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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 5, 1997, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH. Please note the extensive agenda. Accordingly, be prepared for a lengthy meeting and provide for your alternate to attend if you must leave early.

AGENDA

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the April 7, 1997, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. 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. Budget Committee Annual Report - Schaumann
   *2. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report - Gordon-Brannan
   *3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report - Stern & Van Dyck Kokich
   *4 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report - Young

F. Unfinished Business
   None

G. New Business
   *1. Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, d
   *2. Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, j
   *3. Policy Statement on External Gifts and Grants - C. Wamser
   *4. Guidelines for Evaluation of Program Proposals - C. Wamser
   *5. B.A./B.S. in Women’s Studies - R. Pratt

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the April 7, 1997, Senate Meeting
   E1 Budget Committee Annual Report
   E2 Faculty Development Committee Annual Report
   E3 Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report
   E4 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report
   G1 Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, d
   G2 Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, j
   G3 Policy Statement on External Gifts and Grants
   G4 Guidelines for Evaluation of Program Proposals
   G5 B.A./B.S. in Women’s Studies
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 7, 1997
Presiding Officer: Ulrich H. Hardt
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Aso for Becker, Paradis for Cumpston, Chapman for Howe, Truxillo for Perrin, Dobson for Weikel.

Members Absent: Carter, Collie, Friesen, Martin, Westbrook.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Ulrich Hardt at 3:07 p.m. The Faculty Senate Minutes of March 3, 1997, were approved with the following correction:

- p. 88, para. 2, line 2. after “MOOR asked if there would be representation in the Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute of faculty from outside UPA.” Replace remaining text with the following: “WAMSER yielded to W. Ellis, Assoc. Dean, UPA, who stated faculty from the School of Social Work are presently involved, and the Institute would welcome involvement of faculty from any other part of the university who were engaged in research activities related to the purpose of the Institute.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- Andrews-Collier made the following announcement regarding 1997 Faculty Elections, after the Provost’s Report:
It has been brought to my attention that errors in the Nominations ballot (red) mailed on March 31, 1997, may cause inequities in nominations for Advisory Council and IFS. Therefore, upon the advice of the Steering Committee that ballot is declared invalid and I restarted the 1997 Faculty Elections early this week. The new Nominations ballot (blue) will be in campus mail on Wednesday and is due at OIRP by April 18, 1997.

• STERN, Co-chair of the Intercollegiate Athletic Board reported to the Senate on the committee’s review of the recommendations made by the “Big Sky Oversight Committee.” IAB recommended maintaining affiliation with the Big Sky Conference. Attendance and stadium size are principle reasons which preclude a move to any other conference. IAB recommended we continue the existing “sports mix.” IAB recommended a budget for the first year of five-years-out with a university contribution of $1.516872 million. This is equal to the IFC contribution and less than the Athletic Depts. recommended minimum. The committee will continue to work on a five-year budget plan, gender equity issues and fund raising through the remainder of the academic year.

1. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

RAMALEY was in Salem appearing before the Ways and Means Comm. The Provost reported for her during his report.

2. PROVOST’S REPORT

REARDON reviewed the external progress of current academic proposals. The Math Ed Ph.D. is through Academic Council and ready for outside review. It may still have to be approved by the Board as a preliminary proposal before it is moved forward. The M. of Music was approved by the Board at the last meeting, and will be on the consent agenda (for a formal vote) at the coming meeting. The M.S. and Master of Environmental Management has gone forward as part of a series of joint campus graduate programs in Environmental Sciences studies and policies. Preliminary Proposals reviewed at the last Academic Council Meeting and going to the Board for consideration at the next meeting are Chicano/Latino Studies Certificate, Biotechnology Certificate, and M.S. in Conflict Resolution. The Vice Chancellor determined that the Special Education Counselor Education Specialization under the Ed Ph.D. is a new
option and has be considered for external review. Our Criminal Justice Center proposal is on the agenda for the next Board meeting. There may also be some new engineering proposals this year.

JOHNSON asked the Provost to comment on OSU’s recent proposals to offer external degrees. REARDON stated it has not been discussed at the Board nor gone through any procedure. There has been some discussion at Academic Council, ex post facto. They raised some specific concerns regarding undergraduate programs at local community colleges. The community colleges have not been consulted by OSU. It is not related to the Bend or coastal areas issue. The bill to establish a baccalaureate degree granting institution at the community college in Bend has not moved out of committee. An OSSHE response to that bill is to put forward a plan to try to deliver undergraduate education in the Bend area. OSU might be a major player in that effort. We are looking at the impact on our statewide MBA and forthcoming statewide MSW offered there. We also have an interest in Public Administration which was established there by Lewis & Clark. We are not contemplating any other activities at present.

MACK asked the Provost expand on his to comment on OSU activities on the coast. REARDON stated he has no information. SAIFER asked who is the Academic Council, what is the procedure for developing such programs, and what is going on in southern Oregon. REARDON stated the Academic Council consists of the provosts and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and her staff. Approval depends on the province of the programs, for example, self supporting activities require Academic Council approval. Generally, in the past, any time a program has been offered at a new sight, it has required approval of the Academic Council and reporting to the Board. Regarding their designs on southern Oregon, REARDON stated he only knows what he read in OSU’s general plan.

