The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on April 7, 1997, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 3, 1997, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. President's Report
   2. Provost's Report

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

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report - J. Putnam
   *2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report - R. Mercer

F. Unfinished Business

G. New Business
   *1. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Change - R. Liebman

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the March 3, 1997, Senate Meeting
   Attachments: Documents(2) from the IFS Meeting of 7-8 February
   Draft Report of the Strategic Budget Planning Process Task Force
   E1 General Student Affairs Comm. Annual Report
   E2 Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report
   G1 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Change
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 3, 1997
Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride, Presiding Officer Pro tem
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Frey for Anderson, S., Wright for Kenreich.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- The Steering Committee Meeting is Monday, March 10, at 3:00 P.M in 394 Cramer Hall.

- Changes in Faculty Senate since the January meeting:

  FPA: Karen Strand (1999) is replaced by Mary Constans.

- Please add to your agenda for today:

  E.3. Report on the Intercollegiate Athletics Board Deliberations - Stern and Van Dyck-Kokich
1. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

The President was out of town

2. PROVOST’S REPORT

None

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

PERRIN, PSU Faculty member of the to Presidential Search Committee member and Senator, reported on the committee’s progress (D1). She stated that there would be a weekly report in PSU Currently. The Announcement has been published in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Affirmative Action Register, Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, Black Issues in Higher Education, and The Monthly Forum for Women in Higher Education. It is also appearing in The Oregonian, The New York Times, and Seattle Times. Faculty should have received copies in their boxes. The nomination deadline is 28 March and applications received by 4 April receive preference.

The next phase is to finalize the screening criteria and this document has also been distributed to Faculty today. 3 March is the deadline for responses and the committee will examine them tomorrow afternoon. They will be finalized on Thursday, 6 March.

The Search Committee will name the Screening Committee, and is soliciting the campus community for names. The Search Committee has received considerable feedback on the issue of the Search Committee composition, especially the lack of science/engineering representation. This issue will be responded to in the selection of the Screening Committee.

There is an Intranet address available for campus-only discussion on the search process. The address, which can only be accessed from a computer on-campus is: http://www.oaa.pdx.edu/bbs.welcome.fcgi

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL QUARTERLY REPORT
WAMSER distributed the report (E1) and took questions. He stated there will be a draft policy on External Grants and Gifts, and Proposal Evaluation Guidelines forthcoming jointly from UPC, UCC and GC, possibly for the next Senate meeting.

MOOR asked if there would be representation in the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute of faculty from outside UPA. Ellis stated there is Social Work and _______ faculty.

2. REPORT OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 7-8, 1997

ENNEKING summarized the proceedings. AOF and AAUP are jointly submitting a bill to the Legislature to add two faculty members to the State Board membership. IFS agreed to support the bill. Copies of Paul Simond’s statement of support and the draft bill are available at the doors (attached).

IFS met with legislators, including Peter Courtney and Dennis Luke, and also with Peter Callero, President of OFT. Parts of that meeting was referenced in Simond’s statement. Credit transfer is on legislators’ minds.

ENNEKING summarized the findings of the Semester Conversion Survey. EOSC, SOC, and WOSC are unanimously and vociferously for it. OSU has no particular interest in it. UO did not feel it was imminent. OHSU responded similarly to UO. OIT thought it was coming regardless of their position. There were two consistent positions throughout. First, we really shouldn’t consider converting unless the community colleges agree. Second, individual campuses should be allowed to convert to semesters if they wish. These positions were reflected by those of the Academic Council.

Four IFS Senators met with Speaker of the House Lundquist last week. They emphasized the need to support the base budget, the “fighting fund,” regional access and the tuition freeze, and engineering, in that order.

3. REPORT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC BOARD DELIBERATIONS

Judy Van Dyck-Kokich and Bruce Stern reported on IAB progress in reviewing the Athletic Oversight Committee recommendations. Hearings are in progress and a recommendation will be forthcoming hopefully in mid to late April although the workload is immense.
The major issue is that expenses for the first year are as expected but revenue is below what was anticipated. After the first two years there will be revenue sharing, but next year we are still on our own. Major contributing factors were that we were not competitive in football, and the extremely poor weather during football season which discouraged sales at the gate.

