

2-1-2016

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 2016

Portland State University Faculty Senate

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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 319.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/319>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Faculty Senate, 1 February 2016



In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, **Senate Agendas** are calendared for delivery eight to ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have adequate time to review and research all action items. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full proposals of curricular proposals are available at the PSU Curricular Tracking System: <http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>. If there are questions or concerns about agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the Senate. Items may be pulled from the curricular consent agenda for discussion in Senate up through the end of roll call.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of his/her Senate alternate. An alternate is another faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator. A faculty member may serve as alternate for more than one senator, but an alternate may represent only one senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than three meetings consecutively will be dropped from the Senate roster.

www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate

PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE



To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

From: Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **1 February 2016** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- B. * Approval of the Minutes of the 11 January 2016 Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
 - * 1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions
 - 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer and Secretary
 - 3. Research update and new distinguished faculty proposal (L. Zurk)
 - 4. **Discussion item:** “What it means to be educated in the 21st century”
(follow-up from Winter Symposium)
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
 - * 1. Curricular proposals consent agenda (UCC, UNST Council)
 - * 2. Motion to create a Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty
- F. Question Period: Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
 - 1. President’s Report
 - 2. Provost’s Report
 - * 3. Mid-Year Report of Faculty Development Committee
 - 4. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of 11 January 2016 and appendices
- C.1. OAA response to Senate actions for January
- E.1. Curricular proposals consent agenda (UCC and UNST Council)
- E.2. Motion to create a Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty
- G.3. FDC Mid-Year Report

FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

2015-16 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Gina Greco, Presiding Officer

Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer Elect • Bob Liebman, Past Presiding Officer

Richard Beyler, Secretary

Committee Members: Linda George (2016) • David Maier (2016)

Paula Carder (2017) • Alan MacCormack (2017)

Ex officio: Sharon Carstens, Chair, Committee on Committees • Maude Hines, IFS Representative.

****2015-16 FACULTY SENATE (62)****

All Others (9)

Baccar, Cindy	EMSA	2016
Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2016
*O'Banion, Liane (for Skaruppa)	OAA	2016
†Popp, Karen	OGS	2016
Arellano, Regina	EMSA	2017
Harmon, Steve	OAA	2017
Riedlinger, Carla	EMSA	2017
Kennedy, Karen	ACS	2018
Running, Nicholas	EMSA	2018

College of the Arts (4)

Griffin, Corey	ARCH	2016
†Babcock, Ronald	MUS	2017
Hansen, Brad	MUS	2017
Wendl, Nora	ARCH	2018

CLAS – Arts and Letters (7)

Pease, Jonathan	WLL	2016
Perlmutter, Jennifer	WLL	2016
Childs, Tucker	LING	2017
Clark, Michael	ENG	2017
Greco, Gina	WLL	2017
†Epplin, Craig	WLL	2018
†Jaén Portillo, Isabel	WLL	2018

CLAS – Sciences (8)

Daescu, Dacian	MTH	2016
George, Linda	ESM	2016
Rueter, John	ESM	2016
Elzanowski, Marek	MTH	2017
Stedman, Ken	BIO	2017
†de Rivera, Catherine	ESM	2018
†Flight, Andrew	MTH	2018
Webb, Rachel	MTH	2018

CLAS – Social Sciences (7)

†Carstens, Sharon	ANTH	2016
Padin, Jose	SOC	2016
†Davidova, Evguenia	INTL	2017
Gamburd, Michele	ANTH	2017
Schuler, Friedrich	HST	2017
Chang, Heejun	GEOG	2018
Bluffstone, Randy	ECON	2018

College of Urban and Public Affairs (6)

Brodowicz, Gary	CH	2016
Carder, Paula	IA	2016
*Labissiere, Yves (for Farquhar)	CH	2016
†Schrock, Greg	USP	2017
Yesilada, Birol	PS	2017
Harris, G.L.A.	GOV	2018

Graduate School of Education (4)

†McElhone, Dorothy	ED	2016
De La Vega, Esperanza	ED	2017
Mukhopadhyay, Swapna	ED	2017
Farahmandpur, Ramin	ED	2018

Library (1)

†Bowman, Michael	LIB	2017
------------------	-----	------

Maseeh College of Eng. & Comp. Science (5)

*Daim, Tugrul (for Bertini)	ETM	2016
*Siderius, Martin (for Karavanic)	EEN	2016
Maier, David	CS	2017
Monseré, Christopher	CEE	2018
†Trettheway, Derek	MME	2018

Other Instructional (3)

†Lindsay, Susan	IELP	2016
MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2017
Camacho (Reed), Judy	IELP	2018

School of Business Administration (4)

†Layzell, David	SBA	2016
Loney, Jennifer	SBA	2016
Raffo, David	SBA	2017
Dusschee, Pamela	SBA	2018

School of Social Work (5)

Gioia, Sam (for Cotrell)	SSW	2016
†Donlan, Ted	SSW	2017
Taylor, Michael	SSW	2017
Talbott, Maria	SSW	2018
Winters, Katie	RRI	2018

Date: 30 Nov. 2015. New Senators in italics

* **Interim appointment**

† **Member of Committee on Committees**

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 January 2016
Presiding Officer: Gina Greco
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Baccar, Bluffstone, Bowman, Brodowicz, Camacho, Carder, Carstens, Chang, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, De La Vega, de Rivera, Donlan, Duschee, Elzanowski, Farahmandpur, Flight, Gamburd, George, Gioia, Greco, Griffin, B. Hansen, Harmon, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Layzell, Lindsay, Loney, MacCormack, Padín, Pease, Perlmutter, Popp, Riedlinger, Rueter, Running, Schrock, Schuler, Siderius, Stedman, Talbott, Taylor, Tretheway, Webb, Wendl, Winters, Yesilada

Alternates Present:

Hellermann for Childs, Weber for Daim, Cortez for Epplin, Kaimanu for Harris, Eichsteadt for McElhone, Dusicka for Monsere

Members Absent:

Maier, Mukhopadhyay, O'Banion, Raffo

Ex-officio Members Present:

Andrews, Beyler, Fountain, Fraire, D. Hansen, Jhaj, Kinsella, Marrongelle, Marshall, Moody, Percy, Wiewel

[NOTE: THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING REGULARLY SCHEDULED FOR THE FIRST MONDAY OF JANUARY WAS DEFERRED TO 11 JANUARY BECAUSE OF THE CLOSURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ON 4 JANUARY DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER.]

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

As part of the consent agenda, the **30 November 2015 Minutes** (rescheduled December meeting) were **approved** as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. OAA Response to December Notice of Senate Actions, concurrence, was registered [January Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. Announcements by the Presiding Officer and Secretary

None

3. Winter Symposium, “What it means to be educated in the 21st century”

GRECO reminded senators about the Winter Symposium on January 20th. It will feed into a February Senate discussion on liberal education February. There is a need for table hosts.

3. Discussion Item: Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty

GRECO introduced the discussion topic [see **Appendix C.3**]. Reverting to a question at the previous meeting, she compared continuous appointment and tenure positions. Continuous

appointment provides better job security than non-tenure-track faculty [NTTF] had previously; tenure gives yet greater job security. Continuous appointment is ongoing; tenure is indefinite. Both types of appointment can be terminated. Either one can be terminated for cause, or under retrenchment. A continuous appointment can be terminated if there is a change in curricular need resulting in elimination of that position; this does not happen with a tenured line. A continuous appointment can also be terminated if there is an unsatisfactory review and failure to remediate within a year.

After this overview, GRECO stated that she believed the benefits of tenure were clear. She believed that, nonetheless, moving towards continuous appointments for NTTF was a good direction.

GRECO clarified that retrenchment requires declaration of financial exigency, and that layoffs within a department would be in the order: fixed-term faculty; then faculty on annual tenure (tenure-track faculty who have not yet received tenure); then faculty on indefinite tenure.

GRECO reviewed the minimum salaries for various ranks. There are [currently] continuous appointments at assistant professor and associate professor ranks; these ranks are grandfathered, but they will not be employed for future hires. Continuous appointments also include professors of practice. There is thus a financial interest in tenure-line positions.

GRECO reminded senators that last month the Senate approved creation of a task force to develop a process for review of NTTF for continuous appointments. The new contract will require review of people in a timely matter. The members of the task force have been appointed and a first meeting scheduled.

GRECO asserted that continuous appointments are good for faculty, in that they can concentrate on the job they have [rather than seeking the next one]; good for students, who depend on faculty for letters of recommendation, etc.; good for departments, who can invest in people that they rely on; good for shared governance, in that when we make a commitment to people we ask them also to make a commitment to us; it's thus good for those in tenure lines, because duties can be shared; it's good for academic freedom, in that with more security people may feel more free to say what they think.

Senate has now been asked to consider creating another task force, this one to explore the idea of teaching-intensive tenure lines and to report in about 1½ years.

GRECO displayed a draft of a proposed Senate resolution [see **Appendix C.3**, slide 7]. The request came from collective bargaining that Senate explore the possibility of tenure for teaching-intensive positions. Steering Committee was sympathetic to the sense of both sides in bargaining that it was of interest to explore greater job security for faculty and to support academic freedom. Steering Committee additionally felt it was important to mark the role of the scholar-teacher, expressed in the third paragraph of the preamble. Next month there will be a vote on the proposal to create a task force which will: explore the question; conduct research and investigate models; gather input from across the campus; deliberate; and then return with to Senate with a proposal about if or how to proceed.

GRECO suggested possible pros and cons of the idea [**Minutes Appendix C.3**, slide 10]. Pros: increasing the percentage of tenured faculty; preserving academic freedom; making a healthier work environment in which people shared the same commitments and privileges

where possible. Risks included: uncertainties around creating two different tenure tracks; fear that some departments would become service departments with teaching-intensive lines as the only lines, and that only those parts of campus that brought in relatively large amounts of research dollars would retain traditional lines; undercutting the ideal of the scholar-teacher. GRECO hoped that Senate would indeed vote to create a task force next month: this would not be saying “yes” to the idea, but rather exploring it.

D. HANSEN / DONLAN **moved** that the Senate resolve itself into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 3:25).

During the discussion, numerous senators and ex-officio members asked questions about the concept of tenure for teaching-intensive faculty, and offered both supportive comments and critiques of the notion.

At the conclusion of the discussion, B. HANSEN / PADIN **moved** that the Senate return to regular session; the motion was **approved** without objection (at 3:58).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee listed in **January Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved**, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for administrators nor questions from the floor for the chair.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

[NOTE: THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION OF REPORTS WAS REVERSED FROM THAT INDICATED IN THE AGENDA]

1. Provost's Report

[See outline and tables: **Minutes Appendix G.1.**]

ANDREWS reminded senators of the drop-in conversations she is hosting and reiterated announcement of the Winter Symposium on 20 January.

ANDREWS discussed the integrated planning around for enrollment and budget. Schools and colleges have now developed their preliminary budget plan for FY17 [fiscal year 2017]. The budgeting part of the process has been accelerated. Previously, enrollment planning came first, then budget planning; this time, the two parts of the process are integrated. Thus, schools and colleges are looking at preliminary resource plans together with enrollment. These will continue to be refined over the next month. By March or April, OAA [Office of Academic Affairs] will look at overall enrollment planning as well as the budgets. There are still many variables to be determined.

ANDREWS noted several details. Last year OAA projected 1% growth in enrollment for FY16. In summer there was a significant decline from the projection. OAA is still trying

to figure out what happened: it was different for each school or college. In any case, summer enrollment was down about 6.7% from the projection, or about 6000 SCH [student credit hours].

ANDREWS reported that for the fall term, compared to last year, there was a slight increase in enrollment, or essentially flat. For winter term, we are tracking flat compared to last year. However, there are large variations day by day and so the overall trend is not yet fixed. She noted that revenue depends also on the mix of students, and that [the proportion of] non-resident students was up, so from the revenue perspective the projections of some growth were perhaps reasonable.

ANDREWS drew attention to information on retention [see **Appendix G.1**]. The numbers vary considerably from college to college and among departments. She stated that it is important for PSU to look at this, since it directly reflects the success of our students. We now, compared to a couple of years ago, have more students who are starting at PSU and not continuing to their second year. In the recently adopted Strategic Plan, student success is a major factor, so ANDREWS indicated that she would be looking carefully at retention in the coming year.

BLUFFSTONE noted that there has been flux in the summer program over the last several years, and asked what the administration was doing to energize it. ANDREWS replied that after every summer there was an analysis of the mix of classes and of students. She stated that this summer there will be a more coordinated promotion effort. ANDREWS observed that some prior expectations about summer term no longer hold: for example, that students living in Portland but in college elsewhere would take classes here during the summer. With on-line options from their own and other institutions, they now have other choices. CUPA learned that students are most interested in courses required for graduation, rather than electives, and also in on-line courses. ANDREWS noted that ads were taken out in campus newspapers, e.g., at University of Oregon and Oregon State. She solicited further ideas for publicity. We need to dig deep to figure out what is going on, because last summer's enrollment loss was significant.

BABCOCK expressed surprise that retention had gone down given efforts in advising, and asked how our data compared to that from other schools. ANDREWS said that Oregon State's retention rate continues to rise; that Eastern Oregon's has declined; she was not sure where the other state universities were [in terms of retention]. Many urban institutions around the country were seeing increases in their retention rate.

DE RIVERA asked about data on the preparedness of students who are leaving. ANDREWS said that student analytics make this easier to determine—whether they enter with a low GPA, fail particular required courses, have financial issues, etc. Departments have access to the EAB [Education Advisory Board] student success product and can aggregate data to look at what is happening for particular majors.

ANDREWS outlined the work of the Copyright Task Force, which grew out of the Textbook Affordability Task Force as charged by ASPSU and the provost. The latter group concluded that outdated PSU copyright policies did not reflect current faculty work. The Copyright Task Force has issued an interim report. ANDREWS listed the members and summarized their work so far in her handout [**Appendix G.1**]. The task force will probably propose to Faculty Senate a revision of the university's intellectual

property policies. She turned for further comment to Dean of the Library MOODY, co-chair of the task force.

MOODY emphasized that the results were preliminary, but that one key idea going forward is possibly changing from the default position that the university owns copyright, with certain specified exceptions, to the default position that individual faculty own the copyright, with certain specified exceptions. The task force is also looking considering what guidance documents would be most useful and necessary for faculty.

KAIMANU (for HARRIS) indicated that she had wanted to order a previous edition for a class textbook, whereas the bookstore insisted on ordering the new but essentially unchanged edition. She was trying to honor the principle of affordability for students. ANDREWS said that this question, or other issues with the bookstore, could be directed to her. She reminded faculty to place textbook orders as early as possible.

2. President's Report

WIEWEL took note of the passing away of Greg WOLFE, president of the university from 1968 to 1974, during which time Portland State College became Portland State University. He mentioned that Congressman Earl BLUMENAUER started his career as special assistant to President WOLFE.

WIEWEL indicated that enrollment for winter term is flat or a little bit higher than last year. The number of non-resident students continues an upward trend.

He recognized the successful fall athletic season, particularly for the football team which became the sixth seed nationally in post-season play. Bruce BARNUM had been named Big Sky Conference coach of the year and FCS national coach of the year. WIEWEL affirmed that BARNUM was doing a great job with the student athletes.

WIEWEL said that the administration was preparing for the short legislative session that would begin in early February. The seven state universities had asked for \$755 [million] and received about \$700 [million]. While receiving the complete balance was very unlikely, the state universities would now push collectively for \$15 [million] for the remaining year of the biennium. Focus would likely be on student success, advising, and retention. Another issue would be renewal of the University Venture Development Fund, which has been important for research on commercializable technologies.

WIEWEL drew attention to intense discussions starting toward the end of last term relating to issues of race, diversity, inclusion, and equality, and specifically to the event "Students of Color Speak Out" on December 1st which elicited powerful messages from a number of students. In response to the issues raised on that day, WIEWEL stated, the administration reached three quick decisions. One was to change title of the Chief Diversity Officer (Carmen SUAREZ) to Vice President of Global Diversity and Inclusion. Two additional demands were to create spaces—in addition to the existing Native American Educational Student Center, the Multi-Cultural Center, and the Casa Latina—for Black students and for Asian and Pacific Islander students. WIEWEL announced that the administration had committed to do this by the start of next academic year. Vice President John FRAIRE would be working with students on location of and programming for these centers. WIEWEL observed that there are other things on the list of demands, some of which ANDREWS has alluded to in her blog and other messages.

Many of these relate to the curriculum and the extent to which the contributions of people of color are recognized. These were complicated issues which WIEWEL could not tackle alone; they entailed conversations with faculty. Another complicated long-term issue, WIEWEL continued, is the challenge of having a faculty and staff that reflects the diversity of our student population. This is particularly in issue in Portland where the diversity of the community at large has been changing. Human Resources and the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion would become more proactive about providing search committees and hiring units with information and training to create diverse pools and deal with implicit bias. Another major topic is microaggressions, campus climate, and the extent to which people feel safe in the classroom; these often subtle issues required additional training and education. WIEWEL looked forward to working with Senate and the Steering Committee on these long-term, nationally relevant problems.

WIEWEL noted that issues of equity and diversity are addressed explicitly in the Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees at its December 10th meeting. He thanked Steve PERCY, chair of the Strategic Plan Development Team, as well as the many people who participated in topic teams and otherwise provided input. The report has been printed and will be circulated. WIEWEL believes it is a great product. The new plan was necessary, WIEWEL said, because of the new board, because the previous plan was several years old, and because we needed to establish where we are moving either together or with divergent ideas. The planning process accomplished all of these things, WIEWEL believed: there were deep and broad discussions and the resulting document reflected where we are collectively.

WIEWEL reported that the Board of Trustees on December 10th voted on a resolution delineating several approaches to affordability: more state funding, allocation of state funding by the HECC [Higher Education Coordinating Committee], [philanthropic] fundraising, efficiencies in daily operations, and authorizing exploring an affordability initiative through a payroll tax. Discussions with business leaders and other community members have continued. WIEWEL reported that a citizens committee would probably file the ballot initiative in early February. Anyone wanting additional information could contact him or Lois DAVIS (Vice President for Public Affairs). It was unclear how the initiative would fare, especially given the context of other initiatives, but there were some indications of positive public reaction.

PADIN observed that the president obviously felt positive about the initiatives regarding equity and inclusion taken at the end of the last term. He did not want to discourage the positive feeling, since that was something to build on. The timing of the initiatives and what he called their very modest scope, however, suggested to PADIN the hypothesis that these were token gestures. He wondered whether we could assess whether they were more than that. PADIN asserted that renaming bureaucratic positions or providing space for students had occurred in previous years, but that such moves had not made a dent in substantive issues of equity and inclusion. He remarked that in December articulate students—who were also pushing the envelope—had on that premise essentially shut down the Board of Trustees meeting. PADIN wished to register for the record the observation that we needed to watch whether token gestures were not good enough anymore.

WIEWEL replied that he, unsurprisingly, totally disagreed. He remarked that if the change of title was a token [gesture], it was a token that was explicitly asked for [by the

students], and provided within about 48 hours. Secondly, he regarded the request for the spaces as hardly a token; on the contrary they were very valuable, as demonstrated by the Casa Latina, which had been a major breakthrough. He professed surprise that such a request had not arrived earlier; when it did occur, it was met almost immediately. He characterized these as substantive improvements. Some of the other changes asked for are not things that he, the president, can effect by fiat: they reflect what is going on in classrooms and in labs throughout the institution, and they require an institution-wide effort. WIEWEL reiterated that they are not up to him alone but rather issues for the institution as a whole. For him merely to say “Oh, yes, we will do this” would be the empty gesture, in his view. Regarding the events at the Board meeting, WIEWEL stated that if a group stops the business of the organization to make their point, this is a very challenging and problematic approach. He thought it would be hard to accept a repeat of this. He hoped that there could be found ways to make substantive progress through dialogue and discussion.

GIOIA conveyed concern from students, particularly students of color, about armed campus security. He wondered what level of concern was expressed at meetings with the President, and how this concern was being addressed. WIEWEL responded that a group of students had been opposed from the beginning to the creation of a sworn police force and have continued their opposition. Because of concerns expressed by a variety of people, we had created an intensive training program which the three or four sworn officers had gone through. WIEWEL characterized the sworn police force as a model nationwide for training and preparation. He invited a broader discussion through the Public Safety Advisory Committee of other substantive issues of campus safety, not only the issue of the sworn police force.

JAEN PORTILLO, taking up the comments by PADIN, stated that the measures taken so far are fine, but that they are not enough. Other things needed to be done—forexample, the heritage language track which needs to take off in World Languages & Literatures; they are still looking for funding to hire someone to anchor the program. WIEWEL agreed that much still needed to be done. There were about twenty demands; three could be met almost immediately; some were impossible; many others are possible but will take time. A request for a new faculty line, for example, will have to come up through the colleges and will be an allocation decision. WIEWEL stated that he would not decide all these kinds of things from the top: it is not how [faculty] want the university to work. He agreed, again, there was much to do. JAEN PORTILLO asked if he could support it. WIEWEL said that he did not know the specifics the point she raised, but that we have mechanisms to do such things. He concluded that the president cannot, all of a sudden, change the world, and faculty would not be very happy if he could.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:37 p.m.

Continuous Appointment: job security

Ongoing employment

Termination:

- “cause” = behavior that warrants firing
- retrenchment
- change in curricular need that results in the elimination of their position
- unsatisfactory review and fails to remediate teaching within a year

Tenure: greater job security

Indefinite appointments

Termination:

- “cause”
- retrenchment

Retrenchment

- requires a declaration of financial exigency
- Order of layoffs within a department:
 1. fixed-term faculty
 - 1b. continuous appointment
 2. faculty on annual tenure
 3. faculty on indefinite tenure.

**Continuous Appointment:
generally Instructor ranks**

Senior Instructor II: **\$55,305**

Senior Instructor I: **\$46,863**

Instructor: **\$41,112**

**Tenure:
professorial ranks**

Professor: **\$82,971**

Associate Professor: **\$67,446**

Assistant Professor: **\$56,430**

TASK FORCE SENATE APPROVED LAST MONTH: REVIEW OF NTTF

The task force is charged to create clear and consistent processes for:

- **Annual developmental review** of NTT instructional faculty during the **probationary period** that serves to document and evaluate faculty contributions, provide developmental feedback and guidance in preparation for the continuous appointment review,
- A **milestone review** for the granting of continuous appointments,
- Regular departmental review, on a 3-year cycle, of faculty **post - continuous appointment**.

WHY ARE CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENTS (AND TENURE) A GOOD THING?

- individual
- students
- department
- shared governance
- academic freedom

**SENATE HAS BEEN ASKED TO
CONSIDER ANOTHER TASK FORCE:
regarding TEACHING-INTENSIVE
TENURE LINES**

- **Whereas** the Faculty Senate concurs with the shared desire expressed by the administration and PSU-AAUP to provide **increased job security and avenues for promotion for faculty**;
- **Whereas** the Faculty Senate considers especially important the **exercise of academic freedom** that comes with tenure and thus would like to see a greater percentage of PSU's faculty hired in tenure lines;
- **Whereas the Faculty Senate also values the role of the scholar-teacher who participates in a variety of spheres of academic life, thereby enriching the student experience, departmental exchanges and the scholarly conversation within the faculty member's discipline**;
- **Be it resolved that the members of the PSU Faculty Senate create a task force to explore the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines to complement the scholar-teacher lines that must remain primary to departmental composition.**

WHAT EXACTLY WOULD CREATION OF THE TASK FORCE MEAN?

- Task force would **explore** the question, conduct **research**, hold **campus-wide forums**, etc.,
- **deliberate**
- **THEN propose** to the Senate **EITHER** that we vote to create such positions **OR** that we table the discussion

Recommended Timeline:

- **PHASE ONE: RESEARCH/MODELS/ANALYSIS/FEEDBACK**
- **By March 2016:** Task force members appointed and the group convened.
- **Spring 2016:** Task force **researches** models and best practices for rewarding tenure for teaching.
- **Fall 2016:** Two or more **public forums** held to present results of research and solicit feedback from campus. In addition to forums, feedback solicited online and through other means.
- **Winter 2017:** Task force reviews research and feedback and makes an interim report report to Faculty Senate.
- **PHASE TWO: EXPLORE PSU_SPECIFIC MODEL AND IMPLEMENTATION**
- **Spring 2017:** Task force drafts a proposal for the creation and implementation of tenure for teaching at PSU.
- **Fall 2017:** Task force presents its preliminary recommendations to the Faculty Senate and solicits feedback.
- **Winter 2018:** At least 2 **campus-wide forums** held to present the task force's recommendations and solicit feedback widely from across campus. Forums augmented by online and write-in feedback.
- **Spring 2018:** Task force **recommendations** presented at April meeting of the Faculty Senate, questions answered at the May meeting, **vote** held during June meeting.

WHAT MIGHT WE HESITATE?

PRO

- Greater percentage of tenured members in a department increases stability for the program, students, and the individuals.
- Helps preserve academic freedom.
- It's the right thing to do.

CON (risks, fears)

- Creates two different tracks for tenure, which carries the risk of certain departments (such as the Humanities) evolving (devolving) into service departments.
- Undercuts the notion of the scholar-teacher.

Discussion:

NEXT MONTH THE SENATE WILL VOTE ON
THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE
TO EXPLORE TEACHING-INTENSIVE TENURE
LINES.

TODAY, WHAT QUESTIONS/ THOUGHTS/
CONCERNS/ INTERESTS WOULD YOU LIKE TO
DISCUSS?

PROVOST ANDREWS' COMMENTS: JANUARY 11, 2016 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

DROP-IN CONVERSATIONS WITH THE PROVOST

Winter and Spring dates (<http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/drop-in-conversations-wprovost>)

January 22, 2016, 10-11 AM, SMSU 258 Pacific Rim

February 16, 2016, 11:30AM - 12:30PM, SMSU 258 Pacific Rim

April 15, 2016, 1-2 PM, SMSU 258 Pacific Rim

May 18, 2016, 12-1 PM, SMSU 258 Pacific Rim

WINTER SYMPOSIUM - <http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/winter-symposium-2016>

What does it mean to be educated in the 21st century?

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2016.

INTEGRATED PLANNING ENROLLMENT AND BUDGET (IPEB)

<http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/integrated-planning-enrollment-budget>

- Preliminary School/College Enrollment and Resource plans complete
- Faculty Senate Budget Committee input received
- ALT will review all plans and make modifications in January
- Aggregate OAA plan determined in February
- **OAA Budget Forum, Thursday, March 31, 9 - 10:30, SMSU 238, The Browsing Lounge**
- Budgets will not be finalized until April/May

FY 16 Projected	↑	1% growth in Revenue (1.66% SCH)
Summer 2015	↓	6.7% (6,159 SCH)
Fall 2015	▬	0.16% (470 SCH)
Winter 2016 (1/11/16)	▬	0.3% (683 SCH)

Fall to Fall Fulltime Freshman Retention

2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Fall 2009 Cohort	Fall 2010 Cohort	Fall 2011 Cohort	Fall 2012 Cohort	Fall 2013 Cohort	Fall 2014 Cohort
70.0%	72.2%	73.2%	72.7%	71.7%	69.9%

Ethnicity	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Asian	78.9% (112/142)	79.1% (102/129)	80.5% (136/169)	84.1% (127/151)
Black	78.7% (37/47)	78.9% (30/38)	81.7% (49/60)	67.9% (38/56)
Hispanic/Latino	83.3% (120/144)	75.1% (127/169)	71.7% (157/219)	73.1% (182/249)
International Students	78.8% (52/66)	69.8% (67/96)	75% (84/112)	78.2% (79/101)
Multiple Ethnicity/Race	70.3% (64/91)	64% (57/89)	73.4% (80/109)	68% (83/122)
Native American	68.8% (11/16)	50% (5/10)	62.5% (5/8)	58.3% (14/24)
Pacific Islander	77.8% (7/9)	66.7% (8/12)	55.6% (5/9)	57.1% (8/14)
White	68.6% (456/665)	72% (517/718)	68.1% (498/731)	66.2% (500/755)
Declined to Respond/Other	91.7% (22/24)	86.2% (25/29)	76% (38/50)	63.4% (26/41)
PSU Overall	73.2%	72.7%	71.7%	69.9%

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
College/School	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2010, registered 4 th week of Fall 2011)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2011, registered 4 th week of Fall 2012)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2012, registered 4 th week of Fall 2013)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2013, registered 4 th week of Fall 2014)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2014, registered 4 th week of Fall 2015)
College of the Arts	70.8% (155/219)	71.5% (123/172)	71.7% (119/166)	70.5% (148/210)	67.7% (132/195)
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	70.7% (306/433)	76.3% (316/414)	74.4% (291/391)	71.8% (272/379)	69.9% (292/418)
College of Urban & Public Affairs	69.6% (87/125)	75% (87/116)	71% (93/131)	65.5% (110/168)	61.2% (101/165)
Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Sciences	74.8% (86/115)	71% (76/107)	75.8% (122/161)	78% (160/205)	78.1% (164/210)
School of Business Administration	79.6% (133/167)	75.3% (110/146)	74.1% (126/170)	75.6% (130/172)	73.9% (173/234)
School of Social Work	66.7% (14/21)	61.1% (11/18)	56.3% (9/16)	78.6% (22/28)	78.8% (26/33)
Exploratory/Undeclared/Unk nown/ /None	71.8% (153/213)	68.4% (158/231)	69.8% (178/255)	68.9% (210/305)	65.5% (169/258)
Total	72.2% (934/1293)	73.2% (881/1204)	72.7% (938/1290)	71.7% (1052/1467)	69.9% (1057/1513)

New Transfers Retention Rates

2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Fall 2009 Cohort	Fall 2010 Cohort	Fall 2011 Cohort	Fall 2012 Cohort	Fall 2013 Cohort	Fall 2014 Cohort
80.7%	79.7%	79.1%	78.8%	76.8%	78.5%

Ethnicity	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Asian	83.8% (93/111)	80.8% (84/104)	72.8% (83/114)	87.3% (89/102)
Black	91.7% (55/60)	76.2% (64/84)	75.9% (60/79)	75% (51/68)
Hispanic/Latino	76.6% (151/197)	78.3% (173/221)	77.9% (204/262)	78.5% (183/233)
International Students	82.8% (72/87)	79.5% (93/117)	79.1% (91/115)	75.5% (77/102)
Multiple Ethnicity/Race	79.4% (77/97)	73.2% (82/112)	81.7% (94/115)	85% (96/113)
Native American	67.6% (23/34)	81.2% (26/32)	78.8% (26/33)	79.5% (31/39)
Pacific Islander	62.5% (5/8)	69.2% (9/13)	70% (14/20)	80% (12/15)
White	78.8% (1165/1479)	79.6% (1142/1434)	76.5% (1111/1453)	77.9% (1066/1368)
Declined to Respond/Other	78.1% (57/73)	74% (77/104)	76.8% (96/125)	75.2% (88/117)
PSU Overall	79.1%	78.8%	76.8%	78.5%

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
College/School	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2010, registered 4 th week of Fall 2011)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2011, registered 4 th week of Fall 2012)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2012, registered 4 th week of Fall 2013)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2013, registered 4 th week of Fall 2014)	Fall to Fall Retention (Major on 4th week Fall 2014, registered 4 th week of Fall 2015)
College of the Arts	78.8% (171/217)	75.5% (166/220)	80.8% (164/203)	69.1% (132/191)	79.1% (155/196)
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	80.0% (760/950)	78.9% (720/913)	78.4% (732/934)	76.5% (767/1002)	77.9% (738/947)
College of Urban & Public Affairs	77.4% (182/235)	76.8% (175/228)	75.3% (207/275)	78% (199/255)	78.9% (206/261)
Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Sciences	82.1% (151/184)	84% (137/163)	78.9% (168/213)	76.2% (186/244)	78.8% (167/212)
School of Business Administration	81.9% (262/320)	81.7% (263/322)	82.8% (228/348)	82.6% (313/379)	79.7% (282/354)
School of Social Work	83.7% (72/86)	88.2% (90/102)	68% (86/100)	81.5% (75/92)	86.1% (62/72)
Exploratory/Undeclared/Unknown/None	75.3% (165/219)	74.2% (147/198)	70.9% (105/148)	69.9% (107/153)	72.2% (83/115)
Total	79.7% (1,763/2,211)	79.1% (1,698/2,146)	78.8% (1,750/1,290)	76.8% (1,052/1,467)	78.5% (1,693/2,157)

TASK GROUP ON COPYRIGHT

<http://library.pdx.edu/university-charges-new-task-force-on-copyright/>

Charged on August 17, 2015 to: address issues associated with the area of copyright ownership that arise within the PSU University community. The task force will identify existing resources, policies, and practices within the University, intellectual property, the desire to foster scholarly creativity and enhance the creative works of all members of the academic community, advance excellence in teaching, and enhance student learning in an affordable educational environment. The task force should complete its work by June 30, 2016. It is expected that after this date, further work may need to be accomplished to implement task force recommendations.

The task force reports to Provost Sona Andrews and the Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships, Jon Fink and will provide progress reports and recommendation at the end of each academic quarter. The task force is to keep the Faculty Senate apprised of deliberations as it proceeds.

Task Group Members:

Co-Chairs:

- Marilyn Moody – Dean, University Library
- Joe Janda – Director, Innovation & Intellectual Property, Research and Strategic Partnerships

Members:

- Michele Bromley – Inclusive Technology Coordinator, Disability Resource Center
- Johannes De Gruyter – Executive Director, Office of Academic Innovation
- Warren Harrison, Chair, Computer Science. faculty member
- Jon Holt, World Languages and Literatures faculty member
- Maura Kelly, Sociology faculty member
- Tom Potiowsky, Chair, Economics faculty member
- Krista Stearns – Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel

December 2015 Copyright Task Force Interim Report

The Copyright Task Force convened 4 times. In the first two meetings, the task force reviewed their scope and charge, surfaced faculty and administration issues around copyright materials, and was presented with a primer on copyright, fair use, and ownership by a local intellectual property attorney. In the next two meetings the task force zeroed in on some of the largest issues to address in a new policy and on a structure for proceeding over the next three terms.

The largest issues included clarity on ownership of course materials in various creation situations, clarity on how "on-line" materials do or do not effect ownership, and guidance on the use of derivative materials whose derivation is required by other policies (disability access, for example).

The task force structured their work into areas of copyright "production" and "consumption/use" and decided that the goal of the former will be a draft recommended policy for copyright ownership with changes from the current policy annotated with the task force's thoughts on the need for the changes, and that the goal for the latter will be a comprehensive guidance document for faculty, staff, and students built on a model document offered at Grinnell College and incorporating existing PSU copyright guidance documents.

In early discussions on a draft policy the task force is examining a model where all copyright materials created by staff are owned by PSU, and all materials created by faculty are owned by their faculty creators, unless

A. sponsored funding has paid for the work, in which case PSU owns the copyright to the materials, or

B. a cognizant PSU unit has decided, and the relevant faculty have agreed, prior to the creation of the materials, that PSU should own them.

In this model PSU would have a blanket permission to use all faculty created copyright materials unless a faculty author/creator proactively denies such permission. This model may not be the final recommendation, but represents the latest discussion by the task force.

Over the next term, the task force will work on the draft policy, and in the two terms after that it is hoped that the task force will move on to the guidance document.

Attachment C.1.



Office of the PSU Faculty Senate (OAA)
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Market Center Building 650
tel. 503-725-4416
fax 503-725-4499

To: Provost Andrews
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
Gina Greco, Presiding Officer
Date: 13 January 2016
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

On 11 January 2016, the Senate approved the Curricular Consent Agenda recommending the proposed new graduate and undergraduate courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs listed in Attachment E.1 to the January 2016 Agenda.

[1-21-16—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda.](#)

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gina Greco'.

Gina Greco
Presiding Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard H. Beyler'.

Richard H. Beyler
Secretary to the Faculty

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sona Andrews'.

Sona Andrews, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

January 11, 2016

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 **2015-16 Comprehensive List of Proposals**.

College of the Arts

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.1

- Film 384 American Cinema and Culture – change title to *Topics in American Cinema and Culture*; change description, repeatability.

E.1.c.2

- TA 314 Lighting Design I – change title to *Lighting Design 1*; change description, credits hours from 3 to 4, prerequisites, grading option.

E.1.c.3

- TA 430 Scene Design III – change title to *Scene Design 2*; change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.4

- TA 435 Lighting Design II – change title to *Lighting Design 2*; change description, credit hours from 3 to 4, prerequisites.

School of Business Administration

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.5

- BA/BS in Business Administration – change requirements.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.6

- BA 301 Research and Analysis of Business Problems – change prerequisites.

College of Liberal Arts and Studies

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.7

- BA/BS in Communication – change requirements.

E.1.c.8

- Minor in Sexuality Gender and Queer Studies – change requirements.

E.1.c.9

- Minor in Writing – change requirements.

New Courses

E.1.c.10

- WLL 361 Bestsellers and Blockbusters (4)
Study of the interplay between literary works from a variety of time periods and their cinematic representations. Students will develop analytical and critical thinking skills applicable both to the page and the screen. May be repeated with different topics. Course taught in English.

E.1.c.11

- WS 367 War, Sexual Violence and Healing (4)
Addresses various forms and causes of human rights violations during periods of both conflict and peace. Examines how poverty, injustice and gender-based inequalities reflect the political-economic structures that perpetuate gender-based violence among people. Students will investigate methods and means to combat such violence and facilitate healing.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.12

- Anth 379 Practicing Forensic Science – change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.13

- Ar 204, 205, 206 Common Spoken Arabic – drop.

E.1.c.14

- Ar 304 Intermediate Common Spoken Arabic – change title to *Common Spoken Arabic*; change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.15

- Ar 305 Intermediate Common Spoken Arabic – change title to *Common Spoken Arabic*; change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.16

- Ar 306 Intermediate Common Spoken Arabic – change title to *Common Spoken Arabic*; change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.17

- CR 310 Fundamentals of Conflict Resolution – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.18

- CR 311 Introduction to Conflict Resolution Psychology – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.19

- Fr 340 Fundamentals of French Literary Studies – change description.

E.1.c.20

- Fr 341U Introduction to French Literature – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.21

- Fr 342U Introduction to French Literature – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.22

- Fr 343U Introduction to French Literature – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.23

- Ger 484 German Stylistics – add 484 to existing Ger 584.

E.1.c.24

- Hst 325 Mexican American/Chicano History I, 1492-1900 – change title to *Chicano/a History, 1492-1900*.

E.1.c.25

- Hst 326 Mexican American/Chicano History II, 1900-Present – change title to *Chicano/a History, 1900-Present*.

E.1.c.26

- Hst 385 The Modern Middle East I – change title to *Late Imperial Middle East, 1700-1914*; change description.

E.1.c.27

- Hst 386 The Modern Middle East II – change title to *Middle East in the Twentieth Century*; change description.

E.1.c.28

- It 341U Introduction to Italian Literature – change course number to It 344U; change title to *Italian Literary and Cultural Movements*; change description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.29

- It 342 Introduction to Italian Literature – drop.

E.1.c.30

- Wr 312 Intermediate Fiction Writing – change description, prerequisites, concurrent enrollment, grading option.

E.1.c.31

- Wr 313 Intermediate Poetry Writing – change description, prerequisites, concurrent enrollment, repeatability, grading option.

E.1.c.32

- Wr 412 Advanced Fiction Writing – separating 412 from Wr 512; change description, prerequisites, concurrent enrollment, repeatability, grading option.

E.1.c.33

- Wr 413 Advanced Poetry Writing – change description, prerequisites, concurrent enrollment, repeatability, grading option.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses

E.1.c.34

- PS 373 Violence, Rebellion, and Civil War (4)
Discusses the causes and consequences of the dominant modes of rebellion and civil war with attention to the role that violence plays in shaping their character, duration, and outcome. Topics include genocide, famine, civil war, sexual violence in war, nationalism and ethnic conflict, counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, and peacekeeping.

New Prefix

E.1.c.35

- UPA – Urban and Public Affairs – new prefix.

Undergraduate Studies

Changes to Existing Clusters

E.1.c.36

- Science in Social Context – cluster name change.

Attachment E.1.d

December 22, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Joel Bettridge
Chair, University Studies Council

RE: Consent Agenda

The following courses have been approved for inclusion in UNST Clusters by the UNST Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

New Cluster Courses

ANTH 310	Chinese Culture and Society	Global Perspectives
ENG 325	Postcolonial Literature	Global Perspectives
HST 369	Women in World History	Gender and Sexualities
INTL 365	Digital Globalization	Global Perspectives
INTL 380	Globalization Representation and Difference in Media and Film	Gender and Sexualities
WLL 319	Fairy Tales and Folklore	Interpreting the Past
WLL 361	Bestsellers and Blockbusters	Global Perspectives

The link to the cluster proposals is: <https://unstcouncil.pbworks.com/w/page/103072303/2016-2017%20Cluster%20and%20Course%20Proposals>

Attachment E.2

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Motion

To create a Task Force to explore the idea of creating Teaching-Intensive Tenure lines

January 4, 2016

Whereas the Faculty Senate concurs with the shared desire expressed by the administration and PSU-AAUP to provide increased job security and avenues for promotion for faculty;

Whereas the Faculty Senate considers especially important the exercise of academic freedom that comes with tenure and thus would like to see a greater percentage of PSU's faculty hired in tenure lines;

Whereas the Faculty Senate also values the role of the scholar-teacher who participates in a variety of spheres of academic life, thereby enriching the student experience, departmental exchanges and the scholarly conversation within the faculty member's discipline;

Be it resolved that the members of the PSU Faculty Senate create a task force to explore the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines to complement the scholar-teacher lines that must remain primary to departmental composition.

The charge will be to:

- Research models at other universities.
- Solicit feedback across campus through a variety of means including all-campus forums. At least two forums, scheduled during different teaching blocks, will be organized and publicized to all potential stakeholders, including but not limited to students, all faculty (tenure-line, NTT and adjunct faculty), department chairs, employees responsible for student and/or faculty support, and administrators.
- Provide an interim report to the Faculty Senate on their research and the feedback generated through outreach.
- Review models, feedback from campus and input generated at the Faculty Senate meeting, and formulate a proposal for the creation of teaching-intensive tenure lines at PSU, addressing such topics as expectations for hiring, granting of tenure, promotion, work load, departmental and campus contributions, and suggestions for implementation.
- Hold a second round of campus-wide forums to solicit feedback on the proposal, including Faculty-Senate organized meetings and any additional venues thought useful.
- Revise the proposal based on second round of feedback, then present to the Faculty Senate for its approval to amend the P & T Guidelines, after review by AAUP-PSU and OAA

The task force will consist of five members appointed by the Senate, two appointed by the administration, and two by PSU-AAUP. The majority of task force members will be tenured faculty.

Let it be noted that these positions are not to be conceived of as subordinate to our current scholar-teacher lines, thus it is expected that these lines would be filled by candidates holding terminal degrees in the field and have equivalent training to that of other tenure line faculty.

Recommended Timeline:

PHASE ONE: RESEARCH/MODELS/ANALYSIS/FEEDBACK

March 2016: Task force members appointed and the group convened.

Spring 2016: Task force researches models and best practices for awarding tenure for teaching.

Fall 2016: Campus-wide forums held to present results of research and solicit feedback from campus. In addition to forums, feedback solicited online and through other means.

Winter 2017: Task force makes an interim report to Faculty Senate.

PHASE TWO: EXPLORE PSU-SPECIFIC MODEL AND IMPLEMENTATION

Spring 2017: Task force drafts a proposal for the award of tenure for teaching and its implementation at PSU.

Fall 2017: Task force presents its preliminary recommendations to the Faculty Senate and solicits feedback.

Winter 2018: Campus-wide forums held to present the task force's recommendations and solicit feedback widely from across campus. Forums augmented by online and write-in feedback.

Spring 2018: Task force presents its proposal to amend the P&T Guidelines at April meeting of the Faculty Senate, presents draft language at the May meeting, with final approval during June meeting.

Attachment G.3

To: The Portland State Faculty Senate Steering Committee

Re: Winter Report: Activities of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC)

Date: January 11, 2016

Members: David Peyton (Chair, CHEM),

Andrew Black (CMP), Berrin Erdogan (SBA), Georgia Harris (PAD), Barbara Heilmair (MUS), Betty Izumi (UNST), Anoop Mirpuri (ENG), Mary Kristen Kern (LIB), Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP), Tom Kindermann (PSY), Tom Larsen (LIB), Peter Moeck (PHY), Greg Pugh (SSW), Vivek Shandas (URBN), Sarah Tinker (CLAS-SS), Angela Zagarella-Chodosh (ITAL)

1. Travel Awards (annual allocation is \$500,000):

Summer: \$125,839.29 (53/124 applicants): 43% funding rate

Fall: \$124,482.71 (63/85 applicants): 74% funding rate

Winter: \$113,183.64 awarded (54/71 applicants): 76% funding rate

This leaves about \$136.5K for the Spring allocation (which tends to have a higher number of requests than does Fall or Winter terms).

The *Lottery System* has been working for the Travel Awards, in my estimation.

Funding rate so far this year is 170/280 = 61%

Going forward: need for 1 trip per faculty member per year; we are not there yet.

2. Preparation for the Faculty Enhancement Awards (\$650,000):

The call for **Faculty Enhancement Awards** is now 'live' (and has been since before Winter break). The grants are due on the THIRD WEDNESDAY OF FEBRUARY. People who submit proposals will have to supply "Field-appropriate" information related to both past productivity, as well as how the proposed work would contribute to:

- ✓ publications (say how many, and in what venues),
- ✓ grant applications (say how many, and to what agencies),
- ✓ recital performances (how many, where),
- ✓ recording opportunities,
- ✓ conference presentations,
- ✓ invitations to exhibit,
- ✓ broader impacts, including involving undergraduate, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral trainees
- ✓ other ways the work might impact the community & University's standing.

We have enhanced the reviewing process, using a web-based evaluation tool (<https://www.easychair.org/>). This has allowed for better matching of grants to reviewer expertise, as well as submission of, and tracking of reviews.

3. Solidification of funding cycle:

Faculty Enhancement Grant due date: 3rd Wednesday of each February

Travel grant due dates: 10/1, 12/1, 3/1, & 6/1