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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on December 1, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the November 3, 2014 Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor:
   *1. OAA Response to November Senate Actions
   Progress report on the Provost’s Challenge
   APPC Update
   IFS

D. Unfinished Business

E. New Business
   *1c. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda – UCC
   *2. Proposal for a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies
   *3. Resolution on Campus Public Safety (See Background Statement: E3a)
   *4. Proposal for Post-Tenure Review – first reading; final vote in January 2015; to be published to the Senate web site: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report (16:00)
   Provost’s Report
   *1. Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee
   *2. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:*
   B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 3, 2014 and attachments
   C-1 OAA Response to November Senate Actions
   E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda
   E-2 Proposal for a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies
   E-3 Proposal for Post-Tenure Review
   E-3a Background: School of Social Work faculty and staff statement
   G-1 Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee
   G-2 Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

Secretary to the Faculty
hickeym@pdx.edu • 650MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4624
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*Date: Oct. 17, 2014; New Senators in italics*
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

**Minutes:** Faculty Senate Meeting, November 3, 2014
**Presiding Officer:** Robert Liebman
**Secretary:** Martha W. Hickey

**Members Present:** Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopahayay, Padin, Perlmutter, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Santelmann, Schrock, Smith, Taylor, Zurk

**Alternates Present:** Messer for Carder, Lafferriere for Elzanowski (until 3:30), Hanson for Harmon, Hawash for Hollliday, Feng for Maier, Beckett for Popp, Bodegom for Sanchez, Ryder for Skaruppa, Cruzan for Stedman, Kinsella for Yeshilada

**Members Absent:** Carpenter, Hansen (David), Luther, Schuler

**Ex-officio Members Present:** Aylmer, Bowman, Everett, Fountain, Greco, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Labissiere, MacCormack, Marrongelle, McBride, McMillan for Noll, Mercer, Padin, Percy, Reynolds, Rueter, Su, Toppe

---

**A. ROLL**

**B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2014 MEETING**

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The October 6, 2014 minutes were approved as published. [Secretary’s note: BLEILER/HANSEN MOVED to approve, and voice vote sustained, after the APPC discussion.]

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

LIEBMAN launched a new practice of “setting up” each meeting with a progress report on initiatives launched and a preview of up-coming reports to Senate (see slides, minutes attachment B1). He announced that the Chair of PSU’s Board of Trustees has asked to speak at Faculty Senate this year, that a large number of current NTTF faculty have been re-ranked according to the new ranks that Senate approved, and that the Faculty Development Committee will have additional funds to distribute this year. He also reported the Senate Steering members and Committee chairs would be offered leadership training. He encouraged faculty to participate in governance activities linked to APP and the Academic Quality Task Force.
Richard Clucas has agreed to co-chair the Committee on Committees.

LIEBMAN introduced Julie Weissbuch-Allina, Director of Health Promotion and Education in Student Health and Counseling

Smoke and Tobacco-Free Campus Policy

WEISSBUCH-ALLINA offered an overview of the proposed policy, noting that President Weiwel had pledged a smoke-free campus by 2016 (see slides, minutes attachment B2). Under the policy, there will be exceptions to a campus-wide prohibition for traditional ceremonies and research. Of the 4,000 respondents to the 2012 survey conducted, 400 were faculty, with 62% endorsing smoke-free campus. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA encouraged public comment on the proposed policy. (See: http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library.) A request for approval of a fall 2015 implementation date will be sought in December 2014. There will be a marketing campaign to familiarize the campus with the policy.

MERCER and REESE asked if the policy included e-cigarettes and hookahs. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said yes, all use of commercial tobacco products would be banned. DOLIDON asked if the policy applied to visitors to the campus. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said her office and Campus Safety would deal with complaints. LONEY asked if the policy applied to student dorms. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said a smoke-free policy was already in effect in the dorms. RUETER wondered if the policy would cover marihuana use, if legalized. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said this would probably be addressed by a different policy.

KARAVANIC noted the recent discussion of the shortage of resources for Campus Safety, and asked if there were an estimate of the cost of enforcement of the policy. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that initial marketing would be the only real cost, and expressed confidence that the policy would become the accepted community standard.

LABISSIERE wondered why e-cigarettes were included. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that they were following FDA guidelines. Responding to CLARK, WEISSBUCH-ALLINA added that the policy included chewing tobacco.

RIEDLINGER asked if the policy include people standing on the sidewalks in front of campus buildings. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said that the University can only regulate its own property; students are encouraged to be good neighbors on property adjoining the campus. PERLMUTTER asked if current policy would be re-enforced, noting frequent violation of the Clean Air Corridor. WEISSBUCH-ALLINA said an effort would be made.

APPC Update

After briefly reviewing the purpose and scope of Academic Program Prioritization, JONES noted its three planned phases (see slides, minutes attachment B3). The APPC is currently in the first phase of initial parameter setting. He stressed that the document outlining the 6 criteria and suggested metrics and questions that had been
posted for faculty preview were in draft form. These will be the basis for determining the data to be collected and the scoring rubrics. He encouraged faculty to read and respond to the document. (See item C2 added to the November Agenda packet and posted to the Faculty Senate web site: \url{http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials}.)

JONES reported that he has been visiting groups and departments across campus to gather feedback on APP. He pledged that no data collection or scoring would begin until the Committee felt that the process could be consistently implemented across campus and the burden of data collection for program administrators had been minimized. He thought that a three-year cycle of APP review was tenable. Data from enrollment planning and a revised mission statement should be available for the process.

JONES then walked senators through a table illustrating how questions and metrics were intended to align with criteria; the column label SRC captures the projected “source” for data (see B3, slide 13, page 3). The APPC is particularly interested to know if faculty think that there should be a separate seventh criteria related to research, scholarly and creative work. He announced a public forum on APP for Monday, November 24. Feedback can be directed to: appc-discuss@lists.pdx.edu.

DAIM: Wouldn’t having the 30 members to do the scoring chosen from the campus here create a bias that could affect the work of scoring?

JONES: It could happen, but one of the reasons for having 30 people is to minimize it. There will be a random allocation process to assign programs to scorers and the whole process is intended to be completely transparent. The program will have an opportunity to respond to any negative report.

