

2-6-2017

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 2017

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

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

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet February 2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 328.
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/328>

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. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Faculty Senate, 6 February 2017



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 **6 February 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 9 January 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
 - * 1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
 - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:
 - 3. Announcements by Secretary
 - 4. Introductions: Valerie Cleary (Athletic Director), Isaac Dixon (Assoc. VP of HR)
 - 5. Discussion. Copyright policy.
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
 - * 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
- 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
 - * 3. Semi-Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee – *consent agenda*
 - * 4. Budget Principles, submitted by Budget Committee – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 9 January 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- E.1.b,c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.a] – *consent agenda*
- G.3. Semi-Annual Report of FDC
- G.4. BC document

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE, 2016-17

STEERING COMMITTEE

Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer

Michael Clark, Presiding Officer Elect • Gina Greco, Past Presiding Officer
Committee Members: Michele Gamburd (2017) • Alan MacCormack (2017)

Steve Harmon (2018) • David Raffo (2018)

Ex officio: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty • Catherine de Rivera, Chair, Committee on Committees
Maude Hines, IFS Rep. (to December) and Board of Trustees Member • José Padín, IFS Rep. (from January).

****FACULTY SENATE ROSTER (64)****

All Others (8)

Arellano, Regina	ACS	2017
Harmon, Steve	OAA	2017
Riedlinger, Carla	CAP	2017
*Burgess, David (for Running)	OIRP	2018
Kennedy, Karen	ACS	2018
<i>Blekic, Mirela</i>	ACS	2019
†O'Banion, Liane	TLC	2019
<i>Walsh, Michael</i>	HOU	2019

CLAS – Arts and Letters (7)

†Childs, Tucker	LIN	2017
Clark, Michael	ENG	2017
Greco, Gina	WLL	2017
†Epplin, Craig	WLL	2018
Jaén Portillo, Isabel	WLL	2018
<i>Brown, Kimberley</i>	LIN	2019
<i>Reese, Susan</i>	ENG	2019

CLAS – Sciences (8)

*Ruedas, Luis (for Elzankowki)	BIO	2017
Stedman, Ken	BIO	2017
†de Rivera, Catherine	ESM	2018
†Flight, Andrew	MTH	2018
Webb, Rachel	MTH	2018
<i>Cruzan, Mitchell</i>	BIO	2019
<i>Mitchell, Drake</i>	PHY	2019
<i>Podrabsky, Jason</i>	BIO	2019

CLAS – Social Sciences (6)

†Gamburd, Michele	ANT	2017
Schuler, Friedrich	HST	2017
Chang, Heejun	GGR	2018
*Robson, Laura	HST	2018
<i>Luckett, Thomas</i>	HST	2019
†Schechter, Patricia	HST	2019

College of the Arts (4)

†Babcock, Ronald	MUS	2017
Hansen, Brad	MUS	2017
*de la Cruz (for Wendl)	COTA	2018
<i>Fiorillo, Marie</i>	COTA	2019

* Interim appointment

† Member of Committee on Committees

New senators in italics

Date: 9 January 2017

College of Urban and Public Affairs (6)

†Schrock, Greg	USP	2017
Yesilada, Birol	POL	2017
*Bluffstone, Randall	ECN	2018
Harris, G.L.A.	PAD	2018
<i>Nishishiba, Masami</i>	PAD	2019
<i>Smallman, Shawn</i>	IGS	2019

Graduate School of Education (4)

De La Vega, Esperanza	CI	2017
*Thieman, Gayle (for Mukhopadhyay)	CI	2017
Farahmandpur, Ramin	ELP	2018
<i>Yeigh, Maika</i>	CI	2019

Library (1)

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

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

Maier, David	CMP	2017
Monsere, Christopher	CEE	2018
†Tretheway, Derek	MME	2018
<i>Recktenwald, Gerald</i>	MME	2019
Siderius, Martin	ECE	2019

Other Instructional (4)

MacCormack, Alan	UNST	2017
†Camacho, Judy	IELP	2018
*Fernandez, Oscar	UNST	2018
<i>Carpenter, Rowanna</i>	UNST	2019

