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To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
From: Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on 9 January 2017 at 3:00 p.m. in Cramer Hall 53.

AGENDA

Items on the consent agenda will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

A. Roll Call
B. * Approval of the Minutes of the 7 December 2016 Meeting – consent agenda
C. Announcements and Discussion  
   * 1. OAA response to December notice of Senate actions – consent agenda  
   2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:  
   3. Announcements by Secretary  
   4. Discussion. Shared governance: What does it mean? How do we implement it more effectively?
D. Unfinished Business
E. New Business  
   * 1. Curricular proposals – consent agenda (UCC, GC)  
   * 2. Graduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry – SBA (GC)  
   * 3. Undergraduate Certificate in Art History – COTA (UCC)
F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   1. President’s Report  
   2. Provost’s Report
H. Adjournment

*See the following attachments:
   B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 December 2016 and appendices – consent agenda  
   C.1. OAA response to December notice of Senate actions – consent agenda  
   E.1.a, c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.b] – consent agenda  
   E.2. Grad. Cert. in Athletic and Outdoor Industry  
   E.3. Undergrad. Cert. in Art History
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Library (1)
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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 5 December 2016

Presiding Officer: Brad Hansen
Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Rebecca Ingersoll for Arellano, John Luke Gallup for Bluffstone, Maude Hines for Clark, Pat Burk for Farahmandpur, Wu-Chi Feng for Maier, Bradley Buckley for Podrabsky, Chia Yin Hsu for Schuler, Miranda Cunningham for Taylor, Faryar Etesami for Tretheway

Members Absent:
Brown, Camacho, Cruzan, De La Vega, Duschee, Epplin, Gelmon, Kennedy, Recktenwald, Ruedas, Running, Sorensen, Walsh

Ex-officio Members Present:
Andrews, Baccar, Beyler, Black, Chabon, D. Hansen, Hines (also as alternate), Jhaj, Lafferriere, Marrongelle, Marshall, Moody, Padín, Percy, D. Reese, Wiewel, Woods

A. ROLL
The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
There having been no objections prior to the end of roll call, the 7 November 2016 Minutes were approved as part of the consent agenda.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION
1. OAA concurrence to November Senate actions was received as part of the consent agenda [see December Agenda Attachment C.1].

2. Announcements by the Presiding Officer
B. HANSEN made several announcements [overview: Appendix C.2]. Final guidelines for review of non-tenure track faculty are not yet available for Senate ratification.

A proposal had come to Steering Committee regarding ex-officio representation for the over 1500 part-time teaching faculty. Part-time faculty generate about a third of our student credit hours. Their collective bargaining agreement [CBA] states that chairs will offer an annual evaluation for part-time faculty; among the options for assessment are peer classroom observations or a letter of support from a faculty peer. HANSEN believed it might be a good idea to amend the Faculty Constitution to give a more formal conduit for such issues in Faculty Senate, i.e., an ex-officio seat. (Regular Senate membership is limited to faculty with 0.5 or greater FTE.) He asked for an unofficial straw poll, which indicated some support for such a move.
S. REESE was curious if this would still be desired if it would add more demands to someone’s time. As things are, part-time faculty can attend meetings and be given the floor. HANSEN answered that the point was to legitimize their presence more formally.

HANSEN had received an e-mail from the faculty senate president at Western Washington University, expressing interest on the proposed endorsement President’s declaration of PSU as a sanctuary campus [see item E.3 below]. The raised a question about raised the third point in the declaration, that the University would not share confidential information such as immigration status unless required by court order. The concern was about research grants which require citizenship status. HANSEN had asked [General Counsel] D. REESE about this; the answer is that the declaration is not meant to change current practice about student information in the context of research regulations, export controls, etc. HANSEN had also consulted colleagues about this issue; the general response was that students tend to self-select if citizenship is required.

HANSEN called attention to the Budget Principles [December Packet Attachment C.2.b] formulated by the Budget Committee [BC] in 2014. The committee might make some edits and minor changes to wording to this document.

Departments were being urged, HANSEN stated, to update their bylaws. He encouraged faculty to be involved in faculty governance at all levels.

As Presiding Officer, HANSEN was involved in several committees, including the University Policy Committee. Drafts of two new policies are found in Attachment C.2.a: on copyright, and on public assembly and demonstration. Comments may be sent to the Secretary to be passed on. He partcularly urged senators to read carefully the section on course materials in the draft copyright policy. He noted that the policy on demonstration exempted ORS 243.650, which refers to collective bargaining activities.

Redesign of academic and career advising was underway, HANSEN said, aiming at a more centralized framework. A report is available on-line [www.pdx.edu/student-success/sites/www.pdx.edu.student-success/files/psu_advising_redesign_report_final_RGB_102916.pdf]. One aim in the redesign is to move the student:advisor ratio from 700 to 350.

