

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

2014

Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2014 - June 2015

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 2014 - June 2015" (2014). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 20.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/20>

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 6, 2014
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Harmon, Holliday, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Luther, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopahyay, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada, Zurk

Alternates Present: Messer for Carder, Ryder for Skaruppa

Members Absent: Childs, Clark, Donlan, Griffin, Hansen (David), Hunt, Padin, Perlmutter, Sanchez, Smith

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Aylmer, Bowman, Davis, Fink, Fortmiller, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, Marrongelle, MacCormack, Marshall, McMillan for Noll, Mercer, Reynolds, Rueter, Su, Toppe, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The June 2, 2014 minutes were approved as published. Senators were asked to report their **alternates** for the year.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The agenda was revised to place the interim report from the APPC under C, announcements, and to add the Resolution to Establish a Joint Task Force on Academic Quality as E2 (published to the Senate web as item E3; see minutes attachment B6).

Presiding Officer Bob Liebman welcomed senators and 2014-15 ex officio members to the new term and to what promised to be an exceptional year. LIEBMAN reminded Senate of its constitutional powers regarding faculty welfare, educational policy and curriculum, and alterations to the blueprint of the University. He noted two important 2013-14 resets (see slides, minutes attachment B1): The first was Senate bill 270, creating HECC and devolving power to individual Oregon campuses. He looked forward to working with a Board of Trustees that he hopes will see this as a shared opportunity to improve higher education. The second was the outcome of the

campaign for a PSU-AAUP contract and its implications for Faculty Senate. These include the charge to develop a new post tenure review process under the P&T Guidelines, and an invitation to form a joint task force on academic quality, an idea that originated from the Senate's own 2011 resolution, proposing "A Holistic Approach to Strategic Institutional Development."

Among other 2013-14 legacy issues, LIEBMAN noted the need to figure how the selection of the faculty representative to the Board fits into the faculty governance system. He described two major campus initiatives already underway—a new strategic planning process and the academic program prioritization (APP), which he described as a 360 degree look at the way that we offer instruction, support research and move people towards degrees and certificates. He also mentioned another look at summer session, a textbook affordability initiative, and the proposal for a School of Public Health. Here, he introduced the interim dean who is guiding the new school proposal process, Elena Andresen.

LIEBMAN proposed that all of these activities should aim to bring data to dialogue, look to comparators, and nurture leadership for the long haul. To advance its agenda, Senate may need to continue discussions over a second monthly meeting and might consider video-recording sessions. He said he would disseminate "voters pamphlets" to provide information to engage senators in preparing for meetings. He advocated re-thinking the campus leadership structure and observed that PSU excels at figuring out how with a dearth of money you can get by with a wealth of ideas. He encouraged faculty to take part in the emerging committees.

LIEBMAN reviewed Robert's rules (B1, p.2) and highlighted the avenues for faculty to propose items for Senate consideration and the role of the Committee on Committees (see B1, p.3).

IFS

HINES reported on noteworthy items from the September meeting of IFS in Bend, OR, including sessions with Ben Cannon and Brian Fox of the Higher Ed Coordinating Commission (HECC) and with Senator Michael Dembrow. HECC may shift its formula for allocating funds (from SCH to graduation rates and mission fulfillment) and is concerned about textbook affordability, CPL, and articulation between higher ed and K-12, as it reviews the goals of higher ed in Oregon. IFS also considered issues of academic quality in the face of changing metrics, reverse transfer of credit to community colleges, and part-time/full-time faculty ratios. HINES underscored the need for avenues of communication across institutions like IFS, now that there no longer is a central agency speaking on behalf of higher ed. She urged senators to communicate on issues they would like her to take back to IFS. Fellow IFS senator MERCER agreed that these were the high-points of the meeting.

IFS meeting minutes will be posted here: <http://oregonstate.edu/senate/ifs/min/2014/>

LIEBMAN introduced Mark Jones, chair of the Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC).

APPC Update

JONES introduced the new ad hoc APP committee convened in June to represent the University as a whole over the next phase of APP. (See slides, minutes attachment B2) APPC's charge is to determine the criteria and "categories" according to which all academic credit-granting and degree-related programs will be reviewed as part of an on-going practice. Metrics will be quantitative and qualitative. He explained the rationale for an internal process of taking stock and underscored its parallel relationship to established faculty governance processes.

JONES outlined draft guidelines for the new APP system, including a recommendation to combine review for programs that share substantially the same resources. They have tentatively identified 180 academic programs, half of which are in CLAS. Common criteria under consideration for beta testing include: 1) demand; 2) quality; 3) productivity; 4) financial performance; 5) relation to mission; and 6) trajectory. Programs reviewed could be assigned to three categories: 1) experiencing challenges; 2) healthy; and 3) growth opportunity (B2, pp 5-6). JONES said that the APPC rejects assigning quotas for each category. The APPC plans further outreach activities and opportunities to give feedback this fall term. JONES asked faculty to review APP materials and direct comments to: appc-discuss@lists.pdx.edu [Applause.]

MAIER asked how frequently the APP process would be applied. JONES said every 3 to 5 years was typical. DAIM asked whose priorities we were going after—the community's, the administration's, or students'—and what experts would do the scoring? JONES replied that the six proposed criteria are determined by academic priorities, and the APPC has tried its best to distill those from PSU's mission and community values. GAMBURD commented on the amount of work involved and asked if there were any resources to support APP. JONES noted that APP has had the support of ex officio members and an intern from the PACE program, but it would be need volunteers for the program scoring teams (PSTs). LIEBMAN advocated the need for partnerships with the other task forces underway to support the work of APP.

LIEBMAN introduced interim VP for Finance and Administration Kevin Reynolds, and welcomed members of the Presidential Task Force on Campus Safety

Campus Safety Update

REYNOLDS said that he was seeking Senate input on the on-going dialogue around campus safety and the potential creation of a PSU police department. He reviewed the key findings of the Task Force on Campus Safety (see slides, minutes attachment B3), emphasizing that the number of campus safety officers has not kept pace with PSU's growth and that there are more violent offenses and property crimes than many realize (B3, pp 1 & 3). He noted that PSU is the only one of the Urban-21 state-supported campuses not to have sworn police officers. He explained the operational differences between safety officers and sworn officers, and described the alternatives to PSU's adding sworn police officers that had been explored and rejected (B3, p.4). He reviewed progress on other safety recommendations and the potential cost of and requirements for training and oversight, if sworn police officers were added (B3, p.5).

KARVANIC asked if there was concern that there were only 85 responses to the 2014 campus survey (B3, slide 5). REYNOLDS mentioned the campus forum planned for 10/7 to gather further comment. Phillip Zerzan, Chief of Campus Safety, clarified that the 85 responses were comments directed to the Task Force Report and the only survey he was aware of was the 2013 ASPSU survey [307 responses]. SCHULER asked if statistics were available on the number of safety officers who had been hurt on duty. ZERZAN said yes.

TAYLOR wondered if there had been sufficient outreach to the city, given that the only response cited was from the central police commander (B3, p. 4); and he expressed concern about replicating difficulties that the city police had been experiencing. REYNOLDS replied that the current system does not work, that there were Title 9 and jurisdictional issues, and situations when the Portland police responded with delay. ZERZAN noted that Campus Safety had worked cooperatively with the Portland Police, but there were important differences between campus and municipal policing. A campus police department would have the University as its priority.

LIEBMAN clarified that the meeting had not moved to a committee of the whole, and minutes were being taken of the discussion of the administrative report.

GAMBURD asked how many universities did not have sworn police officers (compared to the 657 campuses that did). ZERZAN said he was not aware of any public campus with over 15,000 students without sworn police officers. Task Force member Chris Henning (AJ) noted that the FBI only tracks institutions with sworn police officers, but PSU appears to be an anomaly.

FINK asked for comment on the dichotomy between the image that PSU likes to project as a safe campus and the reality of the data. REYNOLDS invited Dean of Students Michele Toppe to respond. TOPPE said that PSU is in a very vulnerable position. She noted that incidents occur weekly, describing an assault on a PSU student in the Park Blocks last weekend. The Portland police did not file report on what was to them was a minor incident, although the student had a cut that required treatment.

LAYZELL agreed that Campus Safety was obviously understaffed and understood the worry, but asked if Campus Safety could cross off “armed” from its sworn officer description and still achieve 98% of what it needed to achieve. REYNOLDS noted that U of O, OHSU, and OSU had not gone down that route. Task Force member and Asst. Dean of Student Life Domanic Thomas argued that PSU would have to advocate for the legal authority at the state level to avoid jurisdictional issues arising from having unarmed officers. ZERZAN stated that sworn officers are required to have weapons training, but are not always required to carry a weapon; however, he argued that in the U.S., we are policing an armed populace. GRECO was struck by the fact that of the 21 urban campuses, although PSU has many fewer safety officers, it already has the lowest violent crime rate (B3, slide 11). She asked how much can be changed by introducing armed police officers? REYNOLDS emphasized that PSU’s numbers have remained constant over the last five years, although crime rates generally have declined. ZERZAN added that there are still underlying authority

issues that hamper the response of safety officers to incidents. LINDSAY asked why staffing had not increased to offset PSU's growth. REYNOLDS replied that the decision had been a deliberative process.

LIEBMAN thanked the presenters for informing the Senate in the spirit of promoting an open discussion of the issues.

[Secretary's note: The President and Provost offered their reports at this time.]

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in "E.1" were ADOPTED as published.

2. Resolution to establish a Joint Task Force on Academic Quality

LIEBMAN reminded senators that in addition to APPC, faculty were needed to staff two important teams triggered by the PSU-PSUAAUP bargaining agreement--on issues of family friendly policy and academic quality (if convened by the Faculty Senate). He noted that augmenting support for quality teaching, research and student success had been key concerns of the April 2011 Senate Holistic Resolution that had recommended applying to comparators:

<http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/resources-for-items-under-discussion>

SANTELMANN/BRODOWICZ MOVED the proposal to create a Joint Task Force on Academic Quality, published as E3. [Note: advanced as item E2 in the revised agenda; see minutes attachment B6].

ZURK asked for clarification of the group of faculty referenced in the Resolution. LIEBMAN responded that it was all full-time faculty. MAIER pointed out the discrepancy in the date for June Senate meeting. LIEBMAN thanked him for the correction; he added that the STEM initiative was an example of using comparators at PSU. RUETER asked why comparators have to be better than PSU. LIEBMAN said they were aspirational, that the committee would look at how things were done right at other similar campuses. The amount of data would not be a problem, it will be deciding which questions can be thoughtfully answered using a comparator (for example, how to do targeted hiring). GRECO noted that we have different lists of comparators for different purposes, and that if we are talking about academic quality, she hoped we would aspire to improve. LIEBMAN cited the University's pledge in the bargaining LOA to support the effort.

HANSEN (Music) asked if the task force would do anything besides looking at comparators mentioned in the four points of the charge. Would it look at other topics like teaching? LIEBMAN said the comparators would be the anchor that would help us determine how to better address questions like student success, and deferred to Maude Hines, who was Senate Presiding Officer when the Holistic Resolution was passed.

HINES: The Holistic Resolution of 2011 was really asking a question about resources. That is, if you expect a certain amount of research, a certain level of teaching or student success, what other universities are achieving all of this, how are they doing it, and with what resources? As the University embarks on several concurrent, deeply engaged processes (strategic planning, the structure of CLAS, APP), it's very important to have a committee that is looking at how we can achieve the things that we are moving towards with the resources available.

BLEILER called the question.

The RESOLUTION to establish a Joint Task Force of Academic Quality PASSED by a majority voice vote, with one abstention.

INGERSOLL asked about the status of the Curricular Consent Agenda.

LIEBMAN confirmed that with nothing withdrawn, the Consent Agenda was adopted as published in E1.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

Welcoming faculty to a full and busy year, WIEWEL offered an update on the budget and a preview of upcoming topics. While enrollment is flat, non-resident attendance is up 10%, which will help fill in an anticipated 3 million dollar budget gap. However, the new Board of Trustees has made it clear that it will not approve a deficit budget in the future. Last year closed with a one million dollar loss instead of a budgeted 11 million shortfall, with a cushion of unspent funds in some units. University Advancement, under VP Francoise Aylmer, completed its merger with the

PSU Foundation, successfully raising 39.3 million dollars. WIEWEL also noted the continued recognition for PSU from *U.S. News and World Report* and the high national ranking of the PSU Business Accelerator in the 2014 UBI Global Benchmarks.

WIEWEL listed six key issues for the year: collaboration of all constituencies at PSU in a new strategic planning process, charged by the Board of Trustees (see minutes attachment B4); continuation of the work of ReThink PSU; discussion of the future structure of CLAS; the joint School of Public Health initiative; the upcoming 2015 Oregon Legislature session; and the debate on the Campus Safety recommendations.

WIEWEL thought that APPC efforts and the proposed Task Force on Academic Quality could feed into the work of identifying and discussing questions raised in the planning process. He added that he could imagine a Strategic Plan document having a sentence stating that prioritization of academic programs will be driven by the outcomes of the Academic Program Prioritization process. He expressed optimism about increasing funding for public higher education and said that a collaborative effort among Oregon institutions, administration, faculty, and students would be key to optimizing the outcome. The Presidents Council will be meeting monthly and coordinating with HECC. He also characterized himself as a reluctant convert to the addition of armed police officers after the Reynolds High School shooting. He encouraged faculty to approach the issue with an open minds.

In conclusion, WIEWEL announced interim appointments for a number of open administrative positions where searches are in progress or under consideration: Athletic Director (Valerie Cleary, interim), Dean of Enrollment & Student Management (Dan Fortmiller, interim) and Dean of the School of Business Administration (Scott Marshall, interim), VP for Finance (Kevin Reynolds, interim), Vice Provost in OAA (internal search in progress), and Chief Diversity Officer. [Applause.]

Provost's Report

ANDREWS welcomed faculty and thanked them for their ongoing work, highlighting the contributions of those in Biology and Chemistry to the realization of the Collaborative Life Sciences Building. In reference to the HINES IFS report, she clarified that PSU already has reverse a transfer agreement with PCC, so that PSU credit can be applied to a PCC Associates degree.

ANDREWS announced a new format for her remarks: The Provost's comments will be distributed in a handout that she will not read, to be published in the minutes (see minutes attachment B5). She also referred faculty to her online blog, a response to her impression that broad-based communication with faculty is difficult at PSU. She intends to share information and some of the thinking and input that goes into decision-making. (See <http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/home>.)

ANDREWS asked to use the remainder her time start a conversation with senators about post tenure review, keeping in mind that it is a faculty driven process and that PSU's report to its accreditors is due in Spring 2015.

MAIER: Something important to remember is that many long-time faculty joined a different university and that they came here with certain expectations and have built their careers a certain way. It's important that they be judged on what they embraced at the time rather than what we are actually prioritizing at this moment.

BLEILER: What has concerned me as a previous chair of the Faculty Development Committee is the paucity of resources that are available for faculty. We could easily decide that as a part of post-tenure review that a faculty member needs to perform certain tasks and that this will come down to them as essentially an unfunded mandate. Any post-tenure review process that might recommend ways for a faculty member to modify behavior or move forward in his or her career needs to have an adequate resource base for faculty to get the job done.

LIEBMAN: A Post-tenure Review Committee has convened, including David Raffo, Michele Gamburd, Michael Smith, Ron Narode, Sy Adler, and Gwen Shusterman. I'm confident that they will have a report ready for the December agenda.

ANDREWS concluded by directing senators to item C1 in the Agenda. She noted that these monthly memos are also posted on the web. She asked that senators let her know if this system for acknowledging OAA's response to Senate actions doesn't work; she is open to suggestions for another system. [Applause.]

[Secretary's note: the meeting returned to agenda item E. at this point.]

LIEBMAN reminded senators from CLAS that they would need to caucus after adjournment to select representatives to the Committee on Committees.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 3, 2014
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopahyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Smith, Taylor, Zurk

Alternates Present: Messer for Carder, Lafferriere for Elzanowski (until 3:30), Hanson for Harmon, Hawash for Holliday, Feng for Maier, Beckett for Popp, Bodegom for Sanchez, Ryder for Skaruppa, Cruzan for Stedman, Kinsella for Yeshilada

Members Absent: Carpenter, Hansen (David), Luther, Schuler

Ex-officio Members

Present: Aylmer, Bowman, Everett, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, MacCormack, Marrongelle, McBride, McMillan for Noll, Mercer, Padin, Percy, Reynolds, Rueter, Su, Toppe

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The October 6, 2014 minutes were approved as published. [Secretary's note: BLEILER/HANSEN MOVED to approve, and voice vote sustained, after the APPC discussion.]

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN launched a new practice of "setting up" each meeting with a progress report on initiatives launched and a preview of up-coming reports to Senate (see slides, minutes attachment B1). He announced that the Chair of PSU's Board of Trustees has asked to speak at Faculty Senate this year, that a large number of current NTTF faculty have been re-ranked according to the new ranks that Senate approved, and that the Faculty Development Committee will have additional funds to distribute this year. He also reported the Senate Steering members and Committee chairs would be offered leadership training. He encouraged faculty to participate in governance activities linked to APP and the Academic Quality Task Force.

Richard Clucas has agreed to co-chair the Committee on Committees.

LIEBMAN introduced Julie Weissbuch-Allina, Director of Health Promotion and Education in Student Health and Counseling

Smoke and Tobacco-Free Campus Policy

WEISSBUCH-ALLINA offered an overview of the proposed policy, noting that President Weiwel had pledged a smoke-free campus by 2016 (see slides, minutes attachment B2). Under the policy, there will be exceptions to a campus-wide prohibition for traditional ceremonies and research. Of the 4,000 respondents to the 2012 survey conducted, 400 were faculty, with 62% endorsing smoke-free campus. WEISSBUCH-ALINA encouraged public comment on the proposed policy. (See: <http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library>.) A request for approval of a fall 2015 implementation date will be sought in December 2014. There will be a marketing campaign to familiarize the campus with the policy.

MERCER and REESE asked if the policy included e-cigarettes and hookahs. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said yes, all use of commercial tobacco products would be banned. DOLIDON asked if the policy applied to visitors to the campus. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said her office and Campus Safety would deal with complaints. LONEY asked if the policy applied to student dorms. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said a smoke-free policy was already in effect in the dorms. RUETER wondered if the policy would cover marihuana use, if legalized. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said this would probably be addressed by a different policy.

KARAVANIC noted the recent discussion of the shortage of resources for Campus Safety, and asked if there were an estimate of the cost of enforcement of the policy. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that initial marketing would be the only real cost, and expressed confidence that the policy would become the accepted community standard.

LABISSIERE wondered why e-cigarettes were included. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that they were following FDA guidelines. Responding to CLARK, WEISSBUCH-ALLINA added that the policy included chewing tobacco.

RIEDLINGER asked if the policy include people standing on the sidewalks in front of campus buildings. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that the University can only regulate its own property; students are encouraged to be good neighbors on property adjoining the campus. PERLMUTTER asked if current policy would be re-enforced, noting frequent violation of the Clean Air Corridor. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said an effort would be made.

APPC Update

After briefly reviewing the purpose and scope of Academic Program Prioritization, JONES noted its three planned phases (see slides, minutes attachment B3). The APPC is currently in the first phase of initial parameter setting. He stressed that the document outlining the 6 criteria and suggested metrics and questions that had been

posted for faculty preview were in draft form. These will be the basis for determining the data to be collected and the scoring rubrics. He encouraged faculty to read and respond to the document. (See item C2 added to the November Agenda packet and posted to the Faculty Senate web site: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials>.)

JONES reported that he has been visiting groups and departments across campus to gather feedback on APP. He pledged that no data collection or scoring would begin until the Committee felt that the process could be consistently implemented across campus and the burden of data collection for program administrators had been minimized. He thought that a three-year cycle of APP review was tenable. Data from enrollment planning and a revised mission statement should be available for the process.

