

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

2001

Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2001 - June 2002

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 2001 - June 2002" (2001). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 11.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/11>

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.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting,, October 1, 2001
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Ames, Arante, Barton, Becker, Biolsi, Bjork, Bleiler, Brennan, Brodowicz, Brower, Burns, Cabelly, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Enneking, Feeney, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, George, Glanville, Greco, Haaken, Hagge, Heying, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Holloway, Jacob, Jolin, Ketcheson, Labissiere, Lehman, R. Mercer, O'Grady, Perrin, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reder, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Conrad for Dieterich, S.Elteto for Kern, Wells for Lall, Kauffman for Palmiter.

Members Absent: Anderson, Casperson, Chaille, Falco, Hall, Hunter, Kenny, Kiam, Knights, L. Mercer, Nissen, O'Connor, Pfeiffer, Robinson, Sussman, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Cunningham, Eder, Edmundson, Frank, Da.Johnson, Kenton, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Withers.

NOTE: The following Order of Business, effective for six meetings, was instituted by the Steering Committee pursuant to the charge of the Senate at the March 5, 2001 meeting.

A. ROLL CALL

B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 2001, Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

The minutes of the June 4, 2001, meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate were approved with the following corrections:

- Livneh was present.
- The Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee was accepted by the Presiding Officer at the May 4, 2001 Senate meeting.

C. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Added to today's Agenda:

- I.3. Faculty Grievance Procedure Update

Items to be entered into the minutes of the day's meeting:

- Changes in Senate membership since June 4, 2001:
Claudine Fisher has resigned from the Senate due to sabbatical leave and is replaced by Marjorie Enneking, Robert Liebman has resigned from the Senate due to sabbatical leave and is replaced by Stephen Reder, Shelly Reece has resigned from the Senate to complete his last fulltime year in the English Department, and is replaced by Janice Haaken, Melissa Gilbert has resigned from the University and is replaced by Barbara Brower
- Changes in committee membership since September 1, 2001:
M. Herrington has resigned from the Budget Committee, and the university effective 9/28/01.
The following committees have vacancies to date: Committee on Committees - GSE representative; Faculty Development Committee - GSSW Representative; Budget Committee - GSSW representative, SES representative; Deadline Appeals - one at-large member.
- Senate/Committee appointments since September 17, 2001:
Committee on Committees: Yves Labissière will represent the new Other Instructional Faculty; Mara Tableman will fill the CLAS position vacated by Shelly Reece.

D. DISCUSSION ITEM - *The Future of Student Housing at PSU*

HEYING introduced the participants, Gary Meddaugh, President of College Housing Northwest, and Brian Chase, Director of PSU Facilities. He reviewed the issues outlined in "D" and reviewed procedures for the discussion item: each speaker allotted 8 minutes with 2 minutes of questions to follow for each, followed by 10 minutes for general discussion from the floor.

MEDDAUGH gave a brief history of College Housing Northwest to date, noting that it was started in 1969 as a non-profit corporation to provide housing for PSU students as the college was prohibited by state law from doing so. The board of directors includes four students and three members of the business community. "CHNW" has a residence council, and a professional staff composed of residence managers at approximately one per fifty units, approximately one per thirty freshmen, and additional night managers. Facilities managed by CHNW currently include 928 units, 450 of which pre-date 1932, and 481 of which are owned by CHNW. Facilities are primarily apartments and board objectives include rental at 80-85% of comparable market rate, and a "green" policy with regard to management. Chris Moeller of ASPSU has handout for those who are interested.

CHASE, using two large maps of PSU and the downtown core, reviewed housing issues which confront PSU in the next few years. They include: changes in the university, the ability to hold rents at 80% of market value in the future, age of the

housing units, questions of who manages housing and how it is operated, the rent increase required of all tenants when West Hall was financed, and the new contract to be negotiated in July 2003. Traditionally, housing demands have exceeded supply. The university's perspective is changing, for example, should all student housing should stay at 80% market value. He noted the school/housing project which was shelved, the "Birmingham replacement" scheduled for summer 2002, the use of the Ondine for Freshman students, the need for conference accommodations, and other factors.

DAASCH asked what will be the net gain/loss in housing with the Birmingham replacment. CHASE stated 135 units will be gained and 230 will be lost. DAASACH asked what the units will be like and how that is determined. MEDDAUGH noted the project will be composed of 280 square foot studio apartments with full kitchens, which were designed on the basis of surveys, etc.

KETCHESON noted that a housing review task force was convened last year, and that committee shared their findings and recommendations with CHNW and Facilities. Their deliberations included questions of what should be the student's experience as regards the linkages with academics, etc.

CUMMINGS asked for a clarification of our land usage policy. CHASE noted that there are very few pieces of land available for anything at PSU, and they include the Stratford, possibly Helen Gordon land, tennis courts, PCAT building, etc. The university needs to go up not out; they need more than a half million more square feet for academics and 400-500 new housing units in the future. In the last five years, the university has added one-half million square feet of space. The question is what should be the mix for all these proposals, for example, student housing involves issues of affordability and access.

R.MERCER asked about financing of building projects such as the Birmingham replacement. CHASE noted that most construction has been wood frame, which costs a great deal less than steel and high rise. MEDDAUGH noted that every housing unit constructed in the downtown core in the last 30 years has had government subsidy.

HOFFMAN noted that housing is the largest recruiting problem for Admissions. Furthermore, the literature on housing references the direct relationship of housing satisfaction to retention. She noted, additionally, that Brian Chase is the only university member on the CHNW board and serves only in an ex officio capacity.

RUETER noted that PSU still has no clear long range enrollment plan to apply to these factors. TETREAULT noted she will be addressing that issue in the upcoming year.

THAT ENDED THE DISCUSSION ITEM.

BURNS followed the Discussion item with a short Power Point presentation on faculty governance structures. BURNS concluded, noting that the overall mission for this year's Faculty Senate will be to build community at PSU.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV., 4., 4), h) Teacher Education Committee

Senators were requested to add the word "Graduate" in front of "School of Education" where it had been accidentally deleted at the end of the first paragraph.

The Advisory Council had no comment on the proposed amendment. There was no discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals Changes

EDER presented the proposals for the committee, suggesting the items be divided into three motions.

RUETER asked for a clarification as regards the Senate's responsibility for approving Graduate courses and programs, with respect to budgetary issues. EDER noted that the issue of resources is outside the domain of the Graduate Council, and that the assumption is that the dean in question has previously addressed budgetary issues before forwarding the proposal.

CUMMINGS asked if these proposals in "F-1" parts A., B., C. are all funded out of the base budget or grant monies. EDMUNDSON noted that many of these are certification courses and may be offered a variety of ways depending on resources and faculty.

TABLEMAN asked for a clarification of the difference between M.S. and M.A. degrees. LIVNEH noted that M.A. degrees generally have a requirement for reading proficiency in one foreign language.

ENNEKING asked if the program crossover with other schools with regard to Substance Abuse curriculum had been addressed. It was noted that it had.

CUMMINGS/SHUSTERMAN MOVED the Senate approve "F-1, A. EPFA New Course Proposals, B. Special and Counselor Education New Course Proposals and Changes in MA/MS in Education: Counseling, and C. Certificate in Substance Abuse Counseling."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON asked if undergraduate proposals related to items "F-1", D., E., F. have been approved by the Curriculum Committee. EDER stated that there was no coordination with the Curriculum Committee, particularly on courses that are primarily for the graduate population.

CUMMINGS noted that certain courses did not have prerequisites. EDER noted that many do no, however graduate standing is required.

WOLLNER/MERCER MOVED the Senate approve "F-1, D. CUPA New Course Proposals, E. Graduate Certificate (CUPA/SBA) in Real Estate Development, and F., CLAS New Course Proposals."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER asked for a point of clarification regarding the origin of the \$50.00 per course fee for validation of graduate credit. EDER stated he didn't know. RUETER requested the committee review the fees for the purpose of having them reflect the actual faculty time involved.

DAASCH asked if the 10-year limit was hard and fast. EDER noted that petition was still an option.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's & Vice President's (University Relations) Report

BERNSTINE greeted the Senate and guests. He noted that we have experienced large enrollment increases again this year and the administration is monitoring the impact of this growth carefully. He then yielded to Gary Withers for an update on the PSU Capital Campaign. WITHERS reviewed the campaign to date (see attached handouts and copy of overheads). He concluded by noting that overall fundraising has increasing approximately 15% in the past year, through early September of this year.

Note: there is no recorded transcript from this point through "I.1"

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that a letter from her is on its way to faculty boxes. It highlights the following items: first, the PSU community response to events of 11 September, including the President's letter, the letter of the President, the Senate Presiding Officer, and the ASPSU President; second, the CAE response to those events; and, third, the activities of our faculty as public intellectuals responding to these events. Secondly, the Provost reviewed the Great City - Great University Series, noting in addition the RFP related to \$300,000 for dedicated research. The series this year will include the following potential themes: park blocks neighbors, sustainability, higher education partners, children and family.

TETREAULT discussed enrollment and enrollment management issues. This year to date, headcount is up 7%, FTE is up 4% , and SCH is up 7.4%. There are currently pilots in self-supporting courses. Last year's Enrollment Management Committee subcommittee report will be placed in the Library, and this year the committee has been reorganized and is composed of senior administrators.

Vice President's (Finance & Administration) Report

PERNSTEINER thanked the assembled faculty for "what you have done to make this university so attractive" to our students, and for "staying the course..."
 PERNSTEINER continued, the university was successful in securing the budget from the legislature that was presented to the Budget Committee in June, and all are pleased that we did not have effect any major cuts.

The PSU energy bill has risen from \$430. per hour before 1 October to \$645. per hour after 1 October due to a 49.6% rate increase. We had set aside \$1. million for increases, however since May, Facilities has saved from 14 to 18%. This savings can be improved upon by doing two additional things, remember to turn off lights in classrooms and offices, and contacting Facilities whenever room temperatures are too warm or too cold.

SHUSTERMAN noted that more information regarding conservation would help, for example, reminders that doors remain closed at Hoffman Hall so that the system can self-correct temperature problems. CRAWSHAW agreed, noting that people may not be sure of how often to turn off fluorescent lighting. HAAKEN asked if a conservation campaign is planned. PERNSTEINER noted there will be continued attention in this area.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Interim Report

FRANK reported for the committee, noting that quarterly reports are planned this year, and that the draft NCAA report is completed and on the web at <http://www.president.pdx.edu/reports/ncaa/>.

2. President's Assessment Initiative Update

LIEBERMAN directed attentions to "I-2" in the Agenda mailing and reviewed Assessment activities planned for this year.

3. Information Item Concerning Faculty Grievance(non-contractual) Procedures

PRATT, reporting after "G", presented the information, noting that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Grievance Procedures has additional work to complete this fall as a result of recent changes in Oregon Administrative Rules made by the State Board which have effected the PSU rule(OAR 577-042-). The university has declared temporary changes to the rule to be in effect for 120 days, and copies are available in Academic Affairs.

J. SELECTION OF DISCUSSION ITEM FOR NOVEMBER 2001 MEETING

DAASCH/MERCER MOVED the Senate address the issue of Intellectual Property, and Robert Daasch will be responsible for preparing for the discussion.

DAASCH indicated that he did not have details in place as yet, but was willing to serve as moderator and organize the issues and presenters.

BRENNAN requested that televised lectures be included in the discussion, as they are being re-used. _____ noted there is a recent article in *Academe* relevant to this item. RUETER noted that the Senate might also consider the option of no discussion item in November.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 5, 2001
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Ames, Arante, Barton, Becker, Biolsi, Brennan, Brodowicz, Brower, Cabelly, Casperson, Chenoweth, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Glanville, Greco, Haaken, Hagge, Harmon, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Holloway, Hunter, Jacob, Kern, Ketcheson, Knights, Lehman, R. Mercer, O'Grady, Perrin, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reder, Robinson, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shusterman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Wetzel, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Migliore for Anderson, Kim for Bleiler, Lynch for Dieterich, Wallace for Gelmon, Heuser for Jolin, McCormack for Labissiere, Allen for O'Connor, Morgan for Shinn.

Members Absent: Bjork, Bizjak, Burns, Carter, Chaille, Chapman, Enneking, Falco, George, Hall, Heying, Kenny, Kiam, Lall, L. Mercer, Nissen, Palmiter, Pfeiffer, Rogers, Sussman, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Cunningham, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Livneh, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Pfingsten, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Withers.

NOTE: The following Order of Business, effective for six meetings, was instituted by the Steering Committee pursuant to the charge of the Senate at the March 5, 2001 meeting.

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 1, 2001, meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate were approved with the following corrections:

- Robinson, SES was present.

BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following changes in committee and senate appointments since October 2001 have been entered into the minutes of this meeting:

Steven Harmon, SES representative to the Faculty Senate, has replaced Patrick Feeney in the Senate, due to Feeney's concurrent resignation from the Senate and the university. Jeanne Enders, SBA representative to the Faculty Development Committee, has resigned from the committee.

Special Assistant to the President Diman previewed the NCAA Accreditation Team Visit. DIMAN noted that the accreditation team will visit the PSU campus December 4-6, 2001, and are scheduled to meet with several specific faculty groups, including the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the IAB, the coaches, people from the booster club, Director of Athletics, the NCAA athletic representative, the steering committee that prepared the report, and other people on campus. The five areas of interest are: governance, rules compliance, academic integrity, fiscal and finance, and equity and welfare. There will be ample opportunity for others to talk to representatives on the team at some point during their visit. There is a copy of the self-study in the Reserve Library, and Senators are also welcome to call (5-5271) to obtain a personal copy until they are gone.

C. DISCUSSION ITEM - *Intellectual Property*

DAASCH introduced the item, reviewing issues listed in "D1," what is it, who owns it, how are we going to use it, who is going to fund the distribution of it, and what are the emerging issues and disputes. Vice Provosts Feyerherm and Pratt have been asked to discuss the issue, and hopefully, address the five questions above in the process.

PRATT took the floor to review the administrative rules and internal management directives with respect to intellectual property. The objective is to develop but not keep it. What you do is owned by the Board of Education. There are three steps. The person with the property who wants to protect it has to disclose it to the university, through the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. Graduate students employed by us, are also covered by the same rules, by the way. It must be disclosed to the technology transfer officer on a standard form. A decision is then made as to whether we have an equity interest in the property, whether the property is developable and who should undertake that development. Once into the development phase, it becomes fairly complex as to who is the developer. The disclosure step is confidential and there is some counseling that goes on. We don't want to release things that have value until we are ready to release them. The decision making step determines who has the equity interest, _____. The focus of everything we do and policy developed have been for patent protection, as opposed to copyright protection. Inventions that are not considered work for hire, that is, not done by university assignment, are not considered for this type of protection. Things done in the context of sponsored agreements, e.g. sponsored research, are considered to be work for hire. Copyright materials have become more complex. These types of materials are considered work for hire if done in an assignment, but not if there is minimal university oversight. Therefore, if the university expends considerable resources, then it is work for hire.

Other things, like modules in courses posted on the web, are considered to be things where the rights are ceded to the author like textbooks, etc. The rules are in division 43 of the OARs, in an extensive list of internal management directives.

REDER asked _____. PRATT stated if the university asks, assigns and supplies resources, that is work for hire, but if you do it on your own because you thought it a useful thing to do in the context of a course, those rights are ceded to you as the author or developer. The rule says these types of educational materials, if copyrighted at all, should be so in the name of the author.

DAASCH asked for a clarification of the apparent contradiction between disclosure and research, as research usually means something is being developed. PRATT stated that at some point in the research you may discover something which may be patented, and it is at that point that you are obligated to disclose that, so it can be protected for the university. There are two layers, our own state rules, and federal rules. Industrially sponsored research is the tricky part. Almost all of those agreement are idiosyncratic, and almost always in the industrial context, the people ask us to do something with their intellectual property but they almost always want to extract an agreement that the outcome is theirs.

FEYERHERM noted that one of the stickiest issues is how we deal with for-profit entities. The university system has come up against an IRS rule regarding private use of public facilities, including those related to tax exempt bonds, which states that private use of a public facility in excess of 10% makes that facility private, in other words taxable. There are a number of ways around this, for example, some things the IRS calls "safe harbors." However, there are a number of relationships defined as one on one between the investigator and the company, and there are problems with those. There are ways around these, but they are all idiosyncratic. The issue of commercialization and tech transfer is the second issue, especially since the retirement of Bill Savery, who was an expert on this. PSU has entered into a relationship with OHSU, who has an office of at least eight individuals and can evaluate the development.

DAASCH asked if OIRP also oversees education and teaching issues, such as distance learning. FEYERHERM stated that a policy is being developed by a team in the office, including Barbara Sestak, which can facilitate the appropriate determination.

RECTENWALD asked if all these issues are on the State Board's radar screen. FEYERHERM stated, yes, and there was a recent full afternoon meeting with respect to finding a solution. They are looking to individual campuses for a solution to the copyright issue to emerge.

BRENNAN asked where distance learning educational materials are currently considered to reside. FEYERHERM stated that for the time being they are copyright

(not patent) issues. It should work out that most things will belong to the faculty member who developed them, but at the moment it is a work in progress.

ARANTE asked where ownership lies if a department chairs asks faculty to develop web-based materials but provides no resources or release time. FEYERHERM noted that copyright occurs as soon as the item is on the medium, but the standards are still in development as regards ownership. Most likely if there is minimal university involvement, the ownership will be the faculty member's, but that is conjecture at this date.