CEASE asked the Provost to expand on his comment regarding OSU activities at community colleges. REARDON stated that the local community colleges and Chemeketa, where we have some activities underway as well, all stated that they were approached some time ago by OSU to discuss the idea but discussions did not take place. Recently, they either were approached with specific offers of courses, including time of day, which most declined, or they learned of it from the media as we did.

REARDON reviewed progress on the next Higher Education budget. There still seems to be agreement to hold to the current service level, which include increases in certain categories of funding. The Governor’s request for some
special funding in engineering has bounced around. There is a continuing issue of how OGI might access that investment. SB504 has again been rewritten to remove most of the items we found particularly objectionable. However, the previous version which concentrates engineering education at OGI is still strongly supported by the Wash. Co. legislative contingent. The salary adjustment recommendation is for a 2%-2% increase for all public employees. The governor requested an additional $7.5 million for Higher Ed. If the bulk of the governor’s proposal is approved, we will be closer to a 3%-3% salary increase in Higher Ed. The governor’s budget recommends $10 million for community/four-year institution compacts and various interactions. Part of that proposal addresses our compacts with local community colleges.

REARDON noted that campuses are also simultaneously negotiating institutional budgets with the Chancellor’s office. They are scheduled to be approved at the July board meeting. There are some issue in these negotiations which are important for us. We have essentially agreed on the new enrollment corridor. We are still in negotiations over our share of funds according to the BAS allocation formula. The PSU and Chancellor’s office interpretations of the “mix” of students differ by $1.2 million. Regarding doctoral programs, under funding formulas developed in the 1970’s, interdisciplinary programs have been funded at a lower rate than disciplinary programs. PSU is making the argument that the Ph.D. in Environment Science should be funded at the disciplinary rate. We are also addressing funding of programs in Education, Social Work and Public Administration, which are all currently at the lower end of the funding scale.

LENDARIS asked if improved funding of interdisciplinary programs might also be raised, as we originally urged in the 1970’s. REARDON stated that since the 1970’s, UO and OSU have added some interdisciplinary program. We are seeking data to show how funding of those programs compares to funding of our own.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators, or questions from the floor to the Chair.
E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report.

PUTNAM presented the report (E1) and noted that Alan Zeiber’s name was inadvertently left off the report.

HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

MERCER presented the report (E2) and noted that the petition rate was double the usual load, probably due to the General Education requirement. BRENNER asked Mercer to elaborate. MERCER stated that one cause for petitions is the diversity requirement. ARC is working on updating the approved list for the diversity requirement, and developing a policy to evaluate courses being transferred in. Additionally, the definition of a transfer student is also under review. Some students are going back and forth between PSU and the community colleges, making evaluation under the new General Ed requirements more complex.

HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of April 5, 1997

ENNEKING reported on the IFS meeting after the Provost’s Report. IFS went over budget issues with the Chancellor, and urges grass roots support of the Governor’s budget on the part of faculties and their supporters. A second issue which was addressed at the meeting is periodic review of tenured faculty, principally as it relates to post-tenure review and not incompetence. Policies differ across the campuses, and IFS is interested in clarifying these differences. A sub-committee has been formed to survey the campuses, and John Cooper will represent PSU.

HARDT asked what were differences. ENNEKING stated she was not sure of all specifics, but one example is that on some campuses every course has a course survey every time it is taught. Another example used was the funding attached to the peer review process at PSU, although it was noted that the amount is pitifully small.
F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Change

HARDT noted that President Ramaley requested the process be accelerated when she first arrived at PSU and this has not happened yet. He reviewed the current timeline used for course changes/proposals. Proposals are due in the Office of Academic Affairs on 15 March. UCC and GC forward their recommendations to Senate at the following November/December meeting. The catalogue issued the following summer reflects the changes. In addition to that, each school/college has internal deadlines before March 15, usually commencing in fall quarter.

Robert Liebman, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, presented the report (G1) and reviewed their findings and recommendations. He noted one correction, to delete the last remark under C.1., which talks about the Graduate Handbook.

CABELLY/LENDARIS MOVED the Senate accept the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Change.

DRISCOLL stated, regarding item C., 2., that he supports the concept of a single curriculum committee, but he doesn’t see how combining the committees improves the division of labor. In addition, “professional school faculty” is a confusing term. LIEBMAN stated UCC should be a microcosm of Senate; the committee structure should not create an artificial separation. DRISCOLL also requested, regarding C., 4., that there be more detail on the sub-committee composition, or the definition could become too narrow. Some cross over is a good thing. LIEBMAN stated right now there is no rule that any particular interests are represented on sub-committees.

ENNEKING asked if the recommendations indicate a much larger role for sub-committees. PRATT stated that the current practice is already to use sub-committees. ENNEKING asked what happens next if the Senate accepts the report. LIEBMAN stated there will be a need for one or more constitutional amendments, and some administrative concurrence to other recommendations. JOHNSON asked how much the process is sped up with these changes. LIEBMAN stated course approvals would move to about a three-month cycle.
This timeline would also work to the advantage of such items as new or changed teacher certification requirements.

