TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Robert Liebman, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on February 5, 1996, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the January 8, 1996, Meeting

C. Announcements and Reports
   1. Announcements
   2. President’s Report
   3. Provost’s Report
   4. Vice President’s Report (FADM)

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Presiding Officer

E. Reports from other Administrative Officers and Committees
   1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - M. Enneking

F. Unfinished Business

G. New Business
   1. *Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals - Pratt
   2. *Steering Committee motions
   3. *Formation of Ad hoc committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
B Minutes of the January 8, 1996 Senate Meeting
G1 Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals
G2 Motions submitted by Steering Committee, 2/5/96
G3 Discussion items for Ad hoc committee on procedures for curricular change
   Report of the December, 1995 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting
   Annual Report, University Curriculum Committee (distributed at 1/8/96 meeting)

The Secretary must have names of Senators’ alternates in order for them to be officially noted in your absence. Please submit your alternate’s name to the Secretary at the 5 February Senate meeting or by telephone (5-4416) or e-mail (bobl@po.pdx.edu).
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 8, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Alternates Present: Shireman for Adams, Wyers for Anderson, Meredith for Cumpston, Burns for A Johnson, Bender for Nunn, Holloway for Westbrook.

Members Absent: Bluestone, Danielson, Feeney, Fokine, Friesen, Goslin, Greenfield, Kenny, Limbaugh, Miller, Tinnin, Weikel


B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07. The Faculty Senate Minutes of December 4, 1995 were approved as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The AS-PSU Book Exchange will be open during first week of classes in SMC 290. Faculty are encouraged to announce the Book Exchange in classes. (For Anna Dinh, AS-PSU).

2. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Unable to attend, Ramaley arranged two reports.

JOHN FOWLER, Director of Campus Security, reported that, during the break, a student residing in the Ondine was found with ammonia nitrate and other
bombmaking materials. Security and police removed the materials and, after obtaining a warrant, searched the room. The student was evicted and has been suspended from the university. The student was involved in 7 chargeable criminal offenses at another university, but was not charged or referred in any of these cases.

LENDARIS reported for Ramaley that OSSHE has formed four task forces: Graduate Education and Research, Community and Economic Development, Lifelong Education and Professional Development, and Undergraduate Education. A PSU staff or faculty member sits as member or consultant to each task force. They are: Roy Koch (consultant, Graduate Education and Research), President Ramaley and Morgan Pope (Community and Economic Development), Sherwin Davidson and Marge Enneking (Lifelong Education and Professional Development), Chuck White and Bea Oshika (Undergraduate Education). The task forces will begin meeting in January. The Chancellor asked Presidents to assure involvement on their campuses and Ramaley formed a campus advisory body that will include PSU’s representatives to the task forces, the Provost, the Vice-President (FADM), the Faculty Senate president, a student representative, and other members of the University community who are invited to express their interest.

3. PROVOST’S REPORT

4. Vice-Provost’s Report (OAA)

5. Vice-Provost’s Report (OGS)

REARDON deferred to the reports by the Vice-Provosts. DIMAN reported on the revised time schedules to accommodate four-credit conversion in Fall, 1996. The new schedules will follow the MWF/TTh format used for 3 credit courses by adding minutes to the current time slots. In place of the current 50-minute session, MWF classes will meet for 65 minutes/day for a total of 195 minutes. Classes will start at 7:45 am with a ten-minute break between time slots. In place of the current 75-minute session, TTh classes will meet for 100 minutes/day for a total of 200 minutes. Classes will start at 8 am, 10, 12, and 2. The revision will maximize classroom usage and allows flexible scheduling of 3-credit and other course packages. In answer to KOCAGOLU’s question about evening classes, DIMAN reported that normally 4-credit courses will meet twice at week beginning at either 5:40 pm or 7 pm. In answer to GRECO’s question, the possibility exists for a single 4-hour bloc and its scheduling should attend to bus schedules to accommodate students.
KOCH reported that the committee on graduate education (including faculty representatives from all schools, three from CLAS and Deans Toulan and Kaiser) has met 3 times and targeted three areas: traditional research-based graduate training, professional master’s degrees, and post-baccalaureate/continuing education. Members the committee initiated data-gathering, attended conferences on graduate education, and visited UC, Davis which implemented a graduate-group model. KOCH will present the committee’s prospective goals at Winter Convocation, January 22, 3 pm.