School of Business Administration (4)

Raffo, David	SBA	2017
*Hansen, David (for Dusschee)	SBA	2018
<i>Shin, Shung Jae</i>	SBA	2019
†Sorensen, Tichelle	SBA	2019

School of Public Health (2)

*Gelman, Sherril	HMP	2018
†Messer, Lynne	CH	2019

School of Social Work (5)

†Donlan, Ted	SSW	2017
Taylor, Michael	SSW	2017
*Constable, Kate (for Talbott)	SSW	2018
Winters, Katie	RRI	2018
<i>Bratiotis, Christiana</i>	SSW	2019

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 9 January 2017

Presiding Officer: Brad Hansen

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Arellano, Babcock, Blekic, Bowman, Bratiotis, Brown, Burgess, Camacho, Carpenter, Chang, Childs, Clark, Constable, Cruzan, de la Cruz, de Rivera, Donlan, Fernandez, Fiorillo, Flight, Gamburd, Greco, B. Hansen, D. Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Lockett, MacCormack, Messer, Nishishiba, Podrabsky, Recktenwald, S. Reese, Riedlinger, Schechter, Schrock, Schuler, Shin, Siderius, Smallman, Sorensen, Taylor, Tretheway, Walsh, Webb, Winters, Yeigh

Alternates Present:

Michael Smith for De La Vega, Pat Burk for Farahmandpur, Sarah Newlands for Fernandez, Andrew Black for Maier, Sarah Eppley for Stedman, Joshua Eastin for Yesilada

Members Absent:

Bluffstone, Gelmon, Jaén Portillo, Mitchell, Monsere, O'Banion, Raffo, Robson, Ruedas, Thieman

Ex-officio Members Present:

Allen, Andrews, Baccar, Bangsberg, Beyler, Black (also as alternate), Chabon, Everett, Hines, Lafferriere, Moody, Sanders, Wiewel, Woods

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

Prior to taking the roll, the Secretary made a clerical **correction to item E.1.c**, part of the **consent agenda**, namely that item E.1.c.1, change to Creative Writing BFA, should be listed under College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, becoming item E.1.c.21, and the other items renumbered correspondingly.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

There having been no objections prior to the end of roll call, the **5 December 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 **January Agenda Attachment C.1**].

2. **Announcements by the Presiding Officer**

[For an outline see **Appendix C.2**.]

B. HANSEN indicated that revised guidelines for review of non-tenure-track instructional faculty are in the hands of AAUP. Phil LESCH, executive director of AAUP (recognized by the Chair), said the ratification vote would likely be held next week, thus possibly completed by the end of January. HANSEN asked the Secretary if this could then be included in the packet for February. BEYLER responded that though

if not included in the packet as such, with senators' permission it could be circulated as an addendum after circulation of the packet but prior to the meeting.

HANSEN reminded senators that there was consideration underway of a possible amendment to add an ex-officio member representing part-time faculty. BEYLER had suggested that the representative be chosen by Advisory Council from among nominated part-time faculty. This was only one possible approach; other suggestions were welcome.

CHABON had announced a "soft" deadline of February 10th for departments to revise their bylaws, and HANSEN urged faculty to participate in this process.

Alluding to a prior discussion [October], HANSEN asked senators to forward any comments on the draft copyright ownership policy to himself or the Secretary, as the policy draft was now undergoing final revisions.

Steering Committee and the curriculum committees had noted that while new courses are reviewed rigorously, existing courses may not be including recommended or required items, such as language on academic accommodations or Title IX reporting obligations. While HANSEN was not advocating a blanket inquiry, non-compliance with these rules did represent some exposure for the University. He thought, it might be desirable for there to be some process by which departments or units could systematically collect and review syllabi. It would be desirable for OAA to post templates for faculty to use.

HANSEN reported that Educational Policy Committee was taking up policies and practices regarding on-line education, and RAFFO, co-chair of the committee, had asked that faculty who have interested in this participate in or make comments to a sub-committee that was being formed to deal with these issues.

