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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 1, 2008
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:13. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
   Thomas Keller was in attendance.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in the day’s agenda: Mack will report for Koch.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since November 3, 2008:
replaces Tinkler, LAS, and Rob Bertini replaces Prasad, ESC on the Faculty Development Committee.

FLOWER reminded that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation and Governance has a survey in progress. Thus far, approximately 25% of faculty have responded. The survey concludes on December 14.

President’s Discussion

WIEWEL commenced by noting our pleasant surprise at the quantity of press coverage of his Thanksgiving Dinner hosted for international students. He also noted that PSU is featured in Portland Monthly magazine in an article on higher education. He thanked University Relations. WIEWEL noted that faculty member Lisa Zurk has secured a grant of $450,000 from the Murdock Foundation, one of the largest ever awarded to a single faculty member. WIEWEL noted an error in the recent Vanguard article about giving to the university, stating that the correct figure is $21 Million. WIEWEL congratulated six PSU Fulbright recipients, Michael Clark, Stephanie Farquhar, John Gallup, Christina Hulbe, Pui Tak Leung, and James Morris. He also congratulated the Women’s Volleyball Team for going to the NCAA tournament next week.

WIEWEL discussed the Governor’s recommended 2009-11 higher education budget, released today. He prefaced his remarks by noting that the cut required of PSU for this year is approximately $2.2 Million. We haven’t decided exactly how to take the cut, but it will be probably come from some mixture of central and unit reserves. He continued, subsequent revenue forecasts may effect the 2009-11 recommendations, however, higher education currently comes out better than any other state agency. The higher education budget is about 2.7% higher than the current budget, although it is slightly lower than the Essential Budget Level. A large component is affordability, and the budget assumes an increase in tuition of 3.6% and a large increase, 54%, in Oregon Opportunity Grants. The budget is based on the expectation that the OUS will continue to increase enrollment. Regarding capital construction, considerable funds have been proposed for deferred maintenance and capital construction. Noteworthy for us are proposed funds for a life science complex, an Oregon Center for Sustainability, a south waterfront corporate complex for technology, and the PSU steam loop. This proposal is separate from proposals made to the federal transition team that may be successful. There are also proposals for research, for example ONAME. Regarding salaries, funding is proposed for classified step increases (only).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HARMON/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular recommendations of the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal from ARC to Drop Freshman Transfer Transition Requirement

HICKEY presented the proposal for the committee and took questions.

JHAJ/RUTH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal.

WALTON asked for a clarification, if the change was retroactive. HICKEY stated it is, although the course will be offered for the remainder of this academic year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

MACK noted that the Provost has extended an invitation to make nominations for the honorary degree.

1. Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report

BOWMAN presented the report for the committee adding that Brower has joined the committee since the start of the year.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report

JACOB presented the report for the committee and took questions.

TALBOT asked what is the six-year graduation rate nationally. JACOB yielded to Lockwood who stated it is 46%, noting that PSU’s is slightly higher than the national.
The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Institutional Assessment Council Report

SMALLMAN, STEVENS AND WOLLNER presented the report for the council. SMALLMAN introduced the committee noting that if we have campus-wide learning outcomes in place, we will have come a long way towards satisfying the concerns of the accrediting body.

*Note: recording damaged from this point.*

Last week PSU was selected as a beta campus in the LEAP program, and will be receiving funds for initiatives in assessment. STEVENS described the process. WOLLNER reviewed answers to frequently asked questions, for example, there is still time to change the content, SMALLMAN stated that at the system level, the learning outcomes project is being directed by Elizabeth Zinsner, and WOLLNER noted that PSU is ahead of most of the system institutions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

MERCER declared a committee of the whole and informal discussion followed regarding the Assessment Council Report. MERCER declared the committee of the whole ended.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:54.
The Steering Committee recommends the permanent adoption of the Consent Agenda Process as cited in E-4 of the December 2007 Senate meeting, and stated herein.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE SENATE BY-LAWS TO INCLUDE A CONSENT AGENDA FOR CURRICULAR CHANGE
January 5, 2008

The Steering Committee moves to adopt a Consent Agenda on a one-year trial basis. (See attached description of Consent Agenda.) At the end of one year, the Steering Committee will report to the Senate whether the Consent Agenda saved time and helped to move the meeting agenda along as proposed. We will also poll the senate for their response to the Consent Agenda.

