

2-6-2006

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 2006

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 February 2006" (2006). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 118.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/118>

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.

Claudia Weston, Asst. Director
Library Technical Services
LIB-W

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 **February 6, 2006**, at 1500 in room **53 CH**.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 2006, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

D. Unfinished Business

*1. Graduate Council Program Proposal for the M.M. in Jazz Studies, and Course Proposals
– Wakeland

*2. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposal for the BA/BS in Environmental Studies
and Course Proposals - Lawrence

*3. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals – Wakeland and Lawrence

E. New Business

*1. Graduate Council Course Proposals - Wakeland

*2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals – Wakeland and Lawrence

*3. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals – Lawrence

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. Faculty Development Committee Semi-annual Report - Davis

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of February 2-3 at UO – Burns

*3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies – C. Brown

4. Budget Committee Interim Report – R. Johnson

5. Interim Report of Advisory Cmttee on Academic Information Technologies - Rhodes

6. Report on Oregon SB 300 and Oregon SB 342 – Rhodes

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the Meeting of January 9, 2005

D-1 Graduate Council Program and Course Proposals

D-2 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Program and Course Proposals

D-3 Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

E-1 Graduate Council Course Proposals

~~E-2 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals~~

E-3 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

G-1 Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report

G-3 "G-1" Report of Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies, January 2006, attached

Secretary to the Faculty

andrewscolliers@pdx.edu • 341 CH • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4499

***** 2005-06 PSU FACULTY SENATE ROSTER *****

******2005-06 STEERING COMMITTEE ******

Presiding Office: Duncan Carter
 Presiding Officer Pro tem: Robert Mercer
 Steering Committee Kathi Ketcheson
 John Rueter, Carl Wamser, &
 Teresa Bulman (Comm on Comm), *Ex officio*

******2005-06 FACULTY SENATE******

All Others (13)

Endress, Wendy	SD	2006
Hoffman, Agnes	ADM	2006
Oceguera, Tonantzin(Fortm)	OSA	2006
Toppe, Michelle	OSA	2006
Cardenas, Jennifer	ADM	2007
Hagge, Tim	CAPS	2007
Shattuck, Aimee	WRC	2007
Stoering, Juliette	OIRP	2007
Angell, Nate	OMC	2008
Gregory, Mark	OIT	2008
Ketcheson, Kathi	OIRP	2008
Squire, Patricia	ALUM	2008
Thompson, Dee	CARC	2008

Business Administration (6)

Gilpatrick, Thomas	SBA	2006
†Johnson, Raymond	SBA	2007
Mathwick, Charla	SBA	2007
Buddress, Leland	SBA	2007
Ramiller, Neil	SBA	2008
Yuthas, Kristi	SBA	2008

Education (6)

*Thao, Yer (Farahmandpur)	ED-CI	2006
Wosley-George, Elizabeth	ED	2006
Stevens, Dannelle	ED	2007
†Halverson, Susan	SPED	2007
Caskey, Micki	ED	2008
* _____ (Isaacson)		2008

Engineering and Computer Science (10)

Anderson, Timothy	ETM	2006
Meekisho, Lemmy	ME	2006
Hook, James	CMPS	2006
Bertini, Robert	CE	2007
Lall, B Kent	CE	2007
†Shapiro, Leonard	CMPS	2007
Black, Andrew	CMPS	2008
Maier, David	CMPS	2008
Recktenwald, Gerald	ME	2008
Feng, Wu-chi	CMPS	2008

Extended Studies (3)

Repp, Betty Jean	XS-Sal	2006
†Sedivy, Glen	XS-ESP	2007
Livneh, Cheryl	CEED	2008

Fine and Performing Arts (6)

Hansen, Bradley	MUS	2006
Grant, Darrell	MUS	2006
†Fosque, Walton	ART	2007
Tate, William	TA	2007
* _____ (Fletcher)		2008
Knights, Clive	ARCH	2008

*Interim appointments indicated with asterisk

†Member of Committee on Committees

Liberal Arts and Sciences (37)

*Becker, William (Koch)	CSE	2006
*Bleiler, Stephen(M.Enneking)	MTH	2006
Cummings, Michael	GEOL	2006
*Fernandez, Oscar (Brower)	FLL	2006
Fountain, Robert	MTH	2006
George, Linda	CSE	2006
Johnson, Daniel	GEOG	2006
Latiolais, Paul	MTH	2006
Mercer, Robert	CLAS	2006
Padin, Jose	SOC	2006
Smallman, Shawn	OIA	2006
†Bulman, Teresa	GEOG	2007
Carter, Duncan	ENG	2007
Crawshaw, Larry	BIO	2007
Fischer, William	FLL	2007
Kominz, Laurence	FLL	2007
†*Mandaville, Jon (Biolsi)	HST	2007
Mercer, Lorraine	ENG	2007
†Rueter, John	ESR	2007
*Schechter, Patricia (Ames)	HST	2007
Shusterman, Gwen	CHEM	2007
Wadley, Stephen	FLL	2007
Wamser, Carl	CHEM	2007
Collier, Peter	SOC	2007
†Morgaine, Carol	OCCD	2007
Agorsah, Kofi	BST	2008
Balshem, Martha	CAE	2008
Brown, Kimberly	LING	2008
Burns, Scott	GEOL	2008
Kapoor, Prya	SP	2008
†Medovoi, Leerom	ENG	2008
Reder, Stephen	LING	2008
Watanabe, Suwako	FLL	2008
Weasel, Lisa	BIO-ORB	2008
Wetzel, Patricia	FLL	2008
Works, Martha	GEOG	2008

Library (3)

Jackson, Rose	LIB	2006
†Larsen, Thomas	LIB	2007
Brenner, Michaela	LIB	2008

Other Instructional (4)

†Reynolds, Candyce	UNST	2006
MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2007
Flower, Michael	HON	2008
Labissière, Yves	UNST	2008

Social Work (6)

Brennan, Eileen	SSW	2006
*Yatchmenoff, D. (Corcoran)	SSW	2006
Hunter, Richard	SSW	2007
†Jivanjee, Pauline	SSW	2007
Cotrell, Victoria	SSW	2008
Powers, Laurie	SSW	2008

Urban and Public Affairs (8)

Dill, Jennifer	USP	2006
†Lawrence, Regina	PS	2006
Howe, Deborah	USP	2006
McBride, Leslie	PHE	2007
Sharkova, Irina	PRC	2007
Clucas, Richard	PS	2008
Farquhar, Stephanie	SCH	2008
*Wollner, Craig (Rose)	IMS	2008

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 9, 2006
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present: Agorsah, Anderson, Angell, Balshem, Becker Bertini, Bleiler, Brennan, Brown, Buddress, Bulman, Burns, Carter, Caskey, Clucas, Collier, Crawshaw, Cummings, Dill, Elzanowski, Endress, Farquhar, Feng, Fernandez, Flower, Fosque, Fountain, George, Gillpatrick Grant, Gregory, Hagge, Halvorsen, Hansen, Hoffman, Hook, Howe, Jackson, Jivanjee, D. Johnson, R. Johnson, Ketcheson, Knights, Kominz, Labissiere, Larsen, Latiolais, Lawrence, Livneh, MacCormack, Maier, McBride, Medovoi, R. Mercer, Morgaine, Oceguela, Padin, Ramiller, Rectenwald, Reder, Reynolds, Rueter, Schechter, Sedivy, Shapiro, Sharkova, Shattuck, Shusterman, Smallman, Squire, Stoering, Tate, Thompson, Toppe, Wadley, Wamser, Watanabe, Weasel, Wetzell, Wollner, Works, Wosley-George, Yachmenoff, Yuthas.

Alternates Present: Ferguson for Cotrell, Jacob for L. Mercer, Harmon for Repp, Snider for Sedivy, DeLaCruz for Stevens,

Members Absent: Black, Brenner, Cardenas, Fischer, Fletcher, Hunter, Isaacson, Kapoor, Lall, Mandaville, Mathwick, Meekisho, Powers, Thao,

Ex-officio Members

Present: Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Burns, Desrochers, Diman, Driscoll, Fortmiller, Jacob, Harvey, Kaiser, Koch, Mack, McVeety, Murdock, Nelson, Rhodes, Sestak, Wallack

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2005, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Town Hall Meeting to discuss the Draft Accreditation Report Wednesday, January 18, 3-5 p.m. in CH 53. A link to the draft report of the Accreditation Team is available on the PSU Portfolio, Executive Summary Page. Sponsored by the Faculty Senate.

PSU-AAUP informational forums about the proposed contract settlement, January 11, 12 and 17, 12 – 2 p.m. in SMSU 338.

All Others Caucus of the Faculty Senate is charged to elect their representative to the Committee on Committees, no later than the conclusion of the Senate meeting.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since December 5, 2005: Lorraine Mercer, CLAS has resigned from the Senate effective January 10. Her replacement will be Marek Elzanowski.

President's Report

The President reported after the Provost. BERNSTINE wished the assembly Happy New Year and welcomed everyone back. On January 18, he will lead a Town Hall meeting to discuss the Accreditation report. He and Vice Provost Rhodes would be leaving directly for Seattle to meet with the commission after the Senate meeting. In a previous Faculty Senate meeting, he briefly summarized the commendations and recommendations and concerns in the report. He noted that once Senators read the report, they will see that there are no major surprises. We are expecting a positive outcome, and the only question is whether we would be revisited in five years or get the full ten-year pass. We won't know that for a few weeks after the meeting on Tuesday, but we don't want to delay the town hall or reactions to the report, including developing action plans in response to concerns.

BERNSTINE stated he was sorry he missed the previous Senate meeting and noted he wanted to talk about the budget process and where we are headed. Some people were not satisfied with his statement that the Budget Committee is the appropriate place to deal with some of the serious challenges that we face, but he stands by it. Hopefully the administration will be able to develop a plan of action in collaboration with the Budget Committee. BERNSTINE stated that he has a *Where's Dan?* decal and keeps it on his computer. To the extent that this slogan is a questioning of his commitment to increasing salaries for faculty and staff, he takes issue with it. We are all overworked and underpaid, and under tremendous stress that we are underpaid. The entire administration has been working very hard to continue to develop plans to increase salaries for faculty. In point of fact, to a certain extent, the slogan is a reflection of the strategy that he is using in response to the decision by the Chancellor and the Board not to recalibrate the budget and fund enrollment after this last legislative session. PSU made the argument in both the President's Council and the Administrative Council that enrollment should have been funded. The reality was that the legislature didn't fund enrollment; basically the legislature made a decision to *buy down* tuition rather than fund enrollment. The money was put into the hands of the students but the end result was that there was no increase in the appropriations for the campuses. A recalibration of budgets around enrollment would have meant that we would have been a winner, although not the largest. That would have been OSU, which would have received about \$3.8 Million. PSU would have been second, receiving about \$3 Million, and EOU would have been third, receiving a smaller sum, as they are a smaller institution. UO would have lost around \$800,000, not an insignificant sum, but the reality was that two of the smaller institutions would have gone under. It was clear that neither the Chancellor nor the Board was going to allow these two to go bankrupt in exchange for funding enrollment at three others. The three presidents made a decision that it was a battle they couldn't win, and therefore rather than continuing to alienate the board and the Chancellor's office publicly, we would fight that battle another day. We are fighting that battle now. We are already

meeting with legislators to convince them to look at funding as it comes to the institutions, and the fact that although buying down tuition is a plus for higher ed, the reality is that it doesn't allow us to address the needs of the institutions because it doesn't put money into our budgets. BERNSTINE continued, describing how state appropriations increased through the late 1990's but since then, experienced steady erosion. At the same time our fixed costs rose dramatically, for example, in approximately the last decade salary costs rose 87% and OPE increased 115%. OPE is also now the largest share of our total budget, having increased from 20% to 23%. In terms of our fixed costs alone, if we had not pursued a growth strategy we wouldn't have been able to pay our bills, and that says nothing about the kinds of programs and initiatives that we have also been involved in, particularly after 2000.

BERNSTINE concluded that PSU must wean itself away from dependency on state support. The administration is going to work with the Budget Committee to look at the growth strategy, and in particular the whole question of how we are to deal with continuing erosion of state support. We have to develop strategies that allow us to continue on an upward trajectory, not only to be the university that we are, but also to be the university that we want to be. In order to do that, there are a number of strategies we will have to put in place, for example, growth in the number of students, growth in research, growth in philanthropic support, and growth in auxiliary enterprises. It is dealing with those variables and the complications of the budget that makes the Budget Committee the appropriate body with which to have at least some of the initial discussions. Those issues that are relevant to the academic enterprise and the Senate can be returned to this body for a broad and enlightened discussion about the challenges we continue to face. The basic issue is how we will position the university for the future to deal with the continued erosion of state support.

MEDOVOI asked what was the impulse behind the growth strategy. Many of the faculty are interested in hearing why at a moment of state budget crisis, with a fixed pot that all the universities are competing for, and an assumption that no campus will be allowed to sink, why we would pursue a growth strategy that leads classroom sizes to increases, SCH pressures to mount, and advising tasks to overwhelm us. Is there any way of understanding where this policy came from, and is there any rethinking of it at this point? BERNSTINE stated that firstly, it was not a policy developed by the administration; it was developed along with Budget Committees in the past. Also, tuition dependency is one of the challenges that any private institution faces, and we are becoming much more like a private institution. Tuition will become an increasingly important part of the formula for keeping the institution afloat and allowing us to continue to flourish. One question we have is what is the appropriate mix of students. Another question is what is the upper limit for enrollment, and is the upper limit higher if, for example, we work in conjunction with our community college partners to educate more students by delivering our programs in different ways. The growth strategy is only one piece of the equation, but the reality is that we wouldn't have been able to pay the bills if we hadn't grown our tuition income. We can't sustain that strategy forever; we have to make decisions about growth and about weaning ourselves from dependency on the state.

SCHECHTER asked why the three campuses couldn't politically back a budget strategy that would undermine the financial viability of two smaller campuses, particularly around the notion of the costs of propping up certain campuses. BERNSTINE reminded that we work not just with Portland legislators, and the smaller schools have very strong legislative support. Also, part of the reality is that in the metropolitan area, higher education is down the political agenda. In contrast, see for example Ashland, which has SOU and a state senator, Peter Courtney, who is the president of the senate and on the staff at that campus. The question is where you fight your battle. We are trying to educate legislators about the problem of trading off institutional budgets for buying down tuition. The presidents have to maintain their relations with all constituencies.

COLLIER asked where the issue of access fits into the discussion of increasing tuition. The Vision and Values focus groups several years ago indicated that people are still committed to access. BERNSTINE noted that this question speaks to issue of whether the legislature is really helping access by buying down tuition. If fixed costs continue to rise, for example, buying down tuition doesn't protect access. In conversations with legislators, to a one they all promote access to the detriment of all other priorities including quality. Access must work into our overall strategy. The final question is who will provide education.

REDER asked if we need a political strategy with the legislature to increase institutional support. How can we convince them we need more money when we show we are managing without. BERNSTINE stated that any new funding would likely be based on student headcount, and we can't necessarily cut back saying only that we can't afford to do it. The question is if we can generate broader legislative support, for example, a community college strategy might provide broader access, which would improve our standing.

REDER noted that it is this level of policy discussion that the Senate is asking to be involved in; this can't be done off to the side by a committee. BERNSTINE noted that the committee is a small enough group to work through the variables with, and then we can come back to the Senate and say look, these are the choices.

PADIN noted that he is confused with the language of this conversation; it laments the decline in public support for a public university and also speaks of hastening it. The framing of it as "weaning ourselves of dependency" suggests that PSU is a slothful, able-bodied welfare cheat. BERNSTINE stated that state support is now down to 15%, and other states such as Michigan and Wisconsin have preceded us in this reality. State dollars continue to shrink and this \$3 Million incident is not so isolated. We need to have alternate sources of revenue so we can be in control of our own destiny. We are not really public any more, and it would be a mistake for us to design our destiny around state support. It is much more important for us to design our destiny around the assumption that this support will continue to erode. We are no different that most large public institutions. We must grow research, philanthropy, and other possible revenue streams.

Provost's Report

KOCH stated that he wanted to provide a response to the events and questions of the December meeting. He noted he was somewhat offended by the assumption that he doesn't value the faculty of this institution. Nothing could be further from the truth. That being said, his responsibility is now to the whole institution, of which faculty are one part; he must look at the entire institutional budget. Having been a member of the faculty for a long period of time, he understands the financial situation that faculty find themselves in, and he will be working very diligently over time to address those issues.

KOCH discussed the questions from the December meeting with respect to certain comments about growth. As many people know, he has been at the very least curious and at most somewhat skeptical about the growth agenda over time. Everyone is aware that this is not a sustainable activity in the long run. After reviewing the situation we have found ourselves in, what we did over the last six or seven years appears to have been a logical strategy and the only viable approach to maintaining our current level of activities at the institution. He spent quite a bit of time looking at this, and concluded that this was the best of a bunch of bad options. We are better off than if we had chosen any other option, and given this, we need to focus our attention on the future. We need to grow the resource base of the institution without increasing the workload.

KOCH is working with the deans and VP Desrochers to identify and investigate several scenarios to enhance the resource base of the institution. They are not based on growing anything; rather they are based on changing policies that had evolved over a long period of time but had not changed in response to the changes in our external environment. We are looking at four things in particular that appear to have short-term value with respect to additional resources. One, our tuition and fee policy which came from a time when we were concerned about providing access to as many students as possible including students in Southwest Washington. We need to revisit that policy, as it may be a source of short-term revenue. Two, we remit a lot of tuitions and we have a lot of scholarship funds, and whereas tuition remission involves no money, scholarships are dollars from the foundation that go to the university for operations. We are looking at the relationship between these two pools in order to maximize the use of scholarship funds, which is real money. We are also looking at self-support courses and programs. Three, we are looking at staff and infrastructure support, for example, Student Affairs and Finance & Administration, which were the areas most neglected in recent years. We think a lot of that comes from the fact that we weren't reflecting the value of those activities in "self support." Four, for the longer term, we are seriously looking at our student mix. Given some interest in PSU regionally and nationally, we have had the opportunity to recruit non-resident students. That mix will have an impact on our revenues as well. We are keeping the Budget Committee informed of this activity. We will be producing some preliminary feasibility studies later this month, and will keep the Senate informed. All of this will be done in a consultative manner.

KOCH provided an update on recent proposals approved in the Faculty Senate. The Ph.D. in Biology was approved by the Provost's Council for external review, and the external review has been completed, with a few questions but overall positive results. We hope to take this back to the Provost's Council in February. The Ph.D. in Sociology has had its first reading at the Provost's Council. In an effort to make it a more organic and coherent document, PSU took some liberties with the format of the state system, however, they sent it back to us and said we had to put it back in the traditional format. That has been done, and we have conducted some tentative internal review, which raised questions that we plan to address. The Ph.D. in Engineering & Technology Management has been approved by the Provost's Council for external review, and the review committee has been identified.

KOCH concluded with a discussion of SB 342. OUS has begun to react to the requirements of SB 342, and it will require participation on the part of PSU (attachment, slide 1). SB 342 arose out of a number of concerns about articulation within the OUS and with the community colleges. Whether these were the result of real or perceived problems, we are required to respond to the bill. The first item we need to address is Section I. (1), (c) which states "Develop an outcome-based framework for articulation and transfer that is derived from a common understanding of the criteria for general education curricula (attachment, slide 2)." OUS, working with the Provosts and some additional faculty, have decided that if we look at general education throughout the system and try to develop some larger scale criteria for general education, this might provide a framework for an eventual look at all of the required elements, including the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM), Associate of Arts, etc. (attachment, slide 3). A two-stage process has been proposed. The first stage is to identify broad outcomes, which we are well along the way to having done at PSU, given the work in University Studies some years ago. We also want to look at our outcomes as compared to other institutions' outcomes, and try to develop a common set for the four and two-year institutions (attachment, slide 4). The notion that this should be faculty driven is accepted by the system, so a committee is being formed to deal with this. The Provosts have been charged with identifying people from the campuses to participate in this process in six subcommittees that will meet at PSU on 9-10 February (attachment, slide 5). We will be calling on faculty in the next two weeks to request participation. Once this process is complete, the work will be brought back to the campuses for review. A second stage will involve matching courses at the campuses to the outcomes, so students will know how they are counted at other institutions. At the next Senate meeting, we are anticipating a more detailed discussion of SB 342, as there are several more aspects that may be of interest, as they deal with the organization of the curriculum. Terry Rhodes will lead that discussion.

Chancellor's Report

CARTER welcomed the Chancellor for his first official meeting with the PSU Faculty Senate, and yielded the floor

"I just came from the Oregon Business Summit, a conference sponsored by the Oregon Business Council and attended by 1200 people. The discussion was all about

the 21st century and the imperatives of a flat world and a global economy. There, it was all about the need to improve educational attainment, educational expectations and educational performance, or Oregonians will be left behind in the race that is the 21st century. Most of the members of the legislature were there, the governor was there, and our two senators were there. Most of the major corporations had their CEOs or other executive there. This is the fourth year they have been there, and the fourth year that the same message has been given. A former legislator came up to me as I was leaving and said that after hearing that the overwhelming consensus is that we need to focus our attention on education and that we need to focus our strategy on university-based research, he would feel a lot more optimistic if we hadn't been here before. The biggest problem we have in the state is that we haven't come to grips with the choices we have made as a state. This was the state of affairs in Oregon in 1989: the state investment per university student ranked 23rd in the country; the state and local investment per K-12 student was 8th in the country; the state and local investment per community college student was number one. Last year the K-12 investment fell to 43rd, community colleges are now around 14th, and we are fighting it out with New Hampshire for dead last in university investment. What happened in the 1990 tax revolt and in the shift that Measure 5 caused was a fundamental dislocation in this state. Until then, we could be characterized as a high tax, high service state. We were 9th or 10th in taxes per capita or taxes per \$1,000 income. But we were a high service state and we prided ourselves, and our legislators prided themselves, on that balance. We have now become a low tax state, arguably somewhere around 41st to 43rd, but we have not yet come to grips with the level of service that we as Oregonians are willing to accept for the dollars that we are willing to pay. Until that happens, we will have the kinds of discussions that I just came in on the tail end of. They are not unique in this country – this is happening all over – they are just more pronounced in this state. The biggest problem that this creates is not for us, because as Dan said, we will find a way. As institutions, we will find a way to survive. We will find a way to do as well as is possible what it is we do. Regardless of any other metric you have, there are more faculty at PSU today than there were a dozen years ago. Yes, there are more students, but we increased system-wide, 20,000 students - 10,000 at PSU. We reduced the size of our faculty system-wide over that period of time. This is a problem not unique to Portland state; this is a challenge for all the state. We have managed as a state system in the last dozen years, with fewer faculty, to add 20,000 students. We have also increased markedly our funded research. We're now getting almost to the point, and we may hit that point next year, in which our funded research exceeds our state appropriation. That's a tribute to the faculty system-wide. The rate of growth here is the highest in the state, 91% over the last seven years, but it's the highest by only a percent. We have many of our campuses doing very good work. Our graduation rates are up. The number of degrees and certificates we conferred last year, 19,000, is by far the highest in state history, and it will go up again this year. Our time to degree is down, our retention rates are up, and on every one of the metrics we typically look at for higher education we are doing better than we were ten years ago. We have found a way, but we have found a way to do it without state money. The board of Higher Ed is looking right now, in its strategic planning process, at what the world in Oregon might be like in 2025, a twenty-year plan for us. In 2025, if we serve only the same proportion of students coming out of high school as we serve today, our enrollment system-wide will have

to grow by 35,000 students. Unlike many states to the east and mid-west, our population is growing. We were the fastest growing of the Pacific states last year, in terms of population growth. Unlike in many of the eastern and mid-western states, our younger population, although not growing nearly as fast as our older population is in fact continuing to rise. It is a cause of optimism for our economy, a cause of optimism for our society, a cause of optimism for those of us who are in the education business. But if you look at the trends of investment. In this state, and you trend that forward twenty years, what does it say? If you even take the Governor's proposal, which would guarantee a 10% per biennium growth in appropriations to the universities, K-12, and community colleges, what does that do? The state proportion of the total would either have to decline, in other words we have to find money someplace else in a higher proportion that we do today. That someplace else might be tuition, it might be grants, it might be gifts, it might be business activities, it might be partnerships - it might be almost anything. Or, as Dan talked about, we begin to look at limiting enrollment, and the board is very seriously concerned about and considering that. It is not something that would go unnoticed. We have been told by the leadership in Salem that there will be a penalty to pay if we limit enrollment because their expectation is that somehow we will find a way, even if they don't. We can work on that expectation. We can build alliances with business leaders and others to maybe chip away at it, but long-term in this state, until we address the first question, what level of service we are actually willing to pay for, until we address that, we will not be able to deal with the fundamental question of what does it mean to be public education in this state. I don't see that being addressed directly through our current political process. One of the things that the board is hopeful of doing is getting that issue squarely in front of the policy makers. I am not foolish enough to think that that will be addressed in a short period of time. I am not foolish enough to think it will be addressed successfully without what amounts to a public relations and education campaign that is aimed not only at policy makers but also at citizens. But I do think that there will be an opportunity to address it. In the meantime what do we face? We have some short term and some mid term things to seriously consider. In the short term, the governor continues to assert - and I believe that he will - increase the OUS budget by 10% in 07-09. That won't even address our current operating level, but it will come a lot closer than any budget has since 1999. Secondly, I know that the board will work very carefully to figure out whether or not there should be a different compact with regard to tuition and financial aid than we have today. You can read into that, higher tuition and higher aid. That won't be popular, but the alternative is an erosion of quality that I don't believe this board is willing to countenance. Third, we will continue to increase the fundraising activities of all of our campuses. Last year we raised \$150 Million in donations across the seven campuses. University of Oregon is in the middle of a capital campaign that started three years ago and has four years to run, a \$600 Million campaign, and they have already raised \$385 Million. The idea of trying to broaden our financial resources is one that we have taken on board. I think there is some cause for optimism. The board and I are well aware of the discontinuities that the budget agreements of '02-03 cause and by that I mean, the freezing of enrollment funding at the '02-03 level. What I will propose to the board for '05-07 is that we renormalize the RAM. Let me tell you what that will do, because I don't want people to be overly optimistic or overly pessimistic. That will shift dollars within the same pool from the regional campuses to PSU and

OSU. The regional campuses cannot survive that cut, the dollars are too big - cuts of that magnitude call into questions their very existence and financial viability. My hope is that a proposal to refund the "regionals" as part of that normalization may be more politically salable than funding enrollment growth. We learned that last time. We went after enrollment growth money and we got all the way to the Senate with enrollment money, but in the House the decision was made that we can't do that because that will hurt the regionals. Instead, we will give you more money than the Senate, but you can't fund enrollment except at the '02-03 level. I will freely admit that I took \$13 Million instead of \$9.6 Million. I decided that in the short run, that was the better part of valor, even if in the long run, it was the wrong decision. It's the kind of decision you make in the waning days of the legislative session or you get nothing. But, in the long run if we don't address the issues of how much enrollment this state is really willing to pay for, we continue the fiction that educating students is free. It is not free and that is why I want to take a different tack this time, and that is why I want to make it clear in the short run to the decision-makers on the board, in the governor's office, and in the legislature, the true cost of sustaining regional universities at the expense of this campus and Oregon State. Beyond the short term strategy, we have to come to grips in some fashion with what we as a state are willing to pay for. Maybe coming to grips with tuition and aid policy is a step towards that, because one of the things I've learned in Salem is that high tuition even if moderated by aid, is something that is anathema to most legislators. It's a high-risk gamble which I don't know if the board or the governor will be willing to take. That is something that will have to develop as we work through the strategic planning process. Just as is the question of whether or not we cap enrollments. Just as is the question of whether or not we change our legal relationship with the state, as OHSU has done. There are plusses and minuses to the latter, but they are not the ones you think about. The obvious plus is that we're not as restricted by state requirements, and that's true. The minus is that the state feels no responsibility for you because you're not their creature. A plus is that we could move closer to market in faculty salaries, as OHSU has done, but the way they got there was by reducing benefits. That's a tradeoff, and it's a tradeoff we will be discussing. We raised it recently with IFS and with AOF. Are we willing to look at it, to improve faculty salaries, and will the state be willing to accept that tradeoff. There are a couple of reasons for that. The underlying philosophy of the state benefit package now is fully paid-by-employer healthcare. It is a fundamental belief of many of the people in Salem that that is the right policy choice for Oregon, but its expensive, and it would be more expensive for the state if we pulled out rather than staying in. Witness Virginia recently, which had to pay the state to pull out. We and our families are much healthier than other state employees, and if we pull out, their premium goes up. In the long run, if there isn't a solution to the nation's spiraling healthcare cost problem, then Virginia made the right choice to buy out in today's dollars. If we do solve the national health care crisis, they made the wrong choice. But I have talked too long. Are there questions?"

GREGORY asked if it still makes sense to have the same mix of institutions in the state at all. PERNSTEINER noted that in rural parts of the state fewer young people are going to college today than in their parents' generation. The students' expectations are too low, and we're not helping that with the way we are doing things now. There is a role for regional institutions, but it may or may not be the same as

they are now. For example, perhaps we should merge them with the community colleges in their regions, in order to create the kind of post-secondary connection they need. If local voters and taxpayers are willing to support local institutions, those institutions may have a better chance, although they would probably look different than they do now. Another option is to make them branches of the larger campuses. You don't usually get a lot of savings that way, but we need to ask the question, what is the long term academic and financial viability and sustainability for those regions of the educational offerings we can provide. The PSU Social Work program provides an example of offering a regional program for limited duration. Another example of this is EOU, which is the fastest growing university in the state because they are creating centers all across the state which may have limited lives but fill a current need.

ANGELL asked how it makes sense for EOU to compete with other programs. PERNSTEINER stated that most of these programs are located where no one else is, for example, Hermiston. They are also located here in Portland, but so is virtually every other institution in the state, because the metropolitan area is still under-served.

K.BROWN noted that the traditional measures discussed earlier don't appear to align with these "outside the box" solutions, and asked for a clarification. PERNSTEINER noted that at present it isn't clear, but once the outline of the longterm plan is established a picture may emerge. Presently, legislators demand accountability and performance measures are everything, but in this state, they are willing to let us participate in what those measures and metrics will be. What we have to do is make sure that what we can provide and what they want to measure are as compatible as possible.

R.JOHNSON asked the Chancellor to elaborate on the age demographic issue and on support for graduate education. PERNSTEINER noted that in the last legislative session, for the very first time, research was not a four-letter word. That major milestone was due to the success of ONAME. Now, the legislature recognizes that graduate education is linked to research, and that we are not taking away from undergraduate education. Regarding enrollment demand, it will continue to go up for the next ten years, experience a slight dip, and then continue to grow, because we have a young population.

COLLIER asked if, since there is a national debate, have the states united in a strategy to pressure the federal government to re-invest in higher education. PERNSTEINER stated there are a lot of national coalitions, but until you get someone at the national level who is willing to be a champion, there will be no national solution. BRENNAN asked if planning is being done to address the emerging diversity in the state. PERNSTEINER stated that soon about one-third of K-12 students will be Latino and the state hasn't come to accept or understand what impact this will have. OUS has several initiatives, asking the education deans to address the coming needs in teacher training around this issue, but we have yet to address some of the other changes in student populations, such as drug addictions, etc.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**F. NEW BUSINESS****1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Curricular Proposals**

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committee.

REDER/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in the College of Arts and Sciences listed in "E-1" as follows: ANTH 333, CH 284, CH 285, CH 286, DANE 316, DANE 347, FL 335, FR 335, GRK 333, GRK 335, TUR 330, TUR 341, WR 413.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CRAWSHAW stated, with respect to the proposal for the BA/BS in Environment _____, _____. CARTER noted that this technically was out of order as no motion had been made yet.

HANSEN/WORKS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the degree program change in the Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), College of Arts & Sciences, and the program change in the Bachelor of Music to add the emphasis in Music Education, School of Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in "E-1."

HICKEY asked about the omission of General Education electives and BA/BS requirements in the BM in Music Education. HANSEN stated this parallels the existing BM degree in Performance.

LIVNEH requested clarification with respect to the degree program's relationship to the Graduate School of Education teacher education (G.T.E.P.) program, and certain language in the summary. It was provided. CARTER noted the language will be clear in the catalog.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER/BULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the degree program changes and name change to the BA/BS in "Environmental Sciences," College of Arts & Sciences, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

REDER/LATIOLAIS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new degree program, BA/BS in Environmental Studies, College of Arts & Sciences, as listed in "E-1."

SHUSTERMAN stated with respect to several Chemistry courses, _____ Two haven't been offered for some time, and this is a bad fit. The degree is lacking in certain Chemistry courses and there are some structural issues.

BRENNAN/BLEILER MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Academic Requirements Committee Proposal for Admission Requirements for Transfer Students

HARVEY presented the proposal for the committee, after "E.1."

CUMMINGS/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Proposal for Admission Requirements for Transfer Students, cited in "D-4."

The entry GPA for transfer students having 30 transferable credits, be set at 2.0 for all students who present an Oregon Transfer Module or a transferable Associate's Degree. For those students transferring without the fundamental general education preparation of an associate's degree or OTM, the minimum entry GPA is 2.25. This admission standard would apply to all students, regardless of their geographic residency. [Apart from entry GPA, International transfer students must also present proof of English proficiency (TOEFL or IELTS per the present policy.)

_____ commented, regarding the disadvantage _____.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C. BROWN briefly instructed Senators that they should view the ideas contained in the report as very tentative, and requested feedback in the form of attendance at the scheduled town halls, or to the committee at the web address, <http://www.unstreview.groups.pdx.edu/>

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1708.

Responding to Senate Bill 342
January 2006

1

Excerpt from Senate Bill 342
(73rd Oregon Legislative Assembly—2005)

In continuing to provide and improve upon an effective articulation and transfer framework for students in Oregon's post-secondary sectors, community colleges and state institutions of higher education shall:

- (a) Revise the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree offered by community colleges;
- (b) Develop specific degree pathways as deemed appropriate by state institutions of higher education and community colleges;
- (c) Develop an outcome-based framework for articulation and transfer that is derived from a common understanding of the criteria for general education curricula;

2

Excerpt from Senate Bill 342
(73rd Oregon Legislative Assembly—2005)

- (d) Develop a seamless transfer of credits for all level 100 and 200 general education courses;
- (e) Implement a statewide course applicability system that permits students and advisers to query and view online credit transfer options and conduct online degree auditing;
- (f) Develop uniform standards for awarding college credit for advanced placement test scores; and
- (g) Expand early college programs for 11th and 12th graders who earn college credit and intend to pursue a certificate or associate or baccalaureate degree.

3

**Inter-institutional Faculty Committees for
General Education**

Purpose: Faculty committees are needed to develop descriptions of the characteristics of General Education courses that will count toward transferable degree (AA/OT, AS/OT-Bus) or the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM). Since descriptions at two somewhat different levels are needed, it is probably best to approach the work in two stages.

1. **The first stage is to identify the broad outcomes that are desired from coursework in each of the 6 areas of the AA/OT and OTM.**
2. **The second stage is to describe the general criteria that courses in each of the 6 areas should meet in order to promote the desired outcomes for students.**

4

**Suggested Distribution of the
30 OUS Representatives - by subject area**

Writing:	EOU, OSU, PSU , SOU, UO
Oral Communication:	EOU, OIT, OSU, SOU, WOU
Mathematics:	OIT, OSU, PSU , UO, WOU
Arts and Letters:	EOU, PSU , SOU, UO, WOU
Social Sciences:	EOU, OIT, PSU , SOU, UO
Science/Math/C.S.:	OIT, OSU, PSU , UO, WOU

5

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL
 Music, School of Fine & Perf. Arts
 Forwarded by Graduate Council
 January 9, 2006

Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program Leading to the Masters of Music in Jazz Studies

Summary

The proposed program leading to the MM in Jazz Studies will offer graduate level study in Jazz Applied Instruction, Analytical Techniques: Jazz, Jazz Instrumental Arranging, Jazz Ensemble and Combo Performance, Jazz History, and Pedagogy: Jazz, as well as the standard required courses currently offered for the MM in Classical Performance (Research Methods, Graduate Recital). The availability of such a degree at PSU would allow local Jazz musicians (of which there are many) to pursue graduate degrees without having to leave the area, as well as attract outstanding national and international talent. The proposed courses would also attract graduate students seeking elective credits, local area band directors seeking post-graduate credits, and students pursuing MST or MAT degrees.

The primary objective of the program is to provide quality preparation at the graduate level for the performing jazz musician. The Department's present offerings are consistent with Portland State University's mission as an urban university. Strengthening a center for creative study such as the School of Fine and Performing arts attracts creative people from all disciplines to the state, where they have the potential to contribute their expertise to a variety of opportunities and challenges affecting the region and the state.

Proposed curriculum:

MUS 506	Project: Graduate Recital	2 credits
MUS 511	Research Methods (Music)	3
MUS 576	Analytical Techniques: Jazz	3
MUP 590	Applied Music	12
MUS 526	Instrumental Jazz Arranging	3
MUS 540	Jazz Literature	3
MUS 567	History of Jazz	2
	(Plus one history from offered list)	2
MUS 581	Pedagogy: Jazz	3
	Complete 3 credits from the following:	3
MUS 594	Chamber Music: Jazz Combo	
MUS 598	Major Ensemble: Jazz Lab Band	
	Elective credits selected with advisor:	<u>9</u>
	Total	45

The proposed program can be initiated with existing faculty. This can be done without increasing individual faculty load by (1) offering courses in alternating years and (2) use

of Graduate Teaching Assistants in the more basic undergraduate courses. For example, having a Graduate Assistant teach a section of Jazz Lab Band II (198) for a year would free up load time for Professor Gray to teach MUS 567 History of Jazz one year and MUS 526 Instrumental Jazz Arranging the next. Having a Graduate Assistant teach Beginning Undergraduate Improvisation would free up Professor Grant to teach MUS 520 Analytical Techniques: Jazz one year and MUS 581 Pedagogy: Jazz the next. The BM with Jazz Studies Emphasis currently operates with current faculty and two Graduate Teaching Assistants.

The Department currently has a Master of Music in Performance in place. Library and department resources relevant to the proposed program are already in place and adequate. Resources currently in place for the BM with Jazz Studies emphasis are adequate for the proposed program as well. No other facilities are required in support of this proposed program.

There is no budgetary impact beyond funding of existing programs. All the necessary core resources necessary for a graduate music degree are already included in the Department budget. Any new courses can be allocated in the teaching assignments of current faculty. It will not be necessary to shift any assignments or resources. Support of this program should have no adverse impact on any other institutional programs.

There is a need for this program. The University has attracted an exceptional faculty with expertise in Jazz to the Department. The number of qualified students attracted to Jazz Studies has increased significantly over the past five years due to this. The Jazz Studies area is clearly visible in the community, and students have chosen this Department over other metropolitan and even regional schools for their training. Requests for information regarding graduate degrees in Jazz Studies come regularly, both from current undergraduates and from students outside the University. Just as the presence of advanced classically trained musicians enhances the BM in Classical Performance, the quality of the undergraduate Jazz program would clearly be enhanced with the presence of graduate level Jazz students.

The proposed program offers an option to students not able to leave the area to study at another institution. Currently some students will opt for the MAT/MST or MM in Classical Performance and take as many Jazz related classes as they can in order to stay in the area and still pursue a degree. This is a compromise at best for them, as a Jazz Studies degree would provide far more specific training. The Portland area is home to a large group of Jazz musicians, usually older, who given the opportunity to pursue graduate degrees at PSU would do so. This program would also attract considerable attention from outside the area and the state. Portland has a national reputation as a "Jazz friendly" city, and the Department regularly receives inquiries from outside the state about graduate opportunities in Jazz studies. The Bachelor of Music With Jazz Studies Emphasis began five years ago with about five students and now there are close to fifty jazz studies majors, making it the fastest growing area in the Department. There is no reason to believe that a graduate program in Jazz studies would not experience similar growth.

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS
EPFA, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Forwarded by Graduate Council
December 5, 2005

EPFA 582 Teaching, Learning and Curriculum I, 2 cr – new course

This course examines the role of effective school leadership for best practices in teaching, learning and curriculum which promote the success of all students. Students will examine those factors which make supervision and evaluation really work, i.e., contribute to the larger purpose of building an environment where teachers can deliver their best and children can learn the most. Prerequisite: Admission to Initial Administrator Licensure Program. Must be taken concurrently with EPFA 570.

EPFA 583 Teaching, Learning and Curriculum II, 2 cr – new course

This course examines the complex relationships between staff evaluation, individual professional development, staff development, and effective teaching, learning, and curriculum. Students will formulate a working knowledge of the change process, staffing, program, and faculty needs within an educational setting through problem based learning. Prerequisites: Admission to Initial Administrator Licensure Program and completion of EPFA 570 and EPFA 582: Teaching, Learning and Curriculum I. Must be taken concurrently with EPFA 572.

EPFA 573 Educational Leadership Project I, 1 cr – new course

This course will focus on the development, in a school or agency setting, of an Educational Leadership Project demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the TSPC Initial Administrator License Standards. The course represents the first quarter of a three quarter project designed in conjunction with a practicum supervisor to address a leadership challenge area in teaching and learning for student success within an assigned practicum setting. Students will define the challenge area, research the problem context and related literature, and develop and action plan. Prerequisite: Acceptance into the Initial Administrator Licensure Program.

EPFA 574 Education Leadership Project II, 1 cr – new course

This course will focus on the implementation, in a school or agency setting, of an Educational Leadership Project demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the TSPC Initial Administrator License Standards. The course represents the second quarter of a three quarter project designed in conjunction with a practicum supervisor to address a leadership challenge area in teaching and learning for student success within an assigned practicum setting. Students will implement their action plan by collecting, organizing, and analyzing data. Prerequisite: Acceptance into the Initial Administrator Licensure Program and completion of EPFA 573: Educational Leadership Project I.

EPFA 575 Educational Leadership Project III, 1 cr – new course

This course will focus on final analysis of an Educational Leadership Project demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the TSPC Initial Administrator License Standards. The course represents the third quarter of a three quarter project designed in conjunction with a practicum supervisor to address a leadership challenge area in teaching and learning for student success within an assigned practicum setting. Students will analyze the outcome of their year-long project, suggest implications for further research, and reflect on the entire project. Prerequisite: Acceptance into the Initial Administrator Licensure Program and completion of EPFA 573: Educational Leadership Project I and EPFA 574: Educational Leadership Project II.

EPFA 516/616 Collaborative Ethnographic Research Methods, 4 cr – new course

The course explores if and how a participatory and collaborative form of research will foster knowledge democracy, and give ownership to those whose knowledge is it. Methodologies covered are: different genres of qualitative methods, community-based planning and research, participatory action-research, Gaian participatory science, classical ethnography, auto-ethnography, ethnographic performance, life histories, feminist methodologies, and “dialogue circles.”

EPFA 517/617 Ecological and Cultural Foundations of Learning, 4 cr – new course

This course explores how we teach and learn ecologically and what constitutes ecological and cultural ways of knowing. As one of the key foundational courses for LECL specialization, this course is beyond simply justifying or advocating that our education should be grounded in ecological principals. Rather the course offers an opportunity to engage in critical and comparative analyses of what has been already accomplished and the new areas of innovations in environmental education, mature education, outdoors education, naturalist training and other such genres.

EFPA 519 Sustainability Education, 4 cr – new course

In order to build a robust theory and practice of sustainability education, this course covers local, national and global innovation in light of the UN decade for Education for Sustainability (2005-15). We also critically assesses earlier traditions such as nature education, environmental education, outdoor education, place-based education, and ecological literacy. Students are involved in developing curriculum and teacher preparation modules for K-12.

Mus 540

Jazz Literature (3)

Study and analysis of the classic Jazz compositions and recordings. Prerequisite: Mus 355. [NEW]

Mus 567

Jazz History (2)

Advanced studies in Jazz History. Course involves individual research projects culminating in student class presentations. Historical research projects will be coordinated through PSU's Leroy Vinegar Jazz Institute. Prerequisite: Mus 355. [NEW]

New Program Proposal

College of Arts and Sciences

Forwarded by Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

January 9, 2006

Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies

Environmental Programs, the Department of Geography and the Center for Science Education have collaborated to propose a new degree that will be called "Environmental Studies". Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has approved the "Full Proposal for New Academic Programs". After Senate approval this proposal will be submitted to OUS for approval.

This degree will be similar to the current Environmental Science degree but with a heavier emphasis on courses in policy and management and fewer lower-division prerequisite courses from the natural sciences. The justification for this new degree is based on the demand for a rigorous, four-year program in environmental analysis and policy that is available to transfer students or those students who choose environmental field after their freshman year.

Summary of requirements:

- 25 credits in natural sciences in the subjects of ecology, chemistry, environmental systems, and physical geography
- 24 credits in social sciences and humanities in the subjects of resource management, economics, environmental policy and regulations, and others
- 20 credits from a list of "skills" that includes quantitative analysis, visualization of spatial data, field methods, and others
- 16 credits in identified topical areas that include environmental systems, urban issues, resource management, nature/society interactions, and environmental education

There will be a total of 85 credits required for this major.

Core Content:

Sciences

Ecology – 8 credits in one of the following sequences.....	8
Bi 101, 102, 103: General Biology (with labs) or Bi 251, 252, 253: Principles of Biology or Sci 341, 342: Biology Concepts and Applications or ESR 355, 356: Understanding Environmental Sustainability or equivalent	
Chemistry – 4 credits	4
Chem 160: Physical Chemistry or Chem 170: Fundamentals of Environmental Chemistry or Sci 335: Water in the Environment or equivalent	
Environment Science	8
ESR 220: Introduction to Environmental Systems and ESR 221: Applied Environmental Studies: Problem Solving	
Physical Geography	4
Geog 210: Physical Geography	
Senior Seminar	
ESR 407: Environmental Seminar.....	<u>1</u>
	25

Social Sciences/Humanities

Human Geography/Management	8
Geog 230: Environment and Society: Global Perspectives and Geog 345: Resource Management	
Environmental Economics.....	4
Ec 332: Economics of Environmental Issues or equivalent	
Environmental Policy/Regulations	4
ESR 222: Applied Environmental Studies: Policy Considerations	
8 credits from the following list of courses:	8

Soc 200: Introduction to Sociology, PS 319: Politics of the Environment, Phl 310: Environmental Ethics , Hst 339: The Environment and History, Geog 347: Environmental Issues and Action, or Eng 308: Literature and the Environment

24

Skills: Students must take a total of 20 credits of skill courses, including the following:

- Quantitative/Qualitative Analysis – 4 credits from this list:4
 Stat 243: Introduction to Probability and Statistics I, Sci 314: Environmental Statistics, Geog 397: Visualization of Spatial Data, Geog 497: Spatial Quantitative Analysis
- Visualizing Spatial Data 8
 Geog 380: Maps and Geographic Information and Geog 488: Geographic Information Systems I: Introduction
- Field Methods – 4 credits from this list:4
 Bi 473: Field Sampling or Geog 420: Field Methods in Physical Geography
- 4 credits from one of the following: 4
 Geog 495: Maps, Models and GIS, Wr 327: Technical Writing, Eng 449: Critical Analysis of Texts, Geog 480: Remote Sensing, Geog 485: Map Design and Production

20

Topical Areas Students must take 4 courses from one area of Topical Areas. 16

Environmental Systems

- Sci 335, 336: Water in the environment
- Sci 331, 332: Atmospheric interactions
- Sci 345, 346: Old growth forest ecology/management
- ESR 420: Ecological Toxiology
- ESR 424: Wetland Ecology and Regulations
- ESR 426: Ecology of Streams and Rivers
- ESR 427: Watershed Biogeochemistry
- ESR 428: Urban Ecology
- ESR 429: Environmental Impact Assessment
- ESR 445: Old-growth Forest Ecology
- ESR 475: Limnology and Aquatic Ecology
- ESR 479: Fate and Transport of Toxics in the Environment
- Geog 311: Climatology
- Geog 313: Biogeography
- Geog 322: Alpine Environments

Urban Issues

- Geog 332: Urban Geography
- Geog 432: Urban Landscapes
- Geog 442: Sustainable Cities
- Geog 447: Urban Streams
- Geog 448: The Urban Forest
- ESR 428: Urban Ecology
- USP 313: Urban Planning: Environmental Issues
- USP 431: Urban Economics
- USP 456: Urban Transportation

Resource Management

- Sci 321, 322: Energy and society
- Geog 445: Resource Management Topics
- Geog 446: Water Resource Management
- ESR 433: Natural Resource Economics
- ESR 434: Business Environmental Management Economics
- ESR 443: Global Environmental Economics
- USP 431: Urban Economics

Nature/Society Interactions

- Geog 348: Cultural Ecology
- Geog 346: World Population & Food Supply
- Geog 349: Mountain Geography
- Geog 430: Cultural Geography
- Geog 462: Sense of Place
- USP 419: Population and Society
- Soc 320: Globalization
- Soc 341: Population Trends and Policy
- Soc 465: Environmental Sociology
- Sci 352: Science and Policy of Climate Change
- Sci 363: Ethics in Science
- Anth 414: Culture and Ecology
- Ec 432: Environmental Economics
- Ec 433: Natural Resource Economics
- Ec 444: Economics of Green Power
- Hst 440, 441: American Environmental History
- PS 319: Politics of the Environment

Environmental Education

- Geog 462: Sense of Place
- ESR 470: Environmental Education

ESR 406: Special Projects (in Environmental Education)
Ed 420: Introduction to Education and Society
Sci 311, 312: Teaching Everyday Science

Total for Major:

.....
..... 85

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) will not be accepted toward fulfilling major requirements. Additional courses may be required as prerequisites. All courses used to satisfy the Environmental Studies major requirements, whether taken in the program or in other departments, must be graded C- or above.

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

Forwarded by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

January 9, 2006

New Undergraduate Courses - Descriptions

Ch 284,5,6 General Chemistry Workshop (1,1,1)

Optional peer-led problem-solving sessions designed to promote the success of students in Ch 221,22,223 general chemistry sequence.

Ch 384,5,6 Organic Chemistry Workshop (1,1,1)

Optional peer-led problem-solving sessions designed to promote the success of students in Ch 321,32,323 organic chemistry sequence.

ENG 301 Topics: Shakespeare (4)

A study of Shakespeare's works focusing on topics such as genre (tragedy, comedy, etc.), period (Elizabethan/Jacobean) or cultural contest. Some familiarity with Shakespeare and/or the Renaissance is expected.

Swah 101, 102, 103 First Year Swahili

An introduction to elementary Swahili. Emphasis on listening comprehension, oral practice, the elements of grammar, vocabulary building, and elementary readings.

Swah 201, 202, 203 Second Year Swahili

Intensive review of basic materials introduced in first year program and further development of communication skills.

MuEd 334

Vocal Techniques K-12 (1)

Study of vocal techniques for students in the teacher education program. Special emphasis will be given to teaching voice to groups of young and/or inexperienced students from childhood through high school. [NEW]

MuEd 336

Flute and Double Reeds (1)

Study of how to teach and play flute and double reeds (bassoon and oboe) for students enrolled in the teacher education program. [NEW]

MuEd 337

Clarinet and Saxophone (1)

Study of how to teach and play clarinet and saxophone for students enrolled in the teacher education program. [NEW]

MuEd 338

High Brass Techniques (1)

Study of how to teach and play trumpet and horn for students enrolled in the teacher education program. [NEW]

MuEd 339

Low Brass Techniques (1)

Study of how to teach and play trombone, euphonium and tuba for students enrolled in the teacher education program. [NEW]

MuEd 340

Wind Instrument Techniques (3)

For students in the Choral/General Music Education track. Techniques of brass and woodwind instruments for groups of young students with special emphasis on resources, beginning techniques, and appropriate literature. [NEW]

MuEd 341

Jazz Techniques (1)

Study of techniques used in the teaching of middle and high school instrumental jazz music. Includes rehearsal techniques, basic arranging, swing concepts, rhythm section concepts, and improvisation. Prerequisite: instructor approval. [NEW]

January 18, 2006

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Regina Lawrence
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Wayne Wakeland
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. Course descriptions will be provided by Linda Devereaux.

1) January items

New Courses

- SPAN 434/534 Major Topics: Peninsular Multiple Genres, 4 cr – new course
- SPAN 436/536 Major Topics: Latin American Multiple Genres, 4 cr – new course

Change to Existing Courses

- HST 442/552 Race, Class and Gender in the American West, 4 cr – title change, previously

2) December items – held over from previous Faculty Senate meeting

New Courses

- MUEd 420/520 and 421/521 Choral Literature and Rehearsal Techniques, 3 cr
- MUEd 422/522 and 423/523 Instrumental Literature and Rehearsal Techniques, 3 cr

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

Forwarded by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
& Graduate Council
December 5, 2006

MuEd 420/520, 421/521

Choral Literature and Rehearsal Techniques (3, 3)

Students will learn the essentials of rehearsing large choral groups from grades 6-12 and requisite materials and techniques for starting and building a choral program.

Prerequisites: Mus 322, MuEd 328, 334. [NEW]

MuEd 422/522, 423/523

Instrumental Literature and Rehearsal Techniques (3, 3)

Study of critical thinking about many aspects of music education and developing a repertoire of teaching techniques and leadership skills—for students enrolled in the teacher education program. Prerequisites: Mus 321, MuEd 328, 335. [NEW]

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

Forwarded by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
& Graduate Council
January 9, 2006

*Span 434/534

Major Topics: Peninsular Multiple Genres (4)

Study, analysis, and critique of works in multiple genres on such topics as Medieval Literature, the Celestina, Women Writers, Cine-Lit, Literature of the Franco Years, the Poetry and Drama of Garcia Lorca, and the Generation of '8. Course may be repeated for credit when topics vary. Recommended prerequisites: at least 8 credits of Span 341, 342, or 343. [NEW]

*Span 436/536

Major Topics: Latin American Multiple Genres (4)

Study, analysis, and critique of works in multiple genres on such topics as Transvestism, Feminism, Sickness and Literature, Cine-Lit, Prose and Poetry of Borges, and Pre-Columbian Literature. Course may be repeated for credit when topics vary.

Recommended prerequisites: at least 8 credits of Span 341, 342, or 343. [NEW]

January 13, 2006

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Wayne Wakeland *Wayne Wakeland*
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

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

Changes to Existing Courses

- SPHR 554 Articulatory and Phonological Disorders, 4 cr – change course title to Advanced Speech Sound Disorders: Theories & Application, change course description
- CI 550 Student Teaching I, Early Childhood, 6 cr – change to 5 credits
- CI 551 Student Teaching II, Early Childhood, 15 cr – change to 10 credits
- CI 552 Student Teaching I, Elementary, 6 cr – change to 5 credits
- CI 553 Student Teaching II, Elementary, 15 cr – change to 10 credits
- CI 554 Student Teaching I, High School, 6 cr – change to 5 credits
- CI 555 Student Teaching II, High School, 15 cr – change to 10 credits
- CI 556 Mid-Level Student Teaching I, 6 cr – change to 5 credits
- CI 557 Mid-Level Student Teaching II, 15 cr – change to 10 credits
- EPFA 521 Adult Learning, 4 cr – change title to Adult Learning and Motivation, change course description
- EPFA 522 Adult Motivation, 4 cr – change title to Teaching Diverse Adult Learners, change course description

January 17th, 2006

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate

From: Regina Lawrence, Chair—Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee submits the following program changes and new courses for approval by the Faculty Senate. Descriptions of all new courses and programs are attached.

School of Fine and Performing Arts

Changed Courses

MUED 228 Introduction to Music Education (2), change pre-fix, number, title, description
 MUED 332 String Techniques (3), change pre-fix from MUS, title
 MUED 333 Guitar Techniques (3), change pre-fix, number, title, description
 MUED 335 Percussion Techniques (3), change pre-fix, number, credit hours
 MUS 240,241,242 Composition I (2,2,2), change number, prerequisites
 MUS 311 Formal Analysis (3), change title, description & credits
 MUS 312 Orchestration (3), change title, description & credits
 MUS 313 Counterpoint (3), change description, credits
~~MUS 420 Analytical Techniques (3) new course?~~
~~MUS 421 Analysis of Contemporary Music (3), change number, title, description, credits~~

Dropped Courses

MUS 236, 237 Percussion, Woodwind, & Brass (1,1)
 MUS 333 Stringed Instruments & Vocal Techniques (1)
 MUS 314,315 Harmonic & Structural Analysis (2,2)
 MUS 318 Instrumental Arranging (2)

Program Change

Bachelor of Music in Performance

This proposal restructures the upper division Music Theory requirements for this degree. A third year sequence is established covering the content previously addressed by a group of electives. The Theory III sequence consists of MUS 311 (Formal Analysis), 312 (Orchestration), and 313 (Counterpoint). This is compatible with national standards, ensures coverage of the necessary topic areas, and allows students to plan a clear path to their degree. Loads on faculty and facilities are actually reduced slightly from the existing degree plan. Specifically: MUS 311 Formal Analysis (3), MUS 312 Orchestration (3) & MUS 313 Counterpoint (3) will replace MUS 311,312,313 (2) Counterpoint, MUS 314,315,316 (2) Harmonic & Structural Analysis and MUS 318 (2) Instrumental Arranging.

Program Change: Add Emphasis

Bachelor of Music in Composition

This new emphasis is proposed for the Bachelor of Music student. It provides class instruction in composition at the 200 level, and studio instruction in composition at the 300- and 400- levels. It is comparable to the existing Bachelor of Music in Performance, offering composition as an option to instrumental or vocal performance. The emphasis is strengthened by new courses in analysis and contemporary techniques at the 400 level.

With a few modifications to existing courses we presently offer and the proposed Theory III sequence, there is not a significant amount of change needed in our curriculum.

Composition is considered an applied area of activity, and MUP 390 and MUP 490 studio lessons in composition will be offered to students who meet the prerequisites outlined in the proposal. A minimum of 12 credits will be required at these levels. Specific course modifications are as follows:

The existing composition classes (MUS 414, 415, 416) will be renumbered as MUS 240, 241, 242. Prerequisites are MUS 113 and MUS 116. This will become Composition I.

The third term of Harmonic and Structural Analysis (MUS 316) is evolving into Analysis of Contemporary Music, MUS 421, according to the course change documents.

Finally, we propose teaching a new undergraduate course, Analytical Techniques (MUS 420), combined with the existing graduate Analytical Techniques (MUS 520).

Junior and Senior composition recitals will be required, along with applied music through the MUS 290 level on an instrument or voice, and all other general university and departmental degree requirements.

Requirements for Bachelor of Music in Composition.

In addition to meeting the general University degree requirements, music majors seeking the professional music degree (Bachelor of Music in Composition) must complete the following courses:

	Credits
MUS 111, 112, 113 Music Theory I	9
MUS 114, 115, 116 Sight Singing/Ear Training	3
MUS 191, 192, 193 Class Piano	6
MUS 46 Piano Proficiency Exam	no credit
MUS 203 Music in the Western World	4
MUS 211, 212, 213 Music Theory II	9
MUS 214, 215, 216 Sight Singing/Ear Training and Keyboard Harmony	3
<i>MUS 240, 241, 242 Music Composition I</i>	6
MUS 304, 305, 306 Music History	12
<i>MUS 311 Formal Analysis</i>	3
<i>MUS 312 Orchestration</i>	3
<i>MUS 313 Counterpoint</i>	3
MUS 320 Fundamentals of Conducting	2
Four credits selected from the following:	4

Mus 355 Jazz History	
Mus 374, 375 World Music	
Mus 376 American Music Traditions	
<i>MUS 420 Analytical Techniques</i>	3
<i>MUS 421 Analysis of Contemporary Music</i>	3
MUP 190, 290 Applied Music (Instrumental or Vocal)	12
<i>MUP 390, 490 Applied Music (Composition)</i>	12
MUS 195, 196, 197, or 198: (Large Ensemble) Band, Orchestra, Choir, or Jazz Lab Band	6
<i>MUS 395, 396, 397, or 398 (Large or Small Ensemble)</i>	3
MUS 474, 475 MIDI Applications	4
MUS 48 Junior Composition Recital	no credit
<i>MUS 49 Senior Composition Recital</i>	<i>no credit</i>
MUS 188 Performance Attendance	no credit
Elective music courses to be taken from the following areas: Music History, Music Literature, Music Technology, Music Theory, World Music, Applied Music, Pedagogy, Practicum, Conducting, Ensemble Performance, Instrumental Techniques	<u>13</u>
 Total:	 123

**Faculty Development Committee
Report to Faculty Senate Steering Committee
January 2006**

Members:

Sara Davis, Chair
Alex Ruzicka
Shawn Smallman
Linda Absher
Don Frank
Steve Harmon
Grace Dillon
Erna Gelles

Sue Danielson
Gregory Davis
Leopoldo Rodriguez
Dan Hammerstrom
Charles Colbert
Juliette Stoering
Julie Rosenzweig
Janet Hamilton

Faculty Enhancement Awards

The "Call for Proposals" has been available on the Office of Research and Sponsored Project website (<http://www.gsr.pdx.edu/internal/enhancement/>) since November 15, 2005. A hard copy of the Call for Proposals was also sent out to all University department chairs. There are \$240,000 available for the faculty enhancement grant. The deadline for applications is January 23, 2006 at 5pm. Applicants may apply for awards up to \$10,000, including graduate assistant tuition remissions. Proposal reviews will begin in February.

Professional Travel Grants

The "Call for Proposals" may also be found on the ORSP website (<http://www.gsr.pdx.edu/internal/travel/>). The faculty travel grant fund is now \$75,000 a year. \$29,293 was disbursed over the summer. The Travel Grant Subcommittee met on October 27th to review applications for fall term travel. The committee received 43 applications for the fall with requested funds totaling \$37,826 and granted 37 awards totaling \$17,472. The deadline to submit applications for winter term travel funds was Wednesday, January 11. The subcommittee will be meeting to review these applications on Thursday, January 19.

Deadlines

Here are the deadlines for the remainder of the year:

<u>Term</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Travel Period</u>
Spring/Summer 2006	April 7, 2006	April 1-September 30

Changes to Procedure

On November 21st the committee met to discuss some changes for *next* year. We discussed having the amount *requested* for travel or proposals on the application web page so that people will better understand the competitive nature of the process. We also discussed putting the "Proposal is appropriate to the goals of the grant" at the top of the faculty enhancement application cover page. Our reasoning was that if the proposal is not appropriate that's a no-go right away.

Discussion Points from the University Studies Review Committee January 2006

Cynthia Brown (chair), Ken Ames, MaryAnn Barham, Michael Cummings, Jeff Gerwing, Sukhwant Jhaj, Leslie McBride, Robert Mercer, Kathleen Merrow, Hildy Miller, Ken Peterson, Kristi Yuthas

The University Studies Review Committee was charged by the Faculty Senate in Spring of 2005 as follows:

The Faculty Senate requests that the President, in consultation with the Senate Steering Committee, appoint an ad hoc committee to review the 10-year-old University Studies program. We request that this committee seek campus-wide input in considering both the curricular design and the administrative structure of the program. We further request that the committee convene by April 22, 2005, make a preliminary report to the Senate by the first Senate meeting of the 2005-06 academic year, and make a final report to the Senate by April 2006. We request that the final report shall include specific recommendations regarding the desirability of modifying, streamlining, or adding options to the existing University Studies model. (March 7, 2005)

The Committee recognizes that University Studies has become a signature program for Portland State University, attracting favorable national attention and high rankings from prestigious independent agencies. Our goal is to find ways to address existing problems in the program, improving the quality for students and responding to faculty and administrative needs, while staying within the existing budget. We hope to

- Enhance student learning and retention while preserving the core competencies of Portland State
- Better integrate UNST with the rest of the University
- Improve the longitudinal cohesion of the program
- Propose an administrative structure that supports the other goals

Our committee has met weekly since the beginning of Summer 2005. We have

- Studied the relevant literature concerning general education.
- Heard from numerous individuals, both supporters of the program and skeptics.
- Held focus groups and a town meeting.
- Posted the documents we've collected and other information on our website, <http://unstreview.groups.pdx.edu/>

This document contains some ideas we are considering as we think about ways to achieve our goals. They have been discussed extensively in our committee, but are not yet at the level of recommendations. We hope to refine our ideas through interaction with the University community.

Our plan for gathering feedback on our ideas includes

- Town meeting January 25
- Town meeting February 7
- Debriefing town meeting on April 20
- An email alias for comment from the University community:
unstreview@cs.pdx.edu
- Conversations with people who want to discuss the ideas with us

We request and encourage participation by the University community in these activities.

We divide this report into two major sections. The first discusses academic issues; the second addresses the administrative structure of the program. The committee is working on a financial analysis of the program and the budgetary implications of implementation of our ideas; that will be included in a future version of this document. We will consider timing issues as formal recommendations are developed. We anticipate that some changes can be made right away, while others will require a lengthier implementation process.

I. Academic aspect

Our document is organized according to the level of students being served by the relevant aspect of the program. We then discuss transfer student issues, assessment, longitudinal coherence, and overall goals. A general problem is the lack of connection between the general education program and the BS/BA requirements; we address that in our discussion of the middle part of the curriculum.

A. Freshman Inquiry

Freshman Inquiry (FRINQ) is widely recognized as successfully achieving many of its goals. The teaching of critical thinking, and the provision of a community to help integrate young students into the university, are particular highlights. Major problems we identified include:

- The 5-credit design, which causes many problems for the classroom scheduling process, for those students who are limited to taking eight credits, and for participation of departmental faculty (by which we mean faculty residing in departments other than UNST)
- A perception that writing is not well taught in the current format, and that it is best taught by specialists
- Constant churning of FRINQ themes, which is expensive and time-consuming for faculty, and frustrating for students
- Lack of participation in the program by departmental faculty
- The high school FRINQ program, which, while serving the participating students well, is very expensive. A conservative estimate would be in the neighborhood of \$250,000 per year.

Some ideas for addressing these problems follow. Some will require considerable care in implementation to avoid creating new problems. We hope they are being given early enough that some can be implemented for 2006-07, though we recognize that others will have to wait for the following academic year.

- We envision a rotational model where mostly senior departmental faculty will teach in the program for one or two terms each year for several years; full-time UNST faculty members will provide the necessary stability, continuity, and oversight. To encourage participation, tenure-track faculty lines and graduate student support should go to departments who contribute to the program.
- FRINQ should be changed to four credits, and the scheduling of the class should be adjusted accordingly. We note that the mentor sections are valuable to the students, and should be retained. There is no necessary relationship between the number of hours of credit awarded to a class and the number of hours it meets, which can be more (*vide* Physics labs). One model would be a class that meets in a four-hour time slot, with part of the time devoted to mentor activities, plus a separately scheduled 1-hour mentor session. (We address the issues of equity for FRINQ faculty under this change in the administrative section.)
- Writing 121 or an equivalent should be reinstated as a part of the BS/BA requirements. It could be offered as a three-credit class (absorbing the 3 credits saved per year by moving FRINQ to 4 credits) or as three one-credit writing intensive classes. For majors with heavy requirements, the writing could be incorporated into classes for majors.
- Pilot FRINQs designed to last indefinitely, with faculty rotating in and out. They can be targeted to appeal to the academic interests of students and to tap into major themes of interest to both faculty and students. There should be room for individual faculty who rotate in to bring their own interests to bear. We suggest funding 2-3 alternative FRINQs based around this model for Fall 2006, from the current FRINQ budget. After changing the FRINQ sections to four credits, removing the teaching of writing, and instituting long-lived themes, it should become much more feasible for departmental faculty to participate in the program.
- The high school FRINQ program should be dropped. Some of the benefits of the high school outreach could be achieved in alternate ways, for example by having more capstones interact with the schools.
- The FRINQ mentors could be a combination of graduate students and upper division undergraduates. Funding for this will come from dropping the mentor aspect of Sophomore Inquiry, and using those funds to support at least the equivalent number of graduate students as FRINQ mentors. (See the next section.)

B. The middle part of the curriculum

Problems we identified at this level were more serious than those for the FRINQ. The primary difficulty is a marked lack of cohesiveness in the SINQ/cluster experience. Despite the ostensible structure of this part of the curriculum, we found that there are a few clusters serving the large majority of students. We seek to

- Better integrate the middle of the curriculum with the disciplines
- Encourage more tenure-line faculty involvement
- Make the middle of the curriculum more cohesive
- Integrate the middle of the curriculum with BA/BS requirements
- Address transfer issues

Our ideas for this part of the program include, for the SINC level:

- Redesign SINCQs or create new ones so that there are three types of SINCQs, all interdisciplinary introductions dealing with the broader methodological divisions of academic work (i.e. social science, arts & letters/ humanities, sciences/ engineering). An alternative model would be to have just three interdisciplinary SINCQs.
- Require that students take a SINCQ connected to the minor (see below) they will be completing.
- Expect that the humanities, sciences/ engineering, and social sciences departments work together to create a template for these interdisciplinary SINCQs that exposes students to broad methodological perspectives; SINCQs would then be created by academic departments using these criteria
- Allow SINCQs to be used to complete a portion of the BS/BA requirements
- Drop the mentor sections associated with the SINCQs.

Building on this new vision of Sophomore Inquiry, the rest of the program would then be structured as follows.

- Eliminate the clusters in their current configuration.
- To ensure that students are exposed in depth to an area outside their major, require a minor, either an interdisciplinary one (e.g. Women's Studies) or a disciplinary one (e.g. Geology). Expect that minors be a minimum of 24 credits
- Encourage the development of more minors, especially interdisciplinary ones which could be created with the best of the existing clusters as a basis (e.g., Family Studies)
- Require all students (including transfers) complete the lower division prerequisites for a minor (e.g. the appropriate SINCQ or courses in the minor field, or both).
- A minor could be selected with the intent of completing some part of the BS/BA requirements
- Majors with a large number of requirements could potentially have a different option from other majors (such as fewer SINCQ's)
- Implement the proposed Upper Division writing requirement in some form. The committee suggests instituting at least one upper division required writing course for all students. Departments would choose what sort of course they would like their majors to take from among the following options: 1) WR 323 Writing as Critical Inquiry – an advanced general academic writing course taught in the English department by English faculty; 2) WR 300 Writing in the Disciplines – an upper division advanced writing course in which students investigate the writing

conventions of their own major, taught in the English department by English faculty; 3) A 300-level writing course developed for a single department but taught in the English department by English faculty; 4) A 300-level writing course developed by and taught in the students' major or minor department by its faculty; 5) A writing intensive course (WIC) as currently defined. WIC classes are taught in the students' major department by its faculty, generally with an assigned graduate assistant from the English department.

C. Capstone

The capstone program appears to be working reasonably well, and has also garnered national attention for its community-based learning aspect. We identified some challenges as detailed below, along with some ideas for changes.

- Capstones are taught overwhelmingly by adjuncts. The approximate composition of the capstone faculty is 5% tenure track, 10% fixed term, and 85% adjunct. Adjunct faculty may teach up to 5 Capstones per year (1 per quarter, 2 per summer session); 17-20 instructors teach this load. Retaining experienced instructors, most of whom are adjuncts, is difficult. Time constraints on adjunct faculty make ongoing faculty and program development extremely difficult. We suggest that, as budgets allow, more fixed term or tenure track faculty be involved in the program. The university should gradually increase the number of capstone instructors who are on full-time, fixed-term contracts from 5 to roughly double this number. These could be dedicated capstone faculty, other core UNST faculty, or departmental faculty teaching capstones that are related to their academic areas. These faculty members would provide program continuity from year to year and would be responsible for program development/review activities. They would teach approximately 45% of the 220 capstones offered annually.
- Maintaining quality control, in terms of course content and student learning, within a large and diverse program is a challenge. Currently, a review process is conducted before capstone proposals are approved to ensure that objectives of both the UNST program and the Capstone program are met. If serious problems are detected when student evaluations of capstone courses are reviewed, these are taken up with the department chair who, in turn, reviews options with the instructor of record. The chair of the capstone committee carries a good deal of responsibility for maintaining quality control in the proposal review process, raising the issue of whether, over time, this process can remain robust. We suggest integrating capstone course proposal review with the larger UNST course review process. In addition, develop a process to provide instructors of capstones receiving lower course evaluation scores with appropriate faculty development training. This training could be the responsibility of core capstone faculty.

D. Transfer students

The Oregon University System and Oregon community colleges consider the AAOT as equivalent to the first two years of a college general education curriculum, and the OTM as equivalent to the first year of a college general education curriculum. We should require that transfer students complete a core list of courses to fulfill the equivalent of a reasonable general education component, either in the courses they transfer or those taken at Portland State. This list can be created using the AAOT or OTM course lists. Students should be advised that sophomore or junior standing does not excuse a person from completing all the requirements of their chosen major or minor.

E. Assessment

One of the admirable themes of UNST is a focus on student learning (as distinct from emphasis on subject matter content separate from a question of whether or not students actually learn it). The program is to be commended for the amount of assessment and effort put into it. In particular, the innovative development of portfolio assessment (including electronic portfolios) is a valuable accomplishment.

However, despite much internal assessment activity we found a lack of clear evaluative results and implications accessible to those outside of UNST.

1. The assessment and evaluation design of UNST should be updated to produce:
 - Amounts of assessment activity that are supportable by UNST faculty and students;
 - Evidence that the goals of UNST (student retention, community, integrated learning, active student learning, focus on value-added learning) are supported in each course, each component, and in entire program;
 - Evidence of value-added student learning;
 - Internal data review panels;
 - External expert credentialing of program goals, assessment methods and procedures, data and results, and conclusions and dissemination;
 - Comprehensive cost data; and,
 - Comparisons with interesting competitor programs and approaches to general education.

This updating can be achieved with such features as peer teacher review of course materials, expanded assessment instrument pools (e.g., student survey item pools, participant focus groups, multiple choice item pools), data and reporting compression, data review panels, external (to program AND university) credentialing of value, and a program of evaluation communication and dissemination. A more complete description of these features appears on the UNST Review Site: <http://unstreview.groups.pdx.edu/>

2. We suggest that an UNST Evaluation Board be established to:
 - Advocate for development of assessment and evaluation in the program
 - Recommend policy regarding assessment and evaluation
 - Develop assessment pools, procedures, and instruments

This board would consist of 4 UNST faculty members, 1 UNST administrator, 1 senior student, 1 non-UNST PSU faculty member, and 1 non-PSU faculty member. It would report to the general UNST council described later.

F. Longitudinal coherence and overall goals

One serious problem with the current program is the lack of a coherent progression in the mastery of the University Studies goals once students leave FRINQ. Certainly, a discussion of the goals can be continued into the SINQ's and related to the various fields of study. Attention should be given to continuing this process in the minors and capstones as well; we suggest this aspect be part of the approval process. We have discussed the writing goal above.

This report has not addressed the goal of adding a required international perspective or experience to the curriculum. We think this goal is worthy and that further thought is needed to decide where the best place to deal with it might be.

II. Administrative structure

A. Internal structure of University Studies

The current structure is flawed and does not serve the faculty, the program, or the University well. We propose an administrative structure similar to other units in the University.

- The program should be represented effectively at the Dean level at CADS by a Dean of General Education.. The responsibilities of the Dean would include oversight of UNST faculty and programs, strategic planning, intellectual leadership of the program, personnel management, and budget management. There might also be some responsibility for interdisciplinary programs. Eliminate the position of Director of University Studies.
- There should be a permanent university-wide council, similar to the graduate council, that oversees the curriculum and assessment of the program. This oversight would include approval of new FRINQs or substantial changes to existing ones, approval of SINQs and their templates, approval of capstones, and any other curricular matters. This might be the right body to oversee the interdisciplinary minors, as well. This body would also monitor the goals of the program and the results of the assessments, and consider changes or additions. This council replaces all other committees currently overseeing UNST.
- There should be a full-time FRINQ coordinator and a full-time Mid-Curriculum coordinator. (Potentially these could be the same person in the future.) They should be three-year rotating appointments, chosen by a provost-directed search from the general University faculty. More attention needs to be given to the mentor coordinator position; suggestions will be forthcoming in a future revision of this document. These positions report to the Dean.

- There should be a full-time capstone coordinator. Because of the community contacts needed to do this job well, this should not be a rotating position.
- The full-time UNST faculty should have an elected coordinator who represents them to administration the way a department chair would. (This is not a covert recommendation that UNST should have departmental status.) The group should have governance policies similar to a department, for example in terms of promotion and tenure issues.

B. Workload and quality of life issues for University Studies Faculty

The committee is impressed with the dedication of the University Studies faculty, and their pride in their accomplishments. We believe the following ideas would benefit them. In particular, we believe that teaching FRINQ and only FRINQ is not good for faculty, and that steps should be taken to provide a variety of teaching opportunities to the core UNST faculty.

- Core UNST faculty should teach across the program, in FRINQ, SINQ, capstones, and departmental classes.
- Current FRINQ faculty fear that reducing the credit load of FRINQ to 4 credits will lead to their having to teach 3 FRINQs per year. We agree that this is an unreasonable burden. Some extra credit should be given for the effort of organizing a FRINQ, which under our plan will be the responsibility of the core UNST faculty. FRINQ faculty should also have a regular opportunity for capstone teaching and/or teaching departmentally based classes.
- Each full-time UNST faculty member should have an affiliated department in whose life they are involved and in which they periodically teach.
- The administration should encourage the development of dedicated fixed-term UNST faculty with multiyear contracts. Where possible, the core UNST faculty should be included in tenure-line opportunities.
- In general, an effort should be made to optimize the size of the core University Studies faculty in favor of additional departmental faculty, especially tenure line faculty. The core group should grow only in proportion to the size of the program, and as they are needed to coordinate the FRINQs and teach the capstones.