Apropos the discussion last month on post-tenure review, it had emerged that there were several areas in which the wording of guidelines and policies needed to be tightened up. HANSEN said that he was working CHABON about some revisions to the document to make it more functional. It was asked whether these revisions might have implications for departmental bylaws. HANSEN said yes, potentially.

Another curricular review issue noted by HANSEN was 199, 399 and similar [omnibus] courses which had not been evaluated by curriculum committees, even though taught beyond the supposed maximum of three times. HANSEN said he would be working with HARMON and MARSHALL to discern where these courses are and what could be done to make sure these are meeting our curricular goals.

3. Announcements by the Secretary

BEYLER announced that because of the holiday on January 16th, the next Steering Committee meeting would be on the 23rd.

4. Discussion. Shared governance: What does it mean? How do we implement it more effectively?

B. HANSEN shared some information he had been gathering related to the concept of shared governance. [For slides, see **Appendix C.4.**] The Institute on Governance defined "governance" around authority, decision-making, and accountability. Gary Olsen, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, said that "shared governance" was in danger of becoming a hackneyed phrase, but offered a definition including keywords of

participation, accountability, process, representation, responsibility, communication, and partnership. A 1966 AAUP statement highlighted communication, joint planning, and channels of communication. Particularly relevant for PSU with its new independent Board of Trustees was communication between faculty, administration, and governing boards. Not included in this statement were students, nor bodies such as the state legislature and Oregon's Higher Education Coordinating Committee, which have a great deal of power in higher education. One thing we do not have [at PSU] is a standing liaison committee, or a kind of clearinghouse between various bodies. Brian Rosenberg, in *Inside Higher Education*, depicted faculty unhappy about disempowerment and corporatization, while administrators bemoan faculty not coming to grips with financial realities. Bob LIEBMAN recommended an article by Steven Bahls, in a journal for governing boards [highlighting engagement with the question and shared communication]. HANSEN noted the article's suggestion to "increase social capital between board members and faculty members"; WIEWEL, for example, had suggested reciprocal attendance at Senate and Board meetings. Stanley Aronowitz warned that corporatization and concentration of power was a threat to shared governance. Ron Schacter, in *University Business*, wrote that "community action" was a necessary component of shared governance. HANSEN agreed that more participation could counteract negativity.

B. HANSEN summed up overarching themes: 1) participation/representation; 2) communication/transparency; 3) process/partnership; 4) responsibility/accountability.

DONLAN/D. HANSEN **moved** that Senate resolve into a **committee of the whole**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 3:28).

Issues discussed included: discerning shared values; streamlining processes; making the work of committees more transparent; recruiting new faculty into governance; and improving communication between faculty, administration, and trustees.

D. HANSEN/CLARK **moved** that the Senate return to **regular session**; the motion was **approved** by unanimous voice vote (at 4:02).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs listed **January Agenda Attachment E.1**, subject to the change in placement and numbering noted by the Secretary at the start of the meeting [see item A above], were **approved** as part of the **consent agenda**, there having been no further objection before the end of roll call.

2. Graduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry

WOODS presented the proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry in the School of Business Administration, brought to Senate by the Graduate Council. Through market research SBA had identified this as an area of untapped need; according to Portland Development Commission, over 4000 people were working in this field. There is already an undergraduate certificate, but the target audience here is

different: people already working in the industry who want to augment their skill set. The graduate certificate will use 500-level courses already in the graduate program.

D. HANSEN/HARMON **moved** approval of the proposal as given in **January Agenda Attachment E.2**.

The **motion was approved** by show of hands (50 yes, 1 abstention).

3. Undergraduate Certificate in Art History

SANDERS presented the proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Art History in the College of the Arts, brought to Senate by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The certificate uses existing courses. Its audience is existing students, but also potential students who are currently auditing courses but not getting credit—e.g., docents at local museums seeking qualifications for this work.

SCHROCK/GAMBURD **moved** approval of the proposal as given in **January Agenda Attachment E.3**.

