

5-1-2017

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet May 2017

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 May 2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. 331.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/331>

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 May 2017



NOMINATIONS FOR 2017-18 PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

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 May 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

AGENDA

Items and reports on the *consent agenda* will be approved or accepted 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 3 April 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
 - * 1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
 - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer
 - 3. Announcements by Secretary

NOMINATIONS FOR 2017-18 PSU FACULTY SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT
--

- D. Unfinished Business
 - * 1. Constitutional amendment: Budget Committee charge (BC/Steering)
 - * 2. Guidelines for review of non-tenure-track faculty for continuous appointment
- E. New Business
 - * 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
 - * 2. Undergraduate Certificate in Career & Community Studies (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. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee – *consent agenda*
 - * 3. Annual Report of Honors Council – *consent agenda*
 - * 4. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board – *consent agenda*
 - * 5. Annual Report of Library Committee – *consent agenda*
 - * 6. Annual Report of Scholastic Standards Committee – *consent agenda*
 - * 7. Annual Report of University Studies Council – *consent agenda*
 - * 8. Annual Report of University Writing Council
 - 9. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 3 April 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- D.1. Constitutional amendment: BC charge
- D.2. Guidelines for NTTF review

***Attachments, cont'd:**

- E.1.b,c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.a] – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Undergrad Cert. in Career & Community Studies
- G.2. Annual Report of GSAC – *consent agenda*
- G.3. Annual Report of Honors Council – *consent agenda*
- G.4. Annual Report of IAB – *consent agenda*
- G.5. Annual Report of LC – *consent agenda*
- G.6. Annual Report of SSC – *consent agenda*
- G.7. Annual Report of UNST Council – *consent agenda*
- G.8. Annual Report of UWC and Action Plan

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, 3 April 2017

Presiding Officer: Brad Hansen

Secretary: Richard H. Beyler

Members Present:

Babcock, Blekic, Bluffstone, Bowman, Bratiotis, Brown, Burgess, Camacho, Chang, Childs, Clark, Constable, Cruzan, de la Cruz, De La Vega, de Rivera, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Fernandez, Fiorillo, Flight, Gamburd, Gelmon, B. Hansen, D. Hansen, Harmon, Harris, Kennedy, Lockett, MacCormack, Maier, Messer, Mitchell, Monsere, Nishishiba, O'Banion, Podrabsky, Raffo, S. Reese, Riedlinger, Robson, Schechter, Schuler, Shin, Siderius, Smallman, Sorensen, Stedman, Taylor, Thieman, Tretheway, Walsh, Webb, Winters, Yeigh

Alternates Present:

Rebecca Ingersoll for Arellano, Steve Thorne for Jaén Portillo

Members Absent:

Carpenter, Donlan, Greco, Recktenwald, Riedlinger, Ruedas, Schrock, Yesilada

Ex-officio Members Present:

Allen, Andrews, Baccar, Beyler, Chabon, Everett, Fraire, Hines, Jhaj, Lafferriere, Marrongelle, Moody, Percy, Sanders, Su, Wiewel

Notes:

Item G.4 was moved in the agenda order to between items C.3 and C.4.

At the request of a Senator prior to the meeting, item E.1.c.19 was pulled from the consent agenda for separate consideration.

A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A correction was made to the March Minutes as circulated in the Packet: Senator de la Cruz was present, not absent. There having been no other objections prior to the end of roll call, the **6 March 2017 Minutes** were **approved** as part of the **consent agenda**.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND DISCUSSION

1. OAA concurrence to March Senate actions was **received** as part of the **consent agenda** [see **April Agenda Attachment C.1**].

2. Announcements by Presiding Officer

B. HANSEN said that the association of retired faculty had received notice from the Parking Office that the privilege of parking for emeritus faculty was being reconsidered. This issue had been addressed last year in a report from the Task Force on Emeritus Rank for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, presented to Faculty Senate by Susan LINDSAY in June 2016. This report found that the cost of providing parking to emeritus faculty was not sizeable. HANSEN receive by show of hands (straw poll) approval to represent to Parking that Senate hoped that these privileges could be maintained for retired faculty.

B. HANSEN relayed some information given to him by BACCAR, including the passage of Oregon Senate Bill 207, which mandated that Oregon students scoring at least a 3 on Advanced Placement examinations be given college credit. The bill had not yet passed the House of Representatives. The legislature had also required that universities identify in our class schedule courses with low materials costs. After some discussion, BACCAR and colleagues had determined that it made most sense to have this identification be for courses with no materials costs; these could be designated by August for the next academic year. Regardless of how we might feel about this issue, the legislature was not requiring this kind of identification of courses.

B. HANSEN called attention to the MOU of the guidelines for continuous appointment of non-tenure track faculty. A summary of changes is contained in the packet [**March Agenda Attachment E.4**], scheduled for vote next month.

B. HANSEN had discussed with Provost ANDREWS implications of a move to on-line student evaluations of teaching across the University. For aggregated quantitative data this presented few problems, but there was some concern about how to handle qualitative comments: who has access to these, and are they required to go into the file?

3. Announcements by Secretary

BEYLER called attention to the opt-in survey for Senate, Advisory Council, and IFS, currently in circulation; and to the upcoming nominations for and vote on Presiding Officer Elect, Steering Committee, and Committee on Committees.