HAAKEN noted that the blurred boundaries between public and private ownership of knowledge indicates a worrisome national trend. FEYERHERM agreed. The university, however, must work under the Board rules, and hopefully it will turn out that the Board rules will accommodate the reasonable and legitimate needs of faculty.

DAASCH summarized what he heard as the answer to the five questions: 1) disclosure leads to decision leads to development; 2) the terms "work for hire" and "under supervision" gives a better feel for who owns the property; 3) users fall under two rubrics, copyrights and patents, both of which are in flux here and elsewhere; 4) distribution of funds is a hopeful area at present, and the real goal of the university ought to be to make somebody a millionaire and then worry about their cut later; and, 5) emerging issues and disputes vary from local to global and we must remain vigilant to developments.

D. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

KETCHESON made some announcements after "B. Roll Call (see above)."

Gina Greco has resigned from the Committee on Committees. The CLAS Caucus is requested to meet and provide the Secretary with the name of her replacement.

Commencing 5 November 2001, meetings of the PSU Faculty Senate will be Voice-streamed.

The Web address for Live is www.media.pdx.edu/ch53stream.asx

The Web address for Archives is www.media.pdx.edu

The Faculty Governance Guide, Fall 2001, PDF version is on-line at www.pdx.edu/fgg, and is indexed on the OAA web page under Reference Documents.

Anyone who would like to serve as Senate Parliamentarian for 2001-02, please contact the Presiding Officer or the Secretary to the Faculty.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F. NEW BUSINESS

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

BERNSTINE noted that the Executive Committee is working very hard on the 2 - 10% budget reduction scenarios requested by the Governor by way of the Chancellor, with the objective of preserving the vitality of academic programs. Preliminary figures have been reached and they will be shared with the Budget Committee and the Advisory Council. PSU is trying not to be put in the position of bailing out any sister institutions.

DAASCH asked for what period the 2-10% cuts are to be applied. BERNSTINE stated they are for this budget year, as well as the second of the biennium, so we need to make savings immediately.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT reported that enrollment is up which is helpful in counteracting budget cuts. In the 4th week, we have a headcount of 18,620. Increases include a 13.1% increase in Freshmen, a 13.1% increase in Sophomores, which suggests good retention. There is an increase in post baccalaureate students of 23.9%.

TETREAULT reported the Executive enrollment management group has met this term. The group includes Provost Tetreault, Vice Provost Samuels, Vice President Pernsteiner, Dean Edmundson, and Dean Kaiser. They are engaged in two activities, modeling of the RAM to include the budget climate, enrollment growth, the value of the cells, tuition rates, etc., and finalizing a recommendation to the Academic Requirements Committee to raise the GPA for admission. They have also agreed to undertake discussions with respect to desirable enrollments at specific levels, and the appropriate overall size and composition of the student body. They expect to enlist an implementation committee which will be assigned some of these tasks, most likely the enrollment management committee of last year. TETREAULT noted that the other thing happening as a result of enrollment increases is the ability to take some of our access dollars and allocate that money towards fixed term and tenure track faculty lines (those decisions should be completed by November 15) so that certain searches can get underway.

TETREAULT distributed the membership roster of the ad hoc Great City - Great University planning committee which includes on the reverse the tasks identified for this term (attached). Institutional transformation is scholarly work, that is to say, we don't shrink from questions for which there may not be wide consensus. The planning process will be enhanced by the Urban Portfolio, and the committee progress will be

posted there. This will be a new way of what we know, what we think, and how we communicate with each other.

TABLEMAN asked who, with respect to the proposal to increase the entering GPA, is included in the proposal. TETREAULT noted that this proposal is targeted at students entering from high schools. TABLEMAN asked how this would affect the freshman and sophomore enrollment patterns indicated above, and how will returning students be protected. TETREAULT noted that there would be various allowances for special admits and appropriate dissemination of that information. TABLEMAN noted that we should keep in mind some of the other variables, such as students with GEDs, or those such as the returning woman in "Educating Rita."

TABLEMAN requested a conversation of our "becoming" include consideration of a separate graduate school and dean, if we are going to become a research institution.

ARANTE asked why the makeup of the planning committee includes all constituencies except long time fixed term faculty, and why access money is being used to add more fixed term faculty. TETREAULT noted that access money is being used to respond to enrollment increases, and that there was no rationale for omitting fixed term faculty.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

FOSQUE asked for a clarification regarding student housing, with respect to discussion at the previous Senate meeting, specifically, would the project to cap the I-405 freeway be an option for increasing the availability of building sites. PERNSTEINER stated that he could speak to this issue first hand, having been a city administrator. There are several problems that go along with the proposal, including special ventilation and seismic demands, which make construction more costly than normal. Until the land surrounding the freeway becomes very expensive, it is not realistic to consider the option.

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, Meeting of 5-6 October 2001

WOLLNER presented the report ("I-1") which is included with today's Senate Agenda. He noted in particular that the meeting included an extensive seminar on how to generate more support for higher education, although discussion results were not very hopeful. Additionally, he noted that the new PEBB package eliminates cashback.

WOLLNER reported that subsequent to the IFS meeting of 5-6 October, he submitted testimony to the State Board on October 19, 2001 (<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/Wolner19Oct01.htm>) with respect to the absence of faculty representation on the Chancellor Search Committee. As the Chancellor Search is currently outlined, it will be an internal Board activity exclusively. The IFS is requesting the OUS faculty senates endorse a resolution, and noted that one has already been passed, each, at University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

WOLLNER/TALBOTT MOVED:

WHEREAS the principle of shared governance is no less critical to the successful administration of the Oregon University System than it is to the successful administration of the individual campuses;

WHEREAS the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has outlined a search process for the next Chancellor that does not include formal faculty and student participation; and

WHEREAS such participation is imperative to ensure a selection process and a result that enjoys the full support and confidence of the OUS faculties and other constituencies of the next chancellor;

THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Portland State University Faculty Senate that President VanLuvanee and the Directors of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education should create a new process that specifically includes formal participation by representatives of OUS faculty and students in the evaluation of candidates and the selection of the new chancellor.

TALBOTT asked if there is any sentiment on the board in favor of including faculty in the search. WOLLNER stated that certain board members are in favor of wider representation, and feel that this action would help, and he can provide the names and addresses of those individuals.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

2. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Computing

DRISCOLL AND RHODES, outgoing and incoming chairs, presented the report. DRISCOLL outlined the committee's activities with overheads (attached), including the "SWOT" planning process which was assisted by Alan Zeiber, CAE. DRISCOLL noted he will add relevant materials to the OIT web page.

RHODES reviewed a list of the concrete changes implemented as a result of committee recommendations last year, with overheads (attached). RHODES noted the committee also worked on some of the web page development issues referenced in the discussion item on Intellectual Property earlier in the meeting.

_____ (tape damage, approximately 1.5 minute)

FOSQUE noted that Art submitted a technology proposal two years ago, and it is not in this list. DRISCOLL recommended that Art get in touch with Mark Gregory, OIT Director, to find the proposal.

3. President's Diversity Initiative Update

LIEBERMAN reviewed progress on the initiative, outlined in "I-3."

RUETER asked for a clarification of definitions. LIEBERMAN noted that for hiring, the groupings are principally ethnic, but that for internal initiatives such as professional development, there are other groups identified.

ROBINSON asked if we have data to illuminate this activity. KETCHESON referred Senators to the OIRP web page, and the President's Home page, under his initiatives.

4. Report on the 2000 Housing Review Task Force

HOFFMAN reviewed the report ("I-4") attached to today's Agenda, which was placed on the Senate Agenda with respect to last month's discussion item: Student Housing.

COLLIE asked who made the decision that Brian Chase, Director, Facilities, be an Ex officio member of the CHNW Board.

R.MERCER asked if these findings were shared with College Housing Northwest and Facilities, and if so, what were their responses. HOFFMAN stated the information was shared and was freely available to all parties.

5. ASPSU Report

CUNNINGHAM reported on ASPSU's initiatives for 2001-02. They commenced the year by registering 800 voters this fall, in spite of the fact that it is not a major election year. They have three campaigns for the year: 1) regulation of predatory credit card vendors; 2) reinstatement of a diversity requirement in the curriculum; and, 3) improving communications with respect to on-campus student health care (Health Services).

JACOB asked if recycling was one of ASPSU's projects. CUNNINGHAM stated that it has been in the past. Additionally, they are working on hiring a sustainability coordinator.

J. SELECTION OF DISCUSSION ITEM FOR DECEMBER 2001 MEETING

KETCHESON noted there are no formal proposals, but two topics have been forwarded, Scheduling and Markers for the Baccalaureate degree. After some discussion of the options, Markers for the Baccalaureate degree was selected by a simple vote of hands.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 2001
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Anderson, Arante, Barton, Becker, Biolsi, Bjork, Bleiler, Brennan, Brodowicz, Brower, Burns, Cabelly, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Enneking, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Glanville, Haaken, Hagge, Hall, Harmon, Heying, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Holloway, Jacob, Jolin, Kenny, Kern, Ketcheson, Knights, Lall, R. Mercer, Nissen, O'Connor, O'Grady, Palmiter, Perrin, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reder, Robinson, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shusterman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Wang, Wetzel, Wollner, Wosley-George.

Alternates Present: Allen for Chenoweth, Wallace for Gelmon, Atkinson for George.

Members Absent: Agorsah, Ames, Carter, Falco, Flower, Greco, Hunter, Kiam, Labissière, Lehman, L. Mercer, Pfeiffer, Rogers, Shinn, Sussman, Walsh.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Burman Driscoll, Eder, Feyerherm, Fuller, Da.Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Kathleen Smith for Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pfingsten, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 3, 2001, meeting, were approved with the following corrections:

Jane Kristof was present on 1 October and 5 November.

Brief Announcements

Commencing 3 December 2001, meetings of the PSU Faculty Senate are voice-streamed, and may be accessed at:

Live: <http://www.media.pdx.edu/FacultySenate.asy>

Archive: <http://www.media.pdx.edu>

Added to today's agenda:

I.4. Response to the Senate from Chancellor Cox with respect to the Chancellor Search resolution of November 5, 2001.

Changes in Senate/committee memberships since November 5, 2001:

- Nancy Perrin has resigned from the university effective 12/31/01. Her Senate replacement will be Ma-Ji Rhee, and her Advisory Council replacement will be Nancy Bowers.
- Gina Greco has resigned from the Faculty Senate and will be replaced by Lisa Weasel.
- Gina Greco's replacement on the Committee on Committees is Ma-Ji Rhee.

C. DISCUSSION ITEM - *MARKERS FOR THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE*

BURNS noted that Sandra Rosengrant, past chair of ARC will provide background, Terry Rhodes, Vice Provost for Curriculum will speak on present activities, and William Becker, Assessment Council chair, will address the relationship to assessment. (overheads attached)

ROSENGRANT noted that prior to 1986, candidates for the B.A. degree were required to complete 36 credits from Arts and Letters, to include two years of a foreign language. Candidates for the B.S. were required to complete 36 credits in Sciences/Social Sciences. In 1986, requirements for the B.A. were changed to include only two years of a foreign language, the assumption being that two years were close to the 36 hours. However, as many students enter PSU with foreign language proficiency beyond the two-year level, the effect of that change was to eliminate the B.A. requirement for many students. About 1997, Carl Wamser and Bill Becker forwarded a proposal to change the B.S. requirement, to include a Science requirement of 12 credits, so that non-science majors would be required to take science. About 1999, the B.A. was changed to make it more parallel to the B.S. by requiring a student to have completed 12 credits of Arts and Letters, with a minimum of 4 from FPA, and the current foreign language requirement of 4 credits of 203 or above. As research in preparation for approving these changes, the ARC reviewed baccalaureate requirements at approximately 24 other institutions. They found that approximately one-half made no distinction between the B.A./B.S. options at the institution level, and at institutions with differentiation, the major department determined those requirements. The other half of the programs examined had structures similar to ours. The groups that worked on these issues all felt that further work remained to be done in order to fully integrate baccalaureate requirements.

RHODES stated that PSU has received recognition with respect to University Studies, and as a result of that we received an invitation from the AACU, along with 23 other schools, to pursue a national conversation, entitled "Greater Expectations," about what a liberal education is and what will be the new challenges in this century. The institutions range from comprehensive universities to community colleges. A five-member institutional team was identified last year, and includes Rhodes, Marvin Kaiser, Lisa Weasel, Candyce Reynolds, and Darrell Brown. In conjunction with the first national meeting of above, this group developed the learning outcomes or "markers" - document. Several concerns are embedded in the list that was developed, including the integration of University Studies and baccalaureate requirements, and

building on the vision and mission statement of the university. The overall intent is to be more purposeful in accomplishing student learning outcomes, rather than just identifying a collection of courses.

RHODES yielded to William Becker. BECKER related the "intentional" process to the university's assessment activities, noting that without a campus-wide faculty dialogue, the activity will not be successful. RHODES emphasized that the list before the Senate has considerable research behind it, but it should be regarded only as a list that the five-member team developed to initiate the conversation.

O'CONNOR stated she has a particular concern with respect to marker #6, which is clearly not going to be required anywhere if there are no required courses. RHODES noted that this list is not meant to undermine the current University Studies requirements; on the contrary, it is intended to identify how additional activities related to the degree can contribute to learning outcomes.

SHUSTERMAN asked if there is a plan to identify how students will negotiate a system that looks like this. BECKER reiterated that ideally, one would identify the desired learning outcomes, assess the curriculum with respect to these markers, and then determine if and where changes would be necessary.

CRAWSHAW noted that some of the items listed have to do with belief systems, and might be less measurable than other, therefore their inclusion can be problematic.

ENNEKING/HILLMAN MOVED the issue be referred to the Academic Requirements Committee to start the campus dialogue on Markers for the Baccalaureate, and report back to the Senate in May 2002.

RUETER urged that, included in the activity, should be a study of the "no hypothesis" and additionally, that we explore a majors based curriculum. If we don't necessarily know what we are doing, then we are arrogant in trying to fix it.

R.MERCER suggested that the emerging issue of Portfolio credit be included in the discussions.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council - Course and Program Proposals for the Master of Public Health, and the Master of Science in Statistics

CUMMINGS asked, with respect to differing MS program requirements at PSU, what proportion specify named courses. EDER noted that there is a broad range of MS degree requirements, from some programs where all courses are specified to others where practically none are required. Degrees are customized at the department level.

ENNEKING asked what is the range of MS credit hours required by differing programs at PSU. EDER STATED there is a 45-hour minimum for the MS degree, and the totals range across disciplines, for example, SSW has a 90-hour degree and SBA has a 72-hour degree.

WOLLNER/R.MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Master in Public Health program revision and new course proposals in Public Health Education.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEILER/PERRIN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Maser of Science in Statistics program proposal and new course proposals in Statistics.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

EDER noted that "F1" also contains the PSU policy on graduate credit earned through interinstitutional agreements.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

The President made no remarks.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT prefaced her remarks by thanking the Graduate Council and Vice Provost Feyerherm for their work in the past year to complete a mission statement against which graduate program proposals can be measured.

TETREAULT noted that the Presiding Officer has requested she address the question of how well the promotion and tenure guidelines are working. With respect to third year reviews, she reminded that the Provost is not involved with these except in terms of negative recommendations. TETREAULT noted that she has experienced two promotion and tenure cycles since coming to PSU, and five at another institution as Chief Academic Officer. PSU's guidelines lead the Provost to consult with the Dean,

which is very useful. TETREAULT indicated that her approach is to pay attention to the standards and apply them fairly, and that there are two responsibilities involved, to be fair to the faculty member and to build the institution. Previous levels of review are taken into account, but there is also the necessity to include the perspective of the whole campus.

The PSU 1996 Guidelines are very clear and very thorough, and they don't shrink from recognizing the multiple responsibilities of faculty members to engage in scholarship, to be careful and thoughtful teachers, and be engaged in the community. TETREAULT noted she is pleased to see that these guidelines contain the broadened definitions of scholarship, as suggested by Boyer, and that faculty members must engage in self-appraisal as well as internal and external evaluations.

TETREAULT noted she has heard that faculty have suggested that the scholarship of teaching is not being sufficiently rewarded at PSU, however, she has not seen a file with publications on the scholarship of teaching that has not been successful. She added that there is a difference between scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching, in that the latter is published. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities are also significant activities, therefore, particular attention is paid to self-reflection in the categories. The standards are also useful with respect to external funding, governance, and community service activities.

TETREAULT stated that the guidelines need improvement in certain areas. We could be more helpful and clearer about who and how teaching is evaluated. What is the role of student evaluations and what is the role and nature of colleagues' evaluations. There is great variety across the university with respect to expectations outlined in the letter of hire. We need to be clear about expectations everywhere, and we must help junior faculty to prioritize their efforts to meet these expectations. We need a more rigorous standard in the external review process with respect to the selection of external reviewers, so that there is a better balance between the candidate's suggestions and the department's suggestions.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Curriculum Committee Annual Report

FULLER presented the report (attached) for the committee, noting that only the first page has been distributed, as the remaining pages were included in the March 2001 Senate Agenda mailing.

Hearing no questions, the Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Graduate Council Annual Report

EDER presented the report (I-2") for the committee.

TABLEMAN thanked the Chairperson, and reiterated her remarks of November 2002, that the campus hold a conversation directed to the establishment of a separate graduate school.

HAAKEN expressed concern regarding the increased numbers of fixed-term faculty with respect to the increased number of graduate students and programs. EDER agreed.