B. HANSEN questioned the term “post-baccalaureate”: did this imply a different population of students than the one just described? SANDERS said that it is not [necessarily] post-bacc. KENNEDY: will this certificate be listed as part of a potential package for degree-seeking undergraduates, or is it a stand-alone certificate? SANDERS said that it is stand-alone; it does not require completion of an undergraduate degree. The Registrar’s website includes a list of stand-alone certificates. MACCORMACK asked about the status vis-à-vis post-bacc certificates. BACCAR answered that until last year, undergraduate certificates could not be earned unless you were pursuing an undergraduate degree, or had already earned one [i.e., on a post-bacc basis]. What is new is that undergraduate certificates can be earned before completion of a degree; however, they can also still be earned by someone already with a degree [i.e., post-bacc]. There are just a handful of such stand-alone certificates. KENNEDY asked what these were. HARMON: they are in the ESM and Geography departments. ANDREWS noted that the Senate had voted on pre-bacc certificates last year; they must go through the regular curriculum approval process. D. HANSEN wondered about the reference to senior auditors: did this imply a prior degree was required? SANDERS: no, only that they were anticipated as a substantial part of the population of students. HARMON clarified that the certificate students would have to meet PSU admissions standards. B. HANSEN observed that variant language in the proposal seemed to be referring to the same population.

HARRIS wondered if these questions were due to a lack of data being provided in the proposal. SANDERS acknowledged that the rationale was based largely on anecdotal evidence, but stated that the certificate, based on existing courses, seemed to have no or minimal costs. HARMON noted that the entire proposal, including background information, was available on the Curriculum Tracker Wiki; what was in the packet was just a summary. GRECO conceded that the summary had slippery language, but the overview showed that the aim was to convert current auditors to a credit-based certificate. SANDERS: the Art Department thinks it is worth doing. NEWLANDS stated that she was part of the [museum] community, and that there were many adult learners who were

seeking more formal classroom experience. SCHULER viewed the proposal as a natural way to attract people to the University and provide a connection to the community.

The motion was approved by show of hands (47 yes, 1 no, 3 abstentions).

F. QUESTIONS TO ADMINISTRATORS & COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

WIEWEL came from a meeting with the editorial board of the *Oregonian* together with the presidents of Portland Community College and of the Portland Business Alliance about the need to fund higher education.

Enrollment for winter term, WIEWEL stated, was flat, an improvement over the decline in the fall. ANDREWS had informed him that this was due primarily to better retention.

WIEWEL reported that Debbie KORESKI, heretofore Associate Vice President for Governmental Relations, had been hired by Governor Brown as a policy advisor. Alyson KRAUS was stepping into this role for the time being. PSU was working with the six other state universities on a letter, to be signed by the respective presidents, faculty senate chairs, student government leaders, and union leaders, asking for a collective increase of \$100 million for the biennium so as to avoid a 5% tuition increase.

WIEWEL said that State Senate President Peter Courtney had introduced a bill that would make possible the merger of community colleges and universities. In a press conference, he suggested that PCC and PSU should consider such a merger, to gain administrative efficiencies and facilitate student transfers. WIEWEL noted that the institutions are already collaborating extensively on transfers and dual admissions. Regarding finding efficiencies, he had pointed out to the *Oregonian* editorial board that Oregon already produces student degrees at the lowest cost of any state, while PSU produces degrees at the lowest cost in the state.

The Coalition for College Success and Affordability would meet next in March. WIEWEL hoped that subcommittees would be ready then with somewhat specific proposals to increase funding through the state, philanthropy, or local measures.

WIEWEL reported that the Presidential Search Committee was on schedule to bring in candidates for airport interviews.

New hires of note included Valerie CLEARY as Athletic Director (noted last meeting), and Isaac DIXON as Associate Vice President of Human Resources.

B. HANSEN reverted to the letter mentioned by the President, which would make a strong statement for the importance of higher education funding to avoid raising tuition, and said that, barring any objection, he would be signing it. Regarding the presidential search, he reminded senators of WIEWEL's urging that Senate be active in making the successful candidate feel welcome to the University.