PADIN: Are there any plans for systematic efforts to get feedback on the work, for instance, examining concept development, or having small focus groups or a pilot to test reliability?

JONES: I think you are referring to the assessment piece. I don’t think we have the resources to do it right now, but if anyone has suggestions for simple steps we could take, that would be wonderful. For future iterations of APP, it will be very valuable.

KARAVANIC: Is there a way to indicate how a program’s focus/purpose integrates with state or national engagement? One might not think of community engagement as implying nationwide.

JONES: That’s a good example of where we want to clarify. It think “community” was meant to be very broadly interpreted. This could be made more explicit.

DAVIDOVA: There’s so much emphasis on quantitative information; I don’t see how you will actually capture things that are qualitative.

JONES: We want to develop rubrics that will help us to assess those kind of things. It is a challenge; numbers are relatively easy to obtain, but we don’t want to lean too
much on the numbers. One of the ideas is that we will give programs an opportunity to reflect on those numbers. We want to give opportunities for qualitative feedback at all stages.

CHRZANOVKA-JESKE: Do you expect to able to use the same evaluation criteria for all the programs and that they will be equally important for all programs?

JONES: Yes, we want to apply the same criteria to all programs, but we recognize that different programs have different areas of emphases. APPC has just begun a conversation about how different things will be weighted.

LIEBMAN: Is there any attempt to coordinate with state-wide data gathering? It might be very useful for the University’s case-making, for example in the area of STEM, to have data on measures that demonstrate our progress or success.

JONES: No, we have mostly been focused on PSU.

LIEBMAN: How much will you use this data frame looking forward, so that people can chart their progress based on the metrics of 2014?

JONES: People at other institutions have used information from one evaluation cycle as guidance that might inform decision-making in moving towards the next. That is beyond the scope of this APPC, but we are happy to engage in conversations about it.

LIEBMAN: Maybe that is a follow-on that Senate should do. LIEBMAN invited applause to thank JONES and the APPC for their work.

**Discussion item: Should Faculty Senate offer a resolution on campus safety?**

LIEBMAN reminded senators of the previous meeting’s report from Kevin Reynolds and the campus-wide forum on Campus Safety and the committee hearing held by the Board of Trustees on the subject. The purpose of today’s discussion was to take some measure of faculty feeling around next steps and to give guidance to the Board.

REESE/BRODOWICZ MOVED the session to a committee of the whole at 3:47 pm.

LIEBMAN returned the meeting to regular session at 4:30 pm. He encouraged senators to forward additional questions and comments to the Steering Committee.

REYNOLDS said further questions could be posted to the Campus Safety website: [http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/campus-safety](http://www.pdx.edu/fadm/campus-safety)

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.
E. NEW BUSINESS

LIEBMAN welcomed the new chair of the Graduate Council, David Kinsella.

1. Proposal for a Professional Science Master in Environment and Management (ESM) in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

KINSELLA reviewed the main features of the proposed Master, noting that ESM reported capacity in existing ESM courses and in professional management courses offered by Public Administration and Engineering. ESM plans to grow the program gradually. A small start-up subsidy from the Institute of Sustainable Solutions will cover initial costs. KINSELLA stated that the Graduate Council judged the proposal to be well-conceived and realistic in its assessment of resources needed and demand; the Council recommended the proposal.

PADIN/RAFFO MOVED the proposal for a Professional Science Master, as published in item E1.

DAIM: Can we have more detail on what courses the program will leverage from Engineering? I see courses that we always offer; we would be happy to help.

KINSELLA: The proposal lists four or six courses that would be available.

EVERETT: If you look at the comments on the Curriculum Tracker Wiki, Tim Anderson writes that several Engineering courses were added to the proposal. I think the key point is that Anderson (Chair, Engineering and Technology Management) looked very closely at what should be included from ETM.

HANSEN: Who is the Institute of Sustainable Solutions?

KINSELLA: Its director is Jennifer Allen, at PSU.

LIEBMAN: It’s a network plus support system for sustainability projects at PSU.

SCHROCK: ESM states it will meet demand with existing courses. Are there other programs outside of this department (ETM) that they are going to, and if so is there any concern that they will be cannibalizing other programs?

KINSELLA: I don’t recall discussion involving any other programs than ETM.

RUETER: The PSM and ETM Masters are very similar and will expand somewhat together. There is no concern about cannibalizing.

The MOTION to approve the Professional Science Master in Environment and Management PASSED: 39 to approve, 2 to reject, and 5 abstentions (recorded by ‘clicker.’)
F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

The President was out of town.

Provost’s Report

The Provost was out of town. Her comments were distributed in written form. (See minutes attachment B4.) LIEBMAN suggested that questions about the comments could be emailed to the Provost.

Report of the PSU Foundation President/CEO

AYLMER addressed the merger of University Advancement and the PSU Foundation as a cost saving measure that had also brought greater clarity for donors. There were one-time costs of $180,000 but a permanent cut of $500,000 from the University budget. Her presentation documented the growth of major gifts and overall giving since 2009, despite the fact that when AYLMER arrived in Oregon she had been told that Portland was not a philanthropic city. (Applause; see slides, minute attachment B5.) It had been a matter of changing the culture, she affirmed. She acknowledged the role that faculty can and have played. With a focus on building alumni networks, alumni and students are now a significant portion (48%) of those giving.

AYLMER noted that 15.4 million dollars in gift funds went to cover University expenses in 2013-14 (slides 9-10). Since the Foundation’s inception, over 17 million dollars of endowed funds have supported faculty work. Plans for a comprehensive campaign awaited input from PSU’s new deans. She described the results of a wealth screening study that suggest even greater donor capacity. Although that capacity can only be partially addressed with current resources, future prospects are really good.

LIEBMAN noted that he and Aylmer had discussed the possibility of small group orientations for faculty to discuss how to initiate fund-raising. He thanked Aylmer for the presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.
Senate 11/3/14

We’re back

Take Roll

Set up

Senate 14-15

When will the madness stop?

