

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate
Minutes (Minutes Only)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

2015

Annual Faculty Senate Minutes October 2015 - June 2016

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 2015 - June 2016" (2015). *Annual Compilations of the Faculty Senate Minutes (Minutes Only)*. 26.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateannualmin/26>

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, 5 October 2015
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Loney, MacCormack, McElhone, Monsere, Mukhopadhyay, O'Banion, Padin, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Tretheway, Webb, Yesilada

Alternates Present: Carpenter for Lindsay, Feng for Maier, Gioia for Taylor

Members Absent: Arellano, Griffin, Wendl

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Hitz, Kinsella, Liebman, Marrongelle, Marshall, Mercer, Moody, Percy, Su, Toppe

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 1 JUNE 2015 MEETING

The **1 June 2015 Minutes** were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. OAA Response to June Report of Senate Actions (concurrence) was noted [**October Agenda Attachment C.1**].

2. Senate Procedures, Districts and Meeting Schedule

GRECO noted that as there were no objections to the **curricular consent agenda** [**October Agenda Attachment E.1**], it was thereby **approved**.

GRECO then made several announcements regarding Senate procedures:

- Senators were reminded that if they have any objections to the consent agenda they should send them to the Presiding Officer or Secretary in advance or, at the latest, make them known before the end of roll call. That is the regular procedure, and it will not be a subject of regular announcement. If the consent agenda is agreed upon, and if no objections have been received in advance, we don't have to talk about it.

- Cheat sheets for Robert's Rules of Order are available for anyone who wants one.
- Senators were asked to bear with the new Presiding Officer and Secretary. They are new, and filling very large shoes; they have less experience than those who preceded them. If there is an instance of rules being applied incorrectly, if it will have a substantive influence on the proceedings, please let them know right away so that it can be corrected. However, if the procedural error does not have a substantive influence, if it is more a matter of style, please let them know afterward.

BEYLER announced that there were two corrections to the agenda as originally circulated (viz., the addition of item C.3, and a correction to item E.3). Senators had been e-mailed previously about these changes. Updated copies of the agenda were available for anyone who wanted one.

GRECO then made several further announcements:

- Members were reminded that when they speak, they should say their last name and their unit so that the Secretary can record these in the minutes. Do not assume that the Secretary knows your name.
- The accreditation board is visiting. They are meeting with faculty on October 7th, 1:00-2:00 in Library 170.
- Senate districts will be coming soon. We are endeavoring to update the lists for faculty as of September 15th. Each senator will be assigned about twenty people. We hope to provide the e-mail address of those people in the list, but that may or may not happen. To make communication easy, the Presiding Officer and Steering Committee will write and circulate summaries of what is happening in the Senate; you are free to use this material or not, depending on what is of interest to your unit. Feel free to pick and choose; it is often more effective to say less.
- The regularly scheduled December meeting would be during Exam Week. Steering Committee proposes that since November has five Mondays, we meet instead on the fifth Monday of November (the 30th), which is during the last week of classes. It is the Monday after Thanksgiving, but we usually do meet then.

3. Announcement from Graduation Program Board

Sherril GELMON (PA), chair of the Graduation Program Board (GPB), and RUNNING, consultant to GPB and previously coordinator of commencement, reported on re-visioning PSU's commencement ceremonies. [See **Minutes Attachment C.3.**]

GELMON: GPB has the happy role of planning the "party" celebrating the end of the year. Many are not interested in planning, but have opinions about what works well or not. [Laughter.] PSU used to have summer commencement in Park Blocks and commencement in June; then, two ceremonies, morning and afternoon, in what became the Moda Center. We are now outgrowing that.

RUNNING: Commencement is the single biggest affinity event for over 6000 graduates per year. Enrollment and participation keep increasing; soon, we again be facing a ceremony of nearly four hours (for both of the two ceremonies). Many students also attend a hooding or affinity ceremony on campus. We want to create a meaningful alumni-building experience, celebrate students' achievements, and plan for the future. The new Viking Pavilion could impact what our ceremonies look like.

GELMON: we are looking ahead to 2017-18. We have concerns about students choosing one ceremony over the other. We go back and forth between the buzz and rush, but also size and length of the big ceremony held at the Moda Center vs. the more intimate college, school, or departmental ceremonies, which are lovely but do not build a broader community. Viking Pavilion will have the capacity to do some things, but not really large ceremonies. What do faculty think is best? We sometimes prefer the small events with our people and students, but this misses the buzz of the larger ceremony. What do administrators want? What do students want? Many students and families want something that is personal, but many also love that five seconds when their picture is on the Jumbotron and their name is being read. What about the staff who do most of the physical and intellectual labor leading up to and during the event? The President and Provost have charged GPB to make recommendations over the course of this year. GPB would like to host conversations with a broad community.

RUNNING: GPB will be hosting a series of conversations; we hope Faculty Senate will be involved as well. We are an urban campus that lacks a facility that can hold all students, so we have to be creative. For example, this coming spring OHSU will be holding its commencement on the same day as ours, at the Oregon Convention Center, almost across the street from Moda Center—so please ride your bicycle. [Laughter.] Faculty participation has been increasing, but is still only 150 or 160 faculty and staff. Commencement is what students remember as they go out into the world. GPB hopes to report by mid-winter. Senators should feel free to reach out to GPB members with ideas.

GELMON: Some events will be scheduled later in the day with appropriate refreshments, or over lunch. Please get this information out to constituents. [Applause.]

4. Discussion Item: Academic Program Prioritization

Mark JONES (CS), chair of the Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC), gave a presentation about the committee's current work, and offered for to the Senate for discussion the suggestion to repurpose this work to create an "atlas" of the array of programs at PSU, rather than moving forward with the original concept of scoring individual programs using a quantitative rubric. [See slides, **Minutes Attachment C.4.**]

Following JONES's presentation, the Senate moved to a **committee of the whole** (at 3:42), and discussed the progress made by the APPC as well as potential advantages and disadvantages of the "atlas" approach. At the conclusion of the discussion (at 4:11), the Senate returned to **regular session**.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

There having been no objections by the end of roll call, the curricular proposal given in **October Agenda Attachment E.1** was **approved**.

2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence & Analytics (SBA)

KINSELLA, chair of Graduate Council, introduced the proposal from the School of Business Administration, in cooperation with other units, for a Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence & Analytics [**October Agenda Attachment E.2**]. Four academic units will participate in the certificate: Mathematics & Statistics; Engineering and Technology Management, Systems Science and the School of Business. It targets current degree students, post-baccalaureate students, and industry employees; it anticipates 15 new students per year. The coursework is 21 credits, intended as a year-long curriculum including core math and stats courses, data mining, data warehousing, and business analytics. Business analytics courses listed as new were approved last spring. SBA studied employment trends and comparable programs at other universities, and surveyed potential employers. Administration of the certificate will be in SBA. A steering committee will include faculty from all participating units; an advisory committee will consist of faculty, students, alumni, and industry representatives. Costs are estimated at less than \$10,000 annually, mainly for the new SBA courses.

WEBB noted that STAT 564 has usually been full with thirty students and asked whether a second section will be added.

KINSELLA called on Cliff ALLEN (SBA), who responded that they have been in discussion with faculty about adding a second section of this course, and that the program committee will have to take further steps.

HARMON / RAFFO **moved** to approve the Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence & Analytics.

The **motion** was **adopted** unanimously by show of hands.

3. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems (CUPA)

KINSELLA introduced the proposal from the College of Urban and Public Affairs, in cooperation with other units, for a Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems [**October Agenda Attachment E.3**]. Five academic units will participate: Public Administration, Community Health, Urban Studies and Planning, School of Business Administration, and Geography. The proposers estimate 21 students in the first year, and 75 by year five. Graduate Council thought his latter number was optimistic, but

nevertheless thought the program is worthwhile. The coursework is 18 to 24 credits, organized around six learning outcomes, with courses from multiple disciplines satisfying each outcome. Students must satisfy all of the learning outcomes, but can choose how they do so. An online survey of graduate, undergraduate, and post-baccalaureate students was conducted to gauge interest in the subject, relevance to career aspirations, and potential enrollment. The Division of Public Administration in CUPA will be responsible for administration and the Institute for Sustainable Solutions will offer staff support for two to three years; thereafter, the certificate program might rotate among participating colleges if that's appropriate. All courses for the program are already offered by current faculty.

HARRIS asked about the inclusion of courses PA 504, 509, and 506 towards the listed outcome #5; she was not familiar with PA 506. KINSELLA called upon Jennifer ALLEN (PA), who responded that these were capstone, community/experiential courses which if done with approved focus would be capable of contributing to the goal. She would check about the usage of PA 506.

DE LA VEGA asked whether there was conversation with the specialization in Leadership for Sustainability Education in the Graduate School of Education, which includes work on food and sustainability in educational settings but also in non-profit organizations. She wondered about the overlap. J. ALLEN responded that, in addition to the units mentioned by KINSELLA, GSE is also one of the units involved and that a MOU [memorandum of understanding] between GSE, CUPA, and CLAS is in place.

SCHROCK / DE RIVERA **moved** to approve the Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems.

The **motion** was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

4. **Motion from University Studies Council**

BETTRIDGE, chair of University Studies (UNST) Council, brought the **motion** from the Council [**October Agenda Attachment E.4**] to modify the process for adding existing courses to existing upper-division clusters, viz.:

The University Studies (UNST) Council **moves** that existing courses approved by the UNST Council for inclusion in clusters proceed directly to the Faculty Senate curricular consent agenda.

BETTRIDGE noted that these are courses which have already been approved by UCC (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee), so it is primarily a question of the alignment of courses with clusters. UCC is also in favor of this change. CARPENTER, consultant to University Studies (UNST) Council, said that according to UCC, that committee usually does not do anything with the proposals forwarded by UNST Council. The motion eliminates that UCC step. CARPENTER reiterated that both committees are highly in favor. It will save about four weeks in the process, and will help avoid crowding the May and June Senate agenda.

RUETER asked what is the process for making a new cluster—whether that goes through UCC. CARPENTER answered that, yes, new clusters must still go through UCC, especially since there must be a new Sophomore Inquiry course for a new cluster.

The **motion** was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators or questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

ANDREWS conveyed the President's apologies for his absence; he is chairing the American College and University Climate Commitment meeting in Atlanta today. A couple of points from the President would be included in the Provost's report.

2. Provost's Report

The remarks from ANDREWS included the following points. [For a detailed outline of the report by ANDREWS, see **Minutes Attachment G.2.**]

- A draft of the Strategic Plan will go out to campus no later than October 15th. There are plans to discuss it at the November Senate meeting. The planning team will host a Suds & Sliders event for faculty to give feedback; there be an ice-cream social aimed at students; also opportunity to give feedback on the web. The plan represents an amazing amount of work, and none of the ideas generated have been lost, even though the plan has to be written at a strategic level.
- Carmen SUAREZ has been appointed new Chief Diversity Office, after a search which produced about forty applicants with preferred qualifications; Dan CONNOLLY appointed new Dean of the School of Business Administration; and Maurice HAMINGTON appointed new Director of University Studies.
- The NWCCU accreditation team is visiting this week. In the previous cycle, we did not meet standards on three points: measurement of core themes, a process for reviewing tenured faculty members, and a process for reviewing academic programs. For points one and three we have checked off with the Commission through an interim report. This week we will be able to show them the progress we've made on point two, in part thanks to Senate. There will be sessions for faculty, staff, and students. The meeting on Friday is open to everyone; at that meeting, the commission gives us their report. The University will have opportunity later to correct any factual errors. Thanks are due to Robert HALSTEAD (OAA) for his considerable work on the report, as well as to all those who served on the various committees.
- Drop-in conversations will continue this year.

- Reach out to new faculty.
- Nominations for the honorary doctorate are welcome. Recognizing that confidentiality is a concern, nominators should give whatever information they can about the nominee.
- The Provost called for applause for the work on post-tenure review, and thanked AAUP for working with the administration over the summer to develop an MOU. We will find things which need improvement; if anyone finds something which is not working well, please let us know, because the process is supposed to benefit faculty and departments.
- In regard to the budget: we went through a number of years of reducing our budgets in order to get rid of a deficit. For fiscal year 2015 we said that we could not do all balancing through reductions, especially on the academic side. We need to be concerned about both quality of the University and student access. For FY 2015, filling the \$5.4 million deficit included both \$2.4 million in cuts but also \$3 million of growth. This year, going into FY 2016, we are funding all new growth. Our budget process is bottom-up. Departments can tell us, “Here’s where we want to grow, here’s where we think we can grow, here’s where we need to shrink.” This year we were able to provide resources for direct cost of any additional instruction in order to meet increasing demand. The goal is to continue to do that, but also ensure that quality does not erode. The goal is to fund new growth, but also look at disparities in areas of growth, or areas in which faculty are heavily involved in scholarship but still have significant teaching obligations—to be able to fill those holes. Over next several years, strategic enrollment management planning and performance based budgeting will begin to change those things. The process is not easy to understand. Faculty are urged to come to the upcoming November forum to learn how the budget works and become part of the process.
- The Attachment includes OAA’s anticipated plan for collective work with the Senate this academic year; for each issue, there will be contacts in OAA.
- The certificates just approved give evidence that it is possible to do interdisciplinary work with the new budget model. They are two excellent examples. In fact, the new budget model makes this kind of work easier; chairs and deans can provide ways to make it happen in an environment in which we are not just being asked to do more with less.

LIEBMAN asked what happens at the accreditation meeting. ANDREWS replied that one never knows for sure, but that members of the accreditation team will likely just want to hear what faculty have to say. They focus at a high level, but probably do want input from faculty. Look at the self-study to see what kind of questions the accreditation team is interested in. The final session is not interactive: rather, an announcement by the team of their findings. LIEBMAN asked for the relevant website. ANDREWS replied that it is listed in *Currently* and also on the OAA webpage.

ANDREWS expressed thanks for a great start to the academic year. [Applause.]

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:30 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 November 2015
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, Donlan, Dusschee, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harris, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, Loney, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, Mukhopadhyay, O'Banion, Padin, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters, Yesilada

Alternates Present: Weber for Daim, Thieman for De La Vega, Strecker for de Rivera, C. Hanson for Harmon, Daasch for Siderius, Gioia for Taylor

Members Absent: Brodowicz, George

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Everett, Fountain, Hines, Liebman, Marrongelle, Marshall, Moody, Natter, Percy, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The **5 October 2015 Minutes** were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **OAA Response to October Report of Senate Actions** (concurrence) was noted [November Agenda Attachment C.1].
2. **Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary**

BEYLER announced that Senate district assignments, including a list of e-mail addresses for faculty in each district, had been circulated to senators. Any questions about the assignments should be directed to the Secretary.

E-mail communication to the Secretary should be sent to his individual account, r.beyler@pdx.edu. The address secretary@pdx.edu as well as the Faculty Senate e-mail list were used for outgoing communications, but it would be best for individual messages to use the former address.

BEYLER reminded senators that the next meeting would take place on **30 November** in lieu of the regular December schedule because of exam week and several other considerations. Neither a quorum nor an agenda was anticipated for 7 December.

GRECO introduced Carolina GONZALEZ-PRATS, student trustee on the PSU Board of Trustees. GONZALEZ-PRATS announced the opening of the application and search process, from November 2nd through November 25th, for the next student trustee for the term 2016-18. She asked senators to disseminate this news, identify students with service and leadership potential, and encourage well qualified students to apply. Faculty with questions could contact her at mgonza2@pdx.edu.

BEYLER reminded senators that item E.2 had been added to the agenda that had been originally circulated. This addition had been disseminated by e-mail; hard copies were now also available.

3. Announcement about on-line registration overrides

BACCAR (in her capacity as Registrar) announced a change in certain course registration procedures. The goldenrod special registration form had served its purpose and was now (tearing the form in two) being replaced by a new procedure. [Laughter and applause.] The form has been used for faculty to make exceptions to restrictions on course registration including prerequisites, class level, major or college. Several years ago an electronic version of this form was released to department chairs and department staff. This functionality is now being extended so that any primary instructor for a course (the primary instructor associated with a CRN) can go on-line, as with submitting grades, and make one of these overrides. Overrides may be specific or general. This will also allow students to add up through week two without physically submitting a paper form. After the first day of class, when the automated wait list is turned off, instructors will also then be able to override course capacity using this procedure. Note, however, that lifting the restriction does not automatically enroll the student in the course: the student still needs to take that step using the course registration process. This new system will be launched in December or January; the Registrar's office will be doing outreach to departments and offering training sessions.

In answer to a question, BACCAR clarified that this system cannot be used to drop a student from a course: only to lift restrictions.

In answer to another question, BACCAR stated that if departments still want to manage this centrally (rather than leaving it to individual instructors), that would be a matter of training faculty about how to use the process.

4. Discussion Item: Draft of the PSU Strategic Plan

In preparation for the discussion item, GRECO reviewed the calendar of relevant events and outlined some procedures for the discussion. On the previous Monday (26 October) there was a forum with a panel of faculty and staff who had participated in writing the plan. In the present Senate meeting, PERCY, Chair of the Strategic Plan Development Team (SPDT), would give a presentation, followed by questions and comments. The

drafting committee will be meeting on 6 November to revise the plan, so any suggestions for them to consider must be in by 5 November. GRECO said that she would collate any responses she received, or responses could be sent directly to PERCY. Faculty Senate had been asked to give feedback to the Board of Trustees. That would take the form a motion to be discussed and voted on at the next meeting on 30 November. Discussion today would inform that motion. GRECO envisioned the motion as including a brief statement that summarizes the general sense of the Senate about the Strategic Plan, and then going through the various initiatives and indicating how they align with faculty governance. The aim would be to show where the faculty voice can and should play a role in implementation, and find ways to constructively make the plan ours.

GRECO asked senators to state their name and unit in the discussion today, even though it will be taking place in committee of the whole, since it helps in answering questions to know where the question is coming from. She also urged senators to begin their remarks with “My question is ...” or “My comment is” The first formulation introduces a question that seeks a response. [Laughter.] The second formulation includes rhetorical questions for which no response is necessarily expected, though one may still be offered. The aim was to keep the discussion moving and to allow as many voices as possible to be heard. GRECO asked senators to avoid wordsmithing; any small edits of this sort could be sent to directly to the committee. The discussion in Senate should be at a general level. She reiterated that the Senate response would include a brief statement of the general feeling of Senate regarding the plan and then, regardless of that feeling, an indication of what Senate thought we (faculty) should then do.

PERCY prefaced his remarks by noting that as chair of the SPDT he was speaking on behalf of many voices and many types of participation. He thanked Holly MORAES, office manager and executive support in CUPA, for assisting him with the presentation. He also thanked GRECO and the Faculty Senate for the preliminary discussion last Monday, as well as a prior meeting with the Steering Committee, from which there had been useful feedback; he hoped for more of the same today.

PERCY reviewed the process of writing the plan and outlined the strategic goals. [See slides, **November Minutes Appendix C.4.**]

He emphasized that many different people have part of the process. SPDT is a group of thirty faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community people who began thinking about how to move the plan forward, provided guidance on process, did preliminary listening and screening of ideas and their impact. The goal was an open process; the task then was to sort through and organize the information received. The SPDT developed eight topic teams as a logical way to organize the array of ideas and concerns. Topic teams comprised faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administrators. Input was sought from many quarters.

PERCY noted that while issues of diversity and inclusion were important all along, the late Charlotte GOODLUCK (SSW) called for the plan to look explicitly at equity. The process was modified to include two equity lens panels, one focusing on issues of racial justice, and the other looking at issue of justice for a variety of other stakeholders. It was

desired to examine racial equity separately out of the sense that those questions are sometimes lost amidst everything else, while racial injustice and discrimination have so long been a part of our society and thus need to be called out specifically. The work of these panels definitely influenced the plan.

PERCY asserted that the outreach for input was the broadest in strategic planning that he had ever seen. Two strategic ice cream events generated over 800 items of input from a diverse range of students. Over 400 faculty and over 400 staff and administrators were involved, along with over 100 alumni and community members. Over 1800 comments came from unknown sources.

At end of 2014-15 academic year, seven people volunteered to organize this input and the contributions of the topic teams: Carlos CRESPO (SCH), Rob FULLMER (CLAS / HECC), PERCY (CUPA), Rayleen MCMILLAN (student/alumna), CeCe RIDDER (DMSS), Ethan SELTZER (USP), and THIEMAN (GSE). Aiming for a statement that was short and yet contained key values, they emphasized equity, sustainability, academic excellence, urban engagement, and expanding outreach. The vision talks about creativity, collective knowledge, sustainability, excellence in research and teaching, and fostering lifelong learners. The bulleted format was used on purpose for clarity to express these values for PSU: We achieve excellence through access, inclusion and equity. We have a commitment to curiosity, collaboration, and stewardship. We are problem solvers. We seek to treat people with integrity and respect.

PERCY described the next step as moving to substance. Multiple outlining and drafting exercises (THIEMAN still has all the drafts) resulted in defining five strategic goals, viz.:

- 1) "Elevate student success" should not be a surprise. Over the last ten years, it has received yet more attention at PSU, e.g., through recognizing needs to students from disadvantaged backgrounds, efforts to improve retention, concern with quality of teaching and teaching modalities. Pathways should be clarified and programs designed with student success in mind. Students should be prepared also for career success. The graduate student representative made the point that graduate student success also needed explicit recognition.

- 2) "Advance excellence in teaching and research," recognizes central work in this area and seeks to develop it yet more. New modalities and methodologies of teaching are being investigated, including ways to teach more effectively on-line. We want to recognize outstanding research and creativity; we want to celebrate outstanding research and reward it more. We want to make investments that advance our cause, reflect our plan, and seize opportunities. We want an array of programs that reflects our academic priorities.

- 3) "Extend our leadership in community engagement." PSU is nationally and internationally recognized as a leader in community engagement. PERCY noted that this was how he first became acquainted with PSU; while working on this issue at another institution, he was directed to PSU as the gold standard in this area. Can we take this tradition and history and build on it yet more, and even enhance our reputation? We

ought to grow PSU's status as an anchor institution in the community. We ought to make partnerships more visible and accessible.

4) "Expand our commitment to equity" aims at a bolder statement of elements that were there before. It is exciting, challenging, and will take a lot of work to make this happen. We will have to push ourselves. How can we make hiring more effective and attractive? How can we broaden international opportunities? How can we better define and measure our outcomes?

5) "Innovate for long-term stability" talks about ways to inspire more community support. PERCY referred to the recent Simon Benson event, which was inspirational in revealing interest in and support for PSU. Work on philanthropic support is needed. We need to diversify types of support, and minimize reliance on any single source. Communication is critical; we need to overcome the common sense that "I don't know enough about what is going on around here."