2. Provost's Report

[See **Minutes Appendix G.2** for an outline.]

Regarding the previous discussion on shared governance, ANDREWS noted that the Strategic Plan lists shared values, mission, and vision for its initiatives. Many people had contributed to this framework.

Regarding the statements by B. HANSEN on syllabi, ANDREWS noted that she had sent to department chairs a reminder, to be shared with faculty, about recommended disability resource and Title IX statements. LUCKETT asked if information posted in D2L, even when not part of a specific syllabus, counted as fulfilling the requirements. ANDREWS said she did not know if this constituted compliance. WEBB observed that there were templates and widgets in D2L: could these count? ANDREWS responded, again, that she would look into this. CRUZAN asked if it were redundant to have the same wording on every syllabus, since the same policy applied to all courses. WEBB thought the transparency to students was necessary. ANDREWS thought this would be a good conversation for the curriculum committees. B. HANSEN said the committees had in fact brought the issue to Steering Committee. It would be good to find out more about the regulations. SCHROCK thought there was value in having these policy statements affirmed by instructors. EPPLIN agreed they were a good reminder to students. ANDREWS would look into the specific requirements.

ANDREWS described the current state of the budget process. Schools and colleges were currently putting together strategic enrollment management plans for the next fiscal year. Heretofore Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), as a whole, had been fairly accurate with these plans, to within ca. 1%. More data is now available, such as “funnel” data on applications from Enrollment and Student Affairs. Budget Committee liaisons have been meeting with deans. Over the next weeks, OAA and the deans will discuss revenue growth areas as well as possible reductions. The next OAA budget forum will be February 13th. ANDREWS will post video/audio of the forum.

ANDREWS announced a lecture series about issues relating to the election. Faculty with interest and expertise in this field should submit proposals to deliver one of these nine or so lectures. MACCORMACK asked if the broader community will be invited. ANDREWS said that while the events will be open to the public, they are really aimed at our students, faculty, and staff.

Prompted by GRECO, ANDREWS reminded senators of the faculty bring-your-own lunch at the Simon Benson House on Tuesdays. The Alumni Association will provide dessert on January 24th.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:44 p.m.

January Minutes Appendix C.2

Announcements from the Presiding Officer January 9, 2017

- **NTT Instructional Faculty** – Guidelines for Revision to Article 18
The final version has been submitted to AAUP for ratification, with minor edits. Expect it to be in the packet for the February Senate meeting.
- **Departmental By-Laws**
Updating and revision of these documents is expected by Feb. 10th.
Departmental faculty committees should be actively involved in the process, defining standards for democratic and shared governance
- **Copyright Ownership Policy**
The topic for discussion in the February Senate meeting will likely be the Copyright Ownership Policy finalization. Please review the document circulated with the previous meeting minutes.
- **Course Syllabus Policies**
New and updated course syllabi are evaluated by OCC and GC for compliance with required DRC and Title IX content. Existing syllabi may not conform to University and Governmental guidelines and recommendations.
- **Sub-committee of the Educational Policy Committee - Invitation**
A new sub-committee of the EPC is being formed to examine Online Education Policy, Strategy and Practice at PSU. They are seeking 8 people from across campus to participate. Please contact Richard Beyler or David Raffo to express interest.
- **Revisions to PTR guidelines are forthcoming**
Issues related to the implementation were discussed in the December Senate meeting. Errors and ambiguities, timelines, criteria, logistics, and composition of the evaluating committees will be addressed and submitted for approval.
- **Part-Time Adjuncts: Participation in Faculty Senate, and Selection Process**
A Constitutional amendment to add an Ex-Officio member is being crafted, and questions related to selection and service are being considered.

Shared Governance

Who Shares What with Whom?

What is Governance?

The need for governance exists anytime a group of people come together to accomplish an end. Most definitions rest on three dimensions: authority, decision-making and accountability.

Governance determines who has power, who makes decisions, how other players make their voice heard and how account is rendered.

The application of good governance serves to realize organizational and societal goals.

<http://iog.ca/defining-governance/>

What is Shared Governance?

