

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

2000

Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2000 - June 2001

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 2000 - June 2001" (2000). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 10.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/10>

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 2, 2000**Presiding Officer:** Judy Patton**Secretary:** Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Balshem, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brenner, Brodowicz; Carr, Carter, Chenoweth, Collins, Crawshaw, Cummings, Eder, Ellis, Elteto, Erskine, Feeney, Fisher, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Fortmiller, Fuller, George, Glanville, Hagge, Heying, Hickey, Holloway, Ingersoll, A. Johnson, D. Johnson, L. Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Kiam, Koch, Latiolais, Lowry, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Neal, O'Grady, Patton, Peterson, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reece, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Walsh, Wang, Yachmenoff

Alternates Present: Ogle for Beasley, Masterson for Brennan, Edelblut for Carpenter, Casperson for Daasch, Childs for Dieterich, Duncan for Gilbert, Van Dyck for Herrington, Fahey for Hoffman, Martin for Hopp, Halverson for Lewis.

Members Absent: Barton, Buddress, Cabelly, Chaille, Chapman, Falco, Farr, Hunter, Lall, L. Mercer, Palmiter, Sherman, Shireman, Skinner, Trowbridge, Turcic, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Burns, Carter, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Hall, Sparks for Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Ketcheson, Lieberman, Livneh, Pernsteiner, Pfungsten, Pratt, Rhodes, Sylvester, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Withers.

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of June 5, 2000 were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

William Kenny has been appointed Chair of the Ad Hoc Cmttee. to Review the Non-contractual Grievance Procedures.

Melissa Gilbert has been nominated by the Steering Committee to serve as the Faculty Senate Representative to the Assessment Council.

Paul Latiolais has been elected to fill Candice Goucher's position on the Committee on Committees (through June 2001).

The Faculty Governance Guide is late going to press this year. Chairs and members of the Committee on Committees have been sent current rosters of their committees. If you have any questions as to assignments or other issues, call or e-mail Sarah Andrews-Collier.

Changes in Senate and Committee appointments since 18 September 2000:

Lisa Adajian has resigned from the Senate and is replaced by Louis Elteto (2003)

The Presiding Officer announced for the benefit of the new membership:

- The Faculty Senate conducts its business in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. If anyone wishes to serve as 2000-01 Parliamentarian, please notify the Secretary.
- When recognized, please state your name and department so your statement may be identified on the transcript.
- When you make a motion or amendment, please hand a written copy to the Secretary immediately.
- If you arrive late, please inform the Secretary of your presence in writing.
- Senators and Ex Officio members, are requested to sit below the transverse aisle. The recording microphones do not pick up voices above the aisle.

CRAWSHAW introduced his guest at Senate, Julie M. Schmid, who joined PSU-AAUP effective this date as their new Chapter Coordinator. In addition to her labor relations experience, Dr. Schmid holds an earned doctorate in writing from the University of Iowa.

President's Greeting

BERNSTINE welcomed the Senate back. Enrollment is up this year. Enrollment management will be an important issue this year, as we examine the strategic implications of growth. The action councils, by-products of the Campus Climate Commission, were active last year. This year we have six new faculty-of-color, and Diversity Council is congratulated for their effort in that regard. Shortly, we will be presenting a revised advising system to Council of Academic Deans, and hopefully, it will be presented to Senate soon thereafter. The Assessment Council will conduct an initiative this year, which will involve ten departments across campus, including University Studies.

Two collaborations are underway. First, we are building an affiliation between PSU, OGI and OSU called the Metropolitan Collaborative, and we are still moving forward on that project contrary to yesterday's *Oregonian* editorial. Thanks especially to Engineering

department chairs for our success. The second effort involves the Oregon Historical Society. We haven't completed talks yet, but there are strong indications of support in the community as well as within OHS.

The Capital Campaign is moving forward. We had our first \$1.5 million gift, in the history of PSU, to the schools of Business and Education this fall. This was followed a week later by another \$1. million gift from Peter Stott. We hope this bodes well for the upcoming campaign and challenges other potential donors to step up to support the university.

The new Athletic Director, Tom Burman, was unable to be here today.

This is a great time for PSU. We are looking forward to a great year, and to working with all here.

Provost's Report ·

TETREAULT noted there are several areas in which she wishes to collaborate with the Faculty Senate this year, including planning, graduate education, enrollment management, assessment, budget and faculty vitality. There are also the initiatives on Dan's agenda.

As regards planning, it seems that it is time to sharpen where we are going and what we are doing. The vehicle for that is the Urban University Portfolio Project, which was previewed at Convocation. It is a way for us to quickly communicate what we're doing, and why we're doing it. We will tell stories that inform various publics about what we're doing and use it as a way to articulate our vision, our goals and our objectives. There has been faculty input on the project but more is needed. Please look at it and respond.

The second part of the planning effort is the Great City - Great University activity that was kicked off at the Symposium and will be continued with a series of events. The next event is a lecture by Neal Pierce on 5 October. As we move forward with these two projects, we are going to enlist the University Planning Council to enhance faculty input.

There are many reasons we need to move graduate education to the front burner. It is particularly important as we take up the question of what it means to be a great university. The Graduate Education Task Force will be reconvened to work on criteria for determining the kinds of graduate programs we want to go forward with, since we have to be selective.

Enrollment management is an important issue. We have a 5.2% increase in enrollment as of today, but we need to be strategic because pressure on class sizes, workload and classrooms is growing. The planning committee, under Janine Allen's leadership, is trying to address the questions raised last year about how to move forward strategically in the areas of recruitment, retention, where we grow and why. Most important, how do we gather sufficient and appropriate data to guide what we do.

We are initiating an institutional assessment plan, which Terry Rhodes will be discussing today.

As regards the budget, we had a good year. The process was opened up and we had clarity around it. This year we need to assess the things that worked well and suggest how the budget process can work better.

Thank you to the many people who worked on the collective bargaining agreements and brought success and closure to those efforts. One of our sister campuses put forward a position paper about faculty salaries and enrollment growth, which we can emulate. The Senate Budget Committee will be requested to develop a position paper to frame the issues around faculty compensation, such as our goal of parity with our peers, the relationship of enrollment growth to faculty compensation, and how both teaching and non-teaching faculty are fairly considered.

You are encouraged to investigate the initiatives on the ballot and vote. There are a series of forums scheduled on Wednesdays from now until Election Day on the ballot initiatives.

Faculty vitality is absolutely important to the health of any institution. PSU needs to be a place where people want to work and where people feel that their well being is attended to. It is in this spirit that we have initiated the project, "Enhancing Faculty Vitality While Increasing Student Learning."

In conclusion, TETREAULT noted the first year provided her an opportunity to build up some of the layers of understanding necessary for good administration, and this year she hopes to extend that effort outward into areas such as departments.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. University Assessment Activities

RHODES noted he is new and his position is new. One of his responsibilities is serving as the institutional liaison to the N.W. Assoc. of Schools and Colleges, our regional accrediting body, and he is working on assessment as part of that. Assessment is partly driven by external accrediting bodies, and the regional accrediting bodies are asking us to do more in terms of talking about and focusing on student learning outcomes. We are being asked to demonstrate what our students have learned as graduates of our institutions. Assessment is also something that we do as faculty in any event. We need to have a much better idea of what it is that we want our students to learn, and to be able to articulate that, and we need to have a systematic approach to determining what they are learning.

As for today's students, nearly 80 % indicate that they will go on to higher education, which is a much greater number than when we ourselves were in school. Of those students 70% enroll in higher education within two years of high school. Adults 25 years and older constitute 42% of enrolled students nationally. Only 20-30% of four-year institutions practice any type of selective admissions policies. One-third of college students take at least one course that is considered to be remedial.

PSU's Factbook indicates that in Fall 1999 entering students were composed of about 1000 freshmen and 2000 transfers, indicating a change in the mix of our students. Women were 55% of those students. The average age was 25.8 for undergraduate students and 34.2 for graduate students. White students comprised 67% of our students, and 55% are full time.

PSU's student population is changing. Students coming out of high school in 1991 had an average GPA of 2.79, and in 1999 that had increased to 3.09. In 1991 students had been out of high school an average of nine years before entering PSU, and in 1999 the figure was one year. SAT scores averaged 1000 in 1991, and they averaged 1017 in 1999. Average SCH in 1994 was 39 hours and in 1999 it was 40 hours. Average GPA in 1994 was 2.77, and in 1999 it was 2.9. Our freshmen carry the heaviest credit hour load and our returning students carry the lowest. Our transfer students do the worst in terms of their PSU GPA, and our returning students do the best. In 1994, 30.5% of our students earned A's and 61.4% earned As and Bs. In 1999 31.4% of our students earned A's and 68.7% earned A's and B's. Returning students were the most likely to be earning A's and B's and freshmen the least likely.

Most of our entering students this fall will have been born in 1982. Grace Kelly, Elvis Presley, Karen Carpenter, and the ERA have always been dead. Somebody named Bush has been on every national election ticket except one in his or her lifetime. The Kennedy tragedy was a plane crash, not an assassination. There have always been automated tellers. The year these students were born, the *N.Y Times* announced that the trendy boom in video games was over. They have never heard a phone ring. Spam and cookies are not necessarily food. What all that has to do with assessment, is what our strategy is going to focus on. How can it better inform us as faculty about what we want our students to learn, and let us have a better idea of what they are actually learning. **If** an assessment doesn't give us useful information to improve instruction, it is not worth doing.

Rhodes, Feyerherm, and Lieberman will serve as a triumvirate to look at assessment to include graduate and undergraduate programs. Bill Becker is serving as Chair of the Assessment Council, as well as faculty in residence in the Center for Academic Excellence. Cheryl Ramette will also assist. Resources will be provided such as a web site which will include examples of best practices from other campuses. An assessment resource team, including Kathi Ketcheson, Bob Sinclair, Carl Wamser, Tanya Ostrogorsky, and Am1 Rivinus, will bring other resources to bear. Pilot assessment projects will be conducted in about ten programs including University

Studies, and several CLAS departments, which have already done some work. We plan to use the portfolio from the Portfolio Project as our self-study. We encourage the development of scholarship around this endeavor, as well.

AGORSAH asked if there is any profile on faculty, which resembles that on students. RHODES stated no.

2. Update on the Office of Marketing & Communications

WITHERS noted that part of the overall mission of Marketing & Communications is to keep faculty informed. Their two-year goal was to increase the positioning strength of the university in the minds of those who enroll as students, and of those who support PSU as private givers, donors, and philanthropists. Jan Woodruff, the first director of the Office of Marketing and Communications, has just moved on although the office has achieved several successes in its efforts. Marketing can be alienating to an educational institution, but these are some of the results obtained in the last 12-18 months. We have increased by 80-100,000, the number of new people who can identify PSU and view us favorably. We have increased by 10-11% the number of affluent households who view us favorably. We have increased our media exposure by 21% in the last year.

Jeanie-Marie Price who is at this meeting will serve as Interim Director of O.M.C.. She has played a lead role in the media increase, but she is not a candidate for the Director position. Before moving to the search, an assessment will be conducted of O.M.C. and Publications to develop a more cohesive messaging plan, with the assistance of a consultant from another university. Marvin Kaiser has been asked to serve as chair of the search, which will commence in about sixty days.

The goal this year is to double our media coverage from the previous year. Thank you to several people present who participated in a "virtual" focus group testing several ads. All but one of these has gone back for major overhaul based on that feedback.

3. Report on the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

DRISCOLL presented the report for the committee (attached).

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals and Program Changes in the M.S. in Electrical & Computer Engineering Degree Requirements

EDER introduced the proposals for Graduate Council, prompting the Senate to divide them into two motions.

A. JOHNSON/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.I., items A through E, "course proposals and changes in CUPA, CLAS, SFPA, GSE and SBA."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.I., item F," Change in M.S. in Electrical & Computer Engineering (BCE) Degree Requirements.

HEYING asked if this was being done at all OUS institutions. EDER yielded to DRISCOLL who stated that this proposal is related to a specific aspect of program requirements of the PSU BCE department. OGI has already allowed this sort of thing to happen. CUMMINGS asked what is meant by "full curriculum review." DRISCOLL stated this requirement would now exclude omnibus-numbered courses.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote with one Nay.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 6, 2000
Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agre-Kippenhan, Balshem, Barham, Barton, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brenman, Brenner, Brodowicz, Buddress, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collins, Crawshaw, Daasch, Dieterich, Ellis, Erskine, Faine, Feeney, Fisher, Fosque, Friesen, Glanville, Gelmon, George, Gilbert, Hagge, Harmon, Herrington, Heying, Hopp, Ingersoll, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, R. Mercer, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmiter, Patton, Peterson, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reynolds, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Shusterman, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Wang, Yatchmenoff.

Alternates Present: Sbait for Elteto, Garrett for Barton, Allen for Beasley, Edelblut for Carpenter, Percy for Cummings, Seely for Fortmiller, Barham for Franz, Chapman for Hoffman, Leary for Hunter, Knights for Sestak, Morgan for Shinn.

Members Absent: Ames, Anderson, Cabelly, Chaille, Eder, Falco, Farr, Holloway, L. Johnson, Kiam, Lall, L. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Reece, Shireman, Sherman, Skinner, Squire, Trowbridge, Turcic, Walsh, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Brown, Burman, Burns, Diman, Feyerherm, C. Sparks for B. Johnson, Kaiser, Kenton, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Pfungsten, Pratt, Rufolo, Sylvester, Tetreault, Vieira, Ward, Withers

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

It was noted that the November 2000 Senate Agenda be corrected to show that the Minutes being approved are for 2 October 2000.

The minutes of the 2 October 2000 meeting were approved with the following correction:

p. 10, Jeanette Palmiter was present at the October meeting.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Senators were reminded that copies of the *Great City: Great University Series 2000* update and the "Summary of Provost's Goals 2000-01" (attached) are being distributed at the doors.

Changes in Senate/Committee Appointments since 2 October 2000:

Mark Trowbridge has submitted his resignation from the Faculty Senate.

The SSW position on the Curriculum Committee is vacant due to the resignation of Monique Busch from the university, effective June 2000.

The Presiding Officer introduced the Ex-officio Senate representatives from ASPSU, Chris Sparks and Emily Garrett.

President's Report

BERNSTINE discussed three topics, Engineering & Computer Sciences, Elections, and PSU Athletics. As regards Engineering & Computer Sciences, the outcome of the OUS board meeting at Ashland was positive. The bulk of funding went to OSU but funds did go to PSU and we are still a player. Our major concern was that the board not give license to only one institution for "top tier" status, which could have had a negative impact on the Capital Campaign. This is a significant victory for PSU. We are continuing our activities regarding the Metropolitan Collaborative, which has a combined student population of 25,000 and a combined research budget of \$210 million. We project that by 2010, the collaborative would have a combined research budget of over \$300 million. As currently constituted the collaborative would rank in the top 26-27 schools by *US News & World Report* comparators, and would rank in the top 5-6 by 2010. We are not preoccupied with these standings, rather we are focusing on how we could make targeted investments in the metropolitan region with the three institutions to 1) respond to the issue of doubling the numbers of engineers in Oregon, and 2) to be responsive to the needs of the high tech community. Not only can the collaborative achieve this objective but, along the way, it will also achieve "top tier" status.

BERNSTINE noted that the outcomes of the 7 November Election could have significant negative impact on PSU and would require significant budget cuts. The worst of the ballot measures are predicted to fail but that should not inspire complacency.

BERNSTINE, in response to a request from the Steering Committee, discussed the \$1 million deficit in the athletic program. Since May 1992 we have operated under an OUS board directive that there be no increases in Athletic deficits at PSU and OSU. We made a pledge to the Chancellor a few years ago that we would reduce the deficit each year, and attempt to eliminate it as soon as we could. Last year, ASPSU requested that we no longer carry the accumulated deficit in their student activities account and we agreed to transfer the deficit to the unrestricted general fund. The result was to reduce our overall carryforward for each year, and in consultation with Administrators and the Budget Committee we wiped the

deficit off the books. It was partly a bookkeeping matter, and partly an effort to give a new Athletic Director a clean slate, as well as a directive to and a commitment from the new Director that we would work very hard to make sure that we do not incur significant deficits in the future.

BERNSTINE introduced Tom Burman, the new Athletic Director, who was previously the Assoc. Athletic Director for Development at the U. of Wyoming. With Tom's leadership we are hoping to increase our revenues from Football and Basketball, both men's and women's, and strengthen the support of the Viking Club and other sources of revenue.

BERNSTINE displayed on an overhead "PSU Athletics Budgeted Sources of Funding, 2000-01," and for the sake of comparison, "Budgeted Source of Funding for Big Sky Athletics, 1998-99" (attached). Oregon State University currently budgets \$4.4 million from E&G funds, and currently has a \$6. Million deficit in Athletics. The U. of Oregon currently budgets \$1.96 million of E&G funds for Athletics. PSU student athletes pay in tuition about \$3. Million, which comes back to us a revenue as compared to the budgeted \$2.1 million in institutional support.

HEYING asked if the \$2 million isn't a large sum. BERNSTINE noted that, as he indicated previously, we get back tuition money and we also attract gifts to the university because of the athletic program. One gift that went to SFPA for an endowment equivalent to \$3 million, would not have come but for the Athletic program. A major gift to SBA in the offing will not come but for Athletics. Our largest athletic donor has indicated that his next gift will not go to Athletics but to some other part of the university.

LATIOLAIS stated that the tuition income generated by student athletes does not entirely support Athletics, but needed to fund to the educational programs and services they are ^{en}rolled in across the campus.

HEYING asked if there is any consideration of examining our expenses in relation to those at comparator institutions, as a way of assessing the value of the athletic program. BERNSTINE stated this year's accreditation process includes budgetary review. Our own Advisory Board will also be reviewing the budget. Looking at the data for Big Sky, PSU has the lowest percentage of institutional support in the conference. The real challenge is to determine a realistic Athletics budget and be clear about the return on our investment. For example, as well as the other tangible benefits such as the community recreation field and improvements to the Stott Center, there are intangible benefits.

A. JOHNSON suggested the new Athletic Director and the student representatives work together to improve student attendance at athletic events. BERNSTINE stated that in addition to giving, we also need more paying customers, including faculty, to attend the football and 2 basketball series.

HEYING noted this is a traditional model for Athletics. What about alternative models for athletic programs which can also improve intangible benefits. For example, we don't have a stadium. BERNSTINE stated that is a legitimate question.

BRENNER stated that one of the important considerations should be the totality of what sports do, rightly or wrongly. Our participation in the Big Sky Conference has generated national press and improved our institutional standing in a way that intramural sports would not. The President and the Athletic Director should be commended for the emphasis being placed on doing this in a financially reasonable way. BERNSTINE noted that they will provide as much information as possible this year. He also noted that in a conversation with Pres. Risser recently, he pointed out that the day last year when OSU clinched their first bowl game in 30 years, they raised more money than they ever had in the school's history and it was not for athletic programs. It's difficult to put a dollar value on the investment, and it is important to consider which urban institutions to model from, for example UCLA or UI/Chicago. In terms of what Athletics can bring to the academic part of this university, this is a very small investment on balance.

BURNS suggested that the Athletics accreditation reports being prepared this fall be brought back to the Senate for information. The situation looks far better than generally perceived, for example, in the graduation rate of student athletes. BERNSTINE noted that the administration is committed to a reasonable budget. The investment we make in Athletics must make sense in light of where we are headed as an institution. For example, the student body is becoming younger and we are attracting more traditional students who are looking for a traditional college experience. We will not support athletics to the detriment of the university as a whole.

REUTER asked if our efforts around improving and expanding engineering, as regards "tier" strategy, depend on other institutions faltering. BERNSTINE stated that we at PSU have always pursued the strategy of programmatic development, not *US News* rankings. The success in achieving programmatic goals will cause reputation to follow.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT reviewed her "Summary of Provost's Goals 2000-01," the full text of which is on the OAA Web page, and the *Great City Great University* series. The planning activities are intended to initiate a reflective process about who we are, where we're going, and what we want to be, and translate that reflection into plans that will be communicated through the urban university portfolio project. Enrollment management is also an important area of concern given our rapid growth in the past several years. Lois Becker is one Faculty Senator who is serving on that committee and can provide information. Another important area is issues of academic quality, including the proposals for program review. Faculty are urged to review the full text on the Web.

The Provost was asked about faculty participation in the roundtables. TETREAULT noted that interested faculty should speak to her or to their Dean, as groups will be limited in size to ensure their effectiveness.

BURNS asked for a 4th week enrollment report. TETREAULT stated we are up 7.5% headcount in degree seeking students, and 5.8% credits. PERNSTEINER stated we are slightly down in Extended Studies enrollment, but the overall increase is about 4% in credit hours and a little more in headcount. The official 4th week headcount for degree seeking students is 17,241, and all enrollment is over 20,000. We are the first Oregon institution to ever reach that figure. We had budgeted for 5.2% growth, and although we came in under that, the growth in overall headcount is significant and needs to be evaluated. All in all, the faculty have done an amazing job.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions For Administrators

None

2. Questions From the Floor for the Chair

A. JOHNSON asked if someone could give a progress report on the health of Faculty Senator L. Elteto. ROSENGRANT stated he is recovering nicely from a minor stroke and says hello and thanks for all the good thoughts.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 7-8 October

BURNS presented the report for Wollner, after G.1. BURNS indicated that we will have some involvement with the development of the Bend campus, and yielded to the Provost. TETREAULT noted that although both OSU and UO have approached us about participation, President Bernstine has previously communicated to Chancellor Cox that we want to continue the programs we have already developed including MPA, MBA, MSW, Education programs, Criminal Justice programs and a few others. The Deans have concurred that we are willing to establish agreements with UO & OSU, but not with any exclusively.

BURNS noted the other major discussion item was distance education, as OIT is being forced to go to WEB instruction without compensation. BURNS asked for feedback from the assembly regarding this issue. HEYING stated it should be understood that course development is very costly and time

consuming. CARR stated she just returned from a national meeting in educational administration of mostly Research I institutions where the figure of \$10,000 was cited as an estimate of the minimum cost for course support. Additionally, the nature of Web archiving restricts the free exchange of information. REUTER noted there was a subcommittee on distance learning last year in the Adv. Cmttee. On Academic Information Technology, and that group addressed many of the issues. ANDREWS-COLLIER cautioned of the negative impact on an institution's reputation of a poorly executed course. _____ indicated that we should take into account that the climate at OIT is different from our own.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution Concerning Initiatives Limiting Academic Freedom

MERCER, for the Senate Steering Committee, introduced the resolution and described the background on its content. Although a certain ballot measure prohibits, including by economic sanction, K-12 and community college instruction related to specific topics, the ballot measure will also apply to all public educational institutions as regards the prohibitions contained therein.

A. JOHNSON/M.NEAL MOVED "G1:" "*...BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of Portland State University, on behalf of the Faculty of Portland State University, oppose on principle any legislative proposal or issue before the electorate which interferes with the ethical duty of the professoriate to adhere to the essential principles of academic freedom, and to provide for students services which are essential for their intellectual and physical health and well-being as well as those of the greater society.*"

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 4, 2000
Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Barham, Barton, Beasley, Becker, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brodowicz, Buddress, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collins, Crawshaw, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Eder, Ellis, Fisher, Fosque, Franz, Friesen, Gelmon, Gilbert, Harmon, Herrington, Heying, Hoffman, Holloway, Ingersoll, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, L.Mercer, R.Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmiter, Patton, Philbrick, Rectenwald, Reece, Reynolds, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Talbott, Walsh, Yatchmenoff.

Alternates Present: Wollner for Balshem, Lafferièrre for Bleiler, Sbait for Elteto, Agre-Kippenhan for Erskine, Fahey for Hagge, Toppe for Hopp, Rad for Lall, Morgan for Shinn, Kim for Tableman.

Members Absent: Bjork, Cabelly, Carpenter, Chaille, Falco, Farr, Feeney, Fortmiller, George, Glanville, Hunter, L.Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Peterson, Rogers, Shireman, Sherman, Skinner, Turcic, Wang, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Jacob, Kaiser, Kenton, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Rufolo, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Withers.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

The minutes of the 6 November 2000 meeting were approved with the following correction: p. 10, Douglas Sherman, ED, was present at the October & November Senate meetings.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies has distributed the notice, "Appropriate Use of I and X Grades "(attached), to instructional faculty, as requested by the 1999-2000 Faculty Senate.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since 6 November 2000:

Marc Feldesman, ANTH, has been appointed to fill the vacant CLAS position left by Mark Trowbridge (2001) in the Faculty Senate.

The SBA caucus of the Faculty Senate elected Rodney Rogers, SBA, to serve on the Committee on Committee. He replaces Alan Cabelly, who is on sabbatical.

Committee on Committee appointments to committee vacancies: Wendy Stewart, LIB, has been appointed Chair, Deadline Appeals Committee; Richard Hunter, SSW, has been appointed to the Academically Controlled Auxiliary Activities Committee; Ric Vrana, GEOG, has been appointed a CLAS representative to University Planning Council; Barbara Guthrie has been appointed the SES representative to the University Planning Council; Joseph Poracsky has been appointed to the Student Conduct Committee; Marjorie Enneking has been appointed the Mathematics representative to the Teacher Education Committee; Rebecca Robinson has been appointed the SES representative to the Curriculum Committee.

Committee on Committee appointments to calendar year committees, effective 1 January 2001: Curriculum Committee: Stephen Walton, FLL, replaces Everett for CLAS; Jan Semenza, SCH, replaces Gelmon for UPA; Emily de la Cruz replaces Narode for ED. Beverly Fuller is re-appointed Chairperson.

Graduate Council: Robert Eder is re-appointed Chairperson; Sandra Wilde replaces Lewis for ED.

Library Committee: Tim Anderson is appointed Chairperson; David Holloway, ENG, replaces Gorji.

The President is not in attendance as he was called out of town.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that the President sends his regards and both he and she thank all of you for the work you have done this quarter, particularly for the increased number of students taught, research completed, community partnerships nurtured and forged, and also for the growth in fundraising and the capital campaign.

The Governor's budget was released on December 1st, and it is available on the Web and copies will be placed in the Library. George Pernsteiner, Jay Kenton and Dick Pratt worked through the weekend, to review and respond to it. This morning, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., Vice Pres. Pernsteiner and the Provost attended the "Presidents Plus One" Meeting, to discuss the system-wide response. The discussion was impressively collegial; there seemed to be broad consensus that one of the things to be emphasized was "quality with full funding of the Budget Model." Of course this budget is tentative because the process is just beginning.

We need to use this budget cycle to sharpen our priorities and our vision, and our budget and enrollment planning. Budgets always challenge you to do that. We need to go forward with our year-long series of thinking about what it means to be a great university in this great city, and use the roundtables, the public forums and the Urban Portfolio Project to articulate what that means for us. It is more incumbent on us than ever to put ideas behind the idea of a great university. The first PSU roundtable will be held December 6, to discuss current future collaborations between PSU, OGI, and OHSU, and will include faculty and deans from CLAS, CUPA, GSSW and CECS. On February 7 there will be a public forum to include, as well, representatives from OGI and OHSU. We also expect to go forward with the next idea on the year-long series, creative industries.