Item G.4. was moved to this point in the agenda

G. REPORTS

4. Annual Report of Academic Advising Council

Carla HARCLEROAD, chair of Academic Advising Council and Associate Vice Provost for Advising and Career Services, presented the annual report of AAC. [See **March Agenda Attachment G.4.**] Two of her own advisors from her time as a PSU student were present. She had come to PSU from work on student success and degree completion initiatives at Lewis & Clark and University of Oregon. She reviewed the AAC's charge and highlighted several areas the council had focused on. Academic & Career Advising Redesign (discussion following) was only one such area. A survey was used to define short- and long-term goals: college connections, faculty advising strategies, career advising, cultural awareness, student success metrics and long-term assessment, faculty engagement in academic advising. AAC provided input in the redesign, the four-year degree guarantee, retention metrics, and issues in summer financial aid. The Council also provided input on analytic and advising software. AAC also spent some time thinking about professional development for advisors. Eleven additional advisors had been hired this past fall, with the goal of increase our capacity, provide more proactive support, and improve the student-advisor ratio.

HARCLEROAD continued: the Academic & Career Advising Redesign project had goals of: enhancing one-on-one advising experience for students; creating a unified advising framework; organizing work as a source of joy; increasing students' sense of efficacy and agency. A redesign team met daily over nine months, with input from community members, surveys, focus groups, public forums, etc. Recommendations were

submitted to Provost ANDREWS in November; they were approved in December, and we are now moving into implementation. Phase one focuses on structural changes; phase two focuses on thinking through advising pathways and faculty roles; phase three involves continued work on electronic systems, with goal of launching early next year. Faculty participation is important and is discussed in the Redesign report.

[https://www.pdx.edu/student-success/sites/www.pdx.edu.student-success/files/psu_advising_redesign_report_final_RGB_102916.pdf.]

Return to regular agenda order

4. Discussion. Role(s) of faculty in advising.

B. HANSEN asserted that we all shared a common goal of wanting the best possible advising, but recognized that individual faculty might have different or even divergent views of what their role in advising might be. The plan references faculty's role in various places, and he hoped in the discussion to flesh this out somewhat. Not all faculty embrace advising, given the complexity of the issues, unwieldiness of paperwork, and difference in understanding of departmental vs. university-wide requirements. Use of new software will take training and time. Some colleagues want to maintain a high level of involvement in advising; others perhaps are happy to off-load the task. This kind of self-selection might be in fact a way to move forward.

B. HANSEN noted that the plan seemed to rest in some degree on a model coming from EAB, a firm which specializes in consulting with and services for educational and health care administration; a subsidiary specializes in software solutions for some of these administrative functions. Some colleagues, in prior discussions, had raised the question of how these tools would work in the specific PSU context. EAB could be understood as coming from outside faculty interests and priorities, though the tools they provide might be potentially useful, e.g., in tracking student success and retention. The underlying concerns from some colleagues were about their role in the redesign process and their changing role in advising.

The report stated as a goal that every student receive faculty advising within their major at least once in their junior or senior year. B. HANSEN noted that every department had a different way of providing advising within the major; would these be changed or improved in this plan? Assigned advisors would now need to be in twelve-month positions, which might create a need for different kinds of appointments.

WEBB: what is the pathways model? JHAJ stated strongly that the development of the plan had been an open process, with many sources of input from the campus community, and averred that the result was based primarily on these inputs. It would be a misunderstanding to view the plan as relying on outside consultants. Resource documents and conclusions were all posted on the Redesign website. He agreed that while better advising was a common goal, different faculty and different departments had very different approaches and practices. B. HANSEN suggested that the survey data may have had some limitations. JHAJ reiterated that the planners had approached these questions systematically.

Responding about pathways, JHAJ said it is an emerging concept based on research—undertaken at, e.g., Columbia—aimed at transition of students from community colleges to four-year universities. The fundamental concept is that students can change majors but

still have one-to-one connection with an assigned advisor. When a student enters [even without a declared major], this enables an intellectual connection with a set of departments. WEBB asked about exploratory majors. JHAJ said that AAC is working on a recommendation to bring to Faculty Senate to integrate the exploratory major into the pathways model and to require declaration of major once a student reaches 90 credits.

DE RIVERA asked how the new advising plan would be assessed. JHAJ suggested that there was not currently a robust assessment process. But a change this significant will require ongoing feedback, both formative and summative, to improve practices. It will be an ongoing process, but there is mindfulness. B. HANSEN noted that that the implementation plan called for a proposal about major declaration policy will probably come to Faculty Senate next fall. Will this include exploratory majors? JHAJ: the expectation will probably be that all students, within a given number of credits at PSU, should declare either a major or a pathway—that is, a set of related majors.

MESSER wished for clarification: there was expectation of a one-on-one relationship with an assigned advisor, but also an expectation about advising within the major. What was the relationship? CONSTABLE: there was a dual focus, based on student feedback. Again, different departments handled major advising very differently; it was felt that students ought to have an assigned point of contact. JHAJ said the aspiration was that 80% of students could have the same assigned advisor even if they changed majors. Both students and faculty gave feedback that engagement in the classroom around mentoring, planning etc., was critical if approached holistically. MESSER asked about students who changed trajectories: how could they be directed to the best informed advisors? B. HANSEN thought this was something that would need to be tackled in implementation. JHAJ: health fields presented distinctive, complex problems. STEDMAN raised the question of numbers/resources—e.g., given 600 or 700 students in his department (Biology). JHAJ: not all advising activities had to be individual; this was why they didn't make prescriptions to departments.