The phrase shared governance is so hackneyed that it is becoming what some linguists call an "empty" or "floating" signifier, a term so devoid of determinate meaning that it takes on whatever significance a particular speaker gives it at the moment. Once a term arrives at that point, it is essentially useless.

The writer (Gary A. Olsen) then offers the following definition:

Shared Governance Defined

Shared governance is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other. It has come to connote two complementary and sometimes overlapping concepts: giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation; and allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making.

The key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. When various groups of people are kept in the loop and understand what developments are occurring within the university, and when they are invited to participate as true partners, the institution prospers. That, after all, is our common goal.

Gary A. Olson in the Chronicle of Higher Education, July 23, 2009

<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Joint AAUP, ACE, and AGB Statement on Governance, 1966

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort. The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board include:

1. Circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees;
2. Joint ad hoc committees;
3. Standing liaison committees;
4. Membership of faculty members on administrative bodies;
5. Membership of faculty members on governing boards.

Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Shared or Divided Governance?

Few people appear happy with the state of shared governance at American colleges and universities. Faculty members complain that they are being disempowered by administrators and trustees who are creating an increasingly "corporatized" academic environment and who are more concerned with budgets than with quality.

Administrators lament the extent to which faculties seem oblivious to the fiscal realities threatening the status quo and to the need for significant or even radical change. Trustees struggle to find the appropriate balance between too much and too little involvement in the activities of both faculty members and administrators. And legislators seem baffled by the whole system...

Brian Rosenberg, Inside Higher Ed, July, 2014

<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2014/07/29/essay-new-approach-shared-governance-higher-education>

Making Shared Governance Work

Governing Boards can take these five practical steps to help make shared governance work.

1. Actively engage board members, administrators, and faculty leaders in a serious discussion of what shared governance is (and isn't).
2. Periodically assess the state of shared governance and develop an action plan to improve it.
3. Expressly support strong faculty governance of the academic program.
4. Maintain a steadfast commitment to three-way transparency and frequent communication.
5. Develop ways to increase social capital between board members and faculty members.

Steven Bahls, Association of Governing Boards Trusteeship Magazine, March/April 2014

<http://www.aqb.org/trusteeship/2014/3/how-make-shared-governance-work-some-best-practices>

Corporatization vs. Shared Governance

The steady corporatization of American higher education has threatened to relegate faculty governance, never strong, to the historical archive. In the twentieth century, many scholars—notably Thorstein Veblen, Robert S. Lynd, C. Wright Mills, and Richard Hofstadter—deplored the tendency for boards of trustees and high-level administrators to concentrate power in their own hands and for corporations and corporate foundations to play a more prominent role in governance of some institutions of higher learning. Nonetheless, this has already come to pass. The past quarter century has witnessed a powerful trend toward the disenfranchisement of faculty.

Stanley Aronowitz, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Liberal Education, Fall 2006

<https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/should-academic-unions-get-involved-governance>

A Call to Action

"Once upon a time, you just did your teaching and your research," says the AAUP's Nelson. "But people are becoming aware that only community action can generate the parts of shared governance critical to a university's community life."

Ron Schachter, University Business, August 2011

<https://www.universitybusiness.com/article/what-ever-happened-shared-governance>

Recurring Themes

- Participation/Representation
- Communication/Transparency
- Process/Partnership
- Responsibility/Accountability

January Minutes Appendix G.2

PROVOST ANDREWS' COMMENTS: JANUARY 9, 2017 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

WINTER DROP-IN CONVERSATIONS WITH THE PROVOST

- Friday, January 20, 2017, 9:00 AM - 10:00 AM, SMSU SMSU 258
- Friday, February 24, 2017, 10:00 AM - 11:00 AM, SMSU SMSU 258
- Thursday, March 16, 2017, 9:00 AM - 10:00 AM, SMSU SMSU 258

Dates also posted in Currently and on [OAA website](#)

OAA BUDGET

Status: [Integrated Planning and Budget](#) (IPEB)

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

OAA Winter Budget Forum: Monday, February 13, 1-2:00 in SMSU 296

PROVOST'S OFFICE LECTURE SERIES

The Provost's Office will host [a campus-wide lecture series](#) beginning on February 9 on pre-and post-presidential election-related topics to help understand the complexities of how government works and its implications. A call will go out this week to faculty, inviting volunteers to submit brief proposals for lectures in an area of their teaching or scholarly expertise.

