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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 **JUNE 6, 2011**, at 3:00 p.m. in **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll  
B. *Approval of the Minutes of May 2, 2011, Meeting  
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  
   1. Discussion Item: *SENATE AGENDA SETTING*  
D. Unfinished Business  
   *1. Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on On Line Learning - Reynolds  
   *3. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Implement Changes to the Constitution - Jones**  
E. New Business  
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda  
   *2. Proposal for Master of Real Estate Development  
   *3. Proposed Amendment to the PSU Faculty Constitution, Article V, Sec. 2, Transition to Appropriate Senate Size**  
F. Question Period  
   1. Questions for Administrators  
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair  
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   President’s Report (16:00)  
   Provost’s Report  
   *3. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee – Johnson  
   *4. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee – Bleiler  
   8. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2/3 June at PSU - Rueter  
   *9. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee – De la Cruz  
   *10. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Mitchell  
   *11. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees – MacCormack  
H. Adjournment

[more]
The following documents are included with this mailing:
  D-3 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Implement Changes to the Constitution
  G-1 Annual Report of the Advisory Council
  G-2 Annual Report of the Budget Committee
  G-3 Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee
  G-4 Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee
  G-5 Annual Report of the Graduate Council
  G-6 Annual Report of the Honors Council
  G-7 Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Affairs Board
  G-9 Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee
  G-10 Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
  G-11 Annual Report of the Committee on Committees
  G-12 Assessment Council Report
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DATE: 5/20/11
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 2, 2011
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Duh for Brower, Blekic for Ryder.

Members Absent: Cabelly, Carder, Carter, Elzanowski, Farr, Feng, Glaze, Greco, Hagge, Hansen, Harmon, Hatfield, Jacob, Keller, Kinsella, Lang, Marrongelle, Medovoi, Sheard.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:03. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Griffith was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Nominations for Presiding Officer Elect of the 2011-12 PSU Faculty Senate

SHUSTERMANN/FORTMILLER nominated Rob Daasch. Nominations will close at the June meeting of the Senate.

Discussion Item – Library Committee Draft Report

MERROW briefly presented the Library Committee’s draft report and visioning statement for the next 5 years, as listed in “G-3.” SCHECHTER thanked the library faculty and staff for their collaboration and contributions to the learning environment.
at the university. The meeting was moved to a committee of the whole for 15 minutes.

Discussion Item – Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on On Line Learning

BROWN presented an update on the search for the Director of On Line Learning. ROSE presented a brief update on online learning. The decision to reorganize the online presence was the result of a deliberative review that concluded online services need to be centralized in one location, in order to have ease of access for faculty. The two units with instructional designers, XS and CAE, will be brought together into one unit in a central location tbn. The budget was also carefully reviewed and will be revised. Hopefully the new director will be in place by July 1, and work with the committee can commence to update policy under the new structure. LATOLAIUS asked Rose to elaborate on exam proctoring. ROSE noted that a compliance person would be added to the team to oversee this and other items, for example, ADA compliance. RUETER asked if there would be a testing location. ROSE said that it is under discussion. REYNOLDS presented the draft report as listed in “C.” The meeting was moved to a committee of the whole for 18 minutes.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

SCHECHTER/ RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE ITEM, AS LISTED IN “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposed Joint Resolution of the Faculty Senate and the AAUP

BURNS/ DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-2”, after E.3.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal from EPC to Change Department Name to Theatre and Film

DAASCH/ BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the department name change as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD
None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported after item “C.” He noted that bonding for the life sciences building is moving forward. He noted that the legislative package is moving forward in Salem. He noted that the Fiscal Futures Task Force is working on general recommendations for restructuring our internal allocations with a report scheduled soon, and discussions of their proposals will take place early next year. He noted the dedication of the Confucius Classroom by the Chinese delegation. He commended FPA for their performances of “Street Scene” and “Oleanna” and noted there will be an invited performance of the latter later this month for administrators. He commended Patricia Schechter for her book with Avel Gordley, and faculty who have worked recently on the Japanese earthquake and tsunami. He noted that SB 242 is expected to pass at this juncture, and discussions regarding institutional boards may follow in the fall. He noted the OUS Audit of higher education institutions, OSU, UO, WOU and EOU, scheduled to be released in the next day in conjunction with hearings in Salem, generally faults the universities for not managing faculty time sufficiently. WIEWEL concluded by discussing his remarks at the recent Budget town hall. He noted that to some people it came across as insensitive and blunt, and he wanted to correct that impression. He noted that he appreciates that people work very hard at this university, that we have had great ambitions ever since our founding, and that it will always be tough for us.

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported after the annual reporting. He again reminded of the OUS audit and noted we will post it and our response addresses on the web. He noted that the proposed changes to the OAR regarding academic ranks will be much as the original, and is researching how faculty can comment before it comes before the board for approval. He noted that the Social Work Dean search is still underway, and that the CLAS Dean Search is on schedule.

1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee
2. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
3. Annual Report of the Library Committee - Tabled
4. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
5. Annual Report of the University Studies Council

The respective chairs presented the reports, and there was no discussion. The Presiding Officer accepted the reports for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:35.
Final Report to PSU Faculty Senate

From

Ad-Hoc Committee on Online Learning

Members: Candyce Reynolds, Chair, representative from Educational Policy Committee
Cynthia Brown, from Academic Computing and Instructional Technology Committee
Linda George, representative from Academic Requirements Committee
Robert Gould, representative from the Graduate Council
Rachel Hardesty, representative from Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Definitions:
Face-to-Face/Traditional Classroom Teaching and Learning: Teaching that is conducted in a university classroom with little or no materials presented or shared online.
Online: Learning that is conducted primarily online with one or two face-to-face sessions dedicated to class orientation or testing. Material can be presented online in a variety of ways: through written work, videos, and/or audio tracks. Communication between faculty and students and among students is conducted through online discussions or email. Students submit their coursework and receive feedback and assessment of their work online. Fully online courses typically utilize the course management system that the school has adopted. For PSU, this is Desire to Learn (D2L).
Hybrid: At PSU, Hybrid courses are defined as courses in which 50% or less of the class is spent in a traditional classroom with face-to-face instruction. The online portion of the course can include the same components of online interaction described above.
Web-enhanced: These courses are face-to-face courses that use web-based platforms to provide course materials. Many courses at PSU are web-enhanced and use D2L to deliver this content and support to students.

Introduction and Charge:

The Faculty Senate constituted the Ad-Hoc Committee on Online Learning from representatives of the major Faculty Senate committees charged with overseeing education and curriculum in order to bring their perspectives to issues raised by the Faculty Senate about on-line learning at PSU. The Ad-Hoc Committee on Online Learning has met since late Fall 2010 to consider these issues and presented an interim report to the Senate in May 2011. This final report is revised to address issues and concerns raised during the Senate report.

The original charge of the committee was as follows:

Short-Term Issues
1. The committee shall meet with University Counsel and gain clarification on the ownership of class materials. The policy regarding this is clear, but specifics on how it specifically applies to online courses are not. The committee needs to ascertain how this policy will be interpreted for online courses (in particular, what constitutes incidental use for online course development) and make that information available to the faculty.
2. The committee shall recommend to Faculty Senate a decision on the level of curricular review, if any, required to transition an existing face-to-face course to an online course.
3. The committee shall recommend to Faculty Senate whether any new academic requirements are necessary for online courses.
4. The committee shall work with Online Learning and the Center for Academic Excellence to ensure that a sample of best practices (including assessment) is made available by the instructional designers for faculty to consult while developing their courses.

On-Going Issues

The committee shall discuss faculty support and campus infrastructure issues, such as technical support, testing support, cost, workload issues, and student support (particularly for students without computers of their own). Those discussions will be taken back to COLT, as appropriate, to aid in their deliberations. The committee will recommend a mechanism for future years to ensure faculty input on these issues.

Summary of our Work:

As there is currently a search for a new leader of a new Online Learning Services department, many of the short term issues brought to this committee, especially items 1 and 4, were not fully addressed. We felt that these issues would be best addressed by the new Director of Online Services in consultation with the proposed on-going Faculty Senate committee (see below). Thus this committee chose to focus on a discussion of the ongoing issues raised in the charge and offers the recommendations below.

It should be noted that Portland Community College just completed a yearlong, campus-wide task force on Distance (or Online) Learning and their reports were used in consideration of many of these ideas. (Please see: http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/distance-learning/)

Our Recommendations:

1. Principles Guiding Online Learning at PSU

There is good evidence in the literature and in practice at Portland State University that online learning is a viable method of course delivery, and that there is nothing inherently inferior in offering courses in this manner. As with all teaching methods, best practices in faculty development and support and student support must be followed to achieve the best student learning outcomes. These practices overlap with but are not entirely the same as for face-to-face instruction. A large Department of Education meta-analysis reports these findings. (See: http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf) It should be noted that these positive results were achieved with significant investment in faculty development, distance learning infrastructure and student support.

We recommend that a set of Principles be adopted to support Online Learning Practices at Portland State University and would like to propose the following:

a) The quality of the learning experience for students will be equal, though not necessarily identical, whether the class is offered Face-to-face, Hybrid, or entirely Online.

b) The university commits to and undertakes ongoing assessment of the online learning environment, including understanding who our online students are, assessing learning in these courses, and seeking input from students and faculty on a regular basis.

c) The university provides avenues for all stakeholders, including faculty, students, instructional designers, and administrators, for input to maximize the development of high quality educational options.

d) As much as possible, departments and individual faculty are free to make choices regarding curriculum, pedagogical strategies, and technological enhancements in the online environment as well as choosing whether or not to teach in this manner. As with
all work in a department, such as when faculty teach what class, the department needs to ultimately make choices about the delivery of courses.

e) Developing online courses or programs will not create perverse incentives\(^1\) for a department or individual faculty member. In other words, departments and/or individual faculty members will not benefit from offering online courses beyond the benefit online programs and courses provide to students.

f) Policies related to costs and services associated with the student fee are transparent and accessible. The fee will be structured in a way that is fair and reflects student use of online learning services. At this point, only students who are taking hybrid or online courses are charged a fee. As most students at PSU participate in web-enhanced courses, the fee should be spread out amongst all students to lower the cost and fairly distribute the cost.

2. Input on the current economic model for Online Learning

The economic model for online learning will influence the accessibility of online courses, the role of these courses in the curriculum, and the ability of faculty to develop high quality online curricula. Currently, the OUS Board has delegated authority to OUS institution presidents to establish instructional fees for Continuing Education, Extended Programs, and Distance Education (2010-11 Academic Year Fee Book, OUS, pg. 1). It is under these structures that online courses have been traditionally developed at OUS institutions. The OUS policy has created a situation in which the online tuition rate does not go through the normal tuition setting process with the Oregon state legislature. In effect, online tuition can be set based on what the market will bear (and what an OUS president is willing to charge). At PSU, students pay $30/credit for hybrid and $60/credit for fully online courses on top of all other tuition and fees. These fees are collected and treated as a separate revenue source for online services. We would like to note that these fees are collected based on how a department designates a course in Banner.

One of the reasons expressed by the administration for increasing online education is to improve access to courses. While online instruction makes courses more accessible for students who have limited mobility due to physical or scheduling constraints, the increased cost of online courses reduces financial accessibility. While the university has seen an increase in enrollment in online and hybrid courses even with the increased fee, we should not ignore the fact that for most of our students, this fee increases their debt. A review of online course fees at a few Oregon institutions was conducted based on information available on the web (i.e., what information a student would get about online fees).

Portland State University:

$30/credit for hybrid courses, $60/credit for fully online courses in addition to all other tuition and fees

Notes: The online tuition estimator (http://www.pdx.edu/bao/tuition-estimator) gives no indication that there are additional fees for hybrid or fully online courses. Online fees are not listed in the PSU fee document (http://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.bao/files/media_assets/BAO_PSU_2010_2011).
1_FeeBook.pdf). Apparently students become aware of the online instruction fee after registering for the course when the fee is assessed.

Oregon State University:

~$75/credit for “e-learning courses” in addition to tuition, but no other fees (building, incidental, health) are assessed. For a 12 credit load, the difference is effectively $37/credit premium for online courses.

Notes: The online tuition estimator (http://oregonstate.edu/fa/businessaffairs/tuition-calculator) gives students the option for selecting either campus or “ecampus” credits.

Portland Community College:

$20/course “Distance Learning Fee” in addition to tuition and other fees

Notes: http://www.pcc.edu/resources/ tuition-fees/

University of Oregon

Tuition estimator does not mention online course fees (http://registrar.uoregon.edu/costs/tuition_fee_structure/undergraduate?field_student_level_and_residency=Undergraduate+Resident). It is unclear whether extra fees are charged at UoFO for admitted students.

Vice Provost Melody Rose shared with us the working budget for online education. It is important to note that cost of D2L (the online learning platform) is $200K per year while revenue from fees is $2 million. The rest of the revenue was allocated toward additional personnel for online services. Given that students will undoubtedly take a mixture of online and face-to-face courses, segregating online fees and services does not reflect student (or faculty) experience at PSU. We were not at all convinced that the fees charged to students on top of regular tuition were justifiable.

At the same time that the argument is being made that quality of the learning experience should be independent of the mode of instruction, an economic model that sets online tuition apart from face-face tuition has the potential to undermine this goal. Since budget support for online instruction (instructional designers, course development stipends, etc.) is tied to online fees, the path for developing courses is limited. It is quite reasonable to assume that many faculty will choose to develop a fully online courses after gradually adding online content in a web-enhanced course over a period of years to test ideas out, while still using face-to-face instruction. These faculty have less access to online instructional support since their courses are not contributing to the online budget. This “trial and error” development path should be encouraged in order for faculty to develop high quality online materials and courses. The degree of online content in a course (from web-based materials to modules to hybrid to fully online) should not influence the level of instructional support, as is currently the practice based on the economic model for online instruction.

