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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 April 3, 1995, and on April 17, 1995, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 Cramer Hall. PLEASE NOTE ADDITIONAL MEETING TIME.

AGENDA
A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 6, 1995, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Announcements
   2. President's Report
   3. 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
   • Spring Term Registration Report - Tufts
     1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - Burns
     2. Annual Report, Academic Requirements Committee - Rosengrant
     3. Annual Report, General Student Affairs Committee - Putnam
     4. Center for Academic Excellence - Vice Provost Sherwin Davidson
F. Unfinished Business
   1. Four-credit Course System Interim Report, Academic Requirements Comm. - Rosengrant
   2. Four-credit Course System Interim Report, University Planning Council - Oshika
   3. Four-credit Course System Interim Report, Curriculum Committee - Holloway
G. New Business
   1. Consultant's Report on Improving Student Services - Special Assistant to the Provost Raymond Johnson
H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:
B Minutes of the March 6, 1995, Senate Meeting
E2 Annual Report, Academic Requirements Committee
E3 Annual Report, General Student Affairs Committee
F1 Four-credit Course System and General Education Requirement, ARC

Secretary to the Faculty
341 Cramer Hall (503)725-4416 sarah@po.pdx.edu
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 6, 1995
Presiding Officer: Loyde Hales
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Wineberg for Seltzer, Rosengrant for Wetzel.


B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

The Faculty Senate Minutes of February 6, 1995 were approved as distributed.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- CHANGES IN FACULTY SENATE AND COMMITTEE ROSTERS SINCE 1/9/95
  STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE: Mary Constans, ART and Richard Wattenberg, TA, have been appointed by the President to serve the remaining terms of Steven Fuller and James Hibbard, Spring 1995 through Summer 1995. Eldon Tamblyn has been appointed interim Chair.

- President Ramaley, in accordance with normal governance procedure, approved the motion that the University adopt a four-credit course model for undergraduate curriculum, to take effect Fall 1996.

- Senators and ex-officio members were reminded to speak loudly, and state name and division when recognized by the Chair. Speakers from above the aisle will not be recorded.
1. President’s Report

RAMALEY described plans for Higher Education budget hearings, which begin on March 13. The first week is scheduled for an introduction, including a description of the System, an overview of the budget, discussion of faculty productivity, faculty and staff salaries, tuition plans and trends, the cost of education and how students are paying for it, and OHSU’s special corporation proposal. The second week’s schedule will depend on progress in the first week as well as issues introduced by legislators that week. The goal is to build on last session’s successful effort to involve faculty, staff, student, alumni, and community leaders in the presentation. We have already made an effort this session to comment on a number of issues which don’t have to do with System or PSU budgets, but do have to do with our work environment. You may be requested to participate in coming days, if you have not already.

We continue to refine our message. We want to assure access for graduating high school students and returning adults. We are seeking support for faculty salaries, as well as staff support. We are stressing the importance of stability, or a consistent pattern of funding to insure completion of reforms in the areas of curriculum, support roles, community-based curriculum, and campus operations.

It is time to reward good faith effort. PSU is furthest along in responding to public mandates to be efficient, effective, and affordable. Our achievements have attracted national attention, but these efforts have come at great cost to faculty and staff in time, energy, commitment, and emotional well-being. We must have signals from the legislature that such efforts will be rewarded materially as well as spiritually.

The Higher Education Efficiency Act has come out of committee, with a unanimous vote in favor, and is proceeding through the legislative process. It does not mandate radical changes, as does the OHSU public corporation bill, but we expect its passage will result in increased flexibility.

We have asked the state for $7 million for the first portion of the University District, the Urban Center. This is our only special request.

RAMALEY, in conclusion, urged members to contact and get to know legislators. There is a general positive feeling that higher education should be treated more fairly. Call Debbie Murdock at 5-5040 for assistance or input. We are particularly concerned that all legislators understand the serious implications for students of the escalating cost of public higher education.