B. HANSEN asked about assessment of transfer students' preparedness. JHAJ didn't see this as the role of the advising center, but rather a faculty/departmental prerogative.

ANDREWS reminded senators of the contrast to what advising looked like earlier. Prior to accepting the report in November, she had asked Senate for questions and comments. While she did not want to say it was wrong to revisit things, if there were concerns about the general process it would have been helpful to receive them as decisions were being made. The report had not substantially changed since then. B. HANSEN: the AAC report seemed to suggest it was not set in stone. ANDREWS: the report is what it is; however, as we move to implementation there will be need and opportunity for further discussion. It seemed that part of the current discussion, however, was not about implementation but attempting to revert to the initial concept, even though there had not been much comment initially. HANSEN observed that it was one thing to ask for comment and another thing to incorporate it, though he agreed that there had not been much comment when the potential plan was first presented.

MAIER said it was hard to discern where to apply his leverage, given the wide range of important issues. He favored letting those people who were most interested to make comments and do the work.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**1. WR 228 to qualify as a University writing requirement course**

MACCORMACK, chair of ARC, reviewed that that this motion had been postponed from the March meeting, pending further information about the content of the course. CLARK said that he had been unfamiliar with the relevant background. He recognized Paul COLLINS, chair of English. COLLINS said that this had been around for a long time; it was fundamentally introductory journalism class, but with attention to various media. There are similar classes at other Oregon universities. A comparable class is applicable to the writing requirement, e.g., at OSU. There is a minimum of 6000 words of writing, using recursive processes, editing, etc. There is also a research component.

MACCORMACK noted that the determination of ARC was that, although the course could be repeated, it could not be repeated to fulfill the writing requirement.

[Since the motion had been postponed, **March Agenda Attachment E.4**, a new motion was not required.] It was **approved** (40 yes, 7 no, 3 abstain, by show of hands).

2. Constitutional amendment: membership of AQC

RAFFO/D. HANSEN **moved** consideration of the proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution changing the membership and editing the charge of the Academic Quality Committee, as previewed in **March Agenda Attachment E.5** and repeated as **April Agenda Attachment D.2**. The **amendment was approved** by 2/3 majority (39 yes, 5 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

3. Constitutional amendment: part-time ex-officio member of Faculty Senate

O'BANION/CLARK **moved** consideration of the amendment to the Faculty Constitution for ex-officio representation in Senate for part-time instructional faculty, as given in **March Agenda Attachment E.6** and repeated as **April Agenda Attachment D.3**.

CHABON asked whether the ranks listed in the motion are comprised within the current PSUFA collective bargaining agreement. BEYLER explained that the wording was copied from the extant language in the Faculty Constitution regarding membership in the faculty, with the modification to apply to part-time appointments.

O'BANION asked about inclusion of the All Others category [academic professionals, etc.] BEYLER: that is a question.

A question was asked about numbers: only one? B. HANSEN: the intent was simply to provide official representation; questions about specific numbers could be taken up later.

A question was also asked: why not a full member of Senate? B. HANSEN: the Constitution defined Senate eligibility as greater than 0.5 FTE. BEYLER added: this was strictly speaking a constitutional criterion for membership in the Faculty [as a group]; hence the wording about "persons who hold teaching appointments."

WEBB asked about people with part-time appointments who are not consistently employed from term to term. How would such a case be handled? B. HANSEN: it doesn't specify. JHAJ: previously there was regular attendance by adjunct faculty association representatives. HANSEN: anyone can attend. This is a different role.

MONSERE asked if this would be a paid position, and if so, who would be responsible for that. B. HANSEN: it's not a paid position. MONSERE: so it would be entirely voluntary? ANDREWS: if adjunct faculty do any form of service, according to the CBA we have to pay them for it. The question seems to be, does the responsibility fall on the academic unit or on the Senate budget? GAMBURD: contract language says that if people want to volunteer to do things, they can; the issue is whether they are required to do something. HANSEN: it would be a self-nominated position. CHABON: if we write language that says we invite people to participate, is that not a request? GAMBURD: there are people on PSUFA council who are not receiving compensation.

CLARK: the motivation is to recognize people who contribute to the University in a significant way.

CHABON listed the ranks given in the PSUFA CBA: adjunct professor, adjunct instructor, etc.

RAFFO/WEBB **moved to postpone** consideration pending clarifications. The **motion to postpone was approved** (45 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, by show of hands).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals

With the exception of item E.1.c.19, the new courses, changes to courses, changes to programs, and changes to University Studies clusters listed in **April Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved** as part of the **consent agenda**, there having been no further objection before the end of roll call.

c.19. Changes to English undergraduate major

SANDERS, chair of UCC, summarized the proposed changes: eliminate requirement of the course, Introduction to the English Major; eliminate a group of 200-level survey courses; eliminate old distribution areas. Students would have to take two courses in critical approaches and methods, two topics courses, and a course dealing with diversity or representation of minorities. There would then be many electives. The major would also not include a Bachelor of Science (BS) option. WEBB: where's the science? MACCORMACK: covered by the overall BS requirement. SANDERS: correct, the BA does not require lab science courses, whereas the BS does, but either way this is outside of the major.