The lectures to be held on **Thursdays, from 2:00-3:00 p.m., in Hoffmann Hall** and open to all students, faculty and staff at PSU. There will be a 30-minute opportunity for discussion after each of the 30-minute lectures.

NEXT SECOND THURSDAY SOCIAL CLUB: January 12 4:00 – 6:30 pm, held in the Office of Academic Innovation (Note: The University was closed on January 12th and Social Club was cancelled).

FACULTY BRING YOUR LUNCH EVERY TUESDAY GATHERING:

Resumes this week 11 am – 2pm At Simon Benson House

The Alumni Association will provide dessert on January 24th

My Blog: psuprovostblog.com

Attachment C.1

Office of the Faculty Senate, OAA
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751



To: Provost Andrews
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer
Date: 15 January 2017
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

On **9 January 2017, 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 January 2017 Agenda.

1-18-17—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves these new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs.

In addition, **the Faculty Senate voted to approve:**

- A Graduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry offered by the School of Business Administration.

1-18-17—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the certificate.

- An Undergraduate Certificate in Art History offered by the College of the Arts.

1-18-17—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the certificate.

Best regards,

Handwritten signature of Brad Hansen in black ink.

Brad Hansen
Presiding Officer

Handwritten signature of Richard H. Beyler in black ink.

Richard H. Beyler
Secretary to the Faculty

Handwritten signature of Sona Andrews in blue ink.

Sona Andrews
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Attachment E.1.b

January 18, 2017

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Mark Woods
Chair, Graduate Council

Robert Sanders
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council and 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 Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses

E.1.b.1

- ANTH 460/560 Public Archeology, 4 credits - new course
Reviews ways archaeology contributes to the modern world as a science and a humanity through addressing issues such as community heritage, social justice, and conservation biology. Students will develop a project that shares the benefits of archaeology with the public, as part of a class or independent activity. Prerequisite: Anth 350.

Change to Existing Courses

E.1.b.2

- GEOG 496/596 Visualization of Spatial Data, 4 credits - change course title to Introduction to Spatial Quantitative Analysis; change course description

E.1.b.3

- HST 411/511 Public History Lab, 4 credits - change course number to HST 495/595; change course description; change prereqs

Attachment E.1.c

January 18, 2017

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

New Course

E.1.c.1

- Art 336 BFA: Research and Proposal (4)
Required third year seminar course offered spring term for accepted BFA students. Introduction to both contemporary research methodologies and final project proposal development. Emphasis is placed on developing a body of work and preparing proposals for the final year BFA Project. Prerequisites: Formal departmental admission into the BFA program and Art 203 or Art 303 or with instructor's consent.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.2

- Art 115 Foundation Studio I: 2-D Design – drop.

E.1.c.3

- Art 117 Foundation Studio II: 3-D Design – drop.

E.1.c.4

- Art 118 Introduction to Type and Communication Design – change course number to Art 121, description, prerequisites.

E.1.c.5

- Art 119 Foundation Studio III: Digital Media/Time Design – drop.

E.1.c.6

- Art 182 Idea and Form – drop.

E.1.c.7

- Art 321 Communication Design Studio IV – change description, credit hours from 4 to 6, change lecture and lab hours.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.8

- Finn 101, 102, 103 First-Year Finnish – drop.

E.1.c.9

- Finn 201, 202, 203 Second-Year Finnish – drop.

E.1.c.10

- Hst 104, 105, 106 World History – change title to *Introduction to World History*.

E.1.c.11

- Lat 303 Third Year Latin – change title to *Third-Year Latin: Post-Classical Authors*, description, credit hours from 2 to 4.

E.1.c.12

- Soc 302 Foundations of Sociology II – change title to *Contemporary Sociological Theory*.