WINEBERG read comments from the Graduate Council dated April 2, 1997, addressing the draft report:

"reasons why the current process takes 18 months...is that registration is being moved up each term, requiring an earlier publication of the catalog, and thus earlier deadlines for proposals...the process for the Graduate Council...is often slowed down because departments or schools have not prepared the form correctly,...there is nothing in the proposal about streamlining the process at the Senate level. One suggestion we offer is for the Senators to be given one month to look over course proposals, changes online and to consider curricular change only if a specific question has been raised. Another possibility is for the Senate to look at only new courses and new programs, not minor changes...

perplexed by the need to create a new Senate subcommittee on Curriculum... Faculty elected to the Senate are not necessarily the best persons to make comments on curriculum...this would be a great deal of extra work for those Senators who serve on this Curriculum Committee.

It seems that the primary motivation for such a committee is to deal with 400/500 level courses...risk of the graduate curriculum getting much less attention than the undergraduate...a problem with applying the same criteria for both undergraduate and graduate courses. It is possible that a course might be acceptable as a 400 level course or as a 500 level course but not as both. Separate, independent review is required.

The Graduate Council expects to continue to approve new graduate programs. It is difficult to approve a program within at the same time approving the courses that make up that program."

LIEBMAN stated the committee considered some of these comments to be good sense. The Ad Hoc Committee is not advocating a new separate committee on curriculum, but to change the jurisdiction of the two committees and to include more Senate membership so there is less duplication of effort.

BEESON asked if advising becomes more arcane with more rapid course approvals? LIEBMAN stated the current practice is that departments are internally managing changes which won’t appear officially for eighteen months. An improvement over current practice is reducing omnibus-numbered courses in the process. Courses could follow a shorter cycle, but programs should still be on an annual cycle.

ROSEGRANT asked for (TERDAL who has laryngitis), how does the job description in D.,2. differ from Linda Devereaux's responsibilities. LIEBMAN stated that Devereaux handles the input into the Banner system and compliance for the university. The position lacks a proactive person who establishes the calendar, instructs the committee, and advocates for it. Devereaux makes sure
courses look right and handles publication, but doesn’t act as a resource or ombudsperson for curricular change. PRATT stated the largest problem is a lack of knowledge sharing, even in an 18-month cycle.

BRENNER asked if a proposal for funding such a position was inappropriate. The committee could provide the proactive function if it used technology and streamlined the paperwork, and the other stuff should be pro forma. We should try some alternative before requesting funding. LIEBMAN stated the dollars are spent now, and the report is recommending a change in how they are spent. BRENNER stated perhaps we don’t need either if we reform the system and use new resources.

PRATT stated he was shocked to think there is anything more important to spend money on than curriculum.

CABELLY/LENDARIS requested their motion be withdrawn in order to submit a substitute. There was no objection.

LENDARIS/CABELLY MOVED the Senate accept the spirit of the recommendations contained in the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Curricular Change, and charge the Ad Hoc Committee to prepare a more specific proposal for the Senate which implements the ideas presented and incorporates issues discussed today.

ENNEKING recommended the committee work with GC and UCC Chairs to complete the proposals. LENDARIS noted that this activity is contained in the wording of his motion.

BEESON stated he would appreciate illustrations of how the changes would work technically.

CABELLY requested a review of the timeline to complete this business this year. HARDT stated that a constitutional amendment would have to have a first reading at May Senate to be an action item by the June meeting. That is the preferable timeline, so this membership completes this item. Other issues could be wrapped up at the June meeting. LIEBMAN stated it would also be desirable to complete it under this presidency.

JOHNSON stated Graduate Council has excellent administrative support now and we don’t want to loose it. The Senate should recommend the equivalent support for all curriculum activities. LIEBMAN agreed with Johnson. He noted that at present, Pratt is acting UCC as interim chair, as Committee on
Committees is having difficulty recruiting a chair due to this issue. HARDT stated there is a precedent from the semester conversion when OAA provided UCC with support.

BRENNER reiterated she supports D., 1., but she wants to clarify issues related to D., 2.

DRISCOLL noted that OSU is one example of an institution with an "electronic catalogue" that one can look at. JOHNSON stated that 50% Senators on the sub-committee is unwieldy from the standpoint of the charge of the Committee on Committees. ENNEKING stated she sees an advantage in having dual membership. ROSENGRANT stated she can see the pragmatism in that notion, however, her perception is that it smacks of a control issue, and is not a good use of faculty resources. BEESON stated there are other ways to involve the rest of the faculty with the Senate’s business.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43
MEMORANDUM

TO: PSU Faculty Senate

FROM: Rolf Schaumann

RE: Budget Committee Report

Membership of the 1996/97 PSU Faculty Senate Budget Committee:

Voting Members: Lisa Adajian (MTH), George Battistel (SBA), Erik Bodegom (PHYS), Michael Bowman (LIB), Grant Farr (SOC), William Feyerherm (SSW), James Kimball (TV), Thomas Kindermann (PSY), Cheryl Livneh (XS), Rolf Schaumann (EE) (Chair), Elizabeth Steinberger (ED), Brian Stipak (PA), students (not yet appointed)

Ex officio members: Carl Wamser (CHEM) (UPC); Jay Kenton, Kathleen Stock (FADM)

The Budget Committee met in Fall 1996 to get briefed by Kathleen Stock and George Pernsteiner of FADM on this years' budget issues, OSSHE budget allocation procedures, and likely short falls for the 1996/97 academic year. Having been made aware of the relevant budget issues, the committee decided not to meet unless there was business to be conducted, and to schedule the next meeting, when agenda items would be brought before it. This decision was made in view of the fact that a special ad hoc committee, the Strategic Budget Design Team (SBDT), had been appointed by the President to work on devising a strategic budgeting process under the guidance of the National Council on Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) consultants. (William Feyerherm and Rolf Schaumann held joint membership in both the Budget Committee and the SBDT.)