A comment was made: the proposal adds the BS option, but seems to make many other changes. SANDERS: yes, there are many changes. The brief descriptions are provided by the proposers. The actual changes are contained in the Curriculum Tracker. B. HANSEN said that the discussion in Steering had primarily focused on the change to add the BS option. CLARK again recognized COLLINS: there is still an introductory course; there is still a historical requirement. Regarding the BS, this is primarily aimed at students in technical writing, etc., who currently don't have this option. Several other English departments in other universities have opened this option. The difference is in the courses students take outside the major. BACCAR: this is an option in several departments. COLLINS: the major requirements are the same for both [gen. ed.] options. The proposal includes two changes: adding the BS

option, and changing the major requirements [which applies to both BA and BS options]. SANDERS said that UCC did discuss this question.

BEYLER clarified that what appears in the packet is the summaries; the actual motion for the consent agenda is found in the Curriculum Tracker; including that in the packet would make it very lengthy.

KENNEDY asked about the pedagogical philosophy in English. At other universities, the BA was highly regarded because of the language study. When it gets hard, students will be tempted to bail. What has changed—does English still value linguistic study? EPPLIN noted that the description referred to study of minority and global traditions in literature and culture. If students do not even have to confront another language, how can they do this? He thought many of the changes, allowing more flexibility, were good ideas, but encountering global traditions came through encountering other languages. He didn't understand the rationale. O'BANION pointed to the History Department making a similar move previously. S. REESE characterized this as a long overdue revision of a major that had in some ways become outdated; it allowed more flexibility to students. Regarding the BA/BS, this is an attempt to accommodate (e.g.) students who want to pursue a double major. It seems difficult to deny a major to students who have completed everything but that [language] requirement. Students have different career paths and aspirations.

S. REESE/HARMON **moved** the changes to the English major described in **April Agenda Attachment E.1.c.19** and detailed in the Curriculum Tracker. The **motion was approved** (23 yes, 20 no, 6 abstain, recorded by clicker).

2. Resolution on class size

B. HANSEN pointed to the report by the Educational Policy Committee [**April Agenda Attachment G.3.b**], which had led to a resolution about systematic vs. arbitrary decisions about class size. RAFFO: class size had an impact on students and faculty, and EPC was advocating that this issue be engaged in a systematic way. EPC was recommending that class size increases not be made across the board, but by taking into account learning objectives on a case by case basis.

STEDMAN/S. REESE **moved the resolution** given as **April Agenda Attachment E.2**.

PERCY: does this mean any time there is a fluctuation in class size there must be a discussion, or is there some threshold? B. HANSEN: it has to do with enrollment caps. DE LA CRUZ: does this apply to on-line courses? HANSEN: the report includes data about on-line courses. RAFFO said that there might well be important differences; it depended on the nature of assignments, etc. LUCKETT: how will departments comply? Will they have to file a report, or are we simply asking chairs, etc., to think about it? HANSEN: the resolution supports a concept, without specific implementation measures.

D. HANSEN, in the interest of clarity, **moved an amendment** adding explicit reference to the EPC report [**G.3.b**]. B. HANSEN characterized this as a friendly amendment.

LAFFERRIERE suggested that this would mean that the entire report was part of the motion, which seemed outside the regular process. B. HANSEN: it was merely a reference to the report. The resolution was a suggestion to take into account factors that were brought up in the report.

SMALLMAN understood the intent behind the resolution, but was concerned that the language was too vague to know what we were really voting on. He believed it was best handled at the departmental level. He was concerned this would lead to a bureaucratic process any time there was a change in class size or format. These conversations were best handled at the departmental level; the motion would be thin end of the wedge of involvement in classroom matters.

D. HANSEN/CLARK **moved to postpone** consideration to the May meeting. The motion to postpone was **not approved** (20 yes, 21 no, 5 abstain, recorded by clicker).

RAFFO characterized this as a statement by Faculty Senate: when considering increases to enrollment caps, please take into account factors other than budget. The research is clear that it is not good for students, increases faculty workload, and decreases retention. The resolution does not require any process, but asks for conversation on this issue.

Reverting to the above **amendment** to include reference to the EPC report, it was **approved** (28 yes, 12 no, recorded by clicker).

It was asked: what is the purpose of a resolution? B. HANSEN: a resolution brings attention to the matter.

The **resolution as amended was approved** (27 yes, 11 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTIONS TO ADMINISTRATORS & COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

None.

G. REPORTS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND COMMITTEES

1. President's Report

[In view of time, the President's report was deferred till the next meeting.]

2. Provost's Report

[In view of time, the Provost's report was not presented orally; see **Appendix G.2** for written comments.]

The following reports from committees were accepted as given in attachments to the April agenda:

3. Topical Reports by Educational Policy Committee

a. Suggestions on academic program review guidelines

b. Impact of increasing class size and recommendation for systematic assessment approach

4. *Moved to section C above:* **Annual Report of Academic Advising Council**

5. **Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council**

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:08 p.m.