PERCY concluded that it is important to keep in mind the long, thoughtful discussions that lay behind the document. One example was discussion about the question of geographical reach or perspective. Some people emphasize the connection to and embeddedness in Portland and the region, and advocate that we stay true to this part of our identity. Others, however, emphasize that they are doing international work and that their research goes beyond the region, and look to study abroad opportunities and international students at PSU. This is all legitimate but shows a tension we have amongst ourselves. The team sought to craft a language and approach that was inclusive. He asserted that while we may not achieve an ideal plan, this is an effective real plan. Performance indicators are necessary to measure progress, and also very important for the Higher Education Coordinating Committee (HECC). But this is still a work in progress; key elements are missing, and we need to commit to work together in implementation to find a better and broader set of indicators. He stated that input is still valuable and needed; e.g., a recent comment about advising capacity is not simply measured in numbers.

In implementation, PERCY stated, faculty participation will be important to the much work still needed. Specific ideas have been captured and will be shared with those people and organizations charged with implementation.

PERCY called for recognition of those present who had worked on various aspects of the plan. [Applause.]

TALBOTT / RAFFO **moved** that the Senate resolve itself into a **committee of the whole**; the motion **carried** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:46).

During the discussion, various senators offered comments on the draft of the Strategic Plan and asked questions which were answered by members of the SPDT who were present, including PERCY, THIEMAN, and MCMILLAN.

At the conclusion of the discussion, B. HANSEN / CLARK **moved** that the Senate return to **regular session**; the motion **carried** by unanimous voice vote (at 4:34).

PERCY again thanked the Senate for taking the time to help the SPDT in its work.
[Applause.]

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

There having been no objections by the end of roll call, the curricular proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and UNST Council listed in **November Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**.

2. Resolution from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate: Addressing Violence in Our Schools

HINES as lead representative from PSU to Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) reported that after the shootings at Umpqua Community College, IFS decided as a group that violence in schools is a teaching and learning issue, that it is an academic issue. Together with Ben CANNON, chair of HECC, IFS talked about initiating a state-wide conversation, involving faculty to think about solutions. The result was a short resolution along with a statement of rationale beyond the resolution itself. [See **November Agenda Attachment E.2.**] IFS is hoping for unanimous ratification by the faculty senates of the member institutions. The proposed resolution has three parts, viz.:

1. **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Portland State University Senate offers its deepest sympathy and condolences to the families of the victims and to the survivors of the Umpqua Community College (UCC) shooting, and to all those whose lives have been directly affected by this tragedy;
2. **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Portland State University Senate agrees to work with the IFS to address the threat of violence in our schools through means appropriate to our campus;
3. **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Portland State University Senate supports the efforts of IFS to collaborate with the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) to convene a statewide conversation regarding violence in our schools, including gun violence, which will lead to meaningful action.

HINES stated that it was important to the faculty members of IFS that the conversation be grounded in evidence and lead to effective action. She acknowledged also the presence at IFS of PSU representatives PADIN and Robert MERCER.

RUETER asked why reference to evidence-based studies was not included in the resolution. HINES answered that this question definitely did come up in the discussion at IFS. She believed that the writers of the resolution aimed at a concise statement containing language acceptable to all of the faculty senates, and that they saw faculty

participation as the route to ensure discussion based on evidence. PADIN agreed that faculty participation was key. GAMBURD was reminded of last year's conversation about arming campus security guards. Making our university safer might mean different things to different people, echoing the previous discussion of diversity in connection with the Strategic Plan. Might this not lead to a privileging of one particular point of view in such discussions? HINES asserted that the intent was not to favor one particular reading, but rather to open the door to a statewide conversation in which faculty from the IFS institutions are deeply represented.

MACCORMACK / B. HANSEN **moved** the above resolution proposed by IFS.

LAYZELL asked if it the resolution was worth it: we are against violence, and so ... ? HINES answered that IFS wants to do is engage faculty senates at all the public institutions in continuing conversations with IFS and HECC. LAYZELL asked again if we needed a resolution to do that. HINES responded that it doesn't hurt, and the goal is to show unanimity of support for this process across the state. JAÉN PORTILLO asked how we would move from conversation to action. HINES said the point is to push faculty participation, and that IFS would be tracking this and looking for participation and input from the faculty senates. Informed conversations would generate research; to wait for research results was putting the cart before the horse.

The resolution was **adopted** by majority voice vote (two nays, one abstention).

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

WIEWEL conveyed some of his key goals. [See **November Minutes Appendix G.1.**] He expressed appreciation for the good discussion of the Strategic Plan, and for the enormous time and effort spent by those who had been working on the plan. Many of the comments heard today can be accommodated; some merit further discussion. His own goals would be adjusted as the plan is finalized.

Another key goal was finalizing the accreditation process. We received some commendations and also some recommendations, but nothing that we can't deal with.

We would work hard in the February [legislative] session to get approval of additional funding in the state budget. Current word about views in the legislature is not encouraging: they are nervous about revenues and PERS costs in the next biennium. Therefore we need to scale down expectations about state funding coming out of the February session.

WIEWEL pointed out PSU's new marketing campaign.

WIEWEL stated that he is pleased with the progress in negotiations with the three PSU unions. The bargaining process is slow and sometimes painful, but productive.

The Board of Trustees has asked for key performance indicators. WIEWEL welcomed suggestions for these, but asked all to bear in mind the cost and effort required to collect certain kinds of data.

PSU continues to work with HECC, and is concerned that HECC not become simply another version of OUS (Oregon University System). WIEWEL suggested that nature abhors an organization vacuum, and that with the disappearance of the previous organization, the respective roles of individual institutions and their boards and of HECC entails something of a tug-of-war, albeit a friendly and collegial one.

According to WIEWEL the situation is as good as it has been during his time at PSU. Last year was PSU's best fundraising year ever: \$48 million was four times as much as was raised during his first year. It was the best year in the legislature that higher education had ever had, with 25% more funding and a change in the funding allocation model that will benefit us. It was his first year at PSU that budget cuts were not necessary. Non-resident enrollment continues to go up, which is good for the fiscal bottom line but also says something about perceived quality. PERCY already referred to Simon Benson Award event last Thursday. 1500 civic, business, and political leaders celebrated PSU; the students' speeches had people in tears, moved by these stories of adversity overcome. WIEWEL also noted that while he did not grow up to be a football fan, the presence of over 11,000 people in the rain—PSU's biggest event—and the story being on the front page of the sports section does matter.

WIEWEL then showed three advertisements for the marketing campaign mentioned earlier: <http://www.pdx.edu/fearless/let-knowledge-serve>. He pointed out that the ads include not actors, but rather PSU faculty and students showing examples of the excellence that goes on every day. [Applause.]

2. Provost's Report

ANDREWS ceded her time to the President's Report, but circulated written comments. [See **November Minutes Appendix G.2.**]

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:55 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 30 November 2015
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present: Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carstens, Chang, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, de Rivera, Donlan, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Layzell, Lindsay, Loney, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, Mukhopadhyay, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Taylor, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters

Alternates Present: Puyear for O'Banion

Members Absent: Carder, De La Vega, Dusschee, Harris, Labissiere, Riedlinger, Yesilada

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Connolly, Everett, Fountain, D. Hansen, Hines, Jhaj, Liebman, Marrongelle, Marshall, Mercer, Moody, Natter, Reese, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The **30 November 2015 Minutes** were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **OAA Response to November Notice of Senate Actions** (concurrence) was noted [Agenda Attachment C.1].
2. **Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary**

GRECO reminded senators to pick up a clicker for upcoming votes. BEYLER described the procedure: the question would be displayed on the screen; a vote of "1" would mean "yes"; a vote of "2" would mean "no"; a vote of "3" would mean "abstain."

GRECO/BEYLER announced that two items had been pulled from the Consent Agenda by notification prior to the meeting: E.1.c.10 (SpEd 425) and E.1.c.12 (ESM 493). No other objections having been raised, the rest of the Consent Agenda (other than E.1.c.10 and E.1.c.12) was **approved**.

GRECO announced the upcoming Winter Symposium on January 20th: “What Does It Mean to Be Educated in the 21st Century?” The theme aimed at how to educate our students to be engaged in communities and professions; and how to balance wisdom and information, career and civic formation, free and safe speech, academic and societal expectations. Later Senate will be looking to create a task force to frame specific recommendations.

GRECO relayed a plea from student government to address problems of student food insecurity. In particular, faculty should take note of the ASPSU Food Pantry, open Monday through Friday 12-2 in Smith 325. She urged faculty to consider making donations (sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/psufoodpantry/donate).

3. Update on Collective Bargaining

Anticipating the next item, GRECO in the interest of disclosure reminded senators that in addition to being Presiding Officer she is a member of AAUP bargaining team. She had decided, in view of previous misunderstandings on campus, to do both [jobs] to show that they work together: the Senate represents faculty interests, the union represents faculty welfare, together working for the betterment of students. She then invited Shelly CHABON (Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development) and Pam MILLER (SSW, President of PSU-AAUP) to give an update on bargaining.

MILLER remarked that it was the last day of the 2013-2015 collective bargaining agreement. Negotiations for the next contract are being done using interest-based bargaining [IBB]. [See **Minutes Appendix C.3.**] In that spirit there would be a joint presentation by the union and the administration. Both teams received training in IBB, and are grateful to Janet GILLMAN, facilitator from the Oregon Employment Relations Board. IBB involves seven-step process wherein the parties identify common interests, exchange data, brainstorm options, and eventually agree on a solution. Bargaining began in May, and continued through the summer. Four sessions (24 hours) are scheduled for December, and sessions also anticipated for January and February, with the [previous] contract extended to February 29th. There had been about 150 hours of bargaining so far.

MILLER recognized members of the union’s bargaining team: Leanne SERBULO (UNST), vice-president for collective bargaining; Anh LY (ECN), Michael CLARK (MCECS), Ron NARODE (GSE), David HANSEN (SBA), Gina GRECO (WLL), Phil LESCH (AAUP), and MILLER. Also there were two student representatives: Eric NOLL and Liddy CHAMPION.

CHABON recognized members of the administration’s bargaining team: Robert BUCKER (COTA), CHABON, Lois DAVIS (PO), Ramon DIAZ (HR), Carol HAWKINS (OAA), Scott MARSHALL (OAA), Leslie MCBRIDE (SPH), David REESE (General Counsel/Board of Trustees), Dana TASSON (SHAC), Patricia WILLIAMS (OAA).

CHABON outlined some of the accomplishments and issues of importance so far. The parties agreed to ground rules, including having a facilitator at each session. GILLMAN

had asked the teams to jointly participate on a panel with her to discuss IBB [with other employers and unions]. Letters of agreement [LOAs] had been signed on continuing the Task Force on Academic Quality; on creating a Standing Committee on Work-Life Balance. A tentative agreement [TA] had been reached regarding a donated sick-leave bank. They had signed an LOA on transition for non-tenure-track instructional faculty transition; reached a TA on continuous appointment for NTTF; signed an LOA proposal on tenure for teaching; an LOA on emeritus rank for NTTF; an LOA on regular developmental review for NTTF; and an LOA on summer session minimum salary. The teams were currently engaged in discussions about Article 17: questions about status of academic professionals, career path, and salary.

MILLER highlighted two TAs. One provided job security for NTTF, with provision that annual contracts would only be used under special circumstances. She characterized this as a model that other universities will look at. She thanked those who had served on the bargaining team and those who had worked on the Article 18 task force. Second, she highlighted that summer school wages are now in the contract, such that summer term pay will be at the same rate as in the academic year. Administration and AAUP will look at how summer school goes in 2016 to see if additions or changes are necessary. She thanked members who participated in focus groups and department visits.

CHABON humorously remarked she had not yet seen so much excitement for something she had done. [Laughter.]

MILLER acknowledged that there was still much work ahead, with possibility of rough waters: finishing work on academic professionals, issues involving economics (i.e., money). They would be looking at cost of living adjustments, salary increases, compression, inversion, sabbatical pay, continuous appointments for research faculty, professional development, and retirement options. She recounted that she had had to tell a new faculty member that COLAs were not automatic, and reported the faculty member had serious concerns about housing costs and whether staying at PSU was feasible. She asserted that this concern was widespread, and that wages must keep up with inflation. They had also briefly considered a contract that would go longer than two years. She urged faculty to work toward the “imagine” theme of education that is student-centered, educator-led, and debt-free. She noted that part-time faculty were also in bargaining through PSUFA and that the two unions were working to try to achieve fair agreements. MILLER reminded members that they would need to ratify all the agreements that had been discussed. She urged members to come to bargaining sessions; to monitor updates at imagineportlandstate.com; to talk to colleagues about working conditions and to students about the educational experience.

4. Announcement on Enrollment and Resource Planning

BOWMAN, chair of the Budget Committee, indicated that colleges and schools are now preparing the budget for fiscal year 2017. Budget Committee is meeting with ANDREWS and MITCHELL to give comment on the colleges’ and schools’ plans. In anticipation of a meeting on Thursday [December 3rd] BOWMAN wished to ask senators also to provide feedback to pass on, and to ask constituents. Plans are online at

tinyurl.com/pdx17. Each of the eleven units has an enrollment narrative. Eight units are asking for additional resources and hence have a resource plan.

BOWMAN demonstrated how to use the files. The files included five years' worth of data on student credit hours by department; the narrative presented the trends and what the college/school believes enrollment will be. If there is a difference, a note explains the difference. Given the current budget, what would the college be generating? The resource plan is a statement of what might be generated with additional resources and investments. He briefly demonstrated a particular example from CLAS.

BOWMAN solicited comments or questions about the plans to pass on.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

With the exception of items E.1.c.10 (SpEd 425) and E.1.c.12 (ESM 493), which had been pulled by notification prior to the meeting, the curricular proposals from the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee listed in **Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**, there having been no other objection prior to the end of roll call.

In response to a question from the floor, BEYLER stated that items pulled from the Consent Agenda could be discussed as separate items at this point. Otherwise, it was his understanding from the parties involved that these items would appear again, possibly revised, as part of the Consent Agenda at a later meeting.

2. Resolution on Task Force on Review of NTTF for Continuous Appointments

GRECO introduced a proposal from the Steering Committee to create a Task Force on Review of NTTF [**Agenda Attachment E.2**].

BOWMAN/TAYLOR **moved** the proposal for creation of the task force as published in the agenda.

GRECO referred senators to the joint summary of bargaining. The Senate would be voting on a motion to create a consistent system of review for non-tenure-track instructional faculty. Bargaining has proposed eliminating the annual contract except for specific events such as sabbatical replacement. There would be annual reviews during a six-year probationary period; there would then be a milestone review for movement into continuous appointment; thereafter, reviews would be every three years. A problem, according to GRECO, was that some departments now did not review their NTTF, so there needed to be a campus-wide agreement on what this review should look like.

WEBB asked whether the review would be done by promotion and tenure committees. GRECO answered that this was one of the questions the task force would work on. Bargaining has stated that the system must be consistent and developmental, but they have not created the system: that is for the Senate to do.

WENDL asked whether this included all adjunct professors. GRECO answered no, it is for non-tenure-track [full-time] faculty.

ELZANOWSKI said that on the one hand he was for the proposal in principle, but on the other hand wondered whether we were creating a task force for a task which might not be approved. GRECO answered that a tentative agreement had been signed.

ELZANOSWKI responded that the word “tentative” was just his point. He asked whether AAUP would vote on individual articles. GRECO answered that AAUP would vote on the whole package. ELZANOWSKI reiterated that we were creating a task force for something that might never be approved. GRECO granted that this was a possibility, but described it as unlikely given our history. It would be an option to wait till the contract were approved, but then there would be no system in place to implement it.

PERLMUTTER wondered about the logic of a three-year cycle for review for NTTF as opposed to the five-year cycle for post-tenure review. GRECO indicated that this is something that may be revisited in future bargaining, but that the administrative team had felt strongly about not going beyond three years. The contract can be changed in the future. She further observed that there is a transition plan with a shorter probationary period for faculty already at PSU.

D. HANSEN raised a concern about the timeline. GRECO responded the timeline was a suggestion. She pointed out that when (if) the contract is ratified it will go into effect immediately, so that there is an impetus to have the system articulated before the new academic year begins. She conceded the timetable is ambitious. After consideration of the motions in Senate today, she would send out a request for self-nominations for the task forces, and this would save the time of Committee on Committees having to go through their lists. She knows that it will be a lot of work, but she hoped that people who had good ideas would be willing to serve in this way.

DAIM raised what he termed a technical question: How is this process different from tenure? Why go through the tenure process? GRECO answered that tenure lines have a different pay scale in many disciplines; teaching loads may be different; in many departments there is a lower percentage of tenure lines among instructional faculty. People don't always have a choice what kind of line is available.

The Presiding Officer called for a vote.

The **motion** to create a Task Force on Continuous Review of NTTF, as published in the agenda, was **approved** by a vote of 43 ayes, 6 nays, and 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

3. Resolution on Task Force on Emeritus Rank for NTTF

GRECO introduced the proposal regarding emeritus rank for NTTF. Some departments have given emeritus status to NTTF, but most have not; it is inconsistent. A letter of agreement was signed, and it is up to Senate to determine the specifics. The proposed motion is to create a task force to explore the question of emeritus status for NTTF [**Agenda Attachment E.3**].

CARSTENS/HARMON **moved** the creation of the task force.

ELZANOWSKI asked whether this would be a separate task force. GRECO: yes. ELZANOWSKI then asked whether it would be easier to have just one. GRECO: no, in her opinion. She argued that to have the result voted on at the June meeting means it will have to be read at the May meeting, since it is a constitutional change. To charge one task force to do all of this would fail in the timeline. The emeritus task force would have to work with people from IT, Facilities, Library, Athletics, etc., on issues of sustainability if numbers of emeritus faculty are increased greatly. This task force would thus be dealing with different people about different questions [than the previous one].

The Presiding Officer called for a vote.

The **motion** to create a Task Force on Emeritus Rank for NTTF, as published in the agenda, was **approved** by a vote of 41 ayes, 8 nays, and 3 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

4. **Resolution on Continuation of Task Force on Academic Quality**

GRECO introduced the next proposed motion on the Task Force on Academic Quality, which she characterized as a housekeeping measure; the task force is being recharged with support through the contract [**Agenda Attachment E.4**].

GAMBURD/B. HANSEN **moved** the continuation of the task force.

The Presiding Officer called for a vote.

The **motion** to continue the Task Force on Academic Quality, as published in the agenda, was **approved** by a vote of 45 ayes, 4 nays, and 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

5. **Resolution Regarding the Strategic Plan**

GRECO introduced the proposed resolution in response to the Strategic Plan (SP) [**Agenda Attachment E.5**].

RUETER/CLARK **moved** the resolution for consideration.

GRECO characterized the proposed resolution as a summary or compilation of material expressed at the Senate symposium [of October 26th], the Senate meeting [of November 2nd], and written messages.

RUETER expressed amazement that after all the time spent, work of committees, etc., new ideas were mentioned at Senate including key performance indicators (KPIs) and distinguished faculty ranks and that these are included in the response. He asked about the process of composing the proposed response. GRECO answered that it was drafted by her in consultation with the Steering Committee, based on her notes and sense of the room and the reactions of the SP development team who were present. RUETER followed up that he did not like either of these ideas as part of the SP. Distinguished faculty status was a matter for promotion and tenure committee. KPIs were an added dimension; originally the SP talked about indicators of success and did not attempt to boil these down to an index. GRECO observed that the draft SP had KPIs; the response was to the effect that should also reflect quality and not be limited to easy numbers. RUETER wished the Secretary to write down that he didn't like these ideas. GRECO responded that she didn't understand what RUETER didn't like. RUETER stated that he thought the draft SP was a coherent document, and that adding quality to KPIs created problems. People would develop measures [of success] anyway; trying to add quality indices was a much bigger task. Similarly the question of distinguished faculty: what would be the criteria? GRECO pointed out that KPIs had been removed from the updated version of the SP. She had received much feedback to the effect that KPIs in the draft only referred to quantitative data; there was concern among faculty that this was an invitation to slippage in quality. Faculty wanted to track quality also in some way, though this would be difficult. But in any event the KPIs had been removed from the latest version of the SP.

MONSERE asked whether the language about distinguished faculty status was binding. GRECO answered that it was not binding; a future committee would discuss it, but Senate would have to review and approve any concrete proposals. The language in the Senate response modifies the language in the draft SP, along the lines of OSU's guidelines, which Steering Committee had found helpful: distinguished status entails a national/international profile, but it is reachable in a variety of ways.

D. HANSEN, reverting to RUETER's comments, observed that the [SP draft] he responded to contained KPIs but not targets. He wished for clarification: did the SP to be presented to Board of Trustees have KPIs or not? GRECO reiterated that the SP version of November 18th [viz., a version later than the one discussed by Senate on November 2nd] had removed all KPIs. WIEWEL clarified that the SP development team, based on the Senate discussion and also conversation within the team, thought that more work needed to be done on KPIs, with not enough time before the deadline. The KPIs could be set aside for now; they still need to be developed, but are not integral to the plan itself. Moving forward, there are many moving parts to the SP. Rather than having solidified, permanently fixed KPIs, the current version creates more flexibility.

BLUFFSTONE stated that the proposed response read like the minutes of a discussion and not an official response. He was thus uncomfortable with it on this latter basis. He asked whether it had been said that the discussion would form the basis of the response. GRECO stated the President had asked Senate to make a statement. She thought the best way to do this was to make a general thematic summary, while recording significant items that came up in the discussion. MAIER interjected that the Minutes stated that the

Senate had been asked to give a response to the Board of Trustees, which would take the form of a motion to be discussed and voted on at the next meeting, and that the discussion would inform that motion. BLUFFSTONE reiterated that this document would not be his choice of response. GRECO noted that while the response had been circulated in advance, there had not been any amendments, though suggestions from the floor were also in order.

LIEBMAN called attention to the structure of the resolution above and below the line [of asterisks]. Above the line, he suggested, was a general resolution about how the Senate would move forward [with the SP] through the coordination of its committees; this was an action item. Below the line was a list of specific responses. A question is whether these responses are current since the plan has been changed in the meanwhile. GRECO pointed out that the footnote in the resolution refers to possible changes in final draft of the SP. LIEBMAN said that he can't make a motion, but hoped the response could be time-stamped in some way. He emphasized: how can we move forward? Addressing that question had been the bulk of Steering Committee's work, he said, expressed on page one of the response up through the asterisks. If we regard [the SP] as a working document, then coordinating standing committees, task forces, etc., is how to move forward.

GAMBURD liked the approach of taking aspirational goals and implementing them through existing faculty governance structures. That was her sense of the resolution.

D. HANSEN asked for clarification of which version of SP was the basis of the resolution: evidently an earlier version, and not that being presented to the Board of Trustees. GRECO noted that the resolution states it is based on feedback received October 26th and November 2nd.

GRIFFIN observed that an endorsement of the SP was missing; he assumed that is what the SP committee wants. He maintained that the resolution presents a critique but not an overall assessment. He was unclear what the resolution was supposed to do by way of giving feedback to the SP committee.