Based on information received during the academic year 1995/96 and the Fall 1996 briefing, the budget committee could not hope to be called on for input into any allocation of new moneys. Rather, it was expected that the Committee would be kept very busy with difficult and troublesome deliberations on budget reduction or reallocation issues. Fortunately, that did not materialize. The Education and General (E&G) short fall (≈ $7M) could be covered from the reserve fund, with the expectation that the favorable enrollment picture at PSU will bring in new allocations ($7M - $11M) in 1997/98. Also, much budgetary planning was on hold until the SBOT finished its work. A reasonably final draft of the SBOT recommendations is now available, and the Budget Committee has had an opportunity to critique the draft and comment on it before a final version is written.

Whereas per the Constitution of the PSU Faculty Senate, the Budget Committee is charged with, among others, making recommendations for the preparation for the annual and biennial budgets, recommending budgetary priorities, consulting regarding changes from budgets as prepared, and reviewing expenditures of funds, the Constitution does, of course, not formalize a process of bringing the relevant issues to the Committee. The process recommended by the SBOT promises to change that: It is proposed that the PSU faculty, through the Budget Committee (as well as the University Planning Council) are now officially consulted at all levels of the process of reviewing and guiding the budget design, of setting priorities, and of monitoring outcomes. PSU's budget and budgeting process promise to become less mysterious, with input based on guidelines and priorities agreed upon by the Faculty, with information available on resources, expenditures, and measurable outcomes.
From early on, the plan being developed by the SBDT identified a number of intermediate deadlines in the planning cycle of the 1997-1998 E&G Fund budget. Many of the steps entail input and comment from the Senate Budget Committee, but at this time the work of the SBDT is more than a month behind its self-imposed time line. We hope that time will permit the Administration to involve the Budget Committee in its deliberations throughout the remainder of the year.
Faculty Development Committee Annual Report  
April 14, 1997  
Mary Gordon-Brannan, SpHr, Committee Chair

The Faculty Development Committee received 52 proposals during 1996-97 requesting $317,341. with an average request of $6,103. (range of $1,320. - $18,127.). The Committee was allotted $100,000. to award applicants. The proposals were reviewed by committee members and a disciplinary reviewer. The factors considered in reviewing the proposals included scholarly merit, ability to complete the project, external funding potential, and budget. Thirty-five of the proposals were granted Faculty Development funds with a mean funding level of $2857. for a total of $100,000. Because the requests were more than three times the funds available and because it was decided by the committee to fund as many proposals as feasible, most of the funded proposals were funded below the requested amount. It was the Committee's judgment that the funded projects could be carried out with the funds awarded. The breakdown of requests and funded projects is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Request</th>
<th># Funded</th>
<th>% Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average: 67%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By June, 1997, the Committee will have reviewed peer review requests and awarded $20,000. to applicants.

The Committee strongly recommends that the amount of funds for Faculty Development be increased.

Faculty Development Committee members are:

Mary Gordon-Brannan, SpKofi Agorsah, BST
Sharon Carstens, ANTH
Malgorzata Chrzanowska-Jeske, EE
Amy Driscoll, CAE
Kit Dusky, LIB
Beverly Fuller, SBA
Brad Hansen SC-IS
Heidi Herinckx, SSW
Clive Knights, ARCH
David Morgan, UPA
Dannell Stevens, ED
Herman Taylor, BIO
Gerardo Lafferriere, MTH
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS BOARD
To the PSU Faculty Senate
May 1997

Voting members: Judy VanDyck (co-chair), Bruce Stern (co-chair), Bob Walker, Sy Adler, Richard Forbes, George Hough, Jim Mustard (community member), Chris Groener (student), Joe Shaffer (student), and Ken McMahon (student).

Ex-Officio members: Bob Lockwood, Jim Sterk, Kathleen Stock, Anne McCoy, and George Pernsteiner.

The IAB has been exceptionally busy this year dealing with the ramifications of last year's pledge to move from Division II athletics to the Division I-AA Big Sky Conference. 1997 is the first year of a two year compliance period, and a period of great transition as the university recognizes the institutional commitment that the move to Division I-AA requires.

The IAB has played a central role in exploring and defining our institutional commitment and its financial implications. This process has helped to clarify the expectations and limitations of the campus and community constituencies involved in supporting athletics.

The move to Big Sky requires a larger financial commitment on the part of all supporters, as new required sports are added, as minimum scholarship levels mandated by the NCAA are implemented, and as gender equity advances are achieved. This financial commitment comes from the following sources: university budgetary support; student support in the form of dedicated student fees; revenue from state sports lottery; revenue from sports (tickets, advertisers, guarantees); and revenue from fundraising efforts.