Seeing red >>>

The work: 2013-14

- Board of Trustees – Chair Pete Nickerson to appear
- Shared Governance/Relationship to Faculty Senate (representation, dialog) > Constitution + Strategic Plan
- CBA
- Post-Tenure Review + Allocation Increases planned December
- TF Family Friendly Policies launched
- TF Academic Quality (Comparators) soon to launch
- More TF Senate Minutes
  - Faculty Development: more funding/increased applications
  - NTTF 2/3 year contracts Question to Administrators
  - CBA
- Academic Program Prioritization Discussion
- TF Textbook Affordability launched
- School of Public Health 2 Open Forums

2014-15

Surplus of management ↔ Deficit of leadership

FSenate Leadership Training begins 12/14

What can you do?
AQ – 6 members
APPC - 30 scorers

Roberts’ Rules @ PSU

- Protect Senator’s right to free and fair debate
- PSU Senator’s rights of proxy and referral
- Only Presiding Officer recognizes speakers
- Senators sit below the rail (recording)
- Speakers identify themselves by name and unit
- Debate begins after motion stated
- Move to amend/withdraw, table, limit debate
- Majority decides (hands, voice, clicker, roll)
- PSU Consent agenda
- PSU Committee of the Whole No minutes/decisions
Today

Consent agenda – Items to withdraw (written request to PO before end of roll)
Clickers are back
After adjournment – Committee on Committees (COTA)
Announcements & Communications:
Smoke/Tobacco Free + APPC – Update
Committee on the Whole - Discussion Item:
Should Senate offer resolution campus safety?
Proposal: PSM – ESM
Report Francoise Aylmer, Pres/CEO, PSU Foundation
Rational for Smoke and Tobacco Free Policy

- In 2013, President Wiewel signed the Fresh Air Challenge stating that PSU will be smoke-free by 2016
- More than 950 campuses nationally are smoke and tobacco free, more than 20 colleges and universities in Oregon.

Overview of Policy

- All tobacco products and smoking devices are prohibited on campus (including the PSU Park Blocks), and in University owned/controlled vehicles
- Sale, distribution, and/or advertisement of any tobacco products or smoking products in prohibited on campus and in publications (including new or amended leases)

Overview of Policy, cont.

- Tobacco products and/or smoking devices may be allowed in research or educational purposes with prior approval from the Office of Research Integrity
- Smoking of noncommercial tobacco products is permitted in designated spaces for traditional ceremonies
Overview of Policy, cont.

- Compliance relies on members of the PSU community. However, violations may be addressed through Human Resources or Student Conduct.

Campus Input

- Winter 2012: survey was conducted, 4005 people responded 408 identified as faculty
- 62% of faculty strongly agreed or agreed that PSU should be smoke-free
- 66.5% of faculty strongly agreed or agreed that the PSU Park Blocks should be smoke-free

Timeline

Present – November 24: Public Comment on the Policy
December: Respond to Public Comment and ask President Wiewel to sign the policy
January – September: Marketing campaign regarding Policy
September 12, 2015: Effective Date of Policy
September – June: Additional marketing and evaluation of Policy

Questions?

Julie M. Weissbuch Allina, MSW
Center for Student Health and Counseling
Director of Health Promotion
j.weissbuch-allina@pdx.edu
Charge to APPC, June 2014

MOTION: Faculty Senate approves the creation of the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee as described in item “D-1.”

Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee (May 12, 2014)

As per recommendations from the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee determined that the policy of the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee (APPC) is consistent with the purposes of the Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC). The Faculty Senate Steering Committee has given assurance that the total number of tenure line positions will not decrease as a direct result of the Academic Program Prioritization Process, although tenured faculty may be assigned to another department or program depending on needs and expertise.

COMMITTEE CHARGE:
The APPC is charged with:

- Developing additional specifications for thecomposition and function of the Prioritization Scoring Team;
- Developing additional specifications for identifying and appointing those responsible for assessment and communication activities;
- Determining, in consultation with the Provost’s office and the Faculty Senate, the parameters and benchmarks against which programs will be assessed;
- Determining the type of information that needs to be gathered;
- Compiling and examining reports submitted by each academic program;
- Soliciting feedback on initial reports from each academic program and developing revised assignments of programs to prioritization categories;
- Participating with existing Faculty Senate standing committees, e.g., Budget Committee, in determining final recommendations.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:
The APPC will consist of 7 faculty members with strong prior leadership experience and an understanding of PSU drawn from multiple roles across campus. The APPC may call on other persons and offices as needed for information. Support for the APPC will be provided by the Provost’s Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Scope

- Limited to academic programs (i.e., “collections of activities” leading to or contributing to a credential)
- A typical department/unit houses multiple programs
- All members of the PSU community, including those outside academic departments, contribute to the work of PSU in important and significant ways that fall outside the scope of any particular program
- We concur with previous recommendation that: APP be pursued as part of a broader evaluation that includes all parts of the University

APP in the Context of Shared Governance

Key Components

Communication

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

Phase 2: data gathering, measurement, and analysis

Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

Future iterations of the process
DRAFT Criteria, Metrics, and Questions

DRAFT Criteria, Metrics, and Questions for the Academic Program Prioritization Process at PSU
Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC)
Draft to Faculty Senate, November 3, 2014

Introduction
This document proposes a set of six high-level criteria, together with associated metrics (capturing quantitative data) and questions (capturing qualitative data), for use within the academic program prioritization (APP) process at PSU. These items are intended here in a draft, incomplete, proposed form that we hope will stimulate and focus a productive conversation as the APPC, the Senate, and the faculty as a whole work together to finalize the parameters of the APP process. We welcome and strongly encourage any feedback that will help to improve the draft set of parameters described here.

Scope
The scope of the APP process is limited, by the charge to the APPC, to consideration of academic programs, which are defined as collections of activities that consume resources and either contribute transcripted courses to a credential or else lead directly to a credential. As such, a single academic unit or department may house multiple programs, such as one or more bachelors, masters, doctoral, or certificate programs, for example. We recognize that members of the PSU community are engaged in many activities that contribute in important and significant ways to the work of the university but fall outside the immediate scope of any particular academic program, and hence outside the scope of APP. This includes some of the activities within academic units and departments as well as all other parts of the university, including centers, institutes, student services, facilities, and administrative units. We concur with and repeat the observation in the previous APPC committee’s final report that a review that extends to include all of these activities would require the development and use of evaluation procedures and criteria that may be different from those used in APP. For this reason, we also agree with the previous committee’s recommendation that academic program prioritization be pursued as part of a broader evaluation that includes all parts of the University.