6. Vice-President’s Report (FADM)

PERNSTEINER did not offer a report.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no written questions or questions from the floor.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Committee on Committees - Watne

WATNE reported that CoC completed calendar-year appointments to standing committees. When several chair nominees raised the question of how long they would be expected to serve (and, in some cases, declined), CoC deliberated the question and decided by vote that there should be no presumption of renewal and that chairs would generally serve for one year, though special circumstances may warrant reappointment. To assure a successful transfer of leadership, the committee proposed a model used in other organizations: selecting a vice-chair (as future chair) and asking the past chair to stay on as a mentor to the current chair. S. BRENNER raised two questions: whether the policy would further burden CoC by increasing turnover when one-year terms expire and whether it would require more learning-the-ropes as chairs turn over more often. He approved of CoC’s decision to allow for reappointment under special circumstances. Responding to the first question, WATNE said one-year terms made recruitment easier. LENDARIS responded that seeing burnout discourages sitting members from becoming chair. In answer to WINEBERG’s question of how CoC makes nominations for chair, WATNE responded that CoC tries to find a sitting member who is familiar with the committee’s current concerns and membership. As the current practice of phoning members for names of chair nominees is time-consuming and often unsure, WATNE hopes that CoC and the committees can develop an end-of-year reporting system to speed reappointments and select chairs. Describing the changeover of UCC’s chair as awkward, HOLLOWAY called for better communication between UCC and standing committees during implementation of the new one-year-term policy.
E2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee - Holloway

HOLLOWAY summarized the report (attached), calling attention to the effectiveness of the subcommittee structure, pending 4-credit conversions and program changes, and the lack of time to consider General Education courses.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council - Holloway/Pratt - Goslin/Ellis

HARDTI/KOCAGOLU moved to accept UCC’s recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated with the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

HARDT/SVOBODA moved to accept GC’s recommendations for course and program proposals as circulated with the agenda. In the chairs’ absence, KOCAGOLU agreed to take questions for the Graduate Council. S. BRENNER asked whether changes in the Engineering Management Program (9 new courses by his count) would require additional FTE. KOCAGOLU responded that the nine are existing courses being converted from 510’s to permanent standing. In response to WINEBERG’s question of how often they would be taught, KOCAGOLU said some would be annual offerings, others biannual. Responding to suggestions from HOLLOWAY, LENDARIS, & S BRENNER, KOCAGOLU will revise catalogue copy to indicate which are annual or biannual courses and to correct typos and omissions. The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.
NOTES ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 1-2, 1995 AT PSU
REPORTED TO PSU FACULTY SENATE ON DECEMBER 4, 1995

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1995:

1) Dr. Ramaley: Dr. Ramaley welcomed the IFS to PSU and stressed that we need a coherent vision of what education in Oregon is to be, i.e. K through university and beyond. We need to build collaborative and community partnerships.

2) Dr. Cox, Chancellor: He stressed that we are starting now to get information to the governor on higher education so we will be better represented in the next biennium's budget. It will be semi-finalized in August so we have a lot of work to do. We will be competing for limited funds because prisons and the Oregon Health plan will have greater needs for money and the lottery funds will be down.

   He stated that he has three near term objectives for higher education: a) stop the disinvestment slide (we don't want to take another cut); b) improve salaries; c) build a broad base in the state politically to support higher education.

   He has four steps to reaching these near term and long term objectives: a) we need to better understand the Oregon 2010 and the needs of the future through surveys and associations; b) we need to look internally at our institutional missions and review them critically; c) we need to focus our resources on core institutional missions and attract additional targeted funds for areas Oregon believes are critical; and d) ask governance questions and organizational structures of the state system.

3) Tim Griffin, Vice Chancellor for Corporate and Public Affairs: Mr. Griffin outlined the four task forces that are being structured at the December board meeting to meet the objectives outlined by the chancellor. Three new ones are being formed: undergraduate education, lifelong education and professional development, and economic and community development. The committee on graduate education is already functioning. All task forces will focus on resources and funding, delivery modes and access, accountability, and governance and structural questions.