TAYLOR echoed LIEBMAN's remarks; perhaps a stronger statement would stop at the asterisks.

RUETER/DE RIVERA **moved** an **amendment** in response to the above discussion:

that the passage at the end of the preamble, "After seeking a sense of the faculty at an open forum on October 26 and at a Senate meeting on November 2, and by inviting comments by email, we propose the following response," be changed to bold font and moved to the beginning of the resolution.

The **amendment** was **approved** by a vote of 34 ayes, 0 nays, and 12 abstentions (by show of hands).

PADIN reverted to GRIFFIN's remarks. He suggested that the Steering Committee was perhaps being circumspect, but noted that the resolution states that next steps will require

Senate participation as a partner in shared governance. He read this as Steering's statement that a role for Senate is currently not in [the SP] and this statement represents their effort to reinstate this role. GRECO suggested that it was perhaps assumed, but Steering Committee thought it would be helpful to state it explicitly. PADIN: this [element] was missing and Steering Committee is now reinstating it. GRECO: seeking to make it clear.

GAMBURD said that the sense on campus was that the SP embodied a lot of work and many good ideas, but that it was neither strategic nor a plan: much good stuff, but not an outline of how to get from here to there. It didn't seem productive, polite, respectful of the hard work to merely offer objections. She saw the resolution as saying that we can move forward through organs of faculty governance already established; Senate can and should and must be involved.

B. HANSEN agreed with RUETER's amendment, and with the points made by LIEBMAN and GAMBURD. The general response is to make the plan work through the channels that exist, along with three [critical] comments--prioritize academic quality, disentangle diversity [and equity], and prioritize global education. The question is not whether everyone agrees with all the details below the line, but whether the majority supports the general resolution.

SCHULER expressed the view that [the response] rebalances of a variety of traditions of inquiry, and opens gates for discussion across disciplines. Academia has internal variety and wrestles over the center, but on balance we can move forward by staying true to governance.

(D. HANSEN, as a point of information, referring to LIEBMAN's previous statement, observed that ex-officio members could offer motions though they could not vote.)

GRECO stated that Steering Committee, like many on campus, perhaps felt that the document lacked a strategy, that it collected information from thousands of people and, in trying to reach a consensus, didn't say something decisive. The priority was to have discussion, free exploration of ideas, critiques, and critiques of critiques. No one on Steering Committee wanted to write a strategic plan; their thought, rather, was to reflect faculty priorities. A separate resolution about endorsement might be possible, but the plan was a moving target and had been changed already.

B. HANSEN/RUETER **called the question**, which motion was **carried** by a show of hands of more than two-thirds of senators.

The **resolution** on the response of the Senate to the PSU Strategic Plan, as published in the agenda and **amended** above, was **approved** by a vote of 37 ayes, 9 nays, and 3 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

GRIFFIN/MONSERE then **moved**:

that the Faculty Senate endorse the Strategic Plan.

Multiple senators asked: which version? GRECO noted that the previous draft and the latest version are quite different. She asked who had read the latest draft. [Only a few members raised their hands.] It was asked whether Senate could see a final draft before deciding on endorsement. ELZANOWSKI stated that we cannot endorse something that does not exist: there is not a SP as such.

GRIFFIN asserted that the point was to give feedback to the Board of Trustees. He thought it was important to state that you are either generally endorsing the plan, in whatever draft you have read, or not. He stated that there were clearly senators who did not agree with the SP, who did not think it was worthwhile; it would be amiss for the Board of Trustees to think that we all endorse it. Or, if you are a senator who thinks that the gist of the SP is right, this should be stated clearly.

MACCORMACK wondered whether it would be possible to endorse the work of the SP committee. GAMBURD agreed that that process was very well done, that it elicited a great deal of feedback, that the conversations were valuable, and that there were many good ideas in the plan. Taking the view from 50,000 feet, it was difficult to see how the plan could be implemented as such, given budgetary restraints and choosing among possibilities. If we endorsed the document in its current living state, GAMBURD suggested, we endorsed the good ideas there. To say it provided a clear path would be [overly] ambitious. She would like to see a final document before endorsing it or not; she definitely endorsed the process.

WIEWEL appreciated the previous speaker's comments. He wished to offer a correction: Senate was not asked to approve the plan for the Board of Trustees. The board had charged him to put together a Strategic Plan drawing on the campus community. The development team drew on many inputs. There was no fixed process for approval other than the SP development team itself. The SP draft was brought to the Senate to seek further feedback. He viewed the resolution just passed as doing that very well: recognizing that not all components will happen at once (and some may never happen), it gives a general response and also lists several items of concern. These last are useful also. He noted that GRECO would be speaking to the Board to give further context. It's up to Senate whether or not to have another resolution of approval; it's not necessary. He agreed that it would be better to do that after a final version, which should be available on December 10th.

SCHULER observed that this was his fourth strategic plan; it represented hard work; what was important was not so much endorsement or disapproval but opening up avenues of discussion, learning about different generations and agendas, and renovation without radicalization.

WENDL stated from her perspective on the SP committee that communication to colleagues how we could be proactive was more important than approval or disapproval. GRECO stated that in her view, that was the spirit of the resolution just passed.

B. HANSEN/DONLAN moved to table the motion then on the floor.

The **motion to table** was **approved** by a vote of 33 ayes, 11 nays, and 6 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

WIEWEL, thanking senators for the previous discussion, stated that the SP did indeed contain much strategic specificity. It was true, however, that it is not a work plan. A positive outcome of the resolution was that it pointed towards addressing issues through governance processes.

WIEWEL reported briefly on reactions to the shootings at Umpqua Community College. The Governor had convened a meeting of public and private universities on the subject, started a task force of the Higher Education Coordinating Committee (HECC), and asked the state police to develop response capacities. PSU would be hiring an emergency response coordinator. CPSO was offering training sessions to departments.

He called attention to nationwide conversations about race, diversity, and inclusion, and to his recent messages to campus about these issues. He noted an upcoming forum of students of color taking place on December 1st to collect input, and then present the results. He urged faculty attention to these issues: cultural awareness training; spaces and resources for specific groups; treatment in the classroom and the nature of the curriculum. The latter in particular—how particular traditions are honored—is clearly in the province of faculty responsibility.

He also noted that PSU would be hosting football playoff game against Northern Iowa on Saturday, December 7th.

WIEWEL outlined plans for a regional affordability initiative. The basis for this initiative was the ability of students to come to the university and continue studies, rather than not come at all, or to come and then drop out. Might not PSU have a unique opportunity to tap into local resources? U of O and OSU could tap into private philanthropy; although PSU is doing more in this direction, our foundation is still only \$50 million as opposed to \$500 or \$700 million.

WIEWEL said that there might be an opportunity to gather signatures for an initiative to be put on the ballot in November 2016 for a business payroll tax of approximately 0.1% to 0.2% in the area covered by Metro Council. A citizens committee was forming to write such an initiative, and to collect signatures for presentation to Metro. Such a business payroll tax is the way TriMet is funded, at 0.77%, raising about \$250 million annually. By comparison, 0.1% would raise about \$35 million per year. (Currently PSU receives from the state about \$70 million per year.) The money would be used 1) for scholarships for low- and moderate-income students from the Metro region and 2) other

forms of student support including academic advisors, financial advisors, staff, faculty, etc. There is no sense in getting students in the door if we can't help them succeed.

WIEWEL said that this might significantly change the financial structure of PSU. He said that we had just had the best year for state funding and that in his estimation it is unlikely to increase further. PSU is embarking on new fundraising campaign, but this will only go so far towards operating funds. PSU must continue to be smart about how we deliver education. He would continue to look at the HECC allocation formula. None of these efforts, however, would provide the equivalent funding. Businesses may be willing to support this measure, under the logic that they need an educated workforce. Relying on workers from elsewhere is, arguably, disadvantageous for the long-term future of the region. No one, of course, likes to be taxed. Nevertheless, WIEWEL had heard from numerous business people that, yes, PSU needs the money. No one had said to him: you will just waste it. A challenge for the initiative would be that a coalition of unions is going to present a \$2.5 billion tax proposal. The PSU measure, however, would be about 1/100 of that proposal.

HARMON wondered whether there would be concerted opposition. WIEWEL answered that there would likely be opposition to the union-sponsored ballot measure, and that opposition to the PSU measure might be swept in along with that. The PSU measure, however, was targeted and small, and this might prove to be more appealing.

TALBOTT asked what the community colleges [CCs] would think. WIEWEL conceded that their first reaction had been worry. However, CCs had additional streams of income; moreover, the measure would arguably help CC students who transferred to PSU.

LAYZELL asked whether the price point of the proposal had been fixed. WIEWEL indicated that this was still under study by those drafting the measure.

MONSERE wondered whether it were possible to target specific sectors with the payroll tax. WIEWEL responded that the idea had been floated, but on balance it seemed to complicate the measure too much. This question also entailed further study, however.

LIEBMAN asked if there had been successful campaigns of this type elsewhere, and if so what were the arguments? WIEWEL noted that the *Oregonian* had called the plan exotic and untried, which he took to be synonyms for creative and innovative. [Laughter.] For a while there was a municipal tax in Topeka, KS; there is a sales tax in Kansas City, KS for a research center. CUNY is a city institution, but it is supported by general funds.

D. HANSEN wondered if competitor institutions coming to Portland would have the same opportunity to pursue a payroll tax. WIEWEL: not realistically. PSU's case was unique; there is no other public comprehensive university here; 62% of PSU students come from the Metro area. The U of O and OSU presidents had said that they would not take a stance one way or the other. WIEWEL saw it as extremely improbable that they would seek a similar measure.

CLARK asked about the current level of support. WIEWEL's response was that there appeared to be considerable support, but that much would depend on further developments and the eventual specific wording.

SCHROCK asked if there was concern that a new source of revenue would lead to less funding from the legislature. WIEWEL noted that the legislature allocated funding to all seven public universities [collectively], and HECC by law distributes it according to a formula. The legislature would have to pass a new law specifically to the disadvantage of PSU: this was hypothetically possible, but quite unlikely. Politics is of course full of uncertainties, WIEWEL remarked. The Portland legislative delegation seemed to be generally supportive, though they do have some concerns.

2. Provost's Report

ANDREWS ceded her time to the President's Report.

3. Annual Report of the Internationalization Council

The annual report of IC was presented by Steve THORNE, chair [see **Agenda Attachment G.3**]. He noted that the Council is an administrative advisory committee, but its membership is drawn from the annual survey of faculty. Its purpose is to be an advisory group on internationalization of curriculum and research. It previously reported to Kevin REYNOLDS, but within last academic year switched to Margaret EVERETT [as Vice Provost for International Affairs]. In 2014, at the request of REYNOLDS, IC changed focus to improving international aspects of the curriculum, and promoting and disseminating internationally oriented research.

In the first arena, IC conceptualized an outline for a possible undergraduate certificate in global studies. THORNE referred to similar to moves around the country, e.g., Florida International and San Jose State. It would be a trajectory through existing curricula, something transcriptable indicating a global competencies background. Around 80% of department chairs were supportive, according to a survey. IC developed an outline that was (they hoped) broad-based and flexible, and would prepare students for global citizenship; intercultural communicative activity; contextual understanding of diverse world cultures; and a critical understanding of how colonialism, imperialism, etc., have affected the current era. It thus looks at the complications of globalization. Last spring the Department of International Studies was identified as the unit to develop a specific proposal for an undergraduate certificate.

In the second arena, IC carried out an internationalization grants competition. IC had \$30,000 to disseminate, while receiving over \$207,000 in requests from 58 applications. This illustrates, said THORNE, the power of PSU faculty to do good work; it was difficult to adjudicate among the proposals. Funded projects included international research programs, international internships, study abroad opportunities, dissemination of scholarship at international conferences and events. Included were projects involving Central and South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia.

THORNE stated that IC goals for 2015-16 included: review of the SP approach to internationalization; RFPs [requests for proposals] for internationalization of degree programs; a focus on China, including working with the Confucius Institute; internationalization initiatives using technology including virtual mobility, curricular co-sharing, and research teams networks. In this latter regard, there are plans for an RFP in spring for a faculty-in-residence for virtual internationalization.

4. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

PADIN, chair of EPC, presented its quarterly report [see **Agenda Attachment G.4**]. PADIN thanked his colleagues on the committee. Three main topics for the committee this fall have been. 1) Discussing a proposed STEM institute, based a current external grant of \$2.5 million over five years, one of whose deliverables is such an institute. 2) Taking a fresh look at on-line education, in response to request by Steering Committee last year, particularly in regard to quality. Senate had an ad-hoc committee in 2011; probably a new ad-hoc committee is needed. There is much new research on what types of on-line courses work for what types of students. 3) Receiving early feedback about the possibility of a bachelor's in applied sciences degree.

RUETER noted that the idea of an a bachelor's in applied science degree had been unfavorably reviewed by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate as being akin to vocational training. He urged examination of the relevant articulation agreements.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:05 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 January 2016
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, Loney, MacCormack, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Taylor, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters, Yesilada

Alternates Present:

Hellermann for Childs, Weber for Daim, Cortez for Epplin, Kaimanu for Harris, Eichsteadt for McElhone, Dusicka for Monsere

Members Absent:

Maier, Mukhopadhyay, O'Banion, Raffo

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews, Beyler, Fountain, Fraire, D. Hansen, Jhaj, Kinsella, Marrongelle, Marshall, Moody, Percy, Wiewel

[NOTE: THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING REGULARLY SCHEDULED FOR THE FIRST MONDAY OF JANUARY WAS DEFERRED TO 11 JANUARY BECAUSE OF THE CLOSURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ON 4 JANUARY DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER.]

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **30 November 2015 Minutes** (rescheduled December meeting) were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. OAA Response to December Notice of Senate Actions, concurrence, was registered [January Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary

None

3. Winter Symposium, “What it means to be educated in the 21st century”

GRECO reminded senators about the Winter Symposium on January 20th. It will feed into a February Senate discussion on liberal education February. There is a need for table hosts.

3. Discussion Item: Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty

GRECO introduced the discussion topic [see **Appendix C.3**]. Reverting to a question at the previous meeting, she compared continuous appointment and tenure positions. Continuous

appointment provides better job security than non-tenure-track faculty [NTTF] had previously; tenure gives yet greater job security. Continuous appointment is ongoing; tenure is indefinite. Both types of appointment can be terminated. Either one can be terminated for cause, or under retrenchment. A continuous appointment can be terminated if there is a change in curricular need resulting in elimination of that position; this does not happen with a tenured line. A continuous appointment can also be terminated if there is an unsatisfactory review and failure to remediate within a year.

After this overview, GRECO stated that she believed the benefits of tenure were clear. She believed that, nonetheless, moving towards continuous appointments for NTTF was a good direction.

GRECO clarified that retrenchment requires declaration of financial exigency, and that layoffs within a department would be in the order: fixed-term faculty; then faculty on annual tenure (tenure-track faculty who have not yet received tenure); then faculty on indefinite tenure.

GRECO reviewed the minimum salaries for various ranks. There are [currently] continuous appointments at assistant professor and associate professor ranks; these ranks are grandfathered, but they will not be employed for future hires. Continuous appointments also include professors of practice. There is thus a financial interest in tenure-line positions.

GRECO reminded senators that last month the Senate approved creation of a task force to develop a process for review of NTTF for continuous appointments. The new contract will require review of people in a timely matter. The members of the task force have been appointed and a first meeting scheduled.

GRECO asserted that continuous appointments are good for faculty, in that they can concentrate on the job they have [rather than seeking the next one]; good for students, who depend on faculty for letters of recommendation, etc.; good for departments, who can invest in people that they rely on; good for shared governance, in that when we make a commitment to people we ask them also to make a commitment to us; it's thus good for those in tenure lines, because duties can be shared; it's good for academic freedom, in that with more security people may feel more free to say what they think.

Senate has now been asked to consider creating another task force, this one to explore the idea of teaching-intensive tenure lines and to report in about 1½ years.

GRECO displayed a draft of a proposed Senate resolution [see **Appendix C.3**, slide 7]. The request came from collective bargaining that Senate explore the possibility of tenure for teaching-intensive positions. Steering Committee was sympathetic to the sense of both sides in bargaining that it was of interest to explore greater job security for faculty and to support academic freedom. Steering Committee additionally felt it was important to mark the role of the scholar-teacher, expressed in the third paragraph of the preamble. Next month there will be a vote on the proposal to create a task force which will: explore the question; conduct research and investigate models; gather input from across the campus; deliberate; and then return with to Senate with a proposal about if or how to proceed.

GRECO suggested possible pros and cons of the idea [**Minutes Appendix C.3**, slide 10]. Pros: increasing the percentage of tenured faculty; preserving academic freedom; making a healthier work environment in which people shared the same commitments and privileges

where possible. Risks included: uncertainties around creating two different tenure tracks; fear that some departments would become service departments with teaching-intensive lines as the only lines, and that only those parts of campus that brought in relatively large amounts of research dollars would retain traditional lines; undercutting the ideal of the scholar-teacher. GRECO hoped that Senate would indeed vote to create a task force next month: this would not be saying “yes” to the idea, but rather exploring it.

D. HANSEN / DONLAN **moved** that the Senate resolve itself into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 3:25).

During the discussion, numerous senators and ex-officio members asked questions about the concept of tenure for teaching-intensive faculty, and offered both supportive comments and critiques of the notion.

At the conclusion of the discussion, B. HANSEN / PADIN **moved** that the Senate return to regular session; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 3:58).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee listed in **January Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

[NOTE: THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION OF REPORTS WAS REVERSED FROM THAT INDICATED IN THE AGENDA]

1. Provost's Report

[See outline and tables: **Minutes Appendix G.1.**]

ANDREWS reminded senators of the drop-in conversations she is hosting and reiterated announcement of the Winter Symposium on 20 January.

ANDREWS discussed the integrated planning around for enrollment and budget. Schools and colleges have now developed their preliminary budget plan for FY17 [fiscal year 2017]. The budgeting part of the process has been accelerated. Previously, enrollment planning came first, then budget planning; this time, the two parts of the process are integrated. Thus, schools and colleges are looking at preliminary resource plans together with enrollment. These will continue to be refined over the next month. By March or April, OAA [Office of Academic Affairs] will look at overall enrollment planning as well as the budgets. There are still many variables to be determined.

ANDREWS noted several details. Last year OAA projected 1% growth in enrollment for FY16. In summer there was a significant decline from the projection. OAA is still trying

to figure out what happened: it was different for each school or college. In any case, summer enrollment was down about 6.7% from the projection, or about 6000 SCH [student credit hours].

ANDREWS reported that for the fall term, compared to last year, there was a slight increase in enrollment, or essentially flat. For winter term, we are tracking flat compared to last year. However, there are large variations day by day and so the overall trend is not yet fixed. She noted that revenue depends also on the mix of students, and that [the proportion of] non-resident students was up, so from the revenue perspective the projections of some growth were perhaps reasonable.

ANDREWS drew attention to information on retention [see **Appendix G.1**]. The numbers vary considerably from college to college and among departments. She stated that it is important for PSU to look at this, since it directly reflects the success of our students. We now, compared to a couple of years ago, have more students who are starting at PSU and not continuing to their second year. In the recently adopted Strategic Plan, student success is a major factor, so ANDREWS indicated that she would be looking carefully at retention in the coming year.

BLUFFSTONE noted that there has been flux in the summer program over the last several years, and asked what the administration was doing to energize it. ANDREWS replied that after every summer there was an analysis of the mix of classes and of students. She stated that this summer there will be a more coordinated promotion effort. ANDREWS observed that some prior expectations about summer term no longer hold: for example, that students living in Portland but in college elsewhere would take classes here during the summer. With on-line options from their own and other institutions, they now have other choices. CUPA learned that students are most interested in courses required for graduation, rather than electives, and also in on-line courses. ANDREWS noted that ads were taken out in campus newspapers, e.g., at University of Oregon and Oregon State. She solicited further ideas for publicity. We need to dig deep to figure out what is going on, because last summer's enrollment loss was significant.

BABCOCK expressed surprise that retention had gone down given efforts in advising, and asked how our data compared to that from other schools. ANDREWS said that Oregon State's retention rate continues to rise; that Eastern Oregon's has declined; she was not sure where the other state universities were [in terms of retention]. Many urban institutions around the country were seeing increases in their retention rate.

DE RIVERA asked about data on the preparedness of students who are leaving. ANDREWS said that student analytics make this easier to determine—whether they enter with a low GPA, fail particular required courses, have financial issues, etc. Departments have access to the EAB [Education Advisory Board] student success product and can aggregate data to look at what is happening for particular majors.

ANDREWS outlined the work of the Copyright Task Force, which grew out of the Textbook Affordability Task Force as charged by ASPSU and the provost. The latter group concluded that outdated PSU copyright policies did not reflect current faculty work. The Copyright Task Force has issued an interim report. ANDREWS listed the members and summarized their work so far in her handout [**Appendix G.1**]. The task force will probably propose to Faculty Senate a revision of the university's intellectual

property policies. She turned for further comment to Dean of the Library MOODY, co-chair of the task force.

MOODY emphasized that the results were preliminary, but that one key idea going forward is possibly changing from the default position that the university owns copyright, with certain specified exceptions, to the default position that individual faculty own the copyright, with certain specified exceptions. The task force is also looking considering what guidance documents would be most useful and necessary for faculty.

KAIMANU (for HARRIS) indicated that she had wanted to order a previous edition for a class textbook, whereas the bookstore insisted on ordering the new but essentially unchanged edition. She was trying to honor the principle of affordability for students. ANDREWS said that this question, or other issues with the bookstore, could be directed to her. She reminded faculty to place textbook orders as early as possible.

2. President's Report

WIEWEL took note of the passing away of Greg WOLFE, president of the university from 1968 to 1974, during which time Portland State College became Portland State University. He mentioned that Congressman Earl BLUMENAUER started his career as special assistant to President WOLFE.

WIEWEL indicated that enrollment for winter term is flat or a little bit higher than last year. The number of non-resident students continues an upward trend.

He recognized the successful fall athletic season, particularly for the football team which became the sixth seed nationally in post-season play. Bruce BARNUM had been named Big Sky Conference coach of the year and FCS national coach of the year. WIEWEL affirmed that BARNUM was doing a great job with the student athletes.

WIEWEL said that the administration was preparing for the short legislative session that would begin in early February. The seven state universities had asked for \$755 [million] and received about \$700 [million]. While receiving the complete balance was very unlikely, the state universities would now push collectively for \$15 [million] for the remaining year of the biennium. Focus would likely be on student success, advising, and retention. Another issue would be renewal of the University Venture Development Fund, which has been important for research on commercializable technologies.