DESROCHERS stated we won’t know until mid-April what the budget will look like, so planning is still on hold. RAMALEY stated nobody believes 14% will be cuts, nor will
across the board cuts be required, because at PSU we are doing exactly is expected of us.

2. **Provost’s Report**

DIMAN reporting for the Provost, stated that the accreditation visit will take place in April. The Self Study is published and copies arrived last Friday. DIMAN extended a thank you to all those who contributed, especially to Professor John Cooper, who contributed more time than any individual. A loud show of hands followed. Copies of the study will be distributed to deans and department offices when the press run is complete later this week.

COOPER reported the review team will arrive Tuesday, April 11, and will visit campus April 12, 13 and the morning of April 14. They have received the study, the *PSU Bulletin*, and the *Spring 1995 Schedule of Classes*. They may visit your classes or other activities, and they may contact you personally. It is recommended that all faculty review the documentation describing your unit.

DESRUCHERS asked if there were any requests for visits with groups. DIMAN replied not yet, but it is likely that there will be.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

There were no questions.

E. **REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

1. **Quarterly Report, University Planning Council**

OSHIKA reported that in December the committee completed recommendations for establishment of the Dept. of Architecture and implementation of a 3 to 4-credit course conversion, which were reported at the January Senate. In January the committee continued discussion of the 4-credit course system. In February the committee commenced investigation of the conversion to four credits as charged by the Senate. The committee intends to continue this activity in March and April, and it will have a preliminary report for April Senate, as requested.

F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Extension of the Writing-Intensive Courses Pilot Project**

A. JOHNSON/FRANKS MOVED "(F1)the Faculty Senate extend for one year the pilot project in Writing-Intensive Courses."
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Duncan CARTER, WR, stated that Hugo Maynard, PSY, is heading the evaluation of the program as mandated by the Faculty Senate when the pilot project was approved. The evaluation is generally positive, but the study is quite sophisticated and will not be completed before scheduling deadlines for 1995-96. The intent is to complete a final report for the Fall 1995 Senate. In addition to providing an alternative for students to complete a requirement, the project has provided an important faculty development activity. The people who have taught courses this way will never go back entirely to the lecture format.

WINEBERG asked what would happen if the extension were not approved. CARTER stated the program would stop in June 1995 before evaluation was complete. WINEBERG asked if the intent was to continue the pilot project indefinitely. CARTER stated no, this is at the Senate’s discretion, and this would obviously depend on whether the evaluation was positive or negative.

BRENNER asked if the motion is to insure waiver of WR 323. CARTER stated yes. BRENNER stated it would be desirable to have a description of the program as a basis for today’s decision. CARTER summarized the guidelines in the March 1993 motion for the 1993-95 pilot program; there were five points, including a standard of 5000 words of writing, a certain percentage of the course grade based upon the writing, that some attention be given to writing in that discipline, and specifications for different kinds of writing, such as "writing to learn."

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Transfer Evaluation of International Course Credits

GRECO/DeCARRICO MOVED "the Senate adopt the Evaluation of Transfer Credit from Foreign Institutions proposed by the Academic Requirements Committee(attached)."

ROSENGRANT stated that the recommendation was presented to ARC by Norman Rose based upon several years of development which included discussions with deans and others, to streamline the process. The intent is partially to ensure that the transfer student from foreign institutions be treated in a more equitable way, and partially a response to the new general education requirement which will not require specific numbering of transfer courses as in the past. A number of things in the proposal correspond to current practice. The greatest difference is that the courses would be given a prefix but not tied to a specific PSU course, which will greatly speed up the evaluation process. After Rose presented this proposal, ARC explored it with international admissions,
evaluators, and departments, and proposed modifications, such as item #10., which proposes a strategy for more precise evaluation if the student needs it.

LENDARIS asked how this would be different from the way evaluations are done now? ROSENGRANT stated the courses would have a prefix but not a course number which corresponds to a specific PSU course. ROSENGRANT yielded to ROSE who stated that evaluation would no longer require an official course description in English. One-half of current foreign students can't get course descriptions, as there are none. This practice is already in place at UO and OSU. International schools would still be accredited, but courses would be now accepted for general credit even if a program is not offered at PSU, such as agriculture. For example, recently a student from Calgary, Canada, needed three credits in anything to graduate, but a three-credit interdisciplinary course was not accepted by any department, and there was no provision for accepting general credits. If a student were to need particular credits, there is an appeal process in the departments which would change slightly so the advisor rather than the student would initiate it.

DeCARRICO asked if evaluations would continue to be done in the Registrar’s Office. ROSE stated yes. WINEBERG asked if the changes could be put in the form of a proposal so it would be easier to understand. The Chair stated that is an available option. LENDARIS asked if item #3., which states the student will bear the responsibility to determine if he a had the prerequisite, was a change from current practice. ROSE stated yes. OSHIKA asked if item #9. could be modified, because these courses will not all fit LING electives at the 100 level. ROSENGRANT stated it would be possible to tag these credits in a special way, but theoretically under the new general education requirements this won't be necessary. DeCARRICO stated LING 110 is limited to 18 credits. ROSENGRANT stated the intent is not to give transfer students any advantage. ROSE stated it is possible to receive up to 36 credit for LING 110. OSHIKA stated she still had difficulty with this, and would be more comfortable if the courses were flagged. LENDARIS asked if item #6. was a change. ROSE stated this is current practice and we have the same issue with transfer credit from American institutions. ROSENGRANT stated that in foreign institutions there is no relationship between course numbering and class standing. ROSENGRANT cited an example of her department reevaluating a transfer course in Russian from a Soviet republic, which was taken in the first year but was equivalent to a third or fourth year course here.

SVOBODA stated if this is applicable to students under the new general education requirements, it should state it. ROSE stated foreign students’ first PSU Bulletin is their bulletin, unlike the policy for domestic students. ROSE stated that for the next two years there will be problems which ARC will monitor as the new
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general education requirement is phased in. SVOBODA asked for a clarification of Rose’s comment on agriculture courses. ROSE stated that presently we won’t accept agriculture courses, for example, from foreign institutions, but we will accept them from OSU. SVOBODA asked about vocational courses. ROSE stated that item #7 applies to that issue.

FRANKS stated she teaches many foreign students in WR 323, and she thinks this streamlining would be good. It will make the process a little less overwhelming, and item #10 will help to smooth out wrinkles later. ROSE stated our foreign students are currently waiting 2 - 3 quarters after starting classes to see their Transfer Evaluations. WINEBERG asked how many foreign students transfer in per year. There was no answer. LIEMAN asked for a clarification of item #11. ROSE stated this is present practice.

LENDARIS proposed a friendly amendment to item #3, to change "has met" to "meet." GRECO accepted it.

OGLE asked if this is a first reading, or are we voting now. HALE replied that we are ready to vote. A.JOHNSON reminded members that Steering Committee elected to bring this issue to the Senate on the advisement of the Academic Requirements Committee, rather than have no Senate review. There is no advantage in a delay. ARC has approved this proposal after extensive examination, and has recommended it be passed.

The QUESTION was called.

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote less one.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m., and the Presiding Officer invited all present for refreshments at "K" House.
Academic Requirements Committee

Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

April 3, 1995

Committee Members: Evelyn Crowell, Rod Diman (ex-officio), John Hegel (student), Christopher Lay (student), Robert Mercer, Stephen Martin, Shirley Morrell, David Ritchie, Sandra Rosengrant (chair), Robert Tufts (ex-officio), Helen Youngelson-Neal

1. During the period 9/15/94 to 3/8/95 ARC has processed 94 petitions. Of them, 84 were granted, and 10 denied.

2. ARC has recommended to the Senate that the minimum number of credits required for graduation be reduced from 186-180 (12/5/94).

3. ARC has approved a request from the English Department to replace the WR 323 challenge examination with portfolio examination.

4. ARC has approved and brought to the Senate a proposal regarding the evaluation of transfer credit from foreign institutions (3/6/95).

5. ARC is dealing with issues that arise from the new general education requirements as charged by the constitution. We have had one meeting with University Studies to discuss potential problem areas. It is likely that our talks will result in a set of procedural recommendations.

6. ARC is developing a proposal to bring to the Senate regarding the university's conversion to a 4-credit standard (4/3/95).
Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
to the Faculty Senate
Portland State University
March 1995

Committee Membership:
Chair: Janet Putnam, Faculty, GSSW
Faculty: Fu Li, EE
Robert Lockwood, ADM JUST
Mary Jo Morris, SBA/PDC
Alan Zeiber, SBA
Students: Kathy Bash
Greg Flenniken
Tom Gunderson
Deborah Kubichek
Doug Styles
Consultants: Robert Vieira, Interim Vice Provost & Dean of Students
Ken Fox, Asst to Vice Provost
Susan Hopp, Dir Student Development

Policy development and review have been the major focus of the General Student Affairs Committee during the 1994-95 academic year. Continuing the work of last year’s General Student Affairs Committee, final review of the Space Allocation Policy was completed. This policy outlines the process used to allocate office or storage space to student organizations registered with the Office of Student Development as an IFC or SOC.

The second policy reviewed by the committee was the "Firearms Policy at Portland State University." Developed by Ken Fox, Assistant Vice Provost, the document outlines the process by which an individual may request permission to bring a firearm on campus. Criteria for reviewing the request and security procedures employed if permission is granted are described.

Throughout the year, Bob Vieira has kept the committee informed of the progress in Vice Provost’s search and the study of student affairs being conducted by Pappas Consulting of Peat Marwick. The committee has been updated on new student affairs initiatives including:

♦ expanding IASC services to include evening hours;
♦ establishing e-mail links between all student affair units;
♦ beginning staff training in customer service and diversity.

Proposed activities for the remainder of the year include the following:
♦ ongoing review of existing policies in the areas of student health fees and guidelines for student employment;
♦ further discussion regarding a meeting with the university accreditation team.
March 15, 1995

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Requirements Committee

RE: 4-credit conversion and general education requirements

**CURRENT REQUIREMENT**

1. In each of the academic distribution areas the total credits earned in the two departments must be a minimum of 18 credits. Distribution must include a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 12 in each of the two departments.

2. A total of 18 upper-division credits must be earned in the academic distribution areas with no more than 12 credits from any one department.

3. All bachelor degree students required to successfully complete two courses (six credits) of diversity coursework....

4. Maximum number of correspondence credit: 60

Maximum number of Pass credits that may be counted for graduation: 45

Maximum number of Cooperative Education credits that may be applied towards degree requirements: 12

Residence credit: 45 (excluding credit by examination) of the final 60 or 165 of the total credits presented. *Restriction:* At least 25 of the last 45 credits must be taken for differentiated grades.

**RECOMMENDATION**

recommend change from 18 credits to 16 credits in each of the distribution areas, and to 4. minimum and 12 maximum credits.

recommend change from 18 credits to 16 credits. no change to 12 credit maximum.

recommend change in language to read "two courses (minimum of six credits)"

no change recommended.

no change recommended.

no change recommended.

no change recommended.
EVALUATION OF TRANSFER CREDIT FROM FOREIGN INSTITUTIONS
February 22, 1995

At present, the method used to evaluate transfer credit from foreign institutions is cumbersome, takes a long time to complete, is not student friendly, and frequently works to the student's disadvantage. PSU expects that international students will provide an official description in English for each course the student would like PSU to accept. Frequently, the students do not realize that they need these course descriptions until the students are in the U.S. It is often difficult for the student to obtain course descriptions.

Two points of information. International students who "have earned the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree, with first-class marks, from an approved institution" may be admitted to a PSU graduate program. "An approved institution" is one that has the appropriate notation in one of the books on foreign colleges in the Admission Office. Thus, for graduate work PSU accepts approved degrees at face value. The graduate adviser in consultation with the student determines if the student has any deficiencies in preparation for graduate work in the chosen graduate area.

PSU's new "general education" requirements reduce the need somewhat for extremely detailed transfer evaluations. However, students who want to major in general studies in arts and letters, science or social science or who want to work toward a B.S. degree need to know if their foreign college work is accepted as arts and letters, science, social science or general education credits.

The following is proposed for international students:

1. The international students will be strongly advised, but not required, to have course descriptions and/or syllabi, in English, of their work at foreign colleges.

2. Transfer evaluation will be based on a moderate or liberal interpretation for the student rather than a conservative interpretation.

3. Students will be informed that it is the student's responsibility to determine that the student meet the prerequisites of courses to be taken no matter what is stated on the transfer evaluation.

4. Transfer evaluations will be done by Admissions Office personnel. The assignment of a course prefix will be determined largely by the title of the course and the type of institution offering the course. If the student has completed all steps in a timely manner, it is expected that the evaluation will be available to the student before the student's first registration at PSU.
5. The guideline normally used will be that up to 45 credits per academic year will be accepted.

6. Level of class is to be determined primarily by the class standing of the student at the time the class was taken and/or by course title.

7. All transferable credits* in which a C- or better (or the equivalent) was earned shall be accepted by PSU. If the credits cannot be accepted with a department prefix, then the course will be accepted with an AL, SC or SSC prefix or as general credit.

* Transferable credits - Parallel or equivalent college-level credits earned at an approved foreign institution, an institution that has the appropriate notation in one of the books on foreign colleges in the Admissions Office or an institution for which one of the nationally recognized groups which evaluate foreign credits would recommend acceptance of credits as being college-level. Credits earned at institutions that do not meet either of these criteria are to be evaluated as if taken at an unaccredited institution.

8. Normally, credits whether accepted with a department prefix, AL, SC, SSC prefix or as general credits, will be accepted as elective credits. When appropriate, transfer work may be accepted as equivalent to specific PSU courses.

9. All English classes (taught as if English were a foreign language) are to be accepted with a LING prefix. Other foreign language classes (German taken at a Chinese college, etc.) and non-English literature classes taught in the student's own language (Chinese literature taught at a Chinese college) are to be accepted as foreign language credit.

10. If, after the evaluation is done, an adviser to the student wants to know if a particular course is equivalent to a specific PSU course and the evaluation does not reflect such a specific evaluation, the following process is to be followed:

   a. Student picks up a re-evaluation of transfer credit form from the Admissions Office or Degree Requirements Office and completes the portion that is student's responsibility to complete.

   b. Student takes the re-evaluation form to his/her adviser.

   c. Adviser signs form to verify that in the adviser's opinion a re-evaluation will help the student in meeting prerequisites, major or degree requirements.

   d. Adviser returns signed form to the Admissions Office.

   e. Admission Office prepares a packet of appropriate forms and information and sends the packet to the evaluator designated by the department.
f. The student makes an appointment with the evaluator to discuss the re-evaluation. The student is to provide information on the course content if that information is not in the packet.

g. Evaluator completes form in the packet and returns to Degree Requirements as soon as possible.

h. Student and adviser are each sent a copy of the revised transfer evaluation.

11. All credits accepted from foreign institutions will be accepted as P/NP credits. In addition, foreign students may accumulate up to 45 P/NP credits in their work taken at institutions in the U.S. At least 25 of the final 45 credits must be for differentiated grades.

The student will receive transfer credit for all transferable work in which a C- or better (or equivalent) grade was earned. At present, usually PSU does not accept foreign work, such as agricultural courses, for which there is no corresponding department at PSU.

The proposed process should result in a much faster evaluation of the transcripts of foreign students. Under the present system it is common for a student to first receive the transfer evaluation sometime during the second term (after the student has gone through the registration process twice).