Timeline
In keeping with the charge to APPC, it is our goal to finalize the selection of criteria and associated metrics and questions for this iteration of APP before the end of Fall 2014. As a result of interactions with other ongoing, university-wide projects, we expect that this timeline will allow us to: (1) consider and refine the selection of criteria in light of potential revisions to the University’s mission statement resulting from Strategic Planning; and (2) to use work that is in progress.

Proposed Criteria

- Demand, including both internal (within PSU) and external
- Quality, of program inputs and outcomes
- Productivity, taking considerations of size and scope into account
- Financial Performance, including revenue and costs
- Relation to Mission, including contributions to knowledge, scholarship, and community engagement
- Trajectory, including past history and future opportunities

Metrics and Questions

- Quantitative metrics and qualitative questions are needed:
  - to identify specific data that will be needed/used in the APP scoring process
  - to clarify and explain the meaning of each criterion in more concrete terms
- Numeric data alone will not capture important details of context and nuance that are needed to document and understand the contributions of each program

Critical Challenges and Goals

- Select metrics and questions (and develop associated scoring instruments) such that a consistent, rigorous approach can be applied uniformly across all programs
- Data collection will impose a burden on program administrators; we need to minimize this!
- Eliminate unnecessary metrics/questions
- Leverage OIRP and other sources where possible
- Provide clear, strong guidance on what is expected for remaining items

Current Status

- We recognize that the formulations in the current draft DO NOT MEET these standards
- Commitment: No data collection will begin until these issues have been resolved, and until the rubrics or other scoring instruments have been developed and shared with the campus community

Other Considerations

- Previous committee proposed that data for APP be provided for a spread of three years
- Some data can only be provided at the unit/department level: it will provide a context but not a direct match for evaluating programs
- We must be sensitive to discipline-specific standards, expectations, and natural variations between programs
- Data from SEM Planning will be available to programs in timeframe for data collection
- Strategic planning: revised mission in near term
Examples from the Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Labels: Demand; Quality; Productivity; Financial performance; Relation to Mission; Trajectory.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Src</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How does the program support the mission, signature areas of focus, and strategic priorities of PSU?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: What are the expected outcomes and timelines of any current or recently completed special initiatives that are in support of, or carried out as part of the program?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: Comment on the expected future for the program, using data collected here or from other sources as support.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric: Number of degrees awarded by level &amp; concentration</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric: SCH attributed to program from within and outside the program</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: How is the program connected to and necessary for other programs?</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Proposals to Parameters

- Add what is missing, remove what is unnecessary, clarify what remains.
- This applies to criteria as well as metrics and questions:
  - Example: should there be a new criterion (i.e., column) for “Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work”?
  - The table already includes some metrics and questions that address this particular topic
  - Adding a new column provides a way to recognize this component of the work of our academic programs
  - What do you think?

Next Steps

- We are keen to receive your feedback on the criteria, metrics and questions
  - Finalize the choices for this iteration of APP before the end of this term
  - Public forum, tentative date: Monday, November 24

- In the meantime, APPC is focussing on scoring:
  - Development of scoring instruments, rubrics, etc.
  - Appointment of program scoring team members

Contact address for comments and feedback:
appc-discuss@lists.pdx.edu

still
(website|coming soon)
PROVOST ANDREWS’ COMMENTS: NOVEMBER 3, 2014 FACULTY SENATE MEETING
(Provided in absentia)

Transition of EMSA Functions to OAA
As of November 1st, the Learning Center, Advising and Career Services, and the Registrar’s Office have been successfully transferred from Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) to Academic Affairs (OAA) and report to Vice Provost Sukhwant Jhaj. Please see further details regarding the transition on the Provost Blog.

Academic Affairs and EMSA agreed on and used the following guiding principles for the transition:

1. Retain high-quality, non-interrupted services to students
2. Care about individuals (example: no elimination of positions)
3. Use a collaborative process to develop unit specific transition plans
4. Widely share regular communication of discussions and decisions
5. Maintain unit (or functional) budgets (example: Graduate Recruiting and Admissions)
6. Pay attention to logistics and provide high-quality, non-interrupted services to departments (space, IT support, accounting support, etc.)
7. Minimize duplication of services

While some key tasks and outcomes require additional work, the majority of them will be accomplished by the end of November. I want to recognize all those in OAA and EMSA for ensuring the guiding principles were followed, for the open and transparent dialogue and for being great colleagues throughout this process.

Graduate Studies Dean Margaret Everett, Interim EMSA VP Daniel Fortmiller, EMSA Associate VP Cindy Skaruppa, and others are working on the transfer of graduate student recruitment and admissions. I will report on that progress at next month’s Faculty Senate meeting.

Worthy of Note: Planning and work are underway for a university-wide online graduate application!

Provost’s Blog:
Just a friendly reminder: I do have a blog. You can sign up to get emails of the blog posts, or follow it through the link. A number of posts relate to topics of relevance to Faculty Senate conversations and upcoming actions.

Drop-in Conversations with the Provost
On Thursday, October 30th I held my first drop-in conversation opportunity for faculty and staff members. I will be available the following dates and times during the remainder of the fall term for these non-structured, open sessions:

- Monday, November 10, 2:30-3:30, room 294 SMSU
- Monday, December 1, 1:30-2:30, room 294 SMSU

Please refer to my blog post outlining further details about the drop-in sessions:

Strategic Enrollment Management Planning (SEM) and Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) for FY 16.
On October 13th and 17th, I hosted two open forums to provide a recap on the OAA FY 15 budget, to share information on the FY 16 Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) and Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) process and to listen to concerns and questions.

Links to materials from the sessions are referenced in my blog post.

School of Public Health Initiative
On October 21st and 30th two open sessions were held on the potential joint OHSU/PSU School of Public Health (SPH). Elena Andresen, interim dean of the SPH initiative, Leslie McBride interim associate dean, and others shared information on the planning, and listened and responded to questions. A reminder that the Faculty Senate will be asked to make a recommendation on the forming of this school. You should reach out to Elena (andresee@ohsu.edu) or Leslie (bqlm@pdx.edu) if you were unable to attend one of the open sessions and would like information.

Vacant Vice Provost Positions Update
Interviews for three finalists are currently taking place for the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development. Department chairs, associate deans, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee, AAUP and PSUFA leadership, Deans, President’s Executive Committee, HR and GDI were invited to meet with the candidates and provide input to me. I anticipate making a decision before the end of the month.

The Vice Provost of Budget, Planning and Internationalization position vacated by Kevin Reynolds is being modified and an internal recruitment is anticipated to begin soon. Information will go out to the entire faculty announcing the position and application process.

School of Business Administration Dean Search
First-round interviews for the Dean of the School of Business Administration were held last week. Finalists will be on campus for interviews after November 13th and through early December. Information about schedules and candidates will be posted on the Academic Affairs website: http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/school-of-business-administration-dean-search.

I thank the Search Committee for all their great work.
PSU Foundation
Advancing the Mission of PSU

Performance Indicators
- FY13
  - ROI = 526%
  - Cost to raise a dollar = $0.19
- FY14
  - ROI = 629%
  - Cost to raise a dollar = $0.16

A Culture of Philanthropy Starts at Home
- 75% of Senators contribute
- 10% of all PSU faculty/staff contribute annually on average (Higher Ed annual average is 26%)

THANK YOU
Direct Impact on University Budget

University expenses paid with gift funds:

- 2013-14 $15.4 million
- 2012-13 $12.4 million
- 65% increase since 2010

How Did the Funds Get Disbursed?

- $9.2 million Academic programs, faculty/staff compensation, faculty travel
- $2.6 million Scholarships
- $2.6 million Capital projects
- $1 million Special initiatives, operations

Total: $15.4 million in FY 14

Faculty Support

As of September 30, 2014

- $17.5 million: Endowed funds for faculty support
  - ($54.1 million: PSU Total Endowment)
  - $10.6 million: 15 endowed professorships
  - $4.6 million: 7 endowed chairs
  - $800,000: Awards, professional development
  - $1.5 million: Faculty research
- $4 million: Expendable funds for faculty support
  - $1 million: Current use funds
  - $1.2 million: Endowment payout
  - $1.8 million: Current use for Faculty research

Transformational Fundraising: Campaigns

- Comprehensive Campaign Planning
  - Campaign themes
    - Vibrant Communities
    - Thriving Economies
    - Creating Futures
      - Fundraising priorities
        - Endowed Professorships
  - Feasibility study
    - Capacity analysis
    - Budget, staff and space needs
### Wealth Screening and Predictive Model

#### Top Tier Major Gift Model Prospects with capacity over $100K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Gift Model Tier and Giving Capacity</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Unassigned</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 2.5%</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>4,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>3,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>8,666</td>
<td>10,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Top Tier Major Gift Model Prospects with capacity $25K - $99K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Gift Model Tier and Giving Capacity</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Unassigned</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 2.5%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>4,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9,038</td>
<td>9,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>17,837</td>
<td>18,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grand Total

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Tier Major Gift Model Prospects with capacity over $100K</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>8,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Tier Major Gift Model Prospects with capacity $25K - $99K</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>17,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,039</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,503</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**We Can, We Will!**

Questions?
November 8, 2014

To: Provost Andrews

From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
Robert Liebman, Presiding Officer

SUBJ: Notice of Senate Actions

On November 3, 2014 the Senate approved the proposal for a Professional Science Master in Environment and Management in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, item E1 of the November agenda.

11/10/14—OAA concurs with the approval of the Professional Science Master in Environment and Management in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Steve Harmon will coordinate communications with the unit.

Best regards,

Robert Liebman
Presiding Officer of the Senate

Martha W. Hickey
Secretary to the Faculty

Sona Andrews
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
November 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain
    Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**New Courses**

**E.1.c.1.**

- Film 231 Advanced Film Analysis (4)
  Builds upon the concepts related to the formal analysis of film and presents students with complementary, advanced methodologies, including genre study, narrative, historical research, and industry studies. Prerequisite: Film 131.

**E.1.c.2.**

- Film 280 Classical Film Theory (4)
  Introduces the significant trends of the first fifty years of Western film theory via primary and secondary source essays. Topics may include realism, authorship, conceptions of modernist representation, and Soviet montage. Prerequisites: Film 131.

**Change to Existing Courses**

**E.1.c.3.**

- Film 257 Digital Video Production – change title to Narrative Film Production I; change description.

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**

**Change to Existing Programs**

**E.1.c.4.**

- Economics, BA/BS – changes the minimum upper-division credits of coursework required in residence from 16 to 24. No budgetary impact.
E.1.c.5.
- Environmental Studies minor – changes name to Minor in Environmental Science; increases minor’s total number of credits from 28 to 34; changes catalog copy to make it clear that labs are required with specific courses (does not add to requirements). No budgetary impact.

E.1.c.6.
- International Studies (all areas), BA – reduces the number of courses required from students for graduation by reducing the required number of years of language study or equivalent proficiency from 3 years to 2 years. No budgetary impact.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.7.
- Bi 251, 252, 253 Principles of Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.8.
- Bi 301, 302, 303 Human Anatomy & Physiology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.9.
- Bi 326 Comparative Vertebrate Embryology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.10.
- Bi 328 Comparative Vertebrate Anatomy – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.11.
- Bi 330 Intro to Plant Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.12.
- Bi 334 Molecular Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.13.
- Bi 336 Cell Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.14.
- Bi 341 Intro to Genetics – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.15.
- Bi 357 General Ecology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.16.
- Bi 358 Evolution – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.17.
- Bi 360 Intro to Marine Biology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.18.
- Bi 386 Invertebrate Zoology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.19.
- Bi 387 Vertebrate Zoology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.20.
- Bi 412/512 Animal Behavior – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.21.
- Bi 413/513 Herpetology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.22.
- Bi 414/514 Ornithology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.23.
- Bi 415/515 Mammalogy – change UG prerequisites.
E.1.c.24.  
- Bi 417/517 Mammalian Physiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.25.  
- Bi 418/518 Comparative Animal Physiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.26.  
- Bi 419/519 Animal Physiology Lab – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.27.  
- Bi 421/521 Virology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.28.  
- Bi 424/524 Molecular Genetics – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.29.  
- Bi 425/525 Natural History of Antarctica – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.30.  
- Bi 432/532 Plant Diversity & Evolution – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.31.  
- Bi 433/533 Morphology of Vascular Plants – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.32.  
- Bi 434/534 Plant Anatomy – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.33.  
- Bi 435/535 Plant Systematics – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.34.  
- Bi 436/536 Behavioral Endocrinology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.35.  
- Bi 441/541 Plant Physiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.36.  
- Bi 450/550 Phylogenetic Biology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.37.  
- Bi 455/555 Histology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.38.  
- Bi 462/562 Neurophysiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.39.  
- Bi 463/563 Sensory Physiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.40.  
- Bi 472/572 Natural History – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.41.  
- Bi 473/573 Field Sampling – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.42.  
- Bi 481/581 Microbial Physiology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.43.  
- Bi 487/587 Immunology and Serology – change UG prerequisites.

E.1.c.44.  
- Ch 337 Organic Chemistry Lab I – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.45.  
- Ch 338 Organic Chemistry Lab II/Non-Majors – change prerequisites

E.1.c.46.  
- Ch 339 Organic Chemistry Lab II/Majors – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.47.
- Comm 341 Intro to Public Relations – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.48.
- Mth 261 Introduction to Linear Algebra – change description, prerequisites.

**Undergraduate Studies**

E.1.c.49.
Additions to Existing Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>UNST COUNCIL</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 300</td>
<td>Design is Everywhere</td>
<td>Design Thinking, Innovation, Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>4/14/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 346</td>
<td>Exploring Complexity in Science and Technology</td>
<td>Design Thinking, Innovation, Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>4/14/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Robert Fountain  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
RE: Submission of UCC for Faculty Senate  

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences  

New Program  
• Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies (Summary attached)

FSBC comments: All but one of the classes in the certificate are existing courses. There is not a statement about this certificate attracting new students to PSU, although this may happen. Thus, most of the students taking these courses are either already taking them, or switching from other courses to these, which moves SCH from one course to another. There is little additional revenue from this certificate. The expenditure spreadsheet estimates additional expenditures running from $28,769 in the first year down to $16,904 in the fifth year. This does not include the $2,000 the Library estimates is necessary to build a foundational collection during the first year. There will need to be a subsidy for this certificate to operate, but it is a small one.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Comics Studies  

Overview:  
Comics, graphic novels, comic strips, cartoons. There are many terms for them, but they are all names for innovative storytelling done through some combination of words and images. The academic study of comics is on the rise, with major literature conferences such as the MLA including numerous panels on Comics. Highly lauded university presses frequently publish on Comic Art, and the field of Comics recently established a special Eisner award especially for the Best Academic Book in Comics Studies.

Libraries have also begun to understand the importance of comics as literature. Several University libraries have accumulated collections, including the Virginia Commonwealth University http://guides.library.vcu.edu/comic-arts, and the impressive collection at Michigan State University: http://comics.lib.msu.edu/. The Library of Congress also collects comics in its Caroline and Erwin Swann Foundation for Caricature and Cartoon (including an online exhibition at
The New York Public Library offers many comic-related resources at http://www.nypl.org/blog/2011/10/12/comics-nypl-research-guide, and has an extensive collection of comics in their holdings. Ohio State University recently celebrated the opening of the Billy Ireland Museum and Library of Comic Art: http://cartoons.osu.edu/. The appreciation of comic books has also risen in the public mind, as evidenced by many museums across the country dedicated to comic art, including the Cartoon Art Museum of San Francisco, the Charles M. Schultz Museum, the International Museum of Cartoon Art in Boca Raton, Florida, and the New York City Comic Book Museum (and many others). Other major American Museums (such as the Smithsonian) also include exhibits on comic books. There is no denying that comics are an important part of American culture, representing a diverse range of backgrounds in both their creators and their readers.

Comics are on the cutting edge of contemporary literature, and there are many avenues to pursue in the study of this narrative form. This program will be truly interdisciplinary, drawing on the talent that is already available. The Certificate will promote the scholarly study of comics and provide opportunities for students to experiment with creating comics. Portland is particularly well known as the home of numerous artists, authors, scholars, and publishers specializing in Comic Art. A program focusing on Comics will attract new students and has the potential to enhance ties with the local Comics community. This program would provide students with interdisciplinary theory and hands-on practice, preparing participants to work in the field of comics and cartoon art as writers, artists, and scholars.

Evidence of Need:
The current classes at PSU that focus on comics are extremely popular, with students continually asking for additional programming. Furthermore, faculty members specializing in the area have been approached by potential students (graduate and undergraduate) asking about PSU’s offerings in Comics Studies. A recent panel at the Portland Comic Con was filled with potential students asking about possible opportunities to further their education in Comics Studies. Students have regularly approached Susan Kirtley at academic conferences and speaking engagements making inquiries about Comics classes at PSU. This program would engage current PSU students eager for additional coursework and draw in students looking to study Comic Art. There are currently 1200 Art majors and 750 English majors, and many of these students have expressed an interest in such a program. Furthermore, this interdisciplinary program would draw from departments across the university. This program would also draw from the surrounding community, with local professionals and enthusiasts seeking out Comics programming. Local conventions and conferences such as Stumptown Comics Festival, Wordstock, Wizard World Comic Con, and the brand new festival Linework, have been packed with comics enthusiasts, and scholarly programs focusing on comics would certainly find an audience in the Portland community.

The University of Oregon has a minor in Comics and Cartoon Art. Several community colleges, such as PCC Sylvania and Clackamas Community College, are also offering concentrations in Comics, and Marylhurst offers a Text/Image Concentration. At the national level, the University of Florida offers a major and a graduate degree in Comics, while Ohio State University is increasing its Comics programs exponentially. The PSU program will complement those of the community colleges, and potentially share resources with the already established program at the U of O.
Portland looms large as a locus for Comics publishers such as Dark Horse Comics, Oni Press, Top Shelf Comics, and Periscope Studios, and is also the home of renowned comics artists and writers like Brian Michael Bendis, Matt Fraction, Joe Sacco, Craig Thompson, and Kelly Sue DeConnick. There is a strong regional and national market for those versed in graphic narrative. Furthermore, a Certificate would be beneficial in a variety of careers, including writing, publishing, graphic design, and illustration.

Course of Study:

6 total courses (24 credits) with one required course:

ONE REQUIRED CLASS
• ENG 449/549: Advanced Topics in Cultural Studies: Comics History & Theory

ELECTIVE OPTIONS (CHOOSE 5) from existing courses*
• ENG 490/590: Visual Rhetoric
• WR 300: Special Topics—Writing for Comics
• WR 400/500: Special Topics—Advanced Writing for Comics
• WR 460/560: Introduction to Book Publishing
• WR 471/571: Publishing Software
• ART 297: Book Arts
• ART 356: Visual Storytelling
• ART 370: Topics in Printmaking Techniques
• ART 2/399: Creating Short Comics: Practical Comic Creation (last offered summer 2014)
• ART 455: Time Arts Studio
• JPN 343U: Topics in Japanese Literature
• WLL 448U: Masterworks of World Literature—Manga (last offered summer 2014)
• PHIL 317: Philosophy of Art

(ELECTIVE OPTIONS CONTINUED) (New Course)
• ENG 410/510: Special Topics to Draw on Local Talent, such as:
  o Editing Comics
  o Focus on Frank Miller/Will Eisner
  o European Comics
  o Autobiographical Comics
  o Superheroes and Society
  o Censorship and the Comics Code

• Internships with local comics companies (Dark Horse, Top Shelf, Oni Press, etc.)

• Other courses in additional departments TBA.

* Other courses may be substituted for electives at the direction of the Program Coordinator.
Whereas the PSU Administration has made a recommendation for creating an armed Campus Police force based on the Task Force on Campus Safety report calling for a larger campus security presence on our campus and the surrounding neighborhood;

Whereas the Administration has not provided data that makes a convincing case for arming of PSU Campus Public Safety officers nor created a plan for policies and services beyond policing which will make all in our community feel safer;

Whereas a substantial body of data and research shows that interpersonal and sexual violence does not generally occur in public spaces, and that the introduction of weapons into communities often increases risks of violence, with students of color and people in emotional distress at the most risk;

Whereas the Administration’s recommendation lacks a commitment to create a campus committee for oversight and supervision of a PSU Campus Police,

Be it resolved the members of the PSU Faculty Senate express their:

1. Opposition to arming PSU Campus Public Safety officers;

2. Support for the creation of a campus committee for oversight and supervision of the PSU Campus Public Safety Office as a necessary condition for implementation of changes in campus policing policies, including alternatives to an armed police force. The campus committee must be comprised of administrators, faculty & students.

*from Senators Vicki Cottrell, Ted Donlan, Mindy Holliday, Michael Taylor, David Layzell, Yves Labissiere, Annabelle Dolidon, Susan Reese, Jose Padin, Gina Greco, Evgenia Davidova, Swapna Mukhopadhyaya, Sharon Carstens

**Background (on the following page)**
Background.

School of Social Work faculty and staff statement in response to a proposed armed CPSO force

October 24, 2014

Members of the Portland State University’s School of Social Work are strongly opposed to the PSU administration’s recent proposal to hire armed officers to protect the PSU community. As a school and profession that is concerned with social justice and the well-being of individuals and communities, we have seen the negative impacts of policing, and would instead propose that PSU explore other options for increasing campus safety. We oppose the notion that more guns on campus would make PSU a safer campus and assert that arming PSU officers will, in fact, have the inverse effect. The proposal draws on PSU’s urban location and porous campus to instill fear and support for an armed security force. But this rhetoric is incomplete. As a porous campus, we have a responsibility to not only consider who comes to campus but what campus introduces to the broader community. We hear the concerns from colleagues regarding crisis response times, and feel this is an opportunity to collaborate with the City Council and Police force to clarify our respective roles to better “serve the City.” We are deeply concerned that an armed security presence at PSU would not contribute to a healthier campus community, but would instead create an unsafe environment and even endanger the lives of many including people of color, people in distress, and young women.

The administration cites fears of a school shooting and the need to conduct sexual assault investigations as reasons for the need for an armed security force. However, violent crimes and school shootings are very rare. Only 0.1% of reported crimes on U.S. campuses are murders or manslaughter (Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010). Research also shows that the overwhelming majority of school shootings are not committed by outsiders. They are committed by people who have a relationship with the school (i.e. undergrad and graduate students, faculty, and staff) (Bonanno & Levenson, 2014). In over 90% of all college campus shootings in the United States from 1900 through 2008, the perpetrator had a connection with the institution (Drysdale, Modzeleski, & Simons, 2010). Consequently, the administration’s emphasis on the porous campus as cause for fear is irrelevant to a school shooting scenario; it is highly likely that any hypothetical shooter would be otherwise welcome on campus and known to the victims.

Similarly, only a small minority of sexual assaults are committed by strangers (The White House Council on Women and Girls, 2014). Most sexual assault is perpetrated by acquaintances, and rarely does it happen in public places that are patrolled by armed officers. We understand the need for sworn officers to conduct sexual assault investigations but dispute that guns are needed to carry out this work. PSU administrators should note that police departments across the country have a track record of
disrespectful responses to victims of sexual assault and failure to follow up when charges have been filed (Perez-Pena & Bogdanich, 2014). Consequently, many victims of sexual assault never report the crime to the police. Rather than arming PSU officers, we must work to change the culture of rape common to campuses and across mainstream society and continue to build meaningful prevention and support services regarding these issues on our campus.

News outlets across the country are filled with reports of systemic police harassment and profiling of people of color. Often, this harassment and profiling even escalates to people being killed by police officers. Every 28 hours, a person of color is killed by a police officer or security guard in the U.S. (Movement, 2013). Given this statistic, in discussions about safety on campus and in the surrounding community, we wonder how that community is defined. Whose safety is being considered? Communities of color, both those within and beyond the PSU community, will not be kept safer by bringing in more armed officers. We are concerned that more police on campus could equal more police harassment, more police brutality, and more police-committed killings against members of the PSU community (and members of the surrounding Portland community) who are people of color.

In addition, we are concerned about how people experiencing extreme emotional distress will be treated by potentially armed campus safety officers. Although the City of Portland recently signed a settlement agreement regarding the use of excessive force against people with mental illness and those in emotional distress with the USDOJ, much work remains to be done to address concerns within the community. In general, police are not adequately equipped to work with people experiencing extreme emotional distress or mental health crises. Increasing the number of armed officers on campus could result in the deaths of more people (both those who are members of the PSU community and those who are not).

Finally, we believe that an armed police force may make our female students and staff less safe than they are currently. Male law enforcement officers are accused of sexual assault 1.5 times more than the general male population (Cato Institute, 2011; Carter, 2011), suggesting that armed officers may well inspire reactions of fear and mistrust rather than increased safety. We believe that the administration is mistaken when it claims that additional police will decrease the incidence of sexual assault, and it might, in fact, increase it.

The last thing we need to do is expand the militarization of our communities in the name of increased safety. It would seem that the $1.5 million that PSU wants to spend on armed security would be better directed towards more mental health professionals on campus, so that potential shooters can be identified, students can be better educated to prevent sexual assaults before they happen, and possibly more unarmed campus safety officers could be hired. In addition, the administration may consider alternative strategies to enhance safety on campus including increased student support services, and additional unarmed security officers. There are numerous alternatives. For example, we recommend that the administration look to how other schools have prioritized mental health services over armed police
(e.g., Massachusetts Department of Higher Education, n/d). We also recommend that the administration work with PSU’s Conflict Resolution faculty to investigate other options. And we recommend that PSU put the needs of its most marginalized community members first when considering the implications of this proposal.
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FY15 Budget Update

The Committee received an update on FY14 actual expenditures and the FY15 budget. We also received the FY14 fiscal year-end RCAT and the FY15 adopted budget RCAT.

FY 16 Budget Timeline

We also got a copy of the budget process timeline for the FY16 budget

Liaison Relationship with the Deans

The Committee has had two discussions (one with the Provost) on the liaison relationship with the Deans. Last year, Divisional representatives served as liaisons from the Budget Committee to their Deans.

As was done last year, Budget Committee members will work with the Educational Policy Committee counterparts. Our goal this year is to increase engagement and start that engagement earlier in the process. The colleges and schools are currently developing their strategic enrollment management plans and we hope to have Committee members talk to their Deans during this process, in the hopes that we can comment on and have some influence on the SEM plans.

We are interested in exploring how the faculty in general can become more involved in the development of strategic enrollment management plans.

Role of the Committee in Program Review
The Committee has discussed its role in regards program review in light of the new budget model. In new model, more financial decision-making has been pushed down to the college or school level. A Dean's signature on the new program proposal sheet indicates they will fund the program.

What does review by the Budget Committee bring to this process? Primarily it informs Senators as to the financial impact of a proposal so they can take that into account when they vote on the proposal. If Deans are going to commit to funding a program, then surely their fiscal officers are doing some sort of analysis of the program. Perhaps that analysis can be sent along with the proposal when it leaves the college or school and goes to a curriculum committee.

The Committee is soliciting input from senators and other faculty as to what the Committee's role should be in program review. Please send any comments to bowman@pdx.edu.

Expenditure Spreadsheets

In mid-September the Budget Office provided all-funds, full expenditure spreadsheets for FY13. This has been helpful in understanding the expenditures for that year. The Committee looks forward to receiving revenue spreadsheets for FY13 and both sets of spreadsheets for additional years, particularly last year.

School of Public Health

The Chair met for an hour with Elena Andresen (Interim Dean) and Leslie McBride (Interim Associate Dean) on the forthcoming new unit proposal. Budget information on the proposal is forthcoming and will be provided in multiple steps.

Website

The Committee's website is at www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/budget-committee.
November 7, 2014

To: Martha Hickey, Senate Steering Committee

From: José Padín, Educational Policy Committee

Re: EPC Fall 2014 Report (Draft)

The Educational Policy Committee has formulated an agenda for the academic year 2014-15 in light of its charge and responsibilities, as spelled out in Section 4.4(i) of the Faculty Governance Guide. To wit: EPC is an advisory body to the President and the Senate on matters of educational policy and planning. This charge the Faculty Governance Guide breaks down as follows:

1. **On its own initiative**, take notice of significant developments bearing on educational policy and planning, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
2. **By referral** from the President, faculty committees, the Faculty Senate, prepare recommendations on educational policy and planning.
3. **In consultation** with appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-term University plans and priorities.
4. Evaluate, and make recommendations to the Senate, regarding proposals for the creation, major alteration, or abolition of the educational function or the structure of academic entities (department, programs, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, and other significant academic entities).

**On its own initiative**, and with input from Senate Steering Committee, EPC has established subcommittees to work on three significant matters:

1. Educational policy regarding the online sector.
2. Evaluating significant administrative initiatives underway which contemplate, or are the preamble to, significant restructuring, to ensure the integrity of core values to the Faculty and the mission of a University.
3. A Faculty memorandum articulating the need for any significant plans contemplating changes to educational policy, planning, or the structure of academic entities, to consult with EPC and Budget Committee from early stages of conception. This subcommittee is addressing a concern that is widely shared about significant plans being presented for review too late for real adherence with our norms of shared governance (This is joint work with Budget Committee).

In addition, in response to mounting Faculty concerns,

4. EPC has met with the principals to make sure the proposal for new joint School of Public Health go through the required review process.

This Fall EPC is also reviewing recommendations for the creation or major alteration of academic units:

5. International Studies Program proposal to become a CLAS Department (and with a name change)
6. Proposal for a new School of Gender, Race, and Nation.

**Timeline:**
- Agenda items 3 and 5 we expect to complete this fall.
- Initiate review of item 6 this fall, with a proposal to Faculty Senate winter 2015.
- Yearlong work on items 1-2, with the aim of some reports and recommendations by the end of the 2014-15 academic year.