JONES then walked senators through a table illustrating how questions and metrics were intended to align with criteria; the column label SRC captures the projected “source” for data (see B3, slide 13, page 3). The APPC is particularly interested to know if faculty think that there should be a separate seventh criteria related to research, scholarly and creative work. He announced a **public forum** on APP for **Monday, November 24**. Feedback can be directed to: apcc-discuss@lists.pdx.edu.

DAIM: Wouldn't having the 30 members to do the scoring chosen from the campus here create a bias that could affect the work of scoring?

JONES: It could happen, but one of the reasons for having 30 people is to minimize it. There will be a random allocation process to assign programs to scorers and the whole process is intended to be completely transparent. The program will have an opportunity to respond to any negative report.

PADIN: Are there any plans for systematic efforts to get feedback on the work, for instance, examining concept development, or having small focus groups or a pilot to test reliability?

JONES: I think you are referring to the assessment piece. I don't think we have the resources to do it right now, but if anyone has suggestions for simple steps we could take, that would be wonderful. For future iterations of APP, it will be very valuable.

KARAVANIC: Is there a way to indicate how a program's focus/purpose integrates with state or national engagement? One might not think of community engagement as implying nationwide.

JONES: That's a good example of where we want to clarify. It think “community” was meant to be very broadly interpreted. This could be made more explicit.

DAVIDOVA: There's so much emphasis on quantitative information; I don't see how you will actually capture things that are qualitative.

JONES: We want to develop rubrics that will help us to assess those kind of things. It is a challenge; numbers are relatively easy to obtain, but we don't want to lean too

much on the numbers. One of the ideas is that we will give programs an opportunity to reflect on those numbers. We want to give opportunities for qualitative feedback at all stages

CHYZANOVKA-JESKE: Do you expect to be able to use the same evaluation criteria for all the programs and that they will be equally important for all programs?

JONES: Yes, we want to apply the same criteria to all programs, but we recognize that different programs have different areas of emphases. APPC has just begun a conversation about how different things will be weighted.

LIEBMAN: Is there any attempt to coordinate with state-wide data gathering? It might be very useful for the University's case-making, for example in the area of STEM, to have data on measures that demonstrate our progress or success.

JONES: No, we have mostly been focused on PSU.

LEIBMAN: How much will you use this data frame looking forward, so that people can chart their progress based on the metrics of 2014?

JONES: People at other institutions have used information from one evaluation cycle as guidance that might inform decision-making in moving towards the next. That is beyond the scope of this APPC, but we are happy to engage in conversations about it.

LIEBMAN: Maybe that is a follow-on that Senate should do. LIEBMAN invited applause to thank JONES and the APPC for their work.

Discussion item: Should Faculty Senate offer a resolution on campus safety?

LIEBMAN reminded senators of the previous meeting's report from Kevin Reynolds and the campus-wide forum on Campus Safety and the committee hearing held by the Board of Trustees on the subject. The purpose of today's discussion was to take some measure of faculty feeling around next steps and to give guidance to the Board.

REESE/BRODOWICZ MOVED the session to a committee of the whole at 3:47 pm.

LIEBMAN returned the meeting to regular session at 4:30 pm. He encouraged senators to forward additional questions and comments to the Steering Committee.

REYNOLDS said further questions could be posted to the Campus Safety website: <http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/campus-safety>

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

LIEBMAN welcomed the new chair of the Graduate Council, David Kinsella.

1. Proposal for a Professional Science Master in Environment and Management (ESM) in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

KINSELLA reviewed the main features of the proposed Master, noting that ESM reported capacity in existing ESM courses and in professional management courses offered by Public Administration and Engineering. ESM plans to grow the program gradually. A small start-up subsidy from the Institute of Sustainable Solutions will cover initial costs. KINSELLA stated that the Graduate Council judged the proposal to be well-conceived and realistic in its assessment of resources needed and demand; the Council recommended the proposal.

PADIN/RAFFO MOVED the proposal for a Professional Science Master, as published in item E1.

DAIM: Can we have more detail on what courses the program will leverage from Engineering? I see courses that we always offer; we would be happy to help.

KINSELLA: The proposal lists four or six courses that would be available.

EVERETT: If you look at the comments on the Curriculum Tracker Wiki, Tim Anderson writes that several Engineering courses were added to the proposal. I think the key point is that Anderson (Chair, Engineering and Technology Management) looked very closely at what should be included from ETM.

HANSEN: Who is the Institute of Sustainable Solutions?

KINSELLA: Its director is Jennifer Allen, at PSU.

LIEBMAN: It's a network plus support system for sustainability projects at PSU.

SCHROCK: ESM states it will meet demand with existing courses. Are there other programs outside of this department (ETM) that they are going to, and if so is there any concern that they will be cannibalizing other programs?

KINSELLA: I don't recall discussion involving any other programs than ETM.

RUETER: The PSM and ETM Masters are very similar and will expand somewhat together. There is no concern about cannibalizing.

The MOTION to approve the Professional Science Master in Environment and Management PASSED: 39 to approve, 2 to reject, and 5 abstentions (recorded by 'clicker.')

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

The President was out of town.

Provost's Report

The Provost was out of town. Her comments were distributed in written form. (See minutes attachment B4.) LIEBMAN suggested that questions about the comments could be emailed to the Provost.

Report of the PSU Foundation President/CEO

AYLMER addressed the merger of University Advancement and the PSU Foundation as a cost saving measure that had also brought greater clarity for donors. There were one-time costs of \$180,000 but a permanent cut of \$500,000 from the University budget. Her presentation documented the growth of major gifts and overall giving since 2009, despite the fact that when AYLMEER arrived in Oregon she had been told that Portland was not a philanthropic city. (Applause; see slides, minute attachment B5.) It had been a matter of changing the culture, she affirmed. She acknowledged the role that faculty can and have played. With a focus on building alumni networks, alumni and students are now a significant portion (48%) of those giving.

AYLMER noted that 15.4 million dollars in gift funds went to cover University expenses in 2013-14 (slides 9-10). Since the Foundation's inception, over 17 million dollars of endowed funds have supported faculty work. Plans for a comprehensive campaign await input from PSU's new deans. She described the results of a wealth screening study that suggest even greater donor capacity. Although that capacity can only be partially addressed with current resources, future prospects are really good.

LIEBMAN noted that he and Aylmer had discussed the possibility of small group orientations for faculty to discuss how to initiate fund-raising. He thanked Aylmer for the presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 1, 2014

Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman

Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Daescu, Daim, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Maier, McElhone, Mukhopahyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada, Zurk

Alternates Present: Messer for Carder, Kapoor for Davidova, Bodegom for Sanchez, Ryder for Skaruppa

Members Absent: Arellano, Cotrell, Eppley, Hansen (Brad), Luther, Mercer, Rueter

Ex-officio Members

Present: Bowman, Everett, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, MacCormack, Marrongelle, Marshall, McBride, Padin, Reynolds, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The November 3, 2014 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN drew attention to handouts from University Counsel David Reese and Provost Andrews available at the door.

LIEBMAN recommended suspension of the normal order of business and a two-minute limit on individual responses, because of the need to devote extra time to discussion of the Campus Safety Resolution and Post Tenure Review. He said his goal would be to operate on the principal of “progressive stack” and to cue up questions with a common focus. Reports itemized in G and an update from APPC would be heard after item E-2, focusing the remainder of the time on safety and post tenure. (See minutes attachment B1.)

The recommended MOTION to suspend the normal order of business and allow for time limits on discussion PASSED, 50 in favor, 1 objection, and 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

2. Proposal for a Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Susan Kirtley, Director of Rhetoric and Composition and author of the proposal, introduced the certificate. KIRTLEY noted the depth of PSU’s current offerings on graphic art, Portland’s recognition as a top “comics city,” and the number of enthusiastic interactions she has had with prospective students. She stated that the Comics Studies Program will offer something truly unique that will serve students and bring together the faculty and the community.

KARAVANEC: Could you comment on the intellectual content or use of the Certificate?

KIRTLEY: Comic art is regarded as a genre, a way of telling stories. We’ll be covering a wide range of graphic narratives, journalism, memoirs and fiction, and have the opportunity to study graphic art from scholarly, historical and international perspectives. We’ll work with the wonderful creators we have in our community and have the opportunity to study writing, editing and the full scope of graphic art production. Some students expressing interest are just fans who want to learn more, others want jobs in the industry and mentoring.

CARSTENS: Why is it a post bac certificate? Can undergraduates take it?

KIRTLEY: A post bac certificate will draw in people from the community, many who already have a degree. Undergraduates can take the classes, but will not qualify automatically for the Certificate. According to the Registrar, after their last undergraduate term, PSU students will be able to apply for post-graduate admission and then, for an additional fee (\$25), apply for the Certificate.

GRECO/REESE MOVED the Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies.

The Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies PASSED as published in E2, 42 in favor, 5 opposed, with 5 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

[*Secretary’s Note*: E3 & E4 discussions are summarized after item G reports, as adopted.]

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL reported satisfactory budgetary outcomes from fall enrollment and a 50% increase in fund-raising over the previous year. He congratulated the PSU recipients of a 24 million dollar collaborative NIH research and training grant to boost diversity in health sciences. He noted the beginning of bi-monthly meetings of the Strategic Planning Development committee. He also reported that searches for a new Athletic Director, Dean of SBA, and VP for Enrollment and Student Affairs were in the final stages, and that there are significant increases for deferred maintenance in the Governor's recommended biennial budget. While the addition to Higher Ed's operating budget won't cover much beyond PEBB and PERS increases, the Governor has said that he will work with the Legislature to find an additional \$50 million.

Provost's Report

ANDREWS invited faculty to attend open meetings with candidates for dean of the School of Business and welcomed two new appointees: Shelly Chabon as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development and Margaret Everett, adding the duties of Vice Provost of International Affairs. Her general remarks on post tenure review were included in the printed comments that she distributed. (See minutes attachment B2.) She stated that OAA is committed to implementing the FY 15 salary increases for satisfactory performance for those who will go through the new post-tenure review, but reminded senators that it was worth taking the time needed to put a good process in place. She also noted that PSU-AAUP and the University were exploring the possibility for interest-based bargaining.

Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee

BOWMAN directed senators to the written report distributed (see minutes attachment B3) and the financial data now available on the Budget Committee's website: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/budget-committee>. He asked that senators contact him (bowman@pdx.edu) to let him know how useful they think the Committee's role is in reviewing the budgetary impact of new and/or revised programs; do senators read the information?

LAYZELL asked if the Committee was considering not producing expenditure spreadsheets. BOWMAN clarified that the spreadsheets on the website related to the University budget; he was concerned about the Committee's efforts reviewing new or just revised programs. LIEBMAN observed that the availability of the University-level budget data was a watershed event and noted sessions that the Committee has been running, with Jennifer Chambers' assistance, to help individuals learn how to use the data.

Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

PADIN reviewed the charge of the EPC, noting that its work was a combination of matters referred to it and initiatives that it may undertake. (See minutes attachment B4.) He described three sub-committees that had been formed for the year: one examining educational standards for online courses; one focusing on issues that have an impact on educational quality, and a third drafting a memorandum of understanding with the administration to articulate how units across campus could approach the program change process in a way that lives by the spirit, as well as the letter, of the process.

PADIN listed three program proposals coming forward winter term: a request from the International Studies Program to create a department (under a new name); a proposed merger to form the School of Gender, Race and Nations; and an anticipated proposal for creation of the School of Public Health.

INGERSOL asked about the name change. PADIN said the new department would be called International and Global Studies. CLARK asked how to contact the sub-committee on online standards. PADIN provided his email: padinj@pdx.edu.

APPC Update

JONES announced that an article would be posted on the APPC website responding to feedback from last week's Forum on APP: <http://pdxappc.blogspot.com/>. This site also features a posting on "What is an Academic Program" and a list of programs by college. He encouraged people to review and assess the listing for their own program.

BROWER asked how the Committee would factor in the feedback from the Forum. JONES replied that they would discuss the feedback, and any additional comments received, at their next meeting. PADIN asked what feedback would still be timely. JONES said the Committee's final (fall-term) meeting was in two weeks. LIEBMAN drew senators' attention to the form soliciting comments and volunteers for APP scoring, and asked senators to share the information with their districts.

IFS

HINES agreed to defer her report until January and encouraged senators to forward questions for discussion at the January 23-24 IFS meeting at PSU.

E. NEW BUSINESS [continued after reports, following the adopted order]

3. Resolution on Campus Public Safety

LIEBMAN drew senators' attention to the handout with background information from General Counsel David Reese (minutes attachment B5) and the report from the School of Social Work (E.3a) in the agenda packet. He invited Michael Taylor (SSW) to present the Resolution on behalf of the proposers.

TAYLOR explained that the resolution grew from concerns of members of his faculty, based on their experience and ethics as social workers; it was co-sponsored by 14 senators from 10 departments. He acknowledged both the number of public forums on the administration's proposal and the concerns of campus public safety officers. He invited a fact-based discussion and shared a handout with a series of discussion points (see minutes attachment B6).

HOLLIDAY/DONLAN MOVED the Campus Safety Resolution, as published in E-3.

TAYLOR noted that Reese's memo makes clear that a sworn police force is, essentially, an armed police force. Commenting on the talking points, he stated that crime statistics in the Clery Report don't show rising problems of armed conflict on campus, and noted that it continues to be hard to define campus space and what is shared space with the Portland community on the Park Blocks.

Sponsors of the Resolution offered statements:

GRECO read excerpts from an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 8, 2014; see <http://chronicle.com/article/For-Safetys-Sake-Get-Rid-of-/149275/>.) The authors, professors in the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati and the College of Criminology at Florida State, raise concerns about inherent conflict of interests and lack of impartiality that arise when campus police forces are under the direct control of university administrators and a dual system of justice is created.

TAYLOR drew attention to the extensive obligations the University would take on with sworn officers and a statement from faculty in the proposed School of Gender, Race and Nations, concerned about how investigation of sexual assault will go forward as a collaborative enterprise.

LAYZELL advocated for raising philosophical and ethical objections to what seemed to be a rush to arm campus police. He expressed the belief that it was a question of what kind of society we want to live in and ultimately, for him, taking a stand in opposition was a question of personal conscience. He argued that we know that, around the country, people who are not guilty of capital offenses are being gunned down by police; and, in reality, if a sworn officer claims to feel under threat, it is nearly impossible for a grand jury to indict. (Applause).

LIEBMAN opened the floor for questions and discussion of the resolution.

HARMON asked what "supervision" in second part of the resolution meant.

TAYLOR said it endorsed a review board that looks at complaints. ZURK noted the duties that only sworn officers could fulfill and asked if Portland police were functioning adequately on our campus as needed. REESE reiterated the broader authority of sworn officers. ZERZAN said that the Portland Police Bureau does what campus security cannot on their timeline, and in some cases things were not getting done.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked if concerns had been raised with the city and county, and if the situation would change if more money were added to the current security budget? ZERZAN affirmed that the charge to municipal police to provide services to the city doesn't fit well with policing a university; he offered an example of a four-day wait to follow up on a sexual assault in the dorms. REYNOLDS cited Commander Day of the Portland police, who said that they can provide an *emergency* response to the campus. REESE said providing more money to the current campus force would not solve the problem; safety officers would still lack authorization to conduct certain investigations.

KARAVANEC asked to yield to Karen Kennedy. KENNEDY asked if the mayor and police chief had been engaged in the discussion, noting the contribution that the campus makes to the downtown economy, and the cost of duplicating services that are, or could be, provided by the Portland police. REYNOLDS said the cost of an additional Portland Police officer would be three times greater than adding a sworn officer to PSU. ZERZAN reiterated that a municipal police department is not charged with Title 9 or Clery Act compliance. REYNOLDS added that there would be limited control and no oversight committee with service from the Portland Police. PADIN speculated on the public policy implications of the discussion and doubted that other busy neighborhoods would be authorized to have a sworn police force. He asked if the current campus security department was unable to perform the Title 9 and Clery functions. ZERZAN repeated that what they could and could not do had been delineated, and argued that many communities with singular functions and requirements have their own security forces—transit authorities, hospitals, airports.

LONEY asked why trained, sworn officers could not function without carrying firearms. LABISSIERE inquired how having a gun makes a better officer. REESE stated that nothing in the law requires a sworn officer be armed, but sworn officers have a legal obligation to act, for instance, to make an arrest in the face of evidence of domestic violence. To have an unarmed officer in that kind of volatile situation creates new problems. LABISSIERE said that the argument had been made that the campus was a different kind of community; he suggested that more time was needed to figure out collectively what different approaches were needed. ZERZAN said that he could not ask unarmed officers to do police work without being trained and equipped as police officers. REYNOLDS reminded that unarmed campus officers would then have to wait for an armed response.

MESSER (for Carder) noted evidence suggesting that some criminal activities that happen on campuses, like sexual assaults, are better handled by regular police, not university security. SMITH asked if campus safety officers were trained to use some other forms of self-defense; the portrayal seemed to suggest

guns were their only option. ZERZAN said yes, but there were limitations. SANTELMANN asked how many domestic violence calls were received on the PSU campus and what was the danger of waiting. ZERZAN said 12 to 20 a year, from student housing; and the risk was primarily for potential victims.

WIEWEL stated that the campus discussion had convinced him that it would be irresponsible not to move forward with the proposal to arm campus police. He acknowledged the importance of questions of training and oversight, and said they would be part of the resolution brought to the Board of Trustees. He thought continued discussion would only yield continued stress and aggravation. He had heard broad agreement that officers needed the authority of sworn officers; arming them to be able to confront volatile situations that were a reality on campus also seemed a necessity. He rejected the argument for voting for the world we might ideally want to live in and asked senators not to support the resolution

REESE (Susan) asked if police officers were always trained to shoot to kill and gave a moving example of where that outcome ought to have been an avoidable. ZERAN said police officers are not trained to shoot to kill; they train to shoot to stop the threat, and to use a lesser level of force unless they are precluded from doing that.

REESE/HOLLIDAY called the question.

The Campus Public Safety Resolution as published in E3 PASSED, 38 in favor, 14 opposed, with 3 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

4. Proposal for Post Tenure Review – first reading

LIEBMAN distributed sheets for providing feedback on the post tenure review proposal. He described the draft Post Tenure Review process document as an addendum to the promotion and tenure guidelines outlining a new, independent process. He stated that OAA and AAUP would also be involved in review and discussion of the draft proposal and that a second document would outline implementation of the new process. He introduced David Raffo, chair of the Ad hoc Post Tenure Review Committee.

RAFFO reviewed the Ad hoc Committee's charge and intensive work over the six weeks since it had convened. (See slides, minutes attachment B7). The draft process document, which he acknowledged had not resolved all issues, was delivered to the Steering Committee on November 17 and posted on the Senate web site on November 24 (as E4): <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials>. He noted that the reviews would satisfy accreditation and contractual requirements. He highlighted the fact that the new process would be both formative *and* summative, as well as collaborative. Its goals would differ from promotion and tenure and merit review. Review would rest on the individual's scholarly agenda, acknowledging all contributions to the University; responsibility for the review would be lodged at department level.

Under the proposed process, RAFFO said review of tenured faculty, including those with administrative appointments under .65 FTE, would take place every five years. Two members of the review committee would be chosen by the individual and one by the chair. The post-tenure process would recognize that faculty members' contributions change as they go through their careers. The review would center on a scholarly agenda that clarifies the emphases a faculty member currently places on research, teaching, outreach and service, and articulates how those activities relate to departmental mission and goals, as part of a collective process of departmental planning and decision-making.

RAFFO said that outcome of the review was to be a finding of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance. A satisfactory finding would result in a raise to base pay (4% in 2015-16). A faculty member with an unsatisfactory review would be asked for a personal development plan to improve areas of concern identified, which could be funded. Deans and the Provost would have to approve plans; their role was also to insure compliance with guidelines, and hear appeals.

RAFFO also described an implementation document that would outline the more transitory aspects of the new process. It will specify that faculty be phased into the process, 20% at a time, in annual waves based on years in rank. The Committee recommended that the first review consider only full professors. There will be a procedure to allow for opting out. The timeline for the first reviews still needs to be discussed with the Administration, to determine what options might be available if departmental guidelines could not be approved in time for reviews to be conducted in 2014-15.