The Task Force to Explore Tenure for Teaching Intensive Faculty is meeting. They had identified two universities that have such a policy: British Columbia and Western Michigan. Other universities are talking about it, notably California-Irvine.

HANSEN had been attending meetings of the Board of Trustees and its committees. He found particularly helpful a “dashboard” prepared for the Finance and Administration Committee [http://www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/FinanceandAdministration-17Nov2016-Meeting-v1%282%29.pdf#page=7]. (More generally he called senators’ attention to the minutes of the Board’s meetings available on-line [www.pdx.edu/board].) The report shows where money comes from and where it is going, the categories of expenditure with the E&G [education and general] budget, debt servicing, etc. It anticipates a shortfall of a little over $30 million, which will be met with tuition increases, cuts, and use of reserves. The enrollment forecast is relatively flat for the next five years or so. HANSEN encouraged faculty to attend the budget forums offered by the Provost; he had found these to be informational about the planning process and allocation of money.
HANSEN noted that the Presidential Search Committee had posted an Opportunity and Challenges Profile [www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/2016.11.17%20PSU%20President%20Profile.pdf] which stated, at the end, desired qualifications and experience.

3. Announcements by the Secretary

BEYLER reminded senators that the January Senate meeting will be on the 9th. The January Steering Committee meeting will be on the 23rd. He, as well as B. HANSEN, also urged senators to communicate with their districts about Senate business, using the “What’s Happening in Faculty Senate” messages as a template.

4. Discussion: Post-Tenure Review: what has worked well, what needs modification?

CHABON gave an overview of the post-tenure review [PTR] process and some lessons learned. [For text of slides, see Appendix C.4.] An ad-hoc committee was formed in 2014. Aims were to ensure that faculty work responsibly, sharing responsibilities within the unit; that the review would be collegial and faculty-driven; and that the process should recognize and motivate faculty engagement. Elements of PTR had been around since at least 1995 (cf. Article 16 of the CBA), but development of more systematic efforts was provoked by an accreditation report. Guidelines were discussed and approved by Faculty Senate in April 2015, and by the Provost in June 2015, resulting in a memorandum of understanding between the administration and the union. That summer, faculty in quintiles 1 and 2 were notified. Subsequently, departments worked out specific policies, which were then approved by the administration.

For the first year (two quintiles), CHABON reported, 153 faculty participated, of whom 147 met standards. Of the six who did not, one requested reconsideration by the Provost, ending in a determination that standards had been met. Quintile 3 is currently in process, with 88 faculty participating, 19 deferring, and 12 opting out. By March, deans will report on quintile 3.

CHABON noted that there were unexpected problems, which faculty and administration worked to resolve. These included: errors and ambiguities in the guidelines (inconsistencies within or between documents, etc.); questions about committee composition (can more than one committee member be suggested by the candidate?); timeline difficulties (replacements for deferrals and opt-outs; overlap with promotion and tenure reviews; scheduling by working days rather than calendar days, etc.); questions about criteria (what is meant by “ongoing activity”?); and material logistics (references to missing forms, discrepancies in language, etc.)

CHABON highlighted Faculty Senate, OAA, and AAUP working together to create the process and calibrate responses. Departments and academic units all have guidelines in place. She believed that PSU had addressed the concerns of accreditors.

D. HANSEN/O’BANION moved that Senate resolve into a committee of the whole; the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote (at 3:41).

In the subsequent discussion, senators and ex officio members asked questions about the PTR process, stated concerns, and offered suggestions for refinements going forward.

RAFFO/DE RIVERA moved that the Senate return to regular session; the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote (at 4:16).
D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals from Graduate Council and University Curriculum Committee listed in December Agenda Attachment E.1 were approved as part of the consent agenda, there having been no objection prior to the end of roll call.

2. Graduate Certificate in Public Health

GRECO/BOWMAN moved approval of the Graduate Certificate in Public Health in the OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health [SPH], brought to Senate by Graduate Council [GC], as contained in December Agenda Attachment E.2.