President Ramaley has given the committee five charges in priority order: 1) examine the mix of sports at PSU; 2) examine this membership versus other conferences, particularly the IA Conf., Big West; 3) plan the financing of our move to Division I; 4) plan for gender equity over approximately a five year period; and, 5) plan fundraising strategies for the move to Division I. At PSU the Athletic Budget is around $4 million, whereas at other schools it is $4-6 million. Schools in Division IA have budgets from $3 to $27 million with a median of $15 million. The agenda for the next two weeks is whether to drop certain sports, and input is urgently requested.

WINEBERG asked what the Wrestling Coach will do about next year’s team and what is the deficit. The deficit is $1.4-1.5 million as opposed to the estimate of $800,000. There is already a retention problem in several sports, and recruiting is almost impossible.

JOHNSON stated he disliked Athletics when he arrived at PSU, but now feels that sports are critical to our growth. It is very important to our relationship with the community, just as are other activities such as the arts. It also provides good press.

BRENNER stated it is not a yes or no issue, but at what level/league we participate. We did well in Division II Football, but Division I is very expensive. It is not fair to cut one of our good, long-standing sports such as Wrestling to add a new one simply because it is required in a different division.

VAN DYCK-KOKICH and STERN stated we were told up front it would take four years to become competitive and for Football to generate revenue. Generating.

CABELLY questioned the appropriateness of making the decision at this time. Is it possible to hold on for awhile to build community support and income? If we go deeper, what will the cost of the fallout be. STERN stated that we need to go to a $1.7 million deficit to be competitive according to the Athletics department.
WAMSER asked if we are soliciting a student response. STERN stated there has been abundant correspondence from students, alum, community members, etc. It is collected in 560 SBA. The Wrestling issue has derailed the process somewhat.

LENDARIS asked what will the cost be, and where will it be borne. KENTON stated that the dollars will be taken from academic departments and administrative units. Stern stated the Wrestling program is $115-130, 000 of the deficit or 10%, depending on whose figures you use. We don’t have out-of-state tuition waiver which is affecting our competitiveness.

WINEBERG asked if it is sensible to stop after one year. STERN stated the IAB hasn’t heard all sides yet. WINEBERG stated it is obviously football’s fault, as that is the big parasite sport and harms gender equity. VAN DYCK-KOKICH stated if we don’t have football, we can’t join the conference.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. REPORT ON THE STRATEGIC BUDGET PLANNING PROCESS

KENTON distributed a draft (attached) and stated the final report should be forthcoming at the end of the month. We are negotiating with the Chancellor’s office for a new enrollment corridor of 9,875 FTE, up from our present corridor of 8,815 FTE, which should yield a $7-8 million increase in our base budget. However, we don’t want to be making decision based totally on enrollment. Performance funding measures are being implemented in many states and we want to avert this trend here.

WAMSER stated that UPC is missing from this budget process, and this fact needs to be addressed. The committee should be examining what their role will be in planning budgets.

JOHNSON asked if there was an intent to include retirement budget lines within department budgets. KENTON stated no, they will be “funded off the top,” not in departments. Data show that departments don’t have control over this factor and can’t afford it. JOHNSON asked what will happen to budget lines created from retirements - if they will remain in departments or will they go to new programs? KENTON stated they are trying to improve the evaluation process for these determinations.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.
President Aschkenasy, Members of the Board, Chancellor Cox

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate held its regular meeting on February 7-8 1997 on the WOSC campus at Monmouth. Representatives Peter Courtney and Dennis Luke and Peter Callero, President of OFT, spent time with us Friday afternoon as we discussed the political climate for higher education. Clearly the interpretation of measure 47's impact will strongly influence the final budget and agreement on that impact has not been achieved. We discussed the chances of prepaid tuition, long term investment in state infrastructure, environment, and social services and we considered transferability of credits from community colleges to OSSHE institutions. Legislators are still concerned with articulation between the two levels of higher education in the state. Grattan Kerans joined our discussion Saturday and gave us an update of higher education's budget. Following that much of our business meeting was spent on the following issue.

The AAUP and AOF have arranged to have a bill submitted to the legislature to add two faculty members as voting members of the OSBHE to be appointed by the Governor. Because the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate has discussed this possibility over a number of years, we raised the issue at our 7-8 February meeting and voted to support the bill. The IFS invites the Board to lend your support as well. We understand the members of the Board have varied opinions on the advisability of the move to add faculty members to the board, either as voting or non-voting members. However, we believe the following points are strong reasons for adding faculty representation to the OSBHE.

