

1-3-2011

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet January 2011

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 January 2011" (2011). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 100.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/100>

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 **January 3, 2010**, at 3:00 p.m. in **Univ. Place**.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. *Approval of the Minutes of the December 6, 2010, Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
Discussion Item: **Senate Agenda Setting** in Breakout Sessions
First, what are your group's four top PSU Faculty Senate agenda priorities?
Second, how would your group narrow or define those priorities?
Third, for one or more of your priority agenda items, please answer the following questions:
 - 1) How would your group frame the discussion?
 - How does it reflect on the future of PSU?
 - What questions would the discussion answer?
 - 2) What information would we need to address the topic?
 - Whom should the Steering Committee ask to present the topic preliminaries?
 - What information would be needed (e.g. data, comparators) to focus the discussion and address the topic's central issues?
- D. Unfinished Business
None
- E. New Business
*1. Curricular Consent Agenda
- F. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
 - 1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 3/4 December at PSU - Rueter
- H. Adjournment

*Included with this:

- B Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of December 6, 2010
- C-1 Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 2010
 Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
 Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Arante, Baccar, Barham, Berrettini, Bowman, Brower, C. Brown, D. Brown, Burk, Burns, Butler, Carder, Carter, Caskey, Ceppi, Chaille Daasch, Danielson, Dill, Ediger, Farr, Feng, Flores, Flower, Fortliller, Gamburd, George, Gibson, Greco, Hagge, B.Hansen, Harmon, Hatfield, Henning, Hines, Ingersoll, Jagodnik, Jones, Karavanic, Kohles, Kominz, Lang, Latiolais, Livneh, Lockett, MacConnack, Maier, Mairngelle, McBride, Medovoi, L. Mercer, Miller, Munson, Neal, Ostlund, Ott, Parnell, Paschild, Pejcinovic, Pierce, Reynolds, Rueter, Ryder, F. Sanchez, R. Sanchez, Seppalainen, Sheard, Shusterman, Smith, Sterling, Tarabocchia, M. Taylor, S. Taylor, Trifiletti, Trimble, Turner, Vance, Wadley, Wamser, Weasel, Webb, Welnick, Wetzell, Zurk.

Alternates Present: Ruedas for Murphy, Baccar for Nixon, Lafferriere for Palmiter.

Members Absent: Beyler, Clark, Cabelly, Cummings, Curry, Elzanowski, Fischer, Glaze, Gray, Jacob, Johnson, Kapoor, Keller, Ketcheson, Kinsdla, Kwong, Leite, Mathwick, McBeath, Nash, O'Halloran, Oswald, Preston, Raffo, Rogers, Schechter, Shandas, Strathman, Sytsma, Wendler,

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Aylmer, Balzer, Burgess, Davis, Desrochers, Everett, Hickey, Hillman, Koch, Mack, McBride, Mitchell, Moeller, Ostlund, Reynolds, Rose, Sestak, Wiewel.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 1, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:03. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Burk, Karavanic, Taylor, Griffith were present in November.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

HINES called the meeting to a minute of silence in memory of our colleague, Craig Wollner, who passed away recently. Following, she noted that there would be a memorial service on 19 January.

HINES noted that the meeting order would be changed, and that announcements were moved to follow the President's Report. HINES noted that D2L training would progress with self-paced and guided training in winter 2011. HINES continued, the Steering Committee and the AAUP Council are preparing a resolution regarding the

university's comparators. HINES noted the January meeting would be taken up in almost its entirety with Senate Agenda Setting and would be held at University Place.

MACK reported that a fixed term faculty step promotion proposal, developed over the past 2.5 years by a labor (AAUP)—management (Associate Deans group) group, is ready for CADS and general review. LUCKETT queried if this has been discussed in the context of unfunded mandates. KOCH noted that the administration is in the process of moving fixed term funding on the same basis as other budgets. ARANTE queried if the proposal addresses the balance between teaching and service. MACK stated that there was no change.

JONES reported on the format for the January meeting. He noted that it would be directed like a planning meeting, with groups of 5-10 members with a good mix for each. The immediate purpose is to provide input for the President's Retreat and next year's Senate. He urged Senators to talk to constituents about topics, and use the Wiki to enter them.

Discussion Item: Budget and Finance

BINES noted that Koch (for Desrochers), Hillman, and Reynolds would present on the topic, and then she would move the meeting to a committee of the whole.

KOCH gave an overview of the university budget process, and academic budgeting. He noted that the process has been used for the last 5-6 years, and involves Desrochers, Fung, Koch, and now Reynolds. Desrochers will provide a context based on state-level demands, while OAA requests the academic units to provide credit hour projections, used to develop revenue estimates. There is a parallel process of establishing budgeting priorities, in the context of presidential initiatives, etc., via input from the Deans. Academic requests are then compiled in OAA, and requests and reduction proposals if required are prepared for the President. The President makes a tentative budget decision (as the appropriations are not known as yet) and seeks comments and input, campus-wide. He then makes a final budget decision, still contingent on appropriations. The timeline starts in fall so decisions can be made in winter, recommendations made in March, and consultation and open fora can be completed in April of the year. The FADM webpage provides a timeline and narrative of the activity.

KOCH continued, academic budgeting begins the summer and fall before this to talk about the academic priorities of the institution, in an effort to have consistency as well as addressing immediate demands. Criteria are developed based on themes and academic priorities, for example student success>retention>advising, sustainability, K-20, our relationship with OHSU, on-line learning, curricular effectiveness, etc. Proposals from the deans are evaluated, and recommendations are developed for the president and executive committee. Again, SCH projections are requested, based on the prior year's budget and numbers, plus changes to the same, and enhanced budgets are developed.

HILLMAN provided an overview of the Budget Committee's fall activities. They have been briefed by FADM on a potential 25% E&G cut from the state, but as E&G is -7% of the budget, it is 3% of PSU's total budget. That is as far as the committee can progress until the legislative proposals start coming in. HILLMAN continued, the committee has spent most of their effort on agenda items generated in the Senate leadership summer retreat. Based on his work in his Financial Futures subcommittee, HILLMAN projected the university will have to go to a 'performance based" model. He noted that there needs to be coordination of self-support and summer school to standardize the cost of student credit hour. The committee as a whole has not agreed to a future funding model, but it is clear that there will be no state funding by 8-12 years from now. Other topics have included the cost of initiatives such as Advising and increasing the proportion of tenure lines, versus the outcomes. He noted that given the budget projections, it is hard to see how we can reduce the differential costs of instructional faculty. Another item is the issue of Facilities, in that 6-8 years ago, base budget facilities lines were cut, and the large proportion of support is now soft money driven (chargeable). Facilities has recently provided on their website what is broken out as baseline versus what is chargeable. Overall, this is not a healthy way to operate, and will continue to create tension and animosity. Distance Learning fees is another item. D2L total expense is being placed on distance learning, even though it is used elsewhere. This is also a potentially contentious issue. Finally, in the last several years, Budget Committee has been charged with the fiscal viability of new courses and programs. The overhead rate is about 70%, so that if a new program is to start, there is a significant investment.

SEPPALAINEN asked for a clarification regarding a performance based model for budgeting. HILLMAN stated the committee has not reached any final conclusions, but on average, for every dollar invested in a program there is almost another expended to make it happen. KOCH added that the beginning budget is currently historical only, it is not directly a function of prior activity. He also noted the 45% overhead is capped, one of the arguments for going to a public corporation.

REYNOLDS reported on the Financial Futures Committee. A committee charge is to look at our historic and future financial situations, and from that to model factors that can alter our financial futures. The second charge is to establish principles for future budget allocations, based on our goals and revenue bases. The committee met frequently to be educated on the issues, and more recently it broke into subcommittees, to each tackle smaller portions of the budget. Next quarter, the committee will break out to look at expenditures, and then move on to determining the budget allocation model.

HINES moved the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 15:47 to 15:59.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NOTE: There is no transcript of the meeting beyond this point.

E. NEW BUSINESS

[15]

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BUTLER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Revised Graduate Academic Standing Policy

EVERETT presented the proposal for the Graduate Council.

FLOWER/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal in "E-2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD**1. Questions for Administrators**

1) Question for the Provost regarding Digital Measures

KOCH noted that we somewhat overestimated what digital measures would be able to do and _____. The intent going forward, is to update faculty date only. The program is what it is. When we started, this was the only program, and the newer ones are no better. We will make it work or abandon it. It was undertaken as an element of the proposed new OUS compact with the state, but it does not have budget implications.

2) Question for the Provost regarding University Studies and tenure related lines

KOCH noted that the plan to convert twenty-five faculty positions to tenure lines is now complete.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

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

WIEWEL reported after the discussion item. He noted that many institutions are currently faced with the task of figuring out their real costs. He noted that we value all kinds of things

[16]

that do not generate revenue, but until we figure out what costs what, we can't properly budget. WIEWEL continued that Freshman retention has increased 3% over three years ago. He discussed progress on our strategic alliance with OHSU. Regarding restructuring, in addition to the bills (3) in process, there is a new lobbying group, chaired by Jim Francesconi, the Oregon Higher Education Alliance.

Provost's Report

KOCH noted that between new funds and reallocations we were able to leverage \$800,000 for new tenure lines.

1. Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Report of the IFS Meeting of December at PSU

The Report was tabled until January.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:06.