Attachment G.3

Report of Faculty Development Committee to Faculty Senate 20 January 2017

In previous years, the activities of the FDC have comprised the administration of the Travel Award Program, and of Faculty Development Awards.

Starting with the 2016–17 academic year, travel awards have been discontinued. Instead, the university is funding "Individual Professional Development Accounts" (IPDAs). Tenure-Related Faculty will be credited with \$1000, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty \$600, and Academic Professionals \$500; these funds can be spent on job-related professional development without requiring an application.

The old travel awards had an average of a 75% success rate (decided by lottery, not by merit), and an average award size of around \$2000. The lottery was weighted towards those presenting at a professional meeting, and weighted against those who had recently won the lottery.

The effects of the change to IPDAs is to "spread the margarine more thinly". This change disadvantages those who present at professional meetings and take the trouble to apply for funding, and advantages those who do neither of these things, and thus would not have received the old travel awards. It's too early to know whether this change is good or bad; the FDC is taking a "wait and see" position.

Faculty Development Awards have been renamed the "Faculty Development Program". The university is making available \$650k for this program, and the FDC proposes to administer the funds in the same way as last year.

Proposals will be solicited from Faculty and Academic Professionals for up to \$15k each. The evaluation criteria are the same as last year, and are listed with the call for proposals at <https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-enhancement-grant-program>. The exclusions are the same as last year, and are also listed. The deadline for proposals is 17:00 on 15th February; the submission website is live.

Each proposal will receive multiple reviews from members of the Faculty Development Committee. This will be followed by a series of meetings at which the controversial proposals will be discussed. As has been done for the last two years, proposals and reviews will be submitted using the "EasyChair" online management system, which also allows the members of the FDC to read the reviews and discuss the proposals online. Last year there were 118 proposals, of which 48 were funded; the number of good proposals greatly exceeded the available funds. All proposers received written reviews from the committee.

A small change this year is that we will use the submission system to collect information about the college and department of the proposer; this will make it easier to generate statistics showing how the award monies are distributed across campus. In addition to the above activities, the FDC has also discussed whether or not it should be active in other aspects of faculty development, such as helping to develop faculty skills in teaching large classes, or in writing grant proposals. While these are worthy activities, there is no consensus that they fall within the purview of the FDC, rather than some other entity, such as the OAA.

Respectfully submitted

Andrew P Black,
Chair, FDC

Attachment G.4

Faculty Senate Budget Committee FY18 Budget Principles (January 23, 2017)

The University should prioritize students by supporting services and activities that promote student success and the instructional and research activities of faculty. The University should endeavor to balance investment in support at each level of matriculation (i.e., lower division, upper division, and graduate students), for traditional, nontraditional, and transfer students, to promote engagement and retention. The University should continue to engage in strategic enrollment planning and management to promote the success of individual units as they contribute to the growth of the entire university.

Principles for the Budgeting Process:

- Faculty engagement is critical for developing plans to balance costs and revenues, and to assist with the development of metrics of quality and outcomes.
- The budget process needs to be transparent to facilitate understanding of decisions made at all levels (department, school, college, division, and university).
- When making budgeting decisions, we should;
 - Consider both revenues and expenditures.
 - Take a forward-facing look at educational market forces when evaluating programs.
 - Be cognizant of the cycles that programs go through to develop a balanced perspective on their potential for long term growth and contributions to the goals of the university.

Principles for Budgeting Decisions:

- Protect and promote further development of instructional activities, programs, and services that support student success.
- Provide students with access to a diverse curriculum and a well-rounded liberal arts education.
- Pursue opportunities that generate new revenue and improve efficiency.
- Apply Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) principles and adjustments consistently to promote the success of individual units and the entire university.
- Implement budget decisions that support the success of students and faculty.
- Engage with other divisions to encourage budgeting decisions that do not adversely impact Academic Affairs.
- Consider the potential impact of budget reductions on course offerings, research support, student services, and faculty development.
- Employ these principles for decisions made within each unit as well as for Academic Affairs and the university as a whole.