FULLER asked how the committee envisions graduate programs to grow when the Oregon University System puts a cap on graduate study. EDER noted that proportional reimbursement for graduate credits is the problem, not a cap on numbers, and that the limitations are a stalling tactic at best.

3. Library Committee Annual Report

ANDERSON presented the report (attached) for the committee, noting that next year's committee will have a larger job in reviewing Library changes which will be completed by then.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

DIETERICH presented the report("I-4") for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. President's Advising Initiative Update

SMITH presented the update report for the Initiative ("I-6"), noting that the Student Advising Implementation Team has supplanted the Student Advising Action Council, and that four pilots are underway. The pilot questionnaire as well as other documentaion, is on the Web page.

6. ASPSU Report

The member was not present; therefore the report was tabled.

7. Response to the Senate from Chancellor Cox with respect to the Chancellor Search resolution of November 5, 2001.

BURNS referred members to the Chancellor's letter, dated 20 November 2001, and solicited input in determining the next step.

BRENNAN asked if a letter of reply should include both recommendations on the process and the job description, or would the search process include the latter. ROSENGRANT asked how the Senate would be able to review the letter's contents, given the timeline. ENNEKING suggested that the Steering Committee sign a letter rather than delaying for Senate review. BRENNAN asked for clarification on the time frame. WOLLNER stated that there are two items at issue here, the process and the job description, and that the latter is needed more urgently than the former. FOSQUE asked if we could use the letter from the University of Oregon as a model.

ENNEKING/BRENNAN MOVED the Senate charge the Steering Committee to execute a letter to the Board with respect to the process and the position description.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

J. SELECTION OF DISCUSSION ITEM FOR JANUARY 2002 MEETING

BURNS reminded Senators that the January meeting is the last of six to follow the temporary order of business, including the Discussion Item. He indicated that one topic is outstanding, Scheduling, and asked if there were other proposals.

TABLEMAN stated that forming a graduate school was of interest. FEYERHERM stated that the 1997 Graduate Education Task Force Report addresses this issue, among others, and is available on the OGSR Web page. With respect to the two options, separating or integrating graduate and undergraduate studies, there is about a 50-50 split nationwide, regarding the best option. TABLEMAN might like to discuss the issue with him before submitting a proposal.

BRENNAN/CRAWSHAW MOVED that "Scheduling" be the discussion item for January 2002, to include the structure of the system, the time grid, and classroom assignments.

HOFFMAN agreed to moderate.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Senate members were reminded that the Benson House reception was to commence immediately after the meeting adjournment and the meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 2002
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Ames, Anderson, Arante, Becker, Biolsi, Bleiler, Brodowicz, Burns, Carter, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Falco, Flower, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, George, Glanville, Haaken, Hagge, Hall, Harmon, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Hunter, Jacob, Kern, Ketcheson, Knights, Lehman, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, O'Connor, O'Grady, Palmiter, Reder, Robinson, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Weasel, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Barham for Fortmiller, Heuser for Jolin, Rad for Lall.

Members Absent: Barton, Bjork, Brennan, Brower, Cabelly, Enneking, Heying, Holloway, Kenny, Kiam, Labissière, Nissen, Rhee, Pfeiffer, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Wang, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Brown, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, LaTourette, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pflingsten, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Withers.

NOTE: The following Order of Business, effective for six meetings, was instituted by the Steering Committee pursuant to the charge of the Senate on March 5, 2001. **January 2002 was the last of six.**

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 3, 2001, Meeting were approved with the following corrections:

Flower and Kristof were present.

C. DISCUSSION ITEM - *THE COURSE SCHEDULE*

HOFFMAN noted the program is in three parts. Hoffman will give background data, Cindy Baccar will detail the scheduling process, and Pratt will review OAA aspects of authority and decision-making.

HOFFMAN noted the essence of the issue is recent enrollment increases. Winter

2002 is up 10%, and in the last five years enrollment has increased 26%. There are 155 classrooms scheduled for 7,500 students at any given time. Of the 155 classrooms, 73 rooms (47%) are scheduled by OAR with scheduling software, 28 rooms (18%) are shared by academic departments and OAR, and 54 (35%) rooms are controlled exclusively by academic departments. A 1999 study showed that PSU classrooms are schedule at 36 hours per week, while the optimum rate is considered to be 33 hours per week, and efficiency has increased since then. The most underutilized days and times are early mornings and afternoons, and all day Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. The peak hours are Monday through Thursday at 10 a.m. during which times 4500 students can be found in classrooms. The study also indicated that only 42% of the classrooms scheduled by the university were being scheduled according to "best fit" at which point the request was made to adhere to a schedule grid. Subsequently, working with OIRP, OAR conducted a study, which asked students what their preferences were for class time, and broke out those choices by variables such as year in school, etc. In summary, out of 1660 students who completed the survey, the first choice was Tuesday-Thursdays, and the close second choice was Monday-Wednesday-Fridays, and the third choice was Monday-Wednesdays. The first choice for time of day was 10-2, and the other two preferences were 2-4 and before 10 am. Undergraduates preferred morning and early afternoon, graduates varied more, but overall they preferred evening more than undergraduates. The majority of full-time students preferred morning and day class, and the majority of part-time students preferred afternoon and evening classes.

HOFFMAN yielded to Cindy Baccar, OAR, to discuss the scheduling process. BACCAR noted the process, executed by two individuals, has three parts, building the course schedule, assigning the rooms, and readying the total package for print and on-line versions. Additionally, at any given time, work is going on for multiple terms. "Schedule 25," is the automated software used to schedule the general pool of classrooms, and includes capability for many variables, including proximity of the classroom to the home department. In-grid requests are accommodated first, and out-of-grid requests are added second. After departments schedule their 28 shared rooms, these are added to the list of available rooms. After the rooms controlled by departments have been scheduled internally, they are considered for availability, but not through "Schedule 25." If the room is needed, the department is called with the request. Technology and large classrooms are done by hand as well, by a team of people with expertise in the use of these rooms. If, after rooms are assigned, a change is desired, faculty may file a request form for a change. Ad hoc scheduling, for a special event, etc. is held off until the second week of term if possible, so that the schedule has stabilized.

PRATT noted that this item may involve policy issues, for example one of our sister institutions claims they are completely out of space serving 14,000 students, as compared to our 17,500. There are games played, so prior enrollment is used to estimate enrollments, etc. The process is intended to be an annual process. It has to be done enough ahead of time so optimization can be checked with respect to student headcount, budget requests for access dollars, etc. In load courses have priority in the

general classrooms over customized courses, as well as in shared classrooms. New and or temporary classroom space has been recently added in the PCAT building, the 4th Avenue Building, the Legal Arts building, and the University Center. Last year, PSU purchased the Art Institute building, and will be moving classes in as they vacate. Additionally, the Long House building, and the Northwest Center for Science and Engineering will provide space at some future date. The take home message is that we are trying to put as many students in the seats that we have, in the most optimum way possible.

REUTER asked for examples of departmentally controlled classrooms that are not studios or labs, and if Faculty Senate presents a problem occupying 53CH out-of-grid. PRATT stated that, with respect to Senate use of 53CH, that the 2-4 time isn't very important, but after 4 p.m. it starts to become so. HOFFMAN indicated that SBA 190 is an example of a department room that is not a studio or lab.

WETZEL asked if every department has at least one exclusive classroom. Baccar stated no. PRATT stated that if you include small seminar/conference rooms, that description might apply.

SHUSTERMAN stated that the Sciences faculty has seen erosion of the number of departmentally controlled rooms for meetings, seminars, etc. The model that says unscheduled departmentally controlled rooms are up for grabs is counterproductive to the departments' efforts to increase enrollment. PRATT stated that those rooms are not up for grabs in "Schedule 25," departments can say no to room requests, and they regularly do. Confusion exists with respect to shared rooms, which the university does schedule if they are not being used.

TALBOTT asked if there is a departmental priority in the standard time grid. PRATT stated the only priority is for regular over customized courses.

D. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADDED TO TODAY'S AGENDA:

J. Discussion Item Proposal

The Secretary has recorded the following changes in Senate and Committee appointments since 3 December 2001:

Committee on Committees: Dee Thompson has replaced David Holloway as Chair, effective 7 January 2002.

2002 Graduate Council: Roy Koch, Chairperson. Agnes Hoffman to fill AO vacancy, Harold Briggs to replace Nelson, Jeanette Palmiter to replace Shaghnessy, Sue Danielson to replace Reder, Stanley Hillman to replace Brannan.

2002 Curriculum Committee: Mary Ann Barham, Chairperson. William LePore to replace Bluestone, Carol Morgaine to replace Laffierrière, Xiaoyo Song to replace Hall.

2002 Library Committee: Mary King to replace Schuler, Mark Gregory to replace Yeakley, Ann McClanan to fill vacancy.

2002 Scholastic Standards committee: Candyce Reynolds, Chair, Alan McCormick to replace Fortmiller, Mingdi Yan to replace Dieterich.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

R.MERCER/TABLEMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "F-1, Item I. A. Special Education new course proposals and course changes."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/REDER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "F-1, Item I. B. M.A./M.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies: New Degree Program Proposal."

HAAKEN stated she was dumbfounded to find that this proposal will exclude most of the interdisciplinary programs at PSU. These programs generally have much more experience with interdisciplinary studies than any regular programs. Therefore she and R.Mercer propose a three-part amendment.

HAAKEN/R.MERCER MOVED TO AMEND the proposal for the M.A./M.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies, as follows: Attachment, part 1.

REDER stated the Graduate Council is not attempting to exclude these folks, but felt that each degree needed some representation of faculty with expertise in graduate supervision. However, Haaken's point with respect to interdisciplinarity is well taken.

WETZEL noted the original language does not address that problem, for example, although she sits on graduate committees, she represents a program with no graduate degrees.

KOCH asked, if the basic structure of the program requires the student to craft a degree program which includes courses from 2-3 graduate departments, how does the student craft a program where there are no graduate level courses.

R.MERCER expressed his gratitude that the proposal has come this far, after so many years of effort. A motivator for developing this program was from students interested in disciplines, for example, Philosophy, which offers some graduate courses but no degree. The intent of the amendment is to allow, for example, a Philosophy of Mathematics degree.

GEORGE yielded to Johanna Brenner, WS. BRENNER noted the first amendment speaks to which departments are excluded, and the second amendment speaks to which faculty members may be advisor and serve on a student's committees. Departments, including Women Studies and Chicano-Latino Studies, and until recently Family Studies, are refused permission to offer graduate courses because they don't offer graduate degrees. The interdisciplinary degree program would enable them to offer graduate courses without having to support a full graduate degree program. By locating interdisciplinary graduate programs only in masters' degree programs, this will continue to exclude smaller departments from having any graduate offerings. See, for example, the problems encountered by of Family Studies.

FEYERHERM noted that the informational item on page 4 of "F1" should address Brenner's concern.

BLEILER stated the amendment contains excellent rationale for opening up participation by other departments, however the amendment as worded goes too far in that direction because there is no guarantee that faculty will have graduate level experience. It is a matter of getting the right balance. We might change "program" to "department" in the original proposal, and as these departments have courses approved they will become graduate departments.

TABLEMAN stated Bleiler's comment was well made, and noted this points out that we need to have the graduate school to decide who is graduate faculty.

R.MERCER stated if the intent is that departments, which offer graduate courses, may participate, maybe the first amendment could be withdrawn.

HAAKEN stated there are two separate issues, 1) whether a program generates sufficient graduate coursework, and 2) whether there is sufficient faculty expertise to supervise the graduate work. If those two criteria are met, there is no reason to exclude a department.

WETZEL asked if there are formal criteria for faculty serving on committees. KOCH stated that faculty must be tenure-related. WETZEL noted that, aside

from these, it is her understanding there are no other restrictions on faculty serving outside a department.

O'CONNOR yielded to Carol Morgaine, CFS. MORGAINE stated the bias expressed by these colleagues doesn't take into account faculty expertise gained prior to arriving at PSU, etc.

BRENNAN asked if library resources are available to support these interdisciplinary degrees.

GELMON asked if any degree program has a protocol for determining who is allowed to be a graduate advisor at PSU. KOCH stated there is nothing formal in the university. KOCH noted a similar program exists at OSU, but they do have a graduate faculty. What we use at PSU as a surrogate for graduate faculty is residence in a department which has graduate programs. FEYERHERM noted there are only informal protocols.

GEORGE yielded to Johanna Brenner, SOC. BRENNER stated that never in all her years at PSU has she encountered this notion of a division between faculty, that some people are being considered incapable of supervising graduate work, and it is shocking. Applause. BRENNER continued, although she is a member of a department with no graduate degrees, she has served on a number of graduate committees. Furthermore, although she was invited to be an affiliate faculty in Sociology, and therefore supervises Sociology graduate degrees, she does not credit Sociology for this authority. BRENNER noted she is a sociologist, with a Ph.D. in Sociology, and did not have to be mentored or take a test to supervise graduate study. She continued, noting that she was mystified at the gate keeping concerns, which seem to be at play here, that are not at play in our academic departments. When you are hired in a department, your faculty has accepted you and has expressed confidence in you. That is your credential for participation in graduate studies. It feels as if the departments that are newer, or express newer areas of scholarship, or that come out of a different trajectory are being seen to represent inferior disciplines. Maybe Womens Studies, for example, doesn't want a traditional advanced degree, but wants to cooperate, combine, or create something new. Please reconsider this super-scrutiny of the capabilities of the faculty. As for oversight, this proposal has the coordinator of graduate studies on the admissions committee, there is involvement by Graduate Studies, etc. and that ought to be good enough.

TABLEMAN stated that she just read the proposal, and there is a misunderstanding with respect to exclusion. However, in her department, Math, there is some faculty without Ph.D.s and there are generational differences between older teaching faculty and younger research faculty, although the former are nearing retirement. She continued, at universities with a Graduate School, graduate faculty are identified as such.

BROWN stated she wished to reiterate Brenner's remarks with respect to her previous participation in interdisciplinary programs. The student perspective, with or without this amendment, is that the primary advisor needs to have interdisciplinary advising experience.

WETZEL/WOLLNER MOVED to table the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHINN requested that the proposal be returned to Graduate Council with directions, including the following: 1) the proposal has considerable support; 2) the program should be inclusive of faculty; and, 3) the governance and oversight of the degree program must be carefully stipulated. BRENNAN requested the issue of Library resources be revisited as well. KOCH acknowledged these directions, but noted there is no way of knowing about library resources.

KOCH directed the Senate to "F-1, Part II.," noting that it is for information only.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

BARHAM introduced the proposals for the 2001 committee.

HALL/HILLMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE College of Engineering & Computer Science program and course changes and course proposals in "F-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WOLLNER/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE College of Liberal Arts & Sciences program and course changes and course proposals in "F-2," including the following corrected course descriptions, p. 4:

Phil 455/555 Morality and Health Care (4) Change in title and description to clarify distinction between than and new courses below.

Phil 481-3/581-3 Biomedical Ethics (4,4,4) New three-term sequence that provides a practical bioethics education in clinical health care, biomedical and behavioral research, and public policy **offered in cooperation with the Program for Ethics, Science and Environment at OSU.**

ROSENGRANT noted there is also an error in the Foreign Languages course listing, FLL101-103 should be corrected to read **GRK101-103.**

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CHAPMAN/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE College of Urban & Public Affairs course changes and proposals in "F-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

COLLIE/REDER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE School of Business Administration program and course changes and course proposals in "F-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

AMES/LABISSIERE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE Graduate School of Education program and course changes and course proposals in "F-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FOSQUE/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE School of Fine & Performing Arts program and course changes and course proposals in "F-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. 2001 Curriculum Committee Recommendations

BARHAM presented the recommendations. Hearing no questions, the Presiding Officer noted that a motion would be entertained at the February meeting.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

BERNSTINE spoke briefly, noting that the Governor's budget was announced today. It includes some fairly extensive cuts, including some targeted cuts in CECS and Veterinary Medicine. There is no reason to panic however. The projected date for the Legislature to reconvene is around February 7-8.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that Burns requested she discuss Searches and she has some comments on Enrollment Management. Given the importance of the quality of faculty to the university, the decision was made to move ahead with searches in spite of budget concerns. The qualifications of candidates are quite high and there is lots of interest in PSU. In addition to resignations and retirements, as a result of the improved budget in the previous biennium new tenure-track positions were added, 5 in 1999-00, and 7 more in 2000-01. There are 7 new positions as a result of engineering and computer science funding. There are 5 tenure-track and 7 fixed-term positions as a result of increased enrollment and access dollars. The proposal to move resources from UNST to departments has resulted in 2 tenure-track searches for HST and 1 for GEOG. In summary, in 1999-2000, we hired 38 tenure track faculty, in 2000-01 we hired 32, and this year there are 39 tenure-track searches.

TETREAULT noted the President's Diversity Initiative recognizes a department for hiring a historically underrepresented person of color, with an award of 25% of that salary rate for three years. In 1999-2000, 5 of the 38 faculty hired represented this category, and in 2000-01, 7 of the 32 faculty hired represented this category. The Provost comes into the search when the department has prepared their final recommendations, to talk about what the pool looks like and what has been done. The most important contributor to success has been broadening the job description; for example, the Psychology department had three iterations of a job description, which increased the pool dramatically. Additionally, departments' being up front about diversity has increased their success. Other contributors to success have been the diversity resource team, chaired by Devorah Lieberman, and the sharing of successful department experiences. The feedback has been very positive with respect to the Diversity Initiative awards because the fund follows the faculty member, solidifying the bond between the department and the faculty member.