D. HANSEN asked for clarification about what was being voted on: the document contained in the packet was for OHSU. BOWMAN said that PSU must also approve programs previously considered and approved by OHSU. PERCY asked who would be awarding the certificate. MESSER said that this on-line certificate program had been offered for a long time by OHSU, but PSU Faculty Senate now needs to be aware of, and decide whether to approve this certificate. D. HANSEN asked whether the proposal had been through PSU’s curricular review process. BEYLER: yes, it was coming to Senate from GC. HARRIS asked how recent was the survey mentioned in the proposal. WOODS, chair of GC, clarified that the forms were not PSU’s usual forms, since they had been prepared for OHSU; GC decided last year with three analogous proposals that it would be onerous to require that the proposals be filled out on PSU’s forms. ANDREWS added that in the [SPH] agreement, any programs originating with PSU had to be approved by OHSU, and vice versa. Faculty might propose programs predominantly run by faculty from only one institution, but they had to be approved by the other institution. SCHROCK asked if there was expectation that PSU students would enroll. ANDREWS said there was nothing precluding students from either institution from taking courses in SPH. Any degree would be from both institutions, and hence require approval of both senates. MESSER clarified that this proposal is for a certificate, not a degree.

The motion was approved (47 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

3. Resolution on PSU as a Sanctuary Campus

MACCORMACK/RAFFO moved the resolution given in the December Agenda:

The Faculty Senate endorses President Wiewel’s declaration that PSU is a sanctuary campus.

LUCKETT approved whole-heartedly the spirit of the endorsement. The specific points in the President’s statement are delimited by law. His concern is that we would potentially find ourselves in a position in which the laws would become so unjust that we felt we could not comply. He would not want this statement to be read in a lawyerly fashion, after the fact, as prior approval to any and all [future] laws on this subject, no matter how detrimental to our students. He therefore proposed an amendment to the resolution, viz., adding two sentences:
This endorsement, however, should not be interpreted to imply that the Senate necessarily approves compliance with any future state law, federal law, or court order that would require the University to release confidential student information or otherwise assist in enforcement of federal immigration law. Should such a situation arise, we ask the President to consult with the Senate regarding the appropriate response.

LUCKETT stated that while he trusted our current president on this subject, we have no idea who will be president after the end of the academic year. He did not wish to bind the Senate to a particular course of action, but rather to preserve our freedom of action.

LUCKETT/SCHECHTER moved the amendment as given above.

SMALLMAN said that he strongly supported the President’s position, but that for PSU to survive our students needed to be able to get federal financial aid. Thus we needed to comply with relevant laws. He sympathized with the amendment’s intent, but was reluctant to constrain the president, if legal non-compliance meant risking financial aid.

SCHECHTER maintained that since we don’t know what is ahead, building in a consultative dimension was common sense. It behooves us to deliberate if we feel that a boundary has been crossed. [The amendment] does not tie us to any particular course of action. JAEN PORTILLO supported the idea of consultation, and suggested that we should be more concerned about the safety of individuals than with funding. GRECO understood that our students rely on financial aid. What the amendment says is that we would consult and weigh what the administration was asking, and what the repercussions would be. It doesn’t say what the result of the discussion might be.

WIEWEL expressed appreciation for the proposed resolution. Regarding the amendment, he said it was not clear that if there were new legislation, the penalty would necessarily be loss of federal funding. It is hard to imagine any president who would close down the university. However, that has sometimes been the result of action of repressive regimes in other parts of the world; in such circumstances, shutting down might even be an appropriate response. Usually in a president’s contract, violating the law is cause for dismissal. It seemed to him that the amendment simply asked the president to consult with Faculty Senate, but did not prevent the President from acting if that was necessary for the good of the institution.

YESILADA said that slippery slopes around the world had led to colleagues of his being jailed. For this reason he strongly supported the amendment. He hoped that the day would not come to make such a hard choice, but if it did that we would stand on the side of right. He did not want to go down the road of losing academic integrity.

B. HANSEN reiterated that the point in the President’s declaration which had drawn most attention was the provision that we would not share confidential information unless directed by a court order or similar governmental action. He believed it was not Senate’s position to demand compliance or non-compliance with federal law or court orders, but that it was our role, should the situation arise, to consult with the President about the appropriate response. The amendment calls for Senate to participate in giving such a response. A senator asked whether it was not our current practice not to share such student information with anybody, absent a court order. HANSEN answered that the
General Counsel [D. REESE] had said that the declaration is about immigration enforcement, and not about any long-standing practices about other regulations.

JHAJ saw the President’s statement and the current discussion as a response to fear-mongering, by stating: “We care.” Regardless of the details, and with or without the amendment, the message “We care” has been made by the President and by the Faculty. He affirmed, as an immigrant, that statements like this were of great value.

The question of the amendment was called. The amendment was approved (35 yes, 8 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

The question of the amended resolution was called. The amended resolution was approved (43 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTIONS TO ADMINISTRATORS & COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND COMMITTEES

1. President’s Report

WIEWEL thanked the Senate for the vote on the resolution. Nothing he had done or said during his time as president had received so much positive feedback. Student government leaders had suggested that the declaration did not go far enough in committing to defiance of federal law. Nationally the declaration had received considerable attention, particularly in the use of the term “sanctuary.”