April Minutes Appendix G.2

PROVOST ANDREWS' COMMENTS: APRIL 3, 2017 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

(Provided in writing and not presented)

OAA BUDGET

- Status: [Integrated Planning and Budget](https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/integrated-planning-enrollment-budget) (IPEB) (<https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/integrated-planning-enrollment-budget>)

ASSESSMENT

- Submitted NWCCU report on recommendation to accelerate assessment activities
- See Appendix G.5 from the Institutional Assessment Council Report

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Focus on Strategic Plan Goal #1: Elevate Student Success; Initiative 1.4 *Explore and commit to measures that improve overall wellness, safety, food and housing insecurity and other concerns that can become a barrier to student success.*

PROVOST'S OFFICE LECTURE SERIES

The [lectures](https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/provost-lecture-series) are held on **Thursdays, from 2:00-3:00 p.m. in Hoffmann Hall**. Open to all students, faculty and staff at PSU. Begins Feb 23. (<https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/provost-lecture-series>).

April 6 - **James Russell**: *The Future of Social Security and Medicare in the Age of Trump*

April 13 - **Chia Yin Hsu and Cassio de Oliveira**: *Russian Involvement in the Elections: Kompromat, Ideology, and the Role of the State*

April 20 - **Jason Jurjevich**: *Who Votes for Mayor? Voter Turnout for Mayoral Elections in America's Largest Cities*

NEXT SECOND THURSDAY SOCIAL CLUB: April 13, 4:00 – 6:30 pm, held in the Office of Academic Innovation

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

My Blog: psuprovostblog.com

Attachment D.1

The Budget Committee and Steering Committee propose the following constitutional amendment:

The Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty, Article IV, Section 4.4.j, is hereby amended by adding the following as item (2) in the list of charges for the Budget Committee and renumbering the subsequent items.

2) Consult with academic leaders of Colleges/Schools, Intensive English Language Program, and University Studies, and make recommendations for the preparations of their annual budgets and enrollment plans. Each Budget Committee member from one of the above listed units shall serve as liaison to his/her unit for this purpose, with other members assigned as liaisons as needed.

Rationale:

- 1. To encode the current practice so that academic leaders see this as a required task for the Budget Committee and can anticipate this interaction.*
- 2. Make potential members of the committee aware of specific liaison duties.*

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR
TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES
PROPOSED CHANGES RATIFIED BY AAUP, 27 MARCH 2017**

Note by the Secretary. This Packet Attachment shows the proposed changes to the P&T Guidelines regarding review of non-tenure-track faculty for continuous appointment, i.e., text added to or deleted from the current version (2014) of the P&T Guidelines.

Highlighted text represents material changed from the version of the NTTF Review Guidelines passed by Faculty Senate on 6 June 2016. Some material has also been rearranged between that version and this one.

Underlined text represents proposed additions to the current P&T Guidelines.

Text in regular font, whether highlighted or not, is carried over from the current P&T Guidelines (including text that has been borrowed from another place in the current document).

Text shown ~~struck through~~ represents proposed deletions from the current P&T Guidelines (or if ~~also highlighted~~ deleted from the version of 6 June 2016).

If the changes below are approved, corresponding changes will also be made to the title page (date and circumstances of revision) and table of contents (new items and revised page numbers) of the P&T Guidelines.

For the full text of the current (2014) P&T Guidelines, see:
https://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/sites/www.pdx.edu.academic-affairs/files/PT%20Guidelines%20%205-12-2014_0.pdf

For the version of the changes passed by Senate on 6 June 2016, see:
https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu.faculty-senate/files/NTTF_Review_Guidelines_as_Amended.pdf

IV. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

....

C. Definition, Use, and Conditions of Faculty Appointments

Faculty appointments are defined as (a) non-tenure track or (b) tenure track. Non-tenure track appointments are (a) fixed-term appointments, (b) probationary appointments, or (c) continuous appointments. Tenure track appointments are (a) annual tenure appointments or (b) indefinite tenure appointments.

1. Non-Tenure Track Appointments

a. Fixed-term appointments

Circumstances occasionally warrant the hiring of non-tenure track instructional faculty on a fixed-term appointment for a specific and limited period of time. For example, a fixed-term appointment is appropriate for visiting faculty, to fill a temporary vacancy (such as a vacancy caused by another employee being on

leave or pending a search for a vacant position), when a program is newly established or expanded, when the specific funding for the position is time-limited, or for a specific assignment or to fill a discrete need that is not expected to be ongoing. The letter of offer for a fixed-term instructional faculty appointment shall state the reason that warrants the fixed-term appointment.¹

Fixed term appointments are made for a specified period of time and are not eligible for tenure. Although fixed term appointments do not require timely notice under the provisions of OAR 580-21-305, notices of intent to reappoint or not to reappoint should be sent by April 1 of the first year of a non-tenure track fixed term appointment and by January 1 of subsequent years. Such notices of intent may be based on the availability of funds. Departments are required to provide an annual evaluation of the performance of ~~non-tenure track~~ fixed term faculty after the first year consistent with the practices specified in their promotion and tenure guidelines. It should be understood that non-tenure track fixed term appointments are for specified times and no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

In the event that the University intends to extend a fixed-term appointment beyond three years of continuous service, the University will provide notice to the Association at least 60 days in advance of the extension.² This notice shall provide a rationale for the position remaining a fixed-term appointment.