LIEBMAN thanked the Committee for their work. (Applause.)

MAIER: Did the Committee consider the option of giving a constant increment from the funding pool, instead of a percentage based on salary?

RAFFO: That's something that we could consider. Since the pool was created based on a percentage of salary, we have stayed with that.

DAIM: Will all committees the first year be composed of full professors, because you are evaluating full professors?

RAFFO: Yes. We haven't specified that in the language, but we can.

ZURK: Have you thought about the additional work load for departments, if this is akin to a P & T type evaluation, with extensive document preparation?

RAFFO: This process is not intended to be the extensive kind of review done for promotion and tenure. A minimum list of documents is specified.

PERLMUTTER: It sounds like the only people who can serve on the committees of those on administrative appointments are other chairs or directors.

RAFFO: We tried to exclude those in the reporting chain of the chair; emeritus faculty could serve.

BLEILER: Couldn't former department chairs also serve?

LIEBMAN: Remember that the document still needs more work. Review of chairs was something suggested by the Committee so that people would not be dis-incentivized from serving as chairs.

NARODE: The assumption is that as a colleague a chair would have at least two people on this campus who could be selected to serve on the committee.

RAFFO: Please write me with your suggestions.

GEORGE: I am concerned about the composition of the committees. Isn't it asking for trouble to have faculty select their own committees when the outcome is a 4% raise? I couldn't find any guidelines on line from other universities that have review committees selected by candidates.

RAFFO: We are trying to have this be a peer review by people who are familiar with the faculty member's area of expertise, who can have an honest dialog. (See B7 slides, p. 4, Questions.)

NARODE: This is a process that we hope faculty will look forward to and not be subject to the whim of a particular department chair. We are saying find people who understand your field and what you do, who can contribute to your professional growth. My own preference would be to have the faculty member select all three, with the chair or dean able to opt out of one. If a development plan is needed, from whom is the faculty member more likely to take advice?

LIEBMAN asked senators to participate in a straw poll on three questions related to implementation of post tenure review:

1. Review tenured faculty based on years in rank, in order of full, associate and assistant professors? Year 1: Prioritize long-serving full professors.

Result recorded by clicker: 28 in support, 9 oppose, 5 undecided

2. Allow deferral/expedited review for special circumstances (leave, illness, return from assignment, etc.).

Result recorded by clicker: 42 in support, 0 oppose, 2 undecided

3. A faculty member who announces retirement within 2-3 years may waive post tenure review.

Result recorded by clicker: 39 in support, 2 oppose, 2 undecided

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 5, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Hunt, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Luther, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada

Alternates Present: Kennedy for Arellano, Messer for Carder, Hawash for Holliday, Blekic for Ingersoll, Appleyard (?) for Raffo, Hines for Reese until 3:50, Ryder for Skaruppa

Members Absent: Bleiler, Cotrell, Eppley, Maier, Zurk

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Bowman, Everett, Fink, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, MacCormack, McBride, McMillan for Noll, Mercer, Moody, Padin, Percy, Reynolds, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The December 1, 2014 minutes were approved as corrected: ARELLANO was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN announced the order of business and that clickers would not be used. He welcomed the chair of PSU's new Board of Trustees, Pete Nickerson, as someone really keen to learn and understand the character of the faculty. He noted that Nickerson had previously been very active in the PSU Foundation, was fluent in Mandarin, with business experience and expertise in Asia, and currently co-chaired the PSU Campaign effort to raised funds for scholarships. (Applause.)

NICKERSON announced that the PSU Campaign was ahead of schedule and just short of its 50 million dollar goal; he thanked faculty for their support of that effort. He noted his professional background as the co-founder of a publically traded

company that produces footwear in Asia across 6 different cultures and employing about 92,000. He briefly reviewed the organization of the Board of Trustees and noted that 14 of the 15 members serving are volunteers, all with a passion for PSU. The Board has modeled itself on recommendations from the Association of Governing Boards and the examples of peers at U of Oregon and OSU. In addition to meeting quarterly, it has three standing committees: Academic and Student Affairs, Finance and Administration, and an Executive and Audit Committee. The Board's primary activity is to consider and approve an overall strategy for PSU, as well as to hire and evaluate PSU's President, and to oversee the budget and tuition. Their current objective is to make a smooth transition to the new model of governance and to get to know PSU and each other. He expressed great confidence in the Board's membership and especially thanked Maude Hines, PSU faculty Board member. (Applause.)

HINES: I would absolutely agree with Pete. I have been very impressed with our Board so far.

NICKERSON: I have been asked how can we communicate with the Board. First through the Administration, second through email, but probably most effective is to call on us individually. During the recent campus safety discussions, the most effective communication that I had personally was when somebody came up to me and talked to me directly. We are setting up a generic email system that will be available on the website where you can send comments and questions (<http://www.pdx.edu/board/>).

SCHULER: Please consider profoundly support for the liberal arts, regardless of market forces. This might be the end of a thirty year cycle, everything digital is in; so as you consider this, and I think you understand that one need to adjust to it, be real, and also remember the arts.

NICKERSON: I am the product of a liberal arts education, so I understand your point.

NICKERSON thanked faculty for all their efforts on behalf of Portland State and affirmed that everyone present understood that an institution is only as good as its faculty, citing a Chinese saying ("If you want the race horse to win, you have to feed it properly.") (Applause.)

LIEBMAN noted the change to the January minutes and announced removal of one course (E.1.a.6) from the consent agenda that would return on February's agenda.

LIEBMANH requested that the meeting move to a committee of the whole for the discussion item (at 3:29), and that senators keep their remarks to two minutes. Copies of the presentation slides for the Post Tenure review discussion were distributed (see minutes attachment B1).

Discussion item: Post Tenure Review

Straw polls taken during the discussion indicated support for having departments decide how to choose post-tenure review (PTR) committees, with some university-wide guidelines; a strong preference for having departmental promotion and tenure (P&T) committees rather than chairs name the individual three-person PTR committees; and a split between three alternatives for constituting the committee between 3 members chosen by P&T from a joint list of eligible faculty, 1 each named by the candidate for review, chair and P&T committee, and 2 named by candidate and 1 by chair. There was broad support for having chairs eligible for PTR.

The collective departmental role in defining or negotiating its own and an individual's "scholarly agenda" was discussed at some length. A number of participants in the discussion argued for the importance of recognizing academic leadership and administrative service as component of the scholarly agenda and for flexibility in determining documentation required and criteria relevant for post tenure review.

BRODOWICZ/CARSTENS MOVED the meeting to regular session at 4:25 pm.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in "E.1" were ADOPTED, with one item (E.1.a.6 PHE 515 Bio-statistics) withdrawn.

[Item E. 2 was considered after the reports from President and Provost]

2. Educational Policy Committee Resolution on the Conversion of the International Studies Program to a Department

PADIN, chair of EPC, stated that the EPC unanimously endorsed the proposed conversion.

PADIN/HARMON MOVED approval of the conversion of the International Studies Program to a department, and the change of name to Department of Global and International Studies.

PADIN offered some background: The Program had existed since the 1980s, added its first tenure line in the 1990s, and now has several faculty lines and associated faculty and close to 100 majors. Program members believe that elevation to department status will bring increased visibility, enthusiasm and

resources, and generate additional opportunities for recruiting students and faculty.

YESILADA stated that this move was also in line with the recommendation of an external review conducted four years ago and would substantiate the reputation of the program in Oregon and the West Coast. DONLAN asked what School the new department would belong to. SMALLMAN, director of International Studies, replied that the Program is currently in CLAS, but conversations were in progress about moving to CUPA, with unanimous International Studies faculty support; they were waiting for confirmation of approval of a formal process for moving units between schools.

The MOTION was APPROVED, 55 in favor, with 1 abstention.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL reported PSU Foundation and Advancement fund-raising successes representing a 43% increase to date over the prior fiscal year. He anticipated an announcement that fund-raising goals have been met for renovation of the Stott Center, and added that the Scholarship Campaign had also reached 85% of its goal. He noted recent recognition for PSU grad Mitchell Jackson, author of *The Residue Years*, and the federal grant awarded to the Portland-Metro Partnership to train elementary science teachers that PSU would participate in. Touting the monthly newsletter on campus Strategic Planning, he invited faculty input, and looked forward to Senate's participation in a special meeting on the topic.

WIEWEL stated that he welcomed the Board's vote to introduce sworn police officers and that, although he did not enjoy being in opposition to Faculty Senate, he believed the debate had led to much greater specificity around questions of implementation. As a result a Campus Safety Advisory Committee would be convened, to be co-chaired by Dean Percy and Dr. Ridder, Executive Director of Diversity and Multicultural Student Services. The Advisory Committee will submit a plan for introducing sworn officers to the Board for its review and approval.

WEIWEL announced the hiring of a new VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, John Fraire, from Washington State University, and new Director of Athletics, Mark Rountree, from Miami U of Ohio. He also said that he would continue the practice of holding “open office hours.”

FINK, VP Research and Strategic Partnerships, added that senator Corey Griffin had received an award to support a collaboration between architecture and engineering. (Applause.)

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS thanked Senate for the post tenure review discussion and drew attention to the posting of faculty comments on the PTR draft: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/resources-for-items-under-discussion>, adding that further comments could be sent to Vice Provost Chabon. She said that she, too, would be continuing her open drop-in hours.

ANDREWS said that PSU had again asked department chairs and deans to do strategic enrollment plans to set targets for retention and growth, and report capacity and diminishing demand. Plans for next year have now been submitted and the FY 16 budget will be based on what is needed to achieve the targets. She invited senators to review the plans (<https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/enrollment-watch/>) and attend the campus Budget Forum on February 23. In close, she announced the appointment of Daniel (Dan) Connolly, from the University of Denver’s Daniels College of Business, as the PSU Dean of the School of Business Administration.

LIEBMAN introduced Sukhwant Jhaj, Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success

Update on the Provost’s Challenge

JHAJ invited Cindy Baccar, Registrar, and Yves Labissiere, Director of University Studies, to join him. He directed senators to the project website (<http://www.pdx.edu/oai/provosts-challenge>) as he reviewed the impressive work of the 24 team projects initiated with the 3 million dollar one-time funding. Eight have been completed and the remaining are expecting on-time completion. To provide context, he noted the scaling up from previous CAE/COL support for developing individual courses to a fully online Masters in Social Work, two BA offerings in Business, as well as large clusters of courses in UNST, and a set of courses in ESR.

BACCAR announced the successful initiation of fully-automated online major change in 2014 (Project 136), which has given the University the capacity to track majors and progress to graduation. The number of undeclared majors has dropped from 7.2% in fall 2013 to 3.8% in fall 2014. About 11% changed their majors from spring to fall 2014. She also highlighted the inauguration of an online petition and electronic workflow process for the Academic Requirements Committee (Project

107). She hoped this effort would eventually facilitate the work other University committees dealing with student petitions. (Applause.)

LABISSIERE reported progress on the project to expand the resources and infrastructure for student eportfolios (Project 169). Key to the team's work was the recognition that eportfolios should support pedagogy and student learning as well as assessment. An eportfolio tool was selected in December and over the next 6 months or so the team will be working on several pilot projects helping schools and programs implement the new platform.

LIEBMAN expressed the hope that this update was a teaser for a campus showcase for all the projects. JHAJ said this would happen.

LIEBMAN stressed the importance of work on creating a new post tenure process to meet up-coming deadlines in 2014.

LIEBMAN asked for a show of hands regarding the scheduling of an additional one-hour session at 3:00 pm on Monday, February 9, to allow the Senate to have input into the Strategic Planning Process. A majority of senators present confirmed their availability.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 2, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Loney, Luther, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Skaruppa, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada, Zurk

Alternates Present: Messer for Carder, Weber for Daim, Thieman for De La Vega, MacCormak for Lindsay, Hines for Reese until 3:50

Members Absent: Griffin, Mukhopadhyay, Sanchez, Schuler

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Bowman, Everett, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, MacCormack, McBride, Mercer, Miller, Padin, Percy, Peyton, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The January 5, 2014 minutes were approved. The following correction is added: Mathwick was the alternate for Raffo.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN reviewed his set up for the meeting and drew attention to handouts available, including one explaining how the Psychology Department adapted the scholarly agenda which was discussed at the Forum on Post Tenure Review (PTR) on January 26, 2015 (see minutes attachment B1). LIEBMAN confirmed Consent Agenda items, and noted that the IFS report would be postponed.

Academic Program Prioritization (APP)

JONES announced that the APP Committee planned a forum in three weeks and previewed topics on the agenda, including scoring and timeline (see slides, minutes

attachment B2). He emphasized the opportunity that APP would give faculty to discuss how to balance academic and fiscal priorities with the Administration.

Academic Requirements Committee Memorandum

MACCORMACK, ARC chair, reaffirmed the policy limiting students to 21 credits per term, unless they obtain permission from their advisor, or from the ARC (for over 25 credits). He noted that it has been difficult to track credit taken in the same term through other institutions that registered PSU students transfer after the term is over. However, the Registrar's Office will begin more consistent monitoring for 'after-the-fact' overloads and will deny credit that exceeds the limit, in order to discourage the misuse of online courses.

LUTHER: How will this be communicated to students and when is it effective?

MACCORMACK: We're sending memos to the Advising Council and others. It will be a transitional process, but going forward immediately.

CLUCAS: If some transfer credits are automatically denied, can students still use the traditional appeal process?

MACCORMACK: Yes. In the next year or so, students will need to consult with advisers who can facilitate a legitimate appeal. We are particularly concerned about screening out students registering for as much as 35 or 40 credits in a quarter.

KARAVANEC: Does the limit affect the credit for prior learning initiative?

MACCORMACK: No, CPL credit is not counted against the credit limit.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Draft Proposal for Post Tenure Review - revised

BRODOWICZ/DONLAN MOVED the Proposal as published in D1 [Secretary's note: a revision of the draft document previewed in December]

LIEBMAN summarized the process of revision (see minutes attachment B3). He highlighted strong preferences expressed by faculty for review committees named independent of the chair and for chair oversight of the professional development plan (PDP) process. Faculty had also supported including chairs for PTR and immediate eligibility for a pay increase for individuals who completed their PDPs as an incentive.

LEIBMAN described guiding principles for the Steering Committee's revision—that the process not be cumbersome, that it balance past practice with individual scholarship, and that it be collegial, equitable and effective. He invited faculty who had contacted the Steering Committee in January to provide a rationale for

their suggestions. Proposed changes were circulated and displayed (see minutes attachment B4). [Secretary's note: No individual changes were moved.]

BOWMAN noted that the Library, a unit without departments, wanted to follow its current practice for P&T and select a single committee for all its divisions to do post tenure reviews [amending III. E]. LIEBMAN acknowledged that some fix for units without departments was needed, noting the difficulty of accommodating all 50 to 60 units that the process needed to encompass.

GRECO said her proposals addressed concerns raised at the PTR Forum and worries about work-load creep. She thought that clarifying the difference between reviews for tenure and merit, which do require external or internal ranking, and PTR, which does not, could help streamline the process and its expectations. To respond to widespread anxiety about whether the pool would be funded after the first year, she suggested stipulating that Senate would reopen the guidelines if there were no financial incentive. She also advocated for specifying a step requiring departmental ratification of PTR guidelines if they were to be modified at the Dean's or Provost's level. DONLAN asked if only tenured faculty would vote to approve PTR guidelines, and what would happen if the vote were negative. GRECO said in her home department only tenure-line faculty would vote; and that guidelines that were not agreed upon would go back for more discussion.

LIEBMAN spoke to new language proposed for Article VI.c.7. The addition would stipulate that a required PDP that is attempted but incomplete should not be subject to sanctions under Article 27 in the PSU-AAUP contract.

RAFFO, chair of the Ad Hoc PTR Committee, said that there were explanatory marginal comments for his edits in the handout (see B4). He highlighted four proposed changes: (1) He thought that the definition of service [in IV.C.2.d] needed to be more broadly inclusive because service does not always take the form of being in a leadership position. (2) Review committees need to "provide evidence" for a negative decision; this would provide clarity about what activities a faculty member can do to improve performance. (3) Actions that are asked of a faculty member in the professional development plan (PDP) needed to be substantially within their control" and we should allow the faculty member to drive the drafting of the PDP. (4) Faculty in units without department chairs should have options for discussion before going to the Dean's level for review.

LIEBMAN asked for comments on the suggested changes.

PADIN asked if the intent was to focus discussion on all the proposed changes as a whole. LIEBMAN said that the practice was to bring back the document with all amendments at once for an up or down vote to avoid trying to edit on the floor of the Senate.

PADIN proposed striking the second sentence in III.A requiring units to establish PTR procedures in their P&T guidelines. It could confuse the distinction that senators were trying to make between different reviews; PTR guidelines should

be separate. BLEILER said that units ought to be able to have all guidelines for separate procedures in a common document, and suggested that such a document could be entitled “Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Guidelines.” LIEBMAN agreed that the more precise language was a good alternative. RAFFO asked if any protections would be lost if the guidelines weren’t part of the P&T Guidelines. LIEBMAN thought not, since the reference was to departmental guidelines, which were themselves more directive procedures implemented under University guidelines.

PERLMUTTER reiterated a request that faculty only be required to draft one document for PTR called a “narrative” describing where they shine in the four areas (teaching, research, community outreach, and service); having a separate scholarly agenda suggests a focus only on research. LIEBMAN conceded that requiring both a scholarly agenda and a narrative had been a major source of confusion. GRECO said she thought that the single document suggestion was completely in keeping with Psychology Department practice discussed as a model at the PTR Forum (see B1).

KARAVANEC asked how competing suggestions from RAFFO and BOWMAN for changes in III.E would be reconciled. LIEBMAN said Steering would go back to the proposers. WEBER (for DAIM) asked to what degree the PTR would be external and what discretion departments had. LIEBMAN that the PTR process was set up to be completely internal. PADIN stated that he accepted BLEILER’s proposal for III.A.

Discussion item: Implementation of Post Tenure Review

LIEBMAN distributed copies of a proposal for a motion in March to implement the new PTR process. He reviewed the component points regarding eligibility, funding, training, and assessment (see minutes attachment B6). He noted that OAA had not yet had an opportunity to review the proposal closely.

MAIER proposed that instead of a percentage based on an individual’s salary that the pool of funds set aside for PTR increases be divided so that each person gets an equal amount for a successful PTR to reduce salary disparities. Why should some people get more for jumping the same bar? STEDMAN supported the suggestion. DONLAN asked if the pay raise would be awarded after completion of a PDP. LIEBMAN said yes, eligible, and MACCORMACK clarified that it was not retroactive. YESHILADA thought that the eligibility of Associates in the pool needed to be clarified; we could end with two sets of reviews going on at essentially the same time, if an Associate was being reviewed for PTR and just about to be reviewed for promotion. LIEBMAN suggested this be worked out with OAA, and noted that the 5-year cycle for PTR was a fixed period, while promotion was not. RUETER pointed out that a salary pool divided equally will get smaller every year after the ‘oldest and wisest’ are reviewed first. LIEBMAN said that models would have to be run.

[Secretary’s note: the following action was moved, after new business.]

LIEBMAN requested a motion authorizing the Steering Committee to proceed with amending language of the Post Tenure Review document along lines suggested, in conjunction with the Ad Hoc PTR Committee.

DONLAN/KARAVANEC MOVED that the Steering Committee propose an amended version for vote in March.

The MOTION was APPROVED by majority voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture

KINSELLA reviewed the components of the proposed program focused on sustainable design methods. He said there were no new funding requirements and that the proposers had documented demand and that other disciplines supporting electives had agreed to participate.

PERLMUTTER/HARMON MOVED to approve the Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design.

The MOTION was APPROVED, 54 in favor, no opposed, and no abstentions.

3. Educational Policy Committee recommendation on the creation of the School for Gender, Race and Nations

PADIN, chair, stated that the EPC enthusiastically endorsed the proposal. He explained that when new or altered units are proposed the EPC tries to assess the impact across campus. When there are questions, proposers are given the opportunity to respond and revise their proposal. PADIN proposed that a school could be defined as federations of departments or units that share, or find they share, a philosophical commitment to some practical or applied action. EPC concluded that the School for Gender, Race, and Nations proposal satisfied this definition. External review had also established that the proposal was promising, innovative and credible. They have the resources and are programming jointly.

MERCER/HOLLIDAY MOVED to approve the creation of the School for Gender, Race, and Nations.

INGERSOLL: Are there plans for expanding the undergraduate program, to include a new minor or BA in Gender, Race, and Nations, for example?

PADIN asked the proposers to respond. Sally McWilliams (WSGS) stated the plan was to focus on the graduate level, but they have developed a co-taught undergraduate course that could form a basis for on-going conversation. Cornell Pewewardy said that theirs would be an innovative collaboration, with a program that still needed to be cooperatively built; so the focus would be on the graduate program first. MACCORMACK asked if the school would have a director. MCWILLIAMS said yes.

The MOTION was APPROVED, 53 in favor, no opposed, and 1 abstention.

4. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture

KINSELLA reviewed the Certificate's focus on underserved communities, to address issues of inequality and development of leadership skills and summarized its components. Support for an additional .5 FTE is included in the budget request for the School.

HARMON/RAFFO MOVED to approve the Graduate Certificate in Gender, Race, and Nations.

The MOTION was APPROVED 54 in favor, no opposed, and no abstentions

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

WIEWEL stated that he believed that recent departures had not compromised PSU's ability to move forward with important objectives, and that new hires would benefit from their opportunity to participate in current campus dialogues about shared values and PSU's future. (See full text, minutes attachment B6.)

MARRONGELLE affirmed the central place of the liberal arts at PSU in providing students opportunities to develop necessary skills and that Deans should certainly have a hand in helping to create research and teaching synergies across Schools and Colleges. (See full text, minutes attachment B7.)

Describing the origin of the question, LIEBMAN said the Steering Committee had wondered what we understood about the impact of recent or impending changes in CLAS for the map of liberal arts. He suggested a need for follow-up.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL reported that fall term enrollment had declined 2% from 2014; at the same time non-resident enrollment had increased 4.1%. He noted the international coverage garnered by the report of high levels of formaldehyde in e-cigarettes by PSU researchers Peyton, Strongin, and Pankow. PSU has also been recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for its Community Engagement, and with a top 50 ranking in *US News & World Reports* of its SBA online MBA degree. Describing campus-wide outreach to gather input to the Strategic Planning Process, WIEWEL encouraged senators to take advantage of their session with the Corraggio Group on February 9. He announced the first meeting of the campus safety Implementation Advisory Committee, and the February 16 deadline for applications for the Faculty Athletic Representative. He noted that the legislative co-chairs budget had an increase, above the Governor's budget, for higher ed.

Provost's Report

Referring senators to the handout of announcements (minutes attachment B8), ANDREWS emphasized two items: She thanked faculty who were instrumental in organizing the new Second Thursday Social Club, to debut February 12 in OAI space. She reported that the first draft of unit strategic enrollment plans (SEM) for FY 2016 had been posted (<https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/enrollment-watch/>). An open forum on SEM and performance-based budgeting is scheduled for February 23. She also noted that she would chair the search for the new Chief Diversity Officer.

Second Faculty Senate session at 3:00 pm on Monday, February 9

LIEBMAN reminded senators about the second one-hour session at 3:00 pm on February 9, to allow for Senate input into the Strategic Planning Process. He asked for a show of hands authorizing the recording of the committee of the whole session. A majority of senators approved, by show of hands.

Quarterly Report of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC)

PEYTON, chair, reported increases in the Travel and FDC funds, though funding was still insufficient. He previewed a streamlined Adobe Acrobat questionnaire, and asked if faculty thought they could incorporate the Adobe file in their proposal narratives. He stressed that the funds needed to be distributed to raise PSU's research profile

CLARK asked what the Travel Grant deadline was. PEYTON directed senators to the website and said that there might be some flexibility, if the call was undersubscribed. (See: <http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-development-funding-opportunities.>) MESSER said that the posted date for Travel Grant applications was March 1.

Quarterly Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board

MILLER noted that completion of the search for a new Director of Athletics and requested time at a future meeting in order to introduce him.

LIEBMAN accepted the two reports and thanked the Committees.

Graduation Program Board

GELMON, chair, announced the celebration of PSU's annual commencement scheduled for Sunday, June 14, and emphasized its important goals and value (see slides, posted on the Senate web site: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/resources-for-items-under-discussion>.) GELMON made a special plea for faculty to assist other staff volunteers with graduation set up on the Saturday before graduation, and to identify and encourage students to participate as speakers. More information is available on the Commencement website: <http://www.pdx.edu/commencement/>

PADIN wondered about the antiquated system for offering congratulations. GELMON recommended attendance in person.

ADJOURNMENT

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 9, 2015

Members Present: Babcock, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Layzell, Liebman, Maier, Padin, Popp, Raffo, Santelmann, Schuler, Stedman, Taylor

Alternates Present: Farahmandpur for Mukhopadhyay, Hines for Reese

Members Absent: Arellano, Baccar, Bleiler, Carder, Clucas, Cotrell, Daim, De La Vega, Eppley, Griffin, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Loney, Luther, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Perlmutter, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Schrock, Skaruppa, Smith, Yeshilada, Zurk

LIEBMAN convened senators at 3:02 for an update from the Corraggio consultants facilitating the process on Strategic Planning and to offer input to the consultants. The meeting moved to a committee of the whole for the discussion. The consultants asked senators to weigh a list of possible issues for the Topic Teams investigating "faculty roles and structure," "student learning and academic success," and "innovative research, scholarship, and creative activities" to work on.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 2, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Cotrell, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Rueter, Santelmann, Sanchez, Schrock, Schuler, Skaruppa, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada, Zurk

Alternates Present: Gabarino for Baccar, Hellerman for Childs, Kinsella for Clucas, Messer for Carder, Wortham-Galvin for Griffin, Yuthas for Layzell, Ryder for Luther, Hines for Reese until 3:50

Members Absent: Daim, George, Labissiere, Luther, Holliday, Riedlinger,

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Bowman, Everett, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, McBride, Mercer, Miller, Padin, Percy, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2 & 9, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The February 2 & 9, 2015 minutes were approved with a spelling correction for Karavanic.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN drew attention to the March agenda packet containing the amendments to the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Procedures that the Steering Committee was bringing forward for a vote [D1]. He also anticipated additional amendments, some of which had arisen as a result of concerns that EPC and AAUP had expressed when they reviewed the PTR document. He stated that if Senate did not finish consideration of items D1 and E2, senators would have to convene again on the second Monday.

LIEBMAN acknowledged that no items had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda [Secretary's note: signaling its adoption].

IFS

HINES reported on the January and February IFS meetings. Senators Roblan and Dembrow and representatives from HECC attended. The IFS agenda is now focused on presenting coordinated topical reports, rather than asking for individual updates from each campus. HINES asked senators to suggest topics (mhines@pdx.edu). IFS has offered testimony on legislation affecting tuition waivers and increases (SB81), financial aid, and its current theme of academic quality; it will raise work load and quality issues related to SB 84 (accelerated/dual credit) in April. HINES drew attention to a third Senate Bill (473) that will allow higher-ed staff and students to self-identify gender/sexual orientation.

HINES noted that the Provosts Council has agreed to join IFS in a presentation to HECC on shared governance. HINES and IFS President Jeffrey Dense also take part in HECC Work Group on Evaluation, where they have stressed the importance of designing metrics that do not lead universities to jeopardize academic quality. Dense and MERCER represent IFS in the HECC Textbook Affordability Work Group, an initiative where PSU has a leadership role.

LIEBMAN announced that University committee memberships had been updated in the Faculty Governance Guide (posted on the Senate website) and reminded senators that the Committee Preference Survey to fill committee openings for 2015-16 would take place in March. He also noted the posting of a report from the Corraggio group summarizing the meeting with Senate on the Strategic Plan process here—<http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/resources-for-items-under-discussion>

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal for Post Tenure Review -

Thanking the Ad hoc Committee for Post-tenure Review for its contributions, LIEBMAN briefly summarized the efforts of senators and the Steering Committee to find middle ground among many voices. He drew attention to a handout with additional proposed amendments that would be introduced after the amendments proposed by the Steering Committee published in item D1 of the March agenda were moved, discussed, and voted. Adoption of D1 would set the baseline for further discussion.

LIEBMAN noted two corrections to the document published in D1: the substitution of departmental PTR for departmental P&T guidelines in IV. C.2.iii, [consistent with the change proposed in IIIA]; and a change in IV.D.2 of “to not meet” to “do not meet.” He reminded senators that PTR was designed to be an internal review about meeting a standard called “satisfactory” and responding to individuals whose careers were evolving, rather than an external assessment against benchmarks—factors that make designing the evaluation process more complex.

GRECO/SMITH MOVED to APPROVE the AMENDMENTS to the PSU Procedures for Post-Tenure Review published in D1, as corrected.

BLEILER asked for discussion of the amendments. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked which amendments were under discussion. LIEBMAN clarified that it was the changes published in D1 (pp. 1-12) of the March Senate Agenda packet, as corrected. PADIN asked if amendments get considered before voting on the document. LIEBMAN said yes, explaining that there were portions of the February document that had been struck out and additions that were underlined. The vote was to accept the amendments offered in D1 based on the proposals discussed in Senate on February 2. BLEILER reiterated that the vote was to approve amendments made subsequent to the Motion that introduced the document on February 2; a yeah vote does NOT approve the document itself. LIEBMAN confirmed this. HANSEN (David) asked if we were only voting on the amendments discussed at the last meeting. PERLMUTTER noted that the document also reflected changes that she had suggested after the meeting. LIEBMAN clarified that the Steering Committee had acted to synthesize, and in some cases recast, all the suggestions that had come forward prior to February 16.

ZURK noted two changes that jumped out: the elimination of references to “scholarly agenda,” a big component of a faculty career post tenure, and the emphasis given to tactical support of departmental needs and mission. She asked if others thought that these changes reflected the essence of the comments made previously. LIEBMAN responded that many had found it unwieldy to create a process requiring two separate documents, one called a scholarly agenda, and a second called a narrative. The decision had been to blend the two into a single document called the faculty narrative.

ELZANOWSKI observed that there were no set rules for reviewing department chairs and asked who will play the role of the chair for the chair. LIEBMAN said the consensus was that chairs should be treated as working members of the faculty who have temporarily taken on the duties of administration and should not be penalized for this by exclusion from the PTR review. ELZANOWSKI asked for clarification on the procedural question. LIEBMAN said he did not have an answer. SCHULER noted that the omission could be addressed by offering an amendment during the second round to follow. ELZANOWSKI stated that the statements about sanctions in V.B.6 and VI.D.7 potentially contradicted each other; the requiring of a PDP might be a unilateral change of appointment for those without supplemental letters of hire. LIEBMAN commented that letters of hire were outside the province of Faculty Senate. RAFFO noted that the question about who plays the chair role for chairs under review suggested a situation parallel to that of the units without departments. ELZANOWSKI said that this should be clearly stated.

KARAVANIC and DONLAN noted other references to departmental P & T guidelines that needed to be retitled or reconciled.

HANSON (David) raised a point of order: Discussion should properly be limited to those amendments that have been moved. Other areas of the document that

have not been revised should not be discussed until these amendments have passed or failed.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE said she was troubled that every statement relating to a faculty member's scholarly activity had been removed; it suggested that this activity would not be reviewed or rewarded. Offering a different characterization of the changes, LIEBMAN noted that many departments do not think of the scholarly agenda as a standalone document; in addition, a requirement to produce a document called the scholarly agenda for PTR becomes problematic, if you don't already have one. SANTELMANN asked if the question was about a lack of standards given the deleted reference to the scholarly agenda. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE said the question was why remove the reference. SANTELMANN said the scholarly agenda was just being renamed, not removed. LIEBMAN said that an amendment would be offered specifying what the narrative should contain; changing the title should not be regarded as changing the standard.

HINES noted that bulleted references to scholarship in the Preamble were deleted simply to consolidate points and avoid redundancy. ZURK said she appreciated the economies, but felt there should be specific language acknowledging scholarly contributions to balance the explicit reference to departmental activities. SMITH said the Ad Hoc PTR Committee had been looking for language that was broad enough to value all the ways that faculty contribute, many of which do not necessarily result in publication. LIEBMAN said the issue for Steering was not the word or the meaning of scholarship, but the fact that the term "scholarly agenda" proved to be a stumbling block to describing a form of report required for PTR. GRECO suggested the addition of the word "scholarship" to the first bullet, if the word research was not understood to include this. LIEBMAN acknowledged the suggestion, but worried about starting a discussion to amend the amendments.

BLEILER said that the discussion had gotten off track and called the question. He stated that the question before the Senate was whether to substitute the D1 amended version of the previously moved PTR Procedures as the current "working draft" of this process.

The VOTE to CALL the QUESTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEIER reiterated that the vote was NOT to approve PTR Procedures, but only the amendments to the document that had been proposed in D1.

The MOTION to APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PASSED, 45 to accept, 4 to reject, and 4 abstained (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN said the next step was to consider amendments to the "working draft" He had items prepared for display that were not available in time to include in the handout circulated.

GRECO previewed a proposal suggested by RAFFO that would describe what the faculty narrative should contain. She had argued for the addition of the word “succinctly.”

HANSEN (David)/REECE MOVED that the following language be ADDED to **IV.D.2.ii** of the PTR Procedures “working draft”:

*The narrative should succinctly describe the faculty member’s activities that demonstrate continuing professional development and contributions to the life of the university and external communities which he or she has served during the review period. The narrative ~~should~~ **may** also inform the review committee of the changes in work or life circumstances that occurred that have affected the faculty member’s work during the review period. In addition, the narrative should speak to future plans.*

KARAVANIC objected to language that seemed to require that faculty disclose information about life circumstances. GRECO echoed the objection. LIEBMAN asked the proposers of the amendment if they would accept substitution of the word “may” for “should” in the second sentence. HANSEN and REECE accepted the change.

HANSON (Brad) wondered what time frame was invoked as the period under review. LIEBMAN noted the five-year requirement for PTR, but acknowledged that the first to be reviewed may not have a ready benchmark. PADIN said that in the spirit of the review, the period should be since last review.

There was unanimous agreement by voice vote to call the question.

The MOTION to APPROVE the ADDITION PASSED: 47 approved, 2 rejected, 0 abstentions, (registered by hand count).

BOWMAN previewed a proposed change to IV.D.1 that would allow units that do not have departments to include supervisors as chair designees.

BOWMAN/SANTELMANN MOVED to AMEND **Article IV.D.1** of the PTR “working document” as follows:

In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities shall be fulfilled by a person or persons specified in unit guidelines; potential chair designees include program directors, area directors, the faculty member’s supervisor, or post-tenure review committee chair as the chair designee, as specified in unit guidelines.

BROWER asked if this were the appropriate place to address circumstances for chairs under review. LIEBMAN thought that it would complicate things.

There was unanimous agreement by voice vote to call the question.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED: 48 to accept, 0 to reject, 0 abstentions (registered by hand count).

LIEBMAN introduced David Raffo, chair of the Ad Hoc PTR Committee, to preview his amendments.

RAFFO argued that language describing the process for deferral or opting out of post-tenure review previewed in February as part of the Implementation Motion for PTR should be a permanent part of Procedures document and the execution of the PTR process.

RAFFO/DONLAN MOVED to AMEND the PTR Procedures “working draft” to ADD the following statements to **Article II**:

Tenured faculty who provide a letter stating they will retire within two years shall be allowed to opt out of post-tenure review.

With agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer post-tenure review for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED: 49 to accept, 0 to reject, 0 abstentions (registered by hand count).

LIEBMAN noted that the next amendments would come to the floor in the order delineated in the handout (see B3 attachment to the March 2 & 9 minutes). He previewed the changes proposed to Article IV to be voted: the first was essentially just a correction of the title of the guidelines in IV.B.1, and the second was a deletion in IV.C.2.

RAFFO noted that the current document’s description of service in IV.C.2 placed an emphasis on leadership roles, but a lot of service work that faculty perform does not necessarily mean taking on a leadership position. He argued for a broad definition of service for post-tenure review.

DONLAN/SMITH MOVED to AMEND **Article IV** with deletions and additions as follows:

IV.B.1.iii - Any additional materials required by departmental/unit ~~P&T~~ guidelines *for post-tenure review*.

IV.C.iii.d - Service to the department/academic unit, school, university and profession/academic community, ~~with emphasis on~~ ~~with attention to~~ leadership roles and significant contributions to administration, governance, or to professional/academic communities (Service).

LIEBMAN invited comment on the change to the statement describing service.

DONLAN spoke in support of the amendment, noting that service was not always linked to a leadership role and was part of faculty engagement. GAMBURD argued that there was an expectation that more senior faculty take on leadership roles; and while the language did not require it, the extra work and effort should be honored. RAFFO said that he read the language as implying that it was only leadership roles that would count. GRECO pointed out that the language recognized significant contributions as well as leadership positions. BROWER thought that the wording “with attention to” did not make leadership roles mandatory. LIEBMAN said he understood the intent of the language was to recognize the significant service contributions that faculty make that are often undervalued at PSU. RUETER asked if the words to be deleted were “with attention to” or “with emphasis on.” LIEBMAN said that the wording in the “working draft” was now “with attention to.” ZURK asked for confirmation that the vote would eliminate the entire statement beginning with “with attention to.” LIEBMAN and GRECO confirmed. PADIN wondered if the wording “with special recognition for leadership” would be a compromise position. RAFFO thought the MOTION should stand.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED: 28 to accept, 17 to reject, 0 abstentions (registered by hand count).

LIEBMAN requested a motion to continue the discussion of additional amendments and New Business item E.2 Implementation at the second Monday, March 9 meeting.

PADIN/BRODOWICZ MOVED TO RESUME the PTR discussion on March 9.

The MOTION to RESUME March 9 PASSED by majority voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL said that fundraising continued to outpace last year and that the strategic planning process continued to involve more participants. This meant planning was taking a little longer than anticipated, but the level of interest was a good thing. Topic Teams have been formed and some would be holding their own campus forums. He announced that many PSU faculty, staff, students and alumni would participate in a PSU Day in Salem on March 5. He added that a good budget forecast in May could trigger the kicker and make it less likely that the Legislature would find extra funding for higher ed. He then introduced IAB chair Randy Miller, who introduced PSU's new Director of Athletics from Miami University of Ohio, Mark Rountree.

ROUNTREE, noting that his first job had been as coordinator of academic tutoring and advising for college athletes, said that his first priority was to support student athletes. Responding to questions that the Steering Committee had forwarded, ROUNTREE that he would hold coaches accountable as educators and that concern for academic success was a key selling point in his approach to recruitment. He asserted that PSU Athletics was right where it needed to be, with an appropriate number of sports and level of investment to be competitive in the Big Sky Conference. He argued that aiming for degree completion and fielding winning teams were not mutually exclusive goals, and that training to work to win was part of what they teach. He acknowledged that his success would be measured by attendance and the performance of Athletics as community partners, but felt confident that he had support from passionate alumni and would find ways to work smart to meet goals.

PADIN asked how willing the Athletics Program would be to stand behind athletes in academic difficulty by continuing financial support while they tried to return to standing. ROUNTREE said he was willing, but would want to know that the student was making every effort; there would have to be other factors than academic reasons to discontinue aid. He thanked Faculty Senate for the invitation. (Applause.)

Provost's Report [offered after the Budget Committee Report]

ANDREWS thanked BOWMAN for his SEM presentation and noted that the link to SEM plans could also be found in her Blog. She drew attention to the ASPSU sponsored event celebrating Cultural Competency immediately following Senate and referred senators to the handout with her additional announcements (see March 2 minutes attachment B1). ANDREWS highlighted the history of PSU's collaboration with OHSU on public health education, noting the twenty-one year joint Masters Program and the initiation of discussion and planning for a joint school as early as 2007. She admitted that the merger was not an easy process, but that the Budget Committee and EPC were doing their due diligence. Stating that nothing was worse

than speculation, she urged faculty who have issues and questions about the process to contact interim Dean Andresen or Assoc. Dean Leslie McBride. She offered warm thanks to the new Second Thursday Social Club's steering committee (Alan MacCormack, John Ott, Joyce O'Halloran, Darrell Brown) for a successful first gathering in the space of the Office of Academic Innovation, 4:00-6:00 pm.

Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee

BOWMAN gave an overview of the Student Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan that all college-level units now prepare. In addition to supplying SCH projections, units must provide an explanation for the numbers that describes trends and plans for the coming year, including recruitment and retention efforts. The plans indicate where units are putting resources. Describing how the SEM plan interacts with the budget process, BOWMAN noted that the current year budget becomes a baseline for the next year that can be modified based on a unit's SEM plan, which is also a revenue commitment. He reviewed the School of SocialWork's plan as an example of a detailed and well-executed plan. (See slides for the process calendar, March 2 attachment to the minutes B2.)

RYDER asked if there were a 'slush fund' to make up the short fall, if a unit's projections did not meet expectations. BOWMAN said this year units were required to have contingency plans, funds which they had had to hold until November. ANDREWS said units were told in November to hold or release funds for investment depending on where they were in terms of their goals. RUETER asked why the CLAS SEM is different. BOWMAN said CLAS had been asked to focus on its slowest and fastest growing programs because of its size. STEDMAN asked if the SEM plans were available on line. BOWMAN said the **Budget Committee web site** has a link to plans posted for the last 3 years: <http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/budget-committee>. MESSER asked if the SEM plan looked at past success in predicting performance. Bowman said yes.

Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee (EDC)

PADIN reviewed the Committee's charge and new programs recently approved. He said that the Committee had been pleased and impressed with the provisions for shared governance in the new Guidelines for departments wishing to transfer to another unit. (These Guidelines have not been officially issued yet.) The biggest item on the agenda has been the proposal for creation of a new School of Public Health received in January. The Committee was waiting for additional details that would address the viability and feasibility of the proposal. He thanked committee members for the extra meetings they had been willing to convene.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, **March 9, 2015**
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Carstens, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, Donlan, Elzanowski, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Karavanic, Liebman, Loney, Luther, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Raffo, Reese, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada,

Alternates Present: Messer for Carder, Beckett for Popp from 4:00 pm.

Members Absent: Arellano, Brower, Carpenter, Daim, De La Vega, Dolidon, Eppley, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, Riedlinger, Sanchez, Skaruppa, Smith, Zurk

Ex-officio Members

Present: Bowman, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Mercer, Padin

A. ROLL

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

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal for Post Tenure Review

LIEBMAN announced the distribution of clean copies of the new working draft of *Procedures for Post Tenure Review* (PTR), with amendments approved at the March 2 meeting incorporated (published to the Senate website as D1a, added to the packet). A second handout included the text of proposed amendments received prior to the meeting (published to the web as item D2; see March 2 & 9 minutes attachment B3).

LIEBMAN noted some simple corrections needed to D1a (see B3, pp. 5-6). He stated that he planned to begin with amendments to the Procedures distributed at the March 2 meeting and continue through those submitted after the meeting, asking the proposers to give a brief introduction. The final motions would be to approve the full *Procedures for PTR* as amended, to introduce the Implementation proposal and a motion that would incorporate both documents as a package into the PSU P&T Guidelines.

RAFFO proposed that the length of time that a faculty member had to respond to the PTR Committee report and letter from his or her chair be extended from 10 to 20 working days (IV. E. 2). The purpose was to allow for more time in case both letters required a response.

GAMBURD asked if there would be a negative effect as this rippled through the rest of the timeline. RAFFO said not to his knowledge.

LIEBMAN noted the need to MOVE the amendment before discussion and announced that he had asked Steve Blieler to act as Parliamentarian on his behalf during the meeting.

DONLAN/CARSTENS MOVED to AMEND **Article IV. E. 2** as follows:

The supporting materials must be submitted to the post tenure review committee and/or the department chair as appropriate within 20 ~~10~~ working days of the request for reconsideration.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 37 approved, 2 rejected, 2 abstained (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN introduced the changes proposed to Articles V and VI.

RAFFO/YESILADE MOVED to AMEND **Article V.A.5** to clarify the timeline for holding the faculty member's conference with the Dean as follows:

The conference must be held before the Dean's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. After notifying the Dean that the faculty member requests reconsideration, the faculty member has 10 working days to provide additional materials to the Dean in support of the reconsideration.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 42 approved, 0 rejected, 0 abstained (recorded by clicker).

CARSTENS/ DONLAN MOVED to AMEND **Article V.A.6 and V.A.7** as follows:

6. If upon reconsideration, the Dean reverses his or her original decision and finds the faculty member's contributions meet standards, the Dean shall so report in writing and provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. ~~and~~ The Dean shall send with the original letter and all materials to the Provost.

7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member has met standards when the post tenure review committee's and the department chair's finding disagree, the Dean shall provide a copy of his or her letter to the department chair and faculty member. The Dean's letter to the Provost shall give his or her reasons.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 39 approved, 0 rejected, 1 abstained (recorded by clicker).

GRECO/SCHULER MOVED to AMEND **Article VI. D**, with the addition of the following language to VI.D.5 and VI.D.6, and a new bullet item VI.D.7:

5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member. Additional funding may be required.

6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the ~~Dean~~ department chair within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair's letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.

7. If the department chair reverses his or her decision, ~~they~~ he or she shall write a revised letter to the Dean. The Dean will wait to make a decision until receiving the reconsideration letter from the department chair.

GAMBURD noted the need for an article after "provide" in item 5 and "he or she" to replace "they" in item 7. HANSEN (Brad) noted that this section posed a problem for chairs being reviewed. RAFFO noted the "chair designee" statement in Article III. BLEILER state that the change was not necessary to the Motion. The proposers of the Motion accepted the change of pronouns and addition of "a." article and pronounced. TAYLOR asked if chair or chair designee option was meant to be consistent for the entire document. LEIBMAN said yes, for the cases described at the beginning of the document [Secretary's note, Articles III.E & IV.D.1.]

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND as corrected PASSED, 40 approved, 1 rejected, 0 abstained (recorded by clicker).

BRODOWICZ proposed striking the description of the PTR Committee evaluation process in the working draft in IV.C.2.iii and replacing it with

language that would assure that criteria for the process were more standard across campus. The language proposed differed from language in the 3/2 the handout.

BOWMAN/HINES MOVED to AMEND **Article IV.C.2** by striking the second sentence of IV.C.2.iii and ADDING language as follows:

~~The Committee will find the faculty member's contributions either *meets the standards* with regard to the criteria set forth by the Department Guidelines for post-tenure review or that they do not meet the standards for post-tenure review set forth in the Department P&T Guidelines.~~

The Committee will find the faculty member to have met University Standards for post tenure review if:

- a. the faculty member adequately demonstrates ongoing activity in each of the four areas (above) or the faculty member ~~explains~~ demonstrates to the committee how ~~that~~ his or her activities are ~~is~~ consistent with departmental needs and priorities, and*
- b. the effort expended totals the effort expected of a full time (1.0 full time equivalent) faculty member or prorated commensurate to the faculty member's FTE assignment for those parts of the review period when the faculty member's assignment was less than full time.*

KARAVANIC asked what the perceived advantage of the new language was, as opposed to letting departments specify criteria. BRODOWICZ said the provisions clarified what the common expectations were, rather than just assuming that PTR committees would take these elements into account. PADIN said he liked having a checklist of things for committees to be mindful of. KARAVANIC said it appeared to specify that activity had to be demonstrated in all four areas. BLEILER agreed that the language was puzzling because the part after “or,” talked about activity, but really required explanation of *inactivity*. GAMBURD read it as an either/or statement—a faculty member has met standards either explained as activity in four areas, *or* as activity consistent with department needs—but still problematic. HINES suggested the change of “that” to “his or her.” MESSER suggested that an explanation should be evaluated and recommended the qualifier “adequately.” PADIN thought that “demonstrated” had this sense. MAIER suggested adding “demonstrates” to the second clause. BLEILER argued that the committee was being ordered to find a certain way without assessing sufficiency. RAFFO said the intent was to place the faculty member on the hook to explain how their activity meets departmental guidelines. GRECO concurred. BABCOCK suggested demonstrate “successfully,” adding that this must be demonstrated “to the committee.” HANSEN (Brad) concurred, SANTELMANN asked if the added language was an attempt to make clearer what was meant by a finding of “meets” standards. BRODOWICZ said it was to add specificity to what a committee should be mindful of. SCHULER suggested “evaluate,” rather than “find.” MAIER objected that this did not fit in the sentence. DONLAN noted that (a) and (b) must be linked by “and,” for purposes of evaluation. MCELHONE expressed support for the amendment as a way to make expectations clearer and less subjective. KARAVANIC asked for

confirmation that faculty were not being required to demonstrate activity in four areas. SANTELMANN confirmed they were not. HANSEN (Brad) advocated for adding “adequately demonstrates to the committee” after the “or.” CARSTENS noted “activity” should be plural. CLUCAS advocated for an evaluative word. GAMBURD requested the replacing of “explains” with “demonstrate. BRODOWICZ recorded the changes on the document camera text and he and HINES accepted the revisions noted [underlined] above.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 32 approved, 6 rejected, 3 abstained (recorded by clicker).

BRODOWICZ proposed adding more specificity to the factors that the PTR committee must be mindful of in its evaluation, as described in IV.C.2

CARSTENS/MUKHOPADHYAY MOVED to ADD the following language to **Article IV.C.2** as new **item iv**:

iv. Other factors from the faculty narrative to be considered when determining whether the faculty member has met the standards include but are not limited to:

a. The faculty member’s teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation time required for new forms of instruction such as on-line teaching.

b. Time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of teaching, research, outreach, or service.

c. Increased departmental service as a consequence of the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty.

d. Departmental circumstances such as deaths, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member’s work situation.

e. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances that have had an impact on the faculty member’s work.

BLEILER suggested that the list include should be prefaced with “but are not limited to.” MAIER asked whether the author intended “standard” to be plural as above. KARAVANIC expressed concern that a faculty member would be compelled to document family circumstances. ANDREWS asked why (d) and (e) on list were necessary when faculty could choose to defer under Article II. MAIER said it was not about delay but about interpreting one’s case. PERLMUTTER noted the inclusion of departmental circumstances. DONLAN observed that the choice not to defer might be a matter of degree and how much time was in play.

BLIELER suggested “may be considered” in the first sentence. RAFFO said that if circumstances are stated they must be considered. BOWMAN noted that the

choice should be the faculty member's. CLUCAS said, yes, if requested. SANTELMANN suggested "other factors from the faculty narrative to be considered." ANDREWS asked for examples that might explain why a faculty member would choose not to defer. ELZANOWSKI offered the example of a faculty member who may have been ill for part of the time, but was performing satisfactorily when working; he asked why that person would want to defer a pay increase. SANTELMANN described an instance where sudden loss of a faculty member required a huge shift in the workloads and teaching of others in the program for several years; faculty were doing their jobs, but not the ones they had planned for.

PADIN agreed that the impediments could be a matter of degree; committees could still advise the faculty member to defer. CLUCAS agreed there could be gray areas. SCHULER thought there was limit to what circumstance could or should be anticipated by the document. ELZANOWSKI said we should trust our colleagues and not micromanage. GRECO suggested a temporary slowdown within a period of good job performance should not require a deferral; but if you're not caught back up, then you should defer. MERCER said that helped him understand the difference between the two alternatives. CLARK agreed. KARAVANIC wondered if the reviews of the first round of faculty would be career based, or based on five years. PADIN said the goal was not to micromanage but to ensure that the data was available for fair decision-making. RUETER suggested that another reason not to defer would be to realize a professional development plan through the process.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 35 approved, 3 rejected, 2 abstained (recorded by clicker).

HARMON/TAYLOR MOVED to AMEND **Article IV. C.1ii** as follows:

Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member's career trajectory. An emeritus tenured faculty may be included. Other exceptions can be made in accordance with department/unit guidelines if warranted

HANSEN (Brad) thought the addition was redundant and suggested it be moved to the end of the agenda. LIEBMAN pointed out that the proposal had been moved. PERLMUTTER objected to the provision, noting that emeritus faculty were not included in promotion and tenure reviews. She wondered how they would be compensated, and was skeptical that the University was that short on qualified tenured faculty. GAMBURD and RUETER agreed and spoke in opposition to the amendment.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND FAILED, 14 approved, 27 rejected, 2 abstained (recorded by clicker).

HANSEN (Brad) said a strong PTR document had emerged, but Article IV.C did not specify how to accomplish faculty input into the committee selection process. He advocated for the direct inclusion of the chair and faculty member under review in the selection process, with a third member who could, if necessary, arbitrate. This would ensure consistency across campus.

YESHILADA/SCHULER MOVED to AMEND **Article IV. C.1i** by ADDING language to specify the PTR committee selection process as follows:

The committee shall be comprised of three people. Departments/units shall specify in their guidelines a clearly-articulated process for constituting committees that is collegial, equitable, and formative, and ensures that the faculty member being reviewed have~~has~~ input into the selection process. Each faculty member under review shall have their own post tenure review committee. The department chair shall select one member of the committee, the faculty member shall select one member of the committee and the two committee members shall choose a third member.

BLEILER asked what would happen if the two selected could not agree on a third member. HANSON said that this might be an issue, but he hoped that having a supportive process would take precedence. RUETER argued against the amendment and for departmental autonomy and flexibility. PADIN said that the absence of University-level guidelines for the committee selection process was an inconsistency, and “collegial” and “equitable” were too open. GAMBURD said that external review guaranteed lack of conflict of interest in the case of P&T; having a PTR committee member chosen by the person under review suggested that the model was advocacy rather than objectivity, and could be awkward for the committee member chosen. ELZANOWSKI wondered if a faculty member asked to serve by a colleague could easily say no; he argued for greater trust in one’s colleagues.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND FAILED 17 approved, 19 rejected, 2 abstained (recorded by clicker).

DONLAN introduced the next amendment, stating that allowing the faculty member under review to draft the Professional Development Plan better embodied the spirit of the post-tenure review process.

RAFFO/PERLMUTTER MOVED to AMEND the first sentence of Article **VI.A.1** as follows:

A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) with input from in conjunction with the department/unit chair or chair designee. a Professional Development Plan (PDP).

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 35 approved, 1 rejected, 2 abstained (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN previewed the proposed change to extend the time line for the PDP to up to three years.

HINES/KARAVANIC MOVED to AMEND **Article VI.A.2** as follows:

The PDP can be up to two three years in duration. In exceptional circumstances, a third fourth year may be approved.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 34 approved, 5 rejected, 1 abstained (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN introduced a sentence proposed as an addition to the opening of Article I that would address a founding principle of post-tenure review.

HARMON/MUKHOPADHYAY MOVED to AMEND **Article I** with the ADDITION of the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph of the Preamble:

Post-tenure review is founded on the principle that a strong and healthy university is one that supports, recognizes, and rewards faculty members throughout their careers for their contributions to the institution's mission.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 37 approved, 1 rejected, 1 abstained (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN previewed a proposed concurrent deletion and addition to the paragraph describing PTR in Article I.

ANDREWS observed that the proposed addition, particularly the words “not a punitive attack,” were negatively charged and did not fit with the collegial spirit invoked. The language both repeated and gave more weight to a subset of the following bulleted points in the text that encompassed all stated goals of PTR.

RAFFO/RUETER MOVED to AMEND the fourth paragraph of **Article I** as follows:

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. Post tenure review is not a punitive attack on a faculty member's tenure status; it is not a competitive process that ranks faculty members within a department, and it is not a merit system to reward a few star employees. Post-tenure review is a mechanism to support, recognize, and reward faculty for their ongoing contributions to the University's mission. ~~Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his/her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution.~~

The goals of post-tenure review are...

SANTELMANN asked for a rationale from the proposer. PADIN said that the proposal was meant to address the confusion that still existed about what post-tenure review is and is not. RUETER said he thought the shorter unchanged paragraph was cleaner. BLEILER observed that the motion would delete the sentence beginning “Whereas” at the same time that it added two new sentences. LIEBMAN clarified that the bullet points remained.

BLEILER/PADIN MOVED to hold SEPARATE VOTES on the proposed deletion and additions.

GRECO pointed out that a move to vote separately would allow both the substitute text and the text suggested for elimination to be struck.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION TO HOLD SEPARATE VOTES PASSED on a majority voice vote (4 rejections, 1 abstention).

BLEILER/YESHILADA MOVED to consider the proposed addition first and the deletion second. The question was called and passed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION TO CONSIDER the ADDITION FIRST passed unanimously (registered by hand count).

BLEILER/YESHILADA MOVED to ADD the following sentences to **Article I**:

Post tenure review is not a punitive attack on a faculty member's tenure status; it is not a competitive process that ranks faculty members within a department, and it is not a merit system to reward a few star employees. Post-tenure review is a mechanism to support, recognize, and reward faculty for their ongoing contributions to the University's mission.

CLUCAS said the sentence was an unnecessary addition. CLARK requested a rationale. PADIN said the issue of redundancy seemed to be the motive for the separate vote. RAFFO clarified that the proposers of the addition wanted to address on-going confusion about the differences between PTR and standards for other reviews. HANSON (Brad) said that discussion of the PTR document in his department confirmed that faculty did not know what PTR was supposed to be doing; this spells it out. BLEILER said the first sentence of the paragraph already explicitly states the difference; the proposed addition is all negative. GRECO thought some statement of how the reviews differed was essential; concerned that the deletion, which she had authored, might not be retained, she had decided to support the addition. SCHULER suggested that the next generation of readers might need to have the difference explicitly spelled out. ANDREWS recommended that senators read the entire Preamble before voting on the proposed portion, including the final statement.

MAIER/BRODOWICZ MOVED to call the question, which passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to APPROVE FAILED, 13 to approve, 24 to reject, 3 abstentions, (registered by hand count).

LIEBMAN reminded senators that for the second vote a “yes” vote would be to STRIKE the sentence beginning “Whereas” as preface to the listing of goals for post-tenure in **Article I**; a no vote would retain the language in the document:

~~Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his/her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution,~~

A motion to call the question was unchallenged.

The MOTION to STRIKE FAILED, 8 to approve, 31 to reject, 1 abstention (registered by hand count).

GRIFFIN raised a point of order to ask what the plan for proceeding was, given the lateness of the hour and that parts of the package not yet been considered.

LIEBMAN conceded that the Proposal to Implement Post-Tenure Review would have to be rolled over until the April Senate meeting. He thought there was time to consider the final amendment to the Procedures by 5:00 pm.

BLEILER/HANSON (Brad) MOVED to APPROVE a NEW ARTICLE [to be inserted after current Article IV] as follows:

V. Procedures for Post Tenure Review of Department Chairs/Unit heads, and Program Directors

The procedure of evaluating department chairs/unit heads, and program directors will be the same as those for tenured faculty except that the role of the department chair shall be filled by the immediate supervisor of the individual under review provided the immediate supervisor is not the Dean. If the immediate supervisor of the individual under review is the Dean, the Dean must designate a person to fulfill the role of the immediate supervisor (e.g. an Associate Dean).

HARMON asked what the amendment addressed. ELZANOWSKI noted that Article II lists chairs and program directors as another category to be reviewed, but the document does not directly specify how the rules are to be adapted in their case. The amendment to clarify the process for chairs was proposed as a separate article to change as little as possible of the rest of the PTR document and to retain its order of steps. LIEBMAN reiterated that the goal was to retain the step between the PTR committee and the Dean in the four-step process.

A motion to call the question passed by a majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND PASSED, 38 approved, 1 rejected, 1 abstained (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN noted that the MAIER amendment to the Implementation Proposal, which had not been introduced, still remained for consideration. These would be postponed until April. He thanked all who had contributed their time and amendments to the process. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Luther, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada

Alternates Present: Glaze for Babcock, _____ for Clark, Kinsella for Clucas, Messer for Carder, Ferbel-Azcarate for De Anda, Wortham-Galvin for Griffin, Ryder for Skaruppa, Hines for Reese until 3:50, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: Arellano, Brower, Lindsay, Loney, De La Vega

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Bowman, Dusschee, Fraire, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, MacCormack, McBride, Magaldi, Mercer, Moody, Padin, Percy, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2 & 9, 2015 MEETINGS

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The March 2 & 9, 2015 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN reported that ESM 351 had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda and that it would be considered at a later date.

LIEBMAN reviewed the set up and reminded senators that the Opt-In nomination process for the 2015 elections for Senate, Advisory Council, and IFS were beginning. He encouraged senators to think about nominations for Senate Presiding Officer Elect and Steering Committee, as well as Secretary of the Faculty, a position that would also be open for the coming year. He polled senators to find out if they wanted to meet with the Corraggio Strategic Planning group for a discussion about the work of the Topic Teams; a majority of senators indicated yes.

LIEBMAN stated that the proposal for a new School of Public Health would be previewed at the May meeting. He announced plans for a coffee hour for faculty to meet with PSU trustees before the next Board meeting.

APPC

JONES reiterated the importance of the Academic Program Prioritization Process as a way of ensuring that academic priorities will “share the wheel” with University fiscal priorities and of giving faculty a voice in planning for the future. He announced that the APP Committee would hold a forum 3-4:00 pm, Monday, April 27 in Cramer Hall 53, to gather input on the proposed scoring rubrics and revised timeline for scoring the 157 programs identified: <http://pdxappc.blogspot.com/>

IFS

HINES reviewed a list of pending legislative proposals discussed at the March IFS meeting: legislation concerning credit transfer, free tuition at community colleges, accelerated learning, faculty and staff demographics, textbook affordability, and the state-wide model for funding education. IFS is particularly interested in pushing for measures of inputs (funding positive changes) as well as outputs. IFS is committed to working with community college faculty and plans a joint conference later this year.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

LIEBMAN explained that the Senate’s work on Post-Tenure Review (PTR) would be completed in two parts—first, the votes to approve the final version of the Procedures for PTR, and then a proposal for Implementation to phase in the first five waves of faculty to be reviewed.

1. Procedures for Post-Tenure Review at Portland State University (amended 3/2 & 3/9)

GRECO/SMITH MOVED to APPROVE the corrections to the *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review* amended March 9, 2015, as published in item D1 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda.

LIEBMAN reviewed a short list of small editorial fixes suggested for the working PTR document that had been approved on March 9. [Secretary’s note: The list was published on page 34 of the packet, on page 2 of Appendix D1.]

The MOTION to APPROVE the corrections PASSED, 47 to accept, 1 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

MERCER/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the ADDITION of the following sentence to Article I (Preamble) to the first paragraph:

Post-tenure review acknowledges and values both the continuing scholarly work of the faculty directed towards research, teaching and

outreach, and the many dimensions of service that are often a significant part of the career of tenured faculty members.

LIEBMAN stated that the sentence was intended as a bridge to the initial sections of the PSU P & T guidelines that emphasize the scholarly agenda.

The MOTION to APPROVE the addition to the Preamble PASSED, 45 to accept, 1 to reject, with 4 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN requested a final motion to adopt the March 9 working document for the PTR Procedures, as now corrected and amended.

GAMBURD/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review* as published in item D1 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda, with corrections *and* as amended April 6, 2015, including Article I (Preamble).

The MOTION to APPROVE the *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review* PASSED, 44 to accept, 2 to reject, with 5 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

2. Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review

LIEBMAN explained that since the Steering Committee had published its Implementation Proposal in the March Agenda packet, several amendments had been suggested to clarify how eligibility would be determined for the first five cycles and the determination of the funding pool (see D2, final page). The first proposal was to ensure that assignment to quintiles would not be prejudiced by whether an individual's unit had implemented reviews required by the old Article 16 (Career Support) of the PSU-AAUP CBA.

BLEILER/MUKHOPADHYAY MOVED to APPROVE new language for item 1 in the Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review published in D2n as follows:

1. Eligibility [final paragraph]

A fifth of all eligible tenured faculty will be reviewed in each of the first five years, ~~in order of the year of last review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure~~ ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion. Post-tenure reviews done prior to the approval of these guidelines will not be considered in judging eligibility.

BLEILER asked how far back in time someone whose first review was a decade or more ago would have to document. LIEBMAN said that the Steering Committee thought that this should be left to departments to decide when they write their guidelines, based on local circumstances. RAFFO said that the Ad hoc Committee was torn between wanting a consistent process across campus and giving faculty a choice.

The MOTION to APPROVE the deletions and additions to item 1 PASSED: 41 approved, 3 rejected, with 7 abstentions, (registered by clicker).

CARSTENS/HOLLIDAY MOVED to REPLACE item 4 in the Implementation motion for Post-Tenure Review (as published in D2) as follows:

4. Funding Of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases

~~Senate recommends that a faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equivalent to the percentage of salary set aside for post-tenure salary increases in Article 30 Section 6 Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases, currently 4% in the AAUP-PSU CBA 2013-2015.~~

Senate recommends that the pool for Post-Tenure Review Salary increases (currently equal to 4% of salaries of reviewed faculty per Article 30, Section 6 of AAUP-PSU CBA 2013- 2015) be divided into equal increments, per the number of faculty under review in a year. A faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equal to this increment.

LIEBMAN asked the author of the proposal, David Maier, to provide a rationale.

MAIER noted Hansen's estimate that the fixed increment in the funded first pool would be about \$4,000. He reasoned that since faculty were all clearing the same hurdles, the reward should also be the same. He said that distributions based on a percentage of an individual's salary only exacerbate existing inequities and salary compression, and a fixed increment would be good for morale and retention of lower-paid faculty.

STEDMAN said that most of his district members supported the fixed increment. KARAVANIC said she favored a plan that would give funds to faculty who fall below the bar. MAIER said that the funding of the PDP would come up next. SANTELMANN clarified that the pool only addresses the PTR process for post-tenure faculty. SCHROCK asked how much the annual pool would vary and the advantages or disadvantages of being in a particular cohort. MAIER agreed there would be variations, and noted that only the first year was guaranteed in the contract; the Union could choose to negotiate for the same fixed increment in the future. SANTELMANN asked if PTR was the place to address the inequities of salary compression. MAIER said he was more interested in *not* exacerbating existing problems, but this was a tool now available. Sarah Tinkler (ECON) noted some advantages that more senior faculty have, including tier-one retirement.

LIEBMAN asked David Hansen to address the handout with a financial impact analysis of the motion (see B1 attachment to the minutes).

HANSEN reviewed how different salary ranges and quintiles would be affected if the increment were a percentage of salary or a fixed increment (see B1). Based on salaries in each quintile, each later group would receive a lesser fixed amount,

down to about \$3,300. PADIN point out that colleagues bargaining the next contract could use the first distribution as a benchmark. HANSEN said that would not change the impact on individual salaries. LIEBMAN said that was a compelling demonstration of the differences between the models, that is, who the net beneficiaries and net losers were. GRECO pointed out that many more people would be favored than would lose out. MAIER agreed saying that his approach increased the average percentage rate. DONLAN asked about the low figures defining the bottom bracket. LIEBMAN clarified that this was just the end point of a \$50,000 to 70,000 range. DAASCH thought that the range could be pegged to the minimum for a tenured Associate, and asked if salaries had been adjusted based on anticipated raises. HANSEN said the projections were based on current salary, but thought salaries and quintile pools would rise relative to each other. MAIER noted a possible boost from promotions. DAASCH questioned that, but thought negotiating for a fixed increment would be a great idea. LIEBMAN said that the heart of the vote was to judge between the two models for distribution.

HOLLIDAY/GRECO called the question; with a reminder from BLEILER to gather the nays and abstentions, it was affirmed by unanimous voice vote.

The MOTION to REPLACE item 4 PASSED: 38 to accept, 9 to reject, with 4 abstentions (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN introduced the two options to amend item 5—the second a follow on to the fixed increment proposal just adopted. MAIER said that he thought that the Professional Development Plan (PDP) awards should be parallel to the fixed PTR increment for a successful review.

After some discussion of procedure, BLEILER/BOWMAN MOVED the first option to AMEND the language of item 5, adding “per year” as follows:

5. Funding of PDP [second paragraph]

In keeping with Article 30 section 6 of the 2013-15 University and AAUP CBA that provides for a salary pool equal to 4% of base salaries of all AAUP represented tenured faculty who are reviewed, those whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional developments funds *not to exceed 4% of their salary per year* to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the Professional Development Plan.

RAFFO said that if a PDP were approved as a multiple-year plan, then funds should be available for that plan, if needed. DONLAN asked what if a faculty member did not need funding. LIEBMAN said the proposal directed unexpended funds to the general Faculty Development Fund. DONLAN asked if voting for one option excluded voting for the other. BLEILER said absolutely not. LIEBMAN noted that the Maier version did not have the “per year” language. DAASCH asked what if both options passed. BLEILER suggested that given the order of the two motions, he would encourage the proposers of the second option to consider adding the words “per year” to their motion, if the first option passed.

GAMBURD/CARSTENS called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND item 5 with the addition “per year” PASSED: 28 to accept, 13 to reject, with 6 abstentions (registered by clicker).

BLEILER/RAFFO MOVED the second option to AMEND item 5 as follows:

5. Funding of PDP [second and third paragraphs]

~~In keeping with Article 30 section 6 of the 2013-15 University and AAUP CBA that provides for a salary pool equal to 4% of base salaries of all AAUP represented tenured faculty who are reviewed, those~~ Any faculty member whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional development funds not to exceed 4% **per year*** of their salary the increment amount given in Item 4 to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the Professional Development Plan.

Recognizing that some PDPs will not require funds ~~equal to the 4% amount set aside under Art 30 Section 7~~ the full increment in Item 4, the Senate recommends that any unexpended funds be transferred to the Faculty Development Fund.

*MAIER said that he had accepted the addition of the words “per year” to his motion. CARSTENS asked what would constitute the pool for funding PDPs. BLEILER said the language of the amended proposal prescribed a division of the 4% pool based on the total salaries in the pool into equal per person increments, so the recipient of the PDP would get his or her individual share. DAASCH thought that PDP amount would stay the same year to year. BLEILER thought that the only thing that was sure was the current contract, and the increment could be set by the next contract. GRECO pointed out that the salary increment would carry forward individually for those successfully reviewed, so that same amount should also carry forward with the individual awarded PDP funding who was part of the same quintile. DAASCH said he wanted to establish that PDP funding would stay the same for a multiple. LIEBMAN agreed. BLEILER said he thought there was a cap. HANSEN (D.) said that the fixed increment was only potentially being diverted for the period of the PDP, because successful completion of the PDP would trigger a salary increase. LIEBMAN thought there was consensus was that the fixed PTR/PDP amount moved forward with the individual.

BRODOWICZ/HANSEN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND item 5, with the addition of “per year,” PASSED: 39 to accept, 4 to reject, with 4 abstentions (registered by clicker).

BLEIER and LIEBMAN noted that this vote ended the first option passed.

LIEBMAN reviewed the other items in the proposal, including calls for training and assessment after two rounds. After Senate's vote for approval, the proposal would still need to go to OAA and PSU-AAUP for review and potential bargaining.

GRECO/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the Implementation motion for Post-Tenure Review as published in item D2 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda and as amended.

The MOTION to APPROVE Implementation as amended PASSED: 46 to accept, 2 to reject, with 1 abstention (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN requested a final vote to incorporate both the approved Procedures for PTR and their Implementation into the PSU P&T guidelines, following current Article VI on merit pay.

REECE/BLEILER MOVED the Faculty Senate ADOPT the *Procedures for Post-Tenure Review (PTR)* and their Implementation as approved April 6, 2015, as part of the *PSU Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases*, 1996, revised and reapproved, April 6, 2015.

HANSNEN (D.) asked if all parts discussed today were included. LIEBMAN said yes, all of appendix D1 and D2 published in the April packet, and as amended today, were included in this motion.

The MOTION to APPROVE the incorporation of Procedures for PTR and Implementation PASSED: 46 to accept, 2 to reject, with no abstentions (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN added his thanks to all who had worked on the PTR process.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix "E.1" were ADOPTED as published, with the exception that ESM 351 was withdrawn.

[*Secretary's note: Senate took up New Business after reports from the President and Provost.*]

2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Energy Policy and Management

KINSELLA reviewed the Proposal, noting that it was coming from five collaborating units. ISS had done a study of employment trends to establish demand. Some omnibus numbered courses had to be converted to regular courses (approved in today's Consent Agenda), and a joint Steering Committee would be formed, but no additional funding was needed.

SCHROCK/HANSEN (D.) MOVED the Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Energy Policy and Management

DAASCH asked if only post-bac students would be eligible for the Certificate. KINSELLA said that current grad students were eligible, if they wanted an opportunity to specialize.

THE MOTION PASSED, 42 to accept, 1 to reject, 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker)

3. Proposal for a BS in Quantitative Economics in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on an existing track in Economics and required no new courses or additional funding.

BLEILER/HARMON MOVED the Proposal for a BS in Quantitative Economics

INGERSOLL asked if not having BA version of the degree would cause confusion. Sarah Tinkler (ECON) confirmed it was only BS. Chair Tom Pitiowsky said students would be carefully advised to avoid confusion.

THE MOTION PASSED, 41 to accept, 3 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)

4. Proposal for a Minor in Systems in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses and had no budget impact.

REECE/CARSTENS MOVED the Proposal for the Minor in Systems.

DAASCH said he was unaware of a program based in various departments. WAKELAND said the degree was sponsored by the School of the Environment and students would come from different departments. LIEBMAN cited the example of the liberal arts minor in computing. HARMON agreed that Schools and Colleges had sponsored minors in the past.

THE MOTION PASSED, 39 to accept, 6 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)

5. Proposal for a Minor in Water Resources in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal based in the department of Geography, noting that the degree was based on existing courses and had zero budget impact.

MERCER/RUETER MOVED the Proposal for the Minor in Water Resources

TAYLOR asked what constituted the School of the Environment. Heejun Chang (GEOG) said it was composed of the Geology, Geography, and Environmental Science and Management departments.

LIEBMAN called the question.

THE MOTION PASSED, 41 to accept, 3 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)

6. Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in African Studies in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses in multiple departments and required no additional funding. DAVIDOVA (INTL) added that the Certificate completed an existing set of area studies certificates and it would be the only such African Studies Certificate in Oregon.

MERCER/SCHROCK MOVED the Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in African Studies.

LIEBMAN called the question.

THE MOTION PASSED, 44 to accept, 2 to reject, no abstentions (recorded by clicker)

7. Proposal for an Online Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery in Music in COTA

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses, but there were issues surrounding faculty hires to support the program in the future and the Certificate could require additional funding.

HARMON/MAIER MOVED the Proposal for an Online Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery in Music

MACCORMACK noted that the Certificate planned to target non-PSU degree students, but that currently undergraduate certificates can only be awarded at time of graduation. He added that the ARC has been looking the issue, on Provost Andrews' recommendation; it does have consequences for financial aid and the

Registrar's Office. FOUNTAIN agreed that the Proposal did target students who may not finish at PSU. GRECO asked what the implications for financial aid were. MACCORMACK said that students requesting financial would have to justify the utility of the certificate to the federal government. PADIN said that the policy question had come to EPC's attention and no consensus had been reached. He asked how we could vote on a proposal that was contrary to current policies, although K-12 presented some interesting market opportunities. ANDREWS said that she had proposed that ARC look at offering pre-baccalaureate certificates a year ago, noting that most institutions offer them and PSU needed to catch up. MERCER suggested amending the Proposal with a contingency statement. BLEIRLER concurred. PADIN noted 3 statements that would need to be struck. RUETER noted that the Senate only had the Summary Proposal in hand and said that the larger policy issue needed to be addressed.

MAIER/RAFFO MOVED that the motion be tabled until next month.

The Proposal was tabled by unanimous voice vote.

8. Proposals from ARC for Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas

MACCORMACK said that both Proposals regarded adding courses to academic distribution areas to meet BS/BA requirements; in particular, ARC was recommending approval of the request from Administration of Justice to treat all of their courses as social sciences.

REECE/TAYLOR MOVED the proposed Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas as published in E.

RUETER said the issue for him was not the courses per se, but who had reviewed the content of the courses for the assignment. MACCORMACK said that the UCC had declined to review the courses. He noted that Criminal Justice had supporting documentation and that funding agencies treat their courses as social science. GAMBURD noted that ARC had tried to look broadly at how courses were assigned to distributions and encountered the issue that courses offered by the professional schools were not being counted for the BA/BS. MACCORMACK said that Criminal Justice felt their request was justified by a shift in their discipline away from an applied to a more academic focus; he added that while he didn't think that ARC was the appropriate venue for deciding disciplinary boundaries, this request seemed discreet and justified by practice. MERCER recommended that the University have the broader conversation before it considered any additional proposals. PADIN said that extending a blanket approval to a program in transition seemed inappropriate. MACCORMACK noted that other departments do not have their courses examined individually for distribution assignment, though School of Social Work courses would be reviewed individually. HANSEN (D.) asked if demand or budget were concerns. MACCORMACK stated that most BA/BS requirements were probably fulfilled as students completed regular coursework. INGERSOLL doubted there was a reliable way to gauge if the BS/BA requirement was a motivation. SHULER

noted the split distribution preferences in his own home department of History and agreed with MERCER that there should be a broader discussion.

LIEBMAN said that further discussion and a vote on the motion would have to be postponed until the next meeting, due to the lack of a quorum.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL said that PSU-AAUP and the Administration agreed to a joint two-day training session for interest-based bargaining and he looked forward to constructive discussions during the up-coming bargaining process. He announced that PSU had moved up to #8 in the *U.S. News and World Reports* Top Ten "Up and Coming" universities and that a number of PSU graduate programs had been ranked in the top 50 nationally. (SEE <http://www.pdx.edu/profile/portland-state-university-rankings-and-references>). He described additional opportunities for faculty to have input into the Strategic Planning Process, including a forum with the Topic Teams on April 29; the full draft plan might not be available for Senate review until June or later. He regretted the inevitable evil of the tuition increase recently passed by the Board of Trustees, a result of declining state funding. He also announced that the Campus Safety Advisory Committee would be holding forums in April and May.

WEIWEL thanked Maude Hines and student leaders for their testimony before HECC in support of an outcomes-based formula for allocating funds among the state's higher ed institutions. PSU is significantly disadvantaged by the current model. He explained that Portland City Council had amended it support for the University Urban Renewal district. The City had pledged to invest a certain 25 million dollars over the next 8 years, including money for a bond match and the redevelopment of University Place, as well as a plot of land on Fourth Avenue (the former Budget Rental office).

WEIWEL then introduced PSU's new Vice President for Enrollment and Student Affairs (EMSA) John Fraire.

FRAIRE described his academic and theater arts background and his experience in Washington and at urban-serving universities in New York City, Kalamazoo, and Chicago. He said that he foresaw no new or different directions for EMSA, which was in good shape. He is interested in expanding out-of-state and international

enrollment, where possible. His focus will be on process and production, and creating a safe and healthy campus, with a culture of assessment and clear guidelines. He looked forward to the opportunity of working with faculty at PSU. (Applause.)

Provost's Report

ANDREWS reported that HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission) had approved a program in Sports Product Management that the University of Oregon will offer in Portland. (See <http://spm.uoregon.edu/>) She said that she and others, including the President and Board Trustees, had made every effort imaginable in testifying before HECC to make sure this would be a collaborative program. They had been somewhat effective and Scott Marshall will be working with U of O as they launch the program. However, PSU will have to be much more aggressive if it does not want to see its ability to serve the many undergraduate students in this region undermined by other institutions bringing in multiple niche programs.