WIEWEL reported that the governor’s proposed budget held university funding stable ($667 million in the public university support fund for the biennium), as opposed to a feared reduction. Given cost increases, this will nevertheless require a mixture of cuts, tuition increases, and use of reserves. It will also be necessary to explore additional sources of revenue. The Oregon Business Plan, in a meeting today, recognized a need for additional revenue measures, through the legislature or otherwise. On the capital side, there was a cut of about $5 million in the request for the new Montgomery/4th Avenue building—to house GSE together with other partners—which means a shift from one kind of bond to another, and hence more matching. He was optimistic that once an additional partner was announced, this might be changed. He was working, additionally, with the Coalition for College Access and Success. With the defeat of Measure 97, the ball was very much in their court to pursue other revenue measures.

WIEWEL announced the Jennifer DILL and colleagues had received a $15.6 million federal grant over five years for a National Center for Transportation and Communities (really a continuation of the existing Transportation Center). It is a partnership with other universities, but with PSU taking the lead, and is one of five such grants nationwide.

The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities has given PSU the 2016 Magrath Community Engagement Scholarship Award, citing the specific example of the 27-year partnership with the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. Steve PERCY and Erin FLYNN had spearheaded the award application.

WIEWEL noted that last week Athletic Director Mark ROUNTREE had resigned, effective December 16th, to take a position as deputy AD at Georgia Tech, where he had
both professional and familial connections. WIEWEL praised the work ROUNTREE had done as AD, particularly connecting athletics to the university community, improving the financial situation, and improving the overall spirit in the athletics program. WIEWEL announced the appointment of Valerie CLEARY as AD. She had served as interim AD prior to ROUNTREE’s appointment, and had most recently been at Willamette University. WIEWEL noted, among other strong qualifications, CLEARY’s background in student development and counseling.

WIEWEL wished senators a good luck with the end of the term and a good winter break.

2. Provost’s Report

[See Minutes Appendix G.2 for an outline of the Provost’s comments.] ANDREWS said that faculty seeking resources for dealing with post-election issues with students should let the Office of Academic Affairs [OAA] know. The Office of Academic Innovation would be holding workshops on this topic winter term.

Regarding the OAA budget, ANDREWS reverted to B. HANSEN’s previous comments about the forum on the 21st. The slides from the forum are posted to the OAA website [www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-affairs/files/Nov%202016%20OAA%20budget%20forum.pdf]. She admitted that the slides may be difficult to understand without the narrative, so going forward she will tape her comments. If there is interest from (say) ten or more faculty, she would consider repeating the forum. Performance-based budgeting is complicated, and the principles are continuing to be refined. She wanted to make sure that faculty had access to necessary information to understand the process.

The BC had been doing great work in understanding and providing input into the process. There will be forums again in winter and spring terms. The budget process for fiscal year 2018 has begun with a kickoff meeting this week about strategic enrollment management. Plans for enrollment management will be available on the web, and the BC has designated liaisons for the various academic units. The Budget Principles shared earlier have been used for the past couple of years in OAA budgeting, she noted.

ANDREWS clarified regarding the advising redesign that “centralizing” advising meant coordinating advising. The intent is not to diminish the role of faculty in advising, but rather enhance the ability of faculty to engage with student advising in a meaningful way. The goal is to reduce the ratio of students to professional advisors from 700 to 350, which is around the national average, and to identify pathways so that undeclared students can get the advising they need. ANDREWS had received a report and input from various individuals. This week OAA would be making decisions about an implementation plan.


The Internationalization Council’s annual report for 2015-16, given as December Packet Attachment G.3, was received as part of the consent agenda.

4. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

The Educational Policy Committee’s report for fall 2016, given as December Packet Attachment G.4, was received as part of the consent agenda.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.
Announcements from the Presiding Officer
December 5, 2016

- **NTT Instructional Faculty** – Guidelines for Revision to Article 18
  The final version is STILL not available for Senate to ratify

- **Academic Program Prioritization** and Program Review
  Mark Woods, APPC chair, is STILL developing a final report

- **Part-Time Adjuncts: Participation in Faculty Senate**
  Constitutional amendment to add an Ex-Officio member?

- **Departmental By-Laws**
  Updating and revision being urged on a short time frame
  Departmental faculty committees should be actively involved in the process,
  defining standards for democratic and shared governance

- **Budget Principles will undergo minor revision**
  FY15 Addendum to packet shows the priorities:
  Academics and Student Success, Instruction and liberal arts education
  Faculty engagement at all levels to provide input and develop metrics

- **Copyright Ownership Policy**
  Draft released, included in packet; send comments to Secretary Beyler
  Note: Read V. Policy item 6.0 Course Materials carefully

- **Assembly and Demonstration Policy**
  Draft released, included in packet; send comments to Secretary Beyler
  Note: ORS 243.650 refers to the AAUP and Collective Bargaining activities

- **Academic and Career Advising Redesign**
  Centralized Framework promoted in Advising Redesign Report

- **Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty**
  Task Force is building case studies with information gathered
  Planning Forums and Surveys for university-wide input
• Board of Trustees – Committee Meeting Reports
  BOT Website: http://www.pdx.edu/board/

  Presidential Search
  Position Description, Qualifications and Experience

  Finance and Administration, Nov. 17
  Anticipated budget shortfall = $30M+
  Tuition increase, cuts, and reserves will compensate
  Total enrollment forecast is relatively flat for next 5 years (+/- 5%)
  Budget Forum presentation by Provost Andrews clarifies the process

  Academic and Student Affairs, Nov. 18
  Student Wellness Initiative Review
Post Tenure Review
Faculty Senate Presentation
Shelly Chabon, Vice Provost,
Academic Personnel and Leadership Development
Monday, December 5, 2016

Post Tenure Review (PTR)

Our Mission:
 a. To assure that individual faculty members work responsibly within their units to ensure that unit contributions are shouldered equitably.
b. To be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development;
c. To recognize and motivate faculty engagement.

History of PTR:
Apr. 2014: Accreditation report comes back to PSU and identifies the need to implement an inclusive system for post-tenure review.
Sparks an initial discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting of how to make post-tenure review work for PSU.
Jun. 2014: Faculty Senate establishes Ad-Hoc Committee
Dec. 2014: Committee report presented to Faculty Senate
Apr. 2015: Faculty Senate approves process for PTR
Jun. 2015: Procedure approved by Provost and referred to bargaining with AAUP
Aug. 2015: Execution of MOU with AAUP for revision to P&T guidelines. Quintiles notified.
Oct. 2015: Faculty Senate approves changes
Nov. ‘15-Jun. ‘16: Departments, Deans, and Provost approved all departmental PTR practices

Results:
August 2015 - Quintile 1 and Quintile 2 Notified

Quintile 1:
• 91 Participated
• 4 Deferred
• 14 Opted Out

Quintile 2:
• 62 Participated
• 5 Deferred
• 6 Opted Out

Totals:
• 153 Faculty Participated
• 147 Met Standards
• 6 Did Not Meet Standards
  • 1 Reconsideration request to Provost. Provost determined that standards were met.
May 2016 – Quintile 3 Notified
• 88 Participated
• 19 Deferred
• 12 Opted Out

March 2017:
• Deans’ Reports on Quintile 3 are due to OAA

May 2017 – Quintile 4 to be Notified

OAA, AAUP & FS Monitor Implementation

What Went Wrong - Overview
  a. Errors & Ambiguities
  b. Timeline
  c. Criteria
  d. Logistics
  e. Committee Composition

What Went Wrong
Errors & Ambiguities

Page 7:
• II. Reviews for promotion are considered in lieu of PTR but this section does not make clear whether they may occur at the same time.

Page 8 & 10:
• Pg. 10, V1.A.2. – Specifies that OAA will forward list of eligible faculty to dean and chair but timeline (page 8) specifies dean only.

Page 9:
• #V, D. – Does not specify criteria for determining input in cases where faculty appointment is equally divided between two (2) departments.

Page 12:
• VI, D1. – States that PTR Committee Chair may be allowed to serve as chair designee. This is not permissible.

Committee Composition
  a. (Pg. 11) - Specifies that one committee member must be selected from a list of three (3) submitted by the faculty member, but no maximum number is given.
  b. A form is needed to report that all eligible faculty were identified but no form is provided.
Post Tenure Review
Faculty Senate Presentation
Shelly Chabon, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Leadership Development
Monday, December 5, 2016

Timeline

a. The need to move faculty from one quintile to another when spots were vacated due to deferrals or opt outs created delays and made it challenging to adhere to published timeline.
b. For those who did not meet standards, timeline did not allow agreement about PDP within the academic year.
c. Timeline was not precise, use of working days vs. week days extended process beyond contract year.

Criteria

a. Use of accreditation standards as a benchmark for performance was not consistently understood.
b. (Pg. 11, VI, C, 2.): Criteria versus criteria area has led some units to feel concerned about rigor of process.
c. (Pg. 11, VI, iiiia): Definition of “ongoing activity” is not consistently understood.

Logistics

a. Copy of Notice of Eligibility template was not initially provided to deans.
b. Checklist was not consistently completed.
c. Approval signatures were not consistently received.
d. PTR Approval Form looks exactly like form used for P&T and can draw incorrect comparisons.
e. Template should have emphasized need to read actual procedures.
f. Guidelines did not specify that letter to opt out due to retirement needed to be submitted to H.R.
g. (Pg. 14. VIII.,A.2.): Did not state where dean’s recommendation should be housed.

What Went Right:

a. Faculty Senate, OAA, and AAUP worked together to implement PTR and calibrate responses.
b. 153 faculty participated in the first year of implementation.
c. Departments and other academic units have guidelines in place to support process.
d. 147 faculty had a successful PTR and received salary increases and others have or will receive funding to support and revitalize their scholarship.
PROVOST ANDREWS’ COMMENTS: DECEMBER 5, 2016 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

LAST DROP-IN CONVERSATION OF 2016 WITH THE PROVOST

- December 8, Thursday 3:00-4:00pm SMSU258

OAA BUDGET

OAA Fall Budget Forum was held November 21st, 1:00-2:00PM, SMSU 294.
- Slides available
- All past OAA Budget Forums can be found at the IPEB website

Integrated Planning and Budget (IPEB) kick off this week.

- SEM and Budget
- More data
- Refined tools
- Role of FSBC

ADVISING REDESIGN UPDATE

- Final Report on the Advising Resegin webpage
- Feedback was requested by Nov 30
- Next steps - Decision

NEXT SECOND THURSDAY SOCIAL CLUB: December 8, 4 – 6:30 pm, OAI

FACULTY BRING YOUR LUNCH EVERY TUESDAY GATHERING: 11 am – 2pm, Simon Benson House

Remaining date for 2016 is December 13. There will not be a Faculty Lunch Social on December 20, 27, or January 3. We will resume on January 10, 2017.

My Blog: psuprovostblog.com
To: Provost Andrews  
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate  
Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer  
Date: 7 December 2016  
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

On 5 December 2016 the Faculty Senate approved the Curricular Consent Agenda recommending the proposed new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs given in Attachment E.1 to the December 2016 Agenda.

12-7-16—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the proposed new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs.

In addition, the Faculty Senate voted to approve:

• A Graduate Certificate in Public Health offered by the Joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health.

12-7-16— OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the certificate.

• A resolution in support of President Wiewel’s declaration that PSU is a sanctuary campus.

12-7-16——No OAA action needed on Senate resolutions.

Best regards,

Brad Hansen  
Presiding Officer

Richard H. Beyler  
Secretary to the Faculty

Sona Andrews  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
December 7, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Mark Woods
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2016-17 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Program**
E.1.a.1
- MFA in Creative Writing - change to existing program: clarifying requirements, simplifying elective requirement

**Change to Existing Courses**
E.1.a.2
- SPHR 564 Advanced Medical Speech-Language Pathology, 2 credits - change course title to Medical Speech-Language Pathology I; change course repeatability

**School of Business Administration**

**New Courses**
E.1.a.3
- MKTG 514 Selling and Sales Leadership, 4 credits
  Students will study selling as a key component of an organization’s overall marketing effort. Specific topics will include the sales process, the crucial role of the sales leader, the relationship of sales and marketing, working with channel partners and key issues in recruiting, training, motivating and compensating a sales force. We will focus on business-to-business selling but much of what we learn could be applied to a business-to-business-to-consumer sales environment.
College of the Arts

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.4
• MUS 563 Music History: Classical, 2 credits - change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.5
• MUS 564 Music History: The Romantic Period, 2 credits - change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.6
• MUS 565 Music History: Early 20th Century, 2 credits - change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.7
• MUS 566 Music History: Music since 1950, 2 credits - change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.8
• MUS 567 Jazz History, 2 credits - change course description; change prereqs
December 2, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Sanders
      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 as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2016-17 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of the Arts

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.c.1
   • Creative Writing, BFA – change Fine Arts elective; change Literature electives to English electives; revise Writing electives.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.2
   • Arch 432 History and Theory of Urban Design – Drop.
E.1.c.3
   • Art 393 Intermediate Painting II – change title to Intermediate Painting Topics, description, prerequisites, repeatability.
E.1.c.4
   • Film 358 Narrative Film Production II – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.5
   • Film 359 Narrative Film Production III – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.6
   • Film 361 Documentary Film Production II – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.7
   • Film 362 Documentary Film Production III – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.8
   • Film 381 Film History I: 1894 to the Second World War – change title to Film History I.
E.1.c.9
   • Film 382 Film History II: Cinema and Modernism (1946-1970s) – change title to Film History II.
E.1.c.10
   • Film 383 Film History III: Contemporary World Cinema (1970s-present) – change title to Film History III.
School of Business Administration

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.11

E.1.c.12

E.1.c.13
- ISQA 450 Project Management – change prerequisites.

Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Science

New Courses

E.1.c.14
- ECE 315 Signals and Systems I (4)
  Fundamentals of signals and systems including fundamental signals, basic system properties, linear time invariant systems, Fourier series, Fourier transforms, and filters. This is the first course in a sequence of two: ECE 315 and ECE 316 and must be taken in sequence. Prerequisites: ECE 223, Mth 256, Mth 253.

E.1.c.15
- ECE 316 Signals and Systems II (4)
  Introduction to fundamentals of communications and discrete-time system analysis including sampling, modulation, multiplexing, and the z-transform. This is the second course in a sequence of two: ECE 315 and ECE 316 and must be taken in sequence. Prerequisite: ECE 315.

E.1.c.16
- ECE 361 Computer System Organization (4)
  Basic concepts of modern computer systems, computer programming, and data structures. Topics include system organization, programming and debugging tools, project and software management tools, C, C++, scripting languages, performance benchmarking, data structures, lists. Prerequisites: ECE 102 and ECE 103, or CS 161 and CS 162, or equivalents.

E.1.c.17
- ECE 362 Embedded Operating Systems (4)
  Introduction to the principles of modern operating system design. Topics include: introduction to basic operating system concepts, processes, inter-process communication and concurrent programming, scheduling, memory management, file systems, device management, introductions to protection & security, RTOS structure and operation. Linux will be used for class examples and lab assignments. Prerequisite: ECE 361.

E.1.c.18
- ECE 424 Engineering Professional Practice (2)
  Prepare graduates for careers in electrical and computer engineering. Topics include ethical reasoning and considerations, strategies for job acquisition, career planning, certification and licensure, approaches to lifelong learning, and means of maintaining awareness of contemporary global and local societal issues. Prerequisite: ECE 411.
Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.19
- ECE 411 Industry Design Processes – change description, credit hours from 4 to 2.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.c.20
- Communication BA/BS – changes to undergraduate major requirements.
E.1.c.21
- Communication Minor – change to policy for allowable by-arrangement credits to make consistent between major and minor.
E.1.c.22
- History BA/BS Honors Option – change to align required credits with those of the Urban Honors College.

New Courses
E.1.c.23
- WLL 349 Forbidden Love (4)
  Study of depictions in literary works of gender and sexual identity, orientation, or practice that differs from that of the majority of the surrounding society. Works will be drawn from world literatures in translation. Course may be repeated with different topics. Course conducted in English.
E.1.c.24
- Wr 301 Critical Writing in English (4)
  This writing-intensive course extends the skills developed in ENG 300 by studying some selected theoretical and disciplinary approaches to literary and other texts (including literary and rhetorical theory), and by introducing students to research methods as a way of entering scholarly conversations.
E.1.c.25
- WS 369 Global Reproductive Justice (4)
  This survey course explores movements for reproductive justice within the U.S. and globally. We examine reproductive rights organizing, reproductive health, and the impacts of race, class, gender, sexuality, nationality and ability among other identities on groups seeking to exercise reproductive autonomy.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.26
- Eng 300 Introduction to the English Major – change title to Literary Form and Analysis, description.
December 7, 2016

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Mark Woods
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposal has been approved by the Graduate Council and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2016-17 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**School of Business Administration**

**New Program**
- Graduate Certificate in Athletic & Outdoor Industry
  (two-page summary attached)
PSU School of Business Administration

Proposal Summary for A&O Industry Graduate Certificate

OVERVIEW

The objective of the Athletic and Outdoor (A&O) Industry Graduate Certificate is to develop a pipeline of quality talent, complement our current SBA A&O educational programs, and respond to industry demand and tap an under-served market. It is an opportunity to further PSU’s position as an A&O leader and partner in developing and delivering quality education and programming with industry. The certificate also provides another recruitment tool for SBA graduate programs.

This certificate was developed based on industry demand and informed by discussions with industry leaders, PSU alumni and SBA leadership and faculty. The goal is to prepare students for careers and leadership positions in the A&O industry. The certificate content is built around the concept of a go-to-market strategy, and provides students with a tool kit and an understanding of the language, culture, key relationships and what it takes to succeed in the hyper competitive A&O industry. The goal is to use this certificate to build on the strengths of PSU’s MBA, MIM, GSCM and A&O existing programs while differentiating PSU from competitive programs in content, quality and price.

EVIDENCE OF NEED

There is an increasing need for quality talent as a result of the A&O industry’s growth. According to a 2010 A&O Study led by the Portland Development Commission, the industry employs more than 14,000 people with an average wage of $108,550. The industry is growing, fueling the need for more talent and driving innovation and economic growth for the region. With Nike’s forecast to double their revenues to $50B by 2020 and Under Armour’s announcement to double its revenue by 2018 to $7B, PSU is strategically positioned to be that pipeline of talent.

Students receiving the certificate would be seeking positions in teams like Adidas Concept to Consumer (CTC) Department or the Nike Marketplace Transform Department which include a combination of Merchandise Managers and Activation Managers.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The A&O Industry Graduate certificate will prepare future industry leaders. The objectives are to:

- Further leverage PSU’s competitive location and position as an A&O industry leader
- Build on the success of A&O Industry undergraduate certificate and industry engagement
- Recruit and retain PSU students with the goal of increasing enrollment in existing graduate courses and programs.
- Job placement for our A&O students and alumni
The A&O Industry Graduate certificate will enhance the competitiveness of our graduate and post-baccalaureate students in the job market. It will offer current industry employees an opportunity to enrich their training and advance their careers. It will provide employers with a new option for employee training and workforce development. And it will allow post-baccalaureate students to improve their job prospects and explore PSU graduate degree programs.

**COURSE OF STUDY**

The certificate builds on existing courses for a total of 20 credits. There are four required courses with one additional course selected from a menu of options. The certificate requirements are outlined below. While this class can be taken as a stand-alone certificate, ideally it will be paired with an MBA, part-time MBA, MIM, MSFA or MS in Global Supply Chain Management. A CAPSTONE/CAPSTONE mini project will be required depending on the student’s program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1 (Fall)</th>
<th>Term 2 (Winter)</th>
<th>Term 3 (Spring)</th>
<th>Term 4 (Summer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Brand Management (MKTG 534)</td>
<td>Competitive Dynamics in the A&amp;O Industry (MKGT 536)</td>
<td>Product Management in the A&amp;O Industry (MKTG 537)</td>
<td>Selling &amp; Sales Leadership (MKTG 514)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above classes, certificate students will select one additional course selected from the classes listed below.

Menu of course options - A&O Industry Graduate Certificate.
- Pioneering Innovation (MKTG 513)
- Sustainable Operations Management (ISQA 511)
- Forecasting and Production Planning (GSCM 516)
- Principles of Global Sourcing (GSCM 511)
- Analytics (ISQA 519)
- MBA International Experience - (BA 526) Designated Trips Only

MBA students who do not choose the designated BA 526 trip will need to choose classes that are not currently required as part of the MBA program. Specifically they will choose from Forecasting and Production Planning (GSCM 516) or Principals of Global Sourcing (GSCM 516.)

**LEARNING OUTCOMES**

The certificate is designed to provide students with key industry relationships an understanding of the A&O culture and terminology and a fundamental understanding of 1) Portland’s competitive advantage as the Global A&O Hub; 2) the concept-consumer process; 3) the basic elements of advertising and marketing and the importance of brand position and equity; 4) the role and importance of a sales strategy in a go-to-market plan.
COST AND ORGANIZATION

The program is built on existing classes and therefore will not negatively impact the SBA faculty sufficiency rating. There are no new budgetary or other resource (e.g. library) requirements. Expected enrollment is 15-20 students per year range with about 75% degree students and 25% post baccalaureate students. Current faculty will offer the courses. Administrative support will be provided by existing staff in SBA. An A&O Industry Advisory committee made up of large and small regional A&O brands will assist in marketing, outreach, guest speaking and mentoring.
TO: Faculty Senate  

FROM: Robert Sanders  
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 as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2016-17 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

School of the Arts  

New Program  
Certificate in Art History  

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
Certificate in Art History  

Overview:  
The proposed certificate program would build on the strength of the existing undergraduate art history program, which is a broadly based curriculum that offers a comprehensive survey course sequence followed by numerous upper-level lecture and online courses, seminars, and study travel opportunities. Thus the classes comprising the course of study for the proposed certificate are all already being offered, but the certificate makes them more accessible in a coherent form to people interested in a focused, post-baccalaureate pursuit of art history.

Evidence of Need:  
Although our evidence is anecdotal, we have consistently had a steady stream of post-baccalaureate students enrolled in our art history courses, as well as numerous auditors who have completed their B.A. elsewhere, and our hope is that the certificate would allow us to convert some of that population into certificate-seeking students.

Type of Certificate  
This is a stand-alone undergraduate certificate earned at the completion of all requirements. Students must be admitted to the University and satisfy all University admission requirements.

Course of Study:  
The following assumes that the certificate student has already taken a year-long art history survey. If they have not ArH 204, 205 and 206 (or 208 if Asian art is a proposed focus) should be completed as well.

Two Art History Seminars (ArH 407 and ArH 449) 4 credits each - 8  
Four Additional Upper-Level ArH courses* 4 credits each - 16  
Total credits 24

*The four upper level art history courses may include additional seminars, international study travel, independent research projects, internships, lecture and/or online courses.