DECEMBER 2, 1995

1) We spent most of the time on Saturday compiling a list of topics of interest to faculty that the task forces can discuss in addition to the four listed above. They are listed on the back page of these notes. Also, the OSU faculty senate has voted that ROTC can't have representation in the senate because of its sexual orientation policies. WOSC and OSU both reported on the new policies for presidential searches that IFS helped develop. At WOSC all worked well, and at OSU phases I and II worked well but the phase III was too rushed. In 1996, Craig Wollner will be our new IFS representative from PSU and Beatrice Oshika will make the reports at our faculty senate meetings. I have enjoyed serving on IFS as a representative for PSU.

Scott Burns, Geology
Date: December 7, 1995
To: Tim Griffin
From: Sam Connell, Ph.D.
Subject: Topics for planning discussions for December 15 and beyond

At our Saturday, December 2 working session, IFS members suggested some topics we believe should be part of the framework for the upcoming Board planning sessions on the organization of OSSHE programs and institutions.

Discussion topics:

Given the framework you presented to IFS on Dec 1, we wish to ensure that the following topics are addressed in the discussions.

TOPICS (with reference to most relevant cells on next page):

- Public perception of Higher Ed (primarily C)
- Relationship of summer sessions to overall academic programs (A, B, C)
- Technology infrastructure, both local and for distance learning (1, 2)
- Recruitment, retention, morale of faculty/students (all cells)
- Relationship between full and part-time faculty (1, 2, 4)
- Turnover and stability in administration (1, 4)
- Impact of graduate research and education on undergraduate education (A, B)
- Impact of graduate research and education on economic development (B, D)
- Relationship of professional degree programs to undergraduate and graduate programs (A, B, C)
- Relationship of priority, funding, quality of non-degree professional development programs to overall academic programs (A, B, C)
- Impact of lifelong/distance learning on current programs/resources (A, B, C)
- Role of regional Centers such as those in Bend and Klamath Falls (2, 4)
- Articulation across institutions, including community colleges (2, 4)
- Role of Athletics (1, 2)

and an over-arching concern with maintaining quality of programs.
DATE: January 8, 1996

TO: Robert Liebman, Secretary; and the Faculty Senate

FROM: David Holloway, 1995 Chair for the Curriculum Committee

1995 University Curriculum Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Chairs: Henry David Crockett served as Chair Jan.-March 1995. No meetings were held or business conducted during that period. David Holloway was appointed March 1995 and served Spring through Fall Quarters 1995. He was removed as Chair effective January 1996 by decision of the Committee on Committees Dec. 8.

Members of the 1995 Curriculum Committee: Leah Bosell (-June 1995); Barbara Brower (Sept.-); Teresa Bulman (-June); Henry David Crockett (Chair, Winter 1996); Jerome DeGraaf; Venay Edwards (Sept.-); Sherrie Gradin; Susan Hopp (Sept.-); Pauline Jivanjee; Cheryl Livneh; Gerard Mildner; James (Dick) Pratt (Sept.-); Trevor Smith (Sept.-); Linda Walton; Rich Wattenberg; Elizabeth Wosley-George.

Consultants: Linda Devereaux; Rod Diman; Mary Ricks; Robert Tufts

Procedures: The committee functioned largely as in previous years and in accordance with the Faculty Governance Guide Section 4.4d. Responsibility for Minutes rotated among members. Because of the volume of work involved in 4-hour conversion, detailed reviews of curricula were conducted by subcommittees consisting of members of the Committee; sub-committee Chairs clarified details in direct negotiation with Heads, made sub-committee recommendations to the whole committee; the whole committee then voted to approve or not for recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

Policies and Committee Activities:

(1) The committee continued the policy presented December 1994 to the Senate that course proposals for 400/500 level courses must contain a statement identifying how the course requirements for undergraduates will differ from those for graduates.

(3) On April 3 the Committee presented to the Senate "Interim, preliminary response to the Senate 6 February resolution on 4-hour conversion." This identified the speeded-up deadlines necessary for 4-hour conversion proposals to be processed in time for inclusion in the 1996-97 Bulletin and the Fall 1996 Time Schedule.