Our position in support of faculty members on the board is based on the belief that we, who are the practicing professionals delivering the services of higher education, have much to offer as insights into the practical workings of the system. We are responsible for providing the educational, research and consulting services expected from higher education and know from practical experience what works well. For that reason, we believe our full participation in board activities and deliberations will add to your own expertise drawn from areas outside higher education. The integration of these multiple viewpoints should provide a richer context within which the decisions directing higher education will be made in the future.

We recognize and admire the skill, intelligence and dedication the members bring to the Board. It is for
structural reasons we find faculty continually returning to the proposition that they should be represented on the Board. Most of us belong to associations that regulate how we conduct our professional lives. Lawyers are on Bar Association boards, doctors are on Medical Association boards and some doctors and lawyers are also faculty. Even Anthropologists such as I. belong to American Association of Physical Anthropologists and American and International Associations of Primatologists. The same is true from Anthropology to Zoology. We are accustomed to having votes on these boards and associations that strongly influence our professional lives. From our point of view, membership on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education is a similar proposition.

At another level, the charter of the U of O, later extended to the other campuses in ORS 352.010, 352.004, 352.006, states, “The President and professors constitute the faculty of the University, and, as such, shall have the immediate government and discipline of it and the students therein. The faculty shall also have power, subject to the supervision of the board of regents, to prescribe the course of study to be pursued in the University, and the text books to be used.” This has placed faculty in a position of voting on issues vital to the operation of their institutions and implies, in the eyes of many faculty, a mandate to govern or at least participate in their own governance.

In 1991 a survey by the Arizona AAUP of 485 institutions listed as the best in the US by “US News and World Report” yielded replies from 272 of them. At that time 104 or 38% had faculty on governing boards. On some of these boards faculty have the right to vote (Harvard, Temple, Cornell for example.) On others, faculty vote on board committees (Brandeis, City University of New York for example.) In a third category, faculty can speak but not vote from their seat on the board (University of California System, Michigan State, for example.) Other constituencies represented on governing boards include students (64), alumni (49), staff (20) and administrators (13). Faculty membership on boards governing higher education, even with voting rights, is a feature of higher education governance in this country.

Oregonians are rethinking education from kindergarten through graduate school. Here is an opportunity to examine higher education governance and to ask how its effectiveness could be improved. The IFS believes the best way to achieve this objective is to strengthen the partnership between citizens, students and faculty by adding two voting faculty members to the board. I again invite your support.
A BILL FOR AN ACT  

Relating to the State Board Higher Education; amending ORS 351.010 and 351.020.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 351.010 is amended to read:

351.010. The Department of Higher Education shall be conducted under the control of a board of [11] 12 directors, to be known as the State Board of Higher Education. Two shall be students admitted at different public institutions of higher education in Oregon at the time of their appointment. Two shall be members of the faculty at public institutions of higher education in Oregon at the time of the appointment. The faculty member shall be a voting member of the board.

SECTION 2. ORS 351.020 is amended to read:

351.020. (1) The directors of the State Board of Higher Education shall be citizens of Oregon and shall be appointed by the Governor. The appointment is subject to the confirmation of the Senate in the manner provided by ORS 171.562 and 171.565. No director who is not a student or faculty member at the time of appointment may be an employee of any of the institutions or departments under the control of the State Board of Higher Education, nor shall more than seven graduates of or students admitted at these institutions, nor more than three graduates of or students admitted at any one of these institutions or departments, be members of the board at any time.

(2) To assist the Governor in making appointments of the student members provided in ORS 351.010, the duly organized and recognized entities of student government at each state institution of higher education shall submit a list of nominees to the Governor. The entities are entitled to no more than three nominees per school. The Governor shall consider this list in the selection of student members to be appointed to the State Board of Higher Education.