WIEWEL drew attention to intense discussions starting toward the end of last term relating to issues of race, diversity, inclusion, and equality, and specifically to the event "Students of Color Speak Out" on December 1st which elicited powerful messages from a number of students. In response to the issues raised on that day, WIEWEL stated, the administration reached three quick decisions. One was to change title of the Chief Diversity Officer (Carmen SUAREZ) to Vice President of Global Diversity and Inclusion. Two additional demands were to create spaces—in addition to the existing Native American Educational Student Center, the Multi-Cultural Center, and the Casa Latina—for Black students and for Asian and Pacific Islander students. WIEWEL announced that the administration had committed to do this by the start of next academic year. Vice President John FRAIRE would be working with students on location of and programming for these centers. WIEWEL observed that there are other things on the list of demands, some of which ANDREWS has alluded to in her blog and other messages.

Many of these relate to the curriculum and the extent to which the contributions of people of color are recognized. These were complicated issues which WIEWEL could not tackle alone; they entailed conversations with faculty. Another complicated long-term issue, WIEWEL continued, is the challenge of having a faculty and staff that reflects the diversity of our student population. This is particularly in issue in Portland where the diversity of the community at large has been changing. Human Resources and the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion would become more proactive about providing search committees and hiring units with information and training to create diverse pools and deal with implicit bias. Another major topic is microaggressions, campus climate, and the extent to which people feel safe in the classroom; these often subtle issues required additional training and education. WIEWEL looked forward to working with Senate and the Steering Committee on these long-term, nationally relevant problems.

WIEWEL noted that issues of equity and diversity are addressed explicitly in the Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees at its December 10th meeting. He thanked Steve PERCY, chair of the Strategic Plan Development Team, as well as the many people who participated in topic teams and otherwise provided input. The report has been printed and will be circulated. WIEWEL believes it is a great product. The new plan was necessary, WIEWEL said, because of the new board, because the previous plan was several years old, and because we needed to establish where we are moving either together or with divergent ideas. The planning process accomplished all of these things, WIEWEL believed: there were deep and broad discussions and the resulting document reflected where we are collectively.

WIEWEL reported that the Board of Trustees on December 10th voted on a resolution delineating several approaches to affordability: more state funding, allocation of state funding by the HECC [Higher Education Coordinating Committee], [philanthropic] fundraising, efficiencies in daily operations, and authorizing exploring an affordability initiative through a payroll tax. Discussions with business leaders and other community members have continued. WIEWEL reported that a citizens committee would probably file the ballot initiative in early February. Anyone wanting additional information could contact him or Lois DAVIS (Vice President for Public Affairs). It was unclear how the initiative would fare, especially given the context of other initiatives, but there were some indications of positive public reaction.

PADIN observed that the president obviously felt positive about the initiatives regarding equity and inclusion taken at the end of the last term. He did not want to discourage the positive feeling, since that was something to build on. The timing of the initiatives and what he called their very modest scope, however, suggested to PADIN the hypothesis that these were token gestures. He wondered whether we could assess whether they were more than that. PADIN asserted that renaming bureaucratic positions or providing space for students had occurred in previous years, but that such moves had not made a dent in substantive issues of equity and inclusion. He remarked that in December articulate students—who were also pushing the envelope—had on that premise essentially shut down the Board of Trustees meeting. PADIN wished to register for the record the observation that we needed to watch whether token gestures were not good enough anymore.

WIEWEL replied that he, unsurprisingly, totally disagreed. He remarked that if the change of title was a token [gesture], it was a token that was explicitly asked for [by the

students], and provided within about 48 hours. Secondly, he regarded the request for the spaces as hardly a token; on the contrary they were very valuable, as demonstrated by the Casa Latina, which had been a major breakthrough. He professed surprise that such a request had not arrived earlier; when it did occur, it was met almost immediately. He characterized these as substantive improvements. Some of the other changes asked for are not things that he, the president, can effect by fiat: they reflect what is going on in classrooms and in labs throughout the institution, and they require an institution-wide effort. WIEWEL reiterated that they are not up to him alone but rather issues for the institution as a whole. For him merely to say “Oh, yes, we will do this” would be the empty gesture, in his view. Regarding the events at the Board meeting, WIEWEL stated that if a group stops the business of the organization to make their point, this is a very challenging and problematic approach. He thought it would be hard to accept a repeat of this. He hoped that there could be found ways to make substantive progress through dialogue and discussion.

GIOIA conveyed concern from students, particularly students of color, about armed campus security. He wondered what level of concern was expressed at meetings with the President, and how this concern was being addressed. WIEWEL responded that a group of students had been opposed from the beginning to the creation of a sworn police force and have continued their opposition. Because of concerns expressed by a variety of people, we had created an intensive training program which the three or four sworn officers had gone through. WIEWEL characterized the sworn police force as a model nationwide for training and preparation. He invited a broader discussion through the Public Safety Advisory Committee of other substantive issues of campus safety, not only the issue of the sworn police force.

JAEN PORTILLO, taking up the comments by PADIN, stated that the measures taken so far are fine, but that they are not enough. Other things needed to be done—forexample, the heritage language track which needs to take off in World Languages & Literatures; they are still looking for funding to hire someone to anchor the program. WIEWEL agreed that much still needed to be done. There were about twenty demands; three could be met almost immediately; some were impossible; many others are possible but will take time. A request for a new faculty line, for example, will have to come up through the colleges and will be an allocation decision. WIEWEL stated that he would not decide all these kinds of things from the top: it is not how [faculty] want the university to work. He agreed, again, there was much to do. JAEN PORTILLO asked if he could support it. WIEWEL said that he did not know the specifics the point she raised, but that we have mechanisms to do such things. He concluded that the president cannot, all of a sudden, change the world, and faculty would not be very happy if he could.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:37 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 February 2016
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, O'Banion, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Webb, Winters

Alternates Present:

Hellermann for Childs, Weber for Daim, Yeigh for De La Vega, Kaimanu for Harris, Thorne for Jaén Portillo, Allen for Loney, Etesami for Tretheway

Members Absent:

Layzell, Mukhopadhyay, Riedlinger, Schuler, Taylor, Wendl, Yesilada

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Fountain, Fraire, D. Hansen, Hines, Marrongelle, Natter, Percy, Wiewel

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **11 January 2016 Minutes** were **approved** as published. [Note: the January meeting was rescheduled because the University was closed on 4 January due to inclement weather.]

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1. OAA Response to December Notice of Senate Actions**, concurrence, was noted [January Agenda Attachment C.1].
- 2. Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary**

The Presiding Officer called attention to the report of the Faculty Development Committee contained in the packet [February Agenda Attachment G.3].

3. Research Update and Distinguished Faculty Proposal

Lisa ZURK, Associate Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP), gave an update on research activities, concurrent with Strategic Plan (SP) goal to support excellence in faculty research by assessing, recognizing achievements, and fostering successful activities. [See slides, **February Minutes Appendix C.3.**]

She indicated that RSP has finished a process by which the deans came up with metrics to identify and evaluate productivity. Aims are to communicate expectations to faculty; to recognize faculty who fulfill or exceed expectations; and to connect to resources strategically. A common response is that “What I do isn’t on the list.” A long list is unwieldy, so the result was a smaller list of quantifiable metrics defining baseline levels and aspirations. The next step, according to ZURK, was to collectively identify strategies to foster these goals. She intends to repeat this each year to see how we are going.

Specific measurements vary from college to college, ZURK pointed out. She referred to three examples. One metric is external funding, prominent in hard science and engineering. A chart showed departments with more than \$1 million in funded research expenditures. Some units are nationally competitive, on a par with top institutions in the country, ZURK asserted. Total funding is just under \$60 million; it pays for graduate students; faculty and staff salaries; conference travel; professional development; and labs and equipment. The funding enriches the environment for faculty and students. ZURK continued: another metric is students, particularly doctoral students. The advanced education component separates our institution from other teaching and community outreach institutions. She referred to a calculation that the university spent about \$8 million per year on graduate (not just doctoral) students: an important part of PSU’s access mission. As a third metric example ZURK mentioned publication citations, and thanked the librarians and in particular Jill EMERY for the compilation of data. According to ZURK, this metric shows the impact of our work.

ZURK turned to the distinguished faculty designation, which arose in the strategic planning process, specifically the research task team. She indicated that two or three dozen institutions nationally have a designation of this kind. A draft proposal received review and feedback from various quarters: provost, deans, Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The proposal is that it be capped at 5% of the faculty population, based on impact and recognition of scholarship on a national and international level. The result is recognition and promotion, and a \$2000 annual stipend (not a one-time award).

ZURK stated that RSP is also looking at ways to support research by junior faculty. “Let knowledge serve the city,” according to ZURK, means that we are invested in growing our knowledge base. The SP mandates that we identify a strategy, share it with the community, and grow it appropriately.

TALBOTT asked if the distinguished faculty proposal had gone through bargaining.

ZURK replied that based on feedback, e.g. from the Steering Committee, about the complexities of making this a rank, it was decided not to make it a formally bargained rank (though that is an option within the Oregon Administrative Rules designations).

TALBOTT said it sounded like merit pay, but not determined by faculty. ZURK said that the stipend would be a bonus outside of base pay. TALBOTT then asked who would decide: again, it was seeming not led by faculty. ZURK replied that the mechanisms are still to be determined as the proposal moves forward. It is meant as a recognition for distinguished work.

MAIER noted that there are named professorships which carry stipends with them; the proposal seemed to him in that spirit.

4. Discussion Item: “What does it mean to be educated in the 21st century?”

GRECO said that the discussion topic did not really have a name. As she had thought about this topic previously, she had referred to it as “liberal arts” but this ran into the misconception that it applied only to the humanities, even though the term properly includes both humanities and sciences. A newer term, “liberal education,” more adequately conveys both breadth and depth; she was told, however, that this still carries limiting connotations. The term “general education” would lead to a war between those who are for and against University Studies. So the discussion has no formal name.

Referring to slides [**February Minutes Appendix C.4**] GRECO formulated as starting questions: What should a PSU graduate be able to do? Where are we succeeding in this? How can we expand on that? Where are we failing our students, and how can we reverse that? We are failing our students, GRECO asserted: 400-level students who have trouble writing a paper with grammatical accuracy, or students who don’t know how they are doing in a class because they don’t understand and can’t calculate the weighted grades of various assignments. If they can’t calculate percentages, GRECO asked, how are they set up for life to make personal financial decisions, read and understand electoral measures, etc.? Realizing that she can’t teach every French student math, she has started putting all grades in the D2L gradebook [which does the calculations automatically], but she still sees this as a failure in that she has to feed the information to students in a computer-processed manner, without their actually having an understanding of the numbers.

GRECO was unable to be at the Winter Symposium due to illness, but from the videos and notes of the event she extracted three themes.

1. Humanity: to empower students to be better people, to fulfill their potential, to have a sense of purpose, to understand what it means to be human (the aesthetic, the transcendental, the spiritual, the humane).
2. Citizenship: to prepare students to engage in democracy; to be informed; to participate civilly in society and globally. This is the realm of social ethics and justice.

3. Competence: to ensure that students possess skills for success in careers, to successfully face workplace challenges, work in groups, deal with complexity, work across disciplines. This is the professional domain.

Additional take-aways for GRECO were that how to use what we know requires interdisciplinary learning. We need to ask what the curriculum should look like to achieve our goals. People pointed out that we need to articulate an educational philosophy to ourselves and our students. Finally, diversity depends on the global context; there was much talk about the issue of global and local.

Campus climate was an issue that came up at the full-day talk-out by students in December, and was in other ways being raised by students here and elsewhere. GRECO stated that we needed to pay attention to this issue.

RAFFO asked: what does “safe” mean?

GRECO replied that the word meant different things to different students. Some students do not feel safe in their classrooms in discussions. For some students, the presence of armed police was an issue. Some students feel that faculty are not able to relate to them culturally. For some, they do not feel safe expressing opinions in the classroom because of their peers. Students called for cultural competency; at the faculty event, however, it was suggested that an effective route to inclusion cannot be mandated. For GRECO then the question is how to get people to want to become culturally competent. A guiding question should be how to address the specific needs of our student body.

GRECO hoped that the notes from the Winter Symposium, along with this discussion, would help a small group—a committee or task force—to explore the question further. We are doing some things well, and we all as individuals are doing our job, but something in the curriculum as a whole may not be serving the students at our university.

D. HANSEN / GAMBURD moved that the Senate resolve itself into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:33).

In the ensuing discussion, numerous senators offered perspectives on the state of education in the University and in the broader community. Common themes were the necessity to meet students where they are at; the urgency of equipping students with requisite skills; and practical problems of assessing proficiencies and defining prerequisites to ensure that students are adequately prepared for studies.

MAIER / RUETER moved that the Senate return to regular session; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 4:07).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the University Studies Council listed in **February Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Motion to Create a Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty

B. HANSEN / ELZANOWSKI **moved** the resolution brought by the Steering Committee, contained in **February Agenda Attachment E.2**, to create a task force to explore the issue of a pathway and procedure for granting tenure to teaching-intensive faculty, with a specific charge to the task force and suggested timeline for work.

GRECO referred to the discussion at the previous Senate meeting [during committee of the whole], but invited senators to further speak their mind before voting.

B. HANSEN referred to feedback provided by e-mail by LIEBMAN, who was not present today. LIEBMAN's recommendation was not to kill this before we examine it. HANSEN stated that he had been on both sides of this issue, and that he agreed that killing this before examining it would be a mistake.

RUETER felt, to the contrary, that we should kill it before we examine it because it will not go anywhere. Is more teaching load even being considered? It can be a discussion item, but the task force will be onerous for colleagues.

PADIN rejoined that it might indeed go somewhere, and therefore that a task force should look at the issue and come back with a recommendation.

BLUFFSTONE had received feedback from four faculty in his district: none of them liked the idea. He thought that we should take the prospect of task force seriously. It probably would shift the burden of proof from "Why do this?" to "Why shouldn't we do this?" If the change supports teaching and research, it would be a no-brainer, but he had doubts about this. His view is that we are trying to squeeze as much out of tenure positions as we can; this measure would add another, complicated level of decision-making. It seemed to him not in harmony with where the university has been moving in the last 10-15 years on research.

MACCORMACK observed that the proposal is in the name of academic freedom, and that over half of the faculty do not currently have this freedom. To frame the question as "who will do research?" is to side-step this important issue.

PADIN, responding to previous comments, framed the problem thus: Would the proposal siphon off research positions? If so, then to him it would be a bad idea. Or would it lead to transitions to tenure for positions that are not currently tenured, which are not protected with academic freedom? Then we might feel about it differently, say if we signaled the task force that we wanted a guarantee of this kind. BLUFFSTONE,

replying, said that this would not fundamentally change his position, since he believed we ought to move forward and not merely preserve where we are. He saw each new appointment as a potential academic star, as potentially someone with world-class creative output. That is what puts us on the map and reflects where we want to be in ten or fifteen years. PADIN suggested that the measure was about converting an existing tier to tenure status. BLUFFSTONE wanted to think in terms of institutional aspirations.

MAIER, as a point of order, indicated that during discussion remarks should be directed to the Chair rather than to other members.

B. HANSEN made two observations. The first was that the task force, after exploring the issue, could report back in 2017 with a thumbs down. GRECO interjected: that's right. HANSEN's second observation was the current system allowed flexibility over the course of a career as different elements came to the fore. Would this new system pigeonhole faculty—for example, would a teaching-intensive faculty member be precluded from doing research?

The **question** was **called**; the motion to end discussion passed by voice vote with one nay and the rest aye's.

The original **motion** was **approved** with 25 in favor, 24 opposed, and 2 abstentions (voting by clicker).

GRECO hoped faculty with reservations as well as those who were in favor of the idea would be willing to serve on the task force.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

Connecting to the preceding item, WIEWEL stated that he thought the question, one that had been voiced for some time, was worth considering. He characterized it as one further attempt to bring clarity to the status of non-tenure-track faculty.

WIEWEL reported that winter term enrollment was essentially flat. It was unclear what would happen next year.

There was a continued push for state funding, and on February 11th there would be a joint lobbying day by all seven state universities in Salem. They have been told, however, that they are unlikely to get what they are asking for in this short legislative session.

WIEWEL observed that the finished SP was now available in a variety of formats. A next step would be to look at which units would take responsibility for the various initiatives, and to keep track of progress.

WIEWEL reported that the citizens' committee had filed a ballot measure regarding a payroll tax for PSU funding. This filing created constraints about how PSU employees, as public employees, may discuss the ballot measure. As President, WIEWEL is not allowed to advocate for or against any ballot initiative at any time. Faculty may do advocacy during non-working hours, but not use any University resources (such as e-mail, office supplies, etc.) for this purpose. These same rules apply to another new initiative starting today whereby graduate students are seeking to unionize. Public employees may neither promote nor hinder such unionization efforts on work time or using work resources. (Wearing a button, however, is apparently OK.)

WIEWEL reported briefly on a meeting to follow up on the event held by students of color in December. Task forces on Black student success and Asian-Pacific Islander student success were being initiated, as were requests for campus spaces for those groups. More complicated, but also moving forward, were issues addressing campus climate and the nature of the curriculum. By avoiding extremes of tokenism and hostility, WIEWEL hoped this could be a rich effort addressing significant issues of equity and social change.

2. Provost's Report

[See written handout: **Minutes Appendix G.2.**]

Responding to a question at last Senate meeting on comparative retention rates, ANDREWS pointed to information in her handout from other Oregon public institutions other peer institutions. This information, she observed, is germane to the prior conversation: is it the students that we serve, is it how we teach, is it some combination of these things? What is it that makes our retention rates lower than some of our peer institutions? The question is not just one of numbers, but of what students are learning. This kind of data is necessary to inform the discussion about liberal education.

ANDREWS also noted information on strategies to create a culturally relevant curriculum, course material, pedagogy, and create a good classroom climate. She had received responses to her December blog post and at various department meetings, from faculty and staff offering help or resources for the University to work on this. She encouraged others to contact her if they are interested in doing this. She will blog about a meeting held last week to discuss various strategies. Institutional change will take a collective effort; also, individual schools and colleges are taking steps. There are both internal and external resources to draw upon; for example, the Office of Academic Innovation has been involved in these discussions. Both students and faculty have been actively involved. Several committees, such as the curriculum committees, have already begun to entertain some of these issues.

PADIN said that in looking at the comparative data, and considering the composition of the respective student groups, we need to attend to the value added in each case. We need a more careful analysis, since we may be dealing with different student populations.

ANDREWS agreed, and said that that kind of information could be provided. For example, we could look at how many students at each institution are transfer students. If

people need additional data, let her office know how to drill down to get that data. These numbers [in the handout] are not the only ones that matter.

3. Mid-Year Report of the Faculty Development Committee

This report, submitted by FDC chair David PEYTON, was circulated as **February Agenda Attachment G.3**.

4. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

PADIN reported from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), which comprises members elected from each of the public universities in Oregon. He is one of the three PSU members. The last quarterly meeting was in Eugene on the 22nd and 23rd. IFS has been active in consulting with chairs of higher education committees [in the state legislature] to provide a faculty voice.

One current issue of note, said PADIN, is the accelerated learning work group of the Higher Education Coordinating Committee [HECC]. This group has been exploring, for about a year, ways to award college credit for work done at the high school level. Some draft standards have been developed and there is a period of three months for comment on the draft standards. PADIN stated that IFS is very interested, and that as a voice for faculty they have strong concerns. Referring back to the earlier discussion, PADIN noted that by some measures our [Oregon's] K-12 system is one of the weakest nationwide in delivering high school education. Therefore he believed that the notion that this system should be awarding more college credit is concerning; this would seem to call for improvement of the K-12 system. PADIN asked senators to share with him any thoughts about this issue, or interest in testifying.

PADIN reported that IFS is also participating in a work group around House bill 3308 on work force development. This bill asks HECC to analyze and make recommendations to address disparities in higher education affecting historically marginalized populations.

ANDREWS commented that PSU is the one of the institutions that is concerned about the accelerated learning proposal, particularly the proficiency or competency part of it, for the reasons suggested by PADIN. She characterized our [PSU's] position as one of caution about an aggressive approach to accelerated learning, because we want to ensure that students who have those credits can actually do college-level work. She solicited faculty comments on the proposed standards.

H. ADJOURNMENT

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

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 March 2016

Presiding Officer: Gina Greco

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, Gioia, Greco, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Thieman, Tretheway, Webb, Winters, Yesilada

Alternates Present:

Hellermann for Childs, Kaimanu for Harris, Allen for Loney

Members Absent:

Camacho, George, Griffin, O'Banion, Wendl

Ex-officio Members Present:

Beyler, Chabon, Connolly, Fraire, D. Hansen, Hines, Kinsella, Liebman, Marrongelle, Marshall, Moody, Reynolds, Suarez, Wiewel

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **1 February 2016 Minutes** were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION

1. **OAA Response to December Notice of Senate Actions**, concurrence, was noted [February Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. **Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary**

GRECO reminded senators of the call for nominations and self-nominations for the Task Force to Explore Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty.

In response to information she had received that colleagues in one department had spent three days writing post-tenure reviews, GRECO said that the process was intended to be more efficient than this: it should be fairly easy to determine whether someone was or was not doing their job in a pass/no-pass kind of way. She had offered to meet with departments to help them set the procedure. In her own department [WLL] reports were limited to 250 words.

BEYLER indicated that curricular proposal E.1.c.1 (changes to courses in ArH) had been withdrawn from the agenda.

3. Discussion item: cultural competence and diversity action

GRECO introduced Maria TENORIO, director of the American Indian Teacher Preparation Program (GSE) and co-chair of the Diversity Action Council, and Carmen SUAREZ, Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion, to kick off the discussion topic. [See also slides, **Minutes Appendix C.3.**] TENORIO acknowledged the assistance of Marilyn QUINTERO in preparing her presentation.

TENORIO pointed out that there is a national trend towards first-generation college students, but their retention levels are not high and they are more likely to need financial assistance to complete their education. At PSU, meanwhile, the entering freshman class is comprised 40% students of color.

TENORIO pointed to various efforts at other universities, including Brown, Yale, and Michigan, to develop socially inclusive, just, and safe classrooms. The Michigan Graduate School of Education was talking in terms of “brave” rather than “safe” spaces. Culturally responsiveness was also a topic internationally; in Japan, e.g., the University of Osaka is offering a “Respect” doctorate: Revitalizing and Enriching Society through Pluralism, Equity, and Cultural Diversity”; faculty from Osaka had visited here to talk about this doctoral program. Medical education accreditation bodies have approved training in culturally responsive health care for all physicians.

Responding to the question of what is required to build culturally responsive classrooms at PSU, TENORIO pointed to various kinds of training, such as that offered by senators DE LA VEGA and FARAHMANDPUR. First and foremost, she believed it was important to let students know that their experiences are valued and to make links between life outside the classroom and what they learn in the classroom. Cultural responsiveness helps make this link. She pointed to an example in the work of Richard Milner on mathematics education: offering a cultural lens on mathematics problems.

TENORIO presented other connected questions: Would a survey of faculty needs be helpful? What was the role and responsibility of Faculty Senate in this process?

