tool (RCAT) should allow PSU to assess administrative costs in a precise way.

Responding to the **Question to Administrators** (F. above) about why the Senate Budget Committee only sees the Education and General Fund portion of the budget, RIMAI stated it has taken her some time to understand the PSU budget vernacular, but that in the future the All Funds Budget would be shared. The Financial Administration is planning to post data on its web site so that everyone will know what the constituent elements of the All Funds Budget are, including subsidies that go across units and various fund categories. (See attached slides 14-17, also available at <http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/presentations>.) She said that she would be happy to answer questions about the funds.

### **Provost's Report**

ANDREWS announced that the 2013 graduating class would be the largest in Oregon history and that revisions to the PSU Consensual Relationship Policy would come to the Senate and its committees for review in the fall.

### **Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

FINK offered to share a set of ten questions regarding the conduct and level of research at PSU for future discussion with Senate that he reviewed with the Executive Committee. (See minutes attachment B-3.) DAASCH said that Senate would look forward to that discussion.

## **IFS Report**

HINES said that the future of shared services among OUS institutions under the new governance model and alternative models for faculty governance and integration with the collective bargaining process were major topics of discussion at the May IFS meeting. Revisions to Promotion and Tenure guidelines have been undertaken at Eastern Oregon University and scheduled at University of Oregon for the fall. The University of Oregon Faculty Senate just affirmed the faculty's right to review campus policy *after* administrative review has occurred. HINES also reported that she was elected IFS representative to the system Provost's Council and has been asked to report on on-line learning at PSU to IFS in September.

## **Annual Reports**

The Presiding Officer asked if there were any questions regarding the attached annual reports from Senate committees. HINES drew attention to the Advisory Council recommendation that Senators act as a place to go to bring issues to the Advisory Council. DAASCH noted that this was another way the Senate could take advantage of district representation.

DAASCH accepted the following reports for the Senate and thanked the faculty on the committees for their service:

- 1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee– G1**
- 2. Annual Report of the Advisory Council – G2**
- 3. Annual Report of the Budget Committee – G3**
- 4. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees – G4**
- 5. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee – G5**
- 6. Annual Report of the Graduate Council – G6**
- 7. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committees – G7**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm.