

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Faculty Senate Monthly Packets

University Archives: Faculty Senate

3-1-1995

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 1995

Portland State University Faculty Senate

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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 1995" (1995). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 51.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/51>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

LD4349
.A192
F25

THE PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE



TO: Senators and *Ex-officio* Members to the Senate
FROM: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **March 6, 1995**, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 6, 1995, Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
 - 1. President's Report
 - 2. Provost's Report
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - 1. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council - Oshika
- F. Unfinished Business
 - 1. Extension of the Writing-Intensive Courses Pilot Project - Carter
- G. New Business
 - 1. Transfer evaluation of international course credits - Academic Requirements Committee
- H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the February 6, 1995, Senate Meeting
- E Report of the February 1994 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting
- F1 Extension of the Writing Across the Curriculum Pilot Program

THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 6, 1995

Presiding Officer: Loyde Hales

Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Abrams, Bluestone, Bodegom, Bowlden, Bowman, Brenner, Cooper, DeCarrico, Falco, Feeney, Fosque, Franks, Greco, Hales, Fisher, Fokine, Ansel Johnson, David Johnson, Kenny, Kocaoglu, Kosokoff, Krug, Lall, Lendaris, Liebman, Limbaugh, Maynard, McBride, Miller, Novy, Ogle, Rhee, Robertson, Smith, Svoboda, Talbott, Tinnan, Bulman, Watanabe, Weikel, Wetzell, Wollner.

Alternates Present: Young for Barton, Karant-Nunn for Becker, Harmon for Goldman, Wineberg for Seltzer.

Members Absent: Etesami, Gray, Jolin, Manning, Raedels, Watne.

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Davidson, Diman, Erzurumlu, Kaiser, Koch, Oshika, Ramaley, Reardon, Toscan, Ward.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

The Faculty Senate Minutes of January 9, 1995, were approved with the following correction: E.1.(p. 25), line 3 - replace "complete" with "continue."

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

HALES announced that the December 1994 Faculty Senate motion regarding Measure 8, was mailed to the Governor and legislators on 25 January with his cover letter. Four senators and two representatives, including the chair of Senate, have responded thus far. They have been generally supportive.

CHANGES IN FACULTY SENATE AND COMMITTEE ROSTERS SINCE 1/9/95
SENATE: CAROL FOKINE replaces DEVORAH LIEBERMAN, for the remainder of her term, until June 1997. GENE HAKANSON has resigned from Faculty Senate, effective 1/27/95. A special election of All Other faculty will be conducted to fill his remaining term, (until June 1996).

COMMITTEE: Sheldon Maron is on leave from Deadline Appeals Committee until Spring 1995.

According to normal governance procedures, the President approved the amendments to Article IV, 4), l), and IV, 4), m) of the Constitution passed on January 9, 1995, and the establishment of the Department of Architecture, SFPA.

1. President's Report

RAMALEY, who spoke after E.1., stated she will not start the replacement process for Athletic Director until the decision has been made whether to join the Big Sky Conference.

RAMALEY stated that higher education is hopeful of improving upon the Governor's proposed 14% reduction in the base. We propose to stabilize our base, to effect salary adjustments through merit recognition, to "self-fund" approximately \$25. million for recruitment, retention, and merit recognition, and to supplement that self-funding pool by \$35-50 million. These combined approaches would provide roughly 6% of the salary base for distribution. We also support holding on tuition increases for students. Lottery-related bills proposing direct contributions to education are being monitored. One in particular would support appropriations for the University District.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the Floor to Administrators or to the Chair.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Big Sky Option

OSHIKA reported there will be hearings for faculty, staff and students on March 1-2, 1995. Times and places will be advertised in PSU Currently and other publications.

As the committee's charge is to investigate the feasibility of moving to the Big Sky Conference without additional financial support, they are doing revenue and expense projections. They are also talking to the business community, and conducting a telephone poll of alumni. A random sample poll of the community at large has been contracted, as many people attending our athletic events are not associated with PSU.

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report

BURNS summarized the report of the 3-4 February meeting(attached to these minutes).

COOPER asked if IFS had discussed total compensation. BURNS stated yes. The next IFS meeting is with legislators in Salem in two months.

2. Interim Report, Freshman Inquiry

WHITE stated that we have received broad national recognition, as well as local recognition from entities such as Portland General Electric and local high school districts. Freshman Inquiry was featured in a one-hour OPB program on training the future workforce. There are also many national visitors to the program, on average of one per week. WHITE stated that the program is faculty driven with administrative support, and reviewed the progress of the program from its inception. The Gen Ed Committee's first report was May 1993, and after summer revisions the all-campus forum took place in September 1993. The second report was submitted to the Senate in November 1993, and their proposal was passed by that Senate, 37 to 9. The program is successful and no member of the faculty nor any peer mentor has dropped out of the program. Additionally, there are a large number of student requests to be peer mentors next year. Of all students registered in Freshman Inquiry Fall 1994, 81% are still registered. Of 53 high school students registered Fall 1994, 29 are still registered. Personal intervention by faculty is often cited as an overall retention factor. A great deal of new information about freshmen and transfers at PSU is being learned. Fewer than ten students transferred "themes," with faculty approval in every case, and mainly as a result of scheduling conflicts such as football practice. There are fewer than 5 new entrants in Winter 1995. Advising was done with Winter and Spring 1995 freshman, and most will take Freshman Inquiry in the Summer or Fall 1995.

WHITE introduced Michael Toth, Chair of Freshman Inquiry Faculty Council, who gave a brief survey of the faculty and student experience. The students find it a challenging yet positive experience. The program provides a high degree of contact between faculty and students and students and students, which provides qualitative information not available through previous statistical portraits. It appears that attrition is not a result of dissatisfaction with the program. Increased referrals to student services are apparently a result of greater student to student contact, as well as the program's centralized Cramer Hall location. The program is very labor intensive for the faculty; they spend 3-5 hours per week in team planning alone. Obviously there will be improvements in the next round and a possible third year round, especially in interdisciplinary instruction. A common evolutionary development in the five courses has been plans to take them out to the community in Spring 1995, and an objective is to expose their activities to PSU and the larger community. The Freshman Inquiry Council was created to administer freshman year issues while the Associate Dean engages in planning for subsequent years of the Gen Ed Program. It consists of an elected representative from each group of five faculty who in turn have elected Toth as informal chair.

This group is addressing issues including development of teaching materials for next year, faculty development, internal assessment, and university wide connections. This ad hoc activity will be replaced by some more permanent form in the future.

A. JOHNSON asked program faculty are considering continuing with the program for three years. TOTH replied possibly.

WHITE introduced Thomas Biolsi, representing the Gen Ed Committee, to discuss plans for sophomore through senior year of the General Education Program. BIOLSI stated that the second year requires a more wide ranging curriculum and greater faculty numbers. The 100 faculty members currently working have developed 17 "clusters" and many more are needed. Content, organization, requirements, etc., are at the discretion of each faculty group. Clusters are minimally composed of six courses from at least two departments, and some are much larger than others. This is a very decentralized enterprise; the Gen Ed Committee's role is to facilitate rather than administer the program. For example, the committee is working on a faculty development program composed of workshops, etc., to facilitate development of clusters in subsequent years. There are two clear and practical review processes for the cluster themes and goals and individual courses within them. The Gen Ed Committee will act as a department curriculum committee enforcing the General Education goals passed by the Senate. The University Curriculum Committee will review cluster themes and courses. In future, this program will logically require very widespread participation by faculty as clusters replace the previous general education requirements.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Dean KAISER provided a brief report on recent CLAS activities regarding a four-credit course system. KAISER requested CLAS Chairs poll their departments, at a recent meeting, and at their meeting on 1 February, the Chairs recommended the change. Chairs reported the faculty were positive almost without exception, and many issues were raised in discussion. Regarding scheduling, most people did not want the "dog leg" schedule that the English Pilot Program is using this year. An issue for the sciences is labs. The effect on night classes, teaching load, and credit versus "seat time" were discussed. The College is planning to go to a 2-2-2 load, which will affect productivity. Accreditation concerns were raised. There was concern that a system of fewer courses is less forgiving of student error. Also, with fewer courses, room size was cited as a potential problem. At the request of several Chairs, a survey of student reaction was conducted by R. Shotola, J. Paulson and P. Latiolais (summary attached to these minutes).

1. Proposal for Conversion of Undergraduate Curriculum to a Four-credit Model (F1)

A. JOHNSON/LIEBMAN MOVED "(F1)The Senate recommends the University adopt a four-credit course model for undergraduate curriculum, to take effect Fall 1996, with the following provisions: 1) Academic departments will undertake course/program revisions, where accreditation requirements permit, with the objective of pedagogic improvements; 2) Academic Requirements Committee will establish recommendations for policies applying to the baccalaureate degree, transfer credit, and enrollment; and, 3) University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee will establish protocols for implementation and approval to proceed during 1995-96. The above committees will provide interim recommendations at the June 1995 Senate Meeting."

OGLE/BOWLDEN MOVED to add "4) two principles should guide the course/program revisions: a) the total number of hours required to meet program requirements [majors, etc.] should not increase and, b) the number of course offerings should decrease to reflect the increase in credit hours; 5) 400-level courses that are offered in tandem with graduate courses (colisted) should carry the same credit hours; and, 6) departments have the option of excluding 400-level courses that are offered in tandem with graduate courses (colisted) from consideration in the four quarter-hour conversion."

KARANT-NUNN stated that usually a program will change when curriculum changes, making 4), a) not workable. COOPER stated he objected to 4), a) and b), as the Senate does not intrude on the privilege of departments to set requirements for a major.

COOPER/A.JOHNSON MOVED "to delete 4), a) and b)."

A. JOHNSON stated that it is up to departments to determine program hours and number of course offerings. It is obvious that courses will decrease. BULMAN stated that the motion (F1), part 3) charges University Planning Council and Curriculum to determine issues such as those contained in the amendment.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote "to delete 4), a) and b)."

SVOBODA stated we should not force consideration of 400/500 at this time. The motion is for undergraduate curriculum only. COOPER stated the entire amendment is micro management of department decisions.

The question was called.

The AMENDMENT WAS DEFEATED by unanimous voice vote.

Dav. JOHNSON/A. JOHNSON MOVED "to change June to April."

Dav. JOHNSON stated a June reporting date as Senate adjourns for summer would limit flexibility. OSHIKA stated this was a very short time for the committees to execute their charges, and it will limit their ability to respond. BULMAN stated April is too soon for committees to reply. TINNAN stated that a June reporting date would not allow for a timely conversion to take effect Fall 1996. KOSOKOFF suggested that committee recommendations may include "fast track" approval processes during 1995-96. TINNAN expressed concern that we not repeat the semester conversion experience. Dav. JOHNSON stated that many departments are already engaged in course conversion, and an April reporting date would serve to air concerns.

The question was called.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote less one, "to change June to April."

The question was called.

The MOTION PASSED as amended, by unanimous voice vote less one, "The Senate recommends the University adopt a four-credit course model for undergraduate curriculum, to take effect Fall 1996, with the following provisions: 1) Academic departments will undertake course/program revisions, where accreditation requirements permit, with the objective of pedagogic improvements; 2) Academic Requirements Committee will establish recommendations for policies applying to the baccalaureate degree, transfer credit, and enrollment; and, 3) University Planning Council and Curriculum Committee will establish protocols for implementation and approval to proceed during 1995-96. The above committees will provide interim recommendations at the April 1995 Senate Meeting."

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Motion to refrain from purchasing

TALBOTT/KOSOKOFF moved (G1) "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its commitment to the individual rights of all faculty and staff to determine where they wish to spend their money, and we support the personal decision to not patronize businesses which supported Measure 8.

Further, be it resolved that we recognize and affirm the right to refuse to personally use or accept any or all paper products produced by Boise Cascade or Weyerhaeuser; and that the decision to make hotel accommodations at facilities other than the Shilo Inns or Monarch Motor Hotel in Clackamas is a personal decision which the Faculty Senate supports."

COOPER stated he opposed the motion for two reasons, its legality is doubtful, and the Senate doesn't need to confirm his right to spend money as he wishes. TALBOTT stated her motion is not intended as backlash but to continue pressure on Measure 8 supporters. LENDARIS asked if the motion referred to university or personal money. TALBOTT stated it referred to personal money. A. JOHNSON asked how one determines who donated to Measure 8. TALBOTT stated that the businesses listed in the motion are commonly known to have donated funds to the Measure 8 campaign. BULMAN stated the motion is confusing regarding whether the decision to purchase specific brands of paper products is personal or a departmental issue. TALBOTT stated the motion is a mild statement, but still a statement. COOPER stated the Faculty Senate is not the forum for this issue, and he would like an answer to the question of legality. KOSOKOFF stated the idea is good and the courts can decide the legality; when faculty have an opportunity to make a meaningful statement, he is dismayed they won't. LENDARIS stated he would be willing to support the first and not the second paragraph. WINEBERG asked if the motion would go anywhere. HALES stated that Senate deliberations are public. BOWLDEN stated he agreed with Kosokoff; this is a slightly courageous move the faculty could make. We are stronger a group than as individuals. WOLLNER stated that, speaking for AAUP, adding one more gentle reminder would not hurt.

LENDARIS/COOPER MOVED "to delete the second paragraph of the (G1) motion."

The MOTION PASSED by 16 in favor and 8 against "to delete the second paragraph."

The question was called.

The MOTION PASSED as amended, by unanimous voice vote less one, "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its commitment to the individual rights of all faculty and staff to determine where they wish to spend their money, and we support the personal decision to not patronize businesses which supported Measure 8."

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m., and those present were invited to "K" House.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting

February 3-4, 1995, Oregon State University
Report by Scott Burns, Dept. of Geology, PSU

The meeting on Friday afternoon was mainly an interaction with important speakers on the topic of higher education. President John Byrne of OSU first addressed us and said the three main topics on the OSU agenda were: a) making extension agents part of the faculty; b) helping the activities of the Dean of Students become an important part of the learning process of students, especially for the living groups; and c) evaluation of a new promotion and tenure experiment where the whole department is evaluated and not individual members. The first department to be part of this P & T experiment is Computer Science. He also said faculty morale is low. Chancellor Cox also addressed us as to how he is interacting with the new legislature. His approach is to stress OSSHE's impact on its million customers around the state, not just its impact on the 60,000 students on the campuses. He is stressing lifelong learning and has many agenda items he is pushing such as the efficiency act, equity in faculty salaries, and moderate tuition increases. He wants to be a friend of the faculty and represent us well. He did not like the idea of having faculty members on the board. Gratten Kerans, our OSSHE public relations specialist, also showed two new documents that have been used with the legislature: a book on higher education with a summary of each campus and a report on "faculty work" - what we do. The Secretary of our Faculty Senate has copies of both of these. The Chancellor has met with 80 of the 90 legislators, and they are much more receptive to higher education this year compared to past years. The problem is that to increase our budget, we have to take away from budgets of the K-12 schools and the community colleges. Roger Bassett, Commissioner of Oregon's Community Colleges, mentioned two important items. First, it looks like a 9th four-year college campus is developing in Bend as an outgrowth of the community college there. Second, he said that the community colleges are very receptive to the new general education requirements at PSU and want to make them work because they are very student oriented. State Senator Clifford Trow and State Representative Carolyn Oakley also talked with us. They mentioned that Representative Bob Tiernan has introduced another bill (#2476) that will attack PERS. Our two most important committees to interact with are the education and ways & means committees. The education committees are focussing mainly on the Katz Bill (school reform) which has come under intense fire. The legislature is new and wants the session to be short. Legislators have a good feeling for our Chancellor. They recommend that we become more political through our involvement in such organizations as AOF and AAUP. Our Saturday meeting dealt with formulating a statement to the Board that helps them better define what "equity in salaries" means. The Board has made it one of their aims for this biennium, but their statement is vague. We are trying to add clarity, and I will report about the final statement at our next meeting.

Proposed: That the Faculty Senate extend for one year the pilot project in Writing-Intensive Courses.

Rationale:

1. In March of 1993, the Faculty Senate unanimously passed the proposal that initiated the two year pilot project in Writing-Intensive Courses (WIC). The project involves twenty upper-division courses per year from a range of disciplines. Faculty teaching these courses receive special training; students taking them may substitute them for Writing 323 (assuming a C- or better).
2. On the floor of the Senate, the original proposal was amended to require that this pilot project be evaluated.
3. Consequently, we are in the middle of a sophisticated, multi-perspectived evaluation. Faculty teaching WIC courses are being interviewed, as are their students. In addition, we are evaluating the writing done by students in WIC courses and comparing it to writing done by students in WR 323.
4. Although we hope to be in a position to report preliminary findings some time this spring, we will not be able to complete this study until some time next fall.
5. Assuming that the WIC program will continue in some form beyond the pilot project period, it seems a shame to allow the program to lapse for one year while we wait for an evaluation study to be completed. Hence this request for an extension. (We are making this request now to permit us enough time to round up a full slate of WIC courses for next year and advertise them in the fall term Schedule of Classes.)
6. Our experience to date suggests that faculty and students alike are enthusiastic about their WIC courses. Let's keep this valuable curricular experiment alive.

--Duncan Carter, for the Univ. Writing Advisory Committee

Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

February 6, 1995

To Marv Kaiser, Dean
CLAS
From Bob Shotola
Sociology *Bob*

SUMMARY REPORT ON SURVEY OF CLAS STUDENTS

A survey form was developed by James Paulson, Paul Latiolais and Bob Shotola, to explore student opinion regarding the potential change from 3-credit courses to 4-credit courses as the basic instructional "module" for the University.

The survey consisted of two pages:

A cover page which briefly described the possibility of the change to 4-credit courses and listed several potential consequences of such a change.

A machine-readable form listing four consequences of the change and asking students to indicate whether each consequence "Would be good or bad for you?" and whether each "Would be important or unimportant to you?" Students were also asked, "Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about the possible change to 4-credit courses?" - "Would this change be good or bad for you?" and, "Would this change be important or unimportant to you?" Students were also asked about their class standing, course load, employment status, marital status, gender and age, and whether they ever take night classes.

Surveys were returned from 26 of the 29 class sections selected across CLAS departments and programs to be broadly representative of students in the College (returns included responses from one late afternoon, one evening, and two night classes). Eleven hundred and ninety-one (1191) responses were tabulated.

Responses came from 90 freshmen, 170 sophomores, 363 juniors, 391 seniors, 103 post-bacs and 57 graduate students. Six hundred students identified themselves as female; 413 as male.

"Taking everything into consideration," overall responses were:

44.16%	replied change would be "good" or "very good"
14.46%	replied change would "make no difference"
31.87%	replied change would be "bad" or "very bad"
7.98%	replied "don't know"

Full-time students were more likely than part-time students to reply that the change would be good or very good for them (46.8% to 36.2%).

Responses were related to class standing: undergraduates were more likely than post-baccalaureate or graduate students to see the change as good or very good:

56.7% of freshmen	
50.35 of sophomores	
50.4% of juniors	% replying change would be
43.1% of seniors	"good" or "very good"
29.1% of post-bacs	
28.1% of graduates	
21.1% of freshmen	
32.5% of sophomores	
32.9% of juniors	% replying change would be
27.4% of seniors	"bad" or "very bad"
48.5% of post-bacs	
42.1% of graduates	

Responses were not significantly related to gender, marital status, whether or not students take night classes, or whether they have full-time or part-time jobs.

Respondents were most positive toward the possibility of taking fewer courses to graduate, and taking fewer courses each term with more credit for each course. They were strongly negative toward the prospect that there would be a reduction in the number and variety of specialized courses: 72.92% replied this would be bad or very bad for them.