Background
Q: What is a "Consent Agenda"?
A consent agenda is a time saving tool that groups together routine items and resolutions under one agenda item. Items included in the consent agenda require no discussion before voting and all are approved in one vote. At every senate meeting, at least a few items come to the agenda that do not need any discussion or debate either because they are routine procedures or are already unanimous consent. A consent agenda (Roberts Rules of Order calls it a consent calendar) allows the senate to approve all these items together without discussion or individual motions. This can free up time for more substantial discussion.

Q: What belongs on the consent agenda?
Typical consent agenda items are routine, procedural decisions and decisions that are likely to be non-controversial. Examples include:
Approval of the minutes;
Final approval of proposals or reports that the senate has been dealing with for some time and all members are familiar with the implications;
Routine matters from Committees (new courses and/or course changes from UCC or Grad Council);
Reports provided for information only.

Q: How are consent items handled?
A consent agenda is distributed with the senate agenda in sufficient time to be read by all members prior to the meeting. A typical procedure is as follows:
• The Steering Committee determines whether an item belongs on the consent agenda.
• The Faculty Secretary prepares a numbered list of the consent items as part of, or as an attachment to the meeting agenda; any supporting documents are included in the senate agenda package.
• At the beginning of the meeting, the presiding officer asks members what items they wish to be removed from the consent agenda and discussed individually.
• If any member requests that an item be removed from the consent agenda, it must be removed. Members may request that an item be removed for any reason. They may wish, for example, to discuss the item, to query the item, or to register a vote against the item.
• Once it has been removed, the presiding officer can decide whether to take up the matter immediately or place it on the regular meeting agenda.
• When there are no more items to be removed, the presiding officer reads out the numbers of the remaining consent items.
Then the presiding officer states: “If there is no objection, these items will be adopted. After pausing for any objections, the presiding officer states, “As there are no objections, these items will be adopted.” It is not necessary to ask for a show of hands.
• When preparing the minutes, the Secretary includes the full text of the resolutions, reports or recommendations that were adopted as part of the consent agenda.

Websites consulted
http://garberconsulting.com/FAQ.htm#consentAgenda
http://www.bloch.umkc.edu/mwcnl/board%20resources/Consent%20Agendas.pdf
http://www.help4nonprofits.com/ConsentAgenda.htm

Submitted by P. Wetzel
December 10, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate Graduate Programs and Courses

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Programs**

E.1.a.1  
• Ph.D. in Applied Physics [two-page summary attached]

**Change to Existing Program**

E.1.a.2  
• MA/MS Speech and Hearing Sciences, change requirements to include SpHr 540 and SpHr 470/570

**New Courses**

E.1.a.3  
• PH 545 Microelectronic Device Fabrication I (4)  
The principles of crystal growth and wafer preparation, ion implantation, doping and diffusion, and oxidation, including crystal structure, defects, heterogeneous chemical reactions, thermodynamics and kinetics of basic processes such as diffusion. Realistic process flows, physical metrology, device structure, electrical behavior and their trade-offs are discussed.

E.1.a.4  
• PH 546 Microelectronic Device Fabrication II (4)  
Emphasis: metallization and dielectrics. Metallization issues discussed include silicides, barrier layers, interconnects, multi-level metallization, and low-k dielectrics. Discussion of deposition and properties of various dielectric films. Epitaxial growth and properties of SOI and SiGe devices are covered. Computer simulations of device fabrication.

E.1.a.5  
• PH 547 Microelectronic Device Fabrication III (4)  
Electron beam, x-ray, EUV, and photolithography, including discussion of resist technology. Fundamentals and applications of plasmas for etching and deposition (e.g., high-density plasmas), including plasma damage. The limitations of fabrication and operation of nano-scale devices are discussed. Fabrication of a virtual device with specified electrical performance parameters.

E.1.a.6  
• PH 585, 586 Experimental Methods in Applied Physics (4,4)

E-1.a, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, January 5, 2009
Introduction to modern instrumentation used in applied physics, focusing on nanoscience and materials, atmospheric physics, and biophysics, including theory and practice of the instruments. Prerequisite: admission to Ph.D program in Applied Physics, M.S. in Physics, or ESR Ph.D programs.

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.7
• BI 426/526 Evolution, 4 credits – split course and change course numbers to BI 358 and BI 526, change BI 526 title to Principles of Evolution, change BI 526 course description
E.1.a.8
• BI 461/561 Freshwater Invertebrate Zoology, 5 credits – change title to Invertebrate Zoology, change course description
E.1.a.9
• ESR 570 Environmental Education, 3 credits – change to 4 credits
E.1.a.10
• PH 617 Quantum Mechanics, 3 credits – change to 4 credits, change course description
E.1.a.11
• PH 618, 619 Quantum Mechanics, 4 credits each – add PH 617 to sequence
E.1.a.12
• PSY 516/616 Advanced Industrial/Organizational Psychology, 4 credits – change title to Advanced Organizational Psychology, change course description

Graduate School of Education
New Courses
E.1.a.13
• CI 530 Teaching Struggling Adolescent Readers (3)
  Designed to help teachers to develop an understanding of adolescent readers within school settings, to expand their teaching repertoire, to assist struggling readers, and to organize plans that improve secondary literacy programs. Appropriate for classroom teachers, reading specialists, and administrators interested in adolescent literacy.

School of Social Work
Change to Existing Program
E.1.a.14
• MSW in Social Work, delete prerequisite of human biology

College of Urban and Public Affairs
Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.15
• PA 593 Discrimination and the Law, 3 credits – change title to Civil Rights for Public Managers, change course description
E.1.a.16
• PA 594 Affirmative Action Planning, 3 credits – change title to Enhancing Diversity in the Workplace, change course description and prerequisites
Executive Summary
Proposal for the Implementation of Doctoral Program in Applied Physics
Department of Physics
Portland State University

Introduction
Applied Physics combines a core physics curriculum with research and study in one of several areas that deal either with the application of physics to a technical discipline or with the interface between physics and other areas of science. It can be stated that physics and its applications are one of the fundamental drivers of economic progress since the scientific revolution.

The Department of Physics at PSU currently offers the B.A., B.S., M.A., and M.S. degrees in physics. Students who wish to study physics at the doctoral level do so within the framework of the Environmental Sciences and Resources (ESR) interdisciplinary program. Building on the demand for, and success of, our existing graduate program, the Department of Physics is proposing a disciplinary Ph.D. program in Applied Physics.

The major problem for a university the size of PSU and for a metropolitan area the size and diversity of Portland is the lack of a program that offers the highest degree in a field as fundamental as physics. There have been many calls from the Portland community for the development of Portland State University into a strong research university that can truly serve the advanced educational needs of the regional population, as well as the research and infrastructure needs of the local industry. Expanding graduate education in Applied Physics is central to meeting these needs.

The program’s emphases in atmospheric, materials, and biological physics will serve to both underpin the interdisciplinary ESR Doctoral Program currently offered and the developing interdisciplinary research programs in materials science and biological science. Furthermore, a disciplinary Ph.D. program in Applied Physics will position the University to better capitalize on collaborative opportunities within ONAMI and with OHSU.

Evidence of Need
As Oregon’s only urban University, PSU has committed itself to a role as an essential partner and an intellectual leader, in the educational and economic future of the Portland metro area, an area that is home to 60% of the state’s residents. In particular, the University has recognized the need to substantially expand its science and engineering programs so that PSU may better serve the critical technology needs of the local community and the state.

The proposed program responds to the needs of the Portland area for a higher level of research and educational capabilities in the fundamental sciences. Currently the only Ph.D. program in the Portland metro area available to students interested in advanced study in Physics is PSU’s ESR/Physics program. While this is an excellent program for those students seeking to work at the interface of basic science and environmental resource management, it is not an appropriate program for students with interests in areas outside of environmental science. Furthermore, the majority of applicants to the Department are interested in the program for the opportunity to carry out advanced study in physics, not environmental science, and many faculty research programs are in areas that do not directly overlap with environmental science. Indeed, much of the recent research expansion (in faculty and research funding) in the Physics Department has been in atmospheric and materials physics. The expansion supports the rapidly growing collaborations with local high technology sector, as well as the statewide initiatives around materials science and nanotechnology (ONAMI), sustainability, and biomedical sciences (OHSU).
As evidence of the level of enthusiasm for the proposed program in the community the proposal includes strong letters of support from numerous industrial, biotech, and academic partners, including FEI and ONAMI.

Objectives
The objectives of this program are: 1) to enhance graduate education in Portland by providing an opportunity for advanced education in the physics with emphases in Nanoscience and Materials Physics, Atmospheric Physics, and Biophysics, 2) to provide leadership in applied physics research and education in the Portland metro area, 3) to meet the current and future research and infrastructure needs of the Portland metropolitan area in physics-dependent fields, and 4) to contribute to the growing base of research required for our rapidly advancing technological economy.

Course of Study
The Ph.D. in Applied Physics is a research degree. The equivalent of four to five years of full-time graduate work primarily focused on an original research project will be typical for those candidates entering with the B.S./B.A. in physics. For students entering the program with a M.S./M.A. in physics, this could be shortened by one to two years. Students enrolled in the M.S./M.A. program at PSU who wish to transfer to the Ph.D. program will be required to formally apply to the program as is currently the case for the ESR/physics program. A minimum of 32 credit hours of approved graduate coursework at the 600 level in physics core, the Experimental Methods sequence and at least 3 courses in the student’s specialty (20 credit hours) will be required. Students will also be required to register for at least 27 credit hours of dissertation (PH 603) as mandated by the Office of Graduate Studies.

Each regular degree student will begin discussing potential research projects with faculty members during the first term and must have selected a research advisor before the second term in order to choose coursework which complements the research program. After the selection is made and approved, primary responsibility for the student's program will pass to the research advisor. The research advisor will have the major responsibility for monitoring the progress of the student, even in cases where the research is performed in collaboration with another laboratory. Final approval of the program of study will be the responsibility of the dissertation committee.

Once the student has chosen an advisor, a dissertation committee will be established and appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies upon suggestion by the advisor. The committee shall consist of the research advisor, who serves as chair, two other faculty members of the Physics Department, and one additional member from outside the department but within PSU with expertise in the thesis area. Other members may be added from the local scientific and industrial community.

Learning Outcomes
The characteristics important for a successful Ph.D. graduate in applied physics are: 1) the development of independent and creative thinking skills, 2) acquisition of the body of knowledge comprising the foundations of physics and the relevant areas, 3) expertise in experimental design and implementation, 4) the ability to formulate and address current research problems, and 5) excellent professional communication skills. The proposed program is designed to cultivate each of these skills.

Cost
The Physics Department has had a longstanding involvement in the ESR doctoral program and in the last few years has been the recipient of both institutional investments and significantly enhanced external research funding. Funding has been designated for two new faculty lines; one of these new faculty members is already in place. All of the expertise, resources, and financial commitments for the implementation of this new doctoral program are in place.
September 21, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Joan Jagodnik  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Richard Beyler  
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**

E.1.b.1

- PH 481/581 Introduction to Nano(materials)-Science and -Engineering (4)  
  An introduction to nano(materials)-science and -engineering for students in physics, chemistry, geology, electrical and computer engineering, and mechanical and materials engineering. Nanoscale processes and devices and their applications. Recommended prerequisites: two specific advanced upper division science courses dependent on major, or consent of instructor.

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.2

- BI 426/526 Evolution, 4 credits – split course and change course numbers to BI 358 and BI 526, change BI 526 title to Principles of Evolution, change BI 526 course description  
E.1.b.3

- BI 461/561 Freshwater Invertebrate Zoology, 5 credits – change title to Invertebrate Zoology, change course description

**College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.2

- USP 499/599 Real Estate Finance and Investment, 3 credits – separate 4xx/5xx sections, change 599 title to Real Estate Finance II, change description
School of Fine and Performing Arts

New Courses
E.1.b.1

- ART 430/530 Critical Art Theories II (4)
  Examines art and ideas in a theoretical and philosophical context from the last twenty years. Rather than use a chronology, looks at themes and forms of art: the uses of photography, for example, and the globalization of the art world and its implications. Explores critical theory as much as individual artists or works of art, and examines various responses to the same issues or artists. Places art into a broader theoretical, philosophical and social context, and looks at cross-cultural and interdisciplinary connections. Material presented through slides, films and lectures (from instructor and guests). In addition to readings, there will be a good deal of field work: regular visits to the Portland Art Museum and local galleries, and attendance at lectures and performance events. Prerequisites (required for art majors only): Art 330. Open to non-majors who have prerequisites and instructor’s consent.
January 5, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Joan Jagodnik, Chair
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The following proposals have been approved by the UCC, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

School of Business Administration

Changes in Existing Programs

E.1.c.1.
- BA/BS in Business Administration; General Management Option
  - Changes the name of the “General Management” option to the “Management and Leadership” option.

E.1.c.2.
- BA/BS in Business Administration; Real Estate Finance Option
  - Changes curriculum to the Real Estate Finance option by creating two 2-course sequences in real estate finance and real estate valuation.
  - Renumber and rename Fin/USP 360 Real Estate Finance I (3); Fin 460 Real Estate Finance II (4); Add Fin 459 Advanced Real Estate Valuation (3).

Changes in Existing Courses

E.1.c.3
- Fin 453 Real Estate Finance and Investments – change course number, title and prerequisites to: Fin 360 Real Estate Finance I (3).

New Courses

E.1.c.4.
- ISQA 431 Transportation Regulation (4)
  - Evolution of transportation law in the U.S., including examination of case law as precedent. Designed for those planning careers in transportation, logistics or supply chain management. Prerequisite: BA 339.
E.1.c 5.
• ISQA 440 Governmental Procurement (4)
  Introduction to theories and practices of governmental procurement. Major aspects of purchasing within public agencies in the United States with special emphasis on the Oregon statutes and administrative rules. Differences between public and private purchasing processes. Federal purchasing processes. Prerequisite: BA 339.

School of Fine and Performing Arts

New Courses

E.1.c.6.
• TA 352 Dance Choreography (4)
  Exploring compositional devices and craft unique to group choreography. Choreographing and producing a dance in a performance setting. Recommended prerequisites: TA 350, TA 351.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Instructional Program

E.1.c.7.
• Minor in Special Education
  Creates a new minor in Special Education. Intended for students who plan to enter a graduate teacher education program and be licensed in Special Education. The minor is not a requirement for admission to the PSU Graduate School of Education, Special Education Program, while it does include the general prerequisites and highly recommended courses for admission to the program.

New Courses

E.1.c.8.
• Intl 397 U.S. Policy and International Development (4)
  Explores relation between U.S. domestic and foreign policy on the formulation of the concept of development, its theoretical evolution and application in developing nations. Utilizes a historical approach starting with colonialism and ending with topics of contemporary salience such as trade, financial liberalization and sustainability.
December 10, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following policy change has been approved by the Graduate Council, and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

Introduction

The Council of Graduate Schools strongly encourages shorter times to degree for doctoral students in order to maintain competitiveness, especially with international institutions. At Portland State University, there have been minimal time limits imposed on doctoral students since the inception of doctoral degree programs at PSU. Currently, there is no overall university time limit from admission to graduation at the doctoral level; the only time limit is a minimum of four months and a maximum of five years from advancement to candidacy to graduation. As a result, students can potentially take an inordinate amount of time to complete their degrees. Recent figures show the average and median time to degree at PSU for doctoral students graduating since 1999 are both between six and seven years. Nevertheless, there have been instances of students completing their degrees more than 20 years after admission. Bearing these facts in mind, the Graduate Council recommends that the following proposal be implemented.

Proposal

Beginning in Fall 2009, the following two time limits on doctoral degrees will be established. The new Bulletin language, which will be added to the appropriate places on pages 14, 71, 72, and 73, will be:

“For students entering with a master’s degree, a maximum of five years will be allowed from admission to completion of all required comprehensive examinations. For students entering with a bachelor’s degree, a maximum of two additional years will be added to this limit, for a maximum of seven years from admission to completion of all comprehensive examinations. Failure to meet this time limit will result in cancellation of admission to the doctoral program.”

“A maximum of three years will be allowed from the completion of comprehensive examinations to advancement to candidacy. Failure to meet this time limit will result in cancellation of admission to the doctoral program.”
Supplemental Information

The current time limit of a minimum four months and maximum five years from advancement to graduation will be maintained.

In the case of extenuating circumstances, students can petition the Graduate Council for an extension of these time limits.

Individual doctoral programs can impose their own shorter time limits; many already do. It is up to doctoral programs to monitor and enforce their own program-specific requirements.

If students do not meet the first (admission to comps) or second (comps to advancement) time limit, their admission will be canceled. Such students could reapply for admission; approvals for readmission are required from the doctoral program and the Office of Graduate Studies. For students who do not make the third (already existing) time limit (advancement to graduation), the current policy will remain in effect (students will be removed from candidacy; they would have to retake comprehensive exams and be advanced to a new period of candidacy).

The Office of Graduate Studies will establish a procedure to send reminder letters to students and their doctoral programs six to nine months before the second (comps to advancement) and third (advancement to graduation) time periods expire.

Students admitted to a doctoral program who have not graduated before Fall term 2009 will be grandfathered into these requirements. For example, a student who was admitted in Fall 2006 and has not yet completed comps will have five years beginning Fall 2009 forward to meet this requirement, for a total of eight years (plus an extra two years if the student is working toward a master’s degree at the same time). The third time limit, from advancement to graduation, is currently in existence for all admitted doctoral students; therefore, no grandfather period is needed.

With the establishment of these time limits, doctoral programs have the responsibility to ensure students have access to the appropriate resources necessary for timely progress.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY
Text to be added underlined. Text to be deleted struck-out.

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY
4) STANDING COMMITTEES.

1) Budget Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other divisions, two students, the chairperson of the University Planning Council Educational Policy Committee and, as consultants, the following or his or her representative, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the University Planning Council Educational Policy Committee.

The Committee shall:

1) Consult with the President and her or his designee(s) and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.
2) Recommend budgetary priorities.
3) Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes through a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the program.
4) Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared.
5) Review expenditures of all public and grant funding as requested by the Faculty Senate.
6) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.
7) Report to the Senate at least once each year.

Rationale:
There are several rationales for the changes.

1) The University Planning Council no longer exists. It has been replaced by the Educational Policy Committee; therefore, we are making a change in representation.

2) For the past year, the Budget Committee has reviewed its charge in light of the new strategic planning and budget processes instituted at PSU. The group wanted to make sure the charge still made sense. In general it does; however, there were a couple of places that may never had made sense or don’t currently:
   a. For the past several years, the Budget Committee has not consulted directly with the President. The Budget Committee felt it would be wise to retain consulting with the President in case there is a future President who wants direct consultation, but added “her or his designees” which is now the process. The University Budget Team consults with the Budget Committee, and then the Budget Team provides a proposal to the President.
b. Analyzing the budgetary implications of new programs or program changes seems an appropriate role for this committee. However, it has not been part of the program approval process in the recent past (we are not sure previous to that). We are suggesting that the Budget Committee review new program and program change proposals for financial viability, using language directly out of the OUS review process guidelines “through a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the program”.

c. “Review expenditures of all public and grant funds” is not a realistic task for this committee nor appropriate. It would be the equivalent of doing an internal audit.
MEMORANDUM

December 8, 2008

FROM: Shawn Smallman  
Vice Provost for Instruction & Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Robert Mercer, Presiding Officer  
2008-09 PSU Faculty Senate

RE: Motion regarding a review of the University Honors Program and departmentally-based honors tracks. This motion is being jointly presented to the Senate by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

In recent years cross-campus discussions have occurred in multiple settings about the recruitment, retention, and academic experience of high achieving undergraduates at PSU. As part of PSU’s focus on student success and retention, it is timely to review both the Honors Program and departmental honors options, to consider how these both can best meet student needs.

Motion

The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost, in close consultation with the Senate Steering Committee, appoint an ad hoc committee to review both the University Honors Program and departmentally-based honors tracks. We request that this committee seek campus-wide input in considering both the curricular design and administrative structure of these programs. We further request the committee convene by February 4th, make a preliminary report to the Senate during Winter term, and make a final report to the Senate by the end of the academic year. We request that the final report include specific recommendations regarding how both the Honors Program and honors tracks can be better aligned with the University mission and more fully meet student needs.

Composition of the Committee:

It is the express wish of the Faculty Senate that the Committee to review the Honors Program and departmentally-based honors tracks should consist of no more than 18 individuals and be constituted as follows.

Representation At least one member should be appointed from each of these units: CLAS, FPA, SBA, MCECS, CUPA, GSE, GSSW, OSA, HON and UNST

Department Chairs At least three members of the committee should be (or should have been) department chairs
Representatives from Senate committees One member should be drawn from the current membership of each of these committees: EPC, UCC and ARC

Charge to the Committee:

It is the express wish of the Faculty Senate that the Committee should, in its preliminary report, include the following.

1. Historical data on the evolution of the programs, including data on
   - Student persistence and completion
   - Student and faculty perceptions and satisfaction with these programs.
   - The composition of the Honors Program faculty
   - The integration of the Honors Program, Honors faculty and honors tracks with the larger university community
   - Budget and resource allocations
   - How our program compares with other programs both in the state and nationally.

2. An initial assessment of both the curricular and structural effectiveness of the current Honors Program and departmental honors tracks to meet the University’s goals, in particular with regard to access, opportunity and student success. What administrative structures would best serve the programs’ goals? How can leadership of these programs be best structured to meet student goals and integrate fully with other campus units.

3. How policies related to hiring, promotion and tenure, as well as curricular oversight should be implemented in Honors. How should Honors tracks be designed and reviewed?