The Executive Enrollment Management Team has considered raising the entering Freshman GPA from 2.5 to 3, and is forwarding that recommendation to the Academic Requirements Committee. The average entering GPA is presently 3.2. Should that recommendation move forward, there would be various strategies to protect access.

The Planning Committee and sub-committees on vision and values, have prepared a draft document which is on the Urban Portfolio web page:

http://portfolio.pdx.edu/Portfolio/PSU_Vision/Planning_Minutes/.

Faculty focus groups will be organized in February and March to respond to the draft. Focus groups will be conducted by Martha Balshem, Leslie McBride, Peter Collier, and Kerth O'Brien, and faculty are urged to participate if contacted.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Inter institutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 7-8 December 2001 Report

WOLLNER referenced the report, "I-1", and noted that in addition, at their December 21 meeting, the OUS Board passed a resolution to add one of the student members of the board to the Chancellor Search Committee, but not a faculty member. The new Search Committee Chair, Jim Willis, stated emphatically that he would include faculty input. Another unnamed board member also said he is proactive in this regard.

The new officers of IFS are listed on the IFS web page:
<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html>

The Presiding Officer thanked Wollner for his service as IFS Senator for three years, and IFS President last year. Applause.

2. Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report

KETCHESON presented the report and took questions.

REDER asked what the ratio of proposals is to the number of travel awards. KETCHESON noted the report in June gives that data, and stated this year that there will be fewer awards. She noted they are happy to see travel funds double this year.

3. President's Internationalization Initiative

LIEBERMAN noted that last year an ad hoc committee put together the recommendation with respect to this initiative (see "I-3"), and there is an Internationalization Council in place this year to continue the work.

4. ASPSU Report

CUNNINGHAM was not available to make the report.

J. DISCUSSION ITEM PROPOSAL

WEASEL presented a proposal to discuss the Student Conduct Code, to be moderated by Wendy Endress and Pamela Miller.

REUTER/KETCHESON MOVED the Senate terminate discussion items.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION FAILED by majority voice vote.

CALL FOR A QUORUM. There were 45 members present.

WOLLNER/COLLIE MOVED the proposal to discuss the Student Conduct Code, and to continue the Order of Business currently in place for an additional month.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting as adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 4, 2002

Presiding Officer: Scott Burns

Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Becker, Biolsi, Bizjak, Bleiler, Brodowicz, Brower, Burns, Cabelly, Carter, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Chenoweth, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Dieterich, Enneking, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Haaken, Hagge, Hall, Heying, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Jacob, Kern, Ketcheson, Knights, Kristof, Labissière, R.Mercer, O'Connor, O'Grady, Palmiter, Philbrick, Rhee, Robinson, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Weasel, Wetzal, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Masterson for Brennan, Collins for Collie, Barham for Glanville, Rad for Lall.

Members Absent: Ames, Bjork, Daasch, Falco, Wallace for Gelmon, George, Harmon, Hunter, Jolin, Kenny, Kiam, Lehman, L. Mercer, Nissen, Pfeiffer, Rectenwald, Reder, Rogers, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Barham, Bernstine, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Frank, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Ricks, Samuels, Tetreault, Ward, Withers.

A. Roll Call

B. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the January 7, 2002, meeting were approved after "C." with the following correction:

- Jane Kristof was present

C. Discussion Item - *The Student Conduct Code

The Presiding Officer recognized Wendy Endress, Interim Director of Student Development, and Pamela Miller, GSSW and Chairperson of the Student Conduct Committee. ENDRESS noted she will discuss the process, Miller will discuss the committee, and Vice Provost Samuels will make remarks before the question period.

ENDRESS discussed the Student Conduct Code process. Complaints are received, documented, and evaluated in Student Affairs. There are four ways a complaint is processed: One, if there is a clear violation of the code and the student disagrees, it is sent to the Student Conduct Committee. Their sanction is recommended to the V.P.

for Student Affairs, who administers it. Two, if the student admits the violation, the V.P. determines and administers the sanction. Three, the complaint may be dismissed if the V. P. determines there is no violation. Four, in the case of the previous option, the complainant could be referred for mediation.

ENDRESS stated that she was requested to provide aggregate data for the past five year, but it isn't available. For Fall 2001, there were twenty-one complaints, six from students, four from faculty, one from staff, three from CHNW, and six from Public Safety. Two were related to academic dishonesty, two were related to basic policy violations, six were related to alcohol and drug use, and two related to classroom behavior. In terms of outcomes, three are still pending, four were deflected to mediation, and the balance of fourteen were resolved by a sanction.

MILLER stated that when an issue has been referred to the committee, it conducts hearings (recorded) with the several parties involved, and then determines the recommendation. It is a difficult job, because the situation usually has become protracted by the time a hearing is conducted. MILLER stated that a task force has been organized to review and revise the code. MILLER urged that more faculty come forward to serve on the task force, as it is heavily loaded with legal/security folks.

SAMUELS stated that the task force charge, in addition to recommending revisions, is to translate the code into lay terms.

SCHUSTERMAN asked if records are kept of academic dishonesty if Student Conduct is not involved. ENDRESS stated yes, if it is reported

REUTER asked if minors (under 18 years of age) are treated differently. SAMUELS stated yes.

CRAWSHAW stated he notes two areas of concern. One, we are being too lenient by giving a zero on a quiz if there is an option in the course to drop one quiz grade. Two, the flow chart described above is not reflected in his experience, as he has seen issues restarted and treated differently at the dean's level. SAMUELS stated the latter will not happen now, and if a complaint is made to his office it will be referred back to the starting point. ENDRESS related a student complaint because the student didn't agree with the sanction of zero on the quiz, so she referred it to Academic Appeals.

CARTER asked, if in these cases, shouldn't the second process begin with information gathered in first? ENDRESS stated Carter has raised a good point, because the overlap can become messy.

BIOLSI asked for the definition of disruptive behavior in the classroom. SAMUELS stated the professor sets the classroom expectations, and if that is violated it is disruptive. The professor would notify the student if conduct is disruptive, and if the student doesn't respond, then the faculty member would file the complaint.

REUTER asked if the Bulletin has changed recently, because his recollection is that it formerly indicated that cheating would result in an F.

KRISTOF asked if the faculty member is in a stronger position if F is defined on the syllabus. SAMUELS stated that the whole institution is in a stronger position.

BRODOWICZ asked for a clarification regarding reporting academic dishonesty. ENDRESS reiterated that Student Affairs uses reporting to document a pattern, but reporting is not required.

FOSQUE asked, regarding disruptive aggressive, can the faculty member use the Campus Safety option immediately. SAMUELS stated yes, especially if it is something out of control. FOSQUE asked when are police called in on an incident. COLLINS stated the definition for police involvement is "clear and imminent danger."

HAAKEN asked why is revision being called for now, other than confusion over overlap. Are there more complaints than previously, etc. as 21 doesn't sound like that many? SAMUELS stated that since his arrival, many faculty have expressed concern to him with respect to their responsibility in such matters. MILLER stated that things have changed in the last ten years. The committee feels frustration over the categories of sanctions in the code because they are obsolete. The code doesn't back up committee.

SCHUSTERMAN noted that the general feeling at present is that the faculty can be challenged so change will be good. She asked, with respect to intoxication in her labs, does the code cover that problem? MILLER stated it is in the code.

D. Announcements

BURNS thanked Dee Thompson for her quick response as the new Chair of the Committee on Committees.

Senate members were reminded that there is a reception after the meeting in the 53CH Alcove.

Changes in Senate and committee appointments since January 7, 2002:

Faculty Senate: Fisher has replaced Holloway who resigned in January 2002.

Committee on Committees: Kaufmann has replaced Holloway.

2002 Curriculum Committee: Barbara Brower to replace Lafferrière

2002 Library Committee: Aleksanader Jokic to replace Shotola, Linda Walton to replace Zelick.

2002 Scholastic Standards Committee: John Damis to replace Watanabe, Paula Harris appointed.

2002 Graduate Council: Wayne Wakeland to replace Fraser, Tom Luba to replace Harmon, Donna Philbrick appointed.

E. Unfinished Business

1. 2001 UCC Recommendations

BARHAM introduced the item, noting that she and Burns discussed having questions and then tabling the item until March or April.

FOSQUE called Point of Order, noting that this is an Agenda item, and his colleagues had come prepared to discuss it and take action.

HILLMAN asked if prerequisites will be required by Banner for touch-tone pre-registration. RHODES stated yes.

O'CONNOR noted that no background was provided with these UCC recommendations, and requested some be provided. BARHAM stated her sense of the recommendation is that the former assumption that 400's are for majors is no longer perceived as enough.

ENNEKING asked how will "Banner" pre-registration assess "related experience?" RHODES noted it will fall under instructor approval.

SCHUSTERMAN noted that the purpose for the phrase is so the student can do the appropriate self-evaluation.

KRISTOF noted, relative to 400-level University Studies courses, that pre-requisites are not permitted. BARHAM _____

FOSQUE noted that if recommendation #3 is approved, large changes in the clusters will be required, for example one cluster has a ratio of 18/9, 400-level to 300-level courses. Additionally, with respect to recommendation #2, Art has multiple "concentrations."

WETZEL noted that two university policies are about to clash, so the Senate must address pre-requisites and then clusters. Additionally, recommendation #2 is actually the domain of the Academic Requirements Committee.

CRAWSHAW supported recommendation #2 because it supports the notion of the General Education requirement. BARHAM agreed, noting that many transfer students have, outside their major, only their cluster experience before graduation.

REUTER asked how recommendation #2 will be enforced for General Science majors and students who have not declared the major. WETZEL noted this is already being enforced by DARS and students are already being petitioning. R.MERCER stated the system will allow somebody to take the course if its not being counted in two places at once.

BIOLSI noted that with respect to the intellectual integrity of clusters, it is a radical suggesting that 50% of the courses be 300-level. It is interfering with faculty members who are teaching the clusters. BARHAM noted the conversation between Curriculum Committee and University Studies committees needs to continue on this topic.

BECKER asked what would be the timeline for these changes, as for the History Department, this would require radical course renumbering.

FOSQUE asked, with respect to such changes, if there could be a paperwork reduction mechanism and a predetermined timeline for this.

KRISTOF noted that departments are not in a position to lower the numbering of 400-level courses used by their graduate students.

Discussion was concluded.

F. New Business

1. Proposal to Amend the Constitution: Article IV., Section 3., 4) Order of Business

Burns introduced the item, noting that the four options for the Order of Business are intended to be applied to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty and to the By-laws of the Faculty Senate.

CRAWSHAW noted that in his March 2001 proposal to change the Order of Business, his intent was closest to option #4, in other words, there would not always be a discussion.

SCHUSTERMAN asked if the Senate were to approve option #4, how will discussion items be selected. BURNS stated they could come from the floor in the previous month or from the Steering Committee.

FEYERHERM _____.

FOSQUE noted he preferred option #1 as the President is scheduled at the beginning of the meeting so he isn't kept waiting. CRAWSHAW noted that the President going first was also was part of his original intent. TETREAULT agreed with Fosque.

FOSQUE urged that the discussions should be last. BLEILER stated he strongly disagreed, noting that discussion is important to the Senate. FOSQUE responded that his concern is with respect to the problem of people leaving the meeting early.

TALBOTT noted she is in favor of retaining discussions, in other words option #2, as meetings this year have been more interesting.

ROBINSON proposed a fifth alternative: a) President's Remarks, b) Discussion Item, c) Unfinished Business, d) New Business, and e) Reports from Committees and Officers of the Administration. MERCER agreed, noting that this amended option #4 is the best choice.

WETZEL/WOLLNER MOVED option #4 with the change suggested, that the President remarks come immediately after roll call.

BURNS requested a straw poll on the motion, and heard a majority voice vote in favor of the above.

BURNS noted the Senate has approved and moved the desired option, and directed the Secretary to forward the appropriately worded Proposed Amendment to the Constitution to the Advisory Council for review for proper form and numbering as specified in Art. VIII., to be returned to the Senate for the March 4, 2002, meeting.

2. Proposal to Change GPA Requirement for Entering Freshmen to 3.0

KERN presented the proposal, stating that the committee has conducted their review, and supports the proposal. KERN noted that the proposal was forwarded to the Academic Requirements Committee last month, because Academic Affairs had only recently learned that this change had to receive State Board approval two years in advance of implementation. KERN thanked Academic Affairs, particularly Vice Provost Rhodes and Agnes Hoffman, for providing the committee with information necessary to help them make their decision in a timely manner. KERN concluded by noting that the committee has requested an assessment by Academic Affairs with respect to the effect of this change.

WOLLNER/KETCHESON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal to raise the GPA for entering Freshmen to 3.0.

SHINN requested a description of the academic history of students with entering GPAs between 2.5 and 3.0. FORTMILLER noted he has nothing formal but sees no great difference anecdotally. OIRP is in the process of developing this data, but it is not ready yet. SHINN noted that this information is very important in forming a decision, and without proper data there is no compelling reason to move away from access. KETCHESON noted that the average GPA of incoming

Freshmen is now above 3.1. She continued, there are plans to continue reviewing applications from students with GPAs below 3.0. The data shows that the higher the entering GPA, the higher the retention rates. RHODES stated that the student profile for entering Freshmen at OSU and UO is very similar to our entering Freshman profile. _____.

CUMMINGS noted, with respect to the 182 cited who would not have been admitted, it is not a small number when compared to 900 enrolled, as opposed to comparing it to 18,000 (total student population). HOFFMAN indicated these numbers apply strictly to admission by GPA. SESTAK noted that students are admitted by whichever information comes in first, GPA or SAT, therefore some of the 182 might have been admitted on SAT scores if they had been received before their GPA's were submitted. HOFFMAN noted that testing would be much "less optional" in future

BLEILER expressed concern that the message being sent to the Portland/Metro area is that we are becoming more exclusionary, and that is exactly the wrong message to send.

ENNEKING stated that colleagues in her profession state that, with respect to high school performance, students don't put in the effort at that level if the GPA requirement doesn't set a standard. Students can be co-admitted to the community colleges in the area, as well as PSU. We want people to get a good academic background before they get here. Students need to know that if you mess around you must pay the consequences.

O'CONNOR expressed concern with respect to minority students who wouldn't be admitted under the new standard, therefore, they won't make the effort apply. She also asked what proportion of the students who would have been turned away were minority students. HOFFMAN stated that 62 of the 182 students with a GPA between 2.5 and 3.0 were minority students. She noted that one of the problems with the high school GPA is that everything is included in the GPA from Chemistry to shop classes. PSU is committed entirely to being a diversity campus, and there is every intent to look at minority transcripts in greater detail.

TETREAULT noted that a public campaign will be required with respect to special admissions, so that we will continue to attract these students.

WEASEL urged the Senate that PSU not send the wrong message. We will need to provide extensive counseling to encourage admits in the 2.5 to 3.0 GPA range.

SHUSTERMAN asked about the relationship of this issue to PASS requirements. Isn't this effort redundant. HOFFMAN noted that PASS requirements don't go into effect until 2005 in the best-case scenario, that is if they ever do.

PALMITER asked for clarification of the purpose of attached sliding SAT chart.

TETREAULT reiterated the regret of Academic Affairs that this proposal came to Senate so quickly because of the February 5 deadline. She stated that Arizona State University is a good model wherein they achieved two efforts simultaneously, raising the minimum GPA for admission and increasing admissions of underrepresented groups. They found that students of color have better retention after the first year, due to education equity program activities. Finally, there is an important issue of the Board's perception of our quality. Our problem is not the admission requirement but our retention rates.

ROBINSON noted that this change will have an impact on high school students at the junior and senior level who have only one year to respond. Perhaps we should consider incremental change rather than all at one, so that we can bring the community along with us.

BROWER asked where funding would come from to support the extra activities surrounding the change.

REUTER stated what he likes about the discussion is the dialogue about student preparedness, but what he doesn't like about it is that the entering GPA, whatever we decide, is not a good predictor of success. We don't owe it to underprepared students to let them in, but we owe it to students who are already here to help them succeed. Neither the new or old requirement solves this problem.

SUSSMAN noted that retention rates don't apply to PSU, regardless, because we have such a non-traditional student body.

RHODES noted, regarding the sliding scale, _____ Additionally, most of our first time freshmen are from the Portland metropolitan area. We already have a good relationship with school counselors and we will build heavily on that relationship.

ROBINSON asked if we currently have conditional admission policies, and can we do special GPA calculations to eliminate the non-academic grades that are causing grade inflation. HOFFMAN stated that the conditional process is well developed, and transcripts are already screened, however, the latter would be very difficult to communicate to prospective students. HOFFMAN also noted, with respect to Robinson's earlier suggestion of incremental implementation, that such a policy would make for more confusion.

FOSQUE asked what are the current retention and graduate rates. KETCHESON stated that it is 30% for entering first time Freshmen. FOSQUE asked if raising the entering GPA requirement will improve this. KETCHESON stated that as students are better prepared, retention rates improve.

TABLEMAN noted that there is a national discussion about grade inflation at the secondary level. PSU should have access to enter, but not to exit. We should tighten internal standards.

MERCER noted he is undecided. On the one hand he believes so strongly in access at PSU and on the other hand, he wants to admit people who will succeed. If we can't provide support services, students will not have success. An important option for us is to encourage students to use community college classes.

PALMITER noted that there is a perception issue. We are perceived as not rigorous with a 2.5 entrance GPA. CARTER agreed, except on one point, that

FORTMILLER noted that changes are linked to the advising model brought before this group last year.