MAIER asked if this collaboration would include revenue sharing. ANDREWS said that was not likely with, since there is less opportunity for deep collaboration. GEORGE asked if this would be the last case. ANDREWS said no, PSU would have to keep making the argument. WIEWEL agreed, noting that the issue was a historical one. ANDREWS encouraged faculty to share information they might acquire about other non-PSU programs moving Portland. RAFFO asked what the next potential threat might be. ANDREWS mentioned Oregon Tech plans to offer an all-evening program for a Bachelors in Mechanical Engineering in Portland. BLEILER observed that PSU could market its own programs statewide. ANDREWS said that deans were beginning to work on that; SBA was marketing its on-line bachelor's degree in Eugene. She encouraged faculty to take part. DAIM said that PBB was a barrier to some cross-disciplinary niche programs. ANDREW said PBB should, on the contrary, allow for recognizing collaborations in ways that were not possible before.

ANDREWS alerted senators to a decision that had been made to submit PSU's application for School of Public Health accreditation because the deadline for this year was in April. (See comments, minutes attachment B2). She recognized that the Senate had not yet provided a recommendation. The actual review of PSU's self-study would not happen until December 2015. She acknowledged the work of the Budget Committee, which had just submitted a positive report, and encouraged Senate to move on the matter before the end of the academic year.

Report of the Lower Student Costs (Textbook Affordability) Task Force

Postponed until the May meeting.

Annual Report of the Advising Council

Postponed until the May meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 2015

Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman

Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Layzell (4:20), Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor,

Alternates Present: Kennedy for Arellano, Gabarino for Baccar, Messer for Carder, Anderson for Daim, Gioia for Donlan, Krueger for Luther, Hines for Reese, Kinsella for Yeshilada, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: Holliday, Labissiere, Maier, Raffo, Riedlinger, Skaruppa

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Aylmer, Bowman, Dusschee, Everett, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Kinsella, MacCormack, McBride, Marshall, Mercer, Moody, Padin, Percy, Rueter, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The April 6 Minutes were approved with the following corrections: Kennedy was present for Arellano; the reference to “Administration of Justice” under item E.8 is to be replaced by “Criminology and Criminal Justice” (p. 66).

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN noted small changes to the agenda and stated that courses had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda. He introduced President/CEO of the PSU Foundation and University Advancement Francoise Aylmer.

Presentation of the University Mace

Presenting PSU’s first ceremonial mace to Senate Presiding Officer Robert Liebman, AYLMEER stated that it was a joint gift from the PSU Alumni Association and the

PSU Foundation. It is handmade of walnut and cherry and is to be carried at University commencement as a symbol of PSU's tradition of academic excellence.

Report of the Lower Student Costs (Textbook Affordability) Task Force

MOODY thanked the faculty, staff, and students who were members of the Task Force fall and winter terms and noted the 14 recommendations in the report, along with over 40 strategies for implementation. The full report is available to the public through PDX Scholar, and there is already evidence that it is being reviewed and downloaded by other institutions: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oa_reports/1

LEIBMAN: What kind of process is in place to implement the recommendation for a faculty copyright officer?

MOODY: The recommendation talks about the need for additional policies around intellectual property and the plan is to form a working group to think about the issues and possible costs involved.

LIEBMAN invited applause to thank the members of the task force, many of whom have agreed to carry the work forward. [Applause.]

Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council

JHAJ, Vice Provost for Academic Innovation, thanked committee members and highlighted three projects supported by the Council: the implementation of an advising platform that allows for note-taking and analytics; identification of and recommendations for enrolled students who have accumulated more than the 180 credits required for graduation, and collection and analysis of data aimed at improving the persistence of transfer students. The council is also leading efforts to compile an institution-wide Advising Handbook for release next year.

JHAJ stated that the Council believes that student success will improve by improving advising and that investing in advising is a sound fiscal strategy for the University. He noted that the University currently has 35 professional advisers, with an adviser to student ratio of 650 to 1. NACADA (National Association of Academic Advisers) recommends 300 to 1. The Council is suggesting that the University add 25 new advising positions, an investment of 1.8 million dollars, in order to increase student retention, which would also increase tuition revenues to support that activity (see slides, minutes attachment B1).

TAYLOR asked if new advisors would be deployed to departments. JHAJ said the Council would wait to see what funding was available before making recommendations, but that common tools and platforms would be essential to making progress. LONEY asked if the number of PSU advisors included professional advisors assigned to individual schools like business. JHAJ said they had been counted. STEDMAN wondered if the plan factored in increased teaching loads and that impact on advising. JHAJ said the issue was discussed but was outside the scope of the Council's charge.

GEORGE noted that increasing student success is a multi-variable problem and asked if there were evidence that advising was a driver at PSU. JHAI pointed to a case study at Georgia State, where substantial gains in persistence had resulted from improving advising. MERCER reported that after CLAS added area advisers four years ago, its graduation rates had risen 25% even though its enrollments had remained flat. PERLMUTTER agreed that professional advisers were part of the solution, but students seeking to complete a major, and especially those with a large number of accumulated credits, would benefit greatly from dedicated advising positions located in departments.

KARAVANIC asked if raising the bar on admission standards was being considered. JHAJ suggested that this could undermine the University's access mission, adding that if the bar were raised, unless PSU acted to attract more high-caliber students, it would become a smaller university. HANSEN (Brad) asked if the survey accounted for non-degree seeking students. JHAJ acknowledged their presence, but said that data now show that about 80% of entering Freshmen intend to graduate from PSU. Of more concern is the large contingent of transfer students who come to PSU with majors undeclared. [Applause.]

APPC

JONES noted that 42 faculty had attended the APP Forum on Monday, April 27. He reminded senators that APPC's work would end with the delivery a report evaluating the 157 identified programs, based on qualitative and quantitative data to be collected, and confirmed that they had settled on five scoring criteria. (See slides, minutes attachment B2.) According to a revised timeline currently under discussion, scoring would take place in September. He encouraged faculty to volunteer for the scoring teams and directed senators to the APP website: <http://pdxappc.blogspot.com/>

LIEBMAN noted the need for cross-campus representation in the scoring process and that scorers might receive an honorarium. JONES said the current plan anticipated having materials ready for review by mid-summer, with a scoring event at the end of the summer. HANSEN (David) asked how many scorers were needed. JONES said the goal was to have each program scored by 3 people, so approximately 30 scorers reviewing 15 programs each would be needed. GAMBURD noted that most faculty were off contract over the summer. JONES said that was a reason to offer an honorarium.

HINES asked if the proposed timeline and process would be ratified by Senate. JONES said that the Committee was uncertain as to who had approval authority, but APP felt that an extension was required to do a quality job. RUETER said the same question had been raised on April 27. LIEBMAN noted that the Senate had voted to approve the APPC's charge and timeline, but the real test was whether the APPC's members were willing to stick with the process; there was precedent for granting ad hoc committees an extension to complete their work. SMITH asked if there were a description of the expectations for the scorer position. JONES said APPC estimated it would be about two days of work, potentially in a group setting, with time for training. LIEBMAN noted a similar practice for scoring Freshmen Inquiry portfolios; he thanked APP for their work. [Applause.]

LIEBMAN invited interim SPH Dean Elena Andresen and interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Leslie McBride to preview the initiative for the School of Public Health, which should come as a proposal to Senate in June for a vote.

Preview of the School of Public Health Proposal (SPH)

MCBRIDE acknowledged interested faculty visiting from OHSU in the audience. She reviewed the proposal process that had begun with a meeting the chairs of EPC and Budget Committees in October 2014 to discuss requirements. After several meetings and exchanges of information, with everyone working hard to get things right, a final proposal had been submitted in January 2015. (See slides, minutes attachment B3.) The Budget Committee has completed its work. EPC's review is nearing conclusion. She emphasized that the proposal for a School emerged from a twenty-one-year history of PSU-OHSU (and OSU) collaboration on a Masters in Public Health that has graduated over 1700 students. The SPH proposal had been triggered by OSU's decision to withdraw from the partnership and form its own School in 2007, the recommendations of a CEPH accreditation site visit, and the successful PSU-OHSU collaboration on the Life Sciences Building. PSU and OHSU have each invested \$400,000 in the project.

ANDRESEN reviewed the size and scope of existing programs: With about 60 faculty, 232 graduate and over 1600 undergraduate students enrolled, the new SPH is poised to become one of the largest in the country. She anticipated that the full process to accreditation could be completed by November 2016 (see B3, slides 5-6). She noted that discussions were in progress for a memorandum of understanding with PSU-AAUP. In addition, the merger would bring in several programs and faculty from CUPA and the School of Community Health, which would follow the new process for change of unit assignment after SPH is formed. She invited questions.

BOWMAN said that the Budget Committee had completed its review of the SPH Proposal, and it would be included the June Senate Agenda packet. It looks at the costs of creating the school, of transferring units, and of the projected growth as a School. He noted that the BC's report last June had addressed the question of where PSU's \$400,000 contribution had come from, i.e. that it could not be tracked to cuts to specific units, having come out of the overall reduction to OAA.

PADIN reported that the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) agreed that the SPH proposers had assembled the necessary evidence and offered a persuasive vision for the School. EPC had also thought it prudent to seek outside review of the proposal. It is waiting for the third of three requested external reviews. He didn't foresee that there was much risk that the SPH proposal would fail their review. He encouraged senators to review the draft Bylaws in the SPH with an eye to how robust its protections for shared governance were and to share any comments concerns with EPC:

<https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/83422108/14%2015%20Academic%20Units%20Centers%20Institutes>

LIEBMAN reminded senators that today's look at the proposal was just a preview, not the review, and that creation of the new School would involve moving and reconfiguring several units at PSU, with multiple internal benefits and consequences. He anticipated that Steering Committee would review committee reports and place the SPH proposal on the June Senate Agenda. He thanked faculty for their contributions. [Applause.]

Presiding Officer Elect

LIEBMAN announced the two up-coming positions for Steering Committee, to be elected in June, and the open position of Secretary to the Faculty, beginning in fall 2015. He invited nominations for Presiding Officer Elect for 2015-16. Brad Hansen and Thomas Luckett were nominated.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposals from ARC for Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas

MACCORMACK reminded senators that the proposals had been jointly moved and seconded during the April Senate meeting, but voting had been tabled due to the loss of a quorum. He invited chair of Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) Brian Renauer to review the rationale for approving CCJ as a social science.

RENAUER noted that two of their professional associations belong to the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), the Library of Congress classifies Criminology as a social science, and their top journals are indexed in that category. He also stated that all of CCJ's faculty have doctoral degrees from programs that self-identify as social science and offered the dictionary definition, which he argued encapsulates the CCJ program and curricular focus.

MACCORMACK displayed the list of undergraduate courses that Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) offered, noting that two of them were already assigned to Social Sciences. UCC had not proposed to reconsider their assignment.

HANSEN/CLUCAS MOVED the proposal to assign Criminology and Criminal Justice undergraduate courses to the Social Science academic distribution area, as published in D1.

GRECO explained that the 2 CCJ courses currently classified as social science had moved there with a faculty member who had changed units and that Sociology had at one point determined that CCJ courses were not designed as general education liberal arts courses. She asked for further discussion of the classification issue. GAMBURD agreed that discussion should consider what the core concerns are for a liberal arts education. INGERSOLL noted that a number of programs contributing courses to the liberal arts degree were located in professional schools (political science, child and family studies and urban studies

and planning) and CCJ had adjusted its focus away from professional preparation over the last decade. MACCORMACK suggested that the philosophical discussion would be a much lengthier discussion than this proposal required. RENAUER reiterated that CCJ faculty were all trained social scientists. PADIN expressed reservations about a blanket approval for courses that was not based on a review of their content. MERCER noted that the majority of students graduate with a BS degree requiring only 12 social science credits and he was concerned about the quality of those 12 credits and what the impact there would be for those CCJ majors who might in the future complete all of their social science coursework in the future in CCJ alone. HANSEN (David) asked what distinguishes CCJ courses from Social Work offering and what the budgetary implications were. MACCORMACK the impact would probably be minimal.

LIEBMAN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to approve the Proposal for CCJ's addition to the Social Science distribution area PASSED: 25 to accept, 18 to reject, with 10 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

MACCORMACK displayed the list of undergraduate courses in Physical Geography and GIS to be added to the Sciences distribution area.

BLEILER/TAYLOR MOVED the PROPOSAL to assign the Physical Geography courses published in D1 to the Science distribution area.

MACCORMAK said that the presumption was that in future Geography would specify the distribution assignment for new course proposals. He noted that a majority of universities with physical geography courses now treat them as a physical science and that ARC has in practice accepted these courses for science credit for transfer students when they are designated that way. He also pointed to the confusion that arises when a PSU geography course cross-listed as a science course can be taken by some students for science credit and not by others.

MACCORMACK asked Martin LaFrenz Geography to speak. LAFRENZ noted that the proposal to change the designation from social science had been endorsed by the Director of the School of the Environment and the CLAS Dean and ARC. The status quo is not fair to students and the petition process for requesting science credit is time-consuming. Courses in climatology, hydrology, and soils get a science-based treatment in the PSU department of Geography and are considered STEM disciplines elsewhere. Physical Geography faculty are engaged in collaborative science-based work with peers in PSU science departments.

GAMBURD stated that Anthropology also has a number of science-based courses that should be recognized as such, and recommended that EPC take up the question whether the classification by prefix was a reasonable one. LAFRENZ observed his program had been working its way toward this request for about 15 years. In 2007, EPC had recommended that they take the issue to ARC.

LIEBMAN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to APPROVE the additions to the Science distribution area PASSED: 49 to accept, 3 to reject, with 1 abstention (recorded by clicker).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

2. Proposal for a BFA in Creative Writing in CLAS

FOUNTAIN said that UCC had approved the proposal, noting that it would be based on existing courses and faculty and build on the success of the English department’s MFA in Creative Writing with 75% out-of-state students. He invited the proposal’s author Paul Collins (ENGL) to speak to the proposal.

KARAVANIC/CLARK MOVED the Proposal for a BFA in Creative Writing as published in E2.

COLLINS said that the program would offer the only public BFA west of Nebraska. It would fill a Western region demand.

INGERSOLL asked how many students would be admitted and if the BFA was the standard degree. COLLINS said they were projecting a five-year build up to 72 FTE students. Some programs offer a BA with a creative writing minor or focus track; most of the BFA programs are concentrated in the East. PSU’s would follow AWP (Associated Writing Programs) guidelines. KENNEDY asked how the degree differed from the English BA and if the BFA would eliminate some University BA requirements. COLLINS said AWP guidelines include foreign language and a broader profile of arts-related courses that made the degree significantly different from the BA in English. KARAVANIC asked if there was a math requirement. COLLINS said no, the program will have the general BA requirements. CLARK said that there has been a strong demand among PSU students and from prospective out-of-state students.

LIEBMAN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to approve the Proposal PASSED, 49 to accept, 0 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

3. Proposal to Eliminate the Teacher Education Committee (TEC)

LIEBMAN explained that the proposal to sunset the TEC had been brought to the floor by Karin Magaldi, chair of the Teacher Education Committee, on behalf of TEC. The functions of TEC have been assumed by other units at PSU.

MAGALDI noted that the name of Pat Boas should be added to the list of 10 senators supporting the proposal to eliminate TEC, as published in E3.

HANSEN (Brad)/HARMON MOVED to APPROVE and REFER the Proposal to eliminate the Teacher Education Committee to Advisory Council.

The MOTION to Eliminate TEC PASSED, 36 to accept, 0 to reject, with 0 abstentions (by hand count).

4. Proposals to Amend the Constitution (added to the agenda 4/30)

[Secretary's note: These proposals were considered before item 3 above)

LIEBMAN explained that after a vote to approve that proposals would be vetted by the Advisory Council for proper form for the Constitution. He previewed the proposed changes to Articles II, III, and V, nos. 1-3 adding the new ranks approved in 2014 and successor language for the new Board of Trustees, and ex officio status for Presiding Officer Elect and Past Presiding Officer. The fourth amendment reconciles the dates of the elections calendar. (See minutes attachment B4.)

BLEILER/HANSEN (David) MOVED to APPROVE and REFER the proposed 4 amendments to the Constitution of item E4, added to the agenda.

KARAVANIC was concerned about the listing of Research Assistants as faculty, as the position does not necessarily require the same qualifications as those for most faculty. LIEBMAN said that they were included under the P&T Guidelines by virtue of their rank, and most worked in RRI, running supervised studies. STEDMAN said that was not true of RAs in Biology and he would not be in favor of including that rank in the definition of faculty. LIEBMAN said that the rank was part of a ladder of steps for Research Assistants and Associates. HICKEY clarified that past practice has treated anyone with a "ranked position" as a member of the faculty under the PSU Constitution; however, some units have, on occasion, chosen not to "certify" as faculty those Research Assistants who only hold BA or BS degrees. LIEBMAN said the amendment included a rank as a category that could be eligible to be consistent with the P&T changes in 2014. KARAVANIC asked if every Research Assistant would automatically be considered faculty. HICKEY said yes, unless they were not certified by the unit's Dean. MACCORMACK asked if certification as faculty meant eligible to serve in the Senate. LIEBMAN said yes, as well as eligible to vote for senators. SANTELMANN clarified that the discussion concerned only full-time employees. LIEBMAN agreed, adding that some would hold BA/BS degrees (as have some BFA instructors). BLEILER thought the language suggested that these

appointments were given to research professors. BOWMAN suggested rewriting amendment 1. LIEBMAN asked if the maker of the motion would approve withdrawing the first of the proposed amendments.

Quorum was verified.

BLIELER accepted the withdrawal of the first of the four proposed amendments, so that the vote would be to accept proposed items 2 through 4.

The MOTION to ACCEPT and refer proposed amendments 2 through 4 to the Advisory Council PASSED by majority voice vote, with 1 abstention.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL [Secretary's note: Offered after item E2 New Business]

WIEWEL announced that the Princeton Review listed PSU (#11) in the top 50 greenest universities and fourth in the nation for sending students to the Peace Corps. Four Portland State graduate programs--Biology, along with Linguistics, Social Work and Urban and Regional Planning--have been ranked in the top 25 in the nation, according to GraduatePrograms.com. Outcomes-based funding approved by HECC should increase the allocation to PSU in the future, although the recent PERS ruling will make the Legislature more cautious. The Strategic Plan draft will not be ready for Senate review until fall, but it will be discussed at the Annual Leadership Planning Session on May 26. FADM has a web site for input on the introduction of new safety officers and he urged faculty to encourage their students to vote in the annual ASPSU elections.

Provost's Report [Secretary's note: Offered before New Business]

ANDREWS said that the Senate would be voting on whether to move forward with the partnership with OHSU for a School of Public Health. The June vote would create the School, but it would be the accreditation process that would actually determine whether SPH would exist. She affirmed that SPH would be subject to all of PSU's principles and policies on shared governance. She encouraged those with questions to

send them to Elena or Leslie. She also drew attention to the update on the 2015-16 budget for academic units in her written comments and the open forum on the OAA Budget on May 27. (See minutes attachment B5.)

LIEBMAN noted the Provost's Challenge Celebration and showcase on May 19.

The following reports were accepted:

- 1. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee**
- 2. Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board**
- 3. Annual Report of the Institutional Assessment Council**
- 4. Annual Report of the Library Committee**
- 5. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee**
- 6. Annual Report of the University Studies Council**

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 1, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carder, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Ingersoll, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, McElhone, Maier, Padin, Perlmutter, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor

Alternates Present: Kennedy for Arellano, Black for Karavanic, Estes for Labissiere, Devoll for Mercer, Beckett for Popp, Wong for Raffo, Morris for Skaruppa, Kinsella for Yeshilada, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: George, Hunt, Luther, Mukhopadhyay

New Members

Present: Bluffstone, Chang, Comacho, de Rivera, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Harris, Hatfield, Jaen-Portillo, MacCormack, Monsere, Pease, Running, Gioia for Talbott, Webb

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Bowman, Dusschee, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Kinsella, MacCormack, McBride, Marshall, Padin, Percy, Rueter, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The May 4, 2015 minutes were approved with the following correction (p. 74): BLEILER/TAYLOR moved to assign Physical Geography *and GIS* courses to the science distribution area (as listed in D1).

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN welcomed new senators. He explained that there were handouts that updated today's proposed agenda and that there would need to be a handoff of clickers from old to new senators for the election votes. He thanked Committee on Committee chair David Hansen for organizing electronic caucuses for senators to elect their representatives to the 2015-16 Committee on Committees prior to Senate.

LIEBMAN requested a vote to suspend the published order of business to make some adjustments to the order and add time limits. (See slides, minutes attachment B1.) He also noted that nothing had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda.

BLEILER/GRECO MOVED to suspend the published June agenda to allow the proposed revisions and additions.

The MOTION was ADOPTED by unanimous voice vote.

Update of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

CPL Project Team member Peter Collier reviewed the group's goals and accomplishments, including the nine CPL policies reviewed by Senate in 2014, a flow chart and handbook for students, guidelines for fees and faculty compensation, a training manual and webinars for evaluators, and a dedicated web site. HECC has designated PSU as a CPL pilot site. (See slides, minutes attachment B2, and <https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/>.)

Revision of Policy on Religious Accommodation

Chas Lopez, interim Chief Diversity Officer, introduced Cindy Starke, Office of General Counsel. LOPEZ noted that revision was required because current policy only addressed religious holidays. STARKE noted that laws on religious accommodation were evolving and the proposed new policies were intended to offer consistent guidance and to protect and support both students and faculty. LOPEZ said a comment page had been opened for senators to offer feedback until June 30: <http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library>

[Secretary's note: Update from the Task Force on Academic Quality – shifted to E.6]

Update on the Transition of OARS

David Reese, University General Counsel, said that along with governance changes that allowed PSU to become an independent public university, as of July 1, 2014 PSU was no longer subject to the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act. All of the Oregon University System rules, IMDs and Board policies, and PSU administrative rules have rolled over and become PSU "standards" or "policies." PSU now has its own web page home for a University Policy Library with a table that lists each old administrative rule and notes whether it is still in effect as a standard or has been superseded: <http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/psu-standards-former-oars-and-former-ous-internal-management-directives-and-policies>

DAASCH: Is the site searchable?

REESE: Not now, because the files are all separate PDFs, but we can strive for that.

TAYLOR: Will superseding policies go before the Board or committee for review?

REESE: Depending on what the policy is, it could be a Board resolution, or go to the University Policy Committee, or be changed by the Senate.

Presiding Officer Elect

LIEBMAN opened the floor for nominations for Presiding Officer Elect for 2015-16. Brad Hansen and Michael Bowman received nominations during May. Tom Lockett, also nominated in May, deferred. LIEBMAN shared a brief governance resume for each (see B1, slide 5). There were no further nominations.

BRAD HANSEN was elected by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

Nominations for Steering Committee

LIEBMAN brought forward the names of senators who had expressed a willingness to accept nomination: Paula Carder, Alan MacCormack, and David Maier. LIEBMAN opened the floor for additional nominations. None were offered. Nominations for a one-year appointment to replace retiring Steering Committee member Swapna Mukhopadhyay were also offered: Randall Bluffstone and Michael Taylor. LIEBMAN shared a brief governance resume for each (see B1, slide 6).

[Secretary's note: Steering Committee vote was held after completion of Unfinished Business]

Steering Committee Elections

Paula Carder and Alan MacCormack were elected to the Steering Committee for 2015-2017 by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

David Maier's name was added as a nominee for the one-year replacement position.

David Maier was elected for 2015-2016 by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Approval of Revisions to the *Portland State Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure, Promotion, Merit Increases and Post-Tenure Review & related Appendix.*

LIEBMAN introduced Gina Greco, Presiding Officer elect for 2015-16 and also a member of the PSU-AAUP Bargaining Team that reviewed the PTR Procedures.

In a written statement, GRECO summarized a collaborative process of joint review by the Office of Academic Affairs and PSU-AAUP of the Senate-adopted procedures for post-tenure review. The proposed changes were intended to clarify the process, respecting Senate's intent; to ensure that all procedures were in one document; and to set a common award for successful review for all five years of the implementation process. (See statement, minutes attachment B3.)

In conclusion, GRECO stated that the Senate Steering Committee, OAA, and PSU-AAUP recommended acceptance of the changes; she asked for questions. [Secretary's note: There were none.]

HANSEN (Brad)/CLUCAS MOVED approval of the negotiated changes and additions to post-tenure review in the *Portland State Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure, Promotion, Merit Increases*.

The MOTION to approve the negotiated changes and additions PASSED: 53 to accept, 1 to reject, with no abstentions (recorded by clicker).

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution to Eliminate the Teacher Education Committee (TEC)

MACCORMACK, chair of the Advisory Council, said that the Council had reviewed the proposal to eliminate the TEC, as proposed by its members and 10 senators and saw no issues other than renumbering required.

LIEBMAN explained the process for amending the Constitution, which includes vetting by the Advisory Council after an initial Senate vote.

HOLLIDAY/BLEILER MOVED the proposal to eliminate the Teacher Education Committee.

The MOTION to Eliminate TEC PASSED, 53 to accept, 0 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

3. Proposals to Amend the Constitution (Articles III.1, V.1, & V.2, and By-laws)

MACCORMACK said that Advisory Council had reviewed the four proposed changes in wording to Articles III and V to provide successor language for PSU's new Board of Trustees, ex officio status for Past Presiding Officer and Presiding Elect, and an elections calendar clarification, and found them straight-forward and requiring no change in policy. He noted that a fifth change had been proposed adding the new faculty ranks in May, but withdrawn by the proposers.

LIEBMAN explained that a change to add new faculty ranks approved in 2014 had been withdrawn due to confusion about the status of Research Assistants. The matter would come back for discussion in Senate in 2015-16.

HOLLIDAY/BLEILER MOVED the proposed changes to the wording of the Constitution described in item D-3.

The MOTION to PASSED, to 52 accept, 1 to reject, with 1 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

**[4. Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery of Music,
College of the Arts – withdrawn due to procedural issues.]**

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

2. EPC Motion on the Proposal for a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health

PADIN confirmed that the Educational Policy Committee recommended approval of the proposed School of Public Health. Taking a university-wide perspective, the EPC had set out to answer three questions in its review: is the new school desirable in the Portland metro region, is the joint PSU-OHSU proposal credible, and can the leading proponents deliver on the promises. The EPC believed that there was satisfactory evidence, including 3 positive external evaluations letters, to answer “yes” to all three questions.

PADIN thought that the combined degrees and tracks at all three levels, BA, Masters, and PhD, could make for a formidable school of public health, attract faculty and students, and open new funding vistas. He noted that as the venture moved forward, there would still be on-going conversations about organization and governance. He thanked the members of EPC for putting in extra hours to complete the review.

LIEBMAN acknowledged visitors from OHSU in the audience and invited interim SPH dean Elena Andresen to answer questions.

DAASCH/HARMON MOVED to approve the proposal for a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health.

MAIER: What’s the status on OHSU side, have they approved the School?

ANDRESEN: Yes.

PADIN stated that department transfers to the approved School would start happening in the fall, including the School of Community Health and tracks in CUPA, adding that these were not determined by today’s vote. LIEBMAN concurred that the vote was to establish the school; there would be more work to do around the transfer of units and faculty governance, congruence with the PSU side and the joint school.

The MOTION to approve the School of Public Health PASSED, 46 to accept, 1 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker). [Applause.]

3. Proposal for a BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness in CUPA

BRODOWICZ explained that the BS in Health Studies previously had five separate concentrations. These are all anticipated to move to the new School of Public Health, but it had been determined that it would be more appropriate to revise the exercise/physical activity track as a separate major to follow standards of the National Strength and Conditioning Association (NSCA), rather than CEPH (Council for Education in Public Health) standards adopted for the other four tracks. Randy Miller (Community Health) added that changes resulting from the Affordable Care Act and rising demand in the health and fitness sector, including demand for personal trainers, made this a timely proposal.

STEDMAN/HANSEN (David) MOVED the BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness.

CARSTENS: Will the program stay in CUPA?

BRODOWICZ: We were told that it would be a standalone undergraduate degree in the School of Public Health, not having to meet the stricter CEPH criteria, as long as the program introduced some broad approaches to public health.

MILLER: Nationwide, NCSA is moving towards an accreditation process having a more science-based curriculum. The proposed degree also introduces new core courses to meet these requirements.

The MOTION to PASSED, 39 to accept, 5 to reject, with 6 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

4. Proposal for a Minor in Child and Family Studies in the School of Social Work

Michael Taylor (CFS) introduced Ben Anderson-Nathe, Program Director of Child and Family Studies. ANDERSON-NATHE said the minor would allow students completing the Child and Family Studies Cluster the opportunity to round out their studies with an additional credential enhancing a professional degree or adding an applied focus.

TAYLOR/HOLIDAY MOVED the Minor in Child and Family Studies

The MOTION to PASSED, 45 to accept, 3 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

5. Steering Committee Motions on Academic Program Prioritization (APP)

[Secretary's note: revised agenda order; published as E-7]

LIEBMAN invited Lynn Santelmann and Mark Jones from the APPC to join him. He explained that a single academic year had proved to be an unrealistic deadline

for completion of the work that Senate had asked of the Ad hoc APPC. The motion would endorse the continuation of the APP Committee's work.

SANTELMANN previewed the motion, presenting a revised time line, with a pilot to test and refine a scoring rubric over the summer, that would allow chairs to consult with their faculty in the fall when they complete the APP review forms (see slides, minutes attachment B4). A weekend scoring event is still planned, but will be moved to mid December.

HOLLIDAY/ELZANOWSKI MOVED to endorse the new version of the motion posted on May 28 and circulated as new item E5, **Motion 1**, in handouts:

Faculty Senate endorses the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, per the charge of June 2, 2014. APPC will make an interim report to Senate on October 5, 2015 to solicit feedback on the results of its pilot test of the scoring rubrics. Senate expects to receive the final APPC report in winter term, 2016. (For the full resolution, see minutes attachment B5.)

CARPENTER: What does the pilot look like?

SANTELMANN: There are two visions currently being discussed. One would have members on the committee who are or have been chairs volunteer their programs as guinea pigs. We have also talked about asking programs who have recently gone through accreditation or program review volunteer to be in the pilot.

LIEBMAN: One add-on would be to pilot representative types of programs, undergraduate and graduate, to determine whether the instrument or rubric is flexible enough for the variety of 157 programs to be reviewed.

SANTELMANN: With the acknowledgement that it probably won't.

MOTION 1 PASSED, 47 to accept, 6 to reject, with 1 abstention (recorded by clicker).

SANTELMANN noted that the five large criteria proposed for the review were not the rubric, but rather the categories for data collection. The resolution handout (see B5) describes the indicators for each measure. APPC was trying to balance academic priorities and pragmatic realities and plans on a holistic scoring process based on a combination of factors. It was also trying to minimize the burden on chairs.

BOWMAN/GRECO MOVED the following, distributed as **Motion 2**, item E-5 (see minutes attachment B5):

Faculty Senate approves the five criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation.

PERLMUTTER asked how historical background could be included, and not just a response to data. SANTELMANN replied probably under “demand/trajjectory” along with the opportunity to comment on three years of enrollment data; and more particularly in the narrative for “relation to mission.” LIEBMAN pointed out that some indicators were hard data from OIRP and some were analytic narratives. PERLMUTTER responded that categories 2 through 5 all seem data-related. SANTELMANN said they were also asking qualitative questions about the data, for example, about student learning outcomes and advising not captured by OIRP data, and hoping to balance the two, quantitative and qualitative. LIEBMAN said the goal of the narrative was to capture “the local color.”

GAMBURD asked if there were a sense that OIRP data could be trusted, given how difficult PSU systems made it to collect. SANTELMANN said they were working with OIRP to identify data that it was very confident in. KETCHISON (OIRP) said OIRP would share the information with programs so that it could be reviewed and verified. SCHULER was concerned that it seemed like a very data driven process and might result in eliminating curricula that help make “the whole person”; he asked if the APP process included any measures to compensate for the short-term view of program success. SANTELMANN emphasized that APPC was only charged with designing a system of prioritization; her hope was that Senate would take a very active role in deciding what to do with the information. She argued that a valuable program with lower enrollments or a struggling one should be able to make the case for its retention, or its need for more resources.

GAMBURD wondered if department chairs were going to know how best to present their programs and if the system could be “gamed.” SANTELMANN replied that PSU’s lack of experience with APP would make trying to anticipate results impossible or inadvisable; Steering Committee would need to take up the question of what is to be done with APP results next year. RUETER advised going for a B+.

PADIN wondered why the second motion was needed if APP would be reporting back on their pilot; he was concerned about the balance of revenue related and qualitative components. LIEBMAN said the aim was to make the criteria known, as well as to indicate whether the process could be tested with these five; he also pointed to the many indicators for each that would help identify gaps. GRECO affirmed her understanding that the criteria were not all equally weighted. PADIN asked if it even made sense to roll the results into one index. SANTELMANN said the pilot would help work this detail out and previewed one strategy that would not reduce results to a single number—a radar graph in pentagonal form for representing outcomes (see B4, slides 8-11). LIEBMAN noted that other universities had not reported a single number for APP. HINES asked for more comment on the number of indicators. SANTELMANN directed senators to the table at the end the E-5 handout and gave examples of the qualitative indicators under criteria like productivity (see B5, pages 2-3). HINES observed that looking at the indicators did show how quality received more weight than just 1 out of 5.

LIEBMAN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to approve the five criteria PASSED, 31 to accept, 17 to reject, with 5 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

6. Steering Committee Motion endorsing the work of the Academic Quality Task Force (TAQ)

LIEBMAN introduced Virginia Butler, chair of the Academic Quality Task Force.

BUTLER referred senators to the handout with the Task Force Report (G-11) that had been posted to the Senate website on May 28 (see minutes attachment B6). She noted that Senate and PSU-AAUP jointly convened the Task Force in the fall of 2014 and committee members had enthusiastically taken up the topic. One piece of the Senate charge was to identify aspirational comparators that can be used to address the question. The Task Force recognized that no one university would capture all aspects.

BUTLER said that in grappling with a definition for academic quality, the Task Force had created a survey in March to gather ideas from the campus community on what constitutes quality in teaching, service, and research, asking for examples of where it is supported. The response rate (15% overall, of 2600) highlights the importance of the issue for faculty. Provost Andrews provided GRA support for the analysis. The report highlights some trends and patterns, both with respect to practice and philosophy. The committee proposes completing qualitative analysis and picking five to eight indicators of quality. It will follow up with a more directed survey in winter 2016, looking to prioritize the indicators and to identify institutions that support these aspects of quality. The goal will be to ask what can be done to bring these aspirational practices to PSU, what blocks or promotes them. The Task Force will also look at data that PSU already gathers on the student take on quality. Finally, they hope to develop guidelines for a standing committee on academic quality to support on-going efforts and follow through.

LIEBMAN acknowledged contributions to the Task Force's work from Scott Marshall, Kathi Ketcheson, Alan MacCormack and others across campus. He commented that the thoughtful construction of qualitative responses gathered would be matched with quantitative responses.

GRECO/CARDER MOVED the CONTINUATION of the work of the TAQ.

BOWER asked for clarification of the statement of the motion. LIEBMAN referred senators to the packet, item E-6.

DELAVEGA: I'm really excited about this idea of looking at what we mean by quality. In the Graduate School of Education we are constantly looking at what affects the classroom environment and how we prepare engaged teachers. Seeing no GSE members on the Task Force I would like to recommend adding a faculty member from the GSE.

LIEBMAN: The idea for the Task Force was to start small, but that's an excellent idea.

The MOTION to PASSED, 45 to accept, 6 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

7. ARC Proposal to change the post-baccalaureate certificate PSU residency requirement [Secretary's note: revised agenda order]

MACCORMACK clarified that "residency requirement" did not refer to the bar for in-state tuition, but rather the number of credits that must be taken at PSU for a PSU degree or certificate to be awarded. He observed that the current standard was 30 credits at PSU, without specifying that those credits must pertain to the certificate. In addition, some existing certificates require less than 30 credits. ARC is proposing a standard modeled after the graduate certificate PSU minimum of 16 credits, or three quarters of all course work required for the certificate.

HANSEN (Brad) /HOLLIDAY MOVED to CHANGE the post-baccalaureate certificate PSU residency requirement to the greater of 16 credits or three quarters of required credit, as published in E-5 (E7 in the revised agenda).

DAASCH: Why is the minimum not just three-quarters of the credit?

MACCORMACK: We just wanted to establish some kind of floor. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approves post-bac certificates and right now, I think the lowest number of total credits required is 24.

The MOTION to PASSED, 47 to accept, 3 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

8. Steering Committee Resolution on annual reporting to the Board of Trustees

LIEBMAN stated this motion was the beginning of a project to make the PSU Board aware of the work of Senate committees and establish regular communication with the Board. He referenced remarks that he had made at the March BOT meeting (see minutes attachment B7).

STEDMAN/TAYLOR MOVED the proposal to FORWARD ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORTS to the PSU Board of Trustees, as published in E-8.

BLACK: It's difficult to find, let alone read these annual reports, but they should be available to the Board to read, if they want to. Why not spend the effort on a website where we could actually find the reports?

LIEBMAN: The reports are easy to find in May and June Senate packets, but I take your suggestion about using the website as a useful one.

PADIN: There really should be an annual Senate report, properly presented so that it's readable, rather than just a bunch of disparate reports.

LIEBMAN: That's a good suggestion, to cumulate and add a front piece.

The MOTION to PASSED, 46 to accept, 3 to reject, with 1 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President's Report

WIEWEL said that today represented the culmination of a huge amount of shared governance over the year, both formal and informal, involving the efforts of the APPC, the task forces on job security for non-tenure-track faculty and academic quality, Liebman's and Senate's outreach to the new Board of Trustees, lengthy discussions of post-tenure review, and the strategic planning process. It had also been a year of intense collaboration around higher-ed issues before the Oregon Legislature and with HECC over the funding formula and capital projects. Interest-based bargaining was getting underway. Shared governance was also happening with opportunities to socialize and take advantage of administrative open office hours. The Public Safety Advisory Committee was contributing to Board deliberations. They were all time-consuming, but important activities.

WEIWEL said he was happy to announce the award of tenure to 18 faculty members. He thanked Senate members for their many hours of work over the year and acknowledged the contributions of the out-going Presiding Officer and Secretary. [Applause.]

Provost's Report

ANDREWS declared the passage of the School of Public Health a defining moment for PSU and thanked Michael Bowman and Jose Padin for the diligence and expertise that they and their committees had brought to the approval process. She reminded faculty to attend Commencement. She encouraged senators to review presentation slides from the May 27 OAA FY 16 Budget Forum (<http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/policiesreferences>) and to direct any suggestions or questions not answered there to her office.

LIEBMAN thanked the Provost for her comments, and, in particular, for her innovation of sharing written comments with Senate over the past year. He reviewed the accomplishments of the past year and noted that regularizing the connections with the new Board of Trustees would be the Senate's work for the year ahead (see B1, slide 17).

LIEBMAN expressed regret that there was so little time to acknowledge all the people whose work that was reflected in the 16 annual reports collected at the end of the May and June Senate Agenda packets. He invited applause by way of thanks, and then welcomed David Peyton, chair of the Faculty Development Committee, to introduce a revised report. [Applause.]

The following reports were accepted:

- 1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee**
- 2. Annual Report of the Advisory Council**
- 3. Annual Report of the Budget Committee**
- 4. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees** – submitted June 1, see minutes attachment B8.
- 5. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee** – see revised version, B9.
- 6. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee**

PEYTON presented several summary slides from the revised version of the report showing distribution of Faculty Development awards by rank and college (see minutes attachment B9.) He noted that the funding rate was about 45% of all requests and that full professors were included among the awardees.
- 7. Annual Report of the Graduate Council**
- 8. Annual Report of the Honors Council**
- 9. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
- 10. Annual Report of the University Writing Council**
- 11. Academic Quality Task Force Report** – web posted 5/28, see B6 minutes attachment.

In closing, LIEBMAN acknowledged the committee chairs who were present and invited senators to the end-of-year reception in Smith Center in the OAI.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14.