

3-1-1999

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet March 1999

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 1999" (1999). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 56.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/56>

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.

PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE



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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **March 1, 1999**, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- *B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 1, 1999, Meeting
 - Provost's Report
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
 - 1. Steering Committee Resignation - Cease
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Question for Provost Reardon from the Senate Steering Committee
 - What will be the status of Summer Session under the new Budget Model.*
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - *1. Report of the IFS Meeting of 5-6 February - Cooper
 - *2. University Planning Committee Quarterly Report - Wells
 - 3. Interim Report on Review of the UnSt Task Force Recommendations - Farr, Gelmon, Wetzel (Wells reporting in E.2.)
- F. Unfinished Business
 - *1. ARC Proposal for Articulation of B.S. Requirement Lab Requirement - Wetzel
- G. New Business
 - *1. ARC Proposal for Treatment of D Grade for Transfer Students - Wetzel
 - *2. ARC Proposal for Transfer of Credit from Vocational Technical Coursework - Wetzel
 - *3. Graduate Council Course Proposals for New Courses and Course Changes - Eder
- H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the February 1, 1999, Senate Meeting
- E1 Report of the IFS Meeting of 5-6 February
- E2 University Planning Committee Quarterly Report
- F1 ARC Proposal for Articulation of B.S. Requirement Lab Requirement
- G1 ARC Proposal for Treatment of D Grade for Transfer Students
- G2 ARC Proposal for Transfer of Credit from Vocational Technical Coursework
- G3 Graduate Council Course Proposals for New Courses and Course Changes

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: **Faculty Senate Meeting, February 1, 1999**
Presiding Officer: Ronald C. Cease
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Agre-Kippenhan, Barham, Beasley, Biolsi, Brenner, Broido, Brown, Bulman, Burns, Cease, Collins, Cooper, Corcoran, Driscoll, Ellis, Elteto, Enneking, Erskine, Farr, Franz, Fuller, Gelmon, Holloway, Hunter, Johnson, A., Johnson, D., Johnson, L., Ketcheson, Koch, Lewis, Lieberman, Lowry, Mack, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Movahed, Neal, Olmstead, Ozawa, Parshall, Patton, Perrin, Rueter, Settle, Shireman, Terdal, Thompson, Torres, Turcic, Van Dyck-Kokich, Wamser, Watanabe, Watne, Wattenberg, Wetzel, Wollner, Zelick.

Alternates Present: Bowman for Beasley, Li for Casperson, Stone for Movahed, Harmon for VanDyck-Kokich, Westbrook for Reece, Becker for Weikel.

Members Absent: Bodegom, Carter, Collie, Goslin, Herrington, Holliday, Johnson, R., Lall, Mandaville, Manning, Moor, O'Connor, Powell, Robertson, Skinner, Williams.

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Diman, Feyerherm, Kaiser, Kenton, Murdock, Pernsteiner, Reardon, Sylvester, Toulan, Vieira, Ward, Ricks for Yetka.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The Minutes of the January 4, 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved with the following corrections:

Reuter was in attendance in January.

Page 42, item G2, para. 3, line 7: Replace sentence, "DRISCOLL expressed his concern..." with DRISCOLL stated there was no exam with thesis in all the Engineering masters.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the January 4, 1999, meeting, pursuant to the *Oregon State Department of Higher Education Internal Management Directives 1.125* (Authority over Faculties and Committees) and *1.126* (Internal Governance):

- Amendment to the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. IV, Sec. 4, 4, j) Graduate Council.
- Three graduate programs and course proposals/changes, including: M.S. in Systems Science, M.A.T. in FLL With Initial License Endorsement, M.A./M.S. in Speech Communication, and CLAS course changes and proposals and courses in Computer Science, Music, Architecture.
- Certificate in Biotechnology

Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since 4 January:

David Holloway will fill the unexpired Senate term of Susan Karant-Nunn (through June 2000)

Changes in Today's Senate Agenda:

G2. ARC Recommendation for the B.S. Degree Requirement Notation deleted.

CEASE announced, after the Provost's Report, that copies are available from the Secretary to the Faculty of the e-mail, "OUS Benefits Update for January 29, 1999" which was sent to him from PEBB.