In the event that a fixed-term instructional faculty member is to be appointed to a position eligible for a continuous appointment, the University will notify the Association and the parties agree to discuss, as necessary, the appropriate probationary period and whether any time served as a fixed-term faculty member is to be credited to the probationary period.³

~~b. Use of non-tenure track appointments~~

~~i. Upon the adoption of these guidelines the use of non-tenure track appointments for continuing faculty who are .50 FTE or more on instructional accounts and who hold professorial rank shall be reduced as much as possible, consistent with stable funding and the special needs of academic units.~~

~~ii. Non-tenure track positions should be used for positions established with non-recurring funds that are defined as temporary. Appointments such as a visiting professor or a sabbatical leave replacement are considered temporary.~~

~~c. Conditions for non-tenure track appointments~~

~~i. Initial appointments shall be for an appropriate fixed term period, but typically one or two years. Initial appointments may be granted at the~~

¹ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 3.

² 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 3.

³ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 3.

~~discretion of the Provost or appropriate Vice Provost.~~

~~ii. After six years of cumulative full time service, individuals who hold non-ranked appointments in academic support, administrative support, and student support units on multi-year, fixed term appointments shall be eligible to be considered for administrative leave for professional development. Such leave is at the discretion of the Provost or appropriate vice president consistent with State System guidelines.~~

b. Probationary appointments

Non-tenure track instructional faculty members with a probationary appointment will be employed on annual contracts during the first six (6) years of employment as non-tenure track instructional faculty members. Annual contracts during the probationary period will automatically renew unless timely notice is provided. Notice of non-renewal of an annual contract during the probationary period must be provided by April 1 of the first year of the probationary period and by January 1 of the second through fifth years of the probationary period, effective at the end of that academic year.⁴ Such notices may be based on the availability of funds. It should be understood that no reason for a decision not to reappoint need be given.

c. Continuous appointments

A continuous appointment is provided to a non-tenure track faculty member who has completed the necessary probationary period in a continuous appointment-eligible position. A continuous appointment is an indefinite appointment that can be terminated only under the following circumstances⁵:

1. Pursuant to Article 22 (Retrenchment).
2. When a sanction of termination is warranted and imposed pursuant to Article 27 (Imposition of Progressive Sanctions).
3. Due to a change in curricular needs or programmatic requirements made in accordance with applicable shared governance procedures. In such a case:
 - i. As soon as practicable, but no later than 60 days prior to issuing a notice of termination, the Department Chair must provide written justification for the decision and explanation of the applicable shared governance procedure to the faculty members, the Dean, the Provost and the Association.
 - ii. If the employment of multiple faculty members in equivalent positions, and with equivalent position-related qualifications, skills and expertise, are to be terminated due to the same change in curricular needs or programmatic requirements, then lay-off shall be in order of seniority. Faculty will be laid off in inverse order of length of continuous service at the University.
 - iii. The faculty member is to be given at least six months' notice of termination of employment, with such termination effective at the end of

⁴ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2b.

⁵ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2 e .

the academic year.

iv. The School/College will make a good faith effort to find a comparable position within the University for the faculty member.

v. If the reason for the decision that led to the layoff is reversed within three years from the date that notice of termination was provided to the faculty member, the affected faculty members will be recalled in inverse order of layoff. To exercise recall rights, a faculty member must:

1. Notify Human Resources in writing, within 30 days of the termination notice, of intent to be placed on the recall list. If/when there is a need for a recall list, the University and the Association will meet promptly for the purpose of negotiating a process for administering the recall list.

2. Inform Human Resources of any change in telephone, email or address.

3. In the event of a recall, Human Resources will contact the faculty member by phone and email, and notify the Association, of the recall.

4. The recalled faculty member will have ten (10) working days to accept or reject the position. Failure to contact Human Resources within ten (10) working days will be considered a rejection of the position.

5. A recalled faculty member who rejects a position will be removed from the recall list.

4. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and fails to remediate the deficiencies during the subsequent academic year.

- d. A non-tenure track appointment does not foreclose the possibility that a department may wish to consider that faculty member for a tenure-related appointment. In such cases, the years spent under a non-tenure track appointment may be considered as a part of the probationary period for tenure at the time the individual is placed on the annual-tenure track. A mutually acceptable written agreement shall be arrived at between the faculty member and institutional representative as to the extent to which any prior experience of the faculty member shall be credited as part of the probationary period, up to a maximum of three years.

....

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES/PROMOTION AND TENURE

....

NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS – PROMOTION

....

NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS – CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENT-RELATED EVALUATIONS

This section describes the process through which eligible non-tenure track (NTT) instructional faculty may be considered for continuous appointment, and are evaluated and may be considered for continuous employment. This document covers NTTF hired after September 16, 2016. For NTT instructional faculty hired prior to this date, see also the Implementation Plan.

A. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

The department as a whole shall establish its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for evaluation of faculty for continuous appointment, prior to continuous appointment and after continuous appointment, and shall ensure that these guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The responsibility for evaluating and documenting an individual faculty member's performance rests primarily with the department. The procedures and criteria to be used for evaluation of faculty for continuous appointment, to include the evaluations before and after continuous appointment, must be consistent with university and college or school policy, approved by the Dean and Provost, and must be formulated early enough to allow maximum time for making decisions.