HALL noted he is torn about the notion of access, but feels that students need to be prepared to do the work.

CABELLY noted that perception is something we have control over. What is important in our message is that we are different.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO RAISE THE INCOMING GPA TO 3.0 PASSED by a count of hands, 35 in favor, 20 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

SHINN requested the record state that, regardless of the favorable decision, there has been clear indication that certain information was missing and that the decision was very rushed.

3. Proposal for Department Name Change: Civil & Environmental Engineering

BECKER/ROBINSON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed name change for the Dept. of Civil Engineering to the Dept. of Civil & Environmental Engineering.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal to Change Committee Reporting Schedule: Curriculum, Graduate, Library and Scholastic Standards

ROBINSON/PALMETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal to change the committee reporting schedule to the academic year for Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Library Committee, and Scholastic Standards Committee.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

The Provost withdrew her report.

H. Question Period

There were no questions.

I. Reports from Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 1-2 February

Burns presented the report (attached).

2. Vice President's Report on Development & Marketing

WITHERS noted he would present a brief report on the progress of the silent phase of the Capital Campaign (attached), and then yield to Duncan Carter who will briefly discuss marketing. The campaign has been very successful to date and our continued success depends on getting out our story.

CARTER noted that we have not done a good enough job telling our story. We need to use advertising and use it well. The Integrated Marketing Advisory Council is discussing two advertising projects, one to support the Capital Campaign and the other an "identity campaign." They both have to speak with one voice, however, and the key to shaping that voice is faculty input. Faculty are requested to submit their input to Jeanie-Marie Price and to do this immediately.

3. Vice Provost for Student Affairs

The Presiding Officer tabled the report.

4. Interim Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board

The Presiding Officer tabled the report.

5. ASPSU Report

The Presiding Officer tabled the report.

6. Interim Report on the President's Diversity Initiative

The Presiding Officer tabled the report.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, **March 4, 2002**
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Ames, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Biolsi, Bleiler, Brennan, Brower, Burns, Cabelly, Carter, Casperson, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Enneking, Fischer, Flower, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, Glanville, Haaken, Hagge, Hall, Harmon, Heying, Hillman, Hixson, Hoffman, Jacob, Kern, Ketcheson, Kristof, Labissière, Lehman, L. Mercer, O'Connor, Palmiter, Rectenwald, Robinson, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Walsh, Wang, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Rad for Lall, E.Enneking for Bjork, J. Brenner for R. Mercer, Arriola for O'Grady, Childs for Reder, Paradis for Thompson.

Members Absent: Becker, Bizjak, Brodowicz, Chaille, Dieterich, Falco, Barham for Fortmiller, George, Hunter, Jolin, Kenny, Kiam, Knights, Nissen, Pfeiffer, Philbrick, Rhee, Rogers, Rosengrant, Weasel, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Barham, Bernstine, Cunningham, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Frank, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Tetreault, Ward, Withers.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 4, 2002 meeting were approved with the following correction:

Harmon was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

A reception will follow immediately after the April Faculty Senate meeting at the Simon Benson House.

BURNS noted that Faculty Senator Lois Becker will be leaving the university at the end of the month, and that she will be sorely missed.

BURNS conducted a brief informal survey of the Senate to solicit opinion regarding the conversion of the *PSU Currently* to on-line only format, at the request of the Advisory Council.

President's Report

BERNSTINE reported after E.1. He reviewed the legislative budget process and where we are, to date. We are not sure what the final outcome will be, but we made a good comeback this week. The current gap in the state budget is about \$87 million, and for PSU, it is about \$1. Million. It is reduced because the current proposal added \$5. Million back to the "cells" and the universities didn't have to absorb salary increases. The governor will probably call another special session, to take place in June.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to Amend the Constitution: *Article IV., Section 3., 4) Order of Business*

The proposal, moved and seconded in February 2002, was returned from the Advisory Council, as prescribed in the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. VIII., with approval.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. *Graduate Council Program Proposal for MA/MS in Interdisciplinary Studies and Program and Course Proposals for MS in Materials Science & Engineering*

KOCH presented the first proposal for the committee, noting the changes made to the MA/MS since the Senate returned it to Graduate Council, and noting that there are errors in the copy included in the mailing.

HILLMAN/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the M.A./M.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies.

HILLMAN/CUMMINGS MOVED correction of E.1., Proposal Summary as follows:

Page 1, Para. 6, "Course of Study," first bullet, after "If two departments..." add "or programs" and, Page 1, Para. 6, "Course of Study," second bullet, after "If three departments..." add "or programs."

THE AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BRENNER asked for clarification of the definition of the term “participating graduate programs” listed in the first and second bulleted items, Page 1, Para. 6, “Course of Study.” KOCH stated that this is another error.

HILLMAN/M. ENNEKING MOVED correction of E.1. Proposal Summary as follows:

Page 1, Para. 6, “Course of Study,” first and second bulleted items, delete the word “graduate” from each.

RUETER spoke against the amendment. He noted that careful attention should be paid to insure that this proposal does not make undergraduate into graduate programs, or undergraduate faculty into graduate faculty. This is an important issue with respect to resources, as well as credentials.

BLEILER spoke for the amendment. He stated that this has to do with the notion of what the program is meant to be. We know that our students often don't fit well into traditional channels; therefore our programs tend to be learner driven rather than instructor driven. Our students come to us with what they want to do, and this is one of our strengths as well as a foundation of our reputation. We have not ossified our programs into particular paths, rather we offer our students a corridor of opportunity, and they can move throughout that corridor fairly freely. The notion behind this program is an excellent one. Of course, we want to have proper oversight and not necessarily say that anything goes all the time. The Graduate Council has done a good job of addressing those concerns in this new document. Allowing programs with faculty who are perfectly capable of teaching graduate courses but aren't because those courses aren't on the books, is perfectly logical. To allege that they are unqualified because they are not in a graduate program is not logical. This is not about graduate as opposed to undergraduate faculty; it is about students who don't fit into traditional channels.

FEYERHERM stated that Hillman's amendment, very thoughtfully, doesn't remove the word graduate from the section entitled “Course of Study,” first part, which states: *“The degree is intended to allow students, in collaboration with graduate advisers, to structure a coherent program from the approved graduate courses of at least two, and no more than three, separate academic disciplines.”*

ARANTE asked if fixed term faculty serve on graduate committees. KOCH stated, no. HILLMAN, in reference to the Materials Science proposal, asked if that is accurate information. KOCH requested Hillman's question be reserved for the discussion on that proposal.

RUETER asked to clarify what the Senate is voting on. It is his impression that a program is approved based on the list of courses in it, and the expertise of the faculty teaching them.

HEYING asked if a degree program undergoes a probationary or conditional period in the same way that a new course does. KOCH stated that one of the attractions of this program is its potential for helping to develop new degree programs from the ground up. If a number of students elected the same course of study over time, this could serve as an indicator of the need for a new degree program, as well as a way to test it. KOCH noted, in answer to Heying's question, new programs are revisited and reviewed by the Graduate Council after they have been in place several years.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED by majority voice vote.

SHINN asked for a clarification with respect to the admissions step, and if too many students would make it unwieldy. KOCH stated that our expectation is that this will not be a large program, but we won't know until we try things out to see.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL PASSED by majority voice vote.

KOCH presented the second proposal, noting that the M.S. in Material Science program is a transplant to the Department of Mechanical Engineering from Oregon Graduate Institute.

WETZEL/COLLIE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE PROGRAM PROPOSAL for the M.S. in Materials Science.

CUMMINGS requested the discussion be returned to the issue of the role of fixed term faculty in a graduate program. KOCH yielded to Graig Spolek, Chair, ME, who indicated that the list of faculty in this degree proposal includes 4 tenure-related and 5 fixed-term faculty. RUETER asked if only the tenure-related faculty can serve as graduate advisors. KOCH stated that is correct. CUMMINGS noted that this raises the broader issue of whether students are being supervised by actual as opposed to titular graduate advisors. M.ENNEKING asked if there are ever exceptions to the rule of excluding fixed-term faculty. FEYERHERM stated that the difficulty with this program is that it is a special case because the OGI personnel structure was different, and those faculty have been engaged by PSU faculty using that structure. With respect to a process for exceptions, that is handled by petition to Graduate Council. KOCH stated in his experience, there have been no exceptions made.

TABLEMAN asked for a clarification of the rules, which govern approval of graduate committee memberships. FEYERHERM stated that the chairperson of a

graduate committee must be tenure-related faculty. KOCH stated the same rule applies to members, with some exceptions. FEYERHER noted that this includes emeriti.

RUETER stated that this proposal raises the same issues with respect to resources and each course should be discussed. BURNS yielded to SPOLEK, who stated that the program is not wedded to the individuals currently in the positions.

HEYING asked if all nine faculty in the program have Ph.D. degrees. _____ stated yes. RUETER asked if the four fixed-term faculty in the program teach core courses. _____ stated that some do. RUETER stated that this is a resource problem, as far as he is concerned. ENNEKING noted that the tenure line doesn't determine whether one is qualified to teach a course. BURNS yielded to SPOLEK to answer Rueter's question. SPOLEK noted that he expects the program to long outlast the individuals who currently teach in it.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROGRAM passed by majority voice vote.

KOCH introduced the three new courses in M.S. in Materials Sciences.

BLEILER/WOLLNER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE COURSE PROPOSALS for three new courses in Material Sciences.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

CUMMINGS called point of order, after the Provost's Report, as "F" had been skipped. He asked, "How much can a student's transcript be modified after the fact?" HOFFMAN noted there is an appeal procedure for student to drop a course. BARHAM noted that a course could be removed with appropriate approvals.

G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that she is deferring until April the remarks on enrollment management she didn't make last month, so that she can review the GPA issue in this meeting. The debate in Faculty Senate indicated that there was a lot to attend to with respect to the issue. The day after the Senate meeting, she put together a document with the assistance of Vice Provosts Samuels and Rhodes, and Dean Livneh (attached) entitled "SEEMT Proposal: Implementation for Excellence and Access." Additionally, she has had three meetings with student leaders, a discussion with the Council of Academic Deans, and a meeting with the Senior Executive Enrollment Management Team. The document indicated what we need to do and who will do it.

TETREALT reviewed the document, which indicates what we need to do and who will do it. She noted that we need to have discussions about who we want to be and whom we want to serve. We need to have dual goals of admitting well prepared students and students with potential from under-represented groups. This is not only about recruitment, but also about retention. We need to include more variables in our enrollment management discussions. We need to tie enrollment growth to student demand. We have decided to defer sending the GPA proposal to the Board until February 2003. There was an option to present it in April, but the President and the Provost have decided it was too soon. She yielded to OIRP Director, Kathi Ketcheson, to present some data on the proposal.

KETCHESON presented the analysis entitled, "Changing the High School GPA Requirement for First-time Freshmen at PSU" (attached).

HEYING asked what is Ketcheson's sense about the type of students, etc. and what is going on here with respect to graduation rate. KETCHESON stated our average rate for graduation is 5-6 years, even though "urbans" generally discuss a longer timeframe. Our graduation rates are low, but we don't have all the information on why. TETREAULT added that we need to know what is it we can control.

SUSSMAN asked if there are alternative measures to determine admissions besides the GPA and test scores, for example, life experience which is being used in the UC system. TETREALT stated it is important to remember that we will continue to have special admits. Another important component is the benchmarks of the President's Diversity initiatives.

M.ENNEKING stated the real issue is not what the GPA is, and whether or not we have a special admit category, but what it is we plan to do to support the students we admit.

SHINN asked what is the number of first generation college students in the student group on which the data was presented. KETCHESON stated that we

don't have that information. She continued, however, many of them go through the EOP Program and are successful.

NOTE: THERE IS NO RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS FROM THIS POINT

SHINN stated that changing the life course of 80 individuals a year in an urban institution is a serious thing.

RUETER asked what is the status of the GPA change, what is the student input, and _____ student government. TETREUALT stated we are deferring forwarding the proposal to the Board for one year so that we can ensure student input procedures and _____

RUETER discussed student government, in particular the perception that it needs strengthening.

BRENNER asked, for clarification, with respect to the GPA issue, are we revisiting or are we reviewing the decision. BERNSTINE stated deferral has been selected to allow students to have the opportunity to review it, and so that we can respond to concerns raised in the Faculty Senate. We want the decision to be about substance and not process.

SHINN expressed the Senate's appreciation for having received the additional data this month, which was urgently needed last month. What is still yet to come is the discussion of resources necessary to support the decision.

HAAKEN _____

HEYING _____

The Provost's Report was concluded.

1. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Interim Report

FRANK gave a brief report. He noted that the NCAA Accreditation Report cited two areas of non-conformance, lack of an absentee policy and lack of gender equity. The Athletics budget for next year includes \$225,000. in reductions. BERNSTINE added that he just signed the memorandum to eliminate Golf.

2. ASPSU Report

CUNNINGHAM thanked the Faculty Senate for their open dialogue on the GPA issue. She noted she was unable to attend the February meeting of the

Faculty Senate because Senate conflicts with her Capstone class. She also noted that Rueter's comment are well taken.

CUNNINGHAM reviewed ASPSU activities in progress. They include campaigning for dental coverage for students, campaigning for the Oregon Opportunity Grant, lobbying by three students representative in Washington, DC to repeal the drug conviction clause that prevents convicted students from receiving financial aide (HR 786), campaigning for Voter Registration, conducting the recent GPA Student Forums, and executing the ASPUS Spring Elections.

WETZEL asked what has happened to the Diversity campaign that ASPSU was working on earlier in the term. CUNNINGHAM stated there was considerable opposition to the proposal for required classes, so they have altered their approach to a strategy of working with the University Studies Program to achieve their goals.

3. President's Diversity Initiative Interim Report

LIEBERMAN discussed the draft proposal documents, which were distributed on the Faculty Senate e-mail list, noting that they are also available on the WWW and that hard copies are available at the doors. She stated that there would be sub-group focus groups over the forthcoming week, a campus-wide brown bag meeting on March 18, 2002, and community brown bag meetings to follow. The task force also intends to identify the campus leaders to move forward appropriate actions.

BIOLSI commended the task force for coming up with a model plan on behalf of the Senate. He noted that he would like the Initiative project to add the formal inclusion of academic programs, which already recognize diversity, including Women's Studies and Black Studies, and he urged that we include with them, the establishment of a formal program in Native American Studies.

M.ENNEKING asked with respect to resources needed to support this plan, is funding being developed.

LIEBERMAN noted they are address the issue of resources in three parts, activities that take no additional funding, funding that is now already in place for scholarships, CAE, etc., and recommendations that will be forwarded for future expenditures.

H. ADJOURNMENT

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

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 1, 2002
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Biolsi, Bizjak, Bleiler, Brodowicz, Brower, Burns, Carter, Casperson, Chapman, Collie, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Falco, Fischer, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, George, Glanville, Haaken, Harmon, Heying, Hillman, Hunter, Jacob, Kenny, Kern, Ketcheson, Kiam, Knights, Kristof, Labissière, Lall, Lehman, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, O'Connor, O'Grady, Palmiter, Pfeiffer, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Rhee, Robinson, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Thompson, Wang, Weasel, Wetzell, Wollner, Wosley-George.

STOP

Alternates Present: Elzanowski for Bjork, Allen for Chenoweth, Collins for Hagge, Peigahi for Hixson, Baccar for Hoffman, Heuser for Jolin, Kim for Tableman, Cotrell for Talbott, Cook for Walsh.

Members Absent: Ames, Becker, Brennan, Cabelly, Chaille, Dieterich, Enneking, Hall, Nissen, Reder, Rogers, Sussman.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Barham, Feyerherm, Frank, Da.Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Reuler, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Withers.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 4, 2002, MEETING

The minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of March 4, 2002, were approved with the following corrections:

Bizjak, George, and Rosengrant were present at the March Senate meeting.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

The President was not in attendance.

2002 Faculty Elections

Nominations for Officers of the 2002-03 Faculty Senate will be opened at the May 2002 meeting of the Faculty Senate, with election of officers to take place at the June 2002 meeting. The Steering Committee is hoping to have at least two candidates for each office.

Attached to the Agenda is a chart of Faculty Senate Representation for 2002-03, which includes the number of positions to be filled in each division. It also lists IFS and Advisory Council representation.

Faculty Senate Voting

The Steering Committee has discussed recent voting practices in the Senate, and concurred that as soon as a voice vote is determined not to be unanimous, the Presiding Officer will call for a show of hands or a secret ballot, as specified in the *PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. V., Sec. 3., 2) Rules of Procedure*.

CRAWSHAW requested that the candidates for Presiding Officer of the Senate be asked to speak at the June meeting before the voting takes place. BURNS noted that was an excellent idea.

Senate Attendance

BURNS thanked Senators for their faithful attendance this year. He noted he has called a few Senators concerning absences, particularly in divisions that have been under-represented.

Reception to Follow the Meeting

BURNS noted that the reception following the meeting today at the Simon Benson House will feature Southern Oregon wines.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since March 4, 2002:

Charles Hixson has resigned from the Senate. The Library Caucus has elected Jian Wang to replace him on the Committee on Committees.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal for Missed Class Policy

JACOB noted that the policy was initially introduced at Senate last year, and briefly discussed the rationale. Previous concerns included question as to why a policy was needed, comment that the policy privileged certain kinds of absences, that the policy appeared to impose stiff sanctions on faculty, and the policy placed too much burden on the instructor. During Fall term, the committee reviewed policies at other campuses, and utilized a sub-committee to develop alternative approaches.

HILLMAN/R. MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Missed Class Policy.

HEYING reiterated his previous objections concerning absences. His class includes exercises on consensus-based decision making, which requires attendance, and there is no discrimination between types of absences. Attendance since attendance policy was implemented has risen to 95-96%. The Missed Class Policy privileges certain kinds of misses over others. Our students have very many reasons for missing classes, including personal reasons, no baby-sitter, work responsibilities, night meetings, etc. This policy infringes on course requirements.

JACOB stated that the committee doesn't feel that one kind of absence is privileged over another.

HEYING stated the language implies that the faculty members allow students to make up work in some way, and that is not always possible. FOSQUE stated, concerning item #5, the department chair is empowered to overrule the faculty member, and therefore Heying is correct.

HAAKEN asked if the intent for creating the policy is to create a process that obligates the student to seek permissions and the faculty to set clear rules. JACOB stated, yes, the intent is to establish a process.

FOSQUE stated the policy is acceptable, if item #5 is removed. JACOB stated the committee would be agreeable to that change.

DAASCH asked what was the rationale behind item #5. JACOB yielded for anyone who could answer the question. ALLEN offered that any denial process should include a safety mechanism for protection of the student against an unreasonable decision.

WETZEL asked if there is no other overall set of rules that this procedure would fall under, such as a conduct code, etc. SAMUELS stated no. ALLEN stated there is no formal grievance process for students apart from grades and deadline appeals. WETZEL stated that the larger issue, then, is addressing cohesively the problems indicated in item #5 for all aspects of student life.

MERCER stated that if item #5 is deleted, then there would appear to be no avenue of appeal, and he would feel uncomfortable with that. JACOB agreed.

BLEILER stated that item #5 could end up being one of those floodgate of litigation-type issues. Item #5 suggests that if the students don't like the instructor's answer, they take the dispute elsewhere. Deanlets could end up with many students at their doors, bringing issues that should never get that far.

Jacob yielded to Wendy Endress. ENDRESS noted that the committee intended autonomy for the faculty, and they are aware that attendance is critical in certain courses to the academic experience; therefore item #1 covers syllabus requirements. She also noted, that item #5 only articulates what already happens at present by default, through the Ombuds office.

SCHUSTERMAN stated that she agreed with events as described by Endress, however, the policy would be easier to accept if several word changes were made. For example, in item #4, replace "cleared" with something like "approved" so outcomes are more specific, and similarly in item #3, replace "may" with "should." WETZEL suggested that "decided by the Chair" be replaced with "adjudicated by the Chair" so that it doesn't sound as the Chair will overturn the faculty member's decision. JACOB stated the committee would accept those suggestions, and yielded to Endress. ENDRESS noted that "may" rather than "should" was intentional. SCHUSTERMAN noted that "should" is not "must," for example, a student goes out of town during the final based on the assumption that notice of absence was equivalent to an excuse.

CUMMINGS requested a clarification concerning item #7, asking if it trumps and/or is it consistent with the Bulletin policy on Incompletes? JACOB stated he thinks it is. CUMMINGS reiterated that there are several things in the Bulletin controlling the issue of Incompletes that this wording needs to be consistent with.

ARANTE noted that, concerning item #6, if the intent is that it be linked to item #5, then the policy should clearly say that. Is the instructor solely responsible for deciding on undue burden, or not? ALLEN suggested that would be covered by item #5. ARANTE stated that item #5 doesn't say that. BLEILER asked if item #6 makes the student the active member, meaning that the faculty member is obligated to do what the student wants. The policy implies the faculty is obligated to provide extra service to the absent student. SCHUSTERMAN suggested that items #5 and item #6 be reversed, to clarify these issues.

JACOB offered to return the item to committee, to further clarify the language. BURNS noted that was a good idea, because the policy is sound. HEYING disagreed, noting that as soon as "some expectation of accommodation" is indicated, the students have a right to ask the instructor to approve an absence. BLEILER agreed. BURNS questioned those interpretations.

RUETER, noting that this discussion has been important, requested the assembly draw back from the details for a moment. The debate has indicated what faculty think is important about a class and about being explicit about the student's responsibility. RUETER stated that the NCAA requirement for this policy should be explicitly added to the rationale, and that "athletics" as an example of an activity that "enriched their educational experience" should be removed from the rationale. It is misguided to lump those two together, particularly because there is considerable literature to the contrary, indicating that revenue sports are not

enriching, that graduation rates are poor, that students are graduating as "functional sophomores," and that athletes feel exploited by the current system. RUETER, indicating that he has a Web page listing references on the subject, noted that the proposal is disingenuous.

JACOB requested Heying respond whether any policy would suffice, or would he prefer no policy. HEYING stated that his position is the latter, and that he agrees with Rueter. For example, would we be going through this exercise if any other external non-profit in America, such as the National Board of Realtors, were making this request of us? On the basis of that fact alone, it is incredulous that we are responding.

HAAKEN noted it appears that there is somewhat of a hostile stance towards students in this discussion. The implication is that faculty are never unreasonable, but a policy such as this suggests that faculty must have a reasonable response. HAAKEN noted she is aware of situations where faculty have been exceedingly rigid around the issue of missed exams, and students have been placed in a serious bind. It is good to have policy that puts some pressure on faculty to explain or give reasons for things as opposed to exerting arbitrary authority in sometimes punitive ways.

GELMON asked if this policy will only apply to undergraduate students, and if that it so, then it should be clearly indicated. Also, if this is for undergraduate students, are we implying that faculty have carte blanche concerning graduate students? JACOB noted that the policy is for undergraduate students.

R. MERCER noted that the committee has worked very hard for some time on this issue. If there is no sense that a policy will ever pass, the Senate should stop sending it back to committee. BURNS noted he disagreed with Heying's position, and has a sense that this could be passed.

RUETER/ALLEN MOVED TO TABLE the item.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. ARC Recommendation on Upper Division UNST Cluster Requirements

KERN/_____ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the recommendation ("D2").

WETZEL noted it is problematic to specify that students can't use courses from their major departments because many majors are interdisciplinary, for example International Studies.

PALMITER asked what happens to students who have not declared a major. There are juniors and even seniors with no major declared. This will cause advising problem.

KRISTOF asked if "concentration" could be added after major department, because art students are broken down accordingly. WETZEL _____.

CUMMINGS asked what about courses in a department that can't be used to fulfill the major, for example, all "U" courses in Geology. HILLMAN asked what do we do with General Studies degree students. MERCER yielded to Dan Johnson. JOHNSON noted he manages the CLAS program at the Capitol Center and Salem, and stated that as the recommendation reads, it would delete a group of departments and off campus offerings. There are not enough offerings off campus to accommodate this. SCHUSTERMAN stated that the Curriculum Committee did not intend this for students pursuing a broad program. The intention is to keep people from concentrating an entire academic career in one area, whereas these students would already be meeting the spirit of the rule.

WETZEL noted that this doesn't help the adviser in International Studies, where a student could do all Asia courses, for example, including their cluster.

CRAWSHAW noted he agreed with the general principle. The General Education portion of the degree is supposed to cover a broad area. This would exclude concentrations. RUETER agreed with Crawshaw that the students need breadth.

FOSQUE requested that department be removed, so that students can explore concentrations. Art History is far removed from studio courses, for example, in some institutions, it is a different department.

MERCER noted that it is very difficult for our students to finish their degree in the evening, etc. It was a little easier under the old General Education requirements, but this will be a big deal for these people. See, for example, the Capstone problem. If this passes, it is the university's responsibility to support it with resources across the student population.

FORTMILLER reminded us that this requirement is only focusing on three classes, or twelve credits, outside the major. Perhaps, with respect to off campus courses, we should consider a friendly amendment or get more A&L courses funded at those locations. JOHNSON noted that this doesn't apply to the off campus degree programs, which are using all the courses available.

RUETER noted he agreed with Mercer concerning the seriousness of intent. The policy is sound and should take precedent. If passed, it must be supported by resources. RUETER discussed the definition of interdisciplinarity or interdisciplinary programs.

SCHUSTERMAN asked what the motivation for this is. RUETER noted it is the path of least resistance. WETZEL noted that, anecdotally, she is seeing too much of this.

DAASCH asked for a point of information. _____

ROSENGRANT _____ FORTMILLER _____

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by 37 in favor, 12 against, and 2 abstentions.

BURNS noted that although this proposal has passed, some very important points came up concerning off campus and evening programs, which the administration needs to be cognizant of.

2. UCC Recommendation for 400-level Course Prerequisites and Cluster Courses

BARHAM/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE part #1 of the recommendation ("D3").

WETZEL asked if this goes hand in hand with the new policy enforcing pre-requisites. BARHAM noted that this proposal is not related to Banner registration pre-requisites, and it is coincidental that they are happening simultaneously.

ROSENGRANT noted she strenuously objects to _____

BARHAM stated her impression is that a department can choose for courses to be recommended rather than required for registration purposes.

ROSENGRANT noted it is not always meaningful to have stated prerequisites. BARHAM agreed.

FOSQUE asked why consent of instructor has been removed. BARHAM noted that that has always been the case, so it was not considered a new item.

WETZEL asked if the committee discussed only 400-level courses?

SCHUSTERMAN stated that prerequisites are being removed only to enable courses to fit clusters. It is important to talk about the university's reputation. Some of our courses must demand something beyond a high school diploma, or we are not being true to our missions. We need to have 400's on the books, which show that more is required than just admission to the university. Everything but reputation is driving program decision. Hopefully, 300 level courses will come next.

BIOLSI stated he is in favor of a class standing requirement, but it is an error to assume that no prerequisite implies no scholarly expectations. The nature of certain courses have changed dramatically and that was the assumption when the University Studies program was developed.

SCHUSTERMAN noted that there is nothing wrong with restructuring, but if a course is still the same and we are not communicating with students that certain skills are needed, then we are failing. Most of the paperwork shows the same rationale, that the program is seeking the "U" designation for the course.

GELMON expressed support for the motion. She noted she was the former chair of UCC, and this is in response to the Senate's previous charge. Now the information is available.

CARTER stated it makes more sense to say that if no prerequisites are listed for a 400-level course, than the proposal is required to explain. WOLLNER agree with Carter.

WETZEL noted that this recommendation really stands in the way of non-traditional students.

BARHAM noted that this only frames for students what faculty expectation are. Depending on how it is written, it may or not be enforced by Banner.

SCHUSTERMAN noted that the Curriculum Committee is not dominated by Math and Science faculty, and this is an issue for the non-Math and Science faculty as well. This is not about trusting our colleagues, it is about communicating with students, for example, a 400-level Philosophy course is taught with the expectation that a certain set of academic experiences are in place. This has come about primarily because of Clusters.

WOLLNER noted that the syllabus is intended to convey this information. CRAWSHAW noted he disagreed with Wollner, and agreed with SCHUSTERMAN. The syllabus comes too late in the process. The more information available for the selection process, the better off students will be. It is very simple to list class standing, at a minimum. BARHAM noted that the syllabus is not timely for our students because their lives are so complicated and they need information to plan ahead.

MERCER reiterated Wetzels question, concerning whether every non-admitted student will have to get instructor approval?

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by 38 in favor, 13 against, and 2 abstentions.

BARHAM/COLLIE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE part #2 of the recommendation ("D3").

BARHAM noted that Mark Trowbridge, Chair of the University Studies Committee attended Curriculum Committee meetings, and authored this portion of the proposal.

RUETER asked for a clarification regarding the note to flag courses. BARHAM stated that the intent is to flag courses with pre-requisites in the Cluster listings at the back of the time schedule.

FLOWER asked what would be the impact if this were implemented, as he is concerned that many courses would drop out of the clusters.

BARHAM stated there are no numbers, but the idea is that this would be phased in, by application only to courses new to clusters. The intent is not to have drastic revisions. FLOWER noted this will provide a valuable opportunity to revisit and recraft the nature of the clusters, and will be a good thing.

RUETER asked if the student's experience will really change with an artificial number, as they only take three courses, regardless. Part 2., b. is more important than Part 2., a., and should be listed first.

~~STOP~~
BARHAM stated that, as the Senate has just determined that 400-level courses have pre-requisites, then it is important to make sure that sufficient courses without pre-requisites are still provides in the clusters. She agreed with Rueter that Part 2., b. is more important, and stated she couldn't recall where the 50% figure came from.

O'CONNOR asked what will be the effect on availability of courses for people who have chosen certain clusters. There are already shortages of courses without pre-requisites in certain clusters. BARHAM stated the intent is not to make drastic changes.

FOSQUE noted that this is good as proposed, because it adds more courses to the already existing ones in a cluster. BARHAM added that certain departments are considering removal of some of their 400-level courses, regardless.

GELMON noted that most clusters have 15+ courses and students only need 3, so she doesn't see what the difficulty is.

CUMMINGS/RUETER MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, by striking "Part 2., a)."

THE MOTION TO AMEND FAILED by 24 against, 19 in favor, and 9 abstentions.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by 35 in favor, 7 against, and 7 abstentions.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Changes and Course Proposals

KOCH introduced the proposals.

BLEILER/PALMITER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE proposals in "E1" for CLAS.

RUETER discussed the proposal for an additional work requirement in the MA/MS in Conflict Resolution of and the reliance on fixed term faculty. Concerning the W'02 schedule, the Conflict Resolution program taught 18 undergraduate sections and 23 graduate sections. This is a consequence of our undergraduate curriculum which drives cluster, etc. enrollment, while the graduate programs ride on the back of that. This speaks to the issue of relative support and resources for graduate programs, and how far the university is willing to go with fixed term support.

BLEILER noted he disagreed, as this proposal only speaks to an alternative project, not a need for additional resources. The proposal only changes the manner of work that the student will be doing and better serves the constituency of this particular program. The issues Rueter has discussed are important, but this proposal does not exemplify what he is discussing.

THE MOTION PASSED by 48 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstentions.

COLLIE/HILLMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "E1, part School of Business Administration."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

DAASCH/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "E1, part College of Engineering and Computer Science. "

RUETER asked if this is the first time that 400 versus 500 numbered courses have assigned 4 versus 3 credits. KOCH stated no.

ARANTE asked, concerning, resources, if a department has to make a commitment to tenure lines in the course proposal. KOCH stated not always.

Courses can be introduced in a number of ways, although they are usually tried out first. They are taught by regular faculty, sometimes by new faculty, and occasionally by fixed term faculty.

PALMITER stated that the Graduate Council discussed the university's dependency on fixed term faculty, and noted this should be revisited. SCHUSTERMAN noted that the question is regularly asked in Curriculum Committee, and the answer is usually that the resources have been committed. The issue about who is teaching a course and who is funding it is made at the dean's level.

DAASCH noted there is one course in the CECS proposal that is not taught by a tenure line faculty member.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FOSQUE/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE proposals in "E1, part Fine and Performing Arts."

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

HILLMAN/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE proposals in "E1, part College of Urban and Public Affairs."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals and University Studies Approvals

MERCER/COLLIE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "E2, part College of Arts and Sciences, including correction to WS 428 and WS 470, for both to include a prerequisite of 8 credits in WS, and CS courses. "

DAASCH asked, concerning the new requirement for prerequisites, if these courses meet that requirement. BARHAM stated yes.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHINN/CHAPMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE proposals in "E2, part Urban and Public Affairs."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WEASEL/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "E2, part University Studies Program, including a new cluster in Media Studies, addition of 3 FRINQ courses, removal of USP 428 from the Comm. Studies Cluster and correcting G 366U to read Geography.

RUETER asked a question about University Studies _____

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

The following reports were tabled:

Provost's Report

1. Office of Student Affairs Report
2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report
3. ASPSU Report
4. Advising Implementation Task Force Update

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 6, 2002

Presiding Officer: Scott Burns

Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Present: Agorsah, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Bjork, Bleiler, Brennan, Brower, Burns, Carter, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Chenoweth, Daasch, Enneking, Fischer, Flower, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, George, Glanville, Hall, Harmon, Haaken, Hillman, Jacob, Kern, Ketcheson, Kiam, Knights, Labissière, Lehman, R. Mercer, Nissen, O'Connor, O'Grady, Palmiter, Rectenwald, Robinson, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shusterman, Tableman, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Weasel, Wetzel, Wollner, Wosley-George.

Alternates: _____ for Collie, Ruedas for Crawshaw, Kinnick for Cress, O'Banion for Fortmiller, Collins for Hagge, Tabor for Hoffman, Cottrell for Talbott.

Absent: Ames, Becker, Biolsi, Bizjak, Brodowicz, Cabelly, Cummings, Dieterich, Falco, Heying, Hunter, Jolin, Kenny, Kristof, Lall, L.Mercer, Pfeiffer, Philbrick, Reder, Rogers, Rhee, Shinn, Sussman.

Ex officio

Members present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Cunningham, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Reuler, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Ward.

A. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 1, 2002, were approved as published, after "C."

C. Announcements

There will be a reception after the June Senate meeting for old and new Senate members at the Simon Benson House.

The Senate Steering Committee Meeting this month has been changed to 2-4 p.m., Thursday, May 9, 2002.

A new radio and print advertising campaign about PSU by the Office of Marketing

started this week. Another new project, "Umbrella Tours," personal guided tours by faculty and administrators for special guests of the university, also began this week.

The Presiding Officer recognized Faculty Senator Sorca O'Connor who is retiring this month after 12 years of service. Applause.

President's Report

The Presiding Officer noted that the President yielded his time to the Provost for her report later in this meeting.

Nominations of Officers for the 2002-03 Faculty Senate

The Presiding Officer opened nominations for officers of the 2002-03 Faculty Senate. Nominated for Presiding Officer were Craig Wollner (by Duncan Carter), and Sherrill Gelmon (by Kathi Ketcheson). Nominated for Presiding Officer Pro tem was Craig Shimm (by Robert Mercer). There were no nominations for Steering Committee membership.

D. Old Business

1. Missed Classes Policy

Jacob introduced the revised proposal, and indicated that changes were made by the General Student Affairs Committee in response to the Senate's suggestions at the April meeting.

WETZEL/SCHUSTERMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Missed Classes Policy.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

2. Faculty Grievance Procedures

BURNS thanked Faculty Senator William Kenny, Chairperson, and committee members Lois Becker, Eugene Hakanson, Deborah Howe, and Robert Liebman, for their service on the Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Grievance Procedures, from October 2000 to December 2001.

PRATT introduced the item, noting that it was originally referred to the Senate Steering Committee in April 2000, and referred again in Fall 2001 because changes in Board rules mandated additional changes. PRATT noted AAUP approval as indicated in the joint cover memorandum.

CARTER/HILLMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the revised *Faculty Grievance Procedures* including Draft Confidential Mediation Procedure ("D2").

PRATT noted there are four major changes from the 1988 *Procedures*, 1) the definition of "day" is corrected to mirror the contract, 2) the definition of Grievance Officer is expanded from Provost to include the Vice Presidents for Development, and Finance & Administration, 3) the procedures have been expanded to include an option for confidential mediation (attached), and 4) the process has been contracted to conclude at the Presidential rather than the Board level, although the Board retains the right to review.

CARTER asked if the *Procedures* will appear in the "A,B,C's," the faculty handbook. PRATT noted it will appear in OAR's after public hearings are concluded.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. New Business

1. Graduate Council Course & Program Changes and Course Proposals

KOCH introduced the proposals and recommended the appropriate motions.

WOLLNER/WEASEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Certificate in Geographic Information Systems, changes in the M.A./M.S. in Conflict Resolution, and changes in the M.A./M.S. in Speech & Hearing Sciences in Liberal Arts & Sciences.

RUETER asked if other departments could join the G.I.S. Certificate program at a later date. KOCH stated, yes, but at the time being these are the only relevant courses.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SESTAK/R. MERCER MOVED new courses and changes to courses in Liberal Arts & Sciences.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

ENNEKING asked if there are faculty to teach all these new graduate courses, or will we be relying on adjunct faculty. KOCH stated the Geography certificate is made up of courses already in place and many of the other courses were previously offered as 410/501 courses.

BRENNAN/CHAPMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE changes to the Ph.D. in Social Work and course changes.

CARTER asked if this will alter Social Work's use of four credit course blocks. BRENNAN stated scheduling is not affected overall because the courses in question are all small seminars.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. Question Period

1. Question to the Provost Concerning the Percentage of Fixed Term Faculty in the University Studies Program

(Data from Tetreault, and corrected data from Bjork, attached.)

TETREAULT stated the question is a good one, one of the first she asked when she came to PSU, and again when University Studies was moved to Academic Affairs in January 2000. TETREAULT noted she asked the University Studies Committee to take up the issue at the time of the move, but the committee declined because a Ph.D. student at Harvard is doing a dissertation on the topic. In June 2000, the Provost asked again what hinders and what facilitates participation of tenure line faculty in the program. Vice Provost Rhodes now indicates that the dissertation is forthcoming in just a few weeks, so we will wait to see what it says. TETREAULT noted that then it would be appropriate for some serious faculty discussion around the issue, because it is not her place to tell us why faculty don't choose to participate in University Studies. TETREAULT yielded to Vice Provost Rhodes to discuss the data she requested.

RHODES noted that there were names left off in the data provided with the question, which alters the other data on the question. Additionally, he identified and compared two departments of a similar size and composition to University Studies, with respect to the data. The percentage of fixed term faculty was similar, and the percentage with doctorates was similar, therefore proportions and nature of faculty appointments are similar between the university overall and University Studies.

TETREAULT noted that what faculty in University Studies are charged to do is of value to the university, and this is not a status issue. Members of the Enrollment Management team observed a discussion Friday in order to understand relative student success. There were only fixed term faculty at that meeting, they were very articulate and sophisticated about our students, etc., and care a great deal about student success.

RUETER asked for a clarification from Assoc. Vice Provost for Research Sestak about the data included with the question, and whether it would pass Human Subjects review. It is in the public good to collect information

and make it public, but there was no Human Subjects review with that process. SESTAK noted that the Human Subjects regulations are applicable 1) where the study is of the specific individuals involved, and 2) the research is intended to be published externally. In Senate, the data in question is for our own knowledge, and therefore not subject to Human Subjects review.

BJORK requested the floor and yielded to David Horowitz, HST. HOROWITZ apologized for the several errors in the data. One of the differences between his figures versus the figures from Academic Affairs, is that they are based on the percentage of class time presided over by different faculty, not the percentage of different types of faculties. This is not an attempt to denigrate University Studies faculty, because in point of fact certain critics of the program think they have an impossible job because of the breadth of academic disciplines required of each faculty member. It is unfair, and requires supermen. Furthermore, it is unclear that a Ph.D. dissertation qualifies as valid external review. Be that as it may, there are several other issues involved, including faculty operating outside their areas of expertise, and hires executed by administrators outside appropriate faculty governance channels. These are issues that relate to who is teaching and who elects not to teach in University Studies.

BURNS noted that the question was answered, and that relevant discussion would be appropriate if placed on a future Senate agenda.

SHUSTERMAN asked if the administration views the ratio of fixed term faculty as a problem, or is it the wave of the future. TETREAULT noted she planned to respond in the context of growth, in her remarks on Enrollment Management later in the meeting.

ENNEKING noted that these issues of support and involvement have to do with the "buy in" of regular faculty, for example, by creating a department with tenure lines in University Studies. TETREAULT noted that, indeed, faculty hold the responsibility for curriculum, and tenured-related faculty is a good thing in this regard. For example, here is a search in progress for a Science tenure track faculty to support the program.

RHODES noted that every effort is made to involve tenure track faculty but many can't be released by their departments. As a result, fixed term faculty must be recruited. We don't want to build a separate faculty but only develop a faculty core to direct the program. The new Science tenure track position is to provide additional support to the core, and the Provost only approved it because of pressure to improve that area of the program. Another policy is that departments get tenure lines in exchange for faculty for University Studies. TETREAULT noted another policy is to have the students stay together but alternate faculty. DAASCH asked if most of

the tenure lines participating are due to the trade off of adding lines to departments. TETREAULT stated yes. Also, emeriti faculty are hired as fixed term faculty in University Studies. DAASCH asked if that meant conditions were worse before these new policies? TETREAULT stated not necessarily, for example, some tenure line faculty have rotated in and back out of University Studies already.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that her remarks would address enrollment management. Enrollment management strategies need to come out of the institution's values. We must ensure that faculty are available to teach. We also need to make sure that classrooms and technology support are available. We must be mindful of Legislative expectations. We must explore innovative ways to deliver instruction. There is a group working on articulating our vision and values. We have had an access mission, historically, which continues to be a very important value in these discussions.

TETREAULT continued, we are working to solidify our coalition agreements with community colleges in the area. We are examining graduate enrollment practices, which seem to work well, although there is great concern and activity around the issue of stipends. We also need to ask questions about managing undergraduate enrollment, including what are our 3 – 5 year enrollment goals, what is the number of full time Freshmen, why are Sophomore retention rates lower than Freshman rates, and how much more should we let post bac enrollment expand.

The next issue is ensuring that faculty are available to teach. In the face of budget cuts it is imperative that we continue tenure track searches, which have amounted to about 40 per year. We have attempted to allocate access dollars permanently to the departments. This year we allocated 12 positions and gave the deans the option to have tenure track or fixed term searches. The decision of the deans was that five would be tenure track and seven would be fixed term. In order to help departments plan and schedule better, we have attempted to get non-permanent access allocations to departments sooner. We have experimented with incentives from customized courses, although some controversy has arisen in recent months.

PALMITER asked what are we trying to fix and how do customized courses fix it? TETREAULT stated that we have to meet our overall institutional enrollment goals, but over and above that, departments may offer customized courses for which they will keep the income. PRATT added that the way we used the budget is that we just stopped when the money ran out, but these allow us to go beyond the instructional budget. The return is not dollar for dollar for various reasons, including the fact that some student are not be paying tuition in very instance.

The next issue is the availability of classrooms and technical support. We have added 16 new classrooms, 9 in PCAT, 3 in 4th Ave. Bldg., and 4 in UCB. We have purchased buildings, including the former Art Institute, the 5th Ave. Business Center, and the Sonitrol Building and adjacent house. We have added a number of new technology classrooms, we have upgraded switching technology in Hoffman Hall, We have upgraded Rm. 107 in SB-I, we will upgrade 15 more classrooms this summer, and we have had lab additions and upgrades. Departments include FFL, GEOG, MUS, enhanced SMSU instructional support center, Disability Resource Center, Media Art Center, etc. We have provide 300 faculty and staff with updated computers, 250 of which have been installed so far.

The President and others have spent a lot of time in Salem to make the case that we are meeting student demand, especially for Oregon undergraduates. The conclusion is that our cuts may have been higher, if we had not been able to convey to the Legislature that we could ensure access to students, particularly in the high demand areas of Engineering, science and technology, and teacher training.

It is the faculty's business to find the alternate ways to deliver instruction in ways that insure and improve student learning and faculty vitality. FLL was awarded a PEW grant in course redesign which they are implementing with Spanish 101 - 103. We have sponsored internal grants for increasing faculty vitality and student learning in LIB, Art Graphic Design, FLL, PSYCH, and SSW.

COLLINS asked the Provost to address the issue of the need for increased student services. TETREAULT stated, yes, there is a need to increase support to areas of student services, including recruitment, application processing, financial aid, and Admissions. COLLINS asked if that includes advising. TETREAULT stated yes.

G. Report from Committees and Officers of the Administration

1. Office of Student Affairs Report

Note: Recording for G.1. not available.

SAMUELS reviewed the mission and activities of each of the offices in Student Affairs, as described in attachment "I3." to the Agenda for the Senate Meeting of February 4, 2002, and overheads(attached.)

2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

KERN thanked the committee and their consultants for their work during the past year, and summarized the report.

KERN noted that an item of particular interest is that the Committee has established a policy to no longer accept petitions for non-University Studies

courses for inclusion in Clusters, effective Fall 2002. Exceptions may still be made, however, for credits earned overseas when previously arranged, and certain other extenuating circumstances.

WETZEL noted she is on the committee and a cluster coordinator, and she is the lone dissenter to the above decision, because better data is needed. Not all of the petitions are about substitutions of non-University Studies courses, but about moving between clusters. Additionally, the numbers indicated seem small in proportion to the total number of students in clusters. Additionally, a cluster coordinator should be allowed the discretion to evaluate whether a course is an equivalency, in the same way we evaluate transfer credits in the major.

BROWER noted there is an assumption of underlying rationale for inclusion of a course in a cluster, however, there are multiple circumstances why a course is not listed in a cluster, outside the issue of a course having been examined and found wanting. To make that the arbitrary line between clustered, clusterable, clusterability, unclustered, etc. is dubious.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

KETCHESON introduced the report(attached) and noted that the committee concluded their work on April 26, and that a list of the faculty awarded grants will be released for the June Senate, after recipients are notified. Travel awards for summer will be very small as funds are almost expended.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

RUELER introduced the report, noting that the committee is continuing to focus on pathways for undergrads interested in teaching as a profession.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. ASPSU Report

CUNNINGHAM reported after G.2., noting that her term ends May 14 and she graduates in June. Spring activities of ASPSU included registering 1,206 voters, securing a two year moratorium on credit card sales, and securing full dental coverage for students. She introduced Kristen Wallace and June Zhu, the new President and Vice President of ASPSU.

Due to the hour, the Presiding Officer tabled reports numbered G.6. and G.7.

H. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 3, 2002
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Bleiler, Brennan, Brodowicz, Brower, Burns, Cabelly, Carter, Casperson, Chaille, Chapman, Crawshaw, Cress, Cummings, Daasch, Enneking, Fischer, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, George, Hall, Harmon, Hillman, Hoffman, Hunter, Jacob, Kern, Knights, Kristof, Labissière, Lall, Lehman, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, Palmiter, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reder, Rhee, Robinson, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Tableman, Wang, Weasel, Wetzal, Wollner, Wosley-George.

Alternates Present: E.Enneking for Bjork, Collins for Collie, O'Brien for Haaken, Riedlinger for Hagge, Geddes for Jolin, Burgess for Ketcheson, Paradis for Thompson.

New Members

Present: Allen, Andres, Balshem, Jagodnik for Barham, C.Brown, D.Brown, K.Brown, Butler, Carr, Caskey, Collie, Collins, Farr, Friesen, Gelles, Gregory, Hendricks, Hickey, Johnson, King, Kretovich, Liebman, Michael, Miller-Jones, Morris, Nash, O'Halloran, Peigahi, St. John, Seltzer, Spolek, Temple, Walton, Wanjala, Wattenberg, Wheeler.

Members Absent: Agorsah, Becker, Biolsi, Bizjak, Chenoweth, Dieterich, Falco, Glanville, Heying, Kenny, Kiam, Nissen, O'Connor, O'Grady, Pfeiffer, Shusterman, Sussman, Talbott, Walsh.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Feyerherm, Frank, Da.Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Koch, LaTourette, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Sylvester, Tetreault, Toulan, Wallace, Ward, Withers.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 10, 2002
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Old Members

Present: Agorsah, Ames, Anderson, Arante, Barton, Brodowicz, Burns, Carter, Casperson, Crawshaw, Daasch, Dieterich, Enneking, Falco, Flower, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Gelmon, Glanville, Harmon,

Hillman, Hoffman, Jacob, Ketcheson, Kristof, Labissière, Lall, R. Mercer, Palmiter, Reder, Rhee, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Tableman, Wosley-George.

Alternates Present: Walton for Becker, Harvey for Brower, Allen for Chenoweth, Collins for Collie, Livneh for Cress, Rosengrant for Fischer, Gelles for Jolin, Allen for O'Connor, Semenza for Weasel.

Members Absent: Becker, Biolsi, Bizjak, Bjork, Bleiler, Brennan, Cabelly, Chaille, Chapman, Cummings, Enneking, Falco, George, Haaken, Hall, Heying, Hunter, Kenny, Kern, Kiam, Knights, Lehman, L. Mercer, Nissen, O'Connor, O'Grady, Pfeiffer, Philbrick, Brown for Rectenwald, Robinson, Rogers, Shusterman, Sussman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Wetzal, Wollner.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Frank, Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Livneh, Pratt, Rhodes, Samuels, Tetreault, Ward.

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

RUETER asked for a clarification regarding attachments to the agenda and/or minutes, as to whether approval of the minutes of the Senate is equivalent to approving the item. The Presiding Officer stated that this is not the case.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of May 6, 2002, were approved with the following corrections:

Kristof was present, Collins was present for Collie, and Reidlinger was present for Hagge.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Senate Election Runoff Results:

All Other Instructional Faculty - Martha Balshem

Extended Studies - Patricia Cornman

Urban & Public Affairs - Yvonne Michael

There will be a joint meeting of the Senate Steering Committee of '01-02 and '02-03, on Monday, June 10, 2002, at 3 p.m. in 394 Cramer Hall.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since May 6, 2002:

Nancy Bowers has resigned from the Advisory Council due to her resignation from the university, effective June 28, 2002. In accord with the results of the Spring 2002 elections, Dan Fortmiller will be her replacement.

TABLEMAN requested that the administration follow up on the Senate's community building efforts this year by running a simple survey asking the faculty what proportion would support a faculty club. Faculty need a place to talk on a daily basis, rather than just once a month, and they need one place on the campus to call their own.

TOULAN noted that a survey has been done in the past, with negative results.

BURNS stated he would forward this item to next year's Steering Committee.

Additions/corrections to today's Agenda:

Attachments to agenda items, G2 - Budget Committee Annual Report, and G5 - Travel Report (corrected) are available at the doors.

Correction to the Agenda: "D.2. Interim Report on Diversity" is changed to, "D.2. Interim Report on Advising"

Added to Agenda: E.4. Resolution Honoring Ric Hardt

Election of Officers of the 2002-03 Faculty Senate

Nominations:

Presiding Officer: Sherril Gelmon, Craig Wollner

Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Craig Shinn

Steering Committee Membership: Barbara Brower, Constance Lehman, John Rueter, Craig Wollner, Patricia Wetzel.

Elected:

Presiding Officer: Gelmon

Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Shinn

Steering Committee Members: Rueter, Wetzel, Wollner.

President's Report

None

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Academic Requirements Committee Report on Markers for the Baccalaureate

WETZEL reported after "D.2." She noted that requests were made to departments for several faculty each to respond to the draft markers on a discussion board. The discussion board remains up, and other faculty are urged to respond. The committee will return to report on the findings at the October 2002

Senate meeting. The alumni piece of the research is still ongoing, as it is tough to get responses, and the student piece has not started yet. WITHERS noted that the Capital Campaign board might be willing to help with input.

The Presiding Officer thanked the committee for their continued hard work on this project.