(3) To assist the Governor in making the appointment of the faculty member provided in ORS 351.010, a duly organized and recognized association of faculty members may submit a list of nominees to the Governor. The Governor shall consider the submitted list in the selection of the faculty member to be appointed to the State Board of Higher Education.
GOVERNOR’S PROPOSED 1997-1999 BASE BUDGET FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
(in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE BUDGET*</th>
<th>$ 568.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Maintains current levels for faculty and support staff, and academic programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stabilizes funding for statewide services through a shift from lottery to General Fund support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extension Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forest Research Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Veterinary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joint School of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* General and lottery funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGETED INITIATIVES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Education</td>
<td>$ 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruitment &amp; Retention</td>
<td>$ 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Freeze</td>
<td>$ 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing Industry</td>
<td>$ 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Governor’s University</td>
<td>$ .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Access*</td>
<td>$ 7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Portion of a $10 million item in the community college budget dedicated to increasing access for Oregonians through partnerships and other initiatives with OSSHE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- More than 96,000 individuals will have opportunities to study in credit programs, and another 100,000 will participate in non-credit programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Each year more than 13,000 OSSHE graduates will be prepared to enter the workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oregon’s key industries will be served by providing more highly educated workers ready to keep Oregon competitive in the 21st century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPECTED OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Oregon’s growing high-tech industry will have access to more workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oregonians will have more continuing professional education opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oregon will attract and retain the best and brightest faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All students will have greater access to world class instructional and research opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased access through affordability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investments in people will provide the foundation for long-term business growth and Oregon’s prosperity.
PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC BUDGET DESIGN TEAM

Design Team Membership:
Janine Allen
Barry Anderson
Nancy Chapman
Bill Feyerherm
Ulrich Hardt
Marvin Kaiser
Nancy Koroloff
David Krug
Tom Pfingsten, Chair
Franz Rad
Rolf Schaumann
Barbara Sestak
Glen Sedivy
Bob Tinnin
Michael Toth
Dick Visse

Resource Group Membership:
Dave Devore
Cathy Dyck
Julie Gauthier
Sue Hanset
Joan Hayse
Barbara Holland
Jay Kenton
Alan Kolibaba
Margaret Marshall
Mary Ricks

I. Charge:
A. Provide criteria and a process to ensure appropriate investment and reinvestment in key University and unit assets;
B. Provide a framework to guide allocation decisions and management of University resources;
C. Extend the "culture of evidence" into the budget arena in such a way as to permit the University to test whether or not allocation and investment choices are producing the desired results and to guide future investment decisions.

II. The Design Team received a thorough description of the current PSU budget and the OSSHE allocation process:
A. 78% of the University's E&G budget is spent on personnel expenses (wages, salaries, and OPE).
B. Within OSSHE most funds (tuition and appropriations) are allocated under the Budget Allocation System (BAS) model which was developed in 1983.
1. The most critical data used by the BAS model are projected full-time enrollment figures (student FTE).
2. PSU's budget strategy for FY 1997/99 is to attain a FTE enrollment of 9,875:
   a. This is the midpoint of a new enrollment corridor for PSU which has a floor of 9,525 FTE (Note: we should attain 9,470 FTE this year).
   b. If this enrollment goal is achieved and maintained it should result in an additional $7-8M in the University's base E&G budget for FY 1997/98.
   c. The Team was advised to look at possible new resources but to develop criteria and processes which would be applicable to the total budget.
III. General Principles:

A. Allocation decisions cannot be made solely on the basis of student credit hours produced.

B. Allocation decisions should also be based on:
   1. Objectives and goals of the institution, the Schools, Colleges, etc.;
   2. Expected outcomes;
   3. Institutional values as reflected in promotion and tenure guidelines;

C. The budget process should be open and rational, with expected outcomes openly discussed and established.
   1. Participation by constituents such as the Budget Committee and the Council of Academic Deans should be assured.
   2. The budget process should provide for continuity regardless of administrative leadership changes.

D. There must be a systematic information system which provides data on such things as revenue and expenditures, instructional activities (enrollment, etc.), research activities, etc. which can be used to support the decision-making process. (Note: Much data now being collected around the University is not being used in an effective manner at this time.)

E. Allocation decisions should provide incentives to promote a "collective mentality" which fosters institutional thinking and shared responsibility.

IV. This year, primary attention must be given to providing adequate funding for:

A. Base budget items such as salary increases, retirement incentive payments, Gen Ed, access costs, et al.

B. A contingency fund.

V. Remaining funds should be allocated to the following categories:

A. Asset maintenance (assets are defined to mean people, programs, facilities and equipment) such as the maintenance of University facilities

B. New assets, such as the purchase of computer equipment

C. Special initiatives.

VI. Allocation Criteria for Academic Units. This criteria should be used both for the allocation of resources and to evaluate whether allocations have achieved their intended purpose. (Note: This is not an all inclusive list. Units will be given the flexibility to use other measures as appropriate):

A. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities:
   1. SCH/FTE
      a. Only at the School/College level;
      b. Adjust to reflect joint programs, etc. where courses may be taught by one unit but SCH show up elsewhere
   2. Degrees,
   3. Qualitative assessments:
      a. Graduates employed according to expectations,
      b. Employer evaluations (esp. in professional areas such as Education and Engineering where such evaluations are already being done);
c. Survey graduates to determine if their expected goals were achieved (surveys are now done at one year and five years after graduation);

d. Pass rates on professional exams (CPA, etc.);

e. Persistence (retention rate), adjusted for students who have goals other than graduating from PSU, and for areas such as Engineering where there is a high attrition rate nationally.

B. Research and other creative activities:

1. Externally funded research,
   a. Source of funding (some sources are more prestigious than others);
   b. Application of research funds (do they benefit the institution by providing support for graduate assistants, faculty, equipment, etc.);
   c. Research outcomes related to institutional goals (such as, integrated with the curriculum).

2. Publications, presentations, and performances:
   a. Refereed or otherwise evaluated before publication;
   b. Significance or application in field of knowledge (some people use Science Citation Index, and Social Science Citation Index to determine how frequently the article is cited in other publications);
   c. Rankings.

3. Disclosures of intellectual property developed;

4. Other scholarly contributions as defined in Promotion and Tenure guidelines

C. Community outreach:

1. Partnerships;

2. Student involvement such as internships, capstone, etc.;

3. Public events (Two types: Those related to 1 and 2 above, such as theater performances, and those not related, such as athletic events);

4. Other public service activities as defined in P&T guidelines

5. Qualitative evaluations of community outreach:
   a. Duration of partnership, etc.;
   b. Community's assessment of impact;
   c. Evaluation from advisory groups
   d. Generation of restricted local gifts.

VII. Allocation Criteria for Non-Instructional Units. This criteria should be used both for the allocation of resources and to evaluate whether allocations have achieved their intended purpose. (Note: This is not an all inclusive list. Units will be given the flexibility to use other measures as appropriate):

A. Overriding Criteria is to incent:
   1. Increases in value adding activities
   2. Decreases in non-value adding activities
   (Note: Value as defined from a perspective external to the department being evaluated)

B. Use of NACUBO Benchmark Information in the following areas (Note: This section is a work in progress at this time)
   1. Accounts Payable
   2. Admissions
   3. Alumni Relations
   4. Career Planning and Placement Center
5. Budget Office
6. Collections
7. Development Office
8. Facilities
9. Financial Aid Office
10. General Accounting
11. Human Resources - Benefits Administration
12. Human Resources - General
13. Human Resources - Recruitment
14. Information Technology
15. Intercollegiate Athletics
16. Library
17. Mail Services
18. Parking
19. Payroll
20. Police/Security
21. Purchasing
22. Registrar
23. Sponsored Projects
24. Student Affairs
25. Student Counseling
26. Student Health services
27. Telecommunications

VIII. Budget Process:
See attached Decision Flow Chart.
I. The Strategic Budget Committee develops a strategic budgeting process that emphasizes the generation and preservation of assets as strategic investments. Its purpose is to develop and utilize measures of outcome to guide decision making. Additionally, strategic budgeting will help to clarify how each unit adds to and consumes shared resources and contributes to collective work necessary to achieve mission and goals.

Due: March 1, 1997

II. The President, working with the Provost and VP's define the formats, priorities and parameters for budget process.

Due: March 1, 1997

III. The Council of Academic Deans and the Senate Budget Committee reviews proposed format, priorities, estimated funding and criteria and sends their comments, concerns to the President, Provost and VP's.

Due: March 15, 1997

IV. Budget Office prepares budget request instructions, incorporating the Strategic Budget Committee's criteria, and the President's format, priorities and estimated funding as revised by CAD's and the Budget Committee's input.