(4) On May 3, in consultation with the Graduate and University Planning Councils, the UCC circulated "Interim Protocols for 4-credit conversion." These were circulated to PSU Departments, Schools, and Colleges; comments were solicited (especially at two meetings of the Chair, Holloway, with CLAS Heads). These Protocols were distributed to the Senate and modified at its June meeting.
**Curricular actions:**

(1) Spring 1995: Recommended emergency approval of BA/BS Program in Community Development and BA/BS in Environmental Studies.

(2) Along with the Graduate Council proposed an extensive series of course and program changes as part of the 4-hour conversion process mandated Feb. 6, 1995. These were approved. See “Supplement for the Faculty Senate Meeting” distributed Dec. 4, 1995 and Senate Minutes for Dec. 8. According to Linda Devereaux (Office of Academic Affairs) this is the largest curricular change ever attempted at P.S.U.—and it was accomplished in the least amount of time.

**Unfinished business—specific courses and programs:**

(1) Proposals deferred from Dec. 8 will be considered Jan. 8, 1996, including proposals from Chinese, Math, Physics, Art, Civil Engineering, and History.

(2) Following up on the Committee’s 1994 emergency approval of University Studies catalogue copy, the Committee intended to review University Studies Program Proposals as described in a memo 2 November 1994 to University Studies. Because of the demands of 4-hour conversion, oversight review and recommendations concerning General Ed. (especially Sophomore and Junior “clusters”) had to be postponed in spite of the thorough and thoughtful cooperation of Tom Biolsi and the University Studies office (see Senate Minutes, April 3, “E5”).

(3) Copies of a BA/BS program change for Geology were prepared in time but for some reason never reached the Committee; new copies have been received. It is hoped that the new 1996 committee can deal with these on an emergency basis.

(4) The Committee very much wished to approve a Chicano/Latino studies program but could not approve the actual catalogue copy submitted. It unanimously agreed that the Chicano/Latino studies should be the 1996 committees first and most urgent priority when it is resubmitted.

**Unfinished business—general:**

(1) Interdependence and overlap of courses could not be fully monitored given the heavy load of 4-hour conversion. Many programs depend on other programs which now have changed substantially. There is little effective monitoring of cross-listed courses. Given general budget constrictions plus the costs of General Education, the Committee agrees that curricular efficiency needs closer attention.

(2) The Committee’s “gate-keeping” and “deadline-enforcing” responsibilities were over-emphasized by the unusually heavy paper loads and harsh deadlines required to accomplish four-hour conversion by Fall 1996. In cooperation with other Faculty Committees, the Committee should help OAA develop more efficient systems for curricular development and approval, especially using electronic means—but with due concern for the continued integrity of Bulletin and the curricula it describes.

---

David Holloway
Reproduce proposed catalog statement in full: Requirements for Major leading to the BS degree in Geology. In addition to meeting the general University degree requirements, the major leading to the BS degree in geology must meet the following departmental requirements:

| Credits  |
|------------------|------------------|
| G 201, 202, 203 | 9                |
| G 204, 205, 206 Geology Laboratory | 3                |
| G 207 Bibliographic Resources | 1                |
| G 211 Microcomputer Use in Geology | 1                |
| G 312 Mineralogy | 5                |
| G 313, 315 Igneous Petrology and Metamorphic Petrology | 5                |
| G 316 Sedimentary Mineralogy and Petrology | 5                |
| G 331 Paleontology | 4                |
| G 391 Structural Geology | 4                |
| G 392 Stratigraphy | 4                |
| G 393 Field Methods | 4                |
| G 423 Computer Applications in Geology | 4                |

At least 15 credits of electives from upper division Geology courses (excluding G 351, G 430, G452, G454, G 455). May include up to six (6) credits of upper division science or engineering courses approved by the undergraduate advisor. Students may use up to 4 credits from an approved summer field camp course.:

Sub total 64

Supporting Courses
Mathematics through calculus to include Mth 251, 252, 253, 254 16
One year of 200-level chemistry or equivalent 13-15
Physics 201, 202, 203 plus labs; or
Physics 211, 212, 213, plus labs;
or Physics 211, 212, plus labs and EAS 211 (statics) 12-15
Subtotal 41-46