SUAREZ, from a perspective of years of work on the topic, found it enriching to attend the event Students of Color Speak Out in December, and hear the stories shared by students. SUAREZ said she had thought of what the students’ grandparents had gone through, asking for a seat at the campus table. Students nationwide are now describing what they are seeing, and what they are missing, in the classroom.

SUAREZ framed the key question for Senate as what cultural responsiveness means for curriculum and for pedagogy. What would be a culturally responsive way of teaching? She believed that students, as well as faculty, generally understood that this was more than just a matter of making students feel “comfortable”: it’s about a skill set to navigate changed and changing demographics, and the skill set to enable us to work together. It was, she argued, not just about placing students into a particular environment, but enabling them to step out as engaged citizens and leaders in various arenas. What is the meaning of the degree in this respect?

SUAREZ was impressed at the faculty symposium in January at the conversations and sharing of information about what accountability and assessment in this field would look like.

SUAREZ offered the partnership, resources, and expertise of the Office of Global Diversity & Inclusion in these efforts.

FARAHMANDPUR/CARSTENS moved that the Senate resolve into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote (at 3:23).

In the discussion, various senators, ex-officio members, as well as TENORIO and SUAREZ offered examples of problems and solutions towards cultural responsiveness. An emergent theme was the potential to use cultural diversity/competence as an asset. There were also suggestions about developing institutional forms, such an office analogous to the Office of Academic Innovation to assist faculty in this work, or mini-grants to develop specific projects.

Concluding the discussion, B. HANSEN/DONLAN moved that the Senate return to **regular session**; the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote (at 3:55).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Feedback on proposed accelerated learning standards

HINES observed that accelerated learning is related to the prior discussion [on cultural competence and diversity action]. The legislature is pushing to give Oregonians who don't have easy access to universities exposure to that environment. Steering Committee discussed several aspects of this issue. For example, what constitutes exposure to a university experience when you are not also being exposed to people outside of your high school's catchment area? What about college skills that some people need to work on more than others? What about faculty participation? How do we ensure that a course being offered for college credit in the high school meets the demands for rigor that we have. Provosts Council has raised issue of transcription and transferability.

PADIN reported on a meeting held in Albany on February 19th by the task force on accelerated learning, with representatives of all twenty-four higher education institutions in Oregon (universities and community colleges). Faculty response was largely skeptical. There is a framework of existing standards for pre-admission credit, which guarantee that university faculty drive the process and determine quality control. Newer proposals seek to relax these standards, such that people delivering the courses in high schools might not have terminal degrees and quality control by university faculty might be weakened. What the high school instructors get in lieu of graduate training in the respective fields is, perhaps, a quarterly meeting with a group of peers: PADIN saw this as hardly equivalent. When colleagues from the various institutions raised the question, why are we relaxing the standards, given that we currently have ways to award college credit to high school students, the response was that many institutions are already doing this—not following state standards—and so the new standards will meet them where they are.

PADIN described the impetus as coming from the legislature's interest in making access to higher education less expensive and more accessible for more people. He described this as subcontracting the work to high schools. He saw this premise as questionable. The university's concern is with academic quality; moreover, the notion that transferring this work to high schools will be cost-free or cheap was, in his view, questionable, since it will involve much effort to establish quality control.

PADIN also questioned the proposal on grounds of equity. A Higher Education Coordinating Commission shows that only 22% of Oregon high school graduates complete college. Thus 78% are not in the ballpark to complete college. Additional college credit completion opportunities in high school means, he said, diverting resources from those who are least advantaged to those who are already prepared to take these courses. From an equity standpoint, PADIN believed, this was not a wise investment. Faculty have perspectives on these questions that may elude policy-makers.

HINES stated that Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) is interested in hearing the perspective of the respective faculty senates. She read a statement which had been given by ANDREWS to the Provosts Council: PSU was interested in providing suitable opportunities for college credit to high school students, but had concerns about the lack of proficiency in basic skills (reading, writing, mathematics) among students. According to ANDREWS's statement as read by HINES, faculty would rather see efforts directed towards making more Oregon high school students college-ready (relating to points made in the previous discussion about diversity and equity). Oregon already has pathways and high-quality programs, such as AP exams and IB courses. According to HINES one of IFS's main concerns was with courses that seemed to be an extension of credit for prior learning through proficiency exams: the only difference seemed to be the age of the person taking the exam. Concerns were also raised about potential conflicts of interest about fees. Earning credits in this way may leave students unexposed to other important aspects of university life, academic culture, and interaction with other students coming with a diverse set of experiences.

WEBB noted that PSU is the only institution in Oregon that is accredited for MESA [Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement school outreach program]. She was surprised at the apparent trend to give out credit so freely. Was there any push into include MESA within these credit programs? Gaining approval for this high-quality program was rigorous, she stated.

HINES did not know the answer, but thought that ANDREWS might.

GRECO believed that the programs, as described, could not be accredited.

JHAJ added that PSU faculty had a long history of offering high-quality programs for high school students: for example, the History faculty's [Challenge Link] program, or the Senior Inquiry program paralleling UNST Freshman Inquiry. In general, therefore, we are not opposed to the idea, but we want to remind others that we share these values. He continued that it is also a question of academic freedom: what are our students intended to learn, have they learned it, and who are the faculty [teaching it]? The proposal falls short by disaggregating learning and faculty participation. This is an issue administrators have raised repeatedly.

RUETER perceived the university system [as a whole] being undermined through a over-emphasis on regionalized programs. There was value in the university as a center of connection, innovation, and cultural advancement. This should be allowed to play itself out, he believed. The reasons to be skeptical are not just technical ones.

B. HANSEN had read that there are 16,000 or 17,000 Oregon students applying for free community college. He wondered how we would integrate and work with that cohort of students.

HINES saw this as a germane question; it was raised at the Provosts Council in the context of predicting how many of the applying students will meet the criteria, how many will then get credits to put them on the way to a four-year degree, and how many will then complete the degree. She recalled a comment in the prior discussion, that it was not only important to get people through the in-door, but also get them through the out-door.

HINES asked any additional comments to be sent to her or to PADIN.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council (GC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) listed in **March Agenda Attachment E.1**, with the exception of E.1.c.1 (withdrawn for later consideration) were approved, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management

KINSELLA, chair of GC, introduced the proposal for a new Graduate Certificate in Global Supply Chain Management in the School of Business Administration. The program targeted both stand-alone post-baccalaureate students and students in existing programs (MBA, MIM) seeking a specialized track, including some students in Engineering & Technology Management. The program was anticipated to start with about fifteen students, with about 1/3 and 2/3, respectively, in the two categories; and move to a more even split between about forty students in about five years. Students choose four courses (sixteen credits) from among six covering basic knowledge and specializes skills. All are existing on-line courses. Market research included analysis of employment trends, placement rates, comparable programs at other universities, and survey of potential employers. SBA will administer the program with existing courses and faculty.

D. HANSEN/RAFFO **moved the proposal as listed in March Agenda Attachment E.2**. The **motion** was **approved** by unanimous show of hands.

3. Undergraduate Minor in Conflict Resolution

HARMON presented the proposal for a Minor in Conflict Resolution (CLAS) on behalf of UCC. It is twenty-eight credits; all courses are currently existing.

CARSTENS/ELZANOWSKI **moved the proposal as listed in March Agenda Attachment E.3**. The motion was **approved** by show of hands (55 yes, 1 no).

4. Creation of a STEM Institute

PADIN, chair of the Educational Policy Committee, introduced the proposal to create a STEM institute which, after several iterations with the principals, had been unanimously supported by EPC in February. The Budget Committee also reviewed the proposal. He referred to the background information as given in the packet. The proposal had been several years in the making, involving colleagues from CLAS, MCECS, and GSE, and

included obtaining a five-year grant from the Howard Hughes Institute. Funding came primarily from that organization; PSU had a matching component which did not include anything beyond that necessary to already obtain the grant. EPC saw the proposal as having laudable intentions.

MONSERE/SCHROCK moved the proposal as listed in March Agenda Attachment E.4.

B. HANSEN asked about future costs: the proposal says that no additional university funding is being requested, that the program will be self-supporting. Does this mean that they are guaranteeing there will be external grants starting in 2019? BOWMAN answered that the activities will be externally funded, and that without external funding there wouldn't be activity; the cost to the university will be whatever cost-sharing will be required. B. HANSEN responded that this implied that if they obtain another grant the institute and the directorship position will continue to exist.

BACCAR whether space needs were accounted for. BOWMAN answered that needed space came from the construction done as part of obtaining the grant.

RUETER wondered if there was a curricular aspect, or otherwise why the proposal was coming before Senate? BOWMAN answered that since it is a research center, its creation requires Senate approval.

The motion was approved by show of hands (51 yes, 0 no, 5 abstentions).

5. New incompletes policy

KINSELLA, for GC as well as the Scholastic Standards Committee, introduced the proposed changes in the policy on incompletes. Incentive was an ambiguity in the extant policy about who is eligible for an incomplete. The current language states that "essential work remains to be done." This has led to a wide range of practice, which was confusing to faculty and students. A major point of discussion was how much of the work ought to be completed. The notions of defining a percentage of the term or percentage of the work proved problematic, given the varying structure of courses. The change of language now is that most of the coursework is to be completed, but some essential coursework remain. Another change is to specify that students should not re-take a course in order to remove an incomplete (though perhaps they may sit on part of it). Students should not take an incomplete simply to improve their grade.

PERLMUTTER/RUETER moved the proposed changes as listed in March Agenda Attachment E.5.

TALBOTT asked what happens if most of the work is not done: would it be an X? KINSELLA said that students would then get the grade that they have earned or withdraw. If they have done any work, they do not qualify for an X. TALBOTT wondered: what if it is too late to withdraw? BACCAR indicated that if there are mitigating circumstances, it is possible to petition for a withdrawal after the deadline. TALBOTT wondered if this would result in more petitions. BACCAR said yes, possibly, but observed that there are currently many petitions to clean up uncertainties in the incompletes policy.

TALBOTT asked further: what is the problem with students sitting in on the class subsequently? BACCAR stated that it creates inaccurate registration; also, it is a violation of financial aid policies. Sometimes students put off doing the work for the course till later, but do not want to withdraw because that would affect term financial aid. Aid supposed to be given for work done in a given term, and so if students don't do all or most of the work during the term in question, this seems a problem on its face.

TALBOTT asked: would they flunk the class? BACCAR said that if (for example) they've stayed in the class for seven weeks but not done any work, then they probably will receive an F; if, on the other hand, they've done most of the work then the faculty can determine if an incomplete is appropriate. The problem really arises when students complete only two or three weeks and try to negotiate an incomplete. It is always up to the instructor to determine if an incomplete is appropriate, and what is the threshold.

WEBB reported that some students had been advised to request an incomplete even though they had failed all coursework up to that point. She therefore wondered how the policy would be pushed out to advisors.

KENNEDY said that she appreciated the work put into the revision and that the policy was being made clearer but still leaving room for interpretation. In her view the previous system had been loosey-goosey. She tells students and an incomplete is not for students failing the class, but for those who are doing fine but just missing a few components. If asked whether they could truthfully say they were doing OK in the class, many students admitted they could not. Students had been receiving confusing advice.

B. HANSEN asked if there is an agreement available on-line. Some departments had forms, but it would be helpful to have a form available commonly on-line. KINSELLA said that there is a template. BACCAR said that a fillable form had been developed. HINES reported that she had in fact used such a form.

BLUFFSTONE was thankful for inclusion of examples from other universities, and wondered if we could make the designation of "most" more precise. KINSELLA responded that GC had struggled with this, and decided it was not possible to give a precise designation. In some graduate courses, for example, the grade rested on a final paper so it would not work to specify a given number or weeks or given percentage of workload. The difficulty was the range of courses.

BLUFFSTONE asked whether it would be better to say what to do rather than what not to do. BACCAR asked whether suggestions for changed wording could be made after a vote. GRECO indicated no, but that amendments could be received. RUETER disagreed: people reading the policy needed to see what not to do. KINSELLA observed that departments could state their own (more stringent) policies if they saw fit and could craft their own language.

D. HANSEN asked whether was a still a trigger for graduation turning an I into an F; this seemed not be included. BACCAR observed, however, that this was stated.

The **motion** was **approved** by show of hands (50 yes, 0 no, 4 abstentions).

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

WIEWEL reported that spring term enrollment was down a “smidgen” from winter. Non-resident enrollment was staying about 7% above what it had been last year. Applications for next year looked good, but it was too early to make projections. Though some had worried that the free community college program might hurt PSU enrollment, WIEWEL did not see this currently reflected in applications.

WIEWEL took note of some national recognition for PSU: *US News & World Report* list of top twenty innovative schools; the global supply-chain management program is the list of top on-line programs; service learning receives recognition; top graduate programs include city management and policy, urban and public affairs, rehabilitation counseling, social work, and health care management. Keith Kaufman (PSY) had received a \$750,000 grant to create a model program to prevent sexual assault on college campuses. WIEWEL also referred to the length of service awards, and the unprecedented award to Tony WOLK (ENG) for fifty years of service.

WIEWEL said that the joint lobbying day for universities at the legislature had been successful, with more than 250 people present. The universities, however, did not receive any new funding. The University Venture Development Fund has been reinstated, and this will be good for faculty research.

He called attention to the second Thursday social event for faculty.

WIEWEL reported on the payroll tax initiative. An *Oregonian* editorial had laid out good reasons why PSU deserved the revenue, but concluded with disapproval of a tax. In an op-ed column, PSU alumnus Mike Richardson, founder of Dark Horse Comics, made a case for business support because of need for an educated labor force.

2. Report on Post-Tenure Review

Shelley CHABON, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development, reviewed the post-tenure review process. She noted that some faculty and administrators had made complaints; this was, she felt, a strong reaction to a process designed to support and maintain scholarly work. In response, her office had developed templates and reviewed unit guidelines multiple times. As of March 1st there were still three units with guidelines outstanding. There was flexibility on deadlines, and some further adjustment which will be announced soon. By March 15th, candidates should receive copies of PTR committee reports and chair letters. By March 29th, candidates should review the reports and sign the form PT1 if they are in agreement with the report and letter.

3. Report on Accreditation

Scott MARSHALL, Vice Provost for Academic and Fiscal Planning, reported on NWCCU seventh-year review from last fall. This resulted in two commendations and two recommendations. The commendations were for community engagement, and for innovations such as referred to in the President's report.

Recommendations—areas requiring more work—were 1) a discussion and analysis of PSU's financial status, and 2) accelerated assessment of student learning outcomes. PSU

has requested that both of these be withdrawn. In regard to 1), the audit had not yet been completed and this has now been done, and an ad hoc report was submitted last week.

In regard to recommendation 2), MARSHALL wished to draw attention to the fact that this is driven by work of faculty and programs on assessment. OAI and Institutional Assessment Council try to ensure that these activities take place, but they are faculty-driven. NWCCU will expect an ad hoc report by spring of 2017.

A first-year report is due this coming fall. The Strategic Plan provides an opportunity to make sure our core themes are aligned with strategic goals. Committees have been formed to do this, and to work on reports for the fall.

MARSHALL hoped for broader faculty engagement with the accreditation process, and to build momentum about students learning outcomes assessment. How does academic program review connect to accreditation? Faculty who had gone through program review often found it onerous but useful; embedded within that is assessment activity, and so it would be good to align program review with accreditation reviews.

3. Quarterly Report of Budget Committee

BOWMAN, chair of the Budget Committee, pointed to two budget positives and two negatives looking beyond fiscal year 2017. [See **March Agenda Attachment G.3.**] Positives were: shift in the state funding allocation model, which allocates a somewhat larger share to PSU; and the potential of funding through the metro ballot measure. Negatives were: increased PERS costs over the next three biennia, due to the decision about COLA, of about \$6 million per year cumulatively, unless the legislature takes steps to address this; and a flat or slightly enrollment, together with shifts in distribution among various sectors.

B. HANSEN asked when the PERS increase would go into effect. BOWMAN answered: fiscal year 2018.

4. Quarterly Report of Educational Policy Committee

PADIN reported that, as of week five of the term, EPC had considered these items [see **March Agenda Attachment G.4.**]: proposal for the STEM Institute, approved earlier; proposals to change three divisions in CUPA, namely Criminal Justice, Political Science, and Public Administration, into departments, which have been approved by EPC; and continued discussion of the possibility of creating pre-baccalaureate certificates. PADIN stated that the colleagues on the committee take very seriously their charge of monitoring these issues.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:01 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 April 2016

Presiding Officer: Gina Greco

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Childs, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, Monsere, O'Banion, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Taylor, Thieman, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters

Alternates Present:

Allen for Loney, Kinsella for Yesilada

Members Absent:

Bluffstone, Clark, Kennedy, Labissiere

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews, Beyler, Chabon, Everett, Fraire, D. Hansen, Hines, Kinsella (also as alternate), Liebman, Marrongelle, Moody, Percy, Sanders, Wiewel

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **7 March 2016 Minutes** were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION

1. OAA Response to March Notice of Senate Actions, concurrence, was noted [April Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. Upcoming elections and committee survey

The Secretary reminded senators of the ongoing opt-in surveys for Faculty Senate elections and committee preference, as well as nominations for Senate officers at the next meeting.

[Note: announcements and discussion, as listed in the original agenda, were transposed]

3. Discussion: defining and supporting liberal education at PSU
[originally C.4 in the agenda]

B. HANSEN introduced the discussion by stating that we are in the business of providing a liberal education to students. [See slides, **April Minutes Appendix C.3.**] This is part of a historical inheritance, but in a modern democracy it included the need for an educated populace, for a sense of social responsibility, and for application of knowledge to practical problems. General education refers to knowledge shared by all students; liberal education also includes specialized knowledge in some field.

B. HANSEN referred to several different models put forward across the country. [See **Appendix C.3.**] At Hofstra University, prominent elements include critical thinking, self-examination, and clarity of expression (both written and oral). Duke University highlights different modes of inquiry; and the evaluation, management, and interpretation of information. In 1994 at PSU, Chuck WHITE together with a working group at the creation of University Studies developed principles for life-long inquiry. We need to be prepared to make the case for liberal education and respond to critiques.

B. HANSEN/TAYLOR **moved** that the Senate resolve into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:22).

Among the points touched upon during the discussion were: the questions of depth (specialized learning) vs. breadth (general knowledge shared by or useful in multiple disciplines); the problem of economic pressures on students and the (real or perceived) value of education; technological change; responding appropriately to students at varying levels of maturity and preparation, complicated at PSU by our large transfer population.

MAIER/CARSTENS **moved** that Senate return to **regular session**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:44).

4. Other announcements [originally C.3 in the agenda]

GRECO announced that in a subsequent meeting Senate would probably return to the topic of post-doctoral fellowships. [See slides, **April Minutes Appendix C.4.**] NRS and NIH define a post-doctoral fellow as an individual who has received a doctoral degree or equivalent, and is engaged in temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training, in order to enhance professional skills to pursue the career path. This definition thus does not include career employees on the NTTF track. The coming resolution, GRECO noted, will differ from that passed in February 2014 because that resolution was, evidently, not legally possible. In addition, that previous resolution did provide any retirement benefits to post-doctoral fellows. Post-docs are increasingly important to the institution, and she hoped that we could find a legal solution that is less expensive for our PIs [principal investigators] and does no harm to post-docs. The problem is that PIs must pay for retirement benefits (6% employee contribution, 6% employer contribution, plus a surcharge); however, since a postdoc is by definition temporary and rarely lasts for the five years required to become vested in PERS, the postdoc collects no retirement benefit, nor does the benefit return to the PI's grant.

GRECO stated that Faculty Senate can, legally, do nothing on its own. Instead, she envisioned that we could join in a statement being made by United Academics of Oregon, and would be long the lines of a report by an NIH working group which concluded that post-docs should receive benefits comparable to those of other employees at the institution. She noted that NIH does not necessarily pay for these things that its working group said that post-docs should receive: it's thus aspirational on the part of the NIH. GRECO felt that it was hard to go backward; 55% of institutions were now offering benefits to postdocs. Since the post-docs are by definition temporary, we are also looking for legal way to pay only a 6% contribution into retirement benefits.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposal Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council (GC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) listed in **April Agenda Attachment E.1**, were approved, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Graduate Certificate in Applied Social Demography

KINSELLA, on behalf of GC presented, the proposed Graduate Certificate in Applied Social Demography, brought forward by CUPA, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.2**. Targeted students are those in existing degree programs in social sciences, public health and policy, and business. The program anticipates five students in year one, rising to up to twenty students. It requires twenty credits, including three basic concepts courses, one substantive area course chosen from several options, and one methods course chosen from several options. All courses currently exist. Need was assessed through surveys of alumni of relevant programs. Costs will include one NTTF to be hired by Urban Studies and Planning; administrative support will be provided by USP. Oversight will come from an advisory committee.

B. HANSEN/SCHROCK moved the proposal as listed in Attachment E.2.

The **motion was approved** (45 yes, 1 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

3. Graduate Certificate in Collaborative Governance

KINSELLA, on behalf of the GC, presented the proposed Graduate Certificate in Collaborative Governance, brought forward by CUPA, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.3**. The proposal was developed as part of the ReThink project. Target students are primarily working professionals, including those overseas, but it is open to graduate students in existing programs. Twenty students are anticipated in the first year, increasing to thirty. It requires sixteen credits, with courses on foundations, processes, negotiations, and a practicum, as well as an elective course. Courses are on-line, and include several approved earlier as part of the consent agenda. Need was assessed primarily through work in the field, as well as a request from the State of Oregon's Department of Administrative Services for a training program.

PERLMUTTER/DE RIVERA moved the proposal as listed in Attachment E.3.

DE LA VEGA asked about including conflict resolution in the coursework. KINSELLA answered that it was included within the proposal. MAIER observed that conflict resolution was part of the content of the first foundational course.

A question was asked about effecting quality control for on-line courses. KINSELLA responded that the processes would be the same as for on-line courses in general. PERCY (dean of CUPA) remarked that much of the work was done via videoconferencing and other technologies which allowed for verification: it was not just a "correspondence course."

The **motion was approved** (40 yes, 5 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

4. Undergraduate Certificate in Climate Adaptation and Management

SANDERS, on behalf of UCC, presented the proposed Undergraduate Certificate in Climate Adaptation and Management, brought forward by CLAS, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.4**. It requires 22 credits, with six courses split between science and policy/management; a minimum of three courses are at the 400 level.

HARMON/DONLAN **moved the proposal as listed Attachment E.4.**

CHANG asked about Geography courses that were cross-listed with courses included in these proposals. SANDERS said he was not aware of the cross-listing issue; it had not been raised by the proposers. GRECO asked if anyone had a view on how these should be handled: by addition to the catalog or by overrides? She asked that UCC convey this message back to the proposers. It would not need to reappear before Senate. It was pointed out that one of the proposers was in the Senate (viz., GEORGE), so the message was already conveyed.

The **motion was approved** (41 yes, 5 no, 3 abstain, recorded by clicker).

5. Undergraduate Certificate in Forest Ecology and Management

SANDERS, on behalf of UCC, presented the proposed Undergraduate Certificate in Forest Ecology and Management, brought forward by CLAS, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.5**. The certificate requires 29 400-level credits, using existing courses in several departments. There are indications of strong need in our region.

DONLAN/STEDMAN **moved the proposal as listed in Attachment E.5.**

RUETER said that the same cross-listing issue as above occurred here. GRECO stated that it would be addressed.

WENDL asked about the number of credits for a certificate, which seemed large: would this add time to degree? SANDERS responded that there was considerable variation in the size of certificates, and that in any event it was entirely optional and not required for any degree.

MONSERE asked about a cross-listed Civil Engineering course in hydrology. This also would be followed up.

A question was asked about the difference between minors and certificates. SANDERS answered that this was largely a matter of departmental preference. In some cases a certificate was established prior to the existence of a major. GRECO added that in most cases it was easier to do a certificate than a minor on a post-baccalaureate basis.

The motion was **approved** (43 yes, 3 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

6. Undergraduate Certificate in Lake and Reservoir Management

SANDERS, on behalf of UCC, presented the proposed Undergraduate Certificate in Lake and Reservoir Management, brought forward by CLAS, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.6**. It requires 33-34 credits at the 400 level or above. The involved courses already exist, in several different departments; the core of five courses is in ESM, as the prior preparation required for those 400- and 500-level courses. There are strong indications of need for the certificate.

CARSTENS/MACCORMACK **moved the proposal as listed in Attachment E.6.**

HARRIS asked about the large number of credits required. GRECO responded that a similar question was asked about the previous proposal. A certificate is more supple than a major or minor in that it can be taken on a post-bacc basis more easily: the credential could be taken without the full general education requirements.

The cross-listing issue was again pointed out.

A question was raised about advising, particularly with three new certificates being proposed in ESM. SANDERS said that he understood that advising would and could be subsumed within existing advising capacities in the department.

The motion was **approved** (38 yes, 7 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

7. BA/BS in Urban and Public Affairs

SANDERS, on behalf of UCC, presented the proposed Major (BA/BS) in Urban and Public Affairs, brought forward by CUPA, described in **April Agenda Attachment E.7**. This was an interdisciplinary degree, relying almost entirely on existing courses in several departments. It required 56 credits with a minimum of 24 in residence. SANDERS characterized the distribution of courses among disciplines as judicious, and pointed out the opportunity to include courses from other disciplines; and the requirement of a research skills course, a field experience course, and the new CUPA Dean's Seminar. At least nine courses must be upper-division. It is expected that some courses will be completed face-to-face; some on-line or hybrid. Credit for prior learning may be completed. There are strong indications of need.

DE RIVERA/SCHROCK moved the proposal as listed in Attachment E.7.

INGERSOLL asked about the prospective move of departments to the School of Public Health. SANDERS said that the move itself would not change anything; any change in courses would have to come forward again to UCC.

MACCORMACK said that it appeared it would be possible to complete the degree with no 400-level courses. SANDERS answered that was not the case. GRECO, in conversation of several senators, pointed out that a minimum of eight credits were in fact at the 400 level.

It was asked, was the intention about on-line vs. face-to-face coursework. SANDERS responded that CUPA's aim was to include both methods, above all with the intention of attracting students who had started in CUPA but not completed their degree: thus, they might have started with in-person coursework and now be able to complete the degree on-line. PERCY interjected that the program could be mostly, but not completely, be taken on-line. It was asked, specifically, whether there were required courses which were not on-line. PERCY indicated that the Dean's Seminar was hybrid, and thus required some in-person attendance. SANDERS observed that this was not a matter of rule: in-person courses, or a degrees, could be in the future converted to on-line courses (or vice versa).

MONSERE asked about the difference between the BA and the BS. SANDERS said that this was the same as for other degrees across campus: the BS had certain requirements in math and science, the BA in humanities and specifically foreign language.

The motion was **approved** (29 yes, 15 no, 6 abstain, recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTION PERIOD AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**1. President's Report**

WIEWEL appreciated the prior discussion of liberal education, recognizing that this was hard to do in this kind of forum and that further, more detailed discussions were required.

WIEWEL reported on enrollment: student credit hours for spring were down 0.5%. This was consistent with a pattern for several years. The numbers for any one term were not an issue, and in making estimates being off by only 1% was actually good. But the ongoing pattern required attention.

The University had been participating with the City of Portland, Intel, CH2M Hill, and other partners in a national competition for \$50 million Department of Transportation grant. WIEWEL announced that the PSU collaboration proposal had been named as one of seven finalists.

He also mentioned that the administration was putting together two task forces on African-American and Asian-Pacific Islander student success. Soon there would be a call for nominations and self-nominations for these task forces, with work starting in the spring and completing in the next academic year.

WIEWEL stated that the impact for student workers of the new minimum wage proposal in Oregon was being analyzed: with more wages being required, this could potentially put hiring units in a tight spot.

The Board of Trustees had approved a tuition and fee increase that their meeting last Thursday: a 4% increase in tuition, a 3.7% increase in combined tuition and fees. This represented over the last five years an average increase of 2.2% annually, which WIEWEL characterized as modest. He observed that PSU's tuition is second lowest among the state universities (Eastern Oregon's being lowest).

The PSU Foundation has been doing a search for a new president. A potential hire had not worked out in the negotiation stage, so the search was continuing. It was important not just to settle, WIEWEL said, but to find the right person for this important position.

He reported briefly on building projects. PSU would propose to the legislature in the 2017 session a project for the Graduate School of Education to be built in the lot between 4th and 5th avenues and between Montgomery and Harrison streets: a joint building with the City of Portland and another research organization, which means that private money need not be raised. We are engaged in raising \$10 million towards renovation of Neuberger Hall; a RFP for the general contractor and design has been put forward. Groundbreaking for the Viking Pavilion/Stott Center project will be on April 23rd, and the city's design commission has approved the design.

WIEWEL acknowledged the conclusion of a tentative agreement in bargaining. He was pleased with the process that been agreed upon, interest-based bargaining. Though at the beginning not everyone would have bet that this process would succeed, it had in fact continued through to the end and progress had been continually made. He acknowledged the hard work and persistence of those involved.

2. Provost's Report

[For an outline of the Provost's Report, see **April Minutes Appendix G.2.**]

ANDREWS called attention to the anticipated moves of several departments [ECN and IST from CLAS to CUPA, SCH from CUPA to SPH], proposals for which would come before Senate in the near future. MOUs (memorandums of understanding) on the logistics of the moves had already been approved, and were available for study. The Senate would vote on programmatic aspects of the moves. Faculty and staff involved had been consulted, and questions about office space, etc., had been considered.

ANDREWS announced that a search had been launched for dean of the School of Public Health. The search committee is comprised faculty and staff from both universities [PSU and OHSU], as well as some external members; Dean Karen MARRONGELLE (CLAS) is chairing the search. It was anticipated that candidates would be visiting in early June.

A budget forum was held last Thursday; slides would be posted on the OAA website, ANDREWS stated. It laid out the budget and revenue projections for FY 16 [fiscal year 2016], and preliminary numbers for FY 17. The Budget Committee would discuss these in more detail at their next meeting.

ANDREWS echoed WIEWEL's thanks to those involved in collective bargaining.

3. Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council (

The report of the Academic Advising Council, presented by JHAJ, was **received** as contained in **April Agenda Attachment G.3.**

4. Annual Report of the Institutional Assessment Council

The report of the Institutional Assessment Council, presented by VOEGELE and WISE, was **received** as contained in **April Agenda Attachment G.4.**

VOEGELE provided some comments relating to the report. She referred to information at the previous meeting previous meeting that the NWCCU accreditation agency had critiqued the consistency of assessment at the program level. IAC, with faculty from across the university, had been working this issue in a dedicated way, and was interested in keeping control of assessment in the departments. With that guiding philosophy, how can we learn what is going on across the institution and communicate this to stakeholders? The IAC was working on a plan for more systematic feedback on and support of assessment across the seven-year accreditation and program review cycle.

VOEGELE pointed to results in the report [**Attachment G.4**]. Also, the IAC website included a map of campus-wide learning outcomes to program-level outcomes: www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/status-reports. For the most part, program-level outcomes do indeed map to campus-wide outcomes, though some of the latter are represented more frequently. What's not immediately evident is that outcomes such as sustainability gained from 2009 to 2014, so there are changes over time. She welcomed any feedback.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:44.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 May 2016

Presiding Officer: Gina Greco

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Ingersoll, Kennedy, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, O’Banion, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Taylor, Thieman, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters

Alternates Present:

Thorne for Jaén Portillo, G. Smith for Talbott, Cunningham for Taylor

Members Absent:

Dusschee, Labissiere, Loney, Monsere, Riedlinger

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andresen, Andrews, Beyler, Connolly, Everett, Fraire, D. Hansen, Hines, Jhaj, Kinsella, Liebman, Marshall, Miller, Moody, Natter, Percy, Reynolds, Sanders, Suarez, Wiewel

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **4 April 2016 Minutes** were **approved** with minor changes made prior to the meeting, viz., on p. 54, item C.4:

for “6% surcharge” read “plus a surcharge”

for “is by definition ... the PI’s grant.” read “is by definition temporary and rarely lasts for the five years required to become vested in PERS, the postdoc collects no retirement benefit, nor does the benefit return to the PI’s grant.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION

1. OAA Response to March Notice of Senate Actions, concurrence, was noted [May Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. Announcements by Presiding Officer (*originally C.4 in the agenda*)

GRECO announced that the Alumni Association has offered the use of the Simon Benson House for a space for faculty lunch on Tuesdays, starting in October.

GRECO circulated summaries of table discussions from the Winter Symposium in January: curriculum breadth and depth; equity and inclusion; global/local concerns; wellness [see **May Minutes Appendices C.2.a-d**].

3. Changes to administrative committees (*originally C.2 in the agenda*)

BEYLER announced certain changes to administrative committees listed in the Faculty Governance Guide. The appointment of members for three committees that allocated monies from student fees—the Smith Memorial Union Advisory Board, the Academically Controlled Auxiliary Activities Committee, and the Educational Activities Speakers Program Board—would now be the responsibility of ASPSU. (This had already been the case on a trial basis.) The Campus Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy Committee, which had been listed as inactive, would now be discontinued. The Academic and Research Space Subcommittee of the Capital Advisory Committee would henceforth have a faculty member on a regular basis.

GRECO added that for the latter case, this had already been the case informally, but would this would now be a part of the faculty committee appointment process.

4. Modification of Faculty Senate elections process for 2016 (*originally C.3*)

BEYLER deferred this announcement till later in the meeting.

5. Discussion: culturally responsive courses and curricula

GRECO introduced the discussion topic, starting with presentations by several faculty on introducing or modifying syllabi, curriculum, etc., to highlight cultural diversity and responsiveness. [For slides see **Minutes Appendix C.5.a.**]

Kerth O'BRIEN (PSY), in several courses which were not designated “diversity-related” as such, had introduced this kind of material by accretion, because it would have been bad social science not to. In social psychology, there is a discussion of values and assumptions, which means examining whether what happens for one group is true for the wider population. This shows limitations of the field, not to besmirch it, but to inspire a more expansive, inclusive kind of science. Pointing out limitations leads to new questions. In research methods, she discusses whether survey questions are sensitive to some populations more than others. Is informed consent negotiated only at an individual level, or are group involvements taken into account? This is done primarily because it would have been bad social science not to ask these questions. A winter course on social determinants of health included looking at the influences of stress due to prejudice. O'BRIEN acknowledged the help of the Library in designing materials. A potential pitfall is the need for support to recover from mistakes. Making mistakes is part of the learning process; recovering from them leads to better science.

Shirley JACKSON (chair of BST) related experience of curriculum change at several institutions. As new chair of Black Studies at PSU she has revised the curriculum starting winter term. Serving as a member of the American Sociological Association's Departmental Resources Group, she had visited several sociology departments around the country. The ASA has recommended that departments offer a course or series of courses that focus on diversity. JACKSON called on us to prepare students for life outside the university, therefore to include diversity issues in an intentional way in a variety of courses. The Strategic Plan calls for a commitment to equity. Are we really doing this, or leaving it to someone else? We are in a diverse and global environment, and need to serve students in this environment. The speak-out event by student of color and the visit by representatives of the Black Lives Matter initiative showed that these issues are salient

to PSU students. In 2014, one quarter of the population of Portland were non-white; this means that these issues affect essentially everyone in the community.

Jeff ROBINSON (chair of COMM) referred to an exit poll given to majors in Communication. One result is that students are demanding attention to diversity. What do they mean by that? In addition to faculty and student racial diversity, students want pedagogical diversity. They want to see themselves in course materials, exercises, discussions, etc. About two years ago, COMM made some changes which demanded little cost or time. ROBINSON noted that this was not meant to preclude specific investments: in faculty of color, consultants to help faculty re-design curriculum, etc. He also noted that these changes did not ask faculty to move outside their zones of expertise or training. It was not forcing faculty to teach “intercultural communication,” or to add topics to already full syllabi. Instead, there was attention to choosing reading materials for concept exposition. Systematically, an effort was made to include (or replace) readings so as to focus on diverse populations. Courses not nominally diversity courses could still include diversity related materials. Thus for an introductory course on content analysis, one could encounter readings that deal only with Caucasian populations; instead, a reading is included that discusses police-civilian interactions among different populations. It promoted a sensitive discussion of fundamental concepts.

Tim GARRISON (chair of HST) was unable to be present, but submitted a brief report on examples of cultural diversity-related curricula in the History Department [printed as **Minutes Appendix C.5.b**].

B. HANSEN/RAFFO **moved** that the Senate resolve into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:28).

Among the questions raised during the discussion were the response of students to these initiatives, the significance of our changing student profile, and the need to include consideration of these issues beyond the humanities and social sciences.

STEDMAN/CARSTENS **moved** that Senate return to **regular session**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:38).

NOMINATIONS FOR 2016-17 PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

BEYLER indicated that the POE became Presiding Officer for 2017-18, and then Past Presiding Officer for 2018-19. It was in this sense a three-year commitment. Nominations could also be submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to the June meeting, and also from the floor at the June meeting prior to the vote.

David RAFFO was nominated.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposal Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council (GC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) listed in **May Agenda Attachment E.1**, were approved, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies

SANDERS, on behalf of UCC, presented the proposed Undergraduate Certificate in Global Studies, brought forward by the Department of International & Global Studies, contained in **May Agenda Attachment E.2**. The certificate originated in a suggestion by the Internationalization Council. It would be an additional credential for students. It comprises twenty credits or, in effect, five courses. At least four courses must be upper-division; one must come from a core of several options; the other four courses are drawn from a list of pre-approved courses from about twenty departments. Other courses, including study abroad and internships, may be included with advisor approval. International Studies majors and minors are not eligible to take this certificate: it is meant to be added to other majors.

CHANG/YESILADA moved the proposal as given in Attachment E.2.

RUETER asked how the certificate differed from a minor in International Studies. To answer the question YESILADA recognized Shawn SMALLMAN (chair of IST): the number of credits is lower, and the available courses are diverse. Internationalization Council suggested a way to document international learning that could include students from a variety of majors, e.g., engineering. This was also why it did not include a language requirement. It could overlap with the Global Perspectives UNST cluster. It is meant not to compete with the regional studies certificates: classes were intended to have a global perspective. RUETER wondered why the Foundations of Global Studies course was not included in the certificate. SMALLMAN said that it had been a challenge to keep the number of required courses low. The course in question entailed a great deal of theoretical background, was reading-intensive, and aimed at students in the major. The certificate, conversely, reached out to students across campus. Since courses could be included with advisor approval, one could make an argument to include this course on an individual basis. GAMBURD asked if there a way to move courses on or off the approved list. SMALLMAN said there would be an annual review; however, they wanted courses offered regularly and not 399's.

The **motion was approved** (42 yes, 7 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

3. Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty for Continuous Appointments

GRECO said this was a preview of information for an anticipated vote next month.

DeLys OSTLUND (CLAS and WLL), presented the proposed guidelines on behalf of the Task Force on Review of NTTF Faculty for Continuous Appointments. [For slides, see **May Minutes Appendix E.3**; for text of the anticipated proposal, see **May Agenda Attachment E.3**.] OSTLUND noted that there are two types of non-tenure line faculty: fixed term, who are on an appointment for a fixed span of time which is not renewable; and those on a probationary appointment which could be renewed. The proposal does not cover fixed-term faculty [in the former sense]. She emphasized that this discussion is not to be confused with the discussion around tenure for teaching-intensive faculty. There are two primary sources for the document created by the Task Force: the language of Article 18 [from collective bargaining], and the faculty P&T [promotion and tenure] guidelines. Only the highlighted language in the document is thus open for debate; other

language has already been approved. The Task Force held two public forums and also distributed a survey.

OSTLUND reviewed the three stages of the proposed process. First, NTTF faculty on a probationary appointment would be reviewed annually. A milestone review would then occur in year six. Following that, there would be evaluation every three years. Annual reviews prior to the milestone would document and evaluate faculty contributions, and provide developmental feedback aiming at the milestone review. Feedback indicated considerable diversity in what NTTF faculty are doing across campus, and it was intended that the review process acknowledge that. The milestone review, at year six, would determine whether faculty would receive continuous appointment. It would be consistent with contractual obligations, such as classroom activities or contributions to the curriculum, and also include possibility for peer evaluation. OSTLUND noted that the committee included both NTTF and tenure-line faculty; they all felt that review committees needed to include (at least one) NTTF faculty member. Provision was made for departments that did not have more than one NTTF faculty. After the milestone review, the process would be comparable to post-tenure review, but every three years.

OSTLUND referred to the two documents submitted [in the packet]: one the general review procedure, the other an implementation plan for NTTF faculty already on campus. This latter group included those who had already been promoted, and would be grandfathered in; those who had been here six years with at least four positive annual reviews, who would also be grandfathered in; and those who had been here for six years but had not been evaluated, who would have a cumulative review.

OSTLUND indicated that the Task Force believed there were still questions which needed discussion. One was the issue of diversity and equity. Another was the issue of post-review professional development.

BOWMAN suggested changing language about materials for review which seemed restricted to instructional activity: this did not apply to all NTTF, for example, clinical professors or professors of practice. OSTLUND took note of this for the Task Force.

B. HANSEN called attention to the provision on p. 2 [of Attachment E.3] that time assigned to university, community, and professional service shall not exceed 10%. OSTLUND commented that this language had come out of bargaining, not from the Task Force. B. HANSEN wondered how closely this would be enforced.

DONLAN was curious about why there was not explicit reference to Faculty Senate service in criteria for evaluation. OSTLUND responded that the criteria included what people were required to do, but also allowed inclusion of activities that they opted to do as part of their service. DONLAN hoped that we could encourage NTTF to participate in Senate without penalizing them.

GRIFFIN observed that for tenure-track faculty the process includes “excellence” in at least one of the categories of review. He asked if there is a similar criterion of excellence for continuous appointment: what is the expected level of evaluation. OSTLUND said that was a good question. GRECO said that this would depend on departmental guidelines: the university as a whole does not tell departments how to evaluate people. GRIFFIN reiterated that the university specified “excellence” [in tenure cases].

OSTLUND responded that the document was intended to be as broad as possible, allowing individual units to make more specific recommendations.

A question was asked about faculty who have joint appointments or who move their departmental home: where would they be reviewed. THIEMAN, a member of the Task Force, answered that they took the language of the collective bargaining agreement [on this point] as given. OSTLUND added that this could be decided by the department. LIEBMAN noted that the wording here is a supplement to the wording of the contract; the union does not have the power to write promotion and tenure guidelines, but acts as a steward to make sure they are in keeping with the rest of the contract. He felt it would be wise to include protections for someone who changes from one department or school to another, to ensure that reviews are fair and that favorable reviews are acknowledged.

LIEBMAN also noted that these guidelines, once approved, would also undergo a final review by AAUP to make sure they are compatible with the negotiated contract. GRECO added that the contract deals with process; it is the departments that set expectations and write guidelines; she urged departments to take that role seriously. LIEBMAN agreed that the contract was mainly about procedure; what remained was to write evaluation criteria of an academic portfolio

THIEMAN asked whether Senate wanted a statement about what departments might include in their guidelines. Language that departments “should” include items was meant to apply university-wide. GRECO noted that any changes in language to the guidelines would require amendments [to the main motion]. BEYLER circulated several possible amendments which had already been received, and noted that further proposed amendments could be sent in advance of the June meeting or made at the meeting. GRECO asked that, if possible, amendments be sent in advance.

4. Proposal to amend Constitution to establish an Academic Quality Committee

GEORGE reported from the Task Force on Academic Quality [TAQ]. [See slides, **May Agenda Attachment E.4.b.**] TAQ was initiated about two year ago as a result of collective bargaining. The original charge was to consider expectations for various kinds of faculty activities relative to PSU’s comparators given the mission of PSU, characteristics of the student body, resources, etc. TAQ in its first year “flipped around” its understanding of the charge, and decided to ask first what faculty think constitutes academic quality. They distributed a survey, which had a good response rate. TAQ analyzed the survey and conducted a literature review, and thereupon settled on several aspirational practices as well as several recommendations connected with these.

GEORGE said that another task this year was to consider whether this committee should become a standing committee. Borrowing imagery developed [last year] by Mark JONES: the university has to respond to budgetary considerations as well as external forces, which have clear metrics such as dollars, student credit hours, etc. What’s less clear is the indicators for academic quality. There is a sense of dread that we might, for example, seek to increase [easily measurable] graduation rates but at the expense of academic quality. The suggestion of TAQ is to develop a dashboard to monitor aspects of the academic experience for faculty and students, and use this to help manage the university. This monitoring would be the function of a proposed standing committee. It would administer a biannual survey of faculty, digest the information, make

recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and involve other committee in examining particular issues in more detail.

Annabelle DOLIDON (WLL) discussed several aspirational practices that had been identified by TAQ working in subgroups [see **May Agenda Attachment E.4.b**]. These arose from faculty survey; TAQ considered what other committees might already be working on them and how they connected to the Strategic Plan; and offered preliminary recommendations. 1) Undergraduate research was linked to the Strategic Plan goal of elevating student success. TAQ recommended creation of an ad hoc committee to advocate this issue. 2) They recommended, similarly, looking at graduate student experience. 3) Student writing is already being looked at by a university committee; TAQ emphasizes writing in the disciplines, and favors the re-establishment of the writing intensive course curriculum in some form. 4) Interdisciplinary research and teaching is also part of the Strategic Plan. TAQ sees this a potential domain of excellence for PSU. They suggest, inter alia, working with the Library to create more supports. A project like ReThink might be a way to foster interdisciplinary research and teaching. 5) Support for faculty activities was, in part, discussed on contract negotiations ongoing the time, and thus now, in part, already addressed. Other initiatives include writing support for international faculty; possibility to re-arrange teaching to allow terms off; etc.