1. Senate Representative to University Assessment Council

CEASE announced the Steering Committee has appointed Sherril Gelmon to represent the Faculty Senate on the Univ. Assessment Council.

Provost's Report

Enrollment data for Winter Quarter 1999 indicate that PSU is up by 3.85% in headcount, and 3.01% in SCH over last winter. We have more than met our target.

D. Question Period**1. Question for Provost Reardon regarding the proposed B.A. Requirement**

REARDON emphasized that any such Senate action as adding the Fine Arts component to the B.A. Requirement would require a fiscal analysis. The data provided with the proposal last month was not an accurate profile, as it was based on a graduating class spread over an approximate six-year period, and did not indicate if credit was earned at PSU. Furthermore, any additional resources would derive, for future development, after the enrollment was generated. With the new budget model, this will be the case for any area. Planning thus far is leaning in the direction of establishing "incentive" funds for this purpose.

BRENNER asked what would happen to programs which are already at peak enrollment and flatten out in the first year(s). REARDON stated that a formula for averaging enrollment is being developed to address this.

A. JOHNSON noted that major requirements are large in some cases, such as the Art Department(96 cr.), and that the general education requirement has been reduced. Due to the latter, students not only take a large number of major credits, but they also can take more coursework in the major - contributing to overcrowding.

COOPER asked if the Provost would comment in more general terms about the new budget model. REARDON stated we know that we can't apply the model internally as it will be applied externally. If we did, CLAS and UPA would get more funding and other units would get less than at present. It would be unwise to allocate resources only based on enrollment, as this approach would neglect the overall educational mission.

MILLER-JONES asked for a clarification of how the figures are calculated. REARDON stated budgets will be negotiated based on enrollment estimates of FTE for residents only.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Budget Committee Interim Report on the New Budget Model

FARR gave a brief report on the Budget Committee participation in preparing the university for implementation of the new budget model. Things are still very much in flux, but some very important decisions will be made in the near future which have major implications for individual units and the whole. The good news is that PSU's budget will increase under the new model, but there will be complications in connection with it. We will have to be very careful about enrollment management, recruiting, and retention. We will need to implement a structure which rewards effort but does not destroy program diversity. There will be no enrollment corridor, so we will have to increase Reserves to 5 - 8 % of the budget. Incentives need to be rewarded under the system and the current proposal is to reserve about \$1. million. Details have to be worked out so we are bringing in new students, not stealing each other's. We have to figure out how to budget graduate assistantships, and Budget Committee has recommended this be managed at the department level. We are considering differential tuitions for certain degrees. We are considering whether Extended Studies will be part of the regular program.

FARR concluded that this is a critical moment in the institution's history. The budget process developed last year was never implemented, however a system such as that must be instituted in the near future if we are to be successful under the new model. The administration has been very open with the Budget Committee, and they are consulting with us in a commendable manner. The analogy to our situation, suggested by Michael Toth, is the impact of imposition of an external budget model on the American medical community.

CEASE added that faculty must take the initiative if they want a role. The Republican budget is larger than that proposed by the Governor, and we must all help if that larger budget is to be adopted.

F. Unfinished Business

1. ARC Recommendation for B.A. Requirement - Wetzel

WETZEL reviewed this issue. She noted that last year FPA indicated they needed no new resources, and the Dean indicates a new cluster is being developed.

WAMSER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the B.A. Requirement, and congratulated the ARC for removing all the stumbling blocks.

BULMAN reiterated her concern over cross-listing courses, and the definition of the science requirement. WETZEL stated that these are not part of this issue. BULMAN replied that action should not be taken that is not holistic. DRISCOLL reiterated that the science requirement was validated by last year's Senate. BIOLSI stated this action will continue to move us back towards the old system of complicated requirements, which is a hardship for students.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

G. New Business

1. ARC Proposal for General Education Requirement and Transfer Students Policy

WETZEL introduced the proposal.

BURNS/PARSHALL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE PROPOSAL with several friendly amendments, to state:

"A student who by catalog qualifies for the pre-University Studies model of general education, and who returns to school after an absence of one or more terms, not including summer, may enroll in the University Studies model. She/he will be placed as a transfer student using the cumulative earned credit hours. She/he may still use a pre-University Studies catalog subject to the seven-year rule."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course Changes/Proposals

GELMON/DRISCOLL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE Graduate Course Changes/Proposals("G2").

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Report on the Meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of February 5-6, 1999

Members of the IFS spent the morning of Friday, February 5 at the State Capitol speaking to as many State Representatives and Senators as they could to make the case for fully funding the Oregon University System. We found almost universal support for higher education among all legislators and their staffs and a recognition that it had been unfairly hurt by recent legislative sessions. Support cannot, of course, be translated into guarantees as to the level of funding, so it is clear that we must continue to keep advocating for the system. IFS met together formally at 2 p.m. in the Capitol, and we were addressed by Senator Brady Adams, the Senate President. Senator Adams has proposed funding OUS at \$80 million above the present level; the Governor's budget proposes an increase of \$44.5 million. Senator Adams believes that his budget has built in protection from the expected decline in revenue from cigarette taxes and the likelihood that revenues will be strong enough to instigate the "kicker," the automatic tax refund. The IFS passed unanimously a motion of thanks to Senator Adams for his leadership on behalf of the Oregon University System. Our next speaker was Senator Ginny Burdick, Democrat from Portland. She also presented herself as a strong supporter of higher education, saying that support for it is not a partisan issue. Unlike Senator Adams and the Republicans, she and the Democrats are not interested in putting a tax cut in the draft budget in anticipation of the possibility of the kicker. The Democrats will give first priority to K to 12 education, but they are the minority party in this session. Our final speaker was Grattan Kerans, the OUS director of government relations. He described a meeting between the Republican leadership and the OUS Presidents and Vice-Presidents of Finance and Administration. Presidents were candid about the costs involved in adopting the new budget model. The leadership did not want to put any institution at risk. The leadership was presented with a report on faculty productivity. He mentioned that Senate President Adams has asked for system alumni and senate presidents to act as a cadre to work with him as advocates for higher education. He said that the new budget model can be scaled up; that is, the system can demonstrate what it can do with extra funding. For the rest of the meeting, members of IFS shared their experiences in dealing with various legislators.

On Saturday, the IFS convened at Oregon State. We had reports on recent meetings of the State Board and the Academic Council. Much of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of how the various campuses were planning on applying the new budget model. It was clear that on all campuses there are more questions than answers at this point. The degree of faculty participation in the process varied greatly; it seemed that at least the planning process was more open at PSU than at other institutions. Also there are different interpretations as to whether the money would be directed on the basis of course enrollment or on the basis of majors. On the positive side, some

senators, one in particular, felt that the new model was more rational than the old BAS model, and departments with heavy student loads might get some relief. Also the new model has system institutions benchmarked against other systems in the country, so that there is some hope that this will lead to better funding. It was argued too that the new model would require institutions and faculty to value teaching. On the negative side, some smaller institutions felt threatened, either because they were more dependent than the big ones on state support or because, by favoring graduate over undergraduate courses, the model may weaken institutions whose focus is principally on undergraduate education. There was also concern about the deleterious effect of competition both within and between institutions. There was a consensus that the new model must not result in academic decisions being made solely on financial grounds and that all campuses must be held harmless. There was also concern that neither the new budget model nor tentative plans for the reordering the system addressed the question of faculty recruitment and retention. Although the comparator institutions are to be used as a standard for faculty salaries, the responsibility for attaining those standards has not been assigned. Finally, the IFS unanimously passed the resolution calling for full funding of the new budget model. This resolution was an amended version of a resolution passed by the Oregon State University Senate.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Resolution January 7, 1999

Whereas, the faculty in the Oregon University System provides value to Oregon in carrying out their teaching, research, and public service responsibilities to the students and citizens of the state;

and

Whereas, the rapidly changing nature and complexity of society and the economy require increasingly higher levels of education for Oregonians to productively contribute to the livability of our state; and

Whereas, Oregon's employers have increasingly found it necessary to augment the workforce available in Oregon by recruiting educated workers from outside of our state's boundaries; and

Whereas, the State of Oregon drastically reduced state funding for the public universities, forcing tuition increases of 80% upon resident Oregon students; and

Whereas, debt loads for students of Oregon's public universities have increased dramatically during the 1990s, hampering graduates' ability to pursue graduate studies or start businesses; and

Whereas, the Governor, the Oregon business community, and the Oregon University System have recently approved and implemented important reforms to address the future of higher education in Oregon; and

Whereas, the aforementioned reforms promote stability and ensure quality and access to higher education, basing state funding decisions on student enrollments;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT:

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon University System is united in supporting full funding of the budget model as proposed by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to:

- 1) Increase access to higher education for Oregon residents;
 - 2) Preserve and enhance the quality of the learning experience for university students;
 - 3) Expand higher education offerings to meet critical needs of the state;
 - 4) Encourage collaboration and partnerships with Oregon's community colleges and the private sector.
 - 5) ensure adequate funding for each institution to carry out its mission;
- and
- 6) enable each institution to attract and retain excellent faculty.

Memorandum

February 8, 1999

To: Faculty Senate
From: Scott Wells, CE, Chair University Planning Council

Re: Quarterly Faculty Senate Report

Summaries of the UPC meetings held this quarter are on the web at
<http://www.ce.pdx.edu/~wellss/upc>

The UPC has begun our review of the following items:

(1) Intellectual Property (IP) Issues

Erik Bodegom has formed a subcommittee to come up with appropriate guidelines for IP at PSU. The committee (constituted last year) is:

Bill Savery, Technology Transfer, Mechanical Engineering
Randy Zelick, Biology
Grant Farr, Sociology
Raymond Johnson, SBA
John Rueter, Biology
Jay Kenton, Associate Vice-President
Bob Westover, Library
Warren Harrison, Computer Science
Dick Pratt or Bill Feyerherm, Graduate Studies and Research
Elizabeth Mead, Art
Robert Daasch, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Erik Bodegom, Physics
D. Grant, Music
J. Draznin, University Development

Current ideas related to IP are summarized at
<http://www.ce.pdx.edu/~wellss/upc/IPissuesdraft.htm>

(2) University Studies Issues

The UPC has broken into subcommittees to evaluate 3 issues within University Studies:

- Location of UNST within the University Jon Mandaville, HST, and Berni Pilip, OGS

This issue will determine the outcome of the last 2 issues. Currently, UPC is still deliberating on this item. Some discussion on this are summarized at
<http://www.ce.pdx.edu/~wellss/upc/Agenda1-20-99.htm>

- Chain of command for UNST Paul Latiolais, MTH, and Frances Bates, XS

A proposal has been made but not approved by UPC pending determination of the first issue above.

- Integrate UNST into University Governance Scott Wells, CE, and Ulrich Hardt, ED

A proposal (<http://www.ce.pdx.edu/~wellss/upc/MemoUSFacGov.htm>) has been made but not approved by UPC pending determination of the first issue above.

(3) The UPC has been charged with "reviewing" the Commission on Campus Climate Report. Since that charge was put before the UPC, open-forums with lead faculty members are being conducted around campus on this report. UPC is going to wait until these open-forums have been concluded and their results known before time is expended on "reviewing" this report. The UPC does not want to duplicate existing campus-wide mechanisms for review.

Chairperson: Scott Wells, EAS (EE) (1996-)
Faculty: Erik Bodegom, CLAS (PHY) (1996-)
Duncan Carter, CLAS (ENG) (1997-)
Paul Latiolais, CLAS (MTH)
Elaine Limbaugh, CLAS (ENG) (Fall 1998)
John Mandaville, CLAS (HST) (Winter 1999-)
David Ritchie, CLAS (SP)
Ulrich Hardt, ED (1997-)
Berni Pilip, AO(OGSR) (1997-)
Joy Rhodes, SSW (1997-)
Francis Bates, XS
Anne Christensen, SBA
Darrell Grant, SFPA
Ethan P. Seltzer, UPA (IMS)
Janet Wright, LIB
Grant Farr, Budget Committee Chair

ARC Proposal for Articulation of B.S. Degree Requirements - Lab Requirement

Regarding the "lab/fieldwork" requirement in the B.S.: The ARC does not wish to pursue an alternative strategy for specifying what fulfills this requirement. The burden of establishing criteria for reviewing courses that qualify is not one that the ARC wishes to take on, and the resulting list of courses would be extremely unwieldy in the Bulletin/Schedule. We would like to have the senate vote on the original recommendation as written (*PSU Bulletin, General University Requirements for All Baccalaureate Degrees, #3, p.16* addition to "For the Bachelor of Science Degree:")

Unless otherwise specified, only courses within the Science distribution area that have an explicit indication of lab or field work as part of the catalog description will satisfy the B.S. degree requirement for lab/field work.

Patricia Wetzel, Chair
February 5, 1999

ARC PROPOSAL FOR TREATMENT OF D GRADE FOR TRANSFER STUDENTS

The ARC approved a proposal to change the current inequitably applied policy toward accepting D grades earned at other institutions.

PSU currently grants a student credit with a letter grade of D earned, as long as that grade was received at PSU or within the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) degree. While the latter credit may be transferred, it generally will not meet requirements within a major.

In contrast, a transfer student, who has not completed the AAOT, or who does not have the AAOT as an option, e.g. non-residents, is denied credit where the letter grade of D was earned. By comparison, both University of Oregon and Oregon State University accept the D in transfer credits.

In calculating a student's GPA for admissions and graduation, all grades are used. However, one student may receive credit for a grade of D and another does not even though both have the grade calculated into their GPAs.

To provide an equitable treatment of students, the ARC recommends applying the same standards to all students in granting credit for a D grade regardless of the source.

Patricia Wetzel, Chair
February 5, 1999

ARC PROPOSAL FOR TRANSFER OF CREDIT(S) FROM VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL COURSEWORK

The ARC would like to test a process for allowing students to transfer up to twelve hours of vocational technical credits when they enter PSU. At present, except for clearly articulated programs such as Early Childhood Education/Child and Family Studies, no such credits are accepted for transfer.

A working group consisting of Mike Driscoll (EAS), Robert Mercer (CLAS), Lucinda Eshleman (PCC), Angie Garbarino (Admissions & Records), Agnes Hoffman (Admissions & Records) and Dan Fortmiller was asked by Janine Allen, Vice-Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, to review and recommend policy for transferring of vocational technical credits. The group looked at Oregon State University, University of Oregon, and Southern Oregon University for comparison.

The policies at the three institutions varied from offering a high of 45 credits (OSU) to a minimum of 12 credits (UO). At OSU, the maximum 45 was allowed only within an agreed-upon transfer program, validated at the department level, applied only upon completion of that program, and without assignment of grade or used to classify the student. In a conversation with an assistant registrar at OSU, it was revealed this policy was under reconsideration and was likely to become "tighter" in the near future. The U of O allows for 12 credits of lower-division vocational technical courses with no other stipulations.

The working group proposed that PSU adopt a policy granting students up to 12 hours of vocational technical credits. The number twelve is consistent with PSU's limitation on one-credit PE activity courses and Cooperative Education credits, both capped at twelve.

Wishing to be cautious and to determine the nature and number of such transfer credits, the ARC proposes a two-year trial period(ending with the ARC Annual Report of 2000), of the following policy:

A student may petition to have up to twelve lower division vocational technical credits transferred to PSU, subject to departmental and/or ARC review and approval.

Patricia Wetzel, Chair
February 5, 1999

Date: February 8, 1999
To: Faculty Senate
From: Bob Eder, Chair, Graduate Council
Re: Recommendations for course approvals

The following courses were reviewed by the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:

Philosophy-Conflict Resolution

CR 523 Legalities and Professional Ethics in Conflict Resolution (4) [NEW]
CR 524 Advanced Mediation (4) [NEW]
CR 525 Conflict Resolution Systems Design (4) [NEW]

Sociology

Soc 585/685 Medical Sociology (4) [NEW]

Business Administration

Mgmt 544 Technology Management (3) [NEW]
Mgmt 545 Managing the Human Side of Technological Innovation (3) [NEW]
Mktg 555 Technology Marketing (4) [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM 3 TO 4]

Engineering Management

EMgt 555/655 Technology Marketing (4) [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM 3 TO 4]