

4-2-2007

## Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 2007

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 April 2007" (2007). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 129.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/129>

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](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

Claudia Weston, Asst. University  
Librarian  
Millar Library  
**LIB-W**



In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Senate Agendas are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have sufficient notice of curricular proposals, and time to review and research all action items.

If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate.

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **April 2, 2007**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll

\*B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 5, 2007, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

Provost's Report

Vice Provost's Report on Conflict of Interest Policies

Vice President's Report

D. Unfinished Business

E. New Business

\*1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals – Ostlund

\*2. GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals – Ostlund and Miksch

\*3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals – Miksch

\*4. Scholastic Standards Comm. Proposal to Change Registration Deadlines – Gough

\*5. Textbooks Resolution Proposal – Burns

F. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

\*1. Report of the Graduate Council on Petitions – Ostlund

\*2. Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council – Freels

3. Annual Report of the institutional Assessment Council – Labissière

H. Adjournment

**\*The following documents are included with this mailing:**

B Minutes of the February 5, 2007 Meeting and attachments

E-1 Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

E-2 GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals

E-3 University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

E-4 Scholastic Standards Comm. Proposal to Change Registration Deadlines

E-5 Textbook Resolution Proposal

G-1 Report of the Graduate Council on Petitions

G-2 Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council

*Secretary to the Faculty*

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

**\*\*\* 2006-07 PSU FACULTY SENATE ROSTER \*\*\***

**\*\*\*\*2006-07 STEERING COMMITTEE \*\*\*\***

Presiding Office: Kathi Ketcheson  
 Presiding Officer Pro tem: Gwen Shusterman  
 Steering Committee: Martha Balshem,  
 Cheryl Livneh, Patricia Wetzel &  
 John Rueter (Comm on Comm), *Ex officio*

**\*\*\*\*2006-07 FACULTY SENATE\*\*\*\***

**All Others (16)**

†Cardenas, Jennifer	ADM	2007
Hagge, Tim	CAPS	2007
Ingersoll, R	IASC	2007
Shattuck, Aimee	WRC	2007
Stoering, Juliette	OIRP	2007
Angell, Nate	OMC	2008
Baccar, Cindy	ADM	2008
Ketcheson, Kathi	OIRP	2008
*Santen, David (Gregory)	OMT	2008
Squire, Patricia	ALUM	2008
Thompson, Dee	CARC	2008
Barham, Mary Ann	IASC	2009
*Collins, Mary (Yackley)	SHAC	2009
Jagodnik, Joan	IASC	2009
Luther, Christina	INTL	2009
Ryder, Bill	ADM	2009

**Business Administration (6)**

Johnson, Raymond	SBA	2007
Mathwick, Charla	SBA	2007
Buddress, Leland	SBA	2007
Ramiller, Neil	SBA	2008
Yuthas, Kristi	SBA	2008
Brown, Darrell	SBA	2009

**Education (6)**

* Lenski, Susan (Halverson)	ED	2007
Stevens, Dannelle	ED	2007
Caskey, Micki	ED	2008
* Kim, Dae Y. (Isaacson)	EPFA	2008
Cress, Christine	ED	2009
Thao, Yer	ED	2009

**Engineering and Computer Science (10)**

Bertini, Robert	CE	2007
Lall, B Kent	CE	2007
†Shapiro, Leonard	CMPS	2007
Black, Andrew	CMPS	2008
Feng, Wu-chi	CMPS	2008
Maier, David	CMPS	2008
Recktenwald, Gerald	ME	2008
Brown, Cynthia	CS	2009
Chrzanowska-Jeske, M.	ECE	2009
Devletian, Jack	ECS	2009

**Extended Studies (3)**

†Sedivy, Glen	XS-ESP	2007
Livneh, Cheryl	CEED	2008
Fritzsche, Vincent	XS PDC	2009

**Fine and Performing Arts (5)**

†Fosque, Walton	ART	2007
Tate, William	TA	2007
Knights, Clive	ARCH	2008
*LePore, William (Fletcher)	ART	2008
Wattenberg, Richard	TA	2009

**Library (3)**

†Larsen, Thomas	LIB	2007
Brenner, Michaela	LIB	2008
Paynter, Robin	LIB	2009

**Liberal Arts and Sciences (40)**

Bulman, Teresa	GEOG	2007
Carter, Duncan	ENG	2007
Collier, Peter	SOC	2007
*Sanchez, Eric (Crawshaw)	PHY	2007
*Elzanowski, Marek (L. Mercer)	MTH	2007
Fischer, William	FLL	2007
†Kominz, Laurence	FLL	2007
*Mandaville, Jon (Biolsi)	HST	2007
†Morgaine, Carol	OCCD	2007
†Rueter, John	ESR	2007
*Schechter, Patricia (Ames)	HST	2007
Shusterman, Gwen	CHEM	2007
Wadley, Stephen	FLL	2007
Wamser, Carl	CHEM	2007
Agorsah, Kofi	BST	2008
Balshem, Martha	CAE	2008
Brown, Kimberly	LING	2008
Burns, Scott	GEOL	2008
Jacob, Greg	ENG	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
Arante, Jacqueline	ENG	2009
Blazak, Randy	SOC	2009
Bodegom, Eric	PHY	2009
Dillon, Tracy	ENG	2009
Farr, Grant	SOC	2009
Garrison, Tim	HST	2009
Jiao, Jun	PHY	2009
Hickey, Martha	FLL	2009
Liebman, Robert	SOC	2009
*Perlmutter, Jennifer (Miller-Jones)		2009
†Reese, Susan	ENG	2009
Stovall, Dennis	ENG	2009
Zelick, Randy	BIO	2009

**Other Instructional (4)**

† MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2007
Flower, Michael	HON	2008
Labissière, Yves	UNST	2008
Fallon, Ann	UNST	2009

**Social Work (7)**

Hunter, Richard	SSW	2007
† Jivanjee, Pauline	SSW	2007
Cotrell, Victoria	SSW	2008
Powers, Laurie	SSW	2008
Talbot, Maria	SSW	2009
Wahab, Stephanie	SSW	2009

**Urban and Public Affairs (8)**

McBride, Leslie	PHE	2007
Sharkova, Irina	PRC	2007
Clucas, Richard	PS	2008
Farquhar, Stephanie	SCH	2008
*Wollner, Craig (Rose)	IMS	2008
† Brodowicz, Gary	PHE	2009
Messer, Barry	USP	2009
Sussman, Gerry	USP	2009

\*Interim appointments indicated with asterisk

†Member of Committee on Committees

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, March 5, 2007  
**Presiding Officer:** Kathi Ketcheson  
**Secretary:** Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

**Members Present:** Balshem, Baccar, Barham, Bodegom, Brenner, Brodowicz, C. Brown, Bulman Burns, Cardenas, Caskey, Cherzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Collier, Collins, Cotrell, Cress, Devletian, Elzanowski, Fallon, Farquhar, Feng, Fischer, Flower, Fosque, Fritzsche, Gregory, Hagge, Hickey, Jagodnik, Jivanjee, R. Johnson, Kapoor, Ketcheson, Kim, Kominz, Labissiere, Lall, Larson, LePore, Liebman, Livneh, Luther, MacCormack, Maier, Mandaville, Medovoi, Messer, Paynter, Perlmutter, Reese, Ryder, Sanchez, Santen, Schechter, Shapiro, Sharkova, Shusterman, Squire, Stevens, Stoering, Stovall, Sussman, Talbot, Tate, Thao, Wadley, Wahab, Wamser, Wattenberg, Weasel, Wetzell, Wollner, Works, Zelick.

**Alternates Present:** Rad for Bertini, Hook for Black, Luckett for Garrison, Rhodes for Hunter, Gough for Ingersoll, Michael for Morgaine, McBride, Paradis for Thompson.

**Members Absent:** Agorsah, Angell, Arante, Carter, Blazak, D. Brown, K. Brown, Buddress, T. Dillon, Farr, Jiao, Knights, Lenski, Mathwick, Powers, Ramiller, Rectenwald, Reder, Rueter, Sedivy, Shattuck, Watanabe, Yuthas.

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews-Collier, Bernstine, Diman, Feyerherm, Fortmiller, Fung, Gregory, Koch, LaTourette, Mack, McVeety, Murdock, Nelson, Sestak, Smallman.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2007, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 15:08. The minutes were approved as published.

### **C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

#### **Changes to Agenda**

There is NO G-3 in the packets. It was not mailed.

#### **Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since February 5, 2007**

Eff. 2.20.07, Chris Borgmeier, SPED, has been appointed to the ED vacancy on the Graduate Council. Eff. 2.20.07, Helen Young, SPED, has been appointed to the ED vacancy on the Faculty Development Committee.

M. Pullman, SBA, has resigned from the UNST Council.

### **Other**

The Presiding Officer welcomed Debbie Murdock back to the Senate. Applause.

Senators were reminded of meeting protocols, which include, only members may participate, members must raise a hand to be recognized, members must state your name, and members must provide written copies of all motions to the secretary.

### **President's Report**

BERNSTINE greeted the Senate and gave a quick update on activities in Salem. April 10 is PSU day at the Capitol. Please mark your calendar and attend if you can. Your legislators need to hear from you, know who you are, and learn what kind of work you do.

### **Provost's Report**

KOCH commenced with the introduction of the new PSU football coach, Jerry Glanville. Applause.

KOCH gave a brief report on events at the Board meeting on 2 February. The Graduate Certificate in Software Engineering was approved. Additionally, the Provosts Council approved the Masters of Music in Jazz Studies and it will now have an external review. KOCH briefly reported on the working groups on PSU campus priorities, which will have a joint meeting on April 4. KOCH noted that the budget process, listed on the website at [www.pdx.edu/budget/](http://www.pdx.edu/budget/), and emphasized that the focus is on revenue enhancements as there is very little to reduce in the way of costs. KOCH noted that the Vice President would comment on the study to merge PSU with OHSU.

### **Vice President's Report**

DESROCHERS reminded that this study in being undertaken in response to the proposal by Rep. Mitch Greenlick to merge the two institutions, made approximately two years ago. She is the point person for PSU, and together with our OHSU counterpart and the Chancellor's office, they have selected a consulting group, the Learning Alliance, which is associated with the Higher Education Institute at the U. of Pennsylvania. Their work is underway, and they are about midway through the research portion of the process. The aim is to have a first look ready for the Chancellor in April, so that he could have something to transmit to this legislative session.

LUCKETT asked if this work would include an analysis of the collective bargaining agreements at each. DESROCHERS said, yes, that would have to be included as amongst other things, they are very reflective of our vastly different cultures.

#### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

#### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals**

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

WETZEL/\_\_\_\_\_ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, PA, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

##### **2. GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals**

OSTLUND and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

BURNS/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, GEOG and HST, and course changes MTH, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTON PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE ArH course changes, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-2."

##### **3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals**

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

BODEGOM/\_\_\_\_\_ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE Changes to the Cluster List, University Studies, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTON TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BULMAN/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Geographic Information Systems/Science, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTON TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BODEGOM/MANDAVILLE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a new course, Stat, and a course change, Hst, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in "E-3."

ZELICK noted the language “may include” is problematic.

BARHAM noted the language “on-line” is new here and do we want to include this as it would require on-line delivery. STEVENS noted that this begs the question of where we make the type of instruction known. SHUSTERMAN added that \_\_\_\_\_. ELZANOWSKI representing Math (Chair), withdrew the word “on line” from the course description in “E-3.”

JOHNSON reminded that the *PSU Bulletin* and the *Schedule of Classes* have two different functions in representing courses and programs.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED with the deletion of “on line” from the course description, by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/LEPORE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the BA/BS in Film Studies, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-3.”

MEDOVOI stated he appreciated the effort to put together a film studies major at PSU, but would like to express a major objection to the proposal in its current form. There is an existing disciplinary minor, originally put together out of a 2002 meeting of 30 people that was held when it was clear that there were multiple stakeholders in the university. There was a great deal of interest to allow the greatest possible participation in the field, and the end of that was the interdisciplinary minor which provides a meeting of humanities, social science and arts methods. This proposal represents the truncating of film studies, doesn't recognize the interdisciplinary path that was taken, and will result in the loss of participation of many of the full time faculty across the university. He wants to see a proposal that will continue that broad participation, and invites everybody across camps who has a stake in film studies to be a partner, and will follow in the footsteps of the existing minor.

SUSSMAN noted he coordinates the Media Studies cluster which includes 8 department including Theater Arts, and supports the comment just made that there is a lot of collaboration going on, particularly in film studies. He noted he was not aware of this development until he received the agenda. He asked how many tenure lines are dedicated to this new major. MIKSCH noted that there is a search concluding for a film studies line. SESTAK noted that there is a new dedicated faculty line in film studies in FPA as part of the strategic re-investment process, there are other tenured faculty in Theater Arts who are committed to substantial teaching in the film studies program, and the English, Communications, etc. faculty who are currently associated with the minor are incorporated in this proposal.

(Speaker not a member of the Senate; recognized in error) SANCHEZ noted he was recently hired to teach literature and film, and stated that his department likes the proposal and would like to be included. The Spanish section of FLL recently hosted a film festival.



MIKSCH noted that all of the 16 elective credits in the major could be from other departments. Perhaps the summary didn't do a good job of showing what the electives look like, but this proposal wouldn't have the same worth without them.

BULMAN asked what is the film studies curriculum and how it is defined. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that there is a list of courses jointly maintained by English, Communications, and Theater Arts, which the proposal references and which is listed in the catalog and department web pages. If a department wishes to have a course included in the minor, it can approach the coordinator in English with a proposal.

BULMAN reiterated that she wanted to know what the film studies curriculum is. TATE noted that the major proposal lists specific courses for the core of the major in film studies, and directly references the list of courses for the minor that are available as major electives. In all deference to the comments that have been made by the film people here, the assumption that this is not a multiple-disciplinary proposal is an error. An attempt has been made to allow those departments who have an interest in pursuing film studies to include those courses in this major, and there is certainly possible continued involvement in the film studies minor. This doesn't bring about the end of the minor; it seems that there's been a lacuna of what has been available at Portland State. For several years various departments have talked about putting forward a film studies major proposal, and Theater Arts has just simply gone forward and done it. This doesn't exclude other people from offering courses. If anything, it provides a focus and a certain visibility for film studies at Portland State that it doesn't presently have.

WETZEL noted that on a practical level it seems odd to have a minor in one college department and a major in another college and department. This shows all of us how hard it is to work with the existing structures of the university to do something that is interdisciplinary. If this goes through, it seems it would be possible for someone to get a BA in Film Studies and a minor in English in film studies.

STEVENS stated that it would help to know that international films are part of this major. TATE noted that international films are part of several of the courses offered. It is also part of the intent of the minor and this major proposal, that in the FLL departments, film is offered. Some examples of our past offerings are Japanese and Indian cinema. There is an acute awareness on our part of the international nature of film and that it would be an integral part of this degree.

STOVALL suggested that the Senate table the proposal for further discussion, and get the stakeholders together to determine what allocation of resources should be here, because it is obviously a good thing for us to pursue. \_\_\_\_\_ . At the graduate level in the writing program, they have underway a national film studies journal already funded that fits nicely into this picture, and they need to know how all of that as well as their current undergraduate offerings in film studies are going to fit into this. There needs to be \_\_\_\_\_ and we don't see it in this picture.

HICKEY stated \_\_\_\_\_. One might take the International Studies program as a model, so it would make it clear to students that there is that opening. On paper, it invites students to do that construction. It is a little more labor intensive, and requires some advising, but it is an open program in that way.

KOMINZ stated that he would like to see at least one course on filmmaking. \_\_\_\_\_ in this day and age, the ability to create focused short films is absolutely critical. He doesn't see one offered in the 7 core courses.

WATTENBERG stated that, regarding international scope in this program, Film History I, II, III, 12 hours of the course courseWORK, is a history of film, not American /English film, in the same way History of Art is not restricted to American/ English art, but includes the entire gamut of art. We are losing the point here, that, yes, a lot of people use film in our courses, but film is not literature, it is art, and there are students out there who would like to major in the art. Regarding filmmaking, we have a course in Acting for the Camera and we would like to develop in the direction of production and performance in the next few years. This would most appropriately be housed in the theatre program, not English or other literature programs. That is what we do. We do performance. I guess I have some problem here. I am getting the sense from this body that theatre is not an appropriate place to house a film program, because it has not approached all the other possible departments. All are welcome here. There is room here in the sense that there are elective courses and they are on a clear list, as cited in the proposal. It's not a matter of students having to construct that; that list includes those courses, if you go through the appropriate channels to have courses listed on it.

REESE stated she supported her English colleague's suggestion to table the proposal, so that the document submitted can be more truly representative of the interdisciplinary intention which doesn't come through clearly at this point, and would also like to see a more complete listing of the courses that would be included from all the various departments, for example, we see listed in these core classes, courses that also exist in the English department. If it were truly an interdisciplinary major, if it must be this class, that class could be fulfilled in either department. As far as production, we have a very strong relationship with the Northwest Film studies Center, where students for credit at PSU are able to take courses in production there, and so that exists to some degree at this point.

SESTAK reminded that the minor is across two schools, not just one. There were a variety of different meetings with English and Comm in terms of talking with them when this proposal came out and more recently. There was a concern about a variety of issues, with production as one of them as a matter of fact. This deliberately isn't a production degree. Even though we may want to get there, in part because the English department is concerned about that, we are not immediately heading there. Regarding some of these concerns about duplication, as with who teaches Shakespeare, or Structures for Architecture and Engineering, there are a whole series of different approaches. We all come at it from a very

different direction. As we looked at this, all we were trying to do is get the major started and off the ground, We have tenure lines dedicated to this to get it moving, to which things can be added and changed, but for which there is a focus. There has been an effort to do something else for several years and nothing solidified. One of the things we talked to the English department about was their writing program, which is more related to analysis and is very different from what we want to do. This program is interdisciplinary in that we are incorporating those courses that are available through the minor list. We are moving this along because there is a student demand and a student need for this type of program. This is a way to focus something and grow it. There are resources being provided from a school specifically for this, and there are other resources from other schools that can be a part of it. We would love to see this initiative grow in a variety of different directions in the future, but this is the way to get started.

(Speaker not a member of the Senate; recognized in error) \_\_\_\_\_ the point has been made that film studies can be an interdisciplinary subject, and 40 credits in one department and 16-or-less credits in all other departments is not an interdisciplinary major. I'm concerned that a major of this sort, so narrowly defined, will preclude any future major that is being developed by a liberal arts conglomeration will be possible to develop.

SUSSMAN noted that there are 6 faculty in Speech who are teaching Media Studies and \_\_\_\_\_ welcome the aspect that theatre would bring that other departments can't bring, but it is a broad field. There are stakeholders and it should be a shared project.

TATE stated he supports Wattenberg's and Sestak's remarks. This is an attempt to get something started. Film studies has been on the table and discussed and we have had a minor for a number of years. It disturbs and concerns one, that people are thinking of this so territorially, that somehow Theater is going to take on film studies and everybody else is going to have to get out of the area. That is clearly not the case. The gentleman from Speech mentioned media studies; we are talking here about film studies, specifically. We are talking about trying to get something off the ground and started, around which a lot of things can then cluster. If we continue to insist that we have to be interdisciplinary, we have to get all the players involved, it comes to this - there were a lot of people involved in the film minor discussion, which gradually came down to only a few people in three departments. If film studies is going to have a future at Portland State, it needs a department to step forward, to serve as a kind of lynchpin. I can assure all that this department is not narrow in the sense that it is going to try to exclude anyone. We are going to try to incorporate as many options as possible. To obstruct this motion at this point is inappropriate.

SUSSMAN/REESE MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

WETZEL queried if we can add to the motion that the people involved in film studies come together and come up with a clearer distinction between what the

people in Fine and Performing Arts are doing and what Liberal Arts is doing, and how the territory is being looked at overall.

HICKEY noted that as the program does need a home, it makes good sense that it be Fine and Performing Arts, and there are some things that didn't get discussed, can we put a deadline on the motion to table, and request that we report back at the next senate meeting, so that we can move the program forward.

MANDAVILLE asked if there is any reason why, if this program is approved, that the interdisciplinary program can't continue to exist. There doesn't seem to be any conflict in having two programs, although there is potential conflict here, witness what is going on in this room. By passing this, perhaps those on the books will be required to cooperate.

WAMSER noted that the proposal has a strategic problem, and he would hate to see it fail. The asterisk doesn't provide enough information about the other courses, which are the interdisciplinary ones. He urged that having a new major with a very high demand doesn't necessarily preclude other departments coming forward with new majors in media studies, analysis of film, or whatever is appropriate to that department.

REESE yielded to Michael Clark, Eng. He thanked William Tate for putting this forward because he has been a great supporter of the interdisciplinary minor and has worked closely together with Theater Arts and everyone else who has participated. One of the things that is going on is that in discussion with Sarah Andrews-Collier, was the idea that the English department, rather CLAS and the whole university, would put together an interdisciplinary major to emphasize critical studies, critical theory, media studies, a diverse array of approaches, and that this would be likely \_\_\_\_\_. That hasn't worked or perhaps I misunderstood our fall discussion about film production \_\_\_\_\_, at least as we talked about last week. There has been a change in that sense in how this has been perceived and I would like to bring that to the attention of everyone else in the room right now, because there is a parallel major proposal that is now circulating in the English department in Critical Studies in Film that includes an interdisciplinary component.

\_\_\_\_\_ asked what the future of the motion would be if the vote were affirmative. The Presiding Officer stated that the Steering Committee would solicit comment from the Curriculum Committee after conferring with departments involved, and then bring the proposal back to the Senate.

THE MOTION TO TABLE passed by 44 in favor, 20 against, 6 abstentions.

LEPORE/TATE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Dance, including new courses, Dance, Dept. of Theater Arts, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-3."

MIKSCH noted that this proposal is made possible by the transition of Prof. Judy Patton into the Department of Theater Arts. Several of the new courses in technique were already being offered.

FOSQUE asked for a clarification on the credits to be awarded for 7 Dance Laboratory courses. \_\_\_\_\_ . It doesn't seem that the numbers add up. It was noted that each individual course is (2) credits. MIKSCH yielded to Judy Patton, FPA. PATTON reminded that often students in Dance would have exceeded course objectives in one or all of these courses when entering the program.

BULLMAN stated that the pre-requisites are inconsistent, and asked for clarification on number of credits and funding. SESTAK noted that funding is available to support the program and the department is already primed for this program development, having previously begun to offer courses with adjunct faculty, upgrade their dance studios, etc. MIKSCH reminded that the list looks long partly because they are frequently two-credit courses.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LEPORE/BARHAM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE program changes in Music and Theater, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, TA 480 and ArH 459, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION TO APPROVED PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

TALBOTT/COTTRELL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Bachelor of Social Work including new courses, Graduate School of Social Work, as listed in "E-3."

BARHAM asked for a clarification on whether this is a Bachelor of Arts/Science or a Bachelor of Social Work. MIKSCH noted it is the latter. BARHAM asked for clarification if whether this would mean that students did not have to complete BA/BS requirements. NELSON stated that there was un-clarity about how credit hours work out, and presented an overhead. BARHAM stated this still didn't answer her question, and stated this is misleading regarding where University Studies requirements fit in. BULMAN reiterated Barham's confusion regarding the degree title, as it appeared differently in different parts of the proposal. NELSON stated that this is a BA/BS in Social Work.

SHUSTERMAN stated that the citation of the University Studies courses confuses, as this suggested double dipping. NELSON stated she didn't know how 90 credits got on the document, but once it did she felt compelled to show that 90 credits were not required for the major. MAIER stated he was still confused about the

total number of requirements. NELSON stated it has to do with pre-requisites. BULMAN asked if the overhead was going to be substituted for the published document, because it is also confusing. NELSON stated that if the pre-requisites and the clusters were struck, that is what they are going on. BARHAM recommended that the program not cite the general education requirements. NELSON stated o.k. HICKEY stated that in FLL, the students are required to have completed the first two years; it is not required in the major. BACCAR stated that another model in SBA, is that \_\_\_\_\_. BARHAM urged that it be made explicit that students have to apply, and agreed with Baccar's suggestion. \_\_\_\_\_. MICHAEL (Morgaine) stated that the pre-requisites could be taken care of \_\_\_\_\_. FOSQUE \_\_\_\_\_.

TALBOTT stated she is against the motion to table, as these are minor points. MANDAVILLE stated the Senate couldn't approve something it doesn't understand. NELSON stated she has a lot of community support for this and the overhead is clear; the confusion arose when we were over explaining and trying to show where University Studies fits in. C. BROWN noted that the contents are clear from the overhead, although the narrative is not, however, the latter can be fixed later.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by majority voice vote, with 3 abstentions.

CLUCAS/\_\_\_\_\_ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change, BA/BS in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION TO APPROVE the program change passed by unanimous voice vote.

## **F. QUESTION PERIOD**

None

## **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

### **1. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee**

HANSEN presented the report for the committee.

BARHAM asked for a clarification on the question regarding co-admission, specifically are there concerns about co-admission or about the broader issue of transferring students. It was clarified that the committee is looking at the transitioning of students from community colleges in all of its aspects.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

HICKEY asked if she could step back, and ask if the committee is actually going to report to the Senate regarding the effect of the plateau. HANSEN replied, no, they have no plans at this point. LIEBMAN urged that there be follow-up on this issue, as the Senate has previously discussed problems in this area, specifically for Education, the MSW and the MFA, Art. Previously, Vice Provost Driscoll made a promise to track this issue for the senate. HANSEN reminded that from where they sit, there are many forces acting on enrollment, and even if we do find some problems, there may be no solutions. KETCHESON said that her office could provide the Senate with some data on what has happened. LIEBMAN stressed that part of the concern was the enormous burden that students bore because of credit requirements for in-service training, etc. He continued, that this discussion included proposals for differential tuition, etc.

## **2. Educational Policy Committee Report on Governance**

HANSEN presented the report for the committee.

BULMAN asked for a clarification regarding item #8, with respect to the phrase “a sufficient majority.” HANSEN suggested that he strike the word, “sufficient.” He noted that there could be discrepancies between a committee roster and who attends.

SHUSTERMAN noted that #1, #4, #5, #7 are recommendations for the Senate as action items, although #1 has already been accomplished. SHARKOVA asked for a clarification about the timeline for the evaluation of centers. HANSEN stated he thinks it is included in process document.

KETCHESON requested that the committees in question discuss the recommendations of the committee, and come back to the senate with recommended proposals.

## **3. Report on OUS Proposed Optional Retirement Plan Changes**

R. JOHNSON reported for the PSU members of the OUS ad hoc committee to review proposed optional retirement plan changes, who are he and John Suttle, SBA. He noted that there have been several campus meetings in the last month. The overwhelming concern across the OUS system is loosing access to TIAA-CREF. The second issue, related to personal retirement planning, is the loss of the relationship with the investment advisors. There was significant agreement in this ad hoc committee that there be no increase in fees with the change, and that there be significant retirement planning services available, and they have recommended these to OUS. This activity is not of the magnitude that people should contemplate moving up their retirements.

## **H. ADJOURNMENT**

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 17:03.

March 8, 2007

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: DeLys Ostlund  
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of New Graduate Council Items for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate. Course descriptions will be supplied by Linda Devereaux.

### **College of Urban and Public Affairs**

#### **Change to Existing Program**

MA/MS Health Studies – redistribution of required and elective credits

#### **New Courses**

- PA 514 Global Leadership and Management, 3 credits  
Contemporary global realities require emerging public sector leaders to prepare themselves by learning adaptable leadership and management concepts and tools. This core course is designed to equip interested students, both from the U.S. and abroad, with professional skills and practical knowledge that will help them “to lead and manage responsibly” in a range of global settings.
  
- PA 537 Law & Public Policy, 3 credits  
Law and courts are critical to public policy. The policy process often starts with cases for which no formal policy exists. The seminar examines judges as policymakers and the operation the policy process when courts are involved. It considers critical issues in judicial policymaking, examines fields where courts have played important policy roles, contemplates difficulties faced by judges, and helps students develop techniques to analyze judicial policymaking.
  
- PA 542 Sustainable Development Implementation, 3 credits  
Focuses on the challenges involved in attempting to turn international commitments and policy promises into action. Using examples from around the U.S. and around the world, we examine sustainable development policy implementation and operation in an effort to see what worked, what did not, and how implementation challenges can be addressed.
  
- PA 556 Public Contract Management, 3 credits  
Explores what happens when public sector organizations form working relationships with other agencies, communities, nonprofit organizations, or for-profit firms through contracts. It seeks to understand key elements of the formation, operation, and termination (or transformation) of these relationships and to do so from the perspective of the generalist manager rather than from a narrow technical view. The purpose here is not to debate whether government at all levels should do more contracting or less but to assess what happens when



the decision is made to use contractual arrangements to perform services or provides materials.

- PA 575 Advanced Health Policy, 3 credits  
Provides students focusing on health policy analysis or advocacy the opportunity to explore specific areas of health policy in-depth. Taught as a seminar with students required to select two policy areas, develop readings and questions, and lead class discussion facilitated by the instructor. Coursework emphasizes the understanding, identification and development of successful and sustainable health policy including preparation of four brief, structured policy proposals. Prerequisite: PA 571.
- USP 544 Urban Transportation Planning, 3 credits  
Introduces fundamental concepts and methods used in multi-modal urban transportation planning, including problem identification, alternatives analysis, evaluation and decision making, plan implementation, and program management. Exposes students to processes and analytical methods from multiple disciplines, such as law, politics, engineering, sociology, economics, finance, management and marketing. Emphasis on analysis of moderately complex technical information and its interpretation for communication with decision makers. Required prerequisite: USP535 or equivalent coursework in descriptive and inferential statistics and data presentation. Recommended: USP515 or USP537 or an equivalent intermediate-level course in applied microeconomics.

### **Graduate School of Social Work**

The requested course changes in the MSW program are of two types: (a) changes in the required courses taken by students in their second year as part of their advanced concentrations, and (b) changes in elective courses. None of these changes affect the total of 78 credit hours required for the MSW degree. These changes are in accordance with the revisions in the MSW Program which were approved by the Graduate Council and Faculty Senate last year, and are made in preparation for our Self-Study which will be submitted to our accrediting body in summer, 2008. Last year, the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council approved new courses and revisions required in the first year of study.

The current submission is only related to the second year of the 2-year MSW Program.

### **New Courses**

- SW 527 Political and Legislative Advocacy, 3 credits  
Exposes students to strategies and tactics for political and legislative advocacy. Emphasis is placed on developing skills for effective political lobbying, including the mechanics of political campaigns and working with policy-makers, citizens and issue-specific communities and political interest organizations. Students will be introduced to working with professional/community organizations and coalitions, local, state and federal level policy and decision-making processes, and methods to influence legislative process and administrative rule implementation. Prerequisites: SW 520.
- SW 529/629 International Mental Health Policy, 3 credits

Compares mental health policies from a global perspective, emphasizing United Nations and World Health Organization perspectives. Programs and policies from various countries are compared and contrasted with those of the U.S., and Oregon in particular. Prerequisite: SW 520.

- SW 564 Social Work in Schools, 3 credits  
Uses a policy/practice perspective to prepare students for effective and culturally sensitive social work practice in early childhood and K-12 education. Presents multiple roles of school social workers and educational policies that provide context for practice. Emphasizes collaboration among families, schools, and communities. Prerequisites: SW 520; SW 532.
- SW 566 Social Work Practice in Child Welfare, 3 credits  
Designed for students who are either considering a career or are interested in public child welfare. Explores selected areas of child welfare related to child maltreatment. Emphasis on the critical examination of empirically based case management intervention strategies and their appropriate use with children and their families.
- SW 580 Introduction to Social Service Administration, Leadership, and Management, 3 credits

#### Introduction to Social Service Administration, Leadership and Management (3)

Introduces the student to theoretical and practical elements of social work administrative and management roles to develop and manage the conditions, processes and mechanisms that support evidence-based service delivery systems that benefit consumers, families and communities. Topics include analysis of contemporary organizational leadership task environments, internal and external assessment skills and tools, building strong coalitions and developing strong cross-sector collaborations for dynamic social problem impact and understanding theoretical underpinnings of a variety of organizational leadership approaches. Prerequisite: SW 532.

- SW 581 Issues in Social Service Administration, Leadership, and Management, 3 credits  
Emphasizes critical leadership and management skills relevant to a variety of for-profit, non-profit and government social service agency environments including managed care principles, internal advocacy, hiring processes and procedures, staff supervision and discipline, staff ethics, sexual harassment, and equal employment opportunity laws. Analyzes management philosophy in complex organizations, team building, work with governance boards, participation in organizational planning, and program quality and development of accountability systems. Prerequisites: SW 520, SW 532.
- SW 582 Social Service Program and Policy Development, 3 credits  
Focuses on the conceptual and behavioral skills related to planning and designing programs, program/policy evaluation, and understanding the analysis and design of agency policy and the role of policy in the change process. Students learn ways to compose statements of need, goals, objectives, interventions, action plans, evaluation approaches, and policy changes. Prerequisites: SW 532, 520.

- SW 589 Advanced Standing Seminar, 2 credits  
Seminar orients students accepted into the advanced standing program to the Graduate School of Social Work and the MSW program, provides a connection between BSW curriculum and advanced MSW curriculum, discusses core values and ethics associated with social work, reviews the assessment process at five levels of social work practice, introduces incoming students to social work practice in Oregon, and assists students with successful entry into their advanced field education placement. Prerequisite: admission to advanced standing program.
- SW 590 Advanced Topics in Applied Research Methods for Social Work, 3 credits  
Builds on foundation research methods and data analysis courses. Courses offered under this number present an evidence-based framework for social work practice and methods for analyzing quantitative data (e.g., multiple linear regression) and/or qualitative data (e.g., ethnography). Emphasizes application of methods to build knowledge in a specialized area relevant to a student's field of practice and/or to complete an evaluation of program(s) or practice. Emphasizes interpretation of results to inform effective social work practice in community and agency-based settings. May be repeated for credit. Prerequisite: SW 551.
- SW 591 Child and Adolescent Behavior and Development in the Social Environment: Advanced Theory and Research, 3 credits  
Builds on foundation courses on micro and macro Human Behavior in the Social Environment and on foundation courses on research methods. Presents ecological-developmental framework and empirically-supported and culturally sensitive theories for understanding individual, family, peer, school, community, and societal influences on child and adolescent behavior and development. Presents a prevention framework for building and using research-based knowledge of behavior and development. Emphasizes integration of theory and research to guide social work practice. Prerequisites: SW 541 and 551.
- SW 653 PhD Data Analysis Seminar, 1 credit  
Provides a structure to facilitate a working group of researchers who share ideas and support one another in the conduct of research. Group members may work together on research projects as well as use the group to consult about independent research projects. Expected themes include research design issues, measurement selection, rating and coding procedures, data analysis and presentation and reporting of research results. The primary focus of this group is on quantitative methods, with secondary attention to qualitative methods. Course may be repeated for credit. Prerequisite: SW 634.

### **Change to Existing Courses**

- SW 501 Data Analysis in Social Work Research - change title to Research (return to omnibus course listing)
- SW 522 Issues in Child Welfare - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 523 Health Care Policies and Programs - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 524 Community Organization - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 525/625 Poverty: Policies and Programs - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 526 Social Work and the Law - change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3

- SW 533 Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services I - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 534 Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services II - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 535 Advanced Direct Human Services Seminar - change title to Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services III, change course description, change credit hours from 2 to 3
- SW 536, 537 Advance Community-Based Practice I, II - change course titles (listed in the Bulletin as two separate courses, SW 536 Advance Community-Based Practice I and SW 537 Advance Community-Based Practice II), change course descriptions, change credit hours from 4 each to 3 each
- SW 538 Advance Community-Based Practice: Evaluation and Analysis - change title to Advance Community-Based Practice III, change credit hours from 2 to 3
- SW 545/645 Advanced Theories of Human Behavior in the Social Environment - change credit hours from 4 to 3, change prerequisites
- SW 546 Human Sexuality and Social Work - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 554 Social Work and Health Care - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 555 Social Work Perspectives on Mental Health Disorders - change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 558 Abuse and Trauma: Theory and Intervention - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 560 Social Work with Lesbians, Gay Males, and Bisexuals - change title to Social Work with Gay, Lesbians, Bisexual, and Transgendered Individuals, Families, and Communities, change course description, credit hours from 4 to 3, change prerequisites
- SW 561 Clinical Social Work with Groups - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 562 Social Work with the Dying and Their Families - change title to Social Work with Grief and Loss, change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 563 Social Work with Children, Adolescents, and Their Families - change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 567 Evidence Based Intervention for Community Mental Health Practice - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 571 Social Work with Alcoholics, Substance Abusers and their Families - change course title to Substance Use, Abuse, and Addiction and Social Work Practice, change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 574 Social Work with the Frail Elderly - change title to Social Work with Frail Older Adults, change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3, change prerequisites
- SW 575 Ethnic Competence in Social Work Practice - change title to Multicultural Social Justice Work in Action, change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 578/678 Social Work in the Juvenile and Criminal Justice Systems - change course description, change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 579 Working with Involuntary Clients - change credit hours from 4 to 3
- SW 585 Fundraising and Grantwriting - change credit hours from 2 to 3
- SW 631 Introduction to Quantitative Research Methods in Social Work - change course description
- SW 640 Research Practicum Seminar, SW 641, 642 Research Practicum – change title to SW 640, 641, 642 Research Practicum and Seminar, change course description, change credit hours from credit to be arranged to 2 credits each
- SW 651 Integrative Writing Seminar - change credit hours from 2 to 1

March 8, 2007

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Bonnie Miksch  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

DeLys Ostlund  
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 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.

### **College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

#### **New Courses**

- Hst 461/561 Topics in Jewish History, 4 credits

Examines select aspects of Jewish history, focusing on one or more specific regions, periods, events, or concerns. Possible topics include: medieval and early modern Jewish history, ancient Israelite or rabbinic history and culture, Sephardic Jewry, history of Russian Jewry, and gender and Jewish history. Course may be taken more than once with permission of instructor.

Recommended: upper division standing.

### **School of Fine and Performing Arts**

#### **New Courses**

- Art 440/540 Interactive Team, 4 credits

Interactive media design and development for internal and external community clients. Design solutions are presented, critiqued, and revised based on initial and ongoing client contact. Sites are developed, tested, and maintained on web servers. Team-based design and development process is coordinated through project management practices. Emphasis is placed on strategic and tactical design process, industry standards, usability studies, business proposals, design documents, and other professional practices. Prerequisites: Art 341, 342.

March 12, 2007

**TO: Faculty Senate**

**FROM: Bonnie Miksch  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**

**RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**

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

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Program**

- Minor in History and Philosophy of Science – See Attachment

**New Courses**

- Geog 333 Weather (4) Introductory course in the atmospheric environment providing a comprehensive understanding of atmospheric structure and the changes over time that result in the weather we experience. Topics include, atmospheric moisture (fog, rain, clouds), atmospheric stability and cloud development, air pressure and winds, air masses and fronts, and hurricanes and tornados. This course is the same as Ph 333; course may be taken only once for credit.  
Recommended: upper division standing or Geog 210.
- Ph 333 Weather (4) Introductory course in the atmospheric environment providing a comprehensive understanding of atmospheric structure and the changes over time that result in the weather we experience. Topics include: atmospheric moisture (fog, rain, clouds), atmospheric stability and cloud development, air pressure and winds, air masses and fronts, and hurricanes and tornados. This course is the same as Geog 333; course may be taken only once for credit.  
Recommended: upper division standing or Geog 210.

**Change in Courses**

- Ph 424 Classical Mechanics I (4) [Change credit hours from 3 to 4]

**Change in Program**

- Program change in BA/BS Environmental Physics Option: Updating and streamlining the major and assuring that all of the major courses are ones offered every year. Physics majors must now take the stronger foundation 12-credit general physics. The list of electives is now focused more sharply. The environmental physics option has been spelled out in more detail, but has not changed the program requirements.

**Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program  
Leading to the Minor in History and Philosophy of Science\***

Portland State University

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
(with potential participation of other schools)

History Department, Philosophy Department, Honors College  
(with participation of Center for Science Education,  
Anthropology Department, Biology Department, and potentially others)

---

**Description of Proposed Program<sup>†</sup>**

In the minor program in history and philosophy of science (HPS), students use the methodologies and perspectives of two humanistic disciplines—history and philosophy—and take as their object of study science, regarded both as a system of knowledge and as a set of social institutions. The goal is to gain a deeper appreciation of patterns of reasoning and evidence in science; of the historical evolution of scientific disciplines; and of the cultural, social, political and ethical contexts of science and its applications. An explanation of the specifics of our proposed curriculum is found in section 3, below.

Programs in HPS and related interdisciplinary fields such as science, technology, and society, are represented at a considerable and growing number of universities both in the United States and internationally (see Appendix 1). Although exact statistics on the number of undergraduate programs are not available, it appears that undergraduate minors in HPS and related fields are more common than undergraduate majors. At the post-graduate level, the History of Science Society reports that there are currently 58 American universities with HPS or related programs.

**1. Program Overview**

- a. **Provisional CIP number:** 54.0104. (But this may be N/A, since CIP refers to full academic programs, i.e., majors or certificates.)
- b. **Rationale.** This proposed minor arose out of discussions among the participating faculty, as well as current and former department chairs, who saw an opportunity to package together for students a number of existing course offerings that would fruitfully cross-fertilize each other. From the professionalized point of view of faculty, the interrelation of these courses seems obvious. From the perspective of a student navigating the large array of courses offered at our university, however, this mutual relation might not be immediately obvious, especially since the courses reside in different departments. Indeed, many students are not aware of the existence of history and philosophy of science as established scholarly fields, even if they might be interested in the subject matter. In short, the minor is an effort to make visible to students an

---

\* Based on the OUS proposal outline “Full Proposals for New Academic Programs,” on-line at [www.ous.edu/about/polipro/files/full.pdf](http://www.ous.edu/about/polipro/files/full.pdf). Revised March 2007 in response to queries from the Senate Steering Committee.

<sup>†</sup> This section added in response to queries from the Senate Steering Committee.

intellectual interrelatedness that might otherwise remain obscure. The structure of the program thus serves a kind of advising function.

Some of the courses being proposed for the minor are relatively new in the catalog; it is only within the last couple of years that there has developed a sufficient density of courses to contemplate such a minor at PSU. However, most if not all of the courses are now regular parts of the teaching repertoire of tenured faculty whose scholarly interests are primarily in these fields. In other words, these courses will be regularly taught regardless of the presence of a minor. However, the existence of a minor will encourage new level of synergy, both to students' educational experience and to faculty members' instructional work.

c. The minor will be **operational** upon approval.

d. The program will be **housed administratively** in the History Department. Richard Beyler, one of the faculty submitting the proposal, will initially be **program advisor**, assuming administrative oversight and graduation check duties. However, this may be changed to another department / faculty member with mutual agreement of the departments / individuals involved and confirmation through appropriate curricular review procedures.

The default **advisor for students** in the minor will thus be Richard Beyler. However, any of the submitting or participating faculty (see item 10a below) may advise students by mutual agreement. (For example, students interested primarily in philosophy of science may want to choose Tom Seppalainen as advisor for the minor; students interested in STS approaches may choose to work with Michael Flower; etc.)

*[This item was added to the OUS template in response to a CLAS Curriculum Committee query.]*

## 2. Purpose and Relationship of the Proposed Program to the Institution's Mission

a. **Objectives.** The program's primary objective is to enrich the educational experience of interested students. Specific target audiences include (but are not limited to) students who are seeking a cross-disciplinary enrichment of either science or humanities majors; students contemplating advanced study in history or philosophy of science; and students aiming at a post-graduate professional school. At other universities, history and philosophy of science has proven to be a popular choice as a minor or second major for pre-medical students.

b. Part of the **mission of Portland State University** is "growth towards ... excellence in accessible high quality ... teaching programs" (see <http://www.pdx.edu/about.html>). As noted in the rationale, the motive behind this proposal is to make the history and philosophy of science as a current field of scholarship more visible and accessible to students.

c. Although other **Oregon University System** schools offer courses in history and philosophy of science, PSU would be the first to have an undergraduate program (minor or major) in the field. The university thereby would provide an educational enrichment opportunity for students, especially those noted in item 2a above.



### 3. Course of Study

Students intending to take the minor should contact the advisor (currently Richard Beyler), or one of the other faculty teaching the core or elective courses listed below, to set up a plan for fulfilling the minor requirements.

**a. Proposed curriculum.** The proposed curriculum consists of 32 CH total. This total is comparable to other minors currently offered at PSU, but slightly higher than average due to the relatively flexible “distribution” component noted below.

- **Two core courses (8 CH):**

HST 387 History of Modern Science (currently titled Science and Society: Historical Perspectives; change of title has been approved by Curriculum Committee and Senate)

PHL 470 Philosophy of Science

- **Three elective courses (12 CH) chosen from the following:**

ANTH 325 Culture, Health, and Healing

BI 343 Genes and Society

HST 427 Topics in History of Science (with different topics, may be repeated for credit)

HST 440-441 American Environmental History

HST 446 Topics in the History of American Professions (with different topics, may be repeated for credit)

HST 460 Topics in European Intellectual History (with different topics, may be repeated for credit)

PHL 301-302 History of Philosophy

PHL 306 Science and Pseudoscience

PHL 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science (with different topics, may be repeated for credit)

SCI 359 Biopolitics

SCI 361 Science: Power-Knowledge

- **Cross-disciplinary courses (12 CH) depending on student’s major:**

This requirement refers to the academic distribution areas defined in the PSU *Bulletin* (p. 13 in the 2006-07 edition) in conjunction with the list of programs of study (pp. 9-11).

The arts and letters area includes: Applied Linguistics,  
Architecture, Art, Arts and Letters, English, Foreign Languages

and Literatures, Music, Philosophy, Speech Communication,<sup>‡</sup>  
Theater Arts, Writing.

The social science area includes: Anthropology, Black Studies, Chicano/Latino Studies, Child and Family Studies, Criminal Justice, Economics, Geography, History, International Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Social Science, Sociology, Urban Studies and Planning, Women's Studies.

The science area includes: Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Sciences/Studies, Geology, Mathematics/Statistics, Physics, Science Education

Students with majors in the social science or arts and letters areas, as well as students with majors in Business Administration or Liberal Studies, must take 12 CH in one department in the science area.

Students with majors in the science area, as well as students with majors in Computer Science, Health Science, or one of the engineering programs, must take 12 CH in one department in the social science or arts and letters areas.

These requirements are for coursework beyond that used to fulfill the distribution requirements for the B.A. or B.S. degree, for University Studies, or for the major.

Students should take note of any prerequisites established by the respective departments.

**Rationale** behind proposed core courses [RICHARD]

**b. Rationale of proposed curriculum<sup>§</sup>**

- **Core courses.** The minor, as its title suggests, asks students to take science as an object of study, considered through the methodologies of two disciplines of the humanities: history and philosophy. A glance at history and philosophy of science offerings throughout academia reveals an enormous range of possible topics; what they have in common is thus not so much a canon of specific topics as a grounding in historical and/or philosophical method. The two core courses are intended to introduce students to these methodological approaches and provide a conceptual framework for more specific topics developed in the elective courses (see

---

<sup>‡</sup> The current definition of distribution areas (p. 13 of the 2006-07 *Bulletin*) does not reflect the recent division of Speech Communication into Communication Studies and Speech and Hearing Sciences; therefore, the proper placement of the two newly separate departments seems to be, at this moment, officially undefined. The minor will adhere to whatever final determination is settled upon by the University Curriculum Committee and Senate. Note added in response to query from the Senate Steering Committee.

<sup>§</sup> This section added in response to queries from the Senate Steering Committee.

below): We expect that some students taking the minor will have had other courses in history or philosophy, but this requirement insures that students in the minor will have at least one course in both of the two core disciplines.

A **comparison with other HPS minor programs** indicates that this concept is in line with what is being done. In fact, the majority of HPS and similar minor programs require no or only one “core” course, defined as a course that every student in the minor must take. (See appendix 1.) However, particularly given the fact that PSU does not have a separate history and philosophy of science department, or a distinct numbering system for such courses, we deemed it desirable to give a certain robustness and coherence to the minor by having a designated, but small, course experience that would be common for all students taking the minor.

A **comparison with other minors at PSU** reveals that our concept for the core course requirement is quite in the mainstream. Out of 47 minors at PSU in the 2006-07 catalog, 21 require 0-8 credit hours in core courses, 26 require 9 or more credit hours in core courses. (See appendix 2.)

• **Elective courses.** The rationale flows directly from the intellectual nature of the minor together with some constraints emerging from its instantiation at PSU and the existing course offerings here. **First**, as noted above, the minor consists of two of the central disciplines of humanities, history and philosophy, both of which take science as an object of study and consider it through their respective methodologies. However, since these methodologies are in general use, and since there exist various dimensions of science and its products that constitute possible objects of study through these methodologies, HPS-style courses are not merely to be found in history and philosophy departments’ curricula. Hence, the electives feature courses both from history and philosophy as well as other departments that study science. (See appendix 1 for an indication of the range of departments contributing to HPS programs at various universities. See appendix 3 for descriptions of the specific elective courses.)

**Second**, the list of electives admittedly does not include every course described in the PSU bulletin that would fit the criterion above. The central reason for this is that we attempted to avoid courses that have specific prerequisites in the given discipline but outside the range of other HPS courses. (E.g., a 400-level Sociology course was considered, but since it had a Sociology prerequisite, it was not included in this list.) Such courses could, however, be used if appropriate for the cross-disciplinary distribution component of the minor (see below).

**Third**, new courses, as well as extant courses we may have overlooked, that fit the intellectual content and orientation may certainly be added. In fact we welcome these in the hopes of an even more robust and stronger HPS curriculum at PSU.

• **Cross-disciplinary component.** While the core courses provide methodological frameworks within which to address the sciences as an object of inquiry and the elective courses provide more specific examples of the use of such frameworks, the cross-disciplinary courses will provide greater disciplinary depth beyond that required to fulfill the distribution requirements for the B.A. or B.S. degree, for University Studies, or for the major. We expect the resulting disciplinary depth to supplement knowledge of the objects of inquiry and/or knowledge of the methods that characterize the minor.

Appendix 1 shows that a several HPS and related minors at other universities, albeit not the majority (13 out of 45), have an “open-ended” component to their requirements, i.e., one in which the student chooses courses not from a pre-designated list but rather any course from a certain department or range of departments. Appendix 2 shows that a number of PSU minors also have such a component. Where the minor is within a major department, the courses are taken from that department, but in the case of interdisciplinary minors (Black Studies, Film Studies, Judaic Studies) several departments are involved. Our proposal is distinctive in that it asks each student to designate a department complementary to her/his individual major.

We ask humanities or social science students to stretch themselves academically, and take additional coursework in one of the natural sciences which they otherwise might not have done. The student thereby gains more familiarity with the concepts, techniques, use of evidence and argumentation, etc., of a specific scientific discipline, i.e., of one of the objects of study in HPS. Conversely, we ask student in the sciences to take supplementary coursework in one of the humanistic or social scientific disciplines, thereby adding depth to the cultural contextualization that is part of HPS methodology. We might think of this component of the minor as analogous to a foreign language requirement: the goal is not to achieve “native fluency,” but rather to expose students to the terminology, concepts, and mode of argument of a discipline other than their own.

While we do not designate specific sequences, several departments have these as part of their curriculum, and these would be convenient ways to fulfill this requirement. However, any coherent group of courses within the selected department can be used.

- c. No **new courses** are proposed. However, extant or new courses may be added to the roster of options depending on the interest of the instructor and subject to appropriate curricular review procedures.
- d. No **nontraditional learning** modes are currently envisioned, though conceivably these might emerge in the case of hypothetical changes in the teaching methodology of the respective courses.

March 5, 2007

To: Faculty Senate

From: Scholastic Standards Committee  
Liane Gough, Jennifer Loney (Co-Chairs)

Re: Change to Registration Deadlines

**Issue: Deadline to Add Courses without Instructor Approval**

Current PSU policies allow students to enroll in courses up to the end of the second week of the term. This deadline allows students to enter a course although they may have missed as much as 20% of the term.

Although PSU deadlines specifically allow students to add courses at such a late date without department or instructor approval, many instructors are not willing to allow students to enter their course at this point in the term.

The existing deadline places both students and instructors in a difficult position. Students are led to believe they may make schedule changes and/or enroll in courses until the end of the second week of classes. Yet instructors must determine whether it is reasonable to allow a student to enter their course after having missed a significant number of class meetings.

**Motion**

**The Scholastic Standards Committee recommends a motion to move the last day to add a course without instructor permission from the end of the second week to the end of the first week of the term.** This proposal would not preclude students from adding courses after the end of the first week of the term. However, adding a course after the end of the first week would require instructor or department consent via a Special Registration form.

**Issue: Deadline to Change Grading Option**

Current PSU policies give students until the end of the fifth week of the term to change grading options. This deadline often occurs before a student can make an informed choice based on midterm grades.

**Motion**

**The Scholastic Standards Committee recommends a motion to move the last day to change grading option from the end of the fifth week to the end of the seventh week of the term.** This proposal would place us more in alignment with other OUS institutions and allow students to make more informed choices based on their academic standing in the course after midterms.

## PSU Faculty Senate Resolution

We the PSU Faculty Senate do state the following:

- Where as... The PSU Faculty Senate recognizes that the high cost of certain textbooks and ancillary materials can adversely affect the affordability of higher education for PSU students.
- Where as... PSU Faculty Senate recognizes the national movement to lower the cost of textbooks on the university and legislative level.
- Where as... PSU Faculty Senate realizes that options exist in which the faculty has a direct role in reducing cost to the student.
- Where as... The faculty can develop ways of helping students contain the cost of their education, while maintaining their professional and curricular integrity.

Therefore be it resolved...that consistent with the fundamental right and responsibility of faculty to select course materials, maintain principles of academic freedom and preserve the goal of providing high quality education, the PSU Faculty Senate encourages that - when appropriate, academically sound and feasible- course materials are selected in a manner that minimizes the cost to students.

Be it further resolved... that the options and recommendations available for faculty are

- A. Working with publishers and reviewing pricing guides to adopt the least expensive edition of books they wish to choose
- B. Ordering textbooks from the university bookstore at the earliest time possible to ensure the availability of used copies
- C. Using the same edition of major textbooks for a minimum of three years
- D. Requesting books to be sold unbundled whenever possible, either with the option to buy bundled materials separately or not including the extra materials in the order
- E. Ordering extra textbooks to be kept on reserve at the PSU library
- F. Ordering soft-cover, 'no frills', black & white versions of textbooks

Similar resolution passed in the Associated Student Senate: *ASPSU Resolution #2007-01-DF*. Consistent with this resolution, the ASPSU strongly urge all faculty to support and adhere to the recommendations as stated in the above resolution.

Therefore be it further resolved... that we would support this bill and consistently encourage faculty to develop ways to help contain the cost of textbooks.

Respectively Submitted by: Senator Scott Burns

3/12/07

What follows is a special report from the Graduate Council.

We are concerned about the misuse of the petition process at the graduate level; the overuse of petitions is an issue of accountability on the part of both students and programs.

The petition process is intended as a procedural option in unusual cases with extenuating circumstances. It has become apparent, however, that in some programs petitioning is standard procedure and that many students are under the impression that the grad council will simply rubber stamp any petition submitted. In addition, many petitions reflect the notion that the petition process is the remedy for poor advising. Such an approach gives the impression that the institution can be manipulated by anyone willing to beg for or demand a waiver.

The most frequent types of petitions reviewed by the Graduate Council are:

- Expired incompletes (oftentimes YEARS after the expiration).
- Excessive number of pre-admission credits
- Expired courses (7 year rule)

The next two categories are handled administratively. However, because they reflect the same issues, they are included here.

- Requests to convert 400-level courses to 500-level
- Retroactive add/drop of courses from past terms

We acknowledge that some students experience genuine crises in their lives; the petition process – the request for a waiver of university policy – exists for just this type of student. Petitioning should not be used to remedy poor advising or poor planning.

The Graduate Council hereby asks that the Faculty Senate reaffirm institutional policy regarding petitions at the graduate level.

## Academic Advising Council 2006-2007 Senate Report, April, 2007

**Committee membership:** Mary Ann Barham (ex-officio), Michael Cummings, Sandra Freels (Chair), Michael Flower, Frosti McClurken-Talley, Janet Putnam, Bill Ryder (ex-officio), Juliette Stoering (ex-officio), Paulette Watanabe, Martha Works

### History:

- 1997-98 PSU's Commission on Campus Climate and Life identifies undergraduate advising as one of the critical areas of campus life in need of improvement.
- 1998-01 President Bernstine creates Student Advising Action Council (SAAC) to create an undergraduate advising model appropriate to PSU. Faculty Senate recommends creation of Student Advising Implementation Team (SAIT) to implement the SAAC Undergraduate Advising Model with partial funding.
- 2001-05 SAIT assists Departments in developing undergraduate advising plans. Janine Allen and Cathleen Smith collect baseline data on undergraduate advising experiences and needs. SAIT reports to Interim Provost Michael Reardon on institutionalization of advising initiative. Funding for the initiative is eliminated.
- 2006-07 Provost Roy Koch appoints Academic Advising Council (AAC) to review and make recommendations concerning undergraduate and graduate advising, particularly with regard to student success. AAC begins by reviewing implementation of the SAAC Model.

### SAAC Undergraduate Advising Model:

- All undergraduates will attend orientation.
- All incoming undergraduates will have an individual advising session at UASC within first 24 credits at PSU.
- All undergraduates will declare a major prior to completing 120 credits.
- Upon declaration of a major, all undergraduates will be advised on all requirements within major department. Declared majors should meet with a departmental advisor at least once prior to the completion of 90 credits.
- UASC will continue to advise undeclared undergraduates.

### AAC Activities:

- Confer with Deans.
- Collect "snapshot" data on USAC advisees.
- Collaborate with Allen and Smith on continued assessment of the SAAC Model.

### Next steps:

- Recommend increased investment in undergraduate student advising.
- Request OIRP assistance in demonstrating connection between advising and student success.
- Consider adjustments to the SAAC model.



## **Results of Spring 2006 Survey of Faculty and Students: Advising – Advising Attitudes and Experiences**

In April 2006 faculty with an appointment of .05 or above FTE and all admitted students were asked to complete web-based surveys focused on academic advising at PSU. 171 instructional faculty and 734 undergraduate students responded to the surveys. Both the faculty and student surveys listed 12 functions that the literature suggests are aspects of quality academic advising (See Table 1). Faculty were asked to rate the importance of, their responsibility for, and their satisfaction with each of the 12 advising functions. Students were also asked to rate the importance of and their satisfaction with each of the 12 advising functions. Table 2 gives the means, standard deviations, and ranks of the importance, responsibility, and satisfaction ratings.

The critical findings are:

- Faculty think it is important that all students receive integrated and holistic advising<sup>1</sup>
- Faculty may feel that advising overall is important for students, however, they do not feel that specific details of concern to students (time lines, policies, procedures, financial aid, graduation, petitions, etc.) are their responsibility<sup>2</sup>
- Faculty feel it is their responsibility to help students connect their academic, career and life goals, and to help students choose among courses in the major that connect those goals. However, they feel less responsible for advising related to broader university requirements.<sup>3</sup>
- With respect to the *GenEdConnect* function, 31% of the respondents indicated that they do not help students choose courses in the general education curriculum that connect their academic, career, and life goals (Table 2). Another way to look at this is that over 2/3 of the faculty do provide advising in general education, albeit at a lukewarm level.<sup>3</sup>
- Faculty are generally satisfied with the advising they provide<sup>4</sup>
- On all 12 functions, faculty rate their satisfaction with the advising they provide higher than students rate their satisfaction on the advising they receive.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **Importance Ratings:** When asked “How important is it for undergraduate students to get this kind of advising” for each advising function, faculty rated all 12 on the high or important end of the scale, that is, above scale point 4 on the 6 point scale. In other words, faculty think all the advising functions are important for students to receive. Even the lowest rated function, *assisting students in choosing out of class activities*, such as internships and part-time employment, was rated on the important end of the scale (4.51 on a 6-point scale).

<sup>2</sup> **Responsibility Ratings:** For each advising function, faculty were also asked to rate their level or agreement with the statement that “It is part of my responsibility to provide students with this kind of advising.” One would hope that responsibility ratings would be somewhat commensurate with importance ratings, that is, that faculty would assume greater responsibility for those functions they believe are most important for students. For many of the functions this was the case, that is, the functions faculty considered most important for students were also those functions for which they took the greatest

responsibility. The most notable exception was the *How Things Work* function. The importance rating for this function is 5.21 while its responsibility rating is 3.52, the lowest of any function. This may seem puzzling until you look at the examples given for this function, which include understanding time lines, policies, and procedures with regard to registration, financial aid, grading, graduation, petitions and appeals, etc. These all involve some kind of administrative procedures. Faculty may feel that, while this kind of advising is important for students, the information might better be dispensed by student services offices such as UASC or Degree Requirements Office.

<sup>3</sup> Faculty differentiated among the functions to a greater extent with the responsibility ratings than they did with the importance ratings. Faculty rated only 6 of the 12 functions on the high end of the responsibility scale, that is, above scale point 4. Responsibility ratings for the other 6 functions were all between scale point 3 and 4 on the 6-point scale, ratings that might be characterized as “lukewarm.” You can see, for example, that faculty were lukewarm about 3 of the 5 integration functions. Advising that includes all 5 of these integration functions is what researchers call holistic advising, which means connecting all of the student’s educational experiences into a meaningful whole, including courses in the major and in general education, courses taken for the BA or BS degree, as well as out of class experiences. Faculty think that *all* of these integration functions are important, it is just that they are not sure they are the ones who should provide them.

<sup>4</sup> **Satisfaction Ratings:** Faculty were asked to rate their satisfaction with the advising they provide (How satisfied are you with the advising you provide in this area?) on each function. All of the satisfaction ratings are high, between scale point 4 and 5. Faculty were least satisfied with *Gen Ed Connect*, *Non-Academic Referral*, and *How Things Work*, the functions that had the lowest responsibility ratings. Here we have the classic chicken and egg argument: Are satisfaction ratings lower because the faculty do not see these functions as their responsibility and thus have not developed their abilities in these areas? Or are the responsibility ratings lower because faculty lack confidence in their ability to provide that kind of advising?

<sup>5</sup> **Student and Faculty Ratings:** Table 3 presents the results of t-tests that compared the importance and satisfaction ratings of faculty with students on importance and satisfaction ratings for the same 12 functions. Faculty rated the importance of 7 of the 12 functions higher than students; these were all of the integration functions and both referral functions. Although all of the functions were rated on the high end of the scale by both groups, the two groups do not differ on the information functions, which are rated relatively high by both groups, or on the individuation and shared responsibility functions, which were rated relatively low by both groups.

Table 1: 2006 Advising Survey  
Academic Advising Functions and Variable Names/Abbreviations

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Academic Advising Functions/Survey Items</b>
	<i>Integration Functions (Holistic Advising)</i>
<i>Overall Connect</i>	Advising that helps students connect their academic, career, and life goals
<i>Major Connect</i>	Advising that helps students choose among courses in the major that connect their academic, career, and life goals
<i>Gen Ed Connect</i>	Advising that assists students with choosing among the various general education options (e.g., choice of capstone, cluster, courses within cluster) that connect their academic, career, and life goals
<i>Degree Connect</i>	Advising that assists students with deciding what kind of degree to pursue (Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Music) in order to connect their academic, career, and life goals
<i>Out-of-Class Connect</i>	Advising that assists students with choosing out-of-class activities (e.g., part-time employment, internships or practicum, participation in clubs or organizations) that connect their academic, career, and life goals
	<i>Referral Functions</i>
<i>Referral Academic</i>	When students need it, referral to campus resources that address academic problems (e.g., math or science tutoring, writing, disability accommodation, testing anxiety)
<i>Referral Non-Academic</i>	When students need it, referral to campus resources that address non-academic problems (e.g., childcare, financial, physical and mental health)
	<i>Information Functions</i>
<i>How Things Work</i>	Assisting students with understanding how things work at this university (understanding timelines, policies, and procedures with regard to registration, financial aid, grading, graduation, petition and appeals, etc.)
<i>Accurate Information</i>	Ability to give students accurate information about degree requirements
	<i>Individuation Functions</i>
<i>Skills Abilities Interests</i>	Taking into account students' skills, abilities, and interests in helping them choose courses
<i>Know as Individual</i>	Knowing the student as an individual
	<i>Shared Responsibility Function</i>
<i>Shared Responsibility</i>	Encouraging students to assume responsibility for their education by helping them develop planning, problem-solving, and decision-making skills

Table 2: 2006 Advising Survey  
Means, Standard Deviations, and ranks of Importance, Responsibility, and Satisfaction Ratings of Faculty

Advising Function	Importance				Responsibility				Satisfaction				Do Not Provide <sup>2</sup>	
	N	Mean	SD	Rk	N	Mean	SD	Rk	N	Mean	SD	Rk	n	%
<b>Integration (Holistic Advising)</b>														
• <i>Overall Connect</i>	170	5.46	.86	2	169	5.08	1.11	1.5	164	4.59	1.12	3	6	3.5%
• <i>Major Connect</i>	169	5.41	.94	3	169	5.08	1.23	1.5	160	4.80	1.12	2	10	5.8%
• <i>Gen Ed Connect</i>	169	4.89	1.26	9	168	3.63	1.73	11	117	4.10	1.38	11.5	53	<b>31.0%</b>
• <i>Degree Connect</i>	168	4.90	1.25	8	168	3.90	1.61	7	125	4.51	1.15	4	45	<b>26.3%</b>
• <i>Out-of-Class Connect</i>	167	4.51	1.38	12	166	3.72	1.6	9	136	4.37	1.22	8	33	19.3%
<b>Referral</b>														
• <i>Referral Academic</i>	170	5.37	.91	4	168	4.79	1.36	3	154	4.35	1.28	9	17	9.9%
• <i>Referral Non-Academic</i>	170	5.08	1.10	6	167	3.66	1.68	10	124	4.21	1.25	10	46	26.9%
<b>Information</b>														
• <i>How Things Work</i>	169	5.21	1.08	5	169	3.35	1.76	12	125	4.10	1.37	11.5	36	<b>21.1%</b>
• <i>Accurate Information</i>	170	5.70	.73	1	169	4.49	1.78	4	134	4.90	1.17	1	45	<b>26.3%</b>
<b>Individuation</b>														
• <i>Skills Abilities Interests</i>	169	4.94	1.12	7	168	4.03	1.56	6	143	4.44	1.24	6	27	15.8%
• <i>Know as Individual</i>	171	4.75	1.3	11	169	4.27	1.57	5	154	4.44	1.38	6	17	9.9%
<b>Shared Responsibility</b>														
• <i>Shared Responsibility</i>	169	4.86	1.3	10	167	3.80	1.76	8	132	4.44	1.29	6	39	22.8%

Note. Ratings were made on 6-point scales (1 = not important, strongly disagree, not satisfied, 6 = very important, strongly agree, very satisfied)

<sup>1</sup>Satisfaction ratings exclude those who indicate they did not provide this type of advising.

<sup>2</sup>“Not applicable; I do not provide this type of advising.”

Table 3: 2006 Advising Survey  
 Instructional Faculty and Undergraduate Students  
 Ratings of Importance<sup>1</sup> of, and Satisfaction<sup>1</sup> with, 12 Advising Functions

	Importance Ratings							Satisfaction Ratings <sup>2</sup>						
	Faculty			Students			<i>p</i>	Faculty			Students			<i>p</i>
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	
<b>Integration</b>														
• Overall Connect	170	5.46	.86	729	5.11	1.12	***	164	4.59	1.12	558	3.59	1.49	***
• Major Connect	169	5.41	.94	728	5.16	1.04	**	160	4.80	1.12	559	3.68	1.48	***
• Gen Ed Connect	169	4.89	1.26	727	4.50	1.39	***	117	4.10	1.38	558	3.44	1.53	***
• Degree Connect	168	4.90	1.25	725	4.51	1.57	***	125	4.51	1.15	553	3.68	1.55	***
• Out-of-Class Connect	167	4.51	1.38	727	4.19	1.63	**	136	4.37	1.22	550	3.07	1.50	***
<b>Referral</b>														
• Academic	170	5.37	.91	720	4.44	1.53	***	154	4.35	1.28	545	3.82	1.45	***
• Non-Academic	170	5.08	1.10	725	4.15	1.69	***	124	4.21	1.25	546	3.67	1.47	***
<b>Information</b>														
• Accurate Information	170	5.70	.73	729	5.68	.70		134	4.90	1.17	561	3.89	1.52	***
• How Things Work	169	5.21	1.08	724	5.03	1.23		125	4.10	1.37	557	3.45	1.54	***
<b>Individuation</b>														
• Skills, Abilities, Interests	169	4.94	1.12	725	4.81	1.32		143	4.44	1.24	552	3.59	1.46	***
• Know as Individual	171	4.75	1.28	727	4.71	1.39		154	4.44	1.38	558	3.43	1.64	***
<b>Shared Responsibility</b>														
• Shared Responsibility	169	4.86	1.30	729	4.63	1.38		132	4.44	1.29	554	3.67	1.44	***

<sup>1</sup>1=not important or not satisfied

6=very important or very satisfied

<sup>2</sup>Student not current receiving advice from anyone at PSU were not asked satisfaction questions.

\**p*≤.05

\*\**p*≤.01

\*\*\**p*≤.001