The task for the IAB has been to set reasonable and achievable budgetary guidelines for the next five years to allow PSU teams to increase/maintain their competitiveness in a new conference, while simultaneously making steady progress toward gender equity goals. In its deliberations, the IAB has benefitted from comments and input from faculty and students, community supporters, the Athletic Department, coaches, athletes, the "Big Sky Athletics Oversight Committee", and others.

The IAB's deliberations through April 7 produced a series of recommendations to the President. First it was recommended that our affiliation with the Big Sky Conference be continued, but reviewed in 3-5 years. Secondly, we recommended that the existing sports mix not be changed. Thirdly we recommended that the university's financial contribution from the general fund increase in 1997-98 to a level of $1,516,872 (equal to that of the IFC contribution) to cover the initial move to Division I-AA and to enhance gender equity. This compares to a $900,000 contribution in 1995-96 and an expected 1996-97 contribution of $1,502,000. This recommended amount was less than what the Athletic Department requested to meet the mandated increases in NCAA scholarship levels, producing a challenge to enhance their revenues through increased financial support from the community.

After 1997-98 and through 2000-2001, the IAB recommends that the university's contribution be a flat $1.6 million which includes an incremental increase of $83,000 per year over 1997-98 levels to support gender equity advances. Other sources of support must also increase in order to meet the projected athletic department budget.

The IAB believes that in order for athletics to thrive at PSU, it must be a collaborative effort, based on support from the university, students, the Athletic Department itself, and the community. The IAB believes that its five year plan reflects this philosophy.

The remaining tasks facing the IAB this academic year involve the development of a 5-year gender equity plan and a fund-raising plan. These deliberations will take place from April 14-June 2, 1997.
TO: PSU Faculty Senate

FR: Teacher Education Committee, Emily Young, Chairperson

RE: Annual Report--1996-97

Committee Membership:

Emily de la Cruz, ED; Nancy Brawner-Jones, SPED; Mary Gordon-Brannan, SPHR; David Jimerson, MUS; Ray Mariels, ENG; Jeanette Palmiter, MTH; Betsy Steinberger, EPFA; William Tate, TA; Bob Tinnin, BIO; Suwako Watanabe, FLL; Cathleen Smith, PSY; Emily Young, Art; Suzanna Garrison, Student.

Ex-officio: Robert Everhart, Kathy Greey, Ulrich H. Hardt

1. The major activity of the year was the concurrent accreditation visit of NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) and the program approval visit of TSPC (Oregon’s Teacher Standards and Practices Commission), November 19-22, 1996. In anticipation of the visit, the Teacher Education Committee assisted the School of Education in preparing the necessary materials. During the visit, the Committee met with team members.

Both teams wrote very positive reports, recommending continued approval for the allowable maximum five years. All standards were met. In particular, the following strengths were mentioned:

- Professional Development Partnerships with metro-area schools
- Inclusion program giving students both Elementary and Special Education licenses
- Revised administration licensure program
- Supervision of field placements done by faculty (rather than by adjuncts)
- “Productive climate of faculty governance”
- High quality of staff, faculty, and students

The teams were also pleased that an ESL licensure program was being planned. Clearly, the Portland State School of Education and its supporting cross-campus departments operate model programs and graduate teachers of the highest quality. Cooperating school districts and other agencies have expressed consistently high satisfaction with our graduates.
2. The Committee reviewed the proposed pilot program for the redesigned Oregon licensure and approved it. The pilot has been monitored throughout the year and will have a final report ready following the completion of the pilot year in August. (Beginning January 1999, Oregon will move to four authorization levels for licenses: Early Childhood, age 3 to grade 4; Elementary, grades 3-8; Middle Level, grades 5-10; and Mid and High School, grades 7-12.)

3. During the last two years, the School of Education operated the following cohorts:

- Spring '95 Elementary Cohort (finished Winter '96) = 25 students
- Spring '95 Secondary Cohort (finished Winter '96) = 21 students
- Fall '95 Added Elementary Cohort (finished Spring '96) = 24 students
- Fall '95 Secondary Cohort (finished Winter '96) = 30 students
- Fall '95 Inclusion Cohort (finished Winter '97) = 27 students
- Spring '96 Elementary Cohort (finished Winter '97) = 29 students
- Spring '96 Secondary Cohort (finished Winter '97) = 27 students
- Fall '96 Elementary Cohort (will finish Summer '97) = 29 students
- Fall '96 Secondary Cohort (will finish Summer '97) = 26 students
- Fall '96 K-12 Cohort (will finish Summer '97) = 26 students

- Fall '95 Handicapped Learner/Severely HL Cohort (finished F'96) = 36 students
- Fall '96 Handicapped Learner/Severely HL Cohort (finish F '97) = 30 students
- *Fall '96 Vision Impaired/HL Cohort (finish Spring '98) = 27 students
- Fall '94, '95, '96 School Counseling Cohorts (finish in 3 years) = 30 students

*These 53 students were added to help the University achieve its new enrollment corridor.