Total 105-110

Requirements for Major leading to a BA degree in Geology. In addition to meeting the general University degree requirements, the major leading to the BA degree in geology must meet the following departmental requirements:

| Credits  |
|------------------|------------------|
| G 201, 202, 203 Geology | 9                |
| G 204, 205, 206 Geology Laboratory | may substitute one credit of G 200 | 3                |
| G 312 Mineralogy | 5                |
| G 313, 315 Igneous Petrology and Metamorphic Petrology | 5                |
| G 316 Sedimentary Mineralogy and Petrology | 5                |
12 credits selected from the following courses:
G 331 Paleontology ........................................... 4
G 391 Structural Geology ...................................... 4
G 392 Stratigraphy ............................................. 4
G 393 Field Methods .......................................... 4
G 420 Applied Geophysics ......................................
G 427 Tectonics ................................................ 3
G 432 Stratigraphic Paleontology .............................. 3
G 443 Ground Water Geology ................................... 4
G 445 Geochemistry .............................................
G 446 Economic Geology ......................................... 3
G 447 Sedimentology ............................................ 3
G 470 Engineering Geology .....................................
G 474 Geomorphic Processes .................................... 4
G 475 Introduction to Seismology .............................

8 credits from the following courses:
G 351 Introduction to Oceanography .......................... 3
G 451 Geology of the Portland Area ........................... 2
G 452 Geology of the Oregon Country ........................ 3
G 454 Cascade Volcanoes (3 credits maximum) ............... 1
G 455 Minerals in World Affairs ..............................
G 460 Morphology and Genesis of Soils ....................... 4
G 461 Environmental Geology .................................

Sub total (minimum) ........................................... 47

Supporting courses:
12 credits upper-division Geography, Urban Studies and Planning, and Economics preapproved by the undergraduate advisor ..................... 12.

Mathematics to include Mth 251 ................................ 4
Statistics to include Mth 243; Mth 244 recommended ................ 3
One year of college chemistry plus labs .......................... 13-15
One year of 100- or 200-level biology with labs
or
One year of general astronomy
or
Economics 201, 202, 203 ........................................... 9-12

Subtotal .................................................. 41-46

Total ....................................................... 88-93

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) are not acceptable toward fulfilling departmental major requirements, with the exception of G 211.
January 16, 1996

TO: Richard Pratt, Chair
    University Curriculum Committee

FROM: Mary Constans, Chair
    Department of Art

This is to request a minor change in credit hours only for four Graphic Design courses recently approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate. The other changes approved in course numbers, course titles, prerequisites, etc. are not to be changed.

Specifically, we are requesting that:

ART 224, 225, 226 be offered for 3 credit hours (not 4)
ART 227, 228, 229 be offered for 3 credit hours (not 2)
ART 320, 321, 322 be offered for 3 credit hours (not 4)
ART 326, 327, 328 be offered for 3 credit hours (not 4)

(The fourth year courses are to remain at 4 credit hours each, as proposed and approved.)

We are requesting this change after reflecting on how best to schedule these courses to accommodate the 4th credit. Thanks for your consideration.

cc: Linda Devereaux, OAA

/BL

[Approved 1/17/96]

[Signature]

[Flora Dean, Dean]
Motions submitted by Steering Committee to Faculty Senate
[for meeting on February 5, 1996]

BACKGROUND

The following 3 motions are offered in response to concerns voiced by various faculty members, and brought to the attention of the Senate Steering Committee.

The first is related to the review process [or lack thereof] for new and experimental courses. While there is a university-level review process in place for courses submitted for discrete number designation, there is often little review of courses before they are first offered [typically with omnibus number designations, such as 410/510/610]. The concern is that any course given at PSU should have at least some minimal level of peer review before it is offered.

The second two relate to the observations that there appears to be some non-compliance to a long-standing OSHE policy that a given course may be offered as an omnibus numbered course a maximum of 3 times; thereafter if the faculty wishes to continue to offer it, it must be offered as a discrete numbered course, entailing the normal university-level review process [this does not apply in the cases where departments use the omnibus numbers as a mechanism for cross-listing courses in other departments that do have discrete number designations].