Since many online courses have been subject to different budgetary rules than regular in-load courses, many online courses are self-support courses and have been revenue generators for the program involved. Obviously this revenue is enhanced when adjunct instructors are involved. While revenue generation in of itself is laudable, we worry about the potential for
creating perverse incentives to maximize this revenue at the cost of educational quality and the exploitation of adjunct/fixed term faculty. Unlike face-to-face courses where physical constraints can limit class size, it is easy to increase the number of online students in a course. While tenured faculty can (and will) voice concerns about class size in any mode of instruction, adjuncts have much less institutional power and voice, a situation that is exacerbated by the online, off-campus mode of teaching.

The June Budget Committee report to the Faculty Senate also provides many of the same concerns regarding the online learning fee.

3. Input on specific issues
   
a) Curricular Review

   In considering this question, the committee has considered a full review of online and hybrid courses and programs, no new review of online and hybrid courses, and some form of review for online or hybrid courses.

   While curricular review of all courses that are currently hybrid or online may be overly burdensome, the committee recommends that there should be a university-wide curricular review of programs that exist mainly online. We suggest this not because we think that these programs would be inherently inferior but because we believe that major changes in the delivery of programs are likely to have impact on other programs and/or policies on campus and should be reviewed.

   In addition, to ensure the quality of all course offerings that are offered in a hybrid format or fully online, we recommend that a process be developed for department chairs to approve changes in mode of delivery. We believe that departments should be responsible, not individual faculty members, for deciding how courses and/or programs will be offered, whether face-to-face, hybrid or online. In addition, departments should continue their practice of developing clear learning objectives, pedagogies, and assessments for all of their courses whatever the modality.

b) Academic Requirements

   The committee did not find that additional academic requirements, such as having only a certain percentage of a degree be comprised of online courses, was necessary. Again, we believe in the viability of quality online courses.

c) Student Issues

   Access and support: 24/7 technology support is necessary if Portland State is going to provide quality online and hybrid courses. We believe that the current service is not addressing the needs of students as the after-hours service does not seem to be familiar with Desire to Learn software. The library provides excellent customer service with the 24/7 online chat function, and the committee wonders if that could be replicated in this arena.

   Student Services: We are aware that there are line item budgets for student services in the online technology fee but do not know what kind of services will be available for
online students or how these services will be delivered. The committee believes that the faculty and academic professionals who will deliver these services should be part of the planning process for developing online student support mechanisms. We believe that students who pay for a service should be able to receive that service.

Testing services: The University needs to provide models for testing in online classes that ensure academic integrity. We are aware that there are many ways that testing services can be provided, and faculty need to understand what the options are. In addition, a system for scheduling onsite testing rooms and proctoring services needs to be developed and offered by the University.

d) Faculty Development Issues

The committee is concerned about the separation of online learning services from the Center for Academic Excellence and proposes that faculty development of instructors teaching hybrid or online courses should be coordinated and co-developed with staff from the Center for Academic Excellence. One idea would be to appoint a Faculty in Residence for Online Learning who works closely with the Center for Online learning and provides support for faculty. This person would be charged with deriving best practices from faculty, and from the literature, to share with other faculty, and also developing and facilitating an ongoing assessment plan regarding online learning. The following questions, at a minimum, need to be addressed.

- How should faculty be taught how to transform face-to-face classes and/or develop the pedagogy of courses delivered in an online or hybrid format?
- How should faculty be taught how to use the university sanctioned software to deliver course materials? This includes software beyond D2L.
- Who will be responsible for developing materials for courses? Instructional designers? Faculty?
- How will the university share information and training about new software and pedagogies with the faculty?
- How should assessment for online and hybrid courses be addressed? Can the university provide support for face-to-face testing, for example? What are the best methods for student assessment in these formats?
- How can the university provide “best practice” models for these formats that help faculty design and deliver their courses?

e) Faculty Workload Issues

Several workload issues arise with regard to online and hybrid classes. As a general principle, our view is that the faculty members who teach a class, working with their colleagues and in light of the overall curricular goals, are the people best qualified to determine the ideal format for a class, the largest reasonable class size, and similar pedagogical aspects of class presentation. Overall guidelines and principles on these matters essentially constitute work rules and as such should be developed by the administration in conjunction with the faculty union in a collective bargaining setting. Below we give our opinion on two of the major issues.
First, if there are course format options available, then the choice to teach a given course or course section in an online or hybrid version should be up to the faculty member who is teaching it, in consultation with the department chair and/or the department curriculum committee. Faculty members who are preparing to teach in an online or hybrid format and who need assistance to develop materials and design the class should be given that assistance to a standard of best practice in that modality.

Second, the size of a section for an online class should be determined, if at all possible, by the faculty member teaching the class. If a large class size is necessary, the person teaching should have assistance in the form of teaching assistants and/or graders commensurate with the size of the class. These matters vary considerably with the format, subject matter, and goals of a class. For example, a discussion class may take more time in an online format than in a face-to-face setting, since there is no natural limit on the amount of discussion, as would be provided by the end of a class period. We recommend that departments have discussions about these matters and develop policies as part of their bylaws.

f) Ownership of Online Materials

While the AAUP contract is clear about who owns instructional material that is developed by faculty, the committee feels that it is imperative that new Director of Online Services work with the union, the campus attorney, and the administration to clarify ownership and develop a clear policy that is widely distributed to faculty regarding ownership of materials in online classes. In our research, it has become apparent that there is no clear answer to the question of ownership. Dana Bostrum, Director of Innovation and Industry Alliances stated that intellectual property issues are governed by OUS policy available here http://www.rsp.pdx.edu/policies_intellectual_property.php). Issues such as the ownership of collaboratively developed courses with instructional designers and release time or payment for the development of courses need to be explored and clarified. Copyright issues and royalty fees for usage associated with online course development also need to be addressed and a clear policy developed and disseminated.

4. Establishing a formal structure to collect input from faculty and students on Online Learning

To ensure end users’ (faculty, staff and student) input in the development of the new Center for Online Learning, the committee proposes that the Faculty Senate continue the work of this committee in the form of a new Faculty Senate On-Line Learning Committee. This constitutional committee should include representation from a breadth of disciplines, levels of use, and scholarly achievement. The goal of this new Faculty Senate committee will be to work closely with the new Director in establishing the principles of online learning and in establishing practices that support faculty development and student learning.

Conclusions:

• The committee recommends review and adoption of the Principles for Online Learning to guide the ongoing development of the Center for Online Learning.
• The committee recommends that the economic model for online learning be re-evaluated and that student fees be fair. Fees should reflect the actual use of online services and consider financial accessibility and the long term debt load of our students.
• Curricular review of hybrid and online courses should be made at the departmental level.
• Guidelines and principles on workload should be developed in conjunction with the faculty union in collective bargaining. The committee recommends that the faculty, when possible, should be able to determine how they teach.
• Student issues, including access to technology support, student services, and proctoring services need to be addressed in policy and practice.
• Faculty development, including technology training and course development support, needs to be addressed in policy and practice. The committee believes that there needs to be a strong faculty component in the development of online learning development.
• While the ownership of online learning materials seems to be clear, further exploration of the issues related to use and compensation should be considered and then shared with the university community.
• The Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate continue the work of this committee in the form of a new Faculty Senate On-Line Learning Committee which works with the Director of the Center for Online Learning.

1 A perverse incentive is an incentive that has an unintended and undesirable result which is contrary to the interests of the incentive makers. Perverse incentives are a type of unintended consequences.
Interim Report of the ad-hoc Implementation Committee (ImpCom)  
June 2011

Members: Michael Bowman (LIB), Alan Cabelly (SBA), Paula Carder (CUPA), Rowanna Carpenter (OI), Joan Jagodnik (AO), Mark Jones (ECS), Bob Liebman (LAS), Robert Shunk (XS).

Charge: The charge of the committee, adopted by the senate from the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Constitutional Change from 2010-11, is:

"... we recommend that Senate establish an ad hoc committee for implementation of these constitutional and related non-constitutional changes. The ad hoc committee will advise the Senate steering committee on implementation and track the progress and outcomes of implementation by gathering data for annual reports to the Senate on its effectiveness. The data should address changes in electoral participation, the representativeness, turnover, and absenteeism of Senators, and in the priorities and experiences of Senators and their leadership."

Activity: The committee met throughout the academic year, with a calendar that included a meeting in December 2010 with Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty, to learn more about the elections process and the broader context for our work; a meeting with the Steering Committee in January 2011; and a presentation to the Senate, including a survey of members, in February 2011. ImpCom intends to submit its final report in October after the Senate has voted on a new constitutional amendment that is described below under “Unfinished business”.

The following paragraphs provide more details about the work that the committee did in several areas, including information about associated outcomes in each case.

Changes in eligibility: The constitutional changes introduced in June 2010 resulted in a change in the rules for eligibility in Senate elections, but no specific proposal was developed to describe the process for determining membership according to the changed rules. ImpCom determined that many of the necessary decisions could be made, starting from an initial list pulled from HR data, by the Secretary of the Faculty in consultation with appropriate deans (including the Dean of Graduate Studies for units without a Dean). As part of this process, each eligible faculty member was assigned to a single division, even if their appointment was split between divisions. ImpCom concluded that there should be an “appeals” process that could be used by any person who felt that they had been incorrectly eliminated from senate eligibility or otherwise assigned to the wrong division in this process. As yet, however, no such appeals have been received.

Reduction in senate size: The constitutional changes introduced in June 2010 called for a significant reduction in the size of the Senate, reducing the total number of Senators by 50% by, changing the ratio of senators to faculty from 1:10 to 1:20. The constitutional change committee had sketched one plan for gradual reduction in the size of the Senate, but had indicated a preference for a more dramatic strategy that would elect a completely new slate of Senators in the 2011 election. ImpCom reviewed these proposals but, contrary to the previous committee, developed a consensus for a more gradual transition. To a large degree, this was a result of a
concurrent decision to recommend switching from an opt-out model to an opt-in strategy for Senate elections, which is described separately below. ImpCom's plan for moving to a smaller size over a period of three years was presented in the Senate meeting of February 2011, and subsequently documented in more detail once the numbers of eligible faculty in each division were known. That document is included as an attachment to the current report.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to follow the proposed plan exactly. Although the number of opt-ins received was healthy (see below), the constitutionally mandated nominations phase of the election resulted in a smaller overall slate. At the same time, we also saw larger than expected attrition among sitting senators. As a result, although the final results of the election were not known at the time this report was prepared, we expect that the size of the Senate in 2011-2012 will be closer to the final target than the number suggested by the ImpCom plan.

Encouraging more committed Senators: A key motivation for the constitutional changes that were adopted in June 2010 was to move towards a Senate that is more pro-active, more participative, and more effective as an advocate for PSU’s future. ImpCom discussed a broad range of proposals in this area, which included: developing a covenant of expectations, a more explicit "job description", and a clearer notion of constituency for individual senators; calling for senators to communicate recent senate activity and future goals to the faculty represented by the senator; and further extending the constitution to include a more direct definition of the senate in addition to listing its functions.

The proposal that received most attention, however, was the switch from the “opt-out” system that had been used to allow individual faculty to decline from standing for election to the Senate, the Advisory Committee, and the IFS, to a new “opt-in” system. The committee felt that this significant change would be likely to increase participation by faculty who desire to serve in Senate, or who are encouraged by their colleagues to stand for election. Early feedback on the plan to switch to an opt-in approach was positive although there was some concern about what would happen if we did not receive enough opt-ins. Based on anecdotal evidence, such as the number of self-nominations in previous election years, the committee concluded that this risk was low. In addition, the committee felt that the risk was mitigated by the decision to move to a smaller senate over a period of three years, providing an opportunity to reconsider the decision in future years. The following table shows details from the ImpCom plan for resizing the senate together with initial data about the number of opt-ins that were received from the faculty as of March 31, 2011. These numbers show that the opt-in approach produced at least twice as many potential candidates as there were positions to be filled in all but one division (SSW). The data also shows a particularly high level of interest in senate participation among All Others (AO).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>CLAS-AL</th>
<th>CLAS-SS</th>
<th>CLAS-SCI</th>
<th>CUPA</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>SFPA</th>
<th>GSE</th>
<th>SSW</th>
<th>LIB</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>OI</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of eligible faculty</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt-Ins received as of 3/31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senators to elect in 2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Communication: The need for improved communication between the Senate and the Faculty was identified in the final report of the 2009-10 ad-hoc committee. As part of this, ImpCom drafted a letter to the faculty to explain the changes that were being made, including details about the switch from opt-out to opt-in nominations for senate elections. A copy of this letter was included as item G-1 in the February 2011 Senate packet, and subsequently posted on the Faculty Senate web page, with a link to this document being sent to all faculty members.

The committee also attempted to develop language and graphics for the new opt-in form that would clearly distinguish it from the previous opt-out form. The intent in changing the form was to minimize the chances that a busy faculty member might fail to notice the change from opt-out to opt-in and then complete the form incorrectly. Unfortunately, some of these changes could not be adopted because of limitations in the format that is used to ensure that returned forms are machine-readable. We do know that some faculty members already in Senate were confused by these forms and returned them unnecessarily. However, we are not aware of any faculty member having returned the form when in fact they had intended to be opting out. The potential for confusion between opt-in and opt-out will be avoided in the future if the decision to use an opt-in approach is continued and becomes well established. Nevertheless, there is probably still potential for making further improvements to clarify the purpose of the form.

Evaluation: ImpCom’s charge included collecting data to evaluate the effectiveness of the constitutional changes that were made in June 2010. The committee believes that this work will span multiple years as the senate transitions to its reduced size and as the changes in the Senate become better known throughout PSU. To assist in this process, ImpCom developed a one-page form that was used to survey members of the Senate who were present at the February 2011 meeting; a total of 62 completed surveys were collected at this time. The survey is designed to be repeated next year, without any changes to the form, so that the results of the two surveys can be tabulated, compared, and used as input to the ongoing evaluation. A copy of the survey form was included in the March 2011 Senate packet (the minutes of the February 2011 Senate meeting).

Our discussions identified some other data sources that we felt would provide useful input for evaluating faculty engagement with the senate, including: changes in attendance at senate meetings (measured as percentages to allow for changes in senate size); the number of faculty who have designated alternates; and participation in elections, including the number of faculty who choose to opt-in as nominees and who cast votes in the election. The committee also felt that it would be useful to conduct an annual review of the topics that have been covered in Senate during the past year to assess relevance and to evaluate the extent to which the Senate has behaved in a strategic rather than a reactive manner.

Unfinished Business: The constitutional amendment that was passed in June 2010, after the completion of that year’s elections process, left us with a Senate whose size and distribution of members were not consistent with the new constitution. To address this, a new amendment has been developed that will allow for variance between the constitution and the senate’s size and distribution while it completes the current transition over the next three years. The new amendment will be presented, with the support of ImpCom, at the June 2011 Senate meeting, and formally brought forward for a vote in October. Once the new amendment is adopted,
ImpCom will deliver its final report and then leave the new steering committee either to manage further details of the transition, or else to appoint a new ad hoc committee to continue the work.

**Recommendations:** The Faculty Senate at PSU is in the process of making some significant changes towards a senate that, in the words of the previous ad-hoc committee, is “more pro-active, more participative, and more effective as an advocate for PSU’s future.” Some of the changes that were recommended by the previous committee have already been enacted (such as the use of an agenda-setting summer retreat for senate leadership, the use of a Presiding Officer Elect position, and the extension of steering committee member terms to two years), while others are still in progress. To further assist the Senate as it makes these changes, the implementation committee offers the following recommendations.

- **Continue the use of opt-ins:** The response to the switch from opt-out to opt-in was good; we believe that this strategy should be continued, and we believe that it will contribute to the goals of a more engaged and participative senate membership. An additional benefit of the opt-in process is that it results in a smaller and more manageable slate of candidates for the election. In past years, the slate for IFS and for Advisory Council exceeded 600 and the slate for CLAS exceeded 200; in both cases, this was the result of faculty failing to return the opt-out form.

- **Streamline the elections process:** The current elections process (including phases for determining eligibility, collecting faculty opt-ins, soliciting nominations from this pool, and then conducting the actual election) is very complex. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some faculty have been confused by the forms that support this process. The reliance on paper forms makes it hard for faculty who are off campus at critical times to participate in the election, and makes it hard for a faculty member to know that their response has been received and not lost or delayed in campus mail. In addition, the nominations and elections forms can only be completed by cross-referencing the forms with information that is published on the web, creating an additional complication and disincentive for faculty participation. Finally, there is a substantial administrative burden to the current elections process, much of which is placed on the Secretary to the Faculty. Responding to these observations, we recommend:
  - **Elimination of the nominations phase:** We believe that the use of an opt-in strategy eliminates the need for an additional nominations process. Eliminating this portion of the elections process will also simplify the overall elections process. In past years, the same nominations process has also been used to finalize the slate for elections to IFS and Advisory Council. Because these are at-large elections, we believe that the nominations phase can also be eliminated in these cases, even though it will result in a larger slate of voters.
  - **Development of an on-line elections system:** We believe that a system using electronic ballots will provide faculty with an easier way to participate in elections, and will allow ballots to be customized to particular individuals or divisions. There are multiple ways to authenticate voters in such systems to prevent unauthorized or duplicate votes. However, in the event that an on-line system is not possible, then a
paper-only solution should be adopted instead so that there is no need for voters to rely on cross referencing between paper and online documents.

- **Modification of the opt-in form:** We believe that the opt-in form should be modified to include information about recent senate activities and priorities, as well as a “job description” for faculty senators. This will provide potential senators, including those who are new to the university or who have no previous experience in senate, with more information to better understand what they are being asked to opt-in to. In addition, it will provide a channel for sharing a brief, mid-year faculty senate update with all members of the faculty.

- **Allocation of resources:** We believe that it is necessary to provide more support for the Secretary of the Faculty in administering the elections process, and to facilitate the development of an on-line elections system.

- **Increase communication through sitting senators:** There is a natural role for sitting senators to play in identifying prospective new senators. We recommend that sitting senators take an active role in organizing and participating in meetings within their divisions to share information about Senate, and to encourage interested faculty to self nominate as part of the opt-in process. Sitting senators can also play a key role in notifying colleagues and encouraging them to step forward if the initial number of opt-ins in a senate division does not meet the target that is needed for the election. We believe that this is a particularly appropriate way to reach out to faculty because of the potential that it has to reinforce the relationship between senators and the constituencies of faculty members that they represent.

- **Continue the use of an agenda setting retreat:** We believe that the agenda setting retreat of faculty senate leadership and chairs of major committees was effective, and that this event should be included in the annual faculty senate calendar.

- **Continue the evaluation process:** The task of tracking progress and evaluating the effectiveness of the senate under the revised constitution is an ongoing process. We believe that this activity requires continuing attention. In particular, we believe that the survey conducted in February 2011 should be repeated at the same time next year, without any changes to the survey form, and the results be tabulated and compared with those from the 2011 survey. Some resources should be allocated to provide support for tabulating and analyzing the data that is collected. This might be accomplished, for example, by hiring a GA to help with the evaluation process.
Resizing the PSU Faculty Senate, 2010-2014
(Version of April 5, 2011)

Background:

In June 2010, the PSU Faculty Senate voted to accept a package of constitutional amendments. Because of modifications to the rules for faculty eligibility, as well as an adjustment in the ratio of senators to faculty from 1:10 to 1:20, the implementation of these changes requires a significant reduction in the size of the senate. The vote, however, occurred shortly after an election, conducted under the rules of the previous constitution, that created a senate with 117 members at the start of the 2010-11 academic year, which is more than twice the number permitted by the new constitution.

To advise the Steering Committee on ways of addressing this and other issues arising from the constitutional revisions, an ad-hoc “Implementation Committee” was formed at the beginning of the 2010-11 academic year. This document describes the specific proposal developed by that committee for managing the transition to a smaller senate. An outline version of this proposal was also presented at the regular meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate in February 2011.

The Implementation Committee Proposal:

A key consideration in the discussions of the implementation committee was that the primary functions of the senate, both as a deliberative assembly and as a representative body, should be preserved throughout the transition. The committee also recognized the need to uphold the rules of the constitution to the greatest extent possible. At the same time, however, the committee determined that an immediate reduction in size, to align with the new constitution, could not be realized without compromising other important provisions such as proportional representation of senators across divisions, and the expectation of a three year term for already elected senators.

As an alternative, the committee developed a plan that would allow the senate to complete its transition to the new, reduced size over a period of three years. Guiding principles in this plan were (i) that sitting senators (i.e., those elected to terms expiring in 2012 or 2013) would be permitted to serve their full term; and (ii) that new senators would continue to be elected each year across all divisions but in reduced numbers, beginning in 2011, as appropriate to the representation of divisions under the new constitution. By following this plan, the senate will reach its new target size after three election cycles with proportional representation by division of the full faculty, and uniform distribution between senators with one, two, or three remaining years of service.

The following table demonstrates concretely how this transition can be managed. The most recent data, as of March 2011, in Column (a), shows the number of eligible faculty in each senate division, while the corresponding numbers of senators, following the new constitution, are shown in Column (b). As indicated, the plan assumes that sitting senators, documented in
Columns (c) and (d), will by default serve the terms for which they were originally elected, while new senators will be elected in accordance with the targets in Column (b). The numbers in Columns (e), (f), and (g) show one schedule for electing new senators over a period of three years, resulting in the distribution and overall senate size that are shown in Columns (h), (i), and (j), respectively. The table shows that the distribution and total number of senators that is achieved in 2013-2014 by following this plan (Column (j)) is an exact match for the targets that are set by the constitution (Column (b)). From that point onwards, the size of the senate can be maintained at essentially the same levels by repeating the schedule in Columns (e), (f), and (g) for electing new senators.

Practical Considerations:

The number of eligible faculty in each division can vary from year to year, so some adjustments to the plan described here will likely be needed in practice. However, barring very unusual circumstances where the size of a division changes by more than thirty faculty in a single year, these adjustments will be small, and it should be easy to adapt the plan as necessary.

It is also very likely that some of the already elected senators whose terms end in 2012 or 2013 will not serve their full term. Under normal circumstances, these positions would be filled using alternates. During the transition, however, the Senate leadership might opt to fill vacated positions in this way only when that is necessary to ensure the level of representation that is required by the new constitution. As a result, the size of the senate may actually reach the new target size before the start of the 2013-14 academic year.
May 9, 2011

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret Everett
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate for Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at [http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com) and looking in the 2010-11 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.a.1
- ESM 570  Environmental Education, 4 credits – change course title to Citizen Environmental Science, change description

**Graduate School of Education**

**New Courses**

E.1.a.2
- CI 527  Literature in the Classroom K-8, 3 credits
  This course focuses on the exploration of literature for students in grades K-8, and the application of literature in the classroom. Emphasis is on selection and evaluation of books, children’s reading interests, classroom applications and school leadership in promoting literature in classroom and school settings.

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.a.3
- CI 547  Advanced Methods-Special Subjects Fields in the Elementary School, 4 credits – change course title to Advanced Elementary Literacy Methods, change to 3 credits, change description

**School of Business Administration**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.a.4
- FIN 511  Economics & Sustainability of the Firm, 6 credits – change course title to Economics & Sustainability of the Firm I & II, change credits (2,4), change course number to FIN 511 and 512, change description

E.1.a.5
- FIN 512  Financial Management, 4 credits - Change course number to FIN 513, change prereqs
E.1.a.6
- ISQA 514  Applied Business Decision Tools, 1 credit (sections A&B) – change course numbers to ISQA 514 and 515, change course titles to Survey Research Techniques and Series and Forecasting Techniques, change description and prereqs

School of Fine and Performing Arts

New Courses
E.1.a.7
- ARCH 543  Topics in Professional Practice, 4 credits
  Focused investigation of key aspects of professional architectural practice through direct case study analysis, reflection and critical appraisal. Emphasis on understanding the application of professionally inspired principles and processes in contemporary architectural practice. Prerequisites: Arch 540.

E.1.a.8
- ARCH 586  Integrated Systems, 6 credits
  A companion course to Architectural Design Studio 9, this studio addresses the integration of building systems through detailed development of the design proposition begun in Arch 582 leading to a comprehensive design. Addresses application and technical documentation of building systems including materials, envelope, environmental controls, building services, and structure. Prerequisites: Arch 582.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses
E.1.a.9
- PA 560  Local Government Administration, 3 credits
  Introduction to public administration practice at the local government level. Addresses those factors that make local government administration unique, but informed by the fact that contemporary local government professionals are closely connected to a wide range of intergovernmental and often cross-sectoral working relationships. Local government administration learn that leadership within the organization, engagement with the community, and work across organizational and jurisdictional boundaries.

E.1.a.10
- PA 561  Intergovernmental Relations, 3 credits
  Addresses the complex web of intergovernmental relations that is essential to the successful operation of public administration and policy throughout the nation. At the core of these relationships is a set of concerns about the political, legal, fiscal and organizational relationships across governments and sectors. Provides an indepth examination of the foundations and challenges of these relationships.

E.1.a.11
- USP 513  Introduction to Landscape Architecture, 3 credits
  An introduction to the history, theory and methods of landscape architecture. Course materials to include key readings from the field, case studies, and hands-on exposure to the thought processes underlying the work of landscape architects.
E.1.a.12
• USP 611 America’s Changing Neighborhoods, 3 credits
  Traces the public and private decisions that have shaped the residential environment of American cities. Examines the tensions among market-based development, community action, and public intervention. Topics range in scale from housing style choices to aggregate trends in metropolitan form and cover a wide range of actors including individual households, private builders and developers, reformers, nonprofit organizations, and governments.

E.1.a.13
• USP 612 Community, Planning, and Ethics, 3 credits
  An introduction to the history and theory of community development in North America, the theory and practice of urban planning in North America, and to the ethics of civic and business practices linking the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Focus on plans as the outcome of political processes with specific consequences for different constituencies within the city.

E.1.a.14
• USP 619 Development Partnerships, 3 credits
  Considers public and private partnerships to develop real estate in terms of the benefits to the wider urban community and policy goals such as affordable housing, community redevelopment to economic development, and sustainability. The course looks at how public and private organizations can meet policy goals, create economic returns, and mitigate risk. Expected preparation: USP 523.

E.1.a.15
• USP 624 Project Design, 3 credits
  Provides an understanding of architectural practice, the value added by design, the intersection of design with broader community concerns and developer’s objectives, and the management of the design process, including tools for decision analysis in all phases of the building design process. Case studies of the major building types will be presented. Expected preparation: USP 523.

E.1.a.16
• USP 625 Green Buildings II, 3 credits
  Applies green building concepts to advanced real estate problems, including the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of existing real estate properties. Properties being covered include retail, office, hotel, industrial, and residential properties. The class will examine techniques for increasing density, recycling materials, improving energy efficiency, and creating healthy work and living environments. The course will look at property management and portfolio management from a green building perspective. Prerequisites: USP 529 Green Buildings I.

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.a.17
• USP 523 Real Estate Development I, 3 credits – change to 4 credits, change prereqs

E.1.a.18
• USP 546 Real Estate Development II, 3 credits – change to 4 credits
TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret Everett
Chair, Graduate Council
Drake Mitchell
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2010-11 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses
E.1.b.1
• ESM 418/518 Landscape Ecology, 4 credits
  Examines the structure, function, and change of natural and human-modified communities at the scale between individual communities and regional biomes. Focuses on spatial patterns and processes as they relate to the patch mosaic of interacting ecological communities. This is the same course as Geog 418/518; may be taken only once for credit. Expected preparation: Geog 313 or Bi 357. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

Graduate School of Education

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.b.2
• CI 474/574 Assessing and Instructing Learners with Literacy Problems, 4 credits – change title to Assessing and Teaching Struggling Elementary Readers, change to 3 credits, change description, drop 400 section

School of Fine and Performing Arts

New Courses
E.1.b.3
• ARCH 433/533 Contemporary Issues Seminar, 4 credits
  In-depth exploration of selected topics that explore contemporary issues informing the discipline of architecture. Whether cultural, social, political, economic, aesthetic,
environmental or other, contemporary issues and voices contribute to the dynamic and evolving production, construction and inhabitation of architecture. Topics may include: visual art, literature, aesthetics, ethics, philosophy, politics, culture(s), and technology. Prerequisites: upper division or graduate standing.

E.1.b.4
- ARCH 434/534 Architectural History and Theory Seminar, 4 credits
  Seminar on selected topics focusing on the history and theory of architecture. Consists of discussions, presentations, lectures, and readings on relevant topics as they have historically emerged within the discipline of architecture. May focus on specific historical periods and/or may include philosophy of architecture, architectural representation, architecture and the city. Course may be repeated for credit with different topics. Prerequisites: upper division or graduate standing.

E.1.b.5
- ARCH 435/535 Topics in Modernism, 4 credits
  Seminar investigating the influences and products of industrialized cultures as they relate to the discipline of architecture. Depending on the instructor, emphasis may be on the critical study of cities, buildings, or landscapes, but each will be explored within the comprehensive understanding of the cultural and social conditions of Modernism. Course may be repeated for credit with different topics. Prerequisites: upper division or graduate standing.

E.1.b.6
- ARCH 462/562 Advanced Architectural Materials, 4 credits
  Seminar building on basic properties of architectural materials learned in Arch 360. A research-based course looking at creative use and reuse of materials for construction emphasizing sustainable solutions. Includes case study investigations of contemporary innovative material usage and student-designed building component. Prerequisites: Arch 362 or graduate standing.

Change to Existing Courses

E.1.b.7
- ARCH 430/530 Contemporary Architectural Theory, 4 credits – separate 400 and 500 sections

E.1.b.8
- ARCH 460/560 Advanced Architectural Technology, 4 credits – separate 400 and 500 sections, change prereqs

E.1.b.9
- ARCH 467/567 Advanced Architectural Structures, 4 credits – separate 400 and 500 sections, change prereqs
May 9, 2011

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Margaret Everett
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.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 20010-11 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

School of Business Administration

New Program
E.1.a.1
• Master of Real Estate Development (two-page summary attached)
Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program
Leading to the Masters of Real Estate Development

Summary

The proposed Master of Real Estate Development (MRED) is a professional degree that will train students in the areas of real estate development within the context provided by principles of community and sustainability-based development. The objective for this program is to provide a unique and exceptional Masters degree that will enable students to develop property or assist in the development of property with an understanding of the role that such development plays in the context of broader community concerns and history, and in the context of the larger community and city themselves.

The program is designed to train the next generation of real estate professionals to be familiar with both the requirements for successful real estate development and the norms and expectations of doing real estate development in a manner that builds community capacity and ensures sustainability. By its nature, real estate education is multi-disciplinary, involving finance, economics, urban planning, architecture, law, engineering, appraisal, and other disciplines. Over time, real estate education has changed from being a “master and apprentice” type of profession to a multi-disciplinary specialization that draws from many fields and requires advanced education.

Our aim is to explicitly use our community as a primary “text” for this program. The proposed curriculum will rely heavily on case studies of actual development projects, project histories, and their community, economic, and environmental impacts, and on the interaction between professionals in the real estate industry, community development professionals, urban planners, and academic professionals within the University. The programs currently operated by the PSU Center for Real Estate – the Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Development, Major in Real Estate Finance, and the Minor in Real Estate Development - rely upon these connections, so that developers, bankers, market analysts, appraisers, architects, and engineers are teaching classes built upon their professional expertise.

PROPOSED CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN THEORY</th>
<th>USP 611: America’s Changing Neighborhoods (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USP 612: Community, Planning, and Ethics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USP 569: Sustainable Cities and Regions (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE AND</td>
<td>RE 521: Real Estate Finance I (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>RE 522: Real Estate Finance II (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE 548: Real Estate Market Analysis (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE/USP 573: Housing Economics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USP 596: Affordable Housing Finance (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DEVELOPTMENT</td>
<td>USP 523: Real Estate Development I (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>USP 527: Downtown Revitalization (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USP 546: Real Estate Development II (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USP 624: Project Design (3)
RE/USP 538: Real Estate Law (3)

EXEC BRIEFING
RE 531: Executive Briefing (1)

CAPSTONE
RE 562: Real Estate Development Workshop (4)

Electives: 18 credits
Total: 68 credits

In developing this proposal, three additional full-time faculty members have been hired to create a critical mass for managing the curriculum, overseeing the admissions process, advising admitted students, assisting student recruitment, and creating relationships with other programs and initiatives in the school, the college, across the university, and in the community.

The first position was achieved with the hiring of Gerard Mildner by the School of Business Administration in Fall, 2009, with the replacement of his position in the School of Urban Studies and Planning in Fall, 2010.

The second position will be filled by Julia Freybote in the School of Business Administration. Ms. Freybote is finishing her PhD in Real Estate at Georgia State University. She will be joining Portland State in September, 2011 and will be responsible for teaching courses in real estate finance.

The third position will be filled by Dr. Matthew Gebhart in the School of Urban Studies and Planning. Dr. Gebhart has a PhD in planning from Columbia University and has been teaching at the University of Sheffield in England. He be joining Portland State in December, 2011 and will be responsible for teaching the case study courses in urban real estate development.

There is no budgetary impact beyond the funding of these positions. Support of this program should have no adverse impact on any other institutional programs at the University. No other competing program exists in the state of Oregon.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT to the PSU Faculty Constitution

Article V, Section 2

New Paragraph 6:

6) Transition to Appropriate Senate Size.

a) Pursuant to an amendment to this Constitution adopted in 2010, the size of the Senate has been reduced as provided in Section 2, Paragraph 1 of this Article. The Senate will transition to this reduced size during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years.

b) The Senate Steering Committee and the Secretary to the Faculty shall make best efforts during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years to transition to the required Senate size while striving to maintain proportional representation among divisions and staggered terms among Senators. Provided that each division is represented by at least one Senator, precise adherence to the size of the Senate required by Section 2, Paragraph 1 of this Article or to the proportional representation required by Section 1, Paragraph 2 of this Article are not required during the transition.

c) This Section 2, Paragraph 6 of this Article is repealed effective June 30, 2014.
Annual Report of the Advisory Council

May 16, 2011

Membership, 2010-2011
Bob Liebman, Sociology, Chair (first 6 months)
Scott Burns, Geology, Chair (last 3 months)
Gwen Shusterman, Chemistry
Agnes Hoffman, Assoc. Vice Provost (last 3 months)
Linda Walton, History
Patricia Wetzel, World Languages
Leslie McBride, CAE

Article VI. Section 4. Powers and Duties.

The Council shall: 1) Serve as an advisory body to the President on matters of policy. 2) Serve the President as a committee on ad hoc University-wide committees. 3) Appoint membership of hearing committees and panels as required by the Administrative Regulations of the Oregon State System of Higher Education and the Faculty Conduct Code. 4) Perform those duties related to constitutional amendments, as described in Article VIII. 5) Upon its own initiative or upon the initiative of a member of the Faculty, the Senate or the administration give advice to the President on the meaning and interpretation of this Constitution. 6) Conduct studies and make recommendations on matters of faculty welfare to be presented to the President and/or the Senate. 7) Report at least once each year to the Senate. It may report, with or without recommendation, on any legislation or matters referred to it. This report may be unanimous or in the form of a majority and minority report.

This year the Council addressed a number of issues of interest to the president and/or the faculty, including the Stott Center, budget, reorganization of OUS, general communication strategies, campus safety, campus administration, and the curriculum. Traditionally, minutes are not kept and details of the meetings are kept confidential in order to enhance open and frank discussions. We will be discussing the upcoming Constitutional Amendment in June. We met monthly to discuss issues of current significance to the university community.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Burns
Professor of Geology and Chair
The Budget Committee was given two charges on top of their normal responsibilities during the Senate summer retreat of 2010. The two charges were assessing the budgetary implications of the Online Learning Initiative and charge-back by Facilities for work requested by Departments. These particular topics were at the forefront of concerns raised in the Senate survey of faculty concerns that were in the scope of the Budget Committees responsibilities. Individual Budget Committee reports on those topics are attached.

The Budget Committee also participated in discussions of proposed Administrative solutions to the cuts necessary if the Governor’s budget proposal for OUS passes in the Legislature. The Administration was forthcoming with the Committee as to the constraints from the current budget as well as incorporating recurring budget reductions from the previous legislative budget. Fortunately the Administration anticipated the present reductions and had built up one-time fund balances to soften the impact of anticipated budget reductions in this biennium. These fund balances are not recurring funds. Compounding the short-term budget picture was a significant budget deficit in CLAS. Consequently budget reductions and new revenues are necessary in this next biennium to balance the budget. Maintaining fund balances was a prudent fiscal policy. The Administration’s actions to handle these recurring reductions require a combination of new revenue streams (tuition increases of about 9% each year and a modest 2% enrollment growth increase), a 30% sweep of instructional fund balances and a 40% sweep of non-instructional balances and some permanent budget reductions (3%). Obviously until the legislature passes a budget and allows the proposed tuition increases the financial situation could change. The administrative consultants to the Committee were willing participants in presenting the problem and dealing with Committee concerns as to their proposed solutions.

The Budget Committee also reviewed proposals for a variety of changes in existing programs and new programs for their fiscal soundness. This was facilitated by budgetary forms developed by the Budget Committee over the past two years in concert with the Administration. Though there are still some kinks in the process, there were at least fiscal data required that allowed the Committee to evaluate these proposals with some degree of fiscal objectivity relative to sustainability. The Committee refused to participate in the review of a “proposed” program where faculty were hired and/or being searched for and the second class of graduate students admitted to a program that had not gone through
review by the Graduate Council and Budget Committee. It seemed our review would be a charade to involve faculty after the Dean and Provost had effectively put the program in place without Senate approval.

**Facilities Chargeback Policies**

The Budget Committee reviewed the financial operation of Facilities. This review was initiated as a result of faculty concerns raised in a Senate survey. The budgetary concerns were principally: 1) the chargeback system initiated by Facilities when help from facilities was requested by departments since there was no budgetary support for Facilities work in departmental budgets; and 2) clarification of what Facilities' services could be expected as baseline, non-chargeback services.

Mark Gregory and Robyn Pierce presented a synopsis of the current financial status of Facilities on 11/19/10. The financial dilemma for Facilities has been that since a budget cut 5-6 years ago, a minority (only about 40%) of the facilities staff are supported by E&G Funds from Finance and Administration, the remainder by contingent support from other budgets on campus (E&G and grants). This has necessitated a distinction between work that is covered by the base Facilities budget versus projects that require a budget number for them to be completed by the contingent staff. This confusion and method of funding has the advantage of allowing a larger staff on hand to handle major projects and the needs of campus growth, but has the disadvantage of asking Facilities to operate in an entrepreneurial fashion in a financially strapped microcosm. As a consequence of justifying and paying for themselves and the overhead associated with chargebacks, the costs of projects are inflated. The inflated costs again creates rancor from the faculty. Faculty are generally unaware of this dichotomy for funding work requests from Facilities.

A list of which duties fit in which categories (contingent work vs. baseline service) was provided to the committee and is now up on the Facilities website. Confusion between covered versus contingent services has been a source of confusion and source of some of the rancor between Facilities and the faculty. The clarification of base covered work requests should alleviate some of the confusion and rancor.

It is also clear that the current method is not an optimal budgetary solution to support facilities. Services are required at distributed campus locales without increased budgetary support, and current funding does not adequately fund increased space with enrollment growth. Clearly enhanced space utilization is a component of enhancing facilities service in restricted budgetary times by centralizing obligations for service. The Budget Committee feels that a greater fraction of the Facilities budget should be funded by E&G funds. This will not only allow Facilities to discharge their responsibilities more effectively by decreasing accounting costs, but also increase campus morale.
Summary of Discussions Regarding Online Initiative

PSU Faculty Senate Budget Sub-Committee, April 25, 2011 (final draft)

Members: Kal Toth, Patricia Wetzel, Duncan Kretovich, Cheryl Livneh, Kristen Pedersen, Stan Hillman

PSU’s President, strongly supported at the executive level, envisions online education to be a key ingredient of PSU’s academic and financial future. On October 22nd the Provost announced that an integrated Center for Online Learning (COL) is being established. We understand that the fee for online courses levied last year has been doubled from $15/$30 per SCH for hybrid/online courses to $30/$60 per SCH effective winter 2011.

Nov 5th 2010 Meeting

Provost Roy Koch (RK) presented a preliminary budget and breakdown for the new center indicating that the proposed hybrid/online fee would be used to support all development and operation of online learning at PSU in order to avoid the use of any general funds for that purpose. The Faculty Senate Budget Committee discussed several issues relating to the levying and application of the online fee including (i) impacts on faculty and students; (ii) re-purposing of E&G budgets currently funding online services and capacity; (iii) implications of the state approving the charging of online fees; (iv) possible unintended consequences of charging online/hybrid fees; (v) possible consequences of not crediting online students for classroom space they are liberating; (vi) the rationale behind using the online fee to pay for licensing and support costs for the learning management system (D2L) given the fairly extensive use of D2L to support web-enhanced classes; the need to align online fees with online expenses. The Budget Committee submitted these and related questions to the Provost for later discussion. RK agreed to invite Vice Provost for Academic Programs & Instruction Melody Rose to address these issues at the next opportunity. The Budget Committee established a subcommittee to explore issues related to the online initiative.

Nov 19th 2010 Meeting

An update by the ad hoc subcommittee on the topic of online fees was provided and discussed.

Dec 10th 2010 Meeting

Vice Provost Melody Rose (MR) distributed and discussed: (i) the announcement of the Center for Online Learning (COL); (ii) the draft position description for the COL Director to be recruited by 7/1/11; (iii) the PSU trend lines for # of courses and # of SCH for online and partially online (a.k.a. hybrid); (iv) draft 2011-2012 budget for the Center for Online Learning. A round table discussion was held of all the points identified (above) at the December 5th meeting. The need to incentivize faculty to develop and deliver online/hybrid courses was raised. The
discussion also addressed the possible need to market and brand online/hybrid PSU courses to provide assurances that enrollments would generate the required fees to fund this initiative.

The Budget Committee was encouraged by Melody Rose’s explanation and assurances that the draft budget was a preliminary financial model only, and that the new Director, once staffed and on board, would be charged to develop a comprehensive strategic plan for the Center which would take into consider these questions within the context of PSU’s overall strategic plan and vision including that of the Financial Futures Committee.

On behalf of the subcommittee, Kal Toth presented to all present (including RK and MR) a preliminary exploration of articles and issues relating to online course development, delivery, and marketing costs including comparisons to face-to-face delivery costs. The questions previously presented at the December 5th meeting were updated and expanded to address issues of enrollment estimates going forward, fee elasticity, and marketing costs. Kristen Pedersen (Extended Studies) said that she would contribute further to this initial compilation of relevant support information (which she provided in early 2011).

Kevin Reynolds (Vice Provost Academic Fiscal Strategies and Planning) responded to the Budget Committee’s concerns about transparently rationalizing center funding indicating that a revised draft budget would be produced to better align sources of funds and center costs.

It was agreed that the revised budget for the Center be brought back to the Budget Committee for review and that the raising and application of university-wide distance learning fees be discussed at the Budget Committee to reflect on university-wide implications.

January to April 2011 Meetings

The Budget Committee was concerned about the reality of the budget but recognized further was expected to be done to refine it once the new Director was appointed. The COL budget element allocating $52,000 to copyright verification software was discussed in the context of online learning materials and objects. It was subsequently clarified by Melody Rose, Sharon Blanton and Adriene Lim that this was an error and that the budget would likely be applied to fund a copyright compliance person.

The committee was also informed that a new federal regulation has been introduced, effective July 1st, 2011 (now extended to 2014) requiring universities to obtain certification for each state in which they serve online students (apparently PSU is present in 49 states).

The committee raised the question of liability for copyright violations which was ultimately addressed by our legal counsel David Reese. He explained that copyright infringement liability would depend on the particular facts of a case and
that the university would defend and indemnify an employee unless their actions constituted malfeasance or willful or wanton neglect.

For the sake of liability and litigation prevention, it would therefore be prudent for the University to make both faculty and administrative units aware of our copyright obligations when incorporating copyrighted media and learning objects of others into our online instructional materials. Similarly it would be prudent for the University to ensure that faculty and administrative units understand and comply with faculty ownership rights (copyright) as they pertain to instructional materials used in online course delivery (note: in 2009 this was reinforced in the collective bargaining agreement).

**Summary of Recommendations and Questions Related to the Online Initiative (2010-11)**

1. The rationale for charging students with an online/hybrid fee, given that such students liberate classroom space and make less or no use of campus facilities, should be reviewed.
2. The rationale behind using the online fee to pay for online learning technologies while web-enhanced courses leverage these same technologies, but do not require payment of a fee, should be reviewed.
3. Regarding the budgets and tasks to support PSU’s copyright obligations:
   a. Does the COL budget adequately cover copyright compliance for online learning?
   b. What will be the roles of the library, OIT, faculty, administrative units, central administration, and the COL in the support of copyright compliance for online, hybrid and web-enhanced learning?
4. This committee recommends the implementation of an ongoing process that promulgates the obligations of faculty and administrative units to protect the copyrights of faculty and other owners of media, learning objects and instructional materials used to deliver online, hybrid, and web enhanced courses.
5. This committee recommends that once the new COL Director produces an updated budget for the Center that it be provided to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee for review and comment.
6. The committee requests that the new COL Director develop a strategy and infrastructure to achieve certification for the delivery of online courses to students in other states under the new federal regulation.

The committee looks forward to discussing these issues with the COL Director once brought on board.

Note: As we were beginning to finalize our report we received a copy of an interim report by the “Ad-Hoc Committee on Online Learning” consisting of members Candyce Reynolds, Cynthia Brown, Linda George, Robert Gould, Rachel Hardesty. Our findings 2 and 4 above agree with the findings of their report; and there is no overlap or conflict with our findings in 1, 3, 5 and 6 above.
To: PSU Faculty Senate  
From: Ray Johnson, Educational Policies Committee Chair  
RE: Educational Policies Committee Annual Report 2010-2011

Understanding University Growth
During the year the EPC worked on developing a better understanding PSU’s short term and long term policies regarding enrollment growth. The purpose of this discussion has been to understand the PSU’s policies for growth and the benefits and consequences of that growth. Some of the broader questions of the committee are as follows:

- How has the administration weighed the pros and cons of growth?
- What is the primary purpose of growth?
  - To increase access?
  - To backfill state budget reductions?
- Do we have a strategic plan for growth over the next 3-5 years?

The table below outlines only a few of the changes that PSU has experienced in the last decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time Equivalent Enrollment</th>
<th>2001-2</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Div</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Div</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>18,107</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>2001 04</th>
<th>2009 04</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tenure</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Term- Full Time</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Term- Adjunct</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>103.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee raised a variety of preliminary concerns that are the byproduct of university growth. Some of these are as follows:

Issues that may affect student success
- Concerns about admitting students that are not ready for university level study. We acknowledge that the administration has taken steps to address this issue which is having an impact on student success.
- Faculty raised concerns about jamming 50 or 60 students into classrooms that were designed to hold 40 – 45 students. We are filling flat classrooms to absolute capacity, sometimes with chairs brought in from the hallway, and it is affecting the quality of discussion and student interaction in the classroom.
- Faculty are more frequently having full classes and are turning away students in required courses. This is more than just an issue of getting a
class at a convenient time. Rather, faculty are seeing more students having to wait a term to get a required class in the curriculum. The result hampers student’s ability to make timely progress towards degrees. When students are blocked out of full classes, can a full time student reasonably expect to complete a degree in four years?

**Do we have the appropriate faculty and infrastructure to accomplish growth?**

- Many faculty feel that we are serving more students by:
  - Moving more full time faculty to administrative positions to manage new programs and growth, with the addition of adjunct faculty rather than tenure track faculty
  - When faculty buy out of teaching to work on research grants, this also contributes to hiring more adjunct faculty.
- With a higher proportion of adjunct faculty committee staffing is problematic.
- Do we have the physical capacity to accomplish growth? See the comments above about jamming student into classrooms.
- How has median or average class sizes changed during the last decade?
- Are we fighting among ourselves to obtain students? As departments become more revenue driven, is there an issue where we are all trying to serve the same students?
- At what point does the cost of new facilities to accommodate growth, and adding full time faculty to accommodate growth, cost more than revenues gained by additional students?
- Do we have the facilities and space to accommodate growth in both students and research?
- The library is cutting back on acquiring monographs and books that are often needed by faculty and students due to space and budget constraints. The library is also sending books and journals off-site to make more room for students.
- The library is more crowded with students occupying most of the seats on a typical day. There are long waits for computers in the library.
- Growth often means new programs and new grants that bring additional dollars into the university. These programs and grants rely on additional resources, yet the library is typically not allocated any additional dollars with new grants and programs--even when such funds are written into the grant budget! The library is concerned that funding for collections and services is not keeping up with demand as expanded grants and new programs come into place.
- Do we have the housing infrastructure to accommodate out of state or foreign students?

**Questions about planning for growth?**

- How are we planning thoughtfully for growth at the department level?
- Is there a plan for expected growth from: Freshman?
Transfer students?
Graduate students?

How are we planning for growth with out of state and foreign students vs. in state students? Are we looking to substitute out of state students for in state students? Or are we looking for additional students from out of state and foreign locations?

What happens if the economy gets better and we don’t accomplish planned growth?

Is online learning intended to be a new revenue center and as source of growth in student FTE?

This continues to be a work in progress. This issue surrounding university growth and the resultant change in faculty mix are in large part reflected in the Proposed Joint Resolution of the Faculty Senate and the AAUP that passed the faculty senate in May 2011.

Routine Approvals Processed by the Educational Policies Committee
During the year the EPC processed a variety of approvals that are referred to the EPC. The EPC forwarded its approval to the Faculty Senate for the following items.

- Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling
- Name Change for from the Department of Native American Studies to the Department of Indigenous Nation Studies
- Proposal for a new prefix for classes taught by the Library
- Name Change for from the Department of Theater to the Department of Theater and Film

PSU Performance Measures
During Spring Term 2011 the EPC began a project related to PSU Performance Measures. The draft charge to the committee is as follows:

The general purpose of performance measures it to provide an organization with important information about its products, services, and the processes that produce them. They are tools to help stakeholders understand, manage, and improve what organizations do.

The Oregon University System tracks the performance of its seven universities in order to monitor improvement and examine trends that may affect higher education in the state. However, many university performance measures focus on more traditional institutions. Portland State University is the urban university in the Oregon University System, and as such, its many of its characteristics are significantly different from the other OUS institutions. For example, in the Fall of 2004 PSU admitted 1,087 new freshmen students. Six years later in June of 2010 only 34% of those entering freshmen had graduated. This might lead one to believe that PSU granted about 370 undergraduate degrees in 2010. Yet in June of 2010 PSU actually granted 3,532 undergraduate degrees. Portland State University needs better metrics of student success.

While traditional university performance measures may be important to track, it is important for PSU to develop its own performance measures that are useful for understanding and managing the university. Performance measures should:
• Help us understand how well we are doing as an urban university.
• Tell us something important about our services and the processes that produce them.
• Be understandable and help us identify if, and where, improvements are necessary.
• Help us determine if we are meeting our goals.
• Be sensitive to the campus themes of providing civic leadership through partnerships, improving student success, achieving global excellence, enhancing educational opportunity, and expanding resources and improving effectiveness.

The EPC is charged with working with the PSU administration to develop a limited set of performance measures that will help the university better understand and manage the process of achieving university goals. In the long term measures should be developed surrounding undergraduate education, graduate education, research and community outreach. In the near term it is particularly important to develop useful and informative measures surrounding student success, first at the undergraduate level and then at the graduate level. It would be particularly helpful if an initial draft of student success measures are completed during the spring term 2011. The EPC can then continue the project in other areas during academic year 2011-2012.

The committee’s first meeting with the office of institutional research and planning was May 9, 2011. We will have a verbal update for the Senate at the June Senate meeting.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 9, 2011

To: Faculty Senate

From: Margaret Everett, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Annual report of the Graduate Council for the 2010-2011 academic year

The Graduate Council has been composed of the following members during the past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Years Served</th>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Beasley</td>
<td>09-11</td>
<td>LIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Bodegom</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Everett</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toetu Faaleava</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>AOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Fletcher</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>OIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gould</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo Lafferriere</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Maty</td>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>CUPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Mildner</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Morris</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nash</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candyce Reynolds</td>
<td>09-11</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Robillard</td>
<td>08-11</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rueter</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would also like to acknowledge the ongoing assistance provided by the Council’s consultants from the Office of Graduate Studies and from the Office of Academic Affairs: Melody Rose, DeLys Orlund, Courtney Ann Hanson, Steve Harmon, Beth Holmes, and Diane Mikkelson.

The Graduate Council has met approximately twice per month during the academic year to address graduate policy issues, and to review proposals for new graduate programs, program changes, new courses, and course changes. Teams of Council members have also read and recommended on the disposition of graduate petitions.

I. Graduate Policy and Procedures

Graduate Council activity regarding graduate policy and procedures included the following:

- At the recommendation of the Office of Graduate Studies, the Council reviewed PSU’s current policy that graduate pre-admission and transfer credits can only be letter graded B- or higher; Pass grades are not acceptable. The review was prompted because graduate petitions requesting the use of pre-admission and/or transfer credits graded Pass have a nearly 100%
approval rate. After examining policies at our peer institutions and considerable discussion, GC did not recommend any change to our current policy. Rather, the council recommends better communication to department chairs that the petition process is available for students in instances where pre-admission or transfer credits graded Pass might be appropriate.

- The Council approved a change in the graduate academic standing policy. The Office of Graduate Studies asked the Council to review the policy in light of one particular feature: students can be academically disqualified without their cumulative GPA ever having gone below 3.0, i.e. based on low term probation only. After reviewing the policies of our peer institutions and discussion, the Council voted to recommend that Faculty Senate remove the low term probation category. The Office of Graduate Studies will continue to send warning letters to students whose term GPA is below 2.67.

- The Council discussed the changes to the X and M grade policies, which were approved by Faculty Senate in February 2011. With the approval of the new X and M grade guidelines by Faculty Senate, Graduate Council discussed the possibility of implementing an I to F policy in order to prevent grade abuse from shifting to the I grade. After considerable discussion, it was decided that the Office of Graduate Studies would generate data about I grades and Graduate Council members will discuss this issue with department colleagues in preparation for future discussion of this issue.

- The Council also had extensive discussions about whether or not to approve new courses that are cross listed in a number of departments. In order to consider such proposals, the Council revisited the policy approved by Faculty Senate in 2000 regarding cross listing, and the subsequent clarification of the policy in 2005. These policies make clear that cross listing is limited to the same course being offered by two departments if each unit has a qualified faculty member who can teach the course. The Council will continue to work with programs and departments to support interdisciplinary programs while working within Faculty Senate guidelines regarding cross listing.

II. New Programs and Program Changes

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the proposals for new programs and program changes recommended for approval by the Council and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate (except where noted). Many of these proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications during the review process. Proposals that are still under review are noted later in this report.

Table 1. New Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Real Estate Development</td>
<td>SBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Program Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA in Anthropology</td>
<td>Add MS option</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Course Proposals

Table 3 summarizes information on the new course and course change proposals submitted by the various units. A total of 49 new course proposals were reviewed and recommended to the Senate for approval, along with 31 proposals for changes to existing courses. Many course proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications as part of the review process, most of which in turn were received back and processed during the year.

**Table 3. Summary of Proposals related to courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>New Course Proposals</th>
<th>Course Chg. Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Credit</td>
<td>2 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Petitions

Teams of Graduate Council members reviewed 40 petitions and issued 43 decisions. The distribution of these petitions among the various categories is presented in Table 4. As in past years, the most common petition was the extension of the 1-year limit on Incomplete grades.

Table 5 shows that the total number of petitions continues to decline, even as the number of graduate degrees awarded has been trending upward, again with some fluctuations. In other words, the proportion of graduate students needing to rely on petitions to complete their degree programs has declined significantly. The Council interprets this as a sign of improved graduate advising in the respective academic units, as well as closer scrutiny of petitions by departments before they are forwarded to Graduate Council.
### Table 4. Petitions acted on by the Graduate Council during the 2010-2011 academic year (since the last Annual Report May 6, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Petition Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Percent of Total Petitions</th>
<th>Percent Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>INCOMPLETES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Waive one year deadline for Incompletes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on coursework</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on transfer courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DISQUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Extend probation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Readmission after disqualification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TRANSFER CREDITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Accept more transfer or pre-admission credit than allowed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8*††</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Accept reserved credits before 45 credits of bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Accept non-graded transfer credits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Accept miscellaneous transfer credits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Unusual transfer case (allow transfer credits applied to another degree)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>PhD &amp; DISSERTATION PROBLEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>Extend 5 years from advancement to graduation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Apply UG repeat policy to GR credit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>Refund tuition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes partial approvals
†indicates more than one request category on a single petition; total reflects 43 decisions on 40 petitions
Table 5. Historical overview of number of petitions, approval rate, and graduate degrees granted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Petitions</th>
<th>Percent Approved</th>
<th>Grad Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>Ratio of Approved Petitions to Grad Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>[not yet available]</td>
<td>[not yet available]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Program Proposals in Progress

• There are no new program proposals pending at this time.

VI. Future Graduate Policy

• The Council continues to have concerns about distinguishing between graduate and undergraduate requirements in conjoint 400/500-level (so-called “slash”) courses, and may work on developing more specific policies for departments to follow in this regard.

• In the coming year, the Council will revisit the question of I grades, and whether a policy change is needed in order to prevent misuse of this grade category.

• The Council will continue to work with the Vice Provost for Academic Programs & Instruction and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee on implementing the new pre-submission process for new program proposals. The new process has addressed the Council’s concerns about assessing the financial viability of proposed programs, but some fine tuning of the process may improve communication with departments.
Honors Council:
2010-2011 Annual Report to the PSU Faculty Senate
6 June 2011

Council chair:
Luckett, Thomas (History)

Council members:
Atkinson, Dean (Chemistry)
Bartlett, Michael (Biology)
Fost, Joshua (Philosophy)
Heilmair, Barbara (Music)
Holmes, Haley (School of Business Administration)
Johnson, Gwynn (Civil and Env. Eng)
McElhone, Dorothy (Education)
Morgaine, Carol (School of Social Work)
Natter, Betsy (University Studies)
Ott, John (History)
Valdini, Melody (Political Science)
Weston, Claudia (Library)
York, William (University Honors)

Consultants:
Fallon, Ann Marie (University Studies Council)
Harmon, Steven (Academic Affairs)
Rose, Melody (Academic Affairs)
Wheeler, Lawrence (University Honors)

On 1 November 2010 the PSU Faculty Senate approved an amendment to the Faculty Constitution creating the Honors Council. In December the Committee on Committees chose the chair and members of the Honors Council, which first met on 10 January 2011, and thereafter on the first Monday of each month. Given our late start, and the time needed to consider our charge, the Council began work this year on a number of projects that we did not have time to complete. This first annual report is thus largely an interim report on work that will continue into next year. Nevertheless we have completed work on one large item that we considered especially urgent: Establishing general procedures for the creation or revision of departmental honors tracks.

Completed business:
Proposal for new procedures for creation or revision of departmental honors tracks

Existing procedures for the approval or revision of departmental honors tracks were considered inadequate at several levels: 1) they did not provide uniform standards for honors tracks, 2) they did not require a full description of honors tracks in the PSU course
catalog, and 3) they provided for approval of honors tracks in a manner that largely escaped faculty governance, in apparent non-compliance with the Faculty Constitution. Article 4, section O of the Faculty Constitution empowers the Honors Council to remedy this problem by authorizing the Council to "establish general procedures and regulations for the University Honors Program and departmental honors tracks." In acting on that charge, the Council considered that the creation or revision of a departmental honors track is a special type of change to an existing degree program, and should be processed in a manner similar to other changes to existing degree programs.

In order to provide a better procedure for the creation or revision of departmental honors tracks, the Honors Council therefore proposes to the faculty senate the resolution that appears in detail at the end of the present report.

**Continuing business (subject to further work in 2011-12):**

- The Honors Council recommends to the Academic Advising Council and the Office of Academic Affairs that, as part of our current initiative to improve academic advising at PSU, a professional advisor should be appointed at 0.50 FTE to counsel high achieving students on such issues as Honors Program requirements, honors track requirements, and applications to graduate programs and nationally competitive fellowships. (This position might be combined with that of pre-law advisor at 0.50 FTE, so that the same advisor would counsel students applying to either graduate school or law school.)
- The Honors Council asks the Office of Student Affairs to consider designating a wing of one of PSU’s new residence halls (currently under construction) as an honors residence.
- The Honors Council proposes to establish certain privileges for Honors Program and honors track students, including early course registration and extended library privileges comparable to those of graduate students.
- The Honors Council intends to put mechanisms in place by which all currently enrolled Honors Program and departmental honors track students will be so designated in Banner with appropriate activity codes.
- The Honors Council proposes to integrate departmental honors tracks with the University Honors Program by establishing a rule whereby all upper-division students admitted to departmental honors tracks are simultaneously admitted to the Honors Program at the upper-division level. This rule would have the effect of exempting departmental honors track students from upper-division University Studies courses, and thus allow departments greater flexibility to devise honors course offerings. Some details remain to be worked out. In particular, we will need to determine how honors track students are to complete the balance of their upper-division general education coursework through Honors Program courses, and how such courses will be organized and staffed.
- The Honors Council intends to work closely with the Honors Program to clarify its course requirements in the PSU course catalog, and move omnibus numbered courses to discrete course numbers. Similarly, the Honors Council intends to work with departments to clarify catalog descriptions of course requirements for
established departmental honors tracks. We will work with the Degree Requirements Office to encode course requirements for the Honors Program and all honors tracks in DARS.

- The Honors Council plans to work closely with the Honors Program to create new upper-division interdisciplinary seminars that departmental faculty may be invited to teach on a rotational basis, thereby expanding curricular opportunities for high achieving students across disciplines.
- Subject to available funding, the Honors Council will seek to organize certain annual public events bringing together high achieving students from all disciplines for guest lectures, research presentations, intellectual exchange and academic recognition.
- The Honors Council will continue to study the best practices of honors programs and colleges at other universities, and will consider how to recruit high achieving students to PSU earlier and more proactively.

**Proposed resolution submitted to the PSU Faculty Senate, 6 June 2011:**

- Any department or program wishing to create or revise an honors track must complete and submit the attached form, entitled "Proposal for Addition or Revision of Optional Departmental Honors Track to Existing Undergraduate Degree Program," with all appropriate signatures. (This form will be distributed electronically through the OAA website.)
- This form establishes a few basic requirements for honors tracks, notably:
  - Requirements for admission to and completion of the honors track must be detailed fully in the PSU course catalog.
  - The honors track must include at least eight credits (two terms) of independent study and/or specialized departmental coursework.
  - The honors track must include the completion and presentation of a thesis or comparable final product appropriate to the discipline, representing the full summation of a coherent original creation or line of inquiry.
- After approval by the department and college/school, the proposal must be reviewed by the Honors Council. After approval by the Honors Council, the proposal proceeds to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Steering Committee and Senate for final approval. This process is in keeping with Article 4, section O of the Faculty Constitution, which charges the Honors Council to "Coordinate with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to review recommendations to the Senate regarding the creation of new honors tracks or for changes in the requirements of existing tracks."
- For the time being, departments with honors tracks established prior to 2011 are not required to bring themselves into compliance with the above regulations. Nevertheless the Honors Council intends to work with departments on a voluntary basis to bring their established honors tracks into compliance, and may move to require such compliance in a future year.
PROPOSAL FOR ADDITION OR REVISION OF OPTIONAL DEPARTMENTAL HONORS TRACK TO EXISTING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM:

INSTRUCTIONS

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies has the responsibility to provide direction to the institutional consideration of program changes under discussion in various academic units. Proposed changes in existing instructional programs should be communicated to the college/school Dean for review prior to the preparation of a formal document.

Schools/colleges should submit ONE paper copy with ALL REQUIRED SIGNATURES to Academic Affairs; in addition please submit via email one electronic copy (which may be unsigned) to Steve Harmon in Academic Affairs (harmons@pdx.edu). Departments, schools or colleges generating proposals should prepare enough additional copies to satisfy their own internal procedures.

Request for the following change(s) in __________________________________________________________ in
(degree program: BA, BS, BM, BFA, BSW, etc.)
__________________________________________ ; __________________________________________
(major name) (specialty area, if applicable)

Reproduce existing catalog statement in full:

Leave blank if there is no existing catalog description of the honors track

Reproduce proposed catalog statement in full noting changes (using strikethrough for deletions and underline for additions):

NOTE: At a minimum, the proposed statement should include:
  ▪ The requirements for admission to the departmental honors track
  ▪ The requirements for completion of the departmental honors track, including
    o At least eight credits (two terms) of independent study and/or specialized departmental coursework
    o The completion and presentation of a thesis or comparable final product appropriate to the discipline, representing the full summation of a coherent original creation or line of inquiry
  ▪ An explanation of how the requirements for completion of the departmental honors track will coordinate with those of the PSU Honors Program.

Rationale for the proposed departmental honors track (a statement of justification detailing the academic soundness of the proposal, projected development of supporting curricula, budgetary support and availability of faculty and other resources):

Request prepared by __________________________ Date ________

Approved by Unit (i.e. Department) Curriculum Committee __________________________ Date ________

Approved by Department Chair __________________________ Date ________

Approved by College/School Curriculum Committee __________________________ Date ________

Approved by College/School Dean __________________________ Date ________
Intercollegiate Athletics Board

Annual Report, May 2011

Members 2010-11 academic year

Chair: David Burgess, OIRP  
Melissa Trifiletti, ADM  
Chris Monsere, ECS  
Scott Burns, GEOL  
Robyn Pierce, FAC  
Donovan Powell, student (resigned 04/2011)  
Sean Green, student (appointed 04/2011)  
Mart Stewart-Smith, student (appointed 04/2011)

The Board is charged by the Faculty Senate to:
1) Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University’s program in men’s and women’s intercollegiate athletics.
2) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

I. Budget --

Athletics overall budget increased this year mainly due to increased tuition/fee remission cost, phasing out of the Western Undergraduate Tuition Exchange (WUE), and the Stott Center operations being moved into the athletics department domain. (Stott Center’s operating expenses of about $700,000 is a shift of management responsibility thus a zero-sum gain to the athletics budget). Athletics also hired 2 academic advisors.

2009-2010 total expenses -- $10,124,028
2010-2011 total Budget -- $11,528,769

In general revenue comes from:
34% self-generated and external funds, 29% student fee, 37% university support expenditures go to:
31% student tuition and fees (scholarships), 37% Staff salary and benefits, 10% team travel, 22% other (equipment, uniforms, insurance, meals, etc)

2011-12 Budget note:

Athletics requested $3.81 mil. from the Student Fee Committee (SFC), for 2011-12, the SFC approved $3.64 mil which is a 9% increase over the 2010-11 SFC amount. Overall the core budget for athletics (not including Stott center operations) is increasing by $300,000, of this; $134,000 is for addressing plans for improvement around gender equity and student well-being stemming from the NCAA certification process.
Policy –

**NCAA Certification** – PSU has been certified with no conditions. The IAB would like to recognize the work and contributions all the faculty, staff, students and community members involved in PSU’s self-study for the NCAA certification. This broad-based review was a 2-year process requiring many hours of committee work from more than 40 individuals throughout the PSU community.

IAB will be tasked with the annual review of the plans for improvement stemming from certification. The first review will be winter 2012. PSU’s General Counsel Office is responsible for the management of the Plans for Improvement. The IAB will work with the General Counsel to set up a calendar to insure that individual markers within the plan are making progress.

**Policy for career ending injury** – Approved by IAB 3/3/2011 (see attachment)

**Response to Student Fee Committees ad hoc committee for Athletics** – after discussion board members concluded that the SFCs call for an ad hoc committee would be redundant to the oversight that IAB is currently positioned to provide. The IAB drafted a letter and sent to SFC, ASPSU Senate, President Wiewel and the Faculty Senate stating this opinion. (see attachment)

After reviewing the students concerns the IAB has decided to form a sub-committee with the charge to conduct a historical review of the athletics budget and specifically to evaluate the contribution of institutional and student fee funds to the total budget of Athletics. This review will be set within the context of PSU’s peers and other Big-Sky conference schools. An initial report needs to be completed by January 2012 in order to be presented to the Student Fee Committee.

II. Accomplishments of our 280+ student athletes –

**Academic All-Big Sky Conference honors:** (recognizes student-athletes who have maintained a 3.20 GPA or higher and competed in at least half of the season's competitions.) About 23% of the student-athletes have been honored this last year.

**Spring (2010): 18 students honored**


Men’s Tennis: Jeff Cero – Econ.

Men’s Track: Jeff Borgerson - Civil Eng., Chris Fasching – Undeclared
   Johanna Johnson - Phil., Alexis Kitzman - Intrnl Studies, Kelsey Paden – Film,

Fall (2010): 37 students honored
   Nathan Snow - Health Sci., Kevin Takeno - Comm.
Men's Cross Country: Zach Carpenter – Undeclared, Cary Dunagan – Undeclared
Women's Cross Country: Karissa Fuller – Span./ Phy. Act. & Exer.,
Women's Soccer: Brittany Allen – Undeclared, Eryn Brown - Undeclared
   Michelle Hlasnik – Undeclared, Lainey Hulsizer – Undeclared
Women's Soccer Cont.: Megan Martin - CCJ., Kala Renard - Phy. Act. & Exer.,
   Emily Rohde - Biochem., Frankie Ross - Health Sci., Teal Sigler - Undeclared
   Kajsa Sporseen – Undeclared, Melissa Trammell - Science
Women's Volleyball: Nicole Bateham - Health Sci., Erica Cotton - Undeclared
   Dominika Kristinikova - Graph. Design, Cara Olden - Undeclared
   Lana Zielke – CCJ.

Winter (2011): 13 students honored
   Karley Lampman - Undeclared
Women's Track: Shae Carson - Undeclared, P’Lar Dorsett – Bus. Adm.,
   Amber Rozcicha - Undeclared
Men's Track: Mark Bozarth-Dreher - CCJ, Zach Carpenter - Undeclared,

Academic Progress Rate (APR)* As of November 2010, 13 of 15 teams met or exceeded 925 for single year APR (Women's volleyball [920] and Women's tennis [911]).

13 of 15 teams met or exceeded multi-year APR goal of 900. (Women’s tennis [875] and Men’s cross-country [897]
10 of the teams have posted their best multi-year APR’s to date.
Men’s basketball – Posted an APR of 1,000 (team no longer under NCAA sanctions)
*APR defined: APR is a measure developed to assess the overall academic performance of individual teams. APR awards 2 points each term to student-athletes who meet academic eligibility standards and who remain with the institution. A team’s APR is the total points earned by the team members divided by the total points possible. Teams need to keep their four year APR avg. at 925 or above to avoid NCAA penalties.

Competition:

Women’s Basketball: Big Sky Regular Season Conference Champions

Women’s Golf: second straight Big Sky Conference Championship

Women’s Volleyball: Big Sky Champions

Women’s Softball: Pacific Coast Conference Champions
Response to Student Fee Committee recommendation to create an ad hoc committee PSU Athletics

DATE: March 23, 2011

To: Krystine McCants, Chair - ASPSU Student Fee Committee

From: David Burgess
Chair, Intercollegiate Athletic Board
5-3434

CC: Ethan Smith, Senate President - ASPSU Senate
President Wim Wiewel
Maude Hines, Presiding Officer
Torre Chisholm, Director of Athletics

We have reviewed the Student Fee Committee’s recommendation to form an ad hoc committee on PSU Athletics during the March 17, 2011 meeting of the Intercollegiate Athletic Board (IAB). After review and discussion, the IAB is of the opinion that its mission and scope already provides the oversight requested by the Student Fee Committee. The IAB’s charge is, (to) “Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University’s program in men’s and women’s intercollegiate athletics.” Our interpretation is that creating the SFC ad hoc committee would be redundant to IAB. Thus, we do not support the SFC’s recommendation based on Section 4 of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty that prohibits duplicate committees:

Section 4. Faculty Committees.

Appointment. The Committee on Committees, hereinafter described, shall appoint the members and chairpersons of all constitutional committees and ensure adequate and required divisional representation. The Committee on Committees shall make recommendations to the President concerning the membership and chairpersons of all committees established by administrative action and ensure divisional representation as appropriate. Constitutional committees are those established under provisions of the Faculty Constitution. Administrative committees are those established by the President and charged by him or her with a specific assignment on a continuing basis for periods of one or more years. Ad hoc and special committees may be established at any time by the Faculty, the Senate, or the President, and shall carry out specific duties and report as directed. No special committees shall be established that duplicate the work of an existing Faculty, Senate or administrative committee.

The IAB recognizes the Student Fee Committee concerns and invites the appointment of 2 additional student representatives to serve on the IAB. The membership of the IAB is comprised of 5 faculty members, 3 student members and one member from the public sector as well 5 ex-officio members. The IAB still has 2 open student positions that have not been filled. By rule, the student positions are nominated by the Student Senate. We have had difficulty in the past securing student participation and suggest that this is a process where SFC and IAB can work together to promote the desired oversight.

Sincerely,

David Burgess
Intercollegiate Athletic Board -Chair
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STUDENT-ATHLETE CAREER ENDING INJURY

Name _______________________________ PSU ID _______________________________

Sport _______________________________

INJURY/ILLNESS INFORMATION

Seasons of Eligibility Remaining _______________________________
Expected Date of Graduation _______________________________
Equivalency Award for the Current Year _______________________________
Date of Injury/Illness Occurred _______________________________
Date of Diagnosis or Finding _______________________________
Description of Incapacitating Injury or Illness _______________________________
Academic year non-counter status begins _______________________________

APPLICABLE LEGISLATION

NCAA Bylaw 15.5.1.3 – Counter Who Becomes Injured or Ill.
A counter who becomes injured or ill to the point that the player apparently never again will be able to participate in intercollegiate athletics shall not be considered a “counter” beginning with the academic year following the incapacitating injury or illness.

NCAA Bylaw 15.5.1.3.1 – Incapacitating Injury or Illness
If an incapacitating injury or illness occurs prior to a student-athlete’s participation in athletically related activities and results in the student-athlete’s inability to compete ever again, the student-athlete shall not be counted within the institution’s maximum financial aid award limitations for the current, as well as subsequent, academic years. However, if the incapacitating injury or illness occurs on or after the student-athlete’s participation in countable related activities in the sport, the student-athlete shall be counted in the institution’s maximum financial aid limitations for the current academic year but need not be counted in subsequent academic years.

NCAA Bylaw 15.5.1.3.2 – Change in Circumstances
If circumstances change and the student-athlete subsequently practices or competes at the institution at which the incapacitating injury or illness occurred, the student-athlete again shall become a counter, and the institution shall be required to count that financial aid under the limitations of this bylaw in the sport in question during each academic year in which the financial aid was received.

NCAA Bylaw Interpretation
Incapacitating injury applies to all sports participation
Date Issued: October 16, 1979
A member institution asked if a student-athlete who has been certified as medically unable to participate in the sport of football could subsequently receive a waiver of Bylaw 5-4-(e)-(1) if he participated in basketball. The Council noted that the bylaw clearly specifies that the student-athlete must have been unable to participate in intercollegiate athletics and therefore does not apply on a sport-by-sport basis.
SELECT ONE MEDICAL EXEMPTION CLASSIFICATIONS
A student-athlete who suffers a career-ending injury may become eligible to retain athletic scholarship grant-in-aid via a permanent Medical Exemption classification. Please select one of the following career ending injury categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER-ENDING INJURY SUSTAINED WHILE PARTICIPATING IN PSU REQUIRED PRACTICE OR COMPETITION.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student-athlete is eligible to receive grant-in-aid for the remaining years of athletic eligibility equal to their previous award, but not greater than the cost of tuition, books and fees. Funding will be provided by the Athletic Department and the student-athlete will be expected to work a designated number of hours for the Athletic Department each term. The student-athlete is eligible for, but not guaranteed, 5th year aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER-ENDING OR INCAPACITATING ILLNESS OR MEDICAL CONDITION.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student-athlete is eligible to receive grant-in-aid equal to their previous award, but not greater than the cost of tuition, books, and fees. Funding will be provided by the Athletic Department and the student-athlete will be expected to work a designated number of hours for the Athletic Department each term. Student is eligible for, but not guaranteed, 5th year aid if the illness or medical condition occurs during their junior or senior year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER-ENDING INJURY SUSTAINED DURING OUTSIDE ACTIVITY OR DUE TO A PRE-EXISTING INJURY OR MEDICAL CONDITION.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student-athlete will not be provided grant-in-aid beyond the current academic year, unless their coach elects to provide it. If denied by the coach, the student-athlete can appeal to the Athletics Scholarship Committee for continued support and the committee will consider the nature of the incident and the student-athlete’s actions related to the injury. If grant-in-aid is provided, it will not exceed their previous award or the cost of tuition, books and fees. The student-athlete will be expected to work a designated number of hours for the Athletics Department each term. The student-athlete would not be eligible for 5th year aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENT-ATHLETE AGREEMENT & RESPONSIBILITY
By offering my signature below I agree that:

- I understand the AID I receive will be evaluated and awarded annually
- I understand it is reasonable, but not guaranteed, that I will receive this aid until I graduate with an undergraduate degree provided
  - Maintain a 2.0 GPA.
  - Enroll in a minimum of 12 hours each term.
  - Meet all NCAA Progress toward degree benchmarks required for competition each term.
  - Provide service to the department for not more than 20 hours a week.
  - Sign annually a medical/noncounter financial aid contract
  - Sign and agree to the terms of the student-athlete code of conduct.
  - I must submit a graduation plan to my Team Adviser.

As the student-athlete named above, I agree that I am no longer physically able to participate in college sports because of my physical condition. I have discussed my status with my head coach and athletic trainer, and I agree that I should become medically disqualified for intercollegiate athletics. I understand that being medically disqualified means I cannot practice or compete any longer in any intercollegiate sport (NCAA, or NAIA), effective immediately. Finally, I understand that any athletic aid agreement received will be treated in the same manner as student-athletes who receive athletic aid, and will follow the guidelines outlined above.

__________________________________________
Signature of Student-Athlete/Date
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I agree that the student-athlete named above is no longer able to participate in intercollegiate athletics because of their physical condition. I understand that a student-athlete who becomes designated as medically disqualified is immediately and permanently precluded from any participation, practice or competition, in any intercollegiate sport. I understand that the student-athlete is allowed to continue to receive athletically-related scholarship funding and such funding will no longer count towards NCAA limits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Head Coach/Date</th>
<th>Signature of Athletic Trainer/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Medical Physician/Date</td>
<td>Signature of Compliance/Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 17, 2011

To: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty
From: Emily de la Cruz, Chair
Teacher Education Committee
Re: Teacher Education Committee Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

2010-11 Committee Membership
Committee Members: James Bickford, SPED; Teresa Bulman, GEOG; Michael Cummings, GEOL; Emily de la Cruz, CI; Debra Glaze, MUS; William Fischer, FLL; Maude Hines, ENG; Karin Magaldi, TA; Jana Meinhold, CFS; Jane Mercer, SCH; Kristen Nieman, Engineering; Jeanette Palminter, MTH; Ellen Reuler, SPHR; Amy Steel, ART.
Student Members: James Gent and Josh Hyrkas
Ex-Officio Members: Sarah Beasley, Education Librarian; Randy Hitz, Dean, GSE; Liza Finkel, Associate Dean for Academics, GSE; Cheryl Livneh, Associate Dean for Outreach/Director of Continuing Education, GSE.

Regular Invited Guests: Deb Miller Allen, Director of Licensure; Karen DeVoll, CLAS; Thomas Kindermann, PSY; Lynda Pullen, BTP/ITEP Advisor; Robert Mercer, Associate Dean, CLAS.

The University Teacher Education Committee (TEC) operates under the premise that teacher education is a university-wide responsibility, and TEC serves in an advisory capacity to coordinate activities of the schools, colleges, and departments of the University that are involved in teacher education. The TEC provides a direct communication link between the Graduate School of Education (GSE), the unit directly responsible for teacher education, and those departments across the university that contribute to the preparation and/or education of teacher candidates.

Teacher Education Committee Activities 2010-11

Content Area Advisors Meeting
The Committee strives to facilitate communication between PSU’s undergraduate programs and the Graduate School of Education, particularly the academic advisors who work closely with GSE programs to advise future teacher candidates regarding their content area preparation. The TEC felt that the 2010 Content Area Advisors Meeting was well-received and reaffirmed their commitment to make it an annual event. TEC planned the meeting agenda and activities for a Content Area Advisors Meeting; and co-sponsored the meeting with the GSE in January 2011. There was a good turnout, with 20+ Content Area Advisors from across PSU attending. Some faculty new to Content Area Advising attended and indicated that the information and opportunity to meet with other Advisors and GTEP faculty helped them better understand their role.

Web Resources for Content Area Advising
The Committee has discussed two initiatives regarding Web resources for potential GTEP applicants; the plans for these will be finalized and implemented Fall 2011:
**Electronic Departmental Recommendation Process:** Based on feedback from TEC last year, the GSE initial licensure programs will implement an electronic process for Content Area Advisors to review applicant transcripts. The Departmental Recommendation Form is a document that is in a ‘fill-able’ format and can be completed and submitted electronically. This will streamline the transcript review/recommendation process that currently involves routing a paper copy of a form through a number of steps.

**Undergraduate Content Area Requirements:** The Teacher Education Committee recommended that the Graduate School of Education establish and maintain a website that lists undergraduate content area requirements for each of the State of Oregon Subject Matter Endorsement areas that are offered at PSU. Currently, the information is on academic department websites and in a variety of formats. The GSE Web team is developing a web page template and will facilitate the gathering of relevant content information from each of the departments. This information will be posted in a consistent format and maintained on the GSE website.

**Recruiting PSU Undergraduates**
Cheryl Livneh, an Ex-Officio committee member and the Associate Dean for Outreach/Director of Continuing Education in the GSE, has developed a comprehensive strategy for recruiting potential applicants to initial licensure programs in the GSE. Cheryl presented this document to the Committee for review and agreed to Chair a Recruitment Subcommittee that will identify 2-3 target activities to implement in 2011-12.

**Challenges in Convening Regular TEC Meetings**
We have had a difficult time finding a meeting schedule that works for many TEC members. It has been a challenge to maintain a quorum during many of the meetings this year. There is an expectation that many of the TEC members be recruited from faculty who serve as Content Area Advisors for GTEP; this is a constraint that may distinguish the membership of this committee from other Faculty Senate committees. It is an issue that does affect the committee's ability to accomplish its goals. As Committee Chair and the one who must negotiate the meeting times with busy faculty, it is a challenge; any strategies to expedite the 2011-12 meeting schedule and improve attendance at meetings would be appreciated.