Due: April 1, 1997

V. Departments, units and programs formulate requests based on instructions and submit to Deans or Vice Presidents/Vice Provosts.

Due: April 15, 1997

VI. VP's and Provost working with CAD's prioritize requests and submit to Budget Office.

Due: April 30, 1997

VII. Preliminary requests are reviewed and prioritized by the President, Provost and VP's

Due: May 15, 1997

VIII. (a.) Final Budget Request for consideration by President, Provost and Vice Presidents.

Due: May 31, 1997

VIII. (b.) A compilation of the requests is submitted to the Senate Budget Committee for review and comment. The Senate Budget Committee's comments are incorporated as appropriate and the revised requests are submitted to the President, Provost and VP's for consideration.

Due: May 31, 1997 this year (may take longer in periods of significant budget decrements to allow for additional input.)

IX. President, Provost and VP's review requests and, based on funding availability and other factors, make final decisions for funding.

Due: June 18, 1997

X. Budget Office notifies affected units of their approved budgets

Due: ASAP after adoption

XI. Budget Committee monitors results of operation and performs summative evaluation to inform subsequent processes

Evaluation Feedback to all Groups Involved in the Budget Process
Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
to the Faculty Senate
Portland State University
March 1997

Committee Membership:
Chair: Janet Putnam, SSW
       David Ritchie, SPHR
       Karen Tosi, CLAS
       Maria Wilson-Figueroa, SOC

Students: Sheryl Harris

Consultants: Janine Allen, Vice Provost for Student Affairs
             Susan Hopp, Director for Student Development
             Robert Vieira, Director of Affirmative Action
             John Wanjala, Ombudsperson

The work of the General Student Affairs Committee during the 1996-97 academic year has included the following items:

Incorporation of the Educational Activities Board functions into the General Student Affairs Committee.

Approval of the recommendation by the Director of Student Development that the current Space Allocation Policy adopted in January of 1995 be abolished. The intent of the policy was to provide guidelines and criteria for the allocation of space to student organizations and programs. Implemented for the first time during the 1995-96 academic year, students found the process outlined in the policy to be very cumbersome. At the request of the students, new procedures will be developed and implemented by the Smith Memorial Center Advisory Board.

Nomination of students for receipt of the President’s Award for University Service. This activity will be completed at the April 16 meeting of the committee.

Additional activities which the Committee may undertake prior to the close of the academic year are:

Review of the draft proposal of the Educational Activity Stipend Guidelines.

Continuing our discussions regarding the issue of academic honesty and the exploring the possibility of co-sponsoring a workshop on this issue with the Center for Academic Excellence.
Committee Members: Daphne Allen, Rod Diman (ex-officio), Amy Driscoll, Jack Featheringill, Dan Fortmiller (ex-officio), Angela Garbarino (ex-officio), Martha Hickey, Bob Lockwood, Robert Mercer (chair), Shirley Morrell, Bob Tufts (ex-officio), Chien Wei Wem

1. During the period 9/15/96 to 3/10/97 the ARC processed 211 petitions. Of those petitions, 193 were granted, and 18 were denied.

2. ARC continues to deal with issues arising from students following two distinct tracks for completion of their general education (the distribution and the university studies model). The major change for students following the distribution model was the reduction in distribution and upper division general education requirements from 18 to 16 credits (to reflect the change to a 4-credit norm). Additionally, we have seen a large increase among distribution model students petitioning the acceptance of transfer course work, or PSU courses created after the diversity list, to meet the University diversity requirement (required for catalog years 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96).

3. ARC proposed, and it was passed by the Senate, that students pursuing certain pre-professional programs be treated, for purposes of general education as transfer students. The CLAS Dean's Office, which advises these students, will be responsible for monitoring academic progress and communicating with the Degree Requirements Office regarding student placement into general education should they decide to complete a degree program at PSU.

4. ARC clarified ambiguities in the 1994-95 and 1995-96 catalogs regarding transfer students. Students transferring to PSU under either of these two catalogs with 16 or more credits may choose to complete either the university studies or the distribution model for their general education requirements.