In addition to these numbers, the School also has students working on Standard licenses, masters degrees and doctoral degrees. The SCH production in the School of Education between Fall 1996 and 1997 rose by 20.6 percent.
For consideration by the Faculty Senate, 5/5/97

Proposed Changes to Constitution of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty. Section 4 Faculty Committees

Text to be deleted struck-out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

4d) Curriculum Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two students. The Committee shall:

1) Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new courses and undergraduate programs referred to it by divisional curriculum or other committees.
2) Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new graduate programs and their courses referred to it by the Graduate Council or other committees.
3) Refer recommendations to the Senate with recommendations all modifications and deletions of concerning substantive changes to existing programs and courses brought to it through committee channels referred to it by divisional the Graduate Council or other committees.
4) Suggest needed program and course modifications and deletions changes to the various divisions and departments.
5) Consider and prepare policy statements Develop and recommend policies concerning such curricular-patterns curriculum at the University as the Committee deems necessary.
6) Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of appropriate committees.
7) Suggest and refer to the Senate, after consideration by the Academic Requirements Committee, modifications in the overall degree requirements within the curricular structure.
8) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of courses.
9) Report on its activities at least once each year to the Senate in-summary form, including in such report a listing a list of programs and courses recommended and not recommended reviewed and approved.
9) Act in liaison with appropriate committees in the review of graduate-level courses.
Proposed Changes to Constitution of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty. Section 4. Faculty Committees

Text to be deleted struck-out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

j) Graduate Council. This council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research Dean of Graduate Studies. The Council shall:

1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish procedures and regulations for graduate studies, and adjudicate petitions regarding graduate regulations.

2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or to its appropriate committees and to the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Research Dean of Graduate Studies suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs.

3) Coordinate all graduate activities of instructional units and programs with regard to requests for changes in courses, requests for new courses and programs, and changes in existing graduate courses and for new graduate courses and programs; and submit recommendations to the Senate. **Make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee concerning approval of all new graduate programs and their courses and of all changes in existing graduate programs.**

4) At its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, review existing programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis; consider the need for graduate course modifications and deletions; and review the credit value of graduate courses. Reports of such review and recommendations deriving therefrom shall be submitted to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, the Faculty Senate and appropriate faculty committees. **Suggest needed program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.**

5) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of graduate courses.

6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.

7) Report to the Senate at least once a year, including a list of programs and their courses reviewed and recommended.
DRAFT POLICY STATEMENT ON EXTERNAL GIFTS AND GRANTS

Proposed additions in italics, proposed deletions lined out.

I. The University will accept only gifts and grants which are consistent with its core educational and humanitarian values. In evaluating the appropriateness of any particular gift or grant, the University will consider:

1. Compatibility with the missions of Portland State University and of its individual programs.

2. Compatibility with the purposes of an Urban Grant University as defined by the national standards incorporated in Title 11 of the 1992 Higher Education Act.

3. Compliance with the Internal Revenue Service and other federal laws that stipulate the conditions under which contributions can be given and received.

4. Compliance with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 580, Div. 42, and other state regulations that stipulate the conditions under which contributions can be given and received.

II. The University has a duty to ensure that any gift or grant is used appropriately and that opportunities for the exercise of improper external influence are restricted.

This duty is exercised in the administration of any grant or gift by rigorous application of all existing formal internal review procedures, including normal peer review and curricular review, that govern personnel and policy decisions. In particular, the University adheres to the AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. In addition, all University academic programs undergo regular external reviews conducted by individuals and organizations independent of the University within a reasonable time frame. Such reviews are an important mechanism for evaluating and improving the quality and integrity of University programs.

Finally, the University will scrutinize those institutional arrangements which might make a unit or individual more vulnerable to informal sources of external influence or pressure. To that end, a review will assure that:

First, any unit or individual receiving external funding is well integrated into broader collegial networks and academic units to facilitate peer review.

Second, when new programs are established by external funds, they either are not dependent solely on these funds or there is in place a realistic plan for broadening their maintaining an adequate base of support. Programs which depend exclusively on external funds for their very existence may be more subject to informal sources of influence than those with a wider array of funding sources.

III. Responsiveness to our community

The University will do its utmost to ensure the careful consideration of local concerns which may be raised with respect to specific gifts and grants.

In the event that concerns are expressed, the President will select an appropriate University-wide body to review the proposed gift or grant. This body may be a standing committee of the faculty, such as the Advisory Council, or an ad hoc group. It is expected that, in the latter case, the group will have a significant representation of PSU faculty, although others may be included if the President deems necessary.

Whether or not concerns are expressed about the acceptance of a gift or grant, the University will be attentive to community views as part of ongoing program evaluation. In carrying out external reviews, academic units will be expected to assemble, for consultation with the reviewers, individuals representing a broad range of community perspectives.
General Authority

580-042-0005 The Board encourages gifts by faithfully devoting them, subject to the terms of the gift, to the institution or program for which intended, and by other suitable means.