The University Teacher Education Committee continues to provide an important venue for dialogue and collaboration between the GSE and the rest of the Portland State University community as outlined in the Committee’s mission statement. The Committee is committed to improving the preparation of K-12 teachers by focusing their efforts in 2011-12 on three areas:

- Advising
- Recruitment
- Strengthening undergraduate pathways to initial licensure programs in the Graduate School of Education

Respectfully submitted,
Emily de la Cruz, Chair
PSU Teacher Education Committee
May 9, 2011

To: Faculty Senate
From: Drake Mitchell, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Re: 2010-2011 Annual Report to Faculty Senate

Chair: Drake Mitchell, CLAS

Members: Darrell Brown, SBA
Ramin Farahmandpur, ED
Steve Gance, SES
Jeff Gerwing, UNST
Charlotte Goodluck, SSW
Rachel Hardesty, LAS
Joan Jagodnik, AO
Deb Kaufman, UPA
Drake Mitchell, LAS
Jeanette Palmier, CLAS
Jonathan Pease, CLAS
Branimir Pejcinevic, ECS
Tom Raffensperger, LIB
Robert Sanders, LAS

Consultants: Cindy Bacca, ARR
Pam Wagner, ARR
Steve Harmon, OAA
Melody Rose, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Instruction, OAA

Committee Charge:
1. Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new courses and undergraduate programs referred to it by divisional curriculum or other committees.
2. Convey to the Senate recommendations from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee concerning the approval of all new undergraduate programs and undergraduate courses.
3. Make recommendations to the Senate concerning substantive changes to existing programs and courses referred to it by other committees.
4. Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing undergraduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed undergraduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.
5. Develop and recommend policies concerning curriculum at the University.
6. Act in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairperson of appropriate committees.
7. Suggest and refer to the Senate, after consideration by the Academic Requirements Committee, modifications in the undergraduate degree requirements.
8. Advise the Senate concerning credit values of undergraduate courses.
9. Report on its activities at least once each year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.

Curricular Proposal Review:
In 2010-11 the Committee convened 13 times to review course proposals, new programs and program changes, and to discuss additional issues related to the charge of the Committee. The Committee recommended approval of:

- 68 new courses (68 in 09-10)
- 151 existing courses changed (58 in 09-10)
- 8 dropped course (1 in 09-10)
- 0 new majors (0 in 09-10)
- 18 existing majors changed (16 in 09-10)
- 1 new minor (1 in 09-10)
- 6 existing minors changed (5 in 09-10)
- 0 new certificates (0 in 09-10)
- 1 existing certificates changed (0 in 09-10)
- 16 courses added to UNST clusters (10 in 09-10)
- 23 courses dropped from UNST clusters (40 in 09-10)
- 0 new clusters added (2 in 09-10)
- 2 clusters delisted (0 in 09-10)

The details of the specific courses and programs can be found on the UCC wiki at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/.

Staff Support:
Steve Harmon, Curriculum Coordinator (OAA), Cindy Baccar, Director of Registration and Records (ARR) and Pam Wagner, DARS Coordinator provided support throughout the year.

Other Business:
The UCC found the review of UNST clusters to be ill-defined, in term of review criteria. This review is quite different from all other UCC functions. All courses under discussion are accepted into the University curriculum and the only question before the committee is whether or not a particular course should be added to or subtracted from a particular cluster. The criteria for these decisions originate with the cluster coordinators and the University Studies Council. Thus, the UCC is at somewhat of a loss regarding their function in the review process. The general feeling of the committee was that UNST cluster changes should go directly from the University Studies Council to the Senate.
Committee on Committees
Portland State University

Report to Faculty Senate, June 6, 2011

Chair: Alan MacCormack OI
Membership, Cynthia Baccar AO, Barbara Brower LAS (Geog), Scott Burns LAS (Geol)
Micki Caskey ED, Charles Gray FPA, Kris Henning CUPA, Tom Keller SSW, Laurence
Kominz LAS (WL), David Maier ECS, Christine Paschild LIB, David Raffo SBA, Sarah
Sterling XS, Patricia Schechter LAS (Hst), Stephen Wadley LAS (WL).

The responsibility of the Committee on Committees, as specified in Article IV, Section 4, of the
constitution of the Portland State University faculty is to “… appoint the members and
chairpersons of all constitutional committees and ensure adequate and required divisional
representation. The Committee on Committees shall make recommendations to the President
concerning the membership and chairpersons of all committees established by administrative
action and ensure divisional representation as appropriate.”

In accordance with the Senate governance reform amendment the committee appointed an Ad
Hoc Committee for Implementation whose membership consisted of Michael Bowman (LIB),
Alan Cabelly (SBA), Paula Carder (CUPA), Rowanna Carpenter (OI), Joan Jagodnik (AO),
Mark Jones (ECS), Robt. Liebman (LAS), Robt Shunk (XS)

The committee coordinated the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee for Online Learning
consisting of Cindy Brown (CS) as the at large member, Rob Gould (CNF) for Graduate
Council, Linda George (ESR) for the Academic Requirements Committee, Rachel Hardesty
(CNF) for the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and Candyce Reynolds (ED) for the
Educational Policy Committee.

Following the passage of the Senate resolution forming the Honors Council, the committee
appointed the following representatives: Chair: Tom Luckett, LAS (Hst)
Faculty: Dean Atkinson, LAS (Chem), Michael Bartlett LAS (Bio), Joshua Fost, LAS (Phil),
Barbara Heilmair FPA, Haley Holmes SBA, Gwynn Johnson ECS, Dorothy McElhone ED,
Carol Morgaine SSW, Betsy Natter OI, John Ott LAS (Hst), Melody Valdini CUPA, Jonathan
Walker LAS (Eng), Claudia Weston LIB, William York (Honors).

The Committee on Committees met twice during the fall quarter, once in the winter, and three
additional times during the spring. Much of our business was conducted via email or on line. In
addition to staffing the Honors Council and Ad Hoc committees, the committee found
replacements for 7 members from various committees who resigned during the year.

<Staffing for 2011-12 committees is in progress>
Year One Evaluation Report to NWCCU
Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

Executive Summary
PSU Faculty Senate
May 13, 2011

Introduction

Portland State University’s (PSU) mission, core themes, goals and outcomes, as well as the key indicators that the institution will use to demonstrate mission fulfillment are crucial in providing the foundation for addressing the new Northwest Commission on College and Universities (NWCCU) standards of accreditation. This report will describe the process that the university used to arrive at this framework. In the summer of 2008, Wim Wiewel became the tenth president of Portland State and a key initiative for the new president was to establish institutional priorities and to communicate them to the campus. After consulting with his executive committee, President Wiewel articulated five clear themes to shape the institution’s future: 1. Provide Civic Leadership through Partnerships; 2. Improve Student Success; 3. Achieve Global Excellence; 4. Enhance Educational Opportunity; and 5. Expand Resources and Improve Effectiveness.

In the summer of 2010, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) convened a committee to determine whether the President’s Core Themes should also serve as the basis for the accreditation self-study. By the end of that summer, the committee members, (consisting of faculty members nominated by Faculty Senate and administrators) had voted to select the President’s five themes as the basis for the University’s accreditation reports. As the report and self-study process began to develop, it became apparent that the five themes needed to be slightly recast for the context of accreditation. Therefore, in winter of 2011, the university continued to rework this framework, with input from the president and provost. This work was taken to a committee in spring 2011 (the Accreditation Advisory Committee), made up of faculty and administration from across the university, with Faculty Senate representation. In the end, the university determined that the following four themes more accurately establish a clear sense of identity and priorities for the institution:

1. Civic Leadership
2. Educational Opportunity
3. Student Success
4. Innovative Research and Scholarship

The Accreditation Advisory Committee is currently working to establish the key indicators for mission fulfillment in 2011.

Institutional Context

Portland State University continues to face two ongoing issues, the first of which is continued growth, and the second of which is a discussion within the state about the future of the Oregon University System (OUS), which has been inspired by the financial challenges common to public institutions across the country. Growth has had a profound impact on the institutional environment on many levels. PSU has experienced significant growth in its student population (student credit hours have increased 18% since the 2005 institutional self-study report), its physical space and infrastructure, and its research activities. Portland
State University is now the largest university in the state, and one of the 100 largest institutions of higher education in the United States. Because this growth has taken place without a commensurate increase in state funding, this has led the university to an increasing reliance on partnerships and external funding, a clear trend over the last decade. The student body is also changing, with more students of traditional college age attending PSU, and consequently larger numbers of students living in the residence halls. Growth has also fueled the demand for new academic programs. Between 2006 and 2009, the institution has added seven BA/BS degrees, five MA/MS degrees and six PhDs. At the same time, our level of sponsored research has climbed sharply, from $40,035,885 at the time of our 2005 report, to $58 million for the 2009-2010 academic year. While growth has represented a challenge, it has also led to innovation and positive change.

The institution also remains concerned about the economic situation of the state. A combination of declining state resources and increasing enrollments has led the public universities in Oregon to reconsider their relationship to the state. Legislation currently under consideration in Salem would convert the OUS system from a state agency to a free-standing public university system. If this reform were to move forward, it would most likely create a structure similar to that for community colleges within the state, with the universities retaining more authority over tuition (within a defined range), more local control in terms of oversight, more flexibility in terms of real estate purchases and financial decisions, and perhaps—in the long term—the ability to float local measures for tax resources. This structural change would allow Portland State greater control over its future direction and development. Both our continuing growth and governance issues will pose challenges to Portland State University as it plans for the future. Nonetheless, the institution’s core mission has remained the same, the president has a clearly articulated set of priorities, and innovation has allowed for significant expansion in its programs and research. The University also believes that we also need to take charge of our own destiny with clear strategic planning, so that our future is not decided solely by the trends of the state higher education reform conversation. The institution is well prepared to thrive in the future.

Chapter One – Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, Goals, and Outcomes

Section I: Mission and Goals

Mission Statement

“The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas. The University conducts research and community service that support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the region. It actively promotes the development of a network of educational institutions to serve the community.”

Portland State University’s mission was reviewed and adopted by the Oregon University System Board in 1991 and amended and approved in 1997. The expanded mission statement defines Portland State’s role as an urban university. The mission statement is filed with the OUS Board’s office and appears both in the institutional portfolio and in the university’s catalog, the Bulletin (Standard 1.A.2).

Programs, curricula, and research efforts reflect the university’s close connection with the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic life of the region. Community
relationships are a vital part of academic and research programs throughout the university. The diversity of the student population demonstrates the emphasis the institution places on its role as an urban university committed to providing diverse populations with access to high-quality post-secondary education. Portland State continues to have a student body diverse in ethnicity, age, cultural background, and place of origin.

Mission Fulfillment

Standard 1. A.2: The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, values, and characteristics. Within that definition, it articulates institutional achievements, outcomes, or expectations that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

Portland State University’s core themes directly reflect our mission, and are drawn from specific language within our mission statement. To highlight this fact, the text below has the language in bold from which our core themes flow.

“The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas. The University conducts research and community service that support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the region. It actively promotes the development of a network of educational institutions to serve the community.”

The mission statement clearly states that at the core of Portland State University’s function is “providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas.” From this commitment flows our theme of Educational Opportunity. Our suite of academic programs is designed to serve our urban region. We have a commitment to serving all populations in aspects of the metropolitan region, and to providing access through our work with the public schools to enhance college readiness. To be meaningful, however, our work to ensure access has to be paired with Student Success, by developing quality academic programs, as well as student support. Although there is overlap between Educational Opportunity and Student Success, keeping them distinct reflects the different roles that we need to play in our students’ experience. Together, these two goals embody the goals in the first half of our mission statement, as well as the mission’s statements emphasis on “a high quality educational environment,” and “an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas.”

Our mission statement also refers to “research and community service that support a high quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the region.” It also refers to programs that “especially relevant to metropolitan areas” and the need for “educational institutions to serve the community.” Two themes emerge from this language. The reference to research and community service is reflected in our core theme of Innovative Research and Scholarship, which demonstrates how we are focused on issues of broad significance, which are also of direct relevance to the metropolitan region. We are addressing them in a multi-disciplinary fashion and we are engaging with the community in doing so. Secondly, our core theme of Civic Leadership reflects the emphasis on serving our community. A civic leadership focus is core to our identity as an urban-serving university. Our programs and curriculum reflect the needs and the needs and life of the greater Metropolitan area.
Furthermore, our partnerships even extend to a suite of activities with the City of Portland, which touch upon planning, physical development, and transportation. In that sense, we are a partner with the city in a way that transcends the classroom, to include partnerships economically and culturally, which help to make Portland a vibrant urban area.

Portland State University Mission Statement

Civic Leadership
- Research and Community Service
- Network of Educational Institutions

Innovative Research and Scholarship
- Research and Community Service

Educational Opportunity
- Access Throughout Lifespan
- Professional and Graduate Programs
- Network of Educational Institutions

Student Success
- Access Throughout Lifespan
- Quality Education
- Professional and Graduate Programs

2010-2011 Accreditation Advisory Committee

Co-Chairs: Shawn Smallman, Institutional Accreditation Liaison Officer
           Kathi Ketcheson, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Members:

- Melody Rose, OAA
- Jackie Balzer, VPSA
- Robert Halstead, OAA
- Tom Bielavitz, LIB
- Fu Li, ECE
- Eileen Brennan, SSW
- Kristi Yuthas, SBA
- Rick Johnson, ED
- Ellen Bassett, USP
- Mark Wubbold, FADM
- Jeffrey Gerwing, CLAS
- Kevin Hill, CLAS
- Melissa Thompson, CLAS
- Joel Bluestone- FPA
- Molly Griffith, SES
- Nick Rowe- Student Representative
- Michael Flower - Faculty Senate Representative