MOTION 1: Review Requirements for New and Experimental Courses

Every new course at PSU, experimental or otherwise, must be peer reviewed prior to its first offering. This review is typically to be performed by designated faculty cohorts in a Department or Program for courses offered within those units. Review of courses involving faculty from more than one department is to be performed as above by each of the departments/programs involved; for the case where the the proposing faculty are within a single school/college, they may elect instead to obtain review from their school/college curriculum committee, and for the case where the proposing faculty are from more than one school/college, they may elect instead to obtain review from the University Curriculum Committee or Graduate Council, as appropriate. Inasmuch as the University Studies Inquiry courses are required of all students across the campus, review of these courses is to be performed by the University Curriculum Committee. The above review requirements will be applied retroactively to all courses not having been so reviewed. When a course is being submitted for discrete number designation (i.e., x11-x98), the usual review process will be used.

MOTION 2: Time Limit on Omnibus Numbered Courses

Compliance with the Oregon System of Higher Education's three-times rule for omnibus numbered courses (i.e., x01-x10, and x99) is expected, and should be applied retroactively to all courses. This means that courses may only be offered up to 3 times as an omnibus number; if the faculty wishes to further offer such a course, a discrete number designation must be obtained. At PSU the x10 designation is used as a mechanism for departments/programs to cross-list courses that already have discrete number designations in other departments/programs. Per prior practice, the 3-times rule does not apply in these cases.

MOTION 3: Monitoring of Omnibus Numbered Courses

Each unit offering x10 and x99 courses will maintain a current list of such courses with the number of times each has been offered, their respective review status, and targeted year for seeking permanent status, if appropriate. Each department is expected to self enforce compliance to the 3-times rule.

Notwithstanding, each school/college will monitor the x10 and x99 courses offered by its departments/programs and encourage compliance with the 3-times rule. Each school/college will send to OAA a compiled listing of those x10 and x99 courses to be offered by its units the following term at least one week before final editing of copy for the following term's PSU Schedule. OAA may delete non-complying courses from the Schedule.

The above does not apply to the x10 designations used to cross-list courses in other departments/programs that already have a discrete number.

1/24/96
For Discussion
Ad hoc Committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

As conversion to a four-credit model moved ahead in the Fall, Provost Reardon and Vice-Provost Diman met with the Senate Steering committee to discuss the University’s procedures for curricular change. PSU’s current procedures were instituted years ago, at a time when the State Board of Higher Education reviewed all changes, including modifications of individual courses. Recently, the State Board moved to decentralize the process, choosing to maintain its oversight of degree programs while leaving to individual campuses oversight of the making of curricula. With OSSHE’s mandate for autonomy, it is time for PSU to rethink its curricular change process in keeping with its own purposes and style of governance.

It was decided to delay discussion until after December when the 4-credit conversion process would be substantially completed. At its January meeting, the Steering Committee devoted much of its attention the matter.

We bring before the Senate at the February 5 meeting the prospect of setting up a committee to examine procedures for curricular change. What follows are a number of questions and concerns discussed by the Steering Committee. We hope that you will read them in preparation for discussion on the floor.

Robert Liebman
Secretary to the Faculty

Initiating: How can we facilitate the creation of new courses that fit the needs of our students and community, reflect changes in the University’s purposes and priorities, and adapt to the changing character of our faculty?

Informing: Can we establish guidelines for the curriculum as a whole which will guide the process of curricular change? How best can the guidelines, timetables, and forms be made available to deans, directors, chairs, and all who wish to initiate changes?

Streamlining: It now takes 18-24 months to process a course change and requires, by one count, 17 steps. How can we speed the process of change? How can we shrink the paperwork and possibly reduce the number of steps?

Defining: How do we define different types of courses (departmental, General Education, etc)? What are the distinctions between courses offered at different levels (lower/upper/graduate)? How do we map “seat time” and credits in different types of instruction (labs, lectures, internships)?

Comparing: What can be learned from a look at other universities -- both our sister OSSHE campuses and those elsewhere which have revised their procedures for curricular change? How should we handle “equivalencies” for transfer students who enter or leave PSU?