Stat. Auth.: ORS Ch. 351
Hist.: HEB 3-1978, f. & ef. 6-5-78

Delegation

580-042-0010 (1) Institutions are authorized to apply for and accept, on behalf of the Board, gifts or grants and to negotiate contracts that will not result in:
(a) Enrollments in excess of those on which budgets have been based;
(b) Commitment of funds beyond those available in budgets approved by the Board, or the normal continuation thereof;
(c) Creating a commitment for the institution or the state to continue support of a program funded through gifts, grants, or contracts, in the event such funds are discontinued;
(d) Development or support of activities inconsistent with the approved mission of the department and/or institution;
(e) Launching of new curricular programs that have not received prior Board approval;
(f) Purchase of land or improvements thereof requiring an outlay of $10,000 or more;
(g) Establishing or significantly expanding a clientele for services of an essentially non-research or non-instructional nature.
(2) The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration or a designee is authorized to approve applications for and acceptance of other gifts, grants, or contracts.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 351.070
Hist.: HEB 3-1978, f. & ef. 6-5-78; HEB 2-1986, f. & ef. 1-17-86; HEB 10-1990, f. & cert. ef. 7-26-90; HEB 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-93

Institutional Responsibility

580-042-0015 Requests for gift, grant, or contract funds may be initiated by an institution, division, or statewide service, acting for the Board, subject to the following considerations:
(1) A request obligating the Board to increase an allocation of state appropriations or seek additional state funds where the gift, grant, or contract to be discontinued is subject to Board approval before the request is submitted to the granting agency.
(2) When all or a major portion of project performance requires the services of institutional personnel or use of its property or if project funding includes indirect cost allowances, funding is to be requested in the name of the Board.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 351.070
Hist.: HEB 3-1978, f. & ef. 6-5-78; HEB 2-1986, f. & ef. 1-17-86; HEB 4-1993, f. & cert. ef. 5-10-93

Board Acceptance of Scholarship Gifts

580-0420-020 (1) Gifts made to an institution by any donor to provide scholarships on a competitive basis shall be reported to the Board as scholarship gifts, provided the institution participates in the selection of the recipients.
(2) Gifts made to an institution by nonprofit organizations for the benefit of designated students shall be reported as scholarship gifts to the institution on the assumption that the recipients were selected on a competitive basis.
(3) Gifts made by individuals, or by partnerships or corporations operated for profit, for designated students not selected on some competitive basis ordinarily used in selecting scholarship recipients, shall not be accepted as scholarship gifts to the institution. These payments may be deposited to the credit of the student in the institutional business office in an agency account known as "Student Safekeeping". These contributions or payments shall be considered gifts to the recipient and not to the institution and will not be reported to the Board.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 351.070
Hist.: HEB 3-1978, f. & ef. 6-5-78; HEB 1-1993, f. & cert. ef. 2-5-93

*This online version of the OARs is provided for convenience of reference and enhanced access. The official, record copy of these publications is the printed copy.
University Planning Council

Guidelines for evaluation of program proposals

The University Planning Council is charged to "recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University." It is also charged to "consider proposals for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function" of the University's departments, programs, and other significant academic entities. In order to facilitate such consideration, UPC plans to use the following review guidelines to assure that proposals are (a) clearly and fully developed with the appropriate advice and review, (b) realistic within the University's resource environment, and (c) appropriately matched to the needs and mission of the University.

I. The Issue:
   A. Is there a clear and significant need or opportunity addressed?
   B. Is it consistent with the mission of the university, the school or college, and the department or program?

II. The Proposal:
   A. Does it follow "best practice" in the appropriate fields?
   B. Does it take into account existing solutions to similar problems?
   C. Are the objectives clear and measurable?
   D. Is there a clear implementation plan?
   E. Does it make effective use of resources?
   F. What are the indications for a successful outcome?

III. The Process:
   A. Have all appropriate parties been involved or consulted in a timely manner?
      (see Faculty Governance Handbook for required consultations)
   B. Has the decision-making process followed "best practice"?
   C. Is the proposal presented clearly, completely, and accurately?

IV. The Resources:
   A. Are the necessary financial and other resources clearly indicated: faculty, staff, space, facilities, equipment, etc.?
   B. Are long-term commitments clearly indicated and justified?
   C. What are the specific sources for the necessary resources?
   D. What is the potential for a positive return on investment?

V. The Impact:
   A. What is the projected impact on students, faculty, academic programs, the community, and issues of cultural sensitivity and diversity?
   B. Is there a clear plan for periodic evaluation of the program?
   C. Are there or will there be effective mechanisms for responding to the planned evaluations?

from the University Planning Council - approved April 10, 1997
PROPOSED MAJOR IN WOMEN'S STUDIES—SUMMARY/HIGHLIGHTS

Portland State University has offered an undergraduate and post-baccalaureate Certificate in Women's Studies since 1976 and a minor since 1987. We are proposing to offer a Bachelor's degree, rather than a Certificate at the undergraduate level. The Certificate would remain available as a post-baccalaureate degree.

CURRICULUM:

The Women's Studies Major combines an interdisciplinary core curriculum with individualized courses of study. The core curriculum will include: the introductory course, an interdisciplinary sequence of three courses focused on the development of critical thinking skills and an appreciation for the range of theoretical frameworks and methodologies present in contemporary feminist scholarship; a 3-term sequence in U.S. women's history; 8 credits in experiential learning, including a required seminar to be taken in conjunction with an internship or practicum.

