

11-5-2009

## Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 2009

Portland State University Faculty Senate

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 2009" (2009). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. Paper 147.

<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/147>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **November 2, 2009**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll

B.\*Approval of the Minutes of the October 5, 2009, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

Robert's Rules of Order Bullet Points - Luckett

\*1. Discussion Item: Updating the University Writing Requirement – Academic Requirements Committee and University Writing Committee

D. Unfinished Business

\*1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, 4., 4) m. Educational Policy Committee (Advisory Council affirmative review completed October 14, 2009)

E. New Business

1. Faculty Senate Agenda Setting Discussion – Hines

F. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

Provost's Report

- \*1. Office of International Students & Scholar Services Report – Luther
2. Report of the Associated Students of PSU – Sanford

H. Adjournment

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

- B Minutes of the meeting of October 5, 2009 (attachments: G, G3)
- C-1 Updating the University Writing Requirement – background information
- D-1 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4) m
- G-1 Office of International Students & Scholar Services Report

**\*\*\* 2009-10 PSU FACULTY SENATE ROSTER \*\*\***

**\*\*\*\*2009-10 STEERING COMMITTEE \*\*\*\***

Presiding Office: Maude Hines  
 Presiding Officer Pro tem: Tom Lockett  
 Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier  
 Steering Committee (4): Rob Daasch,  
 Linda George, Brad Hansen, Juliette Stoering  
*Ex officio* (Comm on Comm) Gerardo Lafferriere

**\*\*\*\*2009-10 FACULTY SENATE (115)\*\*\*\***

**All Others (24)**

Accetta, Alexander	CREC	2010
†*Hoffman, Agnes (Cardenas)	ADM	2010
Toppe, Michele	OSA	2010
Kaufman Lissa	OSA	2010
Paradis, Louise	CARC	2010
*Stoering, Juliette (Korbek)	OIRP	2010
<i>Blanton, Sharon</i>	<i>OIT</i>	<i>2010</i>
<i>Kennedy, Karen</i>	<i>UASC</i>	<i>2010</i>
*Kerrigan, Seanna (Goodrich)	UNST	2010
Hage, Time	CAPS	2011
Ingersoll, Rebecca	UASC	2011
Pierce, Robyn	FAC	2011
Turner, April	OAA	2011
Webb, Natalee	OSA	2011
Welnick, Jennifer	SALP	2011
Wendler, Denise	BO-DA	2011
<i>Baccar, Cynthia</i>	<i>ADM</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Fortmiller, Daniel</i>	<i>CARC</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Hatfield, Lisa</i>	<i>DDPS</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Ketcheson, Kathi</i>	<i>OIRP</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Kwong, Jolina</i>	<i>OAA</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>McBride, Leslie</i>	<i>CAE</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Thompson, Dee</i>	<i>CARC</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Vance, Mary</i>	<i>CARC</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Business Administration (6)**

*Buddress, Leland (O'Connor)	SBA	2010
Dickinson, Don	SBA	2010
Cabelly, Alan	SBA	2011
Rogers, Daniel	SBA	2011
<i>Mathwick, Charla</i>	<i>SBA</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Raffo, David</i>	<i>SBA</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Education (6)**

Farahmandpur, Ramin	EPFA	2010
Livneh, Cheryl	CEED	2010
McKeown, Rosalyn	EDU	2011
<i>Caskey, Micki</i>	<i>ED</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Smith, Michael</i>	<i>ED</i>	<i>2012</i>
*Chaille, Christine(Mukhopadhyay)	ED	2012

**Engineering & Computer Science (9)**

† Hook, James	CMPS	2010
* Lall, B. Kent (Morris)	CE	2010
* Anderson, Timothy (Sheble)	ETM	2010
Kohles, Sean	ME	2011
Pejcinovic, Branimir	ECE	2011
Sailor, David	ME	2011
<i>Zurk, Lisa</i>	<i>EEN</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Brown, Cynthia</i>	<i>CS</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Daasch, W Robert</i>	<i>ECE</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Extended Studies (1)**

† Sterling, Sarah	XS PDC	2012
-------------------	--------	------

**Fine and Performing Arts (6)**

Magaldi, Karin	TA	2010
Patton, Judith	TA	2010
†Gray, Charles	MUS	2011
Hansen, Bradley	MUS	2011
<i>Leite, Margarette</i>	<i>ARCH</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Glaze, Debra</i>	<i>MUS</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Library (3)**

†Bielavitz, Thomas	LIB	2010
*Bowman, Michael (Howard)	LIB	2011
<i>Paschild, Cristine</i>	LIB	2012

**Liberal Arts and Sciences (39)**

†Ames, Kenneth	ANTH	2010
Bleiler, Steven	MTH	2010
†Fountain, Robert	MTH	2010
Fuller, Steven	FLL	2010
*Weingrad, Michael (Johnson)	HST	2010
Khalil, Aslam	PHY	2010
†Lafferriere, Gerardo	MTH	2010
Mercer, Robert	CLAS	2010
Mussey, Ann	WS	2010
*Collier, Peter (Padin)	SOC	2010
Palmiter, Jeanette	MTH	2010
Ruth, Jennifer	ENG	2010
†Walton, Linda	HST	2010
Carter, Duncan	ENG	2011
George, Linda	ESR	2011
Hines, Maude	ENG	2011
Lockett, Thomas	HST	2011
Mercer, Lorraine	ENG	2011
Murphy, Michael	BIO	2011
Rueter, John	ESR	2011
Sanchez, Fernando	FLL	2011
Seppalainen, Tom	PHIL	2011
Shusterman, Gwendolyn	CHEM	2011
Wamser, Carl	CHEM	2011
<i>Arante, Jacqueline</i>	<i>ENG</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Balshem, Martha</i>	<i>SOC</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Brower, Barbara</i>	<i>GEOG</i>	<i>2012</i>
†Burns, Scott	GEOL	2012
Butler, Virginia	ANTH	2012
Cummings, Michael	GEOL	2012
Danielson, Susan	ENG	2012
Gamburd, Michele	ANTH	2012
Jacob, Greg	ENG	2012
Latiolais, Paul	MTH	2012
O'Halloran, Joyce	MTH	2012
Schechter, Patricia	HST	2012
Wetzel, Patricia	FLL	2012

**Other Instructional (3)**

Jhaj, Sukhwant	UNST	2010
†MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2011
<i>Trimble, Anmarie</i>	<i>UNST</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Social Work (9)**

Anderson-Nathe, Benjamin	CFS	2010
Coleman, Daniel	SSW	2010
<i>Koroloff, Nancy</i>	<i>ORSP</i>	<i>2010</i>
Keller, Thomas	SSW	2011
* Oschwald, Mary (Nissen)	SSW	2011
<i>Taylor, Michael</i>	<i>CFS</i>	<i>2011</i>
<i>Curry, Ann</i>	<i>SSW</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Miller, Pamela</i>	<i>SSW</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Nash, James</i>	<i>SSW</i>	<i>2012</i>

**Urban and Public Affairs (8)**

Gelmon, Sherril	PA	2010
Wallace, Neal	PA	2010
* Farquhar, Stephanie (Dill)	SCH	2010
Kinsella, David	PS	2011
Neal, Margaret	IOA	2011
<i>Carder, Paula</i>	<i>IOA</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Henning, Kris</i>	<i>JUST</i>	<i>2012</i>
<i>Strathman, James</i>	<i>CUS</i>	<i>2012</i>

**\*Interim appointments**

**†Member of Committee on Committees**

10/13/09

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, October 5, 2009  
**Presiding Officer:** Maude Hines  
**Secretary:** Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

**Members Present:** Accetta, Ames, Arante, Baccar, Balshem, Bielavitz, Blanton, Bleiler, Bowman, Brower, C. Brown, Buddress, Burns, Butler, Carder, Carter, Chaille, Caskey, Coleman, Collier, Cummings, Curry, Daasch, Danielson, Farhadmanpur, Fortmiller, Gamburd, Gelmon, George, Glaze, Gray, Hagge, Hansen, Hatfield, Henning, Hines, Hoffman, Ingersoll, Jacob, Kaufman, Keller, Kennedy, Kerrigan, Ketcheson, Kinsella, Kohles, Lafferriere, Latiolais, Livneh, Lockett, MacCormack, McBride, R. Mercer, Miller, Mussey, Nash, Neal, O'Halloran, Palmiter, Paradis, Patton, Pejcinovic, Raffo, Rogers, Rueter, Ruth, Sailor, Sanchez, Schechter, Seppalainen, Shusterman, Sterling, Stoering, Taylor, Thompson, Toppe, Trimble, Turner, Vance, Walton, Wamser, Welnick, Wendler, Wetzel.

**Alternates Present:** Eckhardt for Farquhar, Feng for Hook, Shearer for Khalil, \_\_\_\_\_ for Murphy, Raffensperger for Paschild, Tarabocchia for Webb.

**Members Absent:** Anderson, Anderson-Nathe, Cabelly, Dickinson, Fountain, Fuller, Jhaj, Koroloff, Kwong, Lall, Leite, Magaldi, Mathwick, McKeown, L. Mercer, Oswald, Pierce, Smith, Strathman, Wallace, Weingrad, Zurk.

### **Ex-officio Members**

**Present:** Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Beyler, Blazak, Burton, Moeller for Cornett, Desrochers, Feyerherm, Hickey, Kaiser, Knight, Koch, LaTourette, Latz, Mack, Nelson, Sestak, Smallman, Spalding, Su, Wiewel.

### **A. ROLL**

### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 1/8, 2009, MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: p. 45, item. #2., para. #3., "proscribed" corrected to read "prescribed."

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

LAFFERRIERE reminded that membership is being sought for the Ad Hoc Committee to Recommend Amendments to the Constitution, as described in the 5 October Currently.

## **President's Remarks**

WIEWEL reminded that a record of the Fall Symposium is available on the web for those who missed it. He continued, the Board last week made the final budget determination for the year. The system is keeping a reserve that could absorb the first part of a potential cut in 2010. Two key factors in this are the January referendum and the economic recovery. The Board also decided not to take funds from the larger campuses to support the smaller campuses as previously proposed, but took them from reserves. WIEWEL continued, Board members are pushing hard for renormalization of the RAM model, in other words giving PSU the state money for our actual enrollment. As you will recall, from 2002 to 2006, we received no additional funds for increased enrollments, and from 2006 to 2008, we received 50% of those funds. The change could result in a net gain of as much as \$3 Million. The campus most hurt by this change would be the University of Oregon, which could lose \$3 Million. The Board also authorized the bonding and the ground lease for the next student housing project at 6<sup>th</sup> and Broadway, so that it would come at no eventual cost to PSU.

WIEWEL noted that the Board and others are having some discussions about the structure of the OUS system, its relative autonomy from the state, the role of individual campuses, etc. WIEWEL requested that the Senate Steering Committee determine how best for him to communicate this issue with the Senate, above and beyond simple communication. This might require for example, a special task force, a charge to the Educational Policy Committee, or that the Steering Committee itself take on the dialogue.

WIEWEL noted enrollments are up about 5% on headcount and about 7% on student credit hours. It is noteworthy, in this time of downturns, that we raised our price by 8% and demand is up by 7%. He also noted that PSU and the Miller Foundation received the 2009 Cecil Andrus Leadership Awards for Sustainability and Conservation, that we are appointing John Gordon the interim director of Center for Sustainable Processes and Practices, and there is a \$1 Million earmark for our Green Building research lab on the federal energy appropriations bills. WIEWEL concluded that later in the fall we will be holding forums and events related to our increased activities in metropolitan K-12 education, and he introduced Pat Burk who will steward this activity.

DAASCH asked for additional information on the potential restructure of OUS, specifically how is PSU represented in these discussions. WIEWEL stated the Governor's Reset Committee has a Higher Ed Committee, with no PSU direct representatives but it includes President Ray, Chancellor Pernsteiner, and board member David Yaden so we have good representation. We're also in the process of putting together a PSU white paper on the issue.

WIEWEL lastly introduced Lois Davis, Chief of Staff, who comes to us from OHSU.

## **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**1. Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV, 4, 4), g) Faculty Development Committee**

WAMSER reported for the Advisory Council that their review of the motion as described in “D-1” evinced no comment. There was no further debate.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda**

BURNS/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.” as published.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**F. QUESTION PERIOD**

There were no questions.

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

**Report of the Provost**

KOCH commenced by introducing Renjeng Su, new Dean of the Maseeh College, KOCH continued, reviewing Board actions and other items. Board meetings have been reduced in number, and program, etc. approvals will be delegated to their new standing committee, Academic Strategy Committee chaired by Jim Francesconi. The moratorium period has ended and that group is reviewing proposals. Regarding the Program Approval process, the Board has prescribed that proposals include a business plan. In response to this charge, we are developing an internal process, including questions. Additionally, the entire process will be electronic. We have also developed a pre-approval process, not to lengthen the process, but so that new academic programs can be folded into the planning processes. Regarding the Academic Strategies Committee approvals, they have approved the Undergrad Certificate in Revitalizing Indigenous Languages, and will review in November the BA/BS in Earth Science.

KOCH continued, in response to a previous Board charge, we have finalized our Minimum Enrollment Policy and will use it as a template this quarter to look at enrollment across campus before formal implementation. The intent of the policy is to be prospective, not for course cancellations, although that is an option in the policy.

SCHECHTER requested the Provost provide more context for the new Board standing committee and the business model requirement. KOCH noted that it is important to measure how new programs affect existing activities. Also, the Board and the Chancellor’s office are very aware that our budgets will not increase in this or the next

biennium, and there is serious concern about continuing to grow programs on campuses in relation to the resources available to do that, the relationship of student/faculty ratios, etc. Also, many of the other campuses have more rigorous fiscal analyses than we, and this will bring us in line with those. Lastly, it will give us collectively better information when proposals are being reviewed.

CARTER noted that as long ago as Governor Kitzhauber, there has been a concern about “nimbleness.” As far as this goes, it already takes us a year to get one course in the bulletin and more like two years for a program. It seems that this is just making these processes more complicated. KOCH noted that he did not see the addition of a business plan as more complicated, in that we are just asking an additional set of questions that address the fiscal aspects of the program so that we know how to pay for it. Regarding the pre-proposal process, he acknowledged Carter’s concern, however he noted that with the exception of certificates, any degree program is a major resource issue in the current fiscal climate.

ARANTE asked a question about faculty lines being an item in pre-program proposals and business plans. KOCH yielded to MACK who stated that there are.

### **1. Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology**

SPALDING reported for the committee and took questions. HICKEY asked for clarification regarding resources for developing on-line courses. SPALDING noted that new distance learning fees were already in place, and course development would be one of the ways they would be expended, in addition to infrastructure costs. BURTON stated that \$1500. Is available for new course development, each. For large classes, there would also be funding for TAs and office support. SPALDING stated that there is a new committee being formed on on-line teaching, the Collaborative On-Line Learning Team (COLT), to include Spalding, Burton, Blanton, and Balzer, and faculty. BURTON reminded that his office represents on-line services, and that departments generate the courses.

SCHECHTER noted that this is all very vague and asked if there is a statement of goals, etc. anywhere. BURTON noted this is a deliberative matter in the domain of the academic departments, from one course through a degree program. SPALDING reminded that distance learning courses save classroom space, and currently all distance learning courses are filling immediately, even with the added fees. SCHUSTER asked what committee would consider such items as the cost of proctored testing.

RUETER noted that there is a disconnect between what is being presented here and what the faculty understand to be policy, for example, Spalding stated that ACAIT is appointed by the Senate, but it is appointed by OAA. SPALDING noted that ACAIT has a narrow charge and certain of these items are being directed by OAA.

The Presiding Officer accepted the committee report for the Senate.

## 2. H1N1 Flu Virus Procedures

DESROCHERS AND BALZER presented information and procedures developed in response to the potential for H1N1 Flu Virus outbreak on campus ([http://www.pdx.edu/hr/prevention\\_handling\\_H1N1](http://www.pdx.edu/hr/prevention_handling_H1N1)). BALZER noted that we are asking that faculty request ill students to leave the classroom, just as they can ask a student to leave a classroom for other reasons. She also noted that, on recommendation of CDC, ill students should not be required to provide a doctor's note. We hope students will rise to the occasion, but if there are concerns, they should be referred to the Student Conduct Committee. She reminded that students would be under a great deal of pressure if they do become ill and are missing all their classes. She yielded to Mary Beth Collins, SHAC. COLLINS noted that numbers are up somewhat but that SHAC is no longer testing for H1N1 on recommendation from CDC. Right now, we are so far, so good. We expect receipt of H1N1 vaccine starting in November. LUTHER reminded that International Students would need notes eventually to protect their residency status.

## 2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2/3 October at OIT

RUETER reported for the Senators (attached), noting that the full report is available at (<http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html>). He noted that

## H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.



### ***Minimum Class Size Policy***

Portland State University

August 24, 2009

***Policy Objectives:*** Although it is assumed that most classes will exceed the minimum enrollments, Portland State University's minimum class size policy is designed to ensure ongoing curricular effectiveness and the efficient use of resources through program planning. Analyses of reports on class offerings and class size will include enrollment as well as the review of course contributions to:

- Educational quality, including the contribution to the curriculum,
- Student success, especially progress towards the degree, and
- Efficient use of resources, including classroom space.

***Class Size Minimums:*** The following minimums should apply:

- Undergraduate lecture class (100-300 level) – 20
- Senior level undergraduate class (400 level) – 15
- Undergraduate seminar, community-based learning, writing intensive and capstone classes – 15
- Graduate (500 level) and combined 400/500 classes – 15
- Graduate level combined classes (500/600 level) - 10

***Exceptions to Minimum Class Size:*** There are both pedagogical and practical reasons why certain classes should be exempt from this policy. Requests for exceptions should be made to the dean who has final authority for the decision. Specific exemptions include:

- Experimental classes which may be offered twice at the dean's discretion before being subject to the minimum enrollment policy
- Other classes in which a low student to faculty ratio is integral to maintaining quality (i.e. certain performance classes in music and labs, studios, and classes requiring the use of specialized equipment)
- Reading and conference courses, practicum seminars, internships, thesis and dissertation credits
- Classes for which the cost to the university would not make it reasonable to cancel the class (e.g. courses where the costs are paid with external funds, self support classes or Chiron courses).

***Review Process:*** The Dean's Office will receive a class size listing from OIRP annually in the Fall for review with department chairs. If the enrollment of any course offered over the most recent three-year period is less than the class size minimum, the course may be cancelled for the subsequent year at the initiation of the dean. Following consultation with appropriate department chairs, it will be the dean's decision how best to balance the objectives of academic quality, student success, and fiscal viability. Deans will include a report on low enrollment classes along with their SCH projections in the Winter.

***Potential Responses to Classes with Low Enrollment:*** Class size policy implementation should occur through regular and effective course review and curricular planning. However, the policy for low enrollment classes can result in the cancellation of classes at any time and the assignment of another class or set of activities to the affected faculty member. Deans and department chairs should be proactive in scheduling classes in a manner that will maximize the enrollment by considering the following actions:

- Offering some courses every other year, and/or
- Reorganizing the curriculum to include key material from consistently under-enrolled classes in other offerings.

<http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/reference-documents>

October 5, 2009

Report to: PSU Faculty Senate  
Concerning: OUS Inter-institutional Faculty Senate meeting  
From: John Rueter (alternate IFS senator)

The meeting was held from Friday Oct 2 to Saturday Oct 3 at OIT in conjunction with the State Board of Higher Education.

The official minutes will be posted at <http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/>

On Friday after the board meeting we met with representatives from OUS, the legislature and OIT administration. On Saturday we met as the Senate. On both days we addressed four major themes:

- Furloughs
- Changes in health insurance
- University budgets – projections and implications
- H1N1 preparation.

There were several important comments made by our visitors.

Chancellor Pernsteiner:

- the revenue forecast could be lower in February. He pointed out that it is possible, because of the stimulus money and possible one-time fixes of taxes, that the 2011/13 budget could be severely hit, as much as a 20% cut for the start of 2011.
- PSU drives system-wide enrollment and that we need flexibility in the system to add new students
- He was surprised by SOU's revelation that the furlough plan they have, where they don't show up for "dead week", would actually impact students. He wants them to reconsider.

Representative Bill Garrad, a strong supporter of higher education, stated that he wants to work for a complete reform of educational funding.

Denise Yunker of OUS HR emphasized that open enrollment is crucial. There were many questions including those about foreign travel.

The IFS had a good discussion about how we can still engage with the Board, the Academic Strategies Committee, and the Provosts Council when they start their new meeting schedule in which there are fewer meetings and they are mostly in Portland. We discussed how it was important for us (in IFS) to visit the different campuses and that it should be useful to the citizens' board members to have the same opportunity. There are issues of travel costs, scheduling time and (ridiculously – carbon footprints).

On interesting discussion was about whether OUS institutions can continue to see themselves as "public" universities with a commitment to access when only 30% or less

of the funding comes from state sources. This was highlighted by the retention and increased academic performance issues that could be addressed by limiting enrollment.

**Summary:**

Many of the topics in this meeting revolved around how important it is for faculty and campuses can stay engaged with OUS administrators. The IFS sees the faculty and universities as part of a system that should work together to solve some of the threats to individual campuses. OUS administrators have clearly stated that closing any of the smaller campuses is just not an option (because those institutions become un-managed assets).

Even though our OUS administrators are excellent and have good ties to the campuses, several examples of the culture gap between OUS and the faculty were apparent. For example, the head of OUS HR (Yunker) referred to the summer as our when we were all on our "vacation". I'm told she doesn't really mean that, but those were her words. In the Chancellor's office they are going take their furlough as a cut of their salary and then they are awarded "Chancellor Days", in which they are free to take the day off in reward for working so hard. I know that Pernsteiner doesn't actually think this way about faculty work, but this statement represents an antiquated conceptual model of work and compensation for the "free time" that each of us gives up to go to work. These are examples of the traditional mindset that seems to surface sometimes within the culture of OUS. We need to keep engaged with them to help them understand how we define the value of our work.

Date: September 30, 2009

To: **Faculty Senate**

From: **University-Wide Writing Committee**

Greg Jacob, Director of Writing (Chair); Hildy Miller, English; Dan DeWeese, Writing Center; Joel Bettridge, English and UNST; Michele Gamburd, Anthropology; Dean Atkinson, Chemistry; Darlene Geiger, Communication; Steve Reder, Linguistics; Duncan Carter, ex-officio.

Subject: **University-Wide Writing Requirement**

The University Writing Committee has asked the Academic Requirement Committee to consider the following proposal: *"Students at Portland State University must meet the following university-wide writing requirement of eight lower-division credits of writing and four upper-division credits of writing as a graduation requirement, effective for the 2011-2012 PSU Catalog."*

This proposal is not intended to impose an increase in the number of stand-alone writing courses that the English department must offer; existing classes described below will serve the purpose. Nor will it affect the total number of credits students are required to take; it merely requires that a set minimum are in writing intensive classes. A writing intensive course by definition requires about 5000 words (including drafts, in-class writing, informal papers, and polished papers). Polished drafts have gone through several revisions, including peer review, and the final drafts should account for 2000 words of the total. The suggested changes reinforce the original goals of University Studies through institutional tracking of the PSU student writing experience.

**Rationale:** A report by the Office of Institutional Research looked at a 2003 cohort of 709 transfer sophomores with 45-90 transfer hours. One hundred and fifty four were randomly selected for the purpose of this study. Consider the following results:

Number of writing classes	Number of students	Average GPA	Graduation rate
1	94	3.07	42.3%
2	26	3.15	55.3%
3	34	3.25	73.5%

Office of Instructional Research: 2003 student survey

The correlation between a larger number of writing classes and higher GPAs and graduation rates suggests a clear connection between a strong writing foundation and eventual academic success.

The committee calls for a reinvigoration of writing as an across-the-curriculum movement, as described below. The suggested changes support the original charge of University Studies that contained written and oral communication as one of its four major goals.

Furthermore, the committee calls for closer monitoring of transfer students who may not have had writing instruction at the lower division but nonetheless continue with degree completion. The following facts characterize students who transfer to PSU:

- Half of the students who enroll in SINQ have not taken FRINQ.
- Seventy percent of students who transferred to PSU with 30 credits or more have taken at least one writing course.
- Eighty percent of students who transferred to PSU with 45+ credits had taken one or more writing classes (2007-08 academic year/Office of Institutional Research).

The committee is concerned about the potential gap in writing instruction for the other 20% to 30% of transfer students, particularly given the loss of UNST 299, Transfer Transition and the large proportion of students who transfer with 45-90 credits. The following proposal will address the writing instruction needs of our freshman and the transfer students.

**Proposed Institutional Tracking of 8-credit Lower-Division Writing Requirement:**

The committee proposes the implementation of an 8-credit lower-division writing requirement. Students could satisfy this requirement in several ways:

1. Students who enter as freshmen and take both Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry will, through the writing-intensive nature of the inquiries as it was envisioned in the 1993 UNST document, meet the requirement of eight credits of composition (see the analysis of Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry below). Students who transfer with 45-89 credits and who have one writing course on their transcript (WR 121 or above) will meet the requirement if they take a Sophomore Inquiry course or WR 211 or 222.
2. Regardless of writing courses taken, students who transfer to PSU with 30-59 credits will need to take three Sophomore Inquiry courses; those with 60-74 will take two; and those with 75-89 will be required to take one SINQ course.
3. If students transfer with 90 plus credits and one or composition courses, they must take one upper-division writing course.

**Analysis of Freshman Inquiry and Sophomore Inquiry:** The existing writing goals for Freshman Inquiry are stated in “PSU General Education Program Goals and Learning Outcomes” and they touch upon writing to summarize and interpret the ideas generated from reading assignments, developing an authentic voice, applying effective rhetorical strategies, and relying upon levels of revision to arrive at a coherent and grammatically sound paper. The committee suggests the following enhancements to the writing component within FRINQ:

1. Students will be given a research assignment that relies on summary and paraphrase and judiciously incorporates source material into the paper.
2. Students will learn several different “invention” or discovery strategies early in the writing process.
3. Classes will contain a major emphasis on revision, particularly at the global or macro level
4. There will be a General Education faculty-wide effort to teach writing as a process and to address the different genres that a student encounters in academic writing.

The general writing goals of Freshman Inquiry are to “introduce” writing concepts; the general goals of Sophomore Inquiry are to “reinforce” the concepts. Faculty who teach SINQ courses have an expectation that students can frame a thesis statement, develop paragraphs, summarize and paraphrase, introduce cited material into a paper, and have knowledge of one or more documentation systems.

To enhance writing instruction at the SINQ level, we strongly recommend that all SINQ courses devote class time, either in main or mentor class, to revision strategies and peer review sessions in which drafts of a paper are peer edited before the final draft is submitted. Within the themes, such as American Studies or Popular Culture, there should be a common assignment that asks for analysis, interpretation, or evaluation of an assigned reading(s).

SINQ faculty members often depend on mentors to teach writing skills during mentor sessions. To fulfill this important function, mentors need adequate training and supervision. To help faculty better implement writing into FRINQ and SINQ, The University-Wide Writing Committee made the following motion to UNST Council: *“We recommend that the fulltime hire of a Director of the Mentor Program be a faculty person with a Ph.D. in English with a background in rhetoric and composition—someone trained in facilitating writing and experienced with peer mentoring and tutorial pedagogy.”*

The committee wishes to point out that we are reinforcing what should be done at the lower division level, and the original 1993 document on the creation of University Studies specifies that Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry be writing intensive.

**Proposed Departmental Decision regarding 4-Credit Upper-Division Requirement:**

The committee further proposes the implementation of a 4-credit upper-division writing requirement. In making this requirement the committee is asking for a revision of existing policy, which removes University Studies from having to satisfy the 4-credits. Instead, we want departments to have control over the upper division-writing requirement. To meet the upper-division writing requirement we propose a menu model that gives students and faculty options without putting the onus on stand-alone writing courses offered through the English department. Many of the top fifteen best writing programs have an upper-division writing requirement in the form of a “writing in the discipline” course (WID). Stanford University, George Mason University, University of Tennessee-Knoxville, Temple University, for example, all require upper-division writing. To enhance Portland State’s national reputation for innovation in general education, we suggest adopting the WID model.

Among the “menu” options for meeting the 4-credit upper-division writing requirement, departments may include the following:

1. A Writing in the Discipline course (WID). A WID course draws on the writing conventions of the particular discipline, calls for close reading and synthesis of data, requires both graded and ungraded writing, and roughly 5000 words of graded writing with opportunity for global and sentence level of revision, and peer review. There are several routes that departments can pursue, but each department will need to identify its course of action to the University-Wide Writing Committee. Some departments

may choose to use their laboratory courses to fulfill their writing-intensive requirement or other departments may wish to designate a specific course within the major. For illustrative purposes, MTH 346, Elementary Number Theory, could be a WID course that requires students to write proofs in a tightly organized and logical sequence. Students would read each other's proofs, make suggestions for revision, and post the most effective ones.

2. A stand-alone writing course, such as WR 323.
3. A Writing-Intensive Course (WIC). These courses, though few in number, have a writing assistant, usually a graduate student, who helps the faculty member with matters of composition. These assistants have taken ENG 413/513, "Teaching and Tutoring Writing." A student could take a WIC course within or outside the major.