TAQ's overall recommendation, DOLIDON continued, was to create an Academic Quality Committee, with a charge as given in **May Agenda Attachment E.4.a**. The committee would continue to monitor these aspirational practices, in cooperation with other relevant committees, and maintain the dashboard as described above.

GIOIA wished to see more about development of instructional practices and support for faculty to remain current with instructional practices. GEORGE responded that the list was not meant to be exclusive; other concerns could be added and it did come up in the survey. GIOIA said that the change [from the survey] seemed dramatic. GEORGE said that the process was integrative and would work on several different things.

5. Creation of an Ad-Hoc Committee on Liberal Education

GRECO reminded senators that several Senate discussions in winter and spring, as well as the Winter Symposium, were devoted to this topic. Steering Committee brings a motion [**May Agenda Attachment E.5**] to create a five-person ad hoc committee to address questions: What skills and outcomes should a successful undergraduate demonstrate? How will we assess quality in this area and respond to this assessment? Do our stated general education goals and campus-learning outcomes reflect our sense of what liberal education should encompass? What should be we doing differently to enhance our students' liberal education experience, to make it more meaningful and engaging? How can we involved faculty across campus in this effort? How do we evaluate transfer students and ensure their successful transition?

PERLMUTTER/SCHULER **moved the motion as given in May Agenda Attachment E.5.**

LIEBMAN/MAIER **moved an amendment** to interpolate "PSU" between the words "successful" and "undergraduate" in the first bullet point. The amendment was **approved** by unanimous voice vote.

ELZANOWSKI asked if the term “liberal education” been defined. GRECO said, yes it was, last month. It is not liberal economics or liberal politics; it is not only the humanities. It is a combination of breadth and depth; the depth comes from the major; the breadth comes typically from general education, including aspects of knowledge, ways of thinking, and ways of knowing that the university decides are important for students.

SCHROCK asked if the charge is discrete, for one year, or will it become a standing committee. GRECO said that it is starting with the idea of a one-year charge. The plan is for someone from AQC (if approved) to sit on this committee. It will look at defining and evaluating liberal education; specific proposals would then come forward for a vote.

The motion as amended was **approved** (42 yes, 7 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

6. Pre-baccalaureate certificate option

MACCORMACK, chair of ARC, presented the proposal as contained in **May Agenda Attachment E.6**. He noted, as background, that PSU currently has options for undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate certificates. This proposal would provide an option for students to take a certificate without being a degree-seeking student at PSU; it would also allow students seeking a degree to receive a certificate before graduation. UCC and EPC have both reviewed and approved this policy change. ARC had waited to see if there would be a concrete program proposal. The Geography Department, he understands, might have done so with their GIS undergraduate certificate proposed last January, but the option was not then available. Unlike various informally designated “certificates” apparently in existence, proposals would now have to undergo the curricular review process. There would be a minimum of sixteen credits for a pre-bacc certificate, with three-quarters taken at PSU. Departments could add further requirements. MACCORMACK clarified that financial aid would not be available for non-degree-seeking students. The proposal was aimed, in part, at addressing the apparently proliferation of informal, non-transcriptable so-called “certificates.” He knew of interest from SBA and, as noted, Geography.

STEDMAN/RUETER **moved the motion as given in May Agenda Attachment E.6**. The motion was **approved** (38 yes, 7 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

KENNEDY asked if other Oregon universities offered pre-bacc certificates.

MACCORMACK answered that OSU has something equivalent to this proposal; U of O does not. He was not sure about the other campuses. He suggested that OSU, in comparison to U of O, had more technical programs in which a certificate might be valuable to students before graduation. His thought that PSU’s urban situation might mean more students here interested in discrete programs.

RUETER stated that the proposals for certificates from ESM, submitted last fall, originally had a pre-bacc option in mind. Is there a path to get them approved now?

MACCORMACK said that this would have to go through the curricular review process, but he guessed it would be largely pro forma. RUETER questioned whether pre-bacc was the best name. MACCORMACK replied that they wanted to be able to preserve the option for certificates to be awarded only with graduation. The discussion had been ongoing for two years, and he had not heard a better suggestion. GRECO thought it was

not necessary that the certificate itself say “pre-bacc”; it would simply be a “certificate in XYZ.” Right now there is no way to give someone a certificate of whatever kind unless they are already getting [or already have] a degree.

WEBB wondered if it is labelled as post-bacc, does that mean that someone already with a degree cannot go back to get the certificate? She also wondered if there is a time limit on achieving the certificate. MACCORMACK answer regarding the second that there is no overall limit, but departments may include limits in their proposals. BACCAR said in regard to the first question that this option as such would not prevent someone with a degree from pursuing the certificate: it simply becomes available to students prior to graduation. Regarding the second question, she noted that curricular requirements in general are subject to the seven-year catalog rule.

BLUFFSTONE inquired whether certificates of completion would need to meet the standard requirements for credit hours, contact hours, etc. MACCORMACK observed that BACCAR was nodding her head, but said that he did not understand the question. BLUFFSTONE explained that he was asking whether or not there would be anything special about the courses in these programs. MACCORMACK answered that the programs would have to go through the regular curriculum approval process: we were talking about normal credit-bearing courses, now transcribed in a new way.

CLARK asked if post-baccalaureate certificates were available on the same model. MACCORMACK said they already existed. Certificates could be available on multiple sets of requirements. BACCAR clarified that for a post-bacc certificate, the department requires that the student already have a degree. CLARK observed then that just the name “certificate” is not sufficient. BACCAR stated further that terms such as “post-bacc” are primarily internal, defining which students are eligible.

ARELLANO was concerned about quality control, particularly for students who may not have any college experience. She alluded to the prior discussion about writing and math ability. She also wondered whether earning just a certificate and nothing else would enhance a student’s possibilities in the job market. MACCORMACK saw two parts to the question. Are we getting into competition with the community colleges? The specific proposals so far have comprised 300- and 400-level courses, some with specific prerequisites. The UCC needs to consider the value of the proposal to the students. He did not see how to write this as a general rule; it would be necessary to rely on the judgment of Senate and its curricular committees.

INGERSOLL stated that while she is a member of ARC she does not support this particular proposal. One reason is that she does not see any way to distinguish what kinds of certificates can be approved as undergraduate certificates [requiring a degree] or as pre-bacc certificates [not requiring a degree]. MACCORMACK wondered whether that was such a terrible thing. GRECO stated that she recognized the quality issue, but noted that specific proposals generally included upper-division courses and would require Senate review. She noted also that federal loans would not be available for students in such programs. MACCORMACK observed that you needed to be a degree-seeking students to received financial aid stated that the university would be guarded in how it promotes these programs. “How?” someone interjected. BACCAR said that it would be up to departments to stipulate requirements for students to take a given certificate

program, e.g., that they be degree-seeking students. In the curricular approval process, they should indicate why it would be appropriate to open it to non-degree students or not.

LAYZELL was in favor of certificates because people seeking them perhaps just want to be happy and may not care directly about career issues. He understood quality issues, but assumed this could be taken care of with careful wording. He was in favor of people coming and studying stuff. MACCORMACK observed that we have a broad community and said it is important to draw them [in].

KENNEDY, along with other advisors, expressed concerns about the struggles of students. What about a student who is non-admissible as a college student, but would nevertheless be trying to get a certificate. What are the standards for creating these certificates? How will this apply to academic standing policy? It could be that, like MOOCs, the certificates will attract mainly college-educated people who want to add certificates. But she wondered if people concerned about their economic situation would think: "I'll just go to PSU and get a certificate; it'll be a cinch," come here, and then flounder. They will be accumulating debt.

THIEMAN, as a new member of Senate, appreciated the different perspectives on this motion. She is intrigued by the idea that this is another way for the university to serve the community. There are many people who would like to come to the university but who are not interested in getting a degree. They want to expand their horizons. Non-traditional students add to diversity and richness of the classroom experience. GIOIA added that universities are traditionally not serving a public need, and this is one of the reasons for the rise of private colleges. He would like us to be part of that, in a responsible way, rather than allowing it to be the Wild West.

The motion was **approved** (34 yes, 16 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

GRECO, observing that the vote was relatively close, proposed that the advisors formulate a note explaining to students and faculty what these certificates are and what they are not.

[NOTE: Because items E.7 through E.9 below were fundamentally similar in character, they were introduced all together.]

7. Change from division to department for Criminology & Criminal Justice

8. Change from division to department for Political Science

9. Change from division to department for Public Administration

PADIN presented the recommendation of EPC to approve motions given in **May Agenda Attachments E.7, E.8, and E.9**. These proposals change current divisions within the Hatfield School (within CUPA) into departments. He characterized the proposals as thorough and persuasive, and embodiments of faculty governance in action. He stated that the cover letter from Dean PERCY could be passed on from EPC verbatim. There had been two years of conversations within CUPA, in order to preserve valuable characteristic of the Hatfield School. PADIN said that EPC views the proposals as preserving the goals and mission of the Hatfield School, and as providing for more effective administration, with the department chairs reporting directly to the dean and allowing more effective faculty participation in shared governance. From EPC perspective the proposals were a model.

The Budget Committee evaluation of these three proposals was circulated [see **May Minutes Appendix E.7-9**].

HARMON/YESILADA **moved the motion given in Attachment E.7** to change the Division of Criminology & Criminal Justice to a Department. The motion was **approved** by voice vote.

YESILADA/SCHROCK **moved the motion given in Attachment E.8** to change the Division of Political Science to a Department. The motion was **approved** by voice vote.

YESILADA/SCHROCK **moved the motion given in Attachment E.9** to change the Division of Public Administration to a Department. The motion was **approved** by voice vote.

[NOTE: Because items E.10 and E.11 below were fundamentally similar in character, they were introduced together.]

10. Move of Department of Economics from CLAS to CUPA

11. Move of Department of International & Global Studies from CLAS to CUPA

PADIN presented the next two proposals, also of a kind, to transfer of two departments from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the College of Urban and Public Affairs: viz., the Department of International and Global Studies and the Department of Economics. The arguments in both cases were similar. The self-determination of the departments in question was positive, PADIN stated, as was the buy-in from the sending and receiving deans. Both departments are essentially saying that the move is to a more favorable ecosystem: they would rather be fish in a smaller than in a larger lake. EPC was recommending both proposals.

The Budget Committee evaluations of these two proposals were circulated [see **May Minutes Appendices E.10 and E.11**].

GRECO reminded senators that last month Provost ANDREWS had shared the MOU's [memoranda of understanding] that underlay the proposals.

RAFFO/CARSTENS **moved the motion given in Attachment E.10** to transfer the Department of Economics to CUPA. The motion was **approved** by voice vote.

YESILADA/ARELLANO **moved the motion given in Attachment E.11** to transfer the Department of International and Global Studies to CUPA. The motion was **approved** by voice vote.

BEYLER now made the announcement deferred from earlier regarding faculty elections. These had been postponed till now, pending the result of these votes. They would now occur, taking into account the departmental moves just approved. It was asked whether this would change the representation in senate. BEYLER said yes; due to proportion of one senator per twenty faculty, and the rounding up or down of the changed numbers in each division, there would be one additional senator. This difference was one of several reasons that the faculty senate election had been delayed.

12. Proposal to amend Constitution to add student member to University Writing Council

GRECO introduced the proposed amendment, **given in May Agenda Attachment E.12**, to add a student member to the University Writing Council. Since it is a constitutional change, a preview is required this month for a vote next month.

DE LA VEGA asked if the student member would be a graduate student. GRECO said the proposed motion did not specify either way. She added that it was possible to propose amendments prior to the vote next month.

13. Proposal to amend Constitution to establish School of Public Health as a faculty governance division

GRECO introduced the proposed amendment, **given in May Agenda Attachment E.13**, to establish the School of Public Health as a faculty governance division. The School of Public Health itself had already been created a year ago; it does not yet exist in the Faculty Constitution. Since it is a constitutional amendment, it is being previewed this month.

14. Proposal to amend Bylaws to update language regarding election of Senate officers

BEYLER said that the proposed amendment to the Bylaws [see **May Agenda Attachment E.14**] was to bring the Bylaws into accord with the provisions of the Faculty Constitution. One substantive change was to add the faculty member of the PSU Board of Trustees as an ex officio member of the Steering Committee. GRECO noted that this addition would keep open channels of communication between the Senate and the Board. De facto, since HINES has also been senior IFS representative, the faculty Board member was ex officio in Steering, but this would not always be the case.

GEORGE asked if there was a change to the Chair of Committee on Committees as an ex officio member of Steering. BEYLER clarified, no.

D. HANSEN brought attention to an inconsistency between the proposed changes and the proposed final text. GRECO ruled that this was a typographical correction, not requiring an amendment, which would be fixed prior to the vote next month. D. HANSEN also asked whether the term “ex officio members” meant that they would have voting members. GRECO stated that the past practice was that the ex officio members in Steering were non-voting members. D. HANSEN asked for clarification. GRECO stated that this could also be clarified prior to the vote next month.

GRECO asked that any proposed amendments to the above be sent in writing, if possible, before the June meeting.

F. QUESTION PERIOD AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

WENDL, on behalf of a colleague in COTA, Eliza GREENSTADT, submitted the following question to Provost ANDREWS:

These questions seek information and background related to faculty teaching loads. A Joint Task Force is examining a proposal that tenure be awarded for teaching-intensive faculty, so it will be necessary to establish the existing standard load. The rationale behind the answers to these questions is welcome.

1. What is the standard teaching load across campus for tenure-track faculty?

This request is for information on standard teaching loads, as indicated in policy documents, not on individually negotiated employment contracts. To instantiate the answer, we request any and all policy documents the university has approved involving the teaching load for tenure-track faculty. There is evidence that individual schools and colleges have implemented guidelines, by-laws, and handbooks for chairs that cite a range from 24 to 30 credits per year. Other documents cite the number of courses to be taught. Currently, tenure-track faculty in some colleges and schools teach fewer credits than in others. We would like to know if there is a standard teaching load that department heads would be authorized to initially offer a candidate for tenure-track employment.

2. What percentage of time should a tenure-track faculty member spend on scholarship, teaching, and service respectively?

Again, the request is for any and all policy documents that the university has approved identifying the percentage of time faculty should devote to different responsibilities required of a tenure-track position. The responsibilities we refer to are scholarship, teaching, and service. In the absence of such policies, the administration's perspective on this matter is requested, observing that the vote was relatively close, proposed that the advisors formulate a note explaining to students and faculty what these certificates are and what they are not.

B. HANSEN recognized GREENSTADT to provide some background. GREENSTADT said that she had assumed, during fifteen years of working at PSU, that there was a standard teaching load for faculty, unless there was an individually negotiated deal upon hiring. When recently moving from one college to another, she discovered that this was not true: there variations among colleges and even within units, with variations from 24 to 30 credits per year. The second part of the question, GREENSTADT said, related to proportions of teaching, service, and research regarded as standard. It could be that faculty in different disciplines might be different types of teaching. Behind this question was also the possibility of tenure for teaching-intensive faculty.

ANDREWS had prepared some initial remarks, and would submit a more comprehensive statement [printed as **May Minutes Appendix F**]. She recognized that the task force, voted on as a result of the administration's and AAUP's negotiations, would probably ask these and similar questions. She would respond as best she could today, but also ask that we gather relevant information in the context of the task force's work. Providing consistent information would be helpful, and hence she hoped the questions would be refined.

Answering the first question, ANDREWS stated that there is not a standard, university-wide policy about teaching load for faculty members. At this time, it is not possible provide the relevant college policy documents, but she will ask for these documents and report back to Senate and the task force. To the second question, ANDREWS said that she would again ask for deans and department chairs to provide further information. Her opinion, however, was that she did not think there should be a campus-wide uniform policy on the percentage work assignments [for teaching, research, and service] for all tenure-track faculty. She concurs with the P&T guidelines, which have been approved by Faculty Senate, stating that faculty

can contribute to the university in varying proportions. Statements of this kind can be found in various sections of the P&T guidelines, which she illustrated by reading several sections. ANDREWS said that these would also provide these in her written statement. ANDREWS believed that her view was consistent with the view, which had been approved by Faculty Senate, that it is up to colleges and departments to determine deployment of faculty talent.

GREENSTADT asked how this applied to persons who have a higher teaching load than others in their unit. Could she request course releases, for example? ANDREWS said that understood the P&T guidelines to say that individual faculty decide this on their own; they could, however, make such requests based on departmental and college criteria.

LIEBMAN observed that some departments have very explicit tallies about various activities which could result in a reduction of teaching load.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

In the interest of time WIEWEL waived his report.

2. Provost's Report

[For written comments from the Provost, see **May Minutes Appendix G.2.**]

ANDREWS thanked O'BRIEN, JACKSON, and ROBINSON for the presentation earlier in the meeting. She viewed it as important for Faculty Senate and the curriculum committees to continue to discuss this issue.

She made her plea for faculty to attend Commencement on June 12th; it is part of the contract for tenured faculty member. The Provost's Graduation Challenge is that she will throw a party for the department with the greatest participation.

The following reports from committees were accepted as given in Attachments to the May Agenda:

- 3. Annual Report of the Honors Council**
- 4. Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board**
- 5. Annual Report of the Library Committee**
- 6. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee**
- 7. Annual Report of the University Studies Council**
- 8. Annual Report of the University Writing Council**

In the interest of time, the oral presentation from UWC was deferred till next month.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:18.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 6 June 2016

Presiding Officer: Gina Greco

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, Donlan, Elzanowski, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, B. Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Ingersoll, Layzell, Lindsay, MacCormack, Maier, McElhone, O'Banion, Padín, Pease, Raffo, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Taylor, Thieman, Tretheway, Webb, Winters, Yesilada

Alternates Present:

Hartig for Childs, Nielsen-Pincus for de Rivera, Allen for Loney, Rad for Monsere, Basci for Perlmutter, Lockett for Schuler

Members Absent:

Baccar, Bluffstone, Daim, De La Vega, Duschee, Griffin, Kennedy, Popp, Wendl

New Members Present:

Allen (also as alternate), Blekic, Brown, Carpenter, Constable, Cruzan, Fernandez, Fiorillo, Gelmon, Lockett (also as alternate), Messer, Mitchell, Nishishiba, Podrabsky, Recktenwald, Reese, Robson, Ruedas, Smallman, Yeigh

Alternate for New Members Present:

Payseno for Walsh

New Members Absent:

Bratiotis, Schechter, Sorensen

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andresen, Andrews, Beyler, Connolly, Everett, D. Hansen, Hines, Kinsella, Kirtley, Liebman, Marongelle, Mercer, Moody, Natter, Percy, Peyton, Sanders, Wiewel

CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, made as part of the consent agenda:

Items G.1-G.4 (Reports) and item F (Question Period)

moved to 4:00 regardless the order of business.

Items E.2-E.6 moved to between items D.4 and D.5.

A. ROLL

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

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **2 May 2016 Minutes**, with the correction of adding the phrase “relative to PSU’s comparators” to E.4, paragraph 1, sentence 2 (p. 65, Proposal to amend Constitution to establish an Academic Quality Committee), between the words “faculty activities” and “given the mission, were **approved**.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION

1. **OAA Response to May Notice of Senate Actions**, concurrence, was noted [**June Agenda Attachment C.1**].

2. **Announcements by Presiding Officer**

GRECO announced that there would be a question for administrators included with the President's report. She clarified the process for voting with clickers: new senators and continuing senators would vote for officers; old and continuing senators would vote on motions.

GRECO also announced the plan of the Office of Academic Innovation (OAI) to have a faculty in residence next year to work on issues related to equity, inclusion, and culturally responsive pedagogy: applications would be received in early fall. It is also planned to have mini-grants on this topic, starting in winter term, e.g., for faculty to work together to develop syllabi, etc.

3. **Discussion: writing across the disciplines**

GRECO introduced Susan KIRTLEY, chair of the University Writing Council (UWC), for a presentation and discussion concerning writing instruction at PSU. [See **Appendix A, slides 8-18**. See also the UWC annual report, attached to the May agenda.]

KIRTLEY indicated that the UWC is a new committee, charged with making recommendations on writing placement, guidelines, and teaching; making recommendations on improving writing instruction; initiating assessment; supporting training of faculty and mentors; and reporting to Senate.

The decentralization of writing instruction at PSU, KIRTLEY said, is both a challenge and a responsibility: defining goals, assigning responsibility. UWC has been working to enhance writing instruction through workshops and activities. They have been seeking grant opportunities.

UWC also has been developing a comprehensive action plan. The Writing Program Administrators Consultant Evaluators Service visited PSU in June 2014 and reported in April 2015 [**Appendix C.3.b**]. In response to this, UWC began working on an action plan together with departments and programs across the university, and in particular with the Dean of CLAS. KIRTLEY indicated five targeted areas: university-wide writing curriculum, undergraduate writing curriculum, graduate students writers, multilingual writers, and faculty and advisor support. Top priorities to start were undergraduate curriculum and multilingual writers, and in both of these areas UWC makes several specific suggestions [see **Appendix A, slide 16**]. Working with multilingual writers was not emphasized in the WPA report, but UWC felt that this was crucial for PSU.

KIRTLEY believed it was important to consider these issues across the university and not only in specific departments such as English or University Studies. A coordinated plan would bring various units into conversation.

GRECO noted that the priorities in the action plan arose out of problems raised in the external report. FARAHMANDPUR asked if the external report was available. GRECO said it would be posted to the Senate website and included with the minutes [**Appendix C.3.b**].

GRECO called members' attention to the other committee reports submitted as attachment to the agenda, and thanked the various committees for their work.
[Applause.]

ELECTION OF 2016-17 PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT AND NOMINATIONS FOR STEERING COMMITTEE

GRECO stated that Michael CLARK had been nominated as Presiding Officer Elect and had accepted the nomination. David RAFFO had been nominated from the floor at the May meeting, but had in the meanwhile declined the nomination. CLARK's candidate statement was displayed [**Appendix A, slide 21**].

GRECO announced that pursuant to a request made by five senators, all voting at the meeting would be by clicker.

CLARK was **elected** Presiding Office Elect for 2016-17.

GRECO stated that there had been four nominations for Steering Committee: Ted DONLAN, Michele GAMBURD, Steve HARMON, and David RAFFO. There were no additional nominations from the floor. The four candidates' statements were displayed [**Appendix A, slides 24-27**].

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment of Bylaws to update language regarding election of Senate officers

GRECO summarized the proposed amendment: to bring Senate election procedures into accord with the Faculty Constitution and precedents; and to add the faculty member of the PSU Board of Trustees as an ex officio member of the Steering Committee.

O'BANION/CARSTENS **moved the amendment as given in June Agenda Attachment D.1**. The amendment was **approved** (46 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

2. Amendment of Constitution to add student member to University Writing Council

TAYLOR/HARMON **moved the amendment as given in June Agenda Attachment D.2**. The amendment was **approved** (40 yes, 5 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

3. Amendment of Constitution to create an Academic Quality Committee

B. HANSEN/BOWMAN **moved the amendment as given in June Agenda Attachment D.3**. The amendment was **approved** (34 yes, 8 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

4. Amendment of Constitution to establish SPH as a faculty governance division

STEDMAN/GAMBURD **moved the amendment as given in June Agenda Attachment D.4**. The amendment was **approved** (44 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

The order of business was changed at this point, in the manner noted above.

F. QUESTION TO ADMINISTRATORS [*changed order of business*]

LIEBMAN submitted a question to the President regarding faculty representation on Standing Committees of the Board of Trustees [**Appendix F**].

WIEWEL, answering, stated that he would recommend to the Board's Executive and Audit Committee, at their upcoming meeting on Wednesday [8 June], that they direct the Secretary of the Board to review best practices in this regard, to consult with the Association of Governing Boards about best practices, and to report back to the committee in the fall with recommendations. In the meanwhile, he would continue to encourage people to attend, such as the Presiding Officer, chairs of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Budget Committee, etc., as relevant. As to whether they should be ex officio, they [the Board] would investigate best practices.

G. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND COMMITTEES

[changed order of business]

1. President's Report

WIEWEL said that final spring enrollment numbers are flat compared to last year. Summer enrollment is running 2-2.5% lower than last year.

Highlights of the year for WIEWEL included: the upcoming commencement; completion of the Strategic Plan; the recent academic leadership retreat, which delved into implementation, and other examples of putting the Strategic Plan into use; successful interest-based bargaining with the various unions (bargaining with the police officers will still be underway); successful re-accreditation, which takes an enormous amount of work; and the creation of the joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health, with interviews for the dean taking place this week.

WIEWEL noted the role of the equity lens in creating and implementing the Strategic Plan, and noted events such as the Students of Color Speak Out as calling attention to these issues. He characterized this as a change in the way that people think and talk, and increasingly act, though much more remains to be done.

WIEWEL referred to the creation of the College Affordability Coalition. The business payroll tax initiative was withdrawn; instead, the University was entering into a partnership with various members of the business community to identify \$25 million annually in new funding sources for PSU. A first meeting would take place later this month.

Construction of the new Business School building and the Viking Pavilion was underway. Thomas Acker had been hired as architect for the planned renovation of Neuberger Hall.

He reviewed several key staffing changes: Bill BOLDT (previously UNLV) had been hired as President of the PSU Foundation. Jon FINK is stepping down as Vice President of Research, and Dan CONNOLLY is stepping down as Dean of SBA.

WIEWEL appreciated the many scholarly achievements of faculty and students, and the work of the Senate during the academic year.

2. Provost's Report

In the interest of time ANDREWS said she would forego the report.

3. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

HINES said that IFS was planning a faculty summit for early 2017, involving faculty from four-year institutions and community colleges, centered on removing barriers to student success. She reported that the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) recently revised policies and procedures to include testimony from and consultation with IFS among other groups.

HINES asked members to consider issues for IFS for October, such as how to implement state-wide faculty oversight of curriculum as state-wide issues emerge: what students are arriving with [to college] and where they are going. Specifically, HINES mentioned dual-credit programs, community college transfers, and the contemplated applied baccalaureate degree. IFS will be working on the statement on the latter this fall.

HINES noted that CLARK would be replacing her as IFS representative starting in January, with PADIN becoming the senior member of the PSU delegation.

4. Report of Task Force on Emeritus Status for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

LINDSAY, chair of the Task Force, introduced the group and its charge [see report, **June Packet Attachment G.4**; and presentation slides, **Appendix A, slides 38-44**]. There was evidently confusion across the University on emeritus status for non-tenure track faculty (NTTF): examples were known, but the Human Resources (HR) website stated that emeritus status was reserved for tenured faculty. The committee determined that since 1975, 148 faculty had been awarded emeritus status, of whom 24 were NTTF. Promotion and tenure guidelines state that the rank may be awarded upon retirement in recognition of outstanding service; there is no mention of a designation for tenured faculty only. There was thus inconsistency between the listed policy, examples of past practice, and information as presented, e.g., by HR, as well as inconsistent application among various schools.

LINDSAY noted that there were questions about the cost of these benefits. Interviews with the staff involved with these benefits showed that the cost was generally minimal. The biggest concern, LINDSAY indicated, was with parking. Analysis was presented in **June Packet Attachment G.4.b**. In most categories, the cost was comparatively small; parking staff, however, desired that the costs be borne elsewhere and not by them.

Summarizing, LINDSAY stated the task force's conclusion that NTTF had been and were still eligible for emeritus status in recognition for outstanding service, and its recommendation that there be consistency in the information presented by HR (e.g., on its website) and units.

LIEBMAN asked what the next step would be. LINDSAY said that she believed the task force had completed its charge. Updating information from HR would be a simple fix. She believed that OAA could work with departments to make sure that they were aware of this policy and to apply it consistently.

It was asked whether a change to the promotion and tenure guidelines would be necessary. GRECO responded that there was apparently nothing in the current wording which precluded emeritus status for NTTF, but that it would be possible to make an amendment to make this explicit.

ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS [*changed order of business*]

Steven HARMON and David RAFFO were **elected** as new members of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

E. NEW BUSINESS [*changed order of business*]**1. Curricular Proposal Consent Agenda**

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council (GC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) listed in **June Agenda Attachment E.1**, were approved, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Transfer of School of Community Health from CUPA to SPH

GRECO explained the question as the transfer of this specific program and its faculty from CUPA to the (already established) SPH. Individual faculty could choose not to move; however, those decisions did not come under Senate purview. BEYLER added that the previous vote had established SPH as a Senate division; the present vote concerned populating that division with faculty.

STEDMAN/RAFFO **moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.2**. The motion was **approved** (40 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, vote recorded by clicker).

3. Transfer of Health Systems Management & Policy Programs from CUPA to SPH

CARSTENS/RUETER **moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.3**. The motion was **approved** (42 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

4. PhD in Epidemiology (SPH)

GRECO explained the issue for the next three items. OHSU had approved prior PSU degree programs now offered by the joint SPH; it was now up to PSU to approve (or not) prior OHSU degree programs that would be offered by SPH. Graduate Council had recommended approval of these degree programs.

RAFFO/TAYLOR **moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.4**. The motion was **approved** (45 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

5. MS in Biostatistics (SPH)

ELZANOWSKI/STEDMAN **moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.5**. The motion was **approved** (43 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

6. Graduate Certificate in Biostatistics (SPH)

LIEBMAN/ELZANOWSKI **moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.6**.

LIEBMAN asked, referring to page 1 of the proposal: what are K-awardees? ANDRESEN said that these refer to awards from the National Institutes of Health and other major funders for post-doctoral certificate programs.

The motion was **approved** (42 yes, 3 no, 0 abstain).

The order of business now reverted to the regular sequence.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [cont'd]

5. Resolution on paying benefits for post-doctoral fellowships

GRECO summarized the proposed resolution as voicing PSU's support for legal measures to allow paying benefits to postdoctoral fellows comparable to those given to other employees, but at a lower cost [to the grant PIs]. She noted that Faculty Senate cannot resolve this problem itself: it requires legislative action. The resolution states support for exploration of such action.

MAIER/STEDMAN **moved the resolution as given in June Agenda Attachment D.5.** The motion was **approved** (40 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain).

LIEBMAN asked about the status of post-docs at the joint School of Public Health. GRECO replied that the question pertained only to persons with PSU contracts; those with OHSU contract were not under PSU Faculty Senate purview.

6. Review of NTTF for continuous appointments

GRECO reviewed procedure for the upcoming discussion: after a motion and second, the floor would then be open for discussion and for any amendments to the main motion. The amendments would then be considered one by one; each amendment had to be considered on its own before going to another amendment or the main motion. BEYLER clarified additionally that the main motion is contained in two documents: **June Agenda Attachment D.6.a** is the proposed guidelines; **D.6.b** is an implementation or phase-in plan for implementation of the guidelines as they pertain to NTTF who have already been at PSU for a number of years; though these are two documents, since **D.6.b.** only makes sense in the context of **D.6.a** it is asked that they be moved together.

B. HANSEN/CAMACHO moved the motion as given in June Agenda Attachments D.6.a and D.6.b.

BEYLER gave a point of information: Prior to the meeting three potential amendments were received in writing, and comprise **June Agenda Attachment D.6.c** in the packet. A fourth potential amendment was received too late to go into the packet, but circulated by e-mail as **June Agenda Attachment D.6.d.** All of these potential amendments, however, had to be moved and seconded from the floor in order to receive discussion and an up-or-down vote.

THIEMAN asked for clarification about amendment #4. GRECO explained that this amendment had been received from the Provost. THIEMAN was under the impression that this amendment was to be considered first. GRECO responded that this was not necessarily the case. PERCY voiced appreciation for the work of the work of the task force, and clarified the import of the amendments as clarifying what may be included for review by faculty with, for example, research expectations. GRECO continued by noting that Steering Committee had received two alternative wordings for Amendment #1, and that it would be necessary to choose one or the other of these for consideration.

LIEBMAN/RAFFO moved the second bullet-point of amendment #1 as given in Attachment D.6.c, viz.:

Move to insert after final bullet point under “Annual Review submission materials may also include” in the section Annual Review:

- Evidence of scholarly activities, at the employee’s discretion, if the job description for any of the annual reviews included research requirements, including required academic affiliation

CARSTENS did not understand the last phrase, “academic affiliation.” PERCY said it related to professional associations related to scholarly work. CARSTENS wondered if there were a better way to say this: “academic affiliation” could mean many things. LIEBMAN suggested: “professional certification.”

LIEBMAN/RAFFO **moved to amend the amendment [#1]**, viz., changing “academic affiliation” to “professional certification.”

CLARK objected that “certification,” as something bestowed upon someone by someone else, might be very different from affiliation or membership. LAYZELL wondered if it might actually mean “non-academic” affiliation, e.g., maintaining a continuous certification as a CPA in order to teach in the Business School: this was not an academic affiliation. LIEBMAN asked if this meant periodical re-certification. LAYZELL: yes. The argument seemed to be about academic affiliations, whereas the change in wording seemed to imply non-academic affiliations. B. HANSEN thought it was too narrow to refer [only] to certification; he thought the point was affiliation with professional organizations as something that may be included in the review. It was asked whether to be consistent with other criteria, whether we could use the language of “licensed” or “certified.” GRECO believed that this would be a matter for departments to decide, and that department guidelines could be more specific than the general university guidelines.

The proposed change in wording (replace “academic affiliation” with “professional certification”) was **defeated** (12 yes, 30 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

LAYZELL/RAD (alternate for Monsere) **moved to amend the amendment [#1]**, viz. changing “academic affiliation” to “non-academic affiliation.” The proposed change in wording was **defeated** (6 yes, 36 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

MCELHONE/TAYLOR moved to amend the amendment [#1], viz., that the bullet point read:

- Evidence of scholarly activities, beyond the classroom, as defined by the discipline

BABCOCK, noting that wording this removed the employee’s discretion, asked about the implications of this. GRECO observed that this was the part of the guidelines about what may be included in the review; thus, it was already at the employee’s discretion. There was a difference between what must be and what may be included. THIEMAN spoke against the change: the original intent came from surveys and forums held by the NTTF Task Force. The concern was that some NTT faculty started employment with a research expectation, say as part of

a project. If the expectations or job description later changed, they still wanted to be able to use this work in their review. That distinction is lost in the proposed change. B. HANSEN supported this observation: it allowed for the accumulation of evidence even if the job description or expectations had changed.

MACCORMACK spoke in favor of the change in wording as being broader and including a variety of scholarly activities. If there were originally no expectations of research, for example, that activity would not be included. D. HANSEN emphasized that we were considering this change without the broader context of the guidelines. The guidelines say these “may” be established by the committee if they choose to do so; this doesn’t mean that they can be overruled by the employee’s discretion. Without that language, it is a much broader prospect.

The change in wording (to “Evidence of scholarly activities ...”) was **approved** (24 yes, 16 no, 6 abstain).

Amendment #1 as revised was approved (39 yes, 4 no, 3 abstain).

THIEMAN/SIDERIUS moved amendment #2 as given in June Agenda Attachment D.6.c.

GRECO explained that this amendment, in three places in the guidelines (annual, milestone, and ongoing review), inserted language that reviews may (not must) include evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations. In response to a question from the floor, GRECO stated that we would consider all these changes as one amendment; if it were desired to remove one of them for separate considering, that could be done by amending the amendment.

THIEMAN referred senators to the rationale included in **Attachment D.6.c**: similar wording had been included in the promotion & tenure guidelines for senior instructors. Also, the Strategic Plan emphasized elevating student success and expanding a commitment to equity, and the Task Force believed that this amendment was important so support that work. PERCY said that this work exemplified how to apply an equity lens to new policies. GRECO said that the document referred to [by THIEMAN] was about promotion of non-tenure-faculty; this was thus part of the guidelines for review of the same people, to allow them to include the same material in these processes. MACCORMACK asked for clarification about the term “may include”; previously, D. HANSEN said this referred to the committee’s decision to include or not include material. Or is it the individual’s option. GRECO said that in her reading of the [overall] guidelines, it would be the employee’s decision. Departments and units could add to the guidelines. D. HANSEN asked where this was to be found in the guidelines. THIEMAN pointed to the distinction (e.g., on page 3 [of **Attachment D.6.a**]) between “should include” and “may include.”

GRECO said that since the employee is the one submitting the items [for review], the word “may” signifies that it is the employee’s decision to submit these items or not, since no one else could submit the materials for the employee. However, it could be required in a unit’s guidelines.

Amendment #2 as given in Attachment D.6.c was approved (38 yes, 4 no, 3 abstain).

THIEMAN/CARSTENS **moved amendment #3 as given in June Agenda Attachment D.6.c.** The **amendment [#3]** was **approved** (40 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain).

PERCY/CARSTENS moved the amendment #4 as given in **June Agenda Attachment D.6.d.**, circulated by e-mail.

B. HANSEN summarized the substantive changes as threefold: first, replacing language referring to “NTT faculty” with language referring to “NTT instructional faculty”; second, adding the phrase “at a minimum” to language referring to materials that should be submitted for review; third, adding the phrase “but is not limited to” to language referring to materials that may be submitted for review. An additional change was to change on p. 2 the phrase “NTTF being hired” to the phrase “Bargaining unit members.” ANDREWS indicated that this change made the language identical to that in the collective bargaining agreement.

D. HANSEN asked about the language [in the second box on p. 1 of **D.6.d**] removing the sentence about non-eligibility of fixed-term contract faculty for continuous employment: what was the intention of this change? PERCY stated that the original language [disallowing eligibility] was to distinguish between the two types of appointment. THIEMAN said that the language explaining fixed-term appointments vs. probationary appointments was as originally written by the Task Force. The proposed change eliminates a redundancy. It was noted, however, that the question pertained to the first passage, not the putatively redundant passage. ANDREWS gave the rationale: we might fight that we have fixed-term faculty who might be hired in another department, or hired to fill an unanticipated new demand [for a NTT position], and she did not want to penalized someone if needs changed and we were able to offer them a continuous appointment. PERCY added: a probationary appointment. GRECO said that while this was a nice thought, the original wording meant that if you were on a fixed-term contract, you should not expect to be eligible to apply for a continuous appointment. D. HANSEN stated that in collective bargaining, the discussion was about “up and out”; what they wanted to rectify was a situation in which someone would be hired for a succession of fixed-term appointments. GRECO agreed, but said that this was not what this wording was about. It said that if you were fixed-term, you could not expect to have a milestone review.

D. HANSEN/TAYLOR **moved to amend the amendment [#4]**, viz., by striking box 2 on page 1 [and thus retaining the sentence “Instructional faculty under ... for continuous employment” in amendment #4].

CAMACHO asked if a vote of yes means that instructional faculty would thereby be ineligible for continuous appointment. GRECO clarified that this was not the case. What it meant was that NTT instructional faculty henceforth would be on either fixed-term contracts or non-fixed-term. In the latter case, after a certain period of time they would be eligible for a milestone review and continuous appointment. In the former case, fixed-term is be used in cases such as sabbatical replacement positions. What the document [D.6.a] currently states is that if you are fixed-term, you are not eligible for review for continuous appointment.

MACCORMACK recognized Anmarie TRIMBLE (UNST, a member of the Task Force). TRIMBLE stated that the Task Force did not define the difference

between fixed-term and non-fixed-term appointments. GRECO: correct. TRIMBLE thus believed it was not possible to make this amendment without also changing the bargaining agreement. To remove the sentence in question would be to change the definition of “fixed term.” GRECO said that if we remove the sentence, as proposed by ANDREWS, it would mean that people on fixed-term contracts would be eligible to apply for continuous appointment. ANDREWS said that she perhaps relied on a too-literal reading: that fixed-term faculty would never be allowed to apply for other appointments. If this was not the intent of the passage [in **D.6.a**], she would be satisfied to leave it in.

The **amendment to the amendment [#4]**, viz. striking box #2 on p. 1, was **approved** (36 yes, 1 no 3 abstain).

D. HANSEN, referring to box #3 on p. 1, suggested that the supposedly redundant language was not exactly duplicating prior language. GRECO observed, however, the document as a whole [**D.6.a**] does include the redundant language albeit in two different places. The rationale is to strike language that occurs elsewhere.

D. HANSEN asked regarding the language about “bargaining unit members” on p. 2 [of **D.6.d**]: not all individuals represented are members. The language would therefore seem to exclude some individuals. ANDREWS stated that this exactly the wording of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA); she wanted to make the language in this document identical to the CBA. WEBB: as a bargaining unit we bargain for people who are not members. D. HANSEN said a similar issue pertained to voting on the contract. LIEBMAN said that the guidelines were not a one-to-one match with the CBA. GAMBURD said that bargaining unit members are people who are represented by the union, regardless of whether they are voting members of that union; thus, we are talking about the category of faculty represented by that union. It is not something that is up for Senate decision.

As a question for the Task Force, D. HANSEN asked whether the language “should,” together with the addition of “at a minimum,” meant that these items were mandatory. THIEMAN said that “should” indicates an expectation, and “at a minimum” meant that departments could go beyond that [in their own guidelines]. D. HANSEN then asked whether the list of specific items after “at a minimum” was whether this list could become more expansive. PERCY said that this list was to signal items that might be relevant, but not to say that this was exclusive. GRECO said that this meant that individuals could include items that were particular strengths for themselves.

D. HANSEN then asked about the phrase “related to unit mission,” wondering whether this also included service beyond the specific unit: would it exclude service at the college or university level? MAIER said that since it’s on the “may” list, the wording did not exclude anything. GRECO agreed this did not limit inclusion other service activities. The specific items in the “may include” list were, so to speak, included in order to jog people’s memories about work done for the University.

LUCKETT (alternate for SCHULER)/LIEBMAN **called the previous question** [viz., amendment #4]. **The motion to call the question passed** (36 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain).

The **amendment #4 as given in Attachment D.6.d, modified** to remove box 2 on p. 1, was **approved** (30 yes, 4 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

It was observed that discrepancies in specific wording would have to be resolved.

GRECO: yes. Since the Provost's amendment [#4] came last, its language could also pertain to the previous amendments. Any remaining issues could come before Faculty Senate in September.

The main motion as given in Attachment D.6.a-b, and amended by Attachment D.6.c (as revised above) and Attachment D.6.d (as revised above) was approved (30 yes, 2 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

E. NEW BUSINESS (cont'd)

7. Course proposal: MGMT 100

SANDERS, chair of UCC, presented this and the subsequent course proposal (E.8) together. They were courses aimed at improving student success in SBA and CUPA. Regarding MGMT 100, he noted that SBA had many programs and it took time for students be sorted into these programs. SBA hopes that this course will help students move more quickly into the specific program, and thus save resources. There is advising, but hard for students to catch all the nuances in just a couple of sessions.

RAFFO/D. HANSEN moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.7.

GAMBURD thought that providing good advising was laudable, but wondered whether it was proper to charge students for that. Should we not do that for them for free? SANDERS answered that SBA does provide free advising, but it is sometimes not enough, and it would be helpful for students to incorporate this one unit into their program. RAFFO recognized Becky SANCHEZ (SBA), who said that the course supplements academic advising; it had been offered already for several years, and students who have been in it have a retention rate that is 5 [percentage] points higher. The class adds personal finance pieces, quantitative skills, etc., which are not covered in advising. B. HANSEN agreed that students need this information; in his unit, there were zero-credit proficiency or competency exams, but not charge for advising. His feeling was that senators might want to discuss this proposal, since it was likely that there would be similar proposals in the future. WEBB said that there had been similar one-credit skills courses in Mathematics for several years. What was the percentage of advising in the proposed course? SANCHEZ: about 30-40%, college skills relevant to SBA, as well as career information. LIEBMAN said he had voted against this proposal in Steering Committee, because of an overlap with the 200-level course approved as part of the consent agenda. What was the separation between the two courses? SANDERS answered that UCC did see them as different, with the 200-level course building on the 100-level. RUETER said that there is a similar course in his department [ESM], and that they seek to get students to pay attention to it. It involves exercises about career issues, etc. He indicated that there were similar courses in other departments: it's a technique being used across the University. D. HANSEN asked whether it was a required course. SANCHEZ: no. D. HANSEN said that his experience in SBA was that students had limited money to pay for their degree, and that making a mistake in choosing the pathway

due to lack of guidance had major negative consequences; for many students, this kind of guidance would save them money down the road.

The proposal as given in Attachment E.7 was approved (28 yes, 5 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

8. Course proposal: UPA 103

SANDERS emphasized that UCC evaluated these advising/student success courses seriously. This proposal had originally come to UCC as a 103/303 proposal, and UCC rejected the latter option. They commended CUPA for their focus on student success.

D. HANSEN/RAFFO moved the proposal as given in June Agenda Attachment E.8.

CARSTENS thought the course seemed very similar to what require of students in Freshman Inquiry. Why was a separate course needed? PERCY said that his college was concerned about student retention, and about students who may lack specific skills. This course is not limited to freshmen but also open to transfer students. O'BANION recognized Tracy BRADEN (advisor in CUPA): the course was developed out of focus on advising; the intent was to allow CUPA students to integrate skills into curriculum and to connect with faculty. It is a robust course with reading, writing, and discussion that cannot be done in an academic advising appointment that happens once or twice a year.

The proposal as given in Attachment E.8 was approved (24 yes, 10 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES TO SELECT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Results

AO: Liane O'BANION

CLAS-AL: Tucker CHILDS, Craig EPPLIN

CLAS-SS. Michele GAMBURD, Patricia SCHECHTER

GSE: to be determined

OI: Judy CAMACHO

SBA: Tichelle SORENSEN

SPH: to be determined

SSW: Ted DONLAN

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:45.