For their individual program, students will design an emphasis which is based in a discipline or in a theme that crosses disciplines.

A discipline-based emphasis will consist of five courses (20 credits) in a department or program outside Women's Studies. Two of these courses are to be courses which familiarize students with that discipline's materials and approaches. The other three courses in the discipline are to be cross-listed with Women's Studies or approved by the Women's Studies advisor in the discipline.

A theme-based emphasis will consist of five courses which together form a coherent multi-disciplinary approach to a subject. All of the courses are to be cross-listed with Women's Studies or approved by their Women's Studies advisor.

Students will be required to develop a program in consultation with their Women's Studies advisor. In order to be considered for the BA or BS degree, this program of study will have to carry approval of both their Women's Studies advisor and the Women's Studies Coordinator. Changes in this program must be similarly approved. Non-approved programs will not be considered to meet major requirements. The point here is to ensure that students are well-advised and that their individually designed programs of study are intellectually coherent and appropriate to the goals of the Women's Studies major.

TOTAL CREDITS REQUIRED IN THE CORE: 32
(students will have a choice of taking either WS 340 or WS 341, although it is recommended that they take both)

TOTAL CREDITS IN INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM: 20

TOTAL CREDITS FOR THE MAJOR: 52

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) are not acceptable toward fulfilling major requirements with the following exceptions: one women's studies elective course, WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship, WS 409.
**WS CORE CURRICULUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WS 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Women's Studies [existing course]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 301</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Critical Inquiry [new course]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-discipline introduction to feminist frameworks including theoretical issues and varying approaches to the study of women and gender. Attention to the relationship between gender and other axes of inequality. Emphasis on the development of critical thinking skills. Pre-requisite WS 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 340</td>
<td>Women and Gender in America, Colonial Era to 1865 (4 credits) OR WS 341 Women and Gender in America, 1865-Present (4 credits) [existing courses]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 342</td>
<td>History of Feminism in the United States [changed course]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After a review of Western feminism’s Enlightenment roots and Victorian variations in the United States, this course focuses on the shaping of modern feminism as a diverse body of questions, ideas, and experiments in American life. Themes include political equality, the emergence of sexual politics, issues of race and difference, women workers and class conflict, the civil rights movement and gender struggles, radical feminism, conservative women and “backlash”, and feminist internationalism. Prerequisite: WS 340 or WS 341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 315</td>
<td>Feminist Analysis [changed course]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An exploration of the interpretive frameworks and research strategies utilized in contemporary feminist scholarship. Drawing on examples from more than one discipline, students will be introduced to a range of theoretical and methodological approaches, while learning to identify the choices that scholars make in carrying out their work. Issues under debate within feminist scholarship as well as the differences between feminist scholars and those working from other frameworks will be examined. Prerequisite: WS 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 404/409</td>
<td>Internship/Practicum (3,3) [existing course]</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 411</td>
<td>Experiential Learning Seminar (1,1) [new course]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be taken simultaneously with WS 404 or WS 409. Students will present material based upon their experiences in practica and internships. The seminar provides an opportunity for students to reflect on the settings where they are working and analyze issues that emerge in applying feminist theory to practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 415</td>
<td>Senior Seminar [changed course]</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With a focus on analysis, critique, comparison and connection, students will work collaboratively as well as independently in this theoretical, thematically-based course. The seminar is taught by faculty from multiple disciplines. Students will be responsible for planning and leading discussion during some sessions as well as presenting and responding to work-in-progress. Prerequisite: WS 315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOURCES:

Courses currently offered throughout the University are sufficient to support the electives for the proposed curriculum. In academic year 1996-1997, a total of 51 elective courses will be offered that could be used to fulfill individualized programs of study. As to the core curriculum, a 1.0 FTE in the History Department and a .66 FTE instructional appointment in Women's Studies support seven courses in the core curriculum. Additional funds to support the participation of departmental faculty in teaching the remaining core courses will be allocated permanently to Women's Studies by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

CHANGES TO THE CERTIFICATE AND MINOR

The Certificate in Women's Studies will be offered as a post-baccalaureate degree only. The structure of the Certificate will remain unchanged. The total number of credits and the core course requirements will change in order to be consistent with the new core curriculum for the major.

The minor will change slightly. The addition of four new core courses (WS 301, 340, 341, 342) allows for increased requirements in the core relative to electives. The total number of credits (28) remains the same.

WOMEN'S STUDIES MINOR

A minor in Women's Studies will consist of 28 credits. Students will be required to take 12 credits in the core courses (not including WS 404/409, WS 411). The additional 16 credits may be fulfilled by either core courses (including WS 404/409, WS 411) or Women's Studies electives (courses cross-listed with other departments or approved by the Women's Studies Coordinator).

CERTIFICATE IN WOMEN'S STUDIES (Post-Baccalaureate Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Women's Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 301 Gender and Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 315 Feminist Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 415 Senior Seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship or WS 409 (Practicum)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved electives (minimum of 12 upper division)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In meeting the 16 elective credits requirement, students may take a maximum of 12 credits in any one academic area (arts & letters, science, social science) and 4 credits in lower division courses.

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) are not acceptable toward fulfilling Certificate requirements with the following exceptions: one women's studies elective course, WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship, WS 409.