**University Honors:** Students in the Honors program will be exempt from the writing requirement. University Honors undertakes writing at three levels: in the first year of the core course (during which, over the three quarters, essential elements of the thesis are taken up one-by-one and examined as the basis of specific writing assignments), in the second year of the core course, during which those tools examined in the first year are returned to, practiced again, and used as the foundation for a year-long research project (specifically framed as an early rehearsal of problems associated with the thesis project), and in the required upper-division seminars of the Program (of which students must take at least two), in which the production of the seminar paper requires the practice of all the writing tools and research skills developed previously, but now focused on the special subject of the given seminar. All courses require extensive collaboration with the writing tutor (the course instructor), multiple drafts and revision, examination of heuristic strategies, and careful placement of particular writing tools within a broadly understood landscape of types of scholarly and academic writing. By the time students approach the thesis project, they have completed at least thirty-five hours of coursework with an integral focus on writing.

**Final Thoughts:**

In an attempt to create a proposal that is not cost prohibitive, the committee points out that no new courses will need to be created and no new faculty hired to teach them. There may, however, be a minimal figure of approximately \$15,000 for training additional writing assistants and roughly \$15,000 for the anticipated additional sections of WR 323.

If this university-wide writing requirement is implemented, there needs to be some form of compensation for faculty teaching writing in the discipline courses. The committee does not wish to see this requirement as simply more work for the faculty to juggle.

For faculty who teach in FRINQ and SINQ, writing courses in the major, and/or WIC, the committee recommends that in the future, assuming budgetary matters improve, that class size reflect no more than a 1:25 faculty/student ratio.

**Proposed Amendment to the Constitution  
of the Portland State University Faculty**

Text to be added underlined. Text to be deleted ~~struck out~~.

**Article IV: Organization of the Faculty**

**4) Standing Committees**

**m) Educational Policy Committee.** The Educational Policy Committee shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Committee shall be composed of the chairperson of the Budget Committee, plus five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the other divisions, one classified member of PSU, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate). The chairperson shall be selected from the membership by the Committee on Committees. The Provost, the Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning shall serve as consultants at the request of the Committee. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee.

The Committee shall:

- 1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.
- 2) Take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, with appropriate consultation with other interested faculty committees, and with timely report or recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
- 3) ~~Receive and consider~~ Make recommendations to the Senate concerning the approval of proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, or other significant academic entities. All proposals must use the Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units.
- 4) In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University.
- 5) Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.
- 6) Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.
- 7) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term.

*Rationale*

These two changes are related to the proposed change in the process for the approval of the establishment, abolition and alteration of academic units.

- 1) The first change copies the initial language of one of the charges of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This is to make the new approval role of EPC clearer (like UCC's approval role in undergraduate curriculum matters).
- 2) The second change makes clear that divisions, centers, and institutes are significant academic entities. Currently that can be inferred from the title of the processes for the approval of academic units, but the new process has a generic title. There is thus nothing explicit that indicates the status of divisions, centers, or institutes.





**Office of International Affairs**

International Student and Scholar Services

Post Office Box 751  
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751

503-725-4094 tel  
503-725-5320 fax  
oia@pdx.edu

## The World Comes to Our Campus

Faculty Senate presentation by the Office of International Student and Scholar Services  
Christina Luther, Asst. Director presenting  
November 2, 2009

The Office of International Student and Scholar Services in the Office of International Affairs interacts with faculty, staff and students at Portland State University in a wide variety of capacities. Our primary charge is four-fold:

- To provide immigration advising and support to the nearly 2500 international students, scholars, visiting faculty and researchers who come to our campus each year;
- To insure that the university complies with federal regulations which oversee such visitors;
- To insure that the university supports and retains international students
- To advocate for our international students, scholars and visiting faculty

Contact information for the Office of International Student and Scholar Services

Office of International Affairs  
East Hall, Suite 101  
503-725-4094  
[oia@pdx.edu](mailto:oia@pdx.edu)  
[www.oia.pdx.edu](http://www.oia.pdx.edu)

International Student statistics – national: <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>

Financial Impact statements:

[http://www.nafsa.org/public\\_policy.sec/international\\_education\\_1/eis\\_2008](http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/international_education_1/eis_2008)

For more information on what international students may (and may not) do while in the United States: [http://oia.pdx.edu/intl\\_students/](http://oia.pdx.edu/intl_students/)

For more information about bringing a visiting scholar or faculty member to your department: <http://oia.pdx.edu/scholars/>

For more information about the special programs our office can arrange: <http://oia.pdx.edu/isp/>