Approval of departmental procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves newly revised departmental criteria, then he/she will submit both departmental recommendations and his/her objections or amendments to the Provost for resolution.

After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department faculty and to the academic Dean. Department chairs should distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

The guidelines must be in writing and be distributed to all members of the department faculty. Guidelines should be clear and unambiguous and include a calendar for a cycle of reviews. Department chairs must distribute these guidelines to new non-tenure track faculty with their appointment letter.

B. Initial Appointment

Initial appointments of NTT instructional faculty are not the responsibility of a sole administrator. Where possible, a committee of at least three faculty including at least one NTT instructional faculty shall seek qualified applicants and forward a recommendation to the chair.⁶

C. Type of Appointment

Initial appointment of NTT instructional faculty may be either probationary or fixed term. In making an appointment of a non-tenure track instructional faculty member, the appointing unit must specify whether the appointment is probationary or fixed term. ~~Instructional faculty under a fixed term contract are not eligible for consideration for continuous employment.~~

D. Faculty Offer and Position Descriptions⁷

The University will provide template letters of offer for non-tenure track instructional appointments. For non-tenure track instructional appointments, 1.00 FTE will include no more than 36 course credits of assigned teaching per academic year. Assigned university / community / professional service and scholarly work shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of

⁶ 2016-2019 Collective Bargaining Agreement, ARTICLE 18, henceforth referred to as "2016-2019 CBA."

⁷ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 4.

an instructional non-tenure track faculty member's workload without a reduction in instructional load.

The template letter of offer will include a position description. Taken together, a letter of offer and position description for non-tenure track instructional appointments will include the following information: whether the appointment is eligible for continuous appointment or fixed-term, appointment start date, appointment end date (for fixed-term appointments only), the reason warranting the fixed-term appointment (for fixed-term appointments only), FTE, annual salary rate, actual salary, teaching assignment (including, where possible, the list of courses to be taught and the location of those courses if not on the downtown University campus), whether the appointment is renewable, and any expectations for research and scholarly work, university service, professional service, or other responsibilities. Bargaining unit members shall have an opportunity to review the letter of offer and position description and will affirm their acceptance of the offer of employment by signing and returning to the University a copy of both the letter of offer and the position description.

The University will direct departments to complete letters of offer and position descriptions at least 30 days prior to the start of work for the initial term of employment of any non-tenure track instructional faculty member so that employment documents are forwarded to the Office of Human Resources according to the published payroll deadline schedule.

E. Annual Review

NTT instructional faculty members are to be evaluated annually through a developmental review process during years one through five of the probationary period.⁸ The review should document and evaluate faculty contributions, and provide developmental feedback and guidance in preparation for the Milestone Review for Continuous Appointment. This review should be consistent with the faculty member's letter of appointment.

Prior to the implementation of this annual review process, each department/academic unit shall establish and maintain guidelines for review of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate. Nothing in this provision affects or alters the Association's ability to file a grievance, as provided in Article 28, that alleges a violation of such guidelines.⁹ In the event that an NTT instructional faculty member has had annual contracts with more than one unit during the probationary period, the department chairs or equivalents and the employee will mutually decide which unit will be responsible for the evaluation. In the event that a mutual decision cannot be made, the Dean or designee of the relevant college, or Provost or designee in the case of multiple colleges, will make a determination.

The departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:¹⁰

- Be in writing and be made available to members;

⁸ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2 c.

⁹ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 6 a.

¹⁰ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 6 b.

- Require each department to identify the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
- Establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
- Provide that the results of the review be in writing and provided to the member;
- Provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
- Provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, which shall be attached to the review;
- Provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
- Provide that the member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
- Provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
- In a department with more than one NTT instructional faculty member, provide that at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee; and
- In the event a department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college, or another school or college if necessary.

The departmental guidelines must provide that Annual Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member should, at a minimum, include the following:

- An annual self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and that highlights activities and achievement;
- Current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- Appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range), or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- Syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that Annual Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- Description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- A reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- Evidence of scholarly activities, beyond the classroom, as defined by the discipline;
- Evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- Evidence of service activities related to unit mission.

F. Timing for Continuous Employment Consideration and Appointment¹¹

In year 6 of the probationary period, NTT instructional faculty members are to be evaluated for continuous appointment through a Milestone Review. Prior to the end of the

¹¹ 2016-2019 CBA, Section 2 d.

final academic year of the probationary period, a NTT instructional faculty member is to be awarded a continuous appointment or provided twelve (12) months' notice of termination of employment.

G. Milestone Review for Continuous Employment

Milestone reviews provide a way to honor and reward a sustained record of commitment and achievement. A milestone review that looks both backward and forward is appropriate when considering the award of a continuous appointment. When the review is clear and consistent, it supports academic freedom and contributes to academic quality.¹²

Each department/academic unit shall establish and maintain guidelines for Milestone Review for Continuous Appointment of NTT instructional faculty members that are consistent with the guidelines developed by the Faculty Senate. Nothing in this provision affects or alters the Association's ability to file a grievance, as provided in Article 28, which alleges a violation of such guidelines.¹³

The departmental guidelines must, at a minimum:¹⁴

- Be in writing and be made available to members;
- Require each department to identify the committee(s) responsible for the evaluations;
- Establish job-relevant evaluation criteria and require the criteria to be in writing;
- Provide that the results of the review be in writing and provided to the member;
- Provide that the member is entitled to meet with the reviewers;
- Provide that the member is able to respond to the review by submitting a statement or comments, which shall be attached to the review;
- Provide that the member may submit relevant materials to the reviewers;
- Provide that the member may request a review if one has not been provided within the time period provided for by the guidelines;
- Provide that the member is to have reasonable notice of the evaluation;
- In a department with more than one NTT instructional faculty member, provide that at least one NTT instructional faculty member will be on the review committee; and
- In the event a department has only one NTT instructional faculty who is being reviewed, the department will add an NTT instructional faculty member from another unit in the school or college.