5. ARC has begun a discussion about the definition of a transfer student for purposes of placement in the university studies model of general education. There exists a certain amount of confusion regarding students who begin at PSU, transfer somewhere else and then return to PSU (and how they are placed into gen ed). Additionally, the issue of continuing distribution model students, or students who return after a long absence, who would like to follow the university studies model needs some action.
The Work of the Committee

The formation of the Ad Hoc Committee was voted by the Senate on February 5, 1996. The Committee on Committees was asked to appoint a member from each division of the Senate. Chairs of the University Curriculum, Graduate, and Academic Requirements Committees served ex-officio. The charge to the Committee is attached (see addendum).

During the Spring 1996 term, the committee met twice to discuss current procedures and to identify areas for further investigation and possible action. The committee decided to examine procedures for curricular change at similar institutions and in different units of the University. It was also decided to reconvene during the 96-97 year when 4-credit course conversion would be largely completed. During Winter 97, members of the committee met to complete this report.

General concerns

After discussions with faculty, including former and current members of the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Committee, the committee targeted two concerns: the need to streamline the process of curriculum change and the need for sharing knowledge about changes.

Need for streamlining
1. The process is slow. Depending on the date when one initiates a change request, it can take as long as 18 months to move from submission to appearance in the catalogue.
2. The process is not consistent. The information required for changes and the number, types, and speed of reviews vary between PSU's schools and colleges.
3. The process was not designed to be responsive to new opportunities and imperatives. Deadlines are organized around the catalogue's publication date rather than the University's desire or obligation to bring new programs on line as happened recently with revised teacher certification.
4. The process adds steps. Courses sharing graduate and undergraduate credit (400/500) must be reviewed by two committees.

Need for sharing knowledge
1. The procedures are not well-known to individual faculty, especially new faculty, who may wish to initiate new courses.
2. The process does not facilitate communication among departments and programs which have a need to know changes that are planned for the offerings of other departments.
3. There is at present little cooperation among faculty who might jointly propose individual courses, course sequences, or programs.

Recommendations
Our review convinces us that the curricular change procedures in place do not operate as swiftly or effectively as they should and should be revised. These procedures were put to the
test during the 1995-96 and 1996-97 years when more than 2000 course changes were completed. While the volume of changes will not again match that occasioned by 4-credit conversion, courses changes will be important to the University's future. They will continue as a result of new hires and changing faculty interests, of an increasing number of inter-departmental and inter-institutional programs, and of PSU's mandate to be responsive to the changing educational needs of the region, the state and the metropolitan area.

From our review, we offer the following recommendations

A. To streamline,
   1. establish uniform guidelines and steps for all instructional divisions of the University such as notification of impacted departments/programs and requirements for review
   2. revise and reduce paperwork for curricular change (now requiring 18 copies) and move toward electronic distribution
   3. allow rolling conversion by establishing an on-line catalogue to speed timing of implementation and to encourage transformation of 410 courses into regular offerings
   4. reorganize committees at the school or college level to assure review by qualified and interested faculty (eg science, arts, social science)

B. For better knowledge-sharing
   1. make new guidelines available in a faculty handbook that is revised annually and publicized to deans, department heads, and directors by the University Curriculum Committee
   2. post course and program changes on PSU's Home Page to make known what has been received, what is under consideration, and what has been approved

C. Governance
   1. The Senate should set general guidelines for types of courses and credit equivalencies (3-hour v. 4 hour, distance learning, and by arrangement). There is a precedent in PSU Graduate Handbook.
   2. The course oversight functions of the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Committee should be combined in a single University Curriculum Committee. At present, there is a mismatch such that professional school faculty review undergraduate courses in UCC and a duplication of effort for 400/500 courses now reviewed by both committees. The Graduate Committee should remain to review petitions and special programs in the manner of the ARC.
   3. The new UCC should become a representative subcommittee of the Senate in which 50% plus one of its members are elected Senators.
   4. The new UCC should include subcommittees of faculty qualified in special subject areas (eg arts & humanities, science, engineering) Note: See A4

D. Administration
   1. Provide a stipend to UCC chair to hire assistance for communications and paperwork
2. Create a 1/2 time position as curriculum coordinator who would combine the currently separated administration of undergraduate courses through OAA and graduate courses through OGS
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ADDENDUM - CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE
Faculty Senate Meeting
2/5/96
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 to 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 Universities 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: What is the nature of different types of courses (lectures, labs, etc)? What are the distinctions between courses offered at different levels (lower/upper graduate)?

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?