As has already been discussed with the Budget Committee, we also need to develop long-term budget and enrollment strategies. The Budget Committee has received a proposal for long term and short-term projects; and with the release of the Governor's budget, it would appear the long term is now. The Budget Committee has agreed that we jointly address enrollment-related questions identified by the Enrollment Management Policy Committee. These include issues related to optimizing enrollment to contribute to institutional revenues, student learning, research, and the quality of faculty and staff work life. We will also work together to clarify how PSU will invest institutional resources with our academic mission in mind to intentionally shape enrollment in relation to the number and mix of students and programs. This includes the question of how we tie enrollment growth and planning to resource allocation. Lastly, we also need to work with Vice President Pernsteiner and others, the AAUP, to develop a position paper that addresses the issue of faculty and staff salaries and how to make consistent progress in achieving parity with peer institutions.

There has been an initiative for faculty and departments to write proposals addressing the issues of enhancing faculty vitality while increasing student learning. The purpose is for faculty and departments to think in new ways about how we do our basic work of teaching and how to do that in ways that don't increase costs but do enhance faculty vitality and student learning. Fifteen proposals have been received so far, and hopefully, new models will result from the proposals that are funded.

We need to organize around the idea of maintaining quality by advocating current funding of the budget model. We are compelled to support the Governor's budget, and we will address its impact on PSU, however, both the Governor and the Legislature in the last session made funding the model the highest priority. We need to work with them to maintain quality by staying the course on the budget model.

The Administration will work with the Budget Committee and CADS to address all of the issues above in relation to the budget reality, as it becomes clear in the coming weeks and months.

TETREAULT yielded to Vice President Pernsteiner to discuss the Governor's budget.

Vice President's Report

PERNSTEINER stated the framework for the budget discussions is the fact that the State General Fund budget does not have enough revenue to fund the Current Service Level in the next biennium. In other words, to do exactly what we are doing now but with the increased costs of salary roll-ups, there are not enough funds. There are three major reasons: 1) the economy is not growing as rapidly as recently, thus reducing the growth in income tax revenues; 2) as in every biennium, year two costs are larger than year one; and, 3) the state has incurred debts of approximately several hundred million dollars as a result of several lawsuits, and these must be paid from the general fund. The net effect of these factors is about a \$700 - 800 million shortfall in the current service level. Within that framework, the Governor also had proposed several initiatives, some of which are not intended to be funded by the General Fund, such as the rural initiatives, but some of which are, such as the Early Childhood Initiatives. The result is that most agencies, including OUS, saw a reduction in their budgets from what it takes to continue at the Current Service Level. Additionally, the Governor has asked higher education to take on some new initiatives within the monies he has allocated. They include the Bend program, some engineering investments, and a stabilization fund for the rural campuses. Thus, with reduced dollars, we will be required to do additional things we were not doing in '99-01.

The focus of today's meetings was the potential impact of the Governor's budget on the Oregon University System. It is safe to say that we will be doing some very careful looking at our budgets. We must maintain our quality, while continuing to serve students, increasing funded research, and keeping college affordable to students. We must save some monies during the remainder of this year in order to help us plan our way over the following biennium. We have to do it in a way so as not to hurt the enrollment of the students currently being served, and does not hurt our trajectory of funded research. We are on the right path; we are doing the things we are supposed to be doing and we are doing the things we want to be doing. Lastly, we will also have to focus our attention on what our high priorities are during the next two years, in order that we can get through the biennium. We may have some budget reductions in those years. We don't yet have numbers.

As the Legislative Session unfolds, as we get further revenue forecasts, as we get more certainty about the costs of lawsuits, as we get a little more clarity about the priorities of the Governor and the legislative leadership, our goal will be to fund the model as fully as is possible to fund it. We want to maintain our quality and we want to maintain the trajectory we are on, with respect to both enrollment and funded research. In the coming weeks we will be working with the Budget Committee and the Council of Academic Deans, to begin to ferret out the plans we will need to work through the next several months. To reiterate, if we don't have a higher appropriation level than the Governor's proposal once the Legislative Session is completed, the '00-01 savings will be used to ameliorate cuts in '01-02 and will not be returned to units.

BURNS requested a clarification of budget figures listed in the 2 December *Oregonian* which suggested an increase in OUS funding. PERNSTEINER stated that although it appears on page 32 of the "Budget in Brief," nobody can figure out what that \$691.4 million means. Our appropriation in the '99-01 biennium, was more than \$750 million, and the appropriation for the '01-03 biennium is roughly \$760 million (including OHSU in both cases).

KOCH asked if the Vice President could estimate the size of the problem. PERNSTEINER stated it is hard to say at this date. If you make some assumptions about enrollment growth and access funding, about tuition increases allowed by the Governor, and about some of the other things looked at this year, you begin to narrow the number down to the point that, working with the Deans and the Budget Committee, we can have some realistic plans that will allow us to stay on our current trajectory. However, it won't be easy.

A. JOHNSON asked what percentage of our total budget comes from the state. PERNSTEINER stated it depends on what you count; if you count everything you get, its about 22%, but if you don't count the auxiliaries, the funded research, etc., it is about 50%.

NEAL asked, if by saying "save some monies" now the Vice President means cuts. PERNSTEINER stated what he is hoping to do is to bank some money this year. For example, if you have a vacancy and are not going to fill it, if you would give him back that money he will put it in an account with your name on it. If it isn't needed, he will let you roll it forward, and you will not loose the position. It's a way of "cashflowing" us through. Otherwise, if you go right up to the date and spend everything you had you have to cut extra to get through the next year. In the second year of the biennium, given the way the state funding works, we would have more money than in the first year. Rather than ratcheting up and down, we would try to smooth it out a little bit.

SBAIT asked if the proposed budget includes a 4% tuition increase per year. PERNSTEINER stated, yes, and that the board had already requested an increase in tuition. SBAIT noted we are one of the highest states, nationwide, with regard to charging students. How will a tuition increase help students, especially low-income students? PERNSTEINER stated that affordability is of great concern. In relation to the Western states, we have a relatively high tuition, and in relation to national tuition rates, we are sort of average. In terms of affordability, because our income in Oregon is slightly below the national norm, it makes it less affordable than for students in some other states.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Faculty Senator Michael Cummings submitted the following questions for Vice Provost Allen on 4 December:

1. What is the status of the reciprocity agreement that allows students from southwestern Washington to attend PSU at in-state tuition rates? I understand, the program has run out of money and is no

longer available. Has the program been permanently discontinued? Or will be refunded by the next legislature? If it is discontinued, what is the potential impact on enrollment at PSU?

2. Now that we have joint agreements with area community colleges (each one being slightly different), what is the policy on financial aid? If a student takes 8 credits at PSU and 4 credits at PCC does this count as 12 credits for financial aid purposes? Is the total number of credits taken at both institutions what is counted or is it only the credit load at PSU that counts?

ALLEN responded to question #1. She noted that the reciprocity agreement with Washington State, which had been in effect for many years, was not funded in the last legislative session. Chancellor Cox signed an agreement with the Higher Education Coordinating Council of Washington to "grandfather" students currently in the reciprocity program to their degree completion. Therefore, no funding has been withdrawn, but the program is ending. PSU has developed an alternative by replacing it with a merit scholarship program for students in the five bordering counties. Anyone with a 3.0 or above is eligible to apply for the limited number of scholarships, currently set at 300, which will range from \$4,500 - \$6,000 per year in fee remissions. We hope this will soften the impact of losing the reciprocity program. ALLEN noted we also participate in "WUE", the Western Undergraduate Exchange program, which allows students from western states to attend PSU at 150% of in-state tuition, however, only twenty-one baccalaureate majors qualify. HOFFMAN added that while the new program does not provide comparable funding, 70 scholarships are reserved for incoming Freshman and the rest are available for students with 30 transferable hours, as opposed to the required 90 transfer hours in the former program. The announcement is already on the Web.

BRENNAN asked if these scholarships would be available for graduate students, as the reciprocity agreement was. ALLEN stated no, noting also that the reciprocity agreement included only 30 graduate placements.

A. JOHNSON commented that WSU-Vancouver is advertising on Tri Met busses that they charge instate tuition. ALLEN noted that he ads are somewhat misleading. Beginning this year, they have the same tuition policy we have, e.g., students enrolled part-time (less than 8 hours) may use the in-state tuition rate.

SBAIT asked what was the number of students served under the old program and what is the impact. PERNSTEINER stated there were 228. ALLEN stated the objective of the new program is to soften the fiscal blow of losing those students. SBAIT asked if they could move to Oregon. ALLEN stated they have to meet the same residency requirements as anyone else, and full-time enrollment actually makes getting residency harder.

D. JOHNSON asked if students taking less than 8 hours are assessed in-state fees. ALLEN stated yes. KENTON added that all students, not just Washingtonians, are assessed in-state fees for less than 8 hours.

MERCER noted that as the proportion of state support diminishes, the notion of in state versus out-of-state tuition becomes more obsolete. MERCER also asked for a clarification of residency policy at Eastern Oregon. ALLEN stated that the new policy is based on the notion that the Portland metropolitan area is on both sides of the river, regardless of state. PERNSTEINER stated Eastern Oregon has had only in-state tuition since the 1950's, however, the small schools are all getting one or another break and we are not really comparable. PSU has argued unsuccessfully for years that our Vancouver students should pay in-state tuition, in the same way that if they work on this side of the river they pay Oregon income tax.

ALLEN responded to question #2. She noted that we have joint financial aid agreements with PCC, MHCC, and Clackamas CC for co-admitted students, which allows us to count enrollment at both institutions towards the 12-hour full-time requirement. This does not apply to other community colleges.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Curriculum Committee

GELMON presented the report, after G.1., and thanked the committee and consultants for this year's work.

MILLER-JONES asked for comment on the issues of pre-requisites for upper division courses, as opposed to prohibition of pre-requisites for upper division UNST cluster courses. A. JOHNSON noted that the Academic Requirements Committee is looking at the issue of prerequisites. The new "DARS" records program makes it possible to automatically block enrollments and several programs have requested it. PALMITER noted that Math is already taking this information off "Banner."

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Annual Report of the Graduate Council

EDER presented the report after E.7. noting one error: page 2, last paragraph, 3rd sentence, should read: "Overall 92% of the petitions were approved, which is an *increase...*"

A. JOHNSON commended the language of sentence 2, Preamble, "Graduate and Professional Programs Mission Statement, " page 2.

RUETER asked, regarding the Masters of ESE, how were you able to specify one particular pedagogical approach (e.g. on-line), and was that approved at the outset or when the proposal was approved? EDER stated the history of the proposal was that it was externally mandated as a collaborative project to be largely web-based. It

received the usual scrutiny, including examination of the on-line issues, and was approved before Eder joined the Graduate Council.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the Library Committee Postponed to January 2001

4. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee

DIETERICH presented the report, immediately after D. Question Period.

A. JOHNSON noted that the Academic Requirements Committee first reviewed the request for A+ grading and passed it on to Scholastic Standards.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Quarterly Report of the University Planning Council

The Chairperson was not in attendance; therefore the Presiding Officer postponed the report to January 2001.

6. Report on the University Studies Program

The Presiding Officer vacated the Chair for the period of this report, and Presiding Officer Pro tem Robert Mercer took the Chair.

GELMON presented the UCC cover report as well as the UNST report, after E.1.

WOLLNER/PATTON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the report.

PALMITER noted she has read the report completely, and asked what was being asked of them beside general information. GELMON stated the request was for a report on what they were learning about what they were doing. This was the first comprehensive, integrated study of the program. The Curriculum Committee did not dictate or direct the study in any way. RHODES stated, although he came into the process after it had started, the attempt was to pull together all information collected up to that point, and to fold this assessment into the overall university assessment pilot project. GELMON noted the report indicates where the University Curriculum Committee sees a need for further and/or improved assessment in the future. RHODES agreed.

SHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification of the graphs on pages 12 - 14. RHODES stated that Martha Balshem prepared the graphs but couldn't attend this meeting. He continued that these charts show overall that the student performance was average.

SHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification of the chart on page 18, and noted it is difficult to evaluate this assessment. RHODES stated that this chart indicates an overall positive response by the students to the program in this term. GELMON stated that the Curriculum Committee encountered similar difficulties in following this information, and noted that the executive summary provides a good synthesis of the findings, however, the committee felt it was their role to encourage assessment, not micro manage the procedures.

BRENNER asked if the Curriculum Committee has requested any particulars for the next round, and requested inclusion of the following questions: 1) Are there any specific learning objectives established for PSU's University Studies Program? 2) If yes, what are they (especially for science and mathematics)? If no, how and when will they be established? GELMON stated the committee felt its parameters did not include assessment of particular programs. BRENNER stated that this program replaced a large body of curriculum, and issues of boundaries, etc., are not the same as those for major programs, for example. GELMON stated if the Senate directs the Curriculum Committee to ask certain specific questions, the committee could direct these questions to the Assessment Council.

EDER asked Vice Provost Rhodes if this "in-house" self-study with no external review will be characteristic of the other assessments which will take place. RHODES stated, yes, that each unit is responsible for articulating the student learning outcomes in that unit. In the case of University Studies, they are attempting to articulate the goals approved by the Senate in a more operational manner, so they can be tested better. Most of the work done to this point has been about curriculum development, and student responses have been positive. We are inviting outside units to assist in the development of the Rubrics as well as how to measure them. EDER asked if, in summary, this means that assessments in future will be more rigorous. RHODES stated yes.

HOLLOWAY noted the difference between this and all other academic units is that the results of their decisions affect the graduation of every student, so its whole nature is different. [TRANSCRIPT STOPPED HERE AT 4:45 p.m.] CRAWSHAW agreed this is very different from other programs; University Studies is not just a major, it is supporting all the programs. Therefore, all faculty need to be involved in review.

... MERCER called for order.

PATTON stated that faculty members outside the program have participated in portions of the review, and many teach in the program. What is needed is help with the Rubrics and development.

_____ commented on lack of coordination of or at the level of Clusters.

RUETER referenced the Curriculum Committee Report of the UNST Assessment Plan, Faculty Senate Meeting of 5 June 2000, "Overview", last paragraph, indicating "improvement," and noted that "that part is missing in the report." RUETER "cut some slack..." GELMON responded ...

RUETER stated that the report is self-referential; and suggested an "all curriculum" pilot be put on the table to compare with/get out of this bind.

D. JOHNSON/A.JOHNSON MOVED TO TABLE the item.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MERCER noted that a request will be forwarded to Martha Balshem be in attendance at the January Senate meeting to answer questions that came up today.

7. Report of the IFS Meeting of 2-3 December at OHSU

WOLLNER reported, after E.5. He noted that as the meeting had just occurred, the written report was not ready, but will be included in the January Senate mailing (attached). Three items were of particular interest 1) The new OSU board chairperson, Don Van Luvanee, Chairman and CEO of Electro Scientific Industries spoke about his particular interest in technical education. He also said that the board should "guide but not lead the institutions" and under his stewardship it should be moving out of the business of micro-managing the state system. 2) PEBB rates will be again held down in 2001, but we should expect dramatic increases in 2002 barring any unforeseen developments. 3) Senators are requested to take an informal vote for or against conversion to semester. (The result was the PSU Faculty Senate favored conversion by a majority voice vote).

BRENNAN noted the palatability of a semester conversion is dependent on the sincerity of the intent. CRAWSHAW stated that it is a better overall instructional mode, but questioned the benefit for PSU's students, and he noted that in addition to the issue of sincerity there is the issue of cost. BRENNER noted that unless there is a definitive study, which includes all the parties at the outset, we should not take this seriously. WOLLNER stated we are not alone in the system in our reservations about this issue.

WOLLNER concluded by noting that he has been elected 2001 President of the IFS, Elaine Deutschman, OIT was elected President-elect; Jeff Johnson, EOU was elected Secretary, and Gary Tiedeman, OSU was elected representative to the Academic Council.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals and Program Changes

EDER presented the proposals, after E.2.

A. JOHNSON/FOSQUE MOVED THE PROPSALS ("E2") BE APPROVED by the Faculty Senate.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

GELMON presented the proposals, including summarizing page 2, which is missing from the December packet (attached).

A. JOHNSON/FISHER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.2., Part 1., Proposals from CLAS and CECS."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.2., Part 2, Proposals from SBA."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G., 2., Part 3, Proposals from SFPA."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BRENNER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE, "G., 2., Part 4, Proposals for Additions to UNST Clusters for 2000-2001."

REUTER asked a question about and item, which GELMON answered.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

MERCER concluded the day's proceedings with a thank you speech to outgoing Curriculum Committee chairperson, Sherri Gelmon, for the outstanding work she has done over the past

two years in developing and coordinating procedures and the approvals process for University Studies courses and program, in addition to the committee's regular on-going workload. The assembly acknowledged Prof. Gelmon with standing Applause.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 8, 2001
Presiding Officer: Judith Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Balshem, Barham, Barton, Beasley, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brodowicz, Buddress, Cabelly, Carpenter, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Collins, Crawshaw, Cummings, Dieterich, Eder, Ellis, Elteto, Erskine, Falco, Farr, Feeney, Feldsman, Fisher, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Glanville, George, Gilbert, Hagge, Herrington, Heying, Hoffman, Holloway, Hopp, Hunter, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmiter, Patton, Peterson, Rectenwald, Reece, Rogers, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Sherman, Shinn, Shireman, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Thompson, Turcic, Yatchmenoff

Alternates Present: Nach for Talbott, Bates for Walsh

Members Absent: Chaille, Chenoweth, Daasch, Ingersoll L. Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Lall, Philbrick, Skinner, Tableman, Turcic, Wang, Wosley-George

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Brown, Burns, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Pernsteiner, Pflingsten, Pratt, Rhodes, Sparks for Johnston, Sylvester, Tetreault, Toulan, Ward, Wollner.

NOTE: THERE IS NO TAPED TRANSCRIPT OF THIS MEETING.

A ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 4, 2000, meeting were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

BERNSTINE reported on Advising (see below).

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that the proposed budget for 2001-02 was distributed to the Deans the previous Thursday, January 4 at their meeting, and will be distributed to the Budget Committee the following Tuesday, January 16.

TETREAULT noted that this week marked the anniversary of the move of University Studies from CLAS to Academic Affairs. Accomplishments in the past year include Terry Rhodes' hiring, integration of capstone support with curriculum, and two people being moved from University Studies to CAE and IASC, to assist with budget reviews and resource allocation review. A Graduate Assistant was assigned to study the question of why there are not more tenure track faculty involved is being researched, but the project is behind schedule. Chairs and Deans have also been requested to address this issue. Another project underway is that student learning expectations are being developed to dovetail more closely with PASS requirements

TETREAULT has asked Vice Provost Rhodes to review the national data and activity around the BA/BS requirement, as well as to consult with the appropriate Senate and Administrative committees. He has also been requested to broaden assessment of general education to include Honors, and the BA/BS requirement. He will review and, if necessary, revise, the charge to the University Studies Committee.

TETREAULT asked faculty and deans to take up a discussion of how we discuss campus issues. The Provost's Office has been made aware of student e-mail, which has indicated that faculty have publicly criticized their University Studies colleagues.

Vice President's Report

PERNSTEINER noted that the Governor has requested state agencies, as well as all Oregonians, to make an effort to reduce energy use. Faculty are reminded to make sure all lighting, etc. is turned off when not in use. Also, please note that computers, including computer monitors, use considerable power and should be turned off when not in use.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

BRENNER asked for confirmation that IASC is being moved from the ground floor corridor of Smith Memorial Center, and if that is true, why is IASC relinquishing this central, visible location? FORTMILLER responded that IASC is moving to the 4th floor SMC, in a trade with the Student Government offices. Objectives for the moves include improved visibility for those student groups, and improvements for IASC such as private offices for student advising.

EDER asked if improvements would be made in the electronic grading system before the end of this term when it becomes required. HOFFMAN responded that OIT has been made aware of the problems that occurred at the end of Fall term 2000. The expectation is that all problems will be fixed and we will be prepared to handle mandatory electronic course grading at the end of Winter 2000. HOFFMAN noted, in response to a question regarding grades from previous terms, that the department is working on "going back in time" for course grades but for the present it is only possible to look up a previous grade by referencing the particular student. HOFFMAN noted also that the SGR (Supplemental Grade Reporting) is still recorded only in hard copy form.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Report on the President's Student Advising Action Council

BERNSTINE presented the summary report (attached) after the Vice President's Report. He reviewed the summary and took questions. ALLEN added that the report is on the web and the address for it is at the bottom of page 1 of the summary.

CARTER requested the privilege to read from e-mail by Robert Mercer, who was out of town. He noted that he was not reading the entire message due to the strongly worded content, but requested that three points be included in the record: 1) there was no public discussion of this advising model; 2) it allocates a quarter-million to IASC while departments, whose advising load greatly expands, get no additional funding; and 3) in light of these problems, senators ought to get complete copies of this report and discuss it openly in the public forum provided by the Senate.

A. JOHNSON asked if any changes have been made to the full report since it was presented to department chairs. ALLEN noted that two concerns forwarded since then have been addressed, what do we mean by mandatory, and what will be resources for the departmental liaisons. BERNSTINE reminded the assembly that for the present, a pilot project is proposed.

A. JOHNSON/CRAWSHAW MOVED the Faculty Senate discuss the Advising Report at the February meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate.

BRENNER noted the summary presented here makes it impossible to discuss the report. He noted that SBA has central advising because their faculty are failures at advising, however, their faculty -appropriately - do the career advising. He supports the motion.

SHUSTERMAN asked how will exceptions to published department regulations be incorporated into this model. HOFFMAN _____

CUMMINGS noted that recently he has advised a considerable number of people before they have applied or made any contact with admissions. How will this plan affect that circumstance?

A. JOHNSON asked why the report, in part #4, recommends declaration of the major so late in the student's program. ALLEN _____

FELDESMAN asked _____ and why there is no checkpoint when the student applies for the degree.

CRAWSHAW asked why the fees being charged of students would go to IASC instead of to the schools who will be doing the advising. ALLEN _____

LATIOLAIS noted this plan would prompt students to select a major according only to when they are asked to declare. He added _____

FOSQUE noted that 500 Art majors would generate \$36.00 per year each, \$18,000. total for one year, and \$54,000.00 total for three years. He continued 17,000 PSU students charged \$36.00 per year would generate \$612,000.00 per year for advising purposes. FOSQUE noted that the advising load in his area, the Graphic Design emphasis of the Art major, would consist of 300 majors to be advised by 3 faculty members. Each advisor, responsible for 100 students, advises four times per week at one-half hour per meeting. This totals 16 students per month, or 100 students per 6.25 months. FOSQUE concluded, if each student were "required at critical junctures" to see an advisor (3 required times, 1 at orientation and 2 by the first 90 hours), it would require 12.5 months to support "required advising" of his majors. FOSQUE also asked what would be the proposal for advising part-time students. ALLEN stated the fee would be prorated for part-time students.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

2. Annual Report of the Library Committee

Zelick was unable to remain at Senate until the item came up. The Presiding Officer postponed the report until the February Senate Meeting

3. Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

KETCHESON presented the report for the committee, noting particularly the new opportunities available this year, and the adjusted committee timelines. Applications are due 16 January.

The Presiding Officer Accepted the Report for the Senate.

4. Quarterly Report of the University Planning Council

There was no member of the committee available to present the report. The Presiding Officer postponed the report.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Report on the University Studies Program

CARTER/SESTAK MOVED to take the item from the table.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer vacated the Chair for the discussion, and Faculty Senator and Steering Committee Member, Duncan Carter assumed the Chair.

Hearing no question, discussion was concluded.

The Presiding Officer assumed the Chair.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, *Article IV., Organization of the Faculty*

A. JOHNSON/SESTAK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed Amendment.

PATTON noted that the two Amendments are proposed to address issues of divisional representation in the Senate and in some committees which have been caused by moving University Studies and Honors to the Office of Academic Affairs. Other small changes have to do with housekeeping items, such as the renaming of Engineering as the College of Engineering and Computer Science.

FORTMILLER/BRENNER MOVED to insert in Art. IV, Sec., 4. 4), d), line #3, after "... the Library," the following: "one from All Other faculty," and to insert in Art. IV., Sec., 4., 4), j), line #2, after "...instructional divisions," the following: "one from All Other faculty."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer, in accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, *Article VIII. Amendments* directed the Secretary to the Faculty to transmit to the Advisory Council the Proposed Amendment as amended for review and reply before the next meeting of the Senate.

2. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, *Article V., Faculty Senate*

A. JOHNSON/SESTAK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed Amendment.

There was no debate.

The Presiding Officer, in accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, *Article VIII. Amendments* directed the Secretary to the Faculty to transmit to the Advisory Council the Proposed Amendment as amended for review and reply before the next meeting of the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

_____/CUMMINGS MOVED the meeting be adjourned

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 5, 2001
Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Balshem, Barham, Barton, Beasley, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brodowicz, Brown, Buddress, Cabelly, Carpenter, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Crawshaw, Cummings, Dieterich, Eder, Ellis, Elteto, Faine, Falco, Farr, Feldesman, Fisher, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Friesen, Glanville, Gelmon, Gilbert, Hagge, Hoffman, Holloway, Hopp, Hunter, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, L.Johnson, Kern, Kiam, Koch, Lall, Latiolais, Lewis, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Patton, Philbrick, Reece, Reynolds, Rogers, Rosengrant, Sestak, Sherman, Shinn, Shireman, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Wosley-George.

Alternates Present: Chapman for Ingersoll, Kim for Palmeter, Streck for Peterson.

Members Absent: Chaille, Collins, Erskine, Feeney, George, Herrington, Heying, Kenny L. Mercer, Rectenwald, Rueter, Skinner, Walsh, Wang, Yatchmenoff.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Pfingsten, Pratt, Tetreault, Withers.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 8, 2001 meeting were approved with the following corrections, moved by CRAWSHAW/JOHNSON:

Page 33, under "H. Adjournment," Paragraphs 1 and 2 deleted.

Page 30, under E., Reports from Officer of the Administrations and Committees, add "1." before "Report on the President's Student Advising Action Council"

Page 30, under E.1. (amended), first sentence, change "...after the Vice President's Report" to read "after D.1. Questions for Administrators."

Page 32, under F.1., Report on the University Studies Program paragraph 4:

- 1) Change the sentence beginning "Hearing no question... to read: "Hearing no question, CARTER noted that discussion was concluded and adjourned the meeting. The University Studies Report was neither accepted nor rejected."
- 2) Delete paragraph 5.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Omitted from the published agenda for today's meeting:

F.3. Discussion of the Advising Action Council Report

Other Announcements

After the Question Period, the Presiding Officer recognized Mark Nelson, AOF, Patricia Squire, Senator and PSU Alumni Association, and Mary Cunningham, ASPSU and OSA, to discuss, respectively, the Governor's proposed budget, the 6 March higher education rally at the State Capitol, and the student initiative to curb tuition increases.

NELSON stated that the last legislative session's higher education victories were in spite of the Governor. For this biennium the governor is proposing a tuition increase which will not be returned to the OUS system. Additionally, he has inflated Current Service Level expenditures for other agencies, as compared to ours. This is in spite of the fact that there is \$1.4 billion in new dollars available as a result of the tobacco settlement, fees, etc. There are lots of activities planned in the coming weeks, and a veto of his proposals is envisioned. If higher education is not successful in this campaign the cuts will be as bad as measure 5.

SQUIRE reminded the faculty that OUS is unable to be involved in the March 6 rally and we no longer have Brady Adams to support higher education, so it is incumbent on individuals to work hard to make this year's rally even more successful than the last one.

CUNNINGHAM described the student campaign to cap enrollment increases below the Governor's proposal, and requested faculty communicate with their legislators the effect they perceive these additional costs will have on their students.

HOLLOWAY asked the ASPSU representatives to comment on the notion of adding student advising fees on top of tuition increases. They responded

that advising fees would be directly related to advising services whereas tuition increases would only be felt negatively.

President's Report

BERNSTINE noted that he has spent considerable time in Salem in the past several weeks. It is too soon to make any determinations about the budget. Bipartisan support is evident from the meetings he has had with legislators, and support for higher education in general and PSU in particular looks good. It is too early to panic about the Governor's proposals, and we must stay optimistic.

Provost's Report

The Executive Committee and Dean's retreat was successful. They focused on the Great City - Great University theme, the Capital Campaign, and Enrollment Management. Useful work was accomplished as regards the issue of Enrollment Management. Ideas were developed in response to the question, "In light of the University's direction as a 21st century urban university, what type of student profile would be the most appropriate match?" An action grid and the series of questions will be forwarded to the Enrollment Management Committee, and other appropriate groups for discussion.

The unofficial tally of 4th week PSU enrollment indicates continued growth.

The Great City-Great University conversation continues and a draft vision document was reviewed last week by the deans. It will be refined and sent on the other groups including University Planning Council, department chairs, etc.

This week the Dean's ex-com reviewed the Graduate Committee's working draft for determining areas of distinction in graduate and professional program. Thank you to Vice Provost Bill Feyerherm and Committee Chair, Bob Eder for their work.

Vice President's Report

None.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions For Administrators

BEASLEY asked the President to elaborate on his optimistic remarks as regards budgetary gains. BERNSTINE stated our success has had to do with the last legislative session. The campuses were committed to speaking with one voice, for the entire system. It was clear to the Legislature that we delivered, so they delivered in return. We are reminding them that we delivered. We don't have to justify to each other the costs in order to continue the momentum.

BRENNAN asked the President to comment regarding our status with respect to the new Bend campus. BERNSTINE noted the franchise to be awarded to OSU or UO is not intended to effect statewide programs, which we offer there.

2. Questions From the Floor for the Chair

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report on Developments in Millar Library

PFINGSTEN discussed the imminent Library remodeling and the Orbis consortium (see attached).

2. Library Committee 2000 Annual Report

ZELICK introduced the report (attached to the January 2001 Agenda), indicating particularly the committee recommendations for Senate action.

FELDESMAN/_____ MOVED (the Library Committee recommendations):

"That the library management prepare its own report to the Faculty Senate describing the actions taken to improve service in this area.

That there be similar reviews of the library made at periodic intervals. The library Committee believes that on-going assessment is an important function, and with this report have established a valuable methodology for performing future assessments.

That one position of the library Committee be reserved for a library faculty member, chosen by the Senate Committee on Committees in the same way other members are chosen. We feel as though this would improve communication between the library and the committee."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2-3 February 2001

WOLLNER presented the report (attached).

A. JOHNSON spoke against the Board move to restructure the Grievance Procedures so the process ends with the university president, noting the value of the Board as a final impartial arbiter.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV., Sec. 4. Faculty Committees

SESTAK noted that the Advisory Council discussed three items in relation to the two amendments, 1) consistent terminology to describe each committee, 2) the distinction between All Others and Other Instructional Faculty, and 3) specific new wording in descriptions for the Council Curriculum Committee, Faculty Development and Graduate Council. The Advisory Council noted that the wording is ambiguous and recommends that the words, "one of" be removed from each.

Before the vote, SESTAK, for the Advisory Council, also recommended that an amendment be proposed in future to alter the Budget Committee description as well.

THE AMENDMENT, WITH THE ADJUSTMENT RECOMMENDED BY THE ADVISORY COUNCIL, PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Amendment to the Constitution, Article V., Sec. 1. Faculty Senate

THE AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Advising Action Council Report Discussion

ELLIS proposed he be allowed to make a friendly amendment to the motion of January 2001 to discuss the Advising Action Council Report. ELLIS, on behalf of the Advising Action Council, noted he apologized for the consternation resulting from the report, he stressed that the report was conceived and supported by faculty, and he urged that changes in advising need to be made. ELLIS noted he applauded the Senate interest in Advising, and invited Senators to join with the council to review, clarify, and amend the

recommendations. ELLIS noted that the council hopes to conclude their deliberations in the next week, therefore time is very important.

BLEILER/BALSHEM MOVED TO TABLE the discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LIEBERMAN noted that the Action Council will be conducting meetings in the coming weeks, and Senators can email her at liebermand@pdx.edu if they are interested in participating. The meetings have not been scheduled to date.

ELTETO urged a careful examination of any issue requiring additional student fees due to the proposed tuition increases.

A. JOHNSON noted that he and Ellis agreed not to table the item immediately, so that there would be time for a few remarks from the floor about the issue. ELLIS noted he pledged that Ansel Johnson's concerns will be discussed. A. JOHNSON noted that discussion in committee is not the same as Senate discussion.

MERCER noted that we have no models for avoiding the kind of conflict generated by this item in the arena of the Faculty Senate, as the item was forwarded administratively. If we can be more open during earlier phases of the decision-making process, conflict wouldn't happen.

ELLIS noted he is supportive of Ansel Johnson's proposal for a constitutional committee to oversee Advising.

FOSQUE asked if, instead of Senators emailing Devorah Lieberman, she could email Senators with a schedule of several meeting times they could choose from.

BALSHEM noted that she has some strong feelings about this issue and is glad there will be a mechanism for her to express them.

G. NEW BUSINESS

None

H. ADJOURNMENT

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

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 5, 2001
Presiding Officer: Judith Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Balshem, Barham, Beasley, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brodowicz, Carpenter, Carr, Carter, Crawshaw, Cummings, Dieterich, Eder, Ellis, Elteto, Faine, Falco, Feldesman, Fisher, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, Friesen, Glanville, Gelmon, Gilbert, Harmon, Herrington, Heying, Hoffman, Holloway, Hopp, Hunter, D.Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmeter, Patton, Peterson, Rectenwald, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Sherman, Shinn, Shireman, Shusterman, Squire, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Trowbridge, Turcic, Walsh, Wang.

Alternates Present: Masterson for Brennan, Kosuge for Erskine, Chapman for Ingersoll, Grathoff for A.Johnson, Rad for Lall.

Members Absent: Anderson, Barton, Brown, Buddress, Cabelly, Chaille, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collins, Daasch, Farr, Feeney, George, Hagge, L.Johnson, Kiam, Philbrick, Reece, Rogers, Skinner, Sussman, Wosley-George, Yatchmenoff.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Diman, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Sylvester, Tetreault, Withers, Ward.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the February 5, 2001, Meeting were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

ADDED to Today's Agenda:

F.1. Discussion of Advising Action Council Recommendations

CHANGES IN SENATE/COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS SINCE JANUARY 8, 2001:

Academically Controlled Auxiliary Activities Committee: Richard Hunter (SSW) appointed.
 Committee on Committees: Rodney Rogers (SBA) elected by SBA caucus.
 Curriculum Committee: Beverly Fuller (SBA) replaces Sherril Gelmon as chair.

Rebecca Robinson (XS) appointed, Lafferrière (CLAS) appointed, Emily de la Cruz (GSE) appointed, Stephen Walton (CLAS) appointed, Jan C. Semena (UPA) appointed.

Deadline Appeals Committee: Wendy Stewart (LIB) appointed Chair.

Graduate Council: Roy Koch (CLAS/ESR) to replace Scott Burns, Michael Bowman (LIB) appointed, Sandra Wilde (GSE) appointed, Steve Harmon (XS) appointed, Bob Eder (SBA) reappointed Chair.

Library Committee: Tim Anderson (Engineering) appointed Chair; Pelin Basci (CLAS/FL) appointed; Dave Holloway (CLAS/ENG) appointed.

Scholastic Standards Committee: Tom Dietrich (CLAS/APL) reappointed Chair; Candyce Reynolds (UNST) appointed; Angela Garbarino (AO) appointed.

Stott Center Advisory Board: Tom Pfingsten appointed Chair.

Student Conduct Committee: Joe Poracsky (CLAS/GGR) appointed to fill vacancy.

Teacher Education: Marge Enneking (CLAS/Mth) appointed MTH representative.

University Planning Council: Mindy Holliday, SSW has resigned eff. March 1, 2001; Rick Vrana (CLAS/Geog) filling vacancy; Barb Guthrie (XS) filling vacancy.

President's Report

BERNSTINE distributed copies of his recent publication, *A Vision for 21st Century Portland State University* (attached), and noted it is posted on the PSU Urban Portfolio Page web page, www.portfolio.pdx.edu. BERNSTINE noted that this a time to continue our momentum from successes gained in the last legislative session. We must continue to target our investments strategically, build on partnerships and innovations already started, and invest in faculty creative teaching and research.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CRAWSHAW was recognized to make an announcement. He reminded Senators to submit questionnaires his group distributed related to University Studies.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. NCAA Division I Accreditation

DIMAN, reporting after E3, discussed the scope of faculty participation in the process, and the chronology of the accreditation process, which commenced Fall 2000. The PSU accreditation team is coordinated by Diman, and membership includes President Bernstine, Presidential Assistant Diman, NCAA Representative Robert Lockwood, Athletic Director Tom Burman, Interim AFM Director Annie Gubitosi-White, OIRP Director Kathi Ketcheson, Asst. to the President Clarence Hein, and

several students. There are four subcommittees, governance and commitment to rules and compliance, academic integrity, fiscal integrity, and compliance. When the draft report is completed this Spring, it will be presented to the university community for general comment.

BRODOWICZ asked what would be the consequences of a negative review. DIMAN stated it would indicate problems that would require addressing during the next cycle to prevent non-certification, in a similar manner to the university's accreditation process.

DIMAN closed with a request that the faculty participate in the process.

2. University Planning Council Quarterly Report

RITCHIE presented the report for University Planning Council.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion of Advising Action Council Recommendations

ELLIS requested the floor for Kathleen Smith, Co-Chair of the Council, to review progress since the last Senate meeting.

SMITH commenced by thanking the Senate for their interest in the issue, and noting that there is good advising going on at the university. Changes resulting since the last Senate meeting include establishing an Implementation team, and replacing the designated student fee with a budgetary line item. There are crucial issues still to be examined by the proposed Implementation team. They include the overarching concern as to how resources are distributed to central advising and departments, and what are rewards, both for units and individuals. As Robert Mercer said, "what you get for good advising is more advisees." Other concerns are what is meant by "mandatory" advising and for whom it is mandatory, and what "checkpoints" should be established. Another issue is how to code such folks are pre-med students in the Banner system. Lastly, additional issues are expected to surface. Therefore, the pilot program, which would most likely prompt additional response from the Implementation team, is recommended.

REUTER asked if mandatory advising had been decided upon. SMITH stated she believed that was not an issue because it is already the case that degree-granting programs provide their major advising. REUTER stated that resources need to following advising assignments, and SMITH agreed.

ELTETO noted it was prudent to remove the advising fee and thanked the committee for this action.

LATIOLAIS asked for a clarification on the implication of mandatory advising, for example, the imposition of sanctions. SMITH stated the committee feels there should be no registration holds placed on student progress, but acknowledged there are many who disagree with that. MILLER-JONES asked for a clarification regarding centralization and resources. SMITH noted that the report recommends new monies and the Implementation team will deal with the resources issue. SCHUSTERMAN asked if the mechanism is available to document advising in the event it becomes mandatory. ALLEN stated it is. _____ stated that mandatory advising without sanctions is pointing an empty gun.

BLEILER stressed his concern about the role of centralized advisors, if they can't be literate on all majors. PETERSON noted that central advising set back his progress in determining his career and undergraduate major. BECKER reminded that central advising is only recommended until the major is declared. PETERSON noted that his experience was with general advising, not major advising. BLEILER reiterated that we are asked a great deal of central advising.

MERCER noted that general advisors can help even in fields where they have no expertise, but to improve advising, the university will have to place greater weight on the activity in P&T decisions. SMITH noted that the committee was advised that altering the P&T Guidelines was a political impossibility. FOSQUE noted that the use of merit money for required positions is antithetical. BLEILER noted that departmental P&T committees should determine merit, not have it legislated from above. CRAWSHAW noted that advising is one of many activities deserving or reward.

SESTAK asked for a response to two questions, what is the timeline for commencing the pilots and from there, to full implementation, and how will we address the issue of pre-registration advising and the tracking for it. LIEBERMAN noted that pilots are tentatively scheduled to commence spring 2001, and continue through next year.

ELLIS/HOLLOWAY MOVED the Senate adopt the motion as presented by Ellis (attached).

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer thanked Chairperson Smith for her assistance.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, *Article IV, Sec. 4, 4) Standing Committees and Their Functions*

D.JOHNSON/R.MERCER moved the proposed amendment, which was recommended by the Advisory Council at the previous Senate meeting.

RUFULO asked for a clarification on the amendment. PATTON stated this page contains the existing language including the small portion lined out. D.JOHNSON stated the proposal was suggested by Advisory Council to eliminate ambiguous language.

FOSQUE requested the Senate consider correlating the "his/her" language in each of the descriptions. There was no other discussion.

The Presiding Officer, in accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, *Article VIII. Amendments*, directed the Secretary to the Faculty to transmit to the Advisory Council the Proposed Amendment for review and reply before the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

2. Curriculum Committee Proposals

FULLER presented the proposals. HEYING indicated that there is an error in the CUPA course proposal, page 8, "2. USP 493 Green Economics," which is actually USP 490 Green Economics and Sustainable Development, and USP 493 Advanced GIS Applications. The correct course descriptions are listed in, "G3", the Graduate Council proposal for those courses.

R.MERCER/J.REUTER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program changes listed in G.2, for Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Studies, Geology, Physics, and Public Health Education.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

R.MERCER/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the course changes listed in G.2, for Liberal Arts and Sciences, Urban and Public Affairs, Business Administration, and Fine & Performing Arts.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

R.MERCER/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the University Studies Course Clusters changes.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Proposals

EDER presented the proposals, including the following correction of the course description for PHE 456/556 Health Aspects of Aging (4):

"Examination of health-related changes that occur with aging. Review of current scientific literature with an investigation of physiological mechanisms responsible for changes in functional capacity throughout life. Explores the role of physical activity and nutrition in healthy aging. Prerequisites: PHE 250/295 or equivalent.

MERCER/AMES MOVED the Engineering & Computer Science program change in Computer Science, course proposals and certificate in Systems Engineering.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEILER/MERCER MOVED the Fine & Performing Arts course proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MERCER/AMES MOVED the Urban & Public Affairs program changes and course proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, *Article IV, Sec. 3, 4) Order of Business*

The Presiding Officer noted that the proposal in the mailing is language from the By Laws, however, the intent was to amend the constitution. Therefore, the Secretary to the Faculty has prepared an amendment proposal (overhead).

CRAWSHAW presented the proposal noting two primary purposes, to move action items to an earlier time in the Senate meeting, and to encourage an optimal form of Senate examination of university-wide items of importance. For example, as regards the latter, a committee chair presenting a recommendation is primarily only representing the majority view.

HOLLOWAY noted his inclination is to trust the Steering Committee to re-order the Order of Business depending on the circumstances, and select and schedule the discussion items through its regular procedures, as many issues have only one, or more than two positions.

BECKER requested clarification of how issues are selected. CRAWSHAW indicated it would be based on Senate initiative. It is intended to be self-corrective.

HEYING suggested that, instead of proposing a constitutional amendment at this point in time, the Senate implement a pilot of the proposal for the next several meetings.

TETREAULT asked if the intent is to remove administrators from the Agenda, as they are not indicated in the proposal. Crawshaw stated that is not the intent; they are not listed on the document as it stands now.

SHINN requested clarification of the proposals. CRAWSHAW stated there are two items, to move action items forward, and to try another approach for presenting issues to optimize information exchange.

HEYING/D.JOHNSON MOVED the Senate suspend rules having to do with Order of Business for the next six Senate meetings, and charge the Steering Committee to implement an interim Order of Business along the lines of the proposal.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 2, 2001

Presiding Officer: Judith Patton

Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Balshem, Barton, Bjork, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brodowicz, Buddress, Cabelly, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Crawshaw, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Ellis, Faine, Farr, Feeney, Feldesman, Fisher, Fosque, Franz, Friesen, Glanville, Gelmon, Hagge, Harmon, Herrington, Heying, Hoffman, Holloway, Hopp, D.Johnson, L.Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmeter, Patton, Philbrick, Reynolds, Rogers, Rosengrant, Sestak, Sherman, Shusterman, Squire, Thompson, Trowbridge, Walsh, Wang, Wosley-George.

Alternates Present: Bowman for Beasley, Shusterman for Bodegom (proxy), Barham for Franz, Choi for Talbott, Torrey for Yatchmenoff.

Members Absent: Elteto, Becker, Brenner, Brown, Carpenter, Chaille, Collins, Eder, Erskine, Falco, Fortmiller, George, Gilbert, Hagge, Hunter, Ingersoll, A.Johnson, Kiam, Lall, L. Mercer, Peterson, Rectenwald, Reece, Rueter, Shireman, Shinn, Skinner, Sussman, Tableman.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Rhodes, Tetreault, Toulan, Withers, Ward.

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 5, 2001, meeting were approved with the following corrections: Anderson was present. Barham was erroneously listed as present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2001 ELECTIONS: The new Other Instructional Division has 35 members, which will result in 4 Senate positions. One CLAS Senator, Martha Balshem (2002) will lose her Senate position due to the reorganization.

CHANGES IN COMMITTEE/SENATE REPRESENTATION SINCE MARCH 5:

Curt Peterson resigned from the Budget Committee, eff. 15 March 2001
Samantha S. Predoehl resigned from UPC, eff. 26 March 2001

The *2000-01 Faculty Governance Guide*, 2nd edition, is now available at:
<http://www.pdx.edu/fgg/gov2001.pdf>

The Presiding Officer announced the passing on March 31, 2001, of past Faculty Senate Presiding Officer (1981-82) and esteemed Emerita, Mary Cumpston. The university's memorial service is scheduled for Tuesday, April 10 at 2:00 p.m. in the Vanport Room.

D. None

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4., 4) Budget Committee

SESTAK reported that Advisory Council has reviewed and approved the amendment for proper form and numbering, according to Article VIII.

THE AMENDMENT PASSED by two-thirds majority voice vote with one abstention.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4., 4) Budget Committee

FISHER/MERCER MOVED the proposed amendment. Hearing no discussion, the Presiding Officer, in accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, *Article VIII. Amendments*, directed the Secretary to the Faculty to transmit the Proposed Amendment to the Advisory Council for review and reply before the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

2. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

BLEILER/HEYING MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE F.2., pp. 1-4., Public Administration and Political Science Course Proposals, Changes and Deletions.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

AMES/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE F.2., p.4, Systems Science Course Revision.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CUMMINGS/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE F.2., p. 5, Anthropology Course Proposals and changes.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEILER/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE F.2., p. 5, Biology Course Proposals and Deletions.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

ROSENGRANT/SESTAK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE F.2., p. 6, Foreign Languages Program Changes in the M.A.T. (addition of Japanese), the M.A.(addition of Chinese), and Course Changes and Deletions in Chinese.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEILER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE cross listing PH 511 as ECE 598, and Geology M.A/M.S. Program Changes, and Course Deletion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted there are many things going on but several are worth special mention. We continue to explore our aspiration to be a great university in this great city. Last month the President distributed his vision, attached to today's agenda, and the Provost has also issued a draft statement of what this vision means as regards Academic Affairs (attached). The next step is achieving consensus as to where the university is headed. Our first roundtable and forum were on collaboration between PSU, OGI, and OHSU. The next faculty roundtable, scheduled for April 18, is on K - 12 collaborations, and the forum in connection with that topic will be May 4. At today's meeting, the Executive Committee reaffirmed the objective that we must engage more faculty in these activities without undertaking a full blown planning process. Senators are reminded that the Urban University Portfolio Project is being directed to reflect these activities.

As Senators are aware, legislative budget hearings are in progress. Internal budget hearings are on schedule, with Vice Provosts and CADS hearings scheduled for April 16 - 17 and Budget Committee hearings scheduled for May 24.

Spring enrollment is up from Spring 2000, 7% headcount and 8% SCH.

Lastly, be reminded that it has been a long year with much hard work but summer is not far off.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

1. None
2. None

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

The Presiding Officer recognized Kris Kern to report for the Chair, Jennifer Loney, who was unable to attend. KERN reviewed the report and took questions. BRENNAN asked why petitions were up, and is the committee working with Graduate Council as regards the issue of pre-requisite requirements becoming mandatory. PATTON noted, in response to the first question, that the numbers look larger because the report includes for the first time, the period between the April--May reporting date and the following Fall term. BLEILER noted that petition numbers would logically have increased, also, as a consequence of in enrollment increases in recent years. RHODES noted, in response to the second question, that there is a pilot being conducted at the undergraduate level only in Business Administration. BRENNAN urged that the pilot cover both levels simultaneously.

CUMMINGS asked if there were increases in certain categories of petitions, or are increases across the board. KERN yielded to Angela Garbarino, Records Office, who stated that there is an increase in petitions related to the University Studies clusters.

J. DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Discussion Proposal: *Athletics at PSU: Budgetary and Other Considerations*

CRAWSHAW noted that many people need to be involved in the Discussion Item experiment, and encouraged others to come up with suggestions for future topics as well as refinements to this one.

CUMMINGS/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal for discussion at the May Faculty Senate Meeting.

PATTON noted the Steering Committee has concluded that the positions have twelve minutes each regardless of the number of speakers. HEYING

added that this approach encourages a panel, rather than a debate-style format, because information, as well as discussion, is desirable. We might try this format, and then others as well. CRAWSHAW noted that his intent is for a rational discussion.

CUMMINGS asked who the proposed speakers are for this topic. CRAWSHAW stated that the original commitments from Stan Hillman and Scott Burns needed to be gathered quickly, but names could conceivably change over the seven weeks until the Senate date. As regards this topic, Scott Burns has passed the torch to Tom Burman since the proposal was forwarded to the Steering Committee on 8 March.

THE PROPOSAL PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2001

Presiding Officer: Judith Patton

Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Anderson, Beasley, Bleiler, Bodegom, Brennan, Brenner, Brodowicz, Buddress, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Collins, Crawshaw, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Ellis, Elteto, Faine, Farr, Feldesman, Fortmiller, Fosque, Franz, George, Gilbert, Glanville, Hagge, Harmon, Heying, Hoffman, Hopp, Ingersoll, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, Koch, Lall, Lewis, R. Mercer, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Palmiter, Patton, Reynolds, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shireman, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Tableman, Talbott, Thompson, Walsh, Wang, Wosley-George, Yatchmenoff.

Alternates Present: Butler for Ames, Morgan for Shinn, Horowitz for Becker, Cress for Chenoweth, Elteto for Kern, Spolek for Rectenwald, Arante for Reece.

Members Absent: Balshem, Barton, Bjork, Brown, Cabelly, Carpenter, Chaille, Eder, Erskine, Falco, Feeney, Fisher, Herrington, Holloway, Hunter, L.Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Latiolais, L. Mercer, Peterson, Philbrick, Rogers, Sherman, Skinner,

Ex-officio Members Present:

Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Driscoll, Edmundson, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Pernsteiner, Pflingsten, Crane for Sylvester, Tetreault, Toulon, Withers, Ward

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

A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The minutes of the April 2, 2001, meeting were approved as published.

C BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

2001 Faculty Elections are underway, and ballots are due May 16, 2001. The newly constituted division, Other Instructional, is repeating Senate Nominations on that ballot, as eligible members were omitted in the first round.

D. DISCUSSION ITEM: Athletics at PSU, Budgetary and Other Considerations

PATTON introduced the discussion moderator, David Johnson, and indicated that the minutes for this portion of the meeting may be less inclusive, depending on the ability of the Secretary to the Faculty to capture discussion and the time involved.

D.JOHNSON introduced the speakers and reviewed the format. He noted that this new feature of the Faculty Senate has prompted extensive discussion, especially around the question of what might or might not be accomplished, and what will be the mark of success. D.JOHNSTON suggested that a good outcome for this activity will be that our understanding of the subject will be deepened. The discussion should complicate our understanding and bring to bear some skepticism about our own preconceptions and our own generalities. Like a good class, we should leave knowing more about the subject, having had our curiosity peaked, and finding our understanding complicated in ways we hadn't imagined before. Grant Farr and Stan Hillman each have been apportioned 10-12 minutes, with Farr speaking first, and this will be followed by 10 minutes of questions and discussion from the floor

FARR indicated he is pro-Athletics, and noted that Tom Burman, Sherry Frey, Tim Walsh, Terri Mariani and Kim Glanville are present. FARR noted he is here to discuss Athletics as a member of the Senate and a Professor, and intends to discuss what he thinks is important about Athletics. FARR distributed two papers on Athletics (attached), and highlighted several issues. We are the largest university in the state and Athletics is a major component of any great university. This is especially relevant to incoming high school graduates. Athletics has brought us national notice this year, and it is important to development efforts. Athletes and their coaches are active in community service. Athletes are active in student government, their grades are comparable to their peers, and they have a higher graduation rate than non-athletes. The Budget for Athletics has increased, and we must have fiscal accountability. Tom Burman is working towards that end by streamlining the program, including releasing six coaches and bringing the remainder into the budget process. He has also reorganized ticket sales and the Viking athletic fund. We now have the beginning of a team in place to eliminate the budget deficit. Other changes to work on are integrating the coaches into the university community, and improving faculty involvement in Athletics. The Faculty Senate has a mechanism for Athletics oversight, the IAB, and that committee must be more active.

HILLMAN noted his inherent leanings are basically pro-Athletics, but the purpose of this presentation is to educate us to differing perspectives. There are three functions of a university, to provide students access to a quality education, provide a variety of scholarly expertise to the community, and to enrich the experiences of the region with cultural and performance events. There are three fiscal sources that support these functions, state funds via the RAM model,

student tuitions and incidental fee support, and external support. In the third area, the President has brought a breath of fresh air to the campus, so the third leg of the stool doesn't collapse one more time as a result of changes in state general fund appropriations. The first question is, does Athletics contribute to our responsibility as a university? Scholarships contribute to access for a diverse group of students. The off-campus interactions of coaches and students, and the expertise they contribute, provide a community service. Athletics events are part of the fabric of a segment of the regional population, which includes alumni. That answered, the question is how do you characterize the interaction of campus units relative to PSU as a whole? The Biological model, for example, illustrates the mutualistic relationship, the commensal relationship (the interaction is favorable to the smaller unit but neutral as far as the whole), and the relationship that is favorable only to the smaller unit, the department for example, but is inhibiting to the growth of the larger organism, in this case the university. The tale of two units, Biology and Athletics, is that Biology provided a net benefit to the university of \$3. million, whereas Athletics incurred a net loss. We know there are about only fifteen athletic programs in the nation that are net revenue, so probably the best we can expect for Athletics is a commensal relationship. However, the interaction for Athletics has become parasitic, as evidenced by the unanticipated bill that appears every year. There are two major outcomes, the problem of chronic deficits, which points to mismanagement of resources, and the morale problem caused by these deficits in the rest of the university. In closing, how will further deficit spending by Athletics be prevented? It has been a failure of the Senate IAB committee not to force the Athletic director to deal responsibly with the budget. Additionally, the President must do this as well. Lastly, it needs to be determined what is the appropriate rate of growth for the Athletic fund.

A.JOHNSON noted it would be good to hear from the Intercollegiate Athletic Board regarding today's discussions. A.JOHNSON yielded to PSU student Shane Jordan. Mr. Jordan noted that an important component of his college experience is activities outside the classroom, and that Student fees cover expenses for such, to a degree.

HEYING noted there has never been a discussion of how important a part of the university this is. For example, what is the number of students and faculty who attend athletic events or are interested in athletics? PSU Athletics are not covered in the local press, etc. so it is difficult to evaluate local interest. FARR noted that lack-of-press is a good point, and that we should make the effort to get the community involved solving it.

LALL stated we are the largest university in Oregon and we have a mission to be the university of choice. Therefore, we need to recognize that high school students choose a university according to the prestige of its athletic programs. As regards budgetary concerns, Athletic tuitions are at out-of-state rates on the income side of the balance sheet. Also, on the model of the organism, Athletics could be

viewed as our fitness program. We must come to an agreement that Athletics should be fully supported.

D.JOHNSON noted that the Steering Committee has proposed that discussion not result in immediate action or motions, but that they could be considered at a future date through regular Senate procedures.

HILLMAN noted that relative to revenue averages of Big Sky schools, PSU Athletics is not doing as well as it could. We contribute average support, but we have a history of under-average performance.

BURMAN noted that Athletics had \$2.1 million prior to the start of year, and at the end of the year there is a deficit of over \$1. million. This is of great concern and the intent of both the President and the Athletics Director is to fix it. As a clarification, it should be noted that Athletics give back almost \$1. million in tuition, fees, etc. Also, next year's proposed budget is more realistic and therefore larger. In the past, the administration focused on the new field and renovations, as opposed to operating expenses, therefore we have experienced under-realized income from gates and stipends. The focus has been shifted to generating income. For example, revenue is doubling monthly, since staff reorganizations. The Senate could make an important contribution to this effort with a very active Intercollegiate Athletics Board.

PALMETER noted that criticisms raised so far are only about budget and deficits. Is there no intent to discuss the academic performance of student athletes? HILLMAN noted he trusts the data that is indicated in the handouts regarding grades, graduation rates, etc. HILLMAN reiterated his view that the consistent problem is with deficits and the impact they have had on academic programs each year.

SCHUSTERMANN noted that graduation rates of student athletes are poor, according to this data. Comparing them to the general population is problematic. The Chemistry Department recommends that athletes should not take any classes in their department while competing, as they consistently under-perform, even in the introductory class. The department doesn't want athletes in their classes, especially male athletes, as they are a routine problem. Athletes are a problem in academics on this campus.

FARR indicated that only 25% of the forms Kim Glanville sent out to faculty were returned, and that faculty do not participate in advising athletes. It is part of the faculty's role to turn around certain cultural attitudes that athletes bring with them into the university about academics.

D.JOHNSON concluded the discussion, noting that the two outstanding issues around Athletics are budget deficits and students' academic success.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4., 4) l, Budget Committee

SESTAK reported for Advisory Council that the language was approved.

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

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. General Student Affairs Committee Proposal for Missed Class Policy

JACOB presented the draft proposal for the committee, noting that the draft has been discussed with the Intercollegiate Athletic Board and Kim Glanville, academic advisor to Athletics. Additionally, it was distributed to Faculty Senators by e-mail on March 21, 2001, for comment. Responses from Heying, Sherman, and Eder were considered by the committee, and the decision was to make no changes to the proposal.

FARR/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Missed Classes Policy.

CRAWSHAW asked for a clarification regarding the policy application to the Final Examination. JACOB indicated it is not intended to apply. WOSLEY-GEORGE asked who is to define "unreasonable burden." JACOB noted it is up to the individual faculty member to decide. BRENNER noted the policy is somewhat incomplete, as it indicates a second "step," contacting the Chair, etc., but it does not indicate what procedure is at the step. JACOB agreed the committee has no answer.

RUETER asked why we need a policy instead of the individual discretion presently exercised by faculty. ALLEN indicated that an established policy serves to, 1) encourage the student to initiate dialogue with the faculty member, and 2) provides a process to determine appropriate accomodation. This proposal is modeled on policy at Arizona State.

HEYING noted, as he stated in his e-mail response, the policy privileges certain students at the expense of others, for example, students might experience day care emergencies, workplace demands, etc. As regards external conflicts, it is important that the student take the responsibility for deciding when and to take the course. Individual faculty members must decide on the resolution.

SHERMAN noted he supported Heying's e-mail, for example, when a student identifies a death in the family, it is up to the faculty member to

make the ruling. The language, "unreasonable burden" is of concern as it suggests a hierarchy of _____. Of greater concern is that the policy has pedagogical implications. There are many class activities other than tests, etc., which pedagogically can't be made up. If there must be a policy, the pedagogical implications have to be acknowledged in it.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MISSED CLASS POLICY WAS DEFEATED by 29 Against, 15 In favor, and 4 Abstentions.

BRENNER asked what is the outcome of this vote. JACOB indicated the committee could take up the issue again although it would have to wait until next fall.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

BERNSTINE thanked David Johnson, Stan Hillman and Grant Farr for participating in the Athletics discussion, and noted he hoped it was informative.

BERNSTINE noted there is certain optimism developing as regards the state budget forecast, which comes out on 15 May.

BERNSTINE announced the 2001 recipients of faculty awards. The Branford Price Millar Award, for scholarship, instruction, university service, and public service, goes to Kenneth Dueker. The George C. Hoffman Award, for distinguished contributions to the university in the areas of instruction, service and scholarship done in the spirit of humanism, civility and collegiality, goes to Roy Koch. Applause.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT reviewed activities in Academic Affairs. The Great City-Great University Series continues. The K-12 Roundtable and Forum took place in the last month. They illustrated the thousands of students who are impacted by PSU faculty and students, and indicated faculty agreement that Pre-K through 12 education is part of faculty responsibility across the disciplines. The next pair of activities is around the Creative Industries, with a roundtable scheduled for 1 June and a forum scheduled for the fall. There was a follow-up activity regarding the earlier topic of our 3-university collaboration in April. A proposal is underway to support planning efforts. PSU Opera performances are in progress. There was a recent activity in the "faculty vitality" project, including a campus visit from Al Guskin. Promotion and tenure decisions will be distributed on 15 May, with the President's decisions to be distributed the first week of June. On May 10 there

will be a activities and an awards ceremony as part of the Kellogg project for civic engagement.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

None

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of April 6-7, 2001

BURNS, reporting for Wollner, noted the report was included in the mailing. There were no questions.

2. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

KETCHESON presented the report for the committee, noting their hope is to be able to announce the awards at the June senate meeting. The committee's new responsibility this year, awarding travel funds, has required developing procedures as well as making the awards themselves. The committee strongly urges that more funds be appropriated in the area of travel funds.

BRENNAN stated the committee should redefine the top award amount so faculty have a more realistic notion of amounts they might receive, and the committee should move the process forward so faculty can plan. KETCHESON noted both points are well taken, and both items have already been addressed. The latter problem was partially as a result of the delayed contract settlement last year.

HEYING asked what was the match of funds that resulted. KETCHESON noted the match was a minimum of 20%.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

FRANK presented the report for the committee, and took questions.

HEYING asked for a clarification regarding the mission statement. FRANK noted the committee has contributed to several drafts and the activity is still in progress. HEYING asked if it is the committee's role to explore with the Athletic Department alternative visions for Athletics at PSU. FRANK stated yes. HEYING requested the committee explore this more seriously, as we are a commuter campus and student interest would

indicate we might go to an alternative model, for example, the intramural vs. the professional sports model we are currently engaged in developing.

A.JOHNSON made the suggestion that more frequent committee reports would be desirable. FRANK indicated that next year, particularly, quarterly reports would be appropriate as we are engaged in our NCAA review.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

REULER presented the report for the committee, and took questions.

To facilitate the Teacher Education Committee recommendations for changes in their constitutional committee description, the Presiding Officer displayed an overhead (attached) an amendment proposal prepared by the Secretary to the Faculty. The Presiding Officer then requested ten Senators submit names for endorsement and the following Senators complied: Sandra Rosengrant, Steve Brenner, Diane Yatchmenoff, Carolyn Carr, Walt Ellis, Barbara Sestak, Margaret Neal, Larry Crawshaw, Ansel Johnson, TH.

CUMMINGS/ELLIS MOVED the Senate approve the proposed Constitutional Amendment, *Art. IV, 4. 4), h. Teacher Education Committee.*

REUTER called for a quorum.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The quorum was lost. The meeting was ended at 4:48 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 4, 2001
Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Ames, Anderson, Barton, Beasley, Becker, Bjork, Bleiler, Brennan, Brodowicz, Buddress, Cabelly, Carr, Carter, Chapman, Chenoweth, Collins, Cummings, Daasch, Dieterich, Eder, Elteto, Erskine, Faine, Feeney, Feldesman, Fisher, Fosque, Franz, Friesen, Gelmon, George, Harmon, Herrington, Heying, Hoffman, Holloway, A.Johnson, D.Johnson, L.Johnson, Kenny, Kern, Koch, Latiolais, Lewis, L. Mercer, R. Mercer, Morgan, Neal, O'Grady, Patton, Philbrick, Reynolds, Rosengrant, Rueter, Sestak, Shinn, Shusterman, Squire, Sussman, Tableman, Thompson, Turcic, Walsh, Wang, Wosley-George, Yatchmenoff.

Members Absent: Bodegom, Brenner, Brown, Carpenter, Kiam, Lall, Miller-Jones, Rogers, Shireman, Sherman, Skinner, Talbott.

Alternates Present: Labissière for Balshem, Fu Li for Casperson, David for Chaille, Mussey for Gilbert, Balough for Palmeter, Barham for Glanville, Ledbetter for Hagge, Edelblut for Ingersoll, Spolek for Rectenwald, Arante for Reece.

2001-02 New

Members Present: Arante, Biolsi, Burns, Cress, Hillman, Hixson, Ketcheson, Kristof, O'Connor, Robinson, Thompson, Wetzel, Wollner.

2001-02 New

Members Absent: Agorsah, Bizjak, Gelmon, Greco, Hall, Jolin, Knights, Lehman, Liebman, Millner, Nissen, Perrin, Pfeiffer.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Allen, Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Diman, Driscoll, Edmundson, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Lieberman, Pernsteiner, Pratt, Pfungsten, Rhodes, Sylvester, Tetreault, Toulan, Withers, Ward.

NOTE: The following Order of Business, is effective for six meetings, by Senate charge on March 5, 2001.

A. Roll Call

B. Approval of the Minutes

The Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting were approved with the following correction:

- Page 56, Item F.1. paragraph 3, line 3: replace "who is to" with "how we would..."

C Brief Announcements

ADDED to TODAY'S AGENDA:

I-8 Report of IFS Meeting of 1-2 June, 2001, at Eugene
(Documents I-6, I-8, and J-1 are available at the doors)

Elections

Runoff in the Graduate School of Social Work Division: Elected - Laura Nissen, Constance Lehman.

Election in the Other Instructional Faculty Division: Elected - Craig Wollner.

Runoff in the Other Instructional Faculty Division for two positions (ballots are being distributed today and are due on June 13).

Election of Officers for the 2001-02 PSU Faculty Senate (which took place as part of the proceedings of the June 4, 2001, Senate Meeting):

Presiding Officer: Scott Burns

Presiding Officer Pro tem: Kathi Ketcheson

Steering Committee: Duncan Carter, Robert Mercer, Patricia Wetzel,

David Holloway, *Ex officio*(Chairperson, Comm. on Committees)

Changes In Senate And Committee Appointments Since 5/7/01:

Barbara Guthrie, SES, has resigned from UPC.

Pam Miller was appointed Chair of the Student Conduct Committee, eff. 5/29/01.

D. Faculty Senate Discussion Item - *The Legitimate Uses of Fixed Term Faculty*

HEYING, moderated. He introduced the speakers, Duncan Carter, Senator and Assoc. Dean of CLAS, and Dick Pratt, Vice Provost, and described the day's procedure: each presenter has 10 minutes, with a 10 minutes discussion to follow.

PRATT profiled faculty across the country and how PSU faculty fit into that, based on two studies from the Harvard Project on Faculty Appointments. The most recent data is from 1998, and the most recent study asks 3000 people who are new faculty and graduating doctoral students what are their preferences on positions they would be willing to take. In 1998, 63.8% of the approximately 1 million faculty in the nation are tenured versus 64.8% in 1980. In 1998, 100% of the institutions reporting require terminal degrees for tenure track faculty. And according to AAUP data, 89% of the institutions in the country employ fixed term faculty in one of three forms, one-year only appointments, multiple year appointments, and renewable appointments, however, only 17% allow those appointments to hold professorial ranks, and only 9% allow promotion to a higher rank. Very few institutions allow or expect fixed term faculty to participate in governance.

PRATT continued, what are the perceptions and attitudes of those who hold or are willing to hold a fixed term position. Faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities are more likely to

accept a tenure track position under almost any circumstances. Faculty in the Sciences and the Professions are willing to take a multiple-year fixed term position in a desirable locale with a defined work balance over a tenure track position in an undesirable locale with an undesirable work balance. "As *The Chronicle* has noted, young faculty are running away from Research I institutions," based on quality of life issues. All faculty agree that tenure line positions have more autonomy, greater academic freedom, greater research pressure, offer more job security, offer more mobility, provide greater influence on the institution at the departmental and institutional level, and offer greater work balance. They do not agree about whether fixed term faculty have academic freedom; 64% of the fixed term faculty said they have the same academic freedom as their tenure line counterparts. The conclusion is that tenure alone is not enough to attract faculty in this and the next generation, and that quality of life has become an overarching factor in the selection of jobs. Lastly, fixed term faculty would like longer contracts.

CARTER noted that this topic has been of interest to him for a number of years, as Director of Writing for six years, as an AAUP bargaining team member and Chief Negotiator, and recently in various administrative posts, including chairing the CLAS Ad Hoc Committee on Fixed Term Faculty. He stated there are two major points to make, the increases in fixed term appointments nationally and at Portland State University, and the resultant cause for concern. For example, in the last five years, the number of our SCH produced by fixed term faculty has risen from 37% to 44%. These numbers are based only on "regular instructional faculty" and do not indicate the additional SCH generated by Teaching Assistants, Emeriti, Academic Professionals teaching classes, etc. These figures could be an artifact of our extension into the community, self support programs, accounting procedures, etc., but we can't know why. Conversely, while we are relying more heavily on fixed term faculty, we are ignoring their needs.

CARTER continued, in the 1970's, bodies such as the Carnegie Commission recommended that higher education institutions rely more heavily on fixed term faculty to cushion against projected national enrollment drops. Due to increases in non-traditional students, however, enrollment drops didn't come. Nevertheless, institutions increased their reliance on fixed term faculty as a result, primarily, of the continual decline in state support "as we went from state supported, to state assisted, to state located." For example in our English Department the number of tenure line faculty has dropped from 46 in 1979 to 25 in 1993, while enrollments have increased. The AAUP takes an acknowledgedly hard stance, in recommending the only legitimate uses of fixed term faculty are unexpected fluctuations in enrollment or to represent a discipline the faculty doesn't have. The question is, will we drift along and passively reflect this trend, or worse, exploit it, or do we remain intentional in this matter. Why, for example, is this issue never discussed in a public setting? Deans have been asked to discuss "enrollment management" as regards students, but not as regards faculty. No one is asking the question, what kind of faculty mix do we want? No one is asking the following other important questions. If one-half the faculty doesn't have academic freedom, isn't that a threat to academic freedom for all? How can we expect continuity, institutional loyalty, faculty development, or program development? How will regular faculty carry the burden of faculty governance and committee work? Who will talk to the alumni when they come back if faculty are all on short term contracts? It is also fair to point out the power imbalances that result. A

program which rests on a faculty with lower status has lower status, for example, that may be the eventual fate of the University Studies Program. There is, finally, a threat to tenure, and we may have to answer to the Legislature for that.

CARTER continued, we acknowledge that we are dependent on fixed term faculty therefore it seems like they deserve the kind of treatment that goes along with that dependence. They are on "kamikaze" missions - being asked to teach heavier loads at the expense of their research, thus making it impossible for them to become tenure track here or anywhere else. Secondly, there is a tendency to acquire the status of the students taught, for example, if you are hired to teach the freshmen because tenured faculty don't want to, you acquire the status of the freshmen. There is confusion regarding roles and responsibilities, such as the commitment to faculty governance. There is also the convenient fiction of "temporary" faculty that still follows people who have been here for 20 years. We have actually gone backwards in the area of longer term contracts since the mid-1990's. He concluded with three recommendations. We must have greater intentionality as regards the faculty mix. We must develop a review structure and an enhanced status for fixed term faculty, such as the UC system "eye of the needle" review. We must create an environment where they can be accepted as full fledged members of the community.

SHUSTERMAN noted there are tenure division between tenured and tenure track faculty as well. O'CONNOR asked if equity implications, such as gender and ethnicity, have been studied. PRATT stated there are more women in the fixed term faculty ranks. TETREAULT noted that the numbers of women are not as great here as was anticipated or found elsewhere. BEASLEY asked if the studies referenced provided any data to indicate how fixed term follow spouses? PRATT stated no, and reminded that this data studies only new faculty. BECKER asked if the number of fixed term faculty differ in different population densities? PRATT noted that more strategies are used as regards trailing spouses in remote locales. SUSSMAN asked Carter if the data varies between private and non private, or elite versus less elite institutions. CARTER stated he had no exact information to draw upon. PRATT reminded that the top twenty institutions use primarily doctoral students, as opposed to all other institutions. R.MERCER commented that it would be useful to study our internal governance structures to assess the problem of diminished tenure line faculty participation. There are not enough people left to serve. HOLLOWAY asked for a comparison with national data of our lack of multiple year contracts. PRATT stated that fixed term contracts range nationally, from nine months to five year. SOU is the only campus allowed to offer multiple year contracts and they currently offer eight. We have about a half dozen multi-year contracts, typically for two years. The "conundrum" in Oregon is that a two-year budget cycle will not accommodate a three-year contract.

E. Unfinished Business

1. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Faculty Grievance Procedure

KENNY introduced the report("E1") for the committee, noting that the State Board has recently made rule changes which will require some additional committee work in early Fall 2001.

HEYING/R.MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Committee Recommendations:

The current non-contractual grievance process often does not resolve disputes in a manner that is speedy, local and limited. Because it is not speedy, problems fester and workplace morale suffers for the delay. Because disputes are not resolved at the lowest level, parties who know little about a specific workplace are called on to make decisions. When grievances move to peer hearing, many faculty who serve are unsure how to exercise their responsibilities. We should aim for dispute resolution processes that are swift, close to the work unit where the individual faculty member works, and respectful of all parties involved. The process should involve parties who are knowledgeable of dispute resolution and the grievance process.

1., The committee recommends that the University expand the options available to grievants to include other less formal tools for conflict management. Such other tools should include mediation, listening, coaching, mentoring, informal problem solving, and direct negotiation between affected parties. The new tools should be designed to be voluntary, collaborative, confidential, fair, impartial, equitable, and safeguard a grievant's right to seek resolution without fear of retaliation. The new ADR procedures should have the following characteristics:

- Provide options for all types of problems and all people, including employees, supervisors, faculty and staff.
- Create a conflict competent culture that welcomes dissent and resolves conflict at the lowest level through direct negotiation.
- Provide multiple access points. Employees can readily identify and access a knowledgeable person whom they trust, for advice about the conflict management system.
- Provide multiple options—both rights-based and interest-based—for addressing conflict.
- Provide structures that coordinate and support the multiple access points and multiple options and that integrate effective conflict management into the organization's daily operations.

The committee expects that such an alternative dispute procedure would be less expensive, lead to rapid settlement, instill a sense of personal empowerment, and preserve the relationships that are critical to the effective workings of the University.

2. The new alternative dispute resolution system should utilize resources now in the University system such as the Office of Affirmative Action and the Campus Ombuds Office. Consideration should be given to the use of models available in SAFE SPACES and the sexual harassment network. Further, the University should create new resources to train mentors, mediators, department chairs, and others involved in both the non-contractual and alternative dispute resolution options.

3. The new alternative dispute option should allow for access from various places in the University community such as from departments, Deans, Office of Affirmative Action, Campus Ombud's Office, or other appropriate places.

4. The alternative dispute resolution option should be coordinated with the more formal non-contractual grievance procedure to comprise a comprehensive and integrated conflict management system. Such integration should provide for a mechanism to declare a "time-out" from the deadlines imposed by the non-contractual procedure to facilitate a faculty member's use of an alternate option. Notwithstanding these recommendations, nothing currently recommended should be construed to eliminate, weaken, or otherwise undermine the current formal rules, including the rights to be free from retaliation and to due process.

5. The committee recommends the rules be changed to allow the parties to a grievance to jointly elect to forego a peer hearing.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Student Advising Implementation Team Update Report

SMITH reported that the new team will be comprised of the previous team, with Walton Fosque, Loraine Mercer and Thomas Dieterich representing the Faculty Senate. The team has discussed the pilot project, and selected four sample academic units which represented several issues each, Architecture, Biology, Business Administration, and Psychology. The timeline is for departments to present their advising plans with rationale for additional resources in Fall term, with implementation in Winter quarter, and evaluation and 2002-03 planning after Spring quarter has begun.

HEYING asked what would be the resources for the pilot project. SMITH noted that a budget placeholder has replaced the fee proposal, but the dollar amount isn't determined. R.MERCER stated the pilot will give a sense of things like what kind of dollars this will really take. SMITH noted that the monetary issues will be part of the evaluation process.

F. New Business

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

CUMMINGS/FISHER MOVED APPROVAL of the amendment.

Hearing no discussion, the Presiding Officer directed the amendment be transmitted to the Advisory Council for review (as specified in the Constitution, *Art. VIII, Amendments*) to be returned at the October 2001 Faculty Senate Meeting.

2. Graduate Council Proposals for Ph.D. in Mathematics and Courses

EDER introduced the proposals, noting a correction to be made to "F2", Course Change Proposals, page 4, paragraph 3, replace "required" with "elective...".

A.JOHNSON/BRENNAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the course proposals in "F2".

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

A.JOHNSON/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences.

RUETER asked for a clarification as regards cross disciplinary and allied areas. BLEILER noted they are trying to integrate vertically the notion of interdisciplinary communication

in addition to the discipline. There was a challenge to design a 21st century program, for inside and outside the academy. RUETER noted he was still uneasy, for example, the obvious location for that task is Systems Science, however, they have indicated that Math has expressed no interest in collaboration. Why isn't it set in the context of the current SYSC program? EDER noted that the Graduate Council received the proposal from Math, not Systems Science, and this was the proposal they made. BLEILER noted that SYSC faculty never expressed those concern in the past to the Math Department, including at Ph.D. committees, and the accusation that Math was operating in bad faith was first heard when the proposal reached the Graduate Council level. Math doesn't know what to do with that. KOCH noted that the Graduate Council became convinced that this is a Math Ph.D. program, and the intent is not for students to be exposed to interdisciplinary research at the doctoral level, but for students to be exposed, through their coursework, to a broader range of topics.

BRENNAN asked what lies in store for the program at the next approval levels. EDER stated that Graduate Council expects it to receive a favorable response, especially as they have reviewed it so carefully. ENNEKING stated he couldn't speak to that directly, but noted there has been extensive national discussion about Ph.D.'s across the curriculum in many disciplines, not just Mathematics. TETREAULT endorsed the quality of the proposal. CARTER noted that external reviews have already been solicited from other universities across the country as well as industrial reviewers, including Boeing, and they have been uniformly favorable.

FELDESMAN asked if the program with the addition of this degree will be able to meet the growing demand for undergraduate engineering training. ENNEKING noted that starting five years ago, projections have been calculated and that information is available in several places on campus. CRAWSHAW endorsed the proposal.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

EDER noted the information item attached to the proposals.

G. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

President's Report

The President greeted the Senate after B. Roll Call. BERNSTINE congratulated the Senate for another great year. As regards the budget for next year, there is still room for optimism. He thanked the Budget Committee and Tony Rufolo for their hard work and cooperation this year.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT introduced the draft proposal for planning: *Visions of a 21st Century Urban University, A Planning Process for Portland State University* (attached). She noted that several groups have already seen the document, and requested Senators to review it and provide feedback in the next few weeks.

H. Question Period

There were no questions.

I. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. Advisory Council Annual Report

SESTAK presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Budget Committee Annual Report

RUFOLO presented the report after I.8, noting their concluding recommendations and requesting an affirmation from the Senate that they continue the budgetary assessment begun last year.

A. JOHNSON MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Committee Recommendations:

...request that the Athletics Director continue to work with the Budget Committee to assess the effectiveness of the changes in the budget process for Athletics and to develop criteria for assessing the benefits that athletics generate for the University.

Direct the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council to continue work on developing criteria for resource allocation within the University and for using the budget process to address long-term priorities.

Request that the University Relations Director look at models for "productivity measurements" in our comparator institutions and/or models that are available from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the organization for constituent developers. Also, develop a process to attribute "credit" for the various gifts to the University. This process would reduce the propensity for several units to take credit for the same gift and allow for more reliable evaluation.

...request that the incoming chair of the Budget Committee meet with the outgoing chairs of the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council before the end of Spring Quarter to discuss continuing work on issues identified this year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. University Planning Council Annual Report

RITCHIE presented the UPC Annual Report, and the joint report of the UPC and the Budget Committee subcommittee on long range issues. Pending a unique role for the UPC, it be suspended, or meet once a year as a coordinating body, or be reconstituted as a smaller long-range issues subcommittee.

D.JOHNSON/_____ MOVED TO SUSPEND the University Planning Council.

RUETER asked if the lack of meeting quorums was the cause or effect of these recommendations. RITCHIE stated that over an extended period of time it has not been clear what the mission or charge to the committee was.

RUETER stated that the other planning activities are administrative and frequently ad hoc. SHUSTERMAN queried, if the committee were suspended, how the Senate would initiate/engage in planning. RITCHIE stated suspension rather than dissolving the committee would allow for retention, if conditions were to change. D.JOHNSON noted that the Steering Committee favored suspension to allow for the committee to be called to service if they were needed with short notice.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION WAS PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer accepted the reports for the Senate and thanked David Ritchie especially for his work on this issue.

8. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Report

WOLLNER presented the report after G.1.(attached), noting that the Chancellor has requested IFS meet with him in the fall to strategize for the next biennium. He is also particularly interested in identifying faculty who specialize in areas related to social change in the region. WOLLNER also noted that benefits will erode in the coming year's PEBB package in tandem with escalating costs. No effect has been made on the Governor's position.

LI/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE ACCEPT the Committee on Committees Annual Report, the General Student Affairs Annual Report, the Supplement to Faculty Development Committee Annual Report, and the Update on Presidential Assessment Initiative, and ADJOURN THE MEETING.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

K. Adjournment

The meeting and the 2000-01 PSU Faculty Senate were adjourned at 5:05.