2. Interim Report on Student Advising

LIEBERMAN briefly reported on the progress of the Student Advising Initiative, noting that the Student Advising Implementation Team was made up of volunteers from the original ad hoc committee and the Senate, and the chairs of Scholastic Standards, Curriculum and Academic Requirements. They worked very hard, meeting twice monthly this year. Funding has been allocated to colleges for summer session advising and student orientation, which were identified as urgent needs. Funding has also been allocated to Student Orientation to improve hospitality and efficiency. Additionally, the university web sites relating to advising are being re-engineered to link with academic departments and be more student-friendly. Funding is being allocated for DARS training. The model projects from SBA, Biology, Architecture, and Psychology are on the website. Next year, the team will examine and recommend allocations for the remainder of funds identified for advising.

WOSLEY-GEORGE requested Lieberman comment on Graduate student advising. LIEBERMAN noted that early on, the team determined to focus on undergraduate advising because there appeared to be an urgent need for improvement in that area, however, the intent is to address graduate advising eventually.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Proposals for New Courses, Course Changes and New Degree: Master of Architecture

KOCH presented the proposals for the committee.

HILLMAN/CHAPMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the MA/MS in Writing, Book Publishing concentration and new courses.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

HILLMAN/REDER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE changes in the MA/MS in Education, new courses and courses changes in Education, and CLAS course proposals in Economics and Geology in "E1."

SHUSTERMAN asked, regarding funding for the new Writing program, if it is no longer the responsibility of the faculty to examine budgetary implications,

especially in light of impending budget cuts at the university. PALMITER noted the Graduate Council questioned the program's reliance on adjunct faculty, and was told that curriculum, not funding is their concern. BURNS requested the Provost comment on funding for the Writing program. TETREAULT yielded to KAISER, who noted that this part of the program is to be built on self-support courses. SCHUSTERMAN noted this is a faculty Senate concern. TABLEMAN noted there is a rumor that someone with a BA only is employed to teach in the program. KAISER stated there is one individual with no graduate degree, but extensive experience and a long history with book publishing.

CABELLY noted that committees have looked at budget in the past, and asked if this was a policy change. KOCH noted it is not fair to say that faculty are not "looking at" the budget, but it is fair to say that faculty don't have control over what happens to it. With each new program proposal, there is a budget attached and each time a program is submitted there is discussion with the proposing department with respect to budget. The Writing program is clearly a self-support program. There is a clear pathway from income to expenses. There are always some uncertainties, but this was certainly not ignored by the Graduate Council.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

TABLEMAN/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Master of Architecture, new courses in Architecture and new courses in Music, including correction of a typographical error on Arch 460/560.

KOCH noted that the Graduate Council is aware of challenges involved in mounting new programs, and we are all aware that if we always waited around to have money before we did anything, we would probably never have done anything. There is a certain challenge here in how we balance the certainty of the budget versus the program approval. Graduate Council did approve this program but noted that additional resources will required. Therefore the Dean and Provost have been requested to address these issues and outline some strategies for funding this program in the future.

SYLVESTER stated the proposal involves a seven-point plan. One, FPA is pursuing a multiple resource strategy, which includes continuing raising external funds and endowments, as well as some university funding in the future. Our growth as a school, from 800-1450 majors in last five years, with 80% of the growth in architecture, is worthy of attention. Two, there has been strong, continuous support from the architecture community in the area, which includes the preponderance of architecture firms in the region. Their support is significant and will aid us in attracting the very best adjunct professors from their firms and sub-disciplines. Three, last year the department was awarded 1.0 FTE to further their programs, hopefully culminating in accreditation. Four, there has been a recent \$1. Million gift to the program and there are others in process. Five, when 20 years ago PSU architecture faculty left PSU, they formed the Oregon School of

Design which attracted hundreds of thousands of dollars from local firms, although they eventually disbanded because they lacked appropriate accreditation. Six, the OUS philosophy has changed, with finances being addressed to follow students. Seven, the accreditation team for schools of architecture visited the campus last year and made a positive recommendation for the department to move forward. That action, however, is contingent on OUS approval within next six months. This proposal has been 2 years in the making, 7 years in discussion.

HILLMAN noted, as a member of the Graduate Council, it is important for people to understand that resources must be reallocated to meet this program's budget, whether or not one is for it.

RUETER asked a question regarding OUS policy on new program proposals. TETREAULT noted that there is a changing dynamic in the System, as a result of the new funding model. Therefore, the thinking about duplication is changing.

BRENNAN requested comment on the implications for physical facilities and library resources. BARTON noted the library collection meets basic needs. Shattuck Hall remodeling will be required, with funding coming from state and private dollars.

CRAWSHAW noted that the Budget Committee impression is that nothing is left over at this point, and queried therefore where funding would come from. PERNSTEINER noted that this proposal would fall under the next budget cycle, with respect to renovation and faculty. Renovation is on his list and we are more than a year out for adding faculty. He went on to emphasize that approval of this particular degree is very important for PSU. We will address the funding when the degree is approved.

BLEILER noted there is extremely strong support in enrollment and in the community for this program, and for us to deny it is violating our mission.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE M.ARCH DEGREE WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal for Name Change: Department of Mathematics & Statistics

Eugene Enneking, Chairperson of the Mathematics Department, presented the proposal.

HILLMAN/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

3. Proposal for Revisions to the Student Conduct Code

JACOB/_____ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE CHANGES IN THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE.

JACOB yielded to Pam Miller, member of the Ad Hoc review task force and Chairperson of the Student Conduct Committee, to present the proposal. MILLER indicated the committee members who were in the room, and noted that the committee met regularly as of January. She briefly reviewed the proposed changes.

CRAWSHAW commended the committee on impressive work, and asked if it includes grading sanctions. MILLER noted that there is language about cheating. ALLEN noted the faculty member could forward a complaint for greater sanctions, as well as failing an assignment. DAASCH noted there is nothing in the document about where to find the computer use policy. He yielded to Mark Gregory, OIT Director, who noted that the policy is on the university Web page, it is posted in all labs, and it is posted on the page where individuals apply for a university account. MILLER noted that that could be added to the document. HICKEY noted that there is nothing in the document regarding harassment and intimidation of students towards faculty and other students. MILLER noted that items #1 and #9 include these issues. The task force did not feel it could anticipate all incidents. HICKEY noted that this issue relates to academic freedom as well as the emotional impact on the victim. ALLEN noted that if the policy becomes overly broad, it would be infringing on first amendment rights. _____ noted that if an incident got to the disruptive level that item #1 would cover it.

KRISTOF asked if one could say that all assignments must be passed to pass the course. MILLER stated yes.

RUETER asked for comment on the university's procedures for individuals undergoing criminal charges. FOWLER noted the key to procedures is related to behavior. Also, a conduct issue is not linked to a court issue.

SHUSTERMAN asked if violations are tracked at OSA. MILLER stated, yes, if they are reported the student will be monitored to see if there is a pattern.

MORRIS asked for a clarification on the severity of penalties. MILLER noted the code allows for schools and colleges to develop their own process and penalties except for expulsion, however that policy must be reviewed at the university level for legality. CRAWSHAW noted that only a zero on the assignment is insufficient sanction for major infractions such as plagiarism. MILLER noted that the charge might be forwarded to a school committee or the university committee for additional sanctions.

COLLIE asked if the document was checked by the university for standard of due process. MILLER stated, yes, the committee was trying to strike a balance

between case law on student rights and faculty prerogatives. DAASCH asked what the "XXX" indicates in various places in the document. MILLER noted these are placeholders for the OAR numbers that will be inserted. BRENNAN noted that falsification of data (e.g. research fraud) is not listed and that has more serious implications than classroom fraud. MILLER noted that that would be a good addition.

SCHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification regarding failing a course. ALLEN noted that the consequences of failing an assignment must be documented on the syllabus. MILLER reiterated that the committee felt it is up to the instructor to decide the grade, whereas they would consider other ways to reprimand the student. AMES asked if the syllabus indicates that cheating resulted in F for the course, would that be legal. MILLER stated no. ROBINSON noted that there is a large loophole on this issue, and requested a clarification. KRISTOF asked if it was permissible to say, "to pass a course you must be passing in all assignments." MILLER stated that was permissible.

SHUSTERMAN stated that this document discourages faculty from reporting academic dishonesty. The infraction must be reported, but the student can know that, therefore there is nothing to protect the faculty member from being sued by a student. The new student culture appears to be that it's ok if one can get away with it. MILLER noted that, having served on the Student Conduct Committee, faculty need to trust the process. Also, the faculty member is less likely to be sued if more people are included in the process. COLLINS stated that we don't know that failing a student is the cruel for academic dishonesty. MORRIS stated that the source of concern is that failing a student is the traditional modest remedy that does not have career damaging impact, and this is being removed from equation as even the committee is unwilling to take that action. MILLER stated that case law indicates that failing is not due process. FOWLER stated the fallacy is that that was ever appropriate.

CARTER noted that faculty clearly feel very strongly about this issue and that an important prerogative is being taken away, especially as there was only one instructional faculty member on the committee. This is not to criticize the committee, but it might be useful to table this until fall so that additional research can be provided to this body.

CABELLY/REDER MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE FAILED by 24 in favor, 32 against, and 0 abstentions.

MILLER noted that the final document would include the item related to research fraud.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE CHANGES IN THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE PASSED, by 45 in favor, 7 against, and 7 abstentions.

BURNS requested the Student Conduct Committee review this discussion, especially the issue of failing a course. He thanked Pam Miller and the ad hoc task force on behalf of the Senate. SCHUSTERMAN asked if the committee could prepare a brief FAQ sheet on the changes for the entire faculty.

4. Resolution Honoring Ric Hardt

SHINN/GELMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the resolution.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions From the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted she promised a report on the planning process. A key component was the series of faculty focus groups held to review the draft vision/value statement. Martha Balshem will summarize the results of activity.

BALSHEM indicated the executive summary (attached) was available at the doors. Of 441 tenure-related faculty, 97 (22%) participated in the focus groups. The executive summary was presented to the Provost on April 10. Since then the committee and the Provost have been working on the information, and the analysis has been developed further. It will be delivered to the Provost by 6/17/02.

TETREAULT thanked the faculty who participated. She distributed the revised draft (attached) and encouraged faculty to review it over the summer while other additional input is being gathered.

The statement is aspirational. There will be work this summer by the Executive Committee and the Council of Academic Deans to begin to further develop some priorities for the university. This is particularly important in this time of budget cuts.

TABLEMAN stated that with respect to climate, the one individual who addressed the Senate in the last two years in a scholarly, caring manner, David Horowitz, was shut down because he had another voice. This is particularly important since Sept. 11th. The faculty here are great, in spite of our leadership, because any school that can have Miss America for their Graduation speaker, is saying to the faculty and the students that there is no statesman or woman. It is an anti-academic and anti-intellectual choice, and none of the faculty, Tableman included, spoke out. Only the students attempted to speak out. This is terribly distressing. TETREAULT stated that these are important issues, and she will be happy to meet with new Senate Steering Committee about this. She stated she is personally deeply committed to having the right kind of discourse in this community, and pledged to make it happen.

Vice President's Report

PERNSTEINER thanked the assembly for a great year. This was not an easy year, but PSU served more students than ever before, and more than we were budgeted for. The faculty rose to that challenge, and provided each and every student with top quality instruction as well. We continued double digit growth in funded research for another of multiple years in a row. He applauded the faculty.

PERNSTEINER discussed the state budget and the PSU budget and distributed a summary (attached). He noted, to paraphrase Roy Koch's remark earlier, it is not fair to say that we are not "looking at" the budget, but it is fair to say that we don't have control over what happens to it. The budget has been a problem since before the biennium began. Coming into this year, we were not funded at the level of last year, with respect to inflation and enrollment increases. The net effect was that we "reduced" the amount of money available by \$4.1 million. In November, anticipating that the state was not going to meet revenue targets, we reduced the '01-02 current spending (not recurring budgets) and saved \$4.8 million. The January Special Session indicated that the '02-03 budget also be reduced by another \$5.6 million, which we subsequently identified. We have drawn down our reserves by \$6. Million based on the budget adopted in May. We have been able to cut recurring budgets by \$3.4 million. We have reduced supporting areas by 7%, Athletics by 10% and instructional service areas by .9%. That would have been enough, except there will be additional shortfalls. No one feels good about the special session, and we will continue to look for more one-off reductions. We may have to raise tuition, but we will not do that lightly. The good work this year has made a substantial difference in how bad our budget cuts might have been and will be.

MERCER thanked Pernsteiner for acknowledging the faculty, and noted the faculty want to thank Pernsteiner, Kenton and Provost's Office for their efforts as well. Applause.

WETZEL/REDER MOVED THE MEETING BE CONTINUED TO Monday, June 10, 2002.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m., to be resumed on Monday, June 10, 2002.

.....

THE SENATE RECONVENED ON MONDAY, JUNE 10, AT 3:15 P.M. IN 53 CH.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Motion to Add Curriculum Proposal to Senate Agenda

MERCER/JACOB MOVED the Senate add to the Agenda, "E.4. Curriculum Committee Proposal for New Courses in ESR."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

President's Report

The President noted the passing of Pamela Merrick, Associate Human Resources Director and longtime member of the PSU community. A memorial service will take place on Thursday, June 12, at 2 p.m.

BERNSTINE commented on issues related to the state budget shortfall. A special session of the Legislature will commence on June 12. We don't know the full parameters of a budget cut. The governor has just declared a hiring freeze and travel reductions, formalizing internal university directives dating back to October 2001.

BERNSTINE noted the resignation of Vice President George Pernsteiner, and wished him the best in his new position at UC Santa Barbara. Assoc. Vice President Jay Kenton, who had recently resigned, has been named Vice President for Finance and Administration. Kenton will be assisted by Cathy Dyck, who has been appointed to his previous position as Budget Officer.

E. NEW BUSINESS

2. Curriculum Committee Course Proposals

The item was introduced after G.8.

CARTER/JACOB MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two courses, ESR 101 and ESR 102.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Advisory Council Annual Report

MERCER presented the report ("G1") for the committee. There were no questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Budget Committee Annual Report

JOHNSON presented the report ("G2") for the committee. He commended the administration for taking the Budget Committee seriously and including them in critical deliberations. One of the key interests on the part of the Budget Committee had to do with participating with the administration in looking into a variety of initiatives through which PSU can address the fundamental questions of financial stability for this university and for its prosperity. The administration, in dealing with the immediate challenge last fall, approached it in an imaginative and intelligent way. It is the case that the next biennium presents additional challenges to the budget for the universities, and it will be very important to consider possible initiatives in this regard. The President has put together a working group to look into a range of ideas as well.

The second major activity of the committee was to review the Athletics Budget. It is the case that Athletics will be in the red by approximately \$275,000. therefore it is important that the Budget Committee continue to monitor this situation. The committee offers its complements to Tom Burman for his valiant effort.

RUETER asked what was the "range of ideas" discussed with the administration. JOHNSON stated that they discussed, for example, autonomy from the state system in setting tuition, establishing differential tuitions, etc. The Vice President gave a great talk last week about the success this university has had in terms of improving its financial situation during periods of adversity. We still must confront the outcome of the federal tax changes, the PERS expenses, etc. and the administration is working on these threats. Faculty should forward their remarks about the budget to the President's working group. Hopefully we will have a better outcome than that in 1982, when Joe Blumel, paraphrasing Abba Iban,

stated that one must be faithful people will do the right thing after they have tried everything else.

RUETER asked what would be the fiscal impact of addressing issues of gender equity. JOHNSON noted more dollars are needed but he doesn't have the figures. KENTON stated that the students are going to contribute student fee money to help meet our compliances. Men's golf was cut in part to meet compliances. BERNSTINE noted we will need to add another women's sport, but we also need to diversify our response, including improved Athletics funding.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Committee on Committees Annual Report

FOSQUE presented the report ("G3") for the committee. M.ENNEKING asked what was the response to the Faculty Committee Preference Survey. FOSQUE stated that only 28% of eligible faculty responded. BURNS noted there are certain areas of the faculty where low responses can be identified, such as within tenure track ranks, certain colleges, etc. and this issue has been forwarded to next year's Steering Committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

JACOB presented the report ("G4") for the committee. There were no questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Faculty Development Committee Supplemental Report

KETCHESON presented the report ("G5") for the committee, noting that the travel report was corrected since mailed, and revised copies are available. She noted that there was a drop this year in applications from Arts & Letters faculty and the committee hopes to increase applications in that area next year.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

FRANK presented the report ("G6") for the committee.

RUETER asked if the NCAA have a policy or guidelines with respect to athletics budgets, e.g. the issue of fiscal integrity. BERNSTINE stated the expectation is implicit that there be fiscal integrity. FRANK noted that PSU is within NCAA guidelines with respect to that principle.

CRAWSHAW asked if the reduced pledges to Athletics are included in the calculation of the \$200,000 deficit. KENTON noted the \$200,000 includes that item.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meetings of April 5-6, & June 1-2, 2002

BURNS noted the meeting over the weekend was more positive than the previous one. Eastern Oregon University is discussing conversion to semesters, and they are taking a vote to join AFT in the coming weeks.

ENNEKING asked if Southern Oregon was still interested in semester conversion.

MERCER stated their representative was not at the meeting.

8. ASPSU Report

The report was tabled because the ASPSU representative was not present.

H. ADJOURNMENT

MERCER requested the assembly join him in thanking the Presiding Officer for his organization, collegiality, and determination during the past year. Applause.

The last meeting of the 2001-02 PSU Faculty Senate was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.