A significant factor in determining an NTT instructional faculty member's performance is the individual's accomplishments in teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities, consistent with the faculty member's contractual responsibilities. Teaching activities are scholarly functions that directly serve learners within or outside the university. Scholars who teach must be intellectually engaged and must demonstrate mastery of the knowledge in their field(s). The ability to lecture and lead discussions, to create a variety of learning opportunities, to draw out students and arouse curiosity in beginners, to stimulate advanced students to engage in creative work, to organize logically, to evaluate critically the

¹² Letter of Agreement, Nov. 5, 2015.

¹³ 2016-2019 CBA, Section 6 a.

¹⁴ 2016-2019 CBA, Section 6 b.

materials related to one's field of specialization, to assess student performance, and to excite students to extend learning beyond a particular course and understand its contribution to a body of knowledge are all recognized as essential to excellence in teaching. Teaching scholars often study pedagogical methods that improve student learning.¹⁵

The Milestone Review of teaching and curricular contributions should not be limited to classroom activities. It also should focus on a faculty member's contributions to larger curricular goals (for example, the role of a course in laying foundations for other courses and its contribution to majors, or contributions to broad aspects of general education or interdisciplinary components of the curriculum).¹⁶ In addition, the Milestone Review should take into account any documentation of student mentoring, academic advising, thesis advising, and dissertation advising. The Review Committee shall take into account any variations in the letters of appointment during the probationary period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that the Milestone Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member should, at minimum, include the following:

- A cumulative annual self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and highlights activities and achievement;
- Current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- Appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range) or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- Representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the six-year review period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that the Milestone Review Submission Materials submitted by the faculty member may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- Description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- A reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- Evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- Evidence of service activities related to unit mission;
- The annual self-appraisals prepared by the faculty member.

Departmental guidelines must provide that the following additional items may be included also considered in the evaluation of teaching and curricular accomplishments, to the extent

¹⁵ Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases, 2014 (henceforth 2014 P&T Guidelines) Sec. E 3.

¹⁶ 2014 P&T Guidelines, Sec. E 3.

consistent with a faculty member's letter of appointment:

- Contributions to courses or curriculum development;
- Materials developed for use in courses;
- Results of creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning;
- Results of assessments of student learning;
- Accessibility to students;
- Ability to relate to a wide variety of students for purposes of advising;
- Mentoring and guiding students toward the achievement of curricular goals;
- Results of supervision of student research or other creative activities including theses and field advising;
- Results of supervision of service learning experiences in the community;
- Contributions to, and participation in, the achievement of departmental goals, such as achieving reasonable retention of students;
- Contributions to the development and delivery of collaborative, interdisciplinary, University Studies, and inter-institutional educational programs;
- Teaching and mentoring students and others in how to obtain access to information resources so as to further student, faculty, and community research and learning;
- Grant proposals and grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques;
- Professional development as related to instruction, e.g., attendance at professional meetings related to a faculty member's areas of instructional expertise;
- Honors and awards for teaching.¹⁷

H. Procedures for Milestone Review

1. Notification

The department chair notifies the chair of the appropriate departmental committee of those non-tenure track faculty who are eligible for review.

2. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee Establishment and Authority

All recommendations for continuous appointment originate with formally established departmental committees; for example, an elected advisory committee, or an elected committee on promotion and tenure. The department as a whole shall determine the composition of the committee and the method of selection of its members and chairperson. When a faculty member has been involved in interdisciplinary teaching and/or research, the committee will include a faculty representative from a mutually agreed upon second department or program. Since the department chair is required to make a separate evaluation of the department faculty, the chair cannot be a member of the committee. The committee may invite other faculty members to participate in its deliberations. This committee acts as an independent reviewer of the performance of department faculty and initiates recommendations for all department faculty except the department chair. Committee members being considered for continuous appointment

¹⁷ 2014 P&T Guidelines, Sec. II.E.3.

shall not participate in the committee review of their cases.

3. Committee Decision and Narrative Report

The Committee's report to the department chair will be in the form of a written narrative for each affected faculty member. The report must address and review all areas of the dossier submitted by the faculty member in application for continuous appointment. The departmental committee must make one of two recommendations for each member of the department and the votes of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form.

a. Denial: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose requests for continuous appointment are not accepted. Denials of continuous appointment must be accompanied by a written report.

b. Approval: This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant continuous appointment. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III must accompany the recommendation form.

4. Responsibilities of Department Chair

The department chair must be satisfied that the departmental committee has followed the departmental guidelines and that the appraisals are complete and in proper form. Department chairs are to make a separate recommendation for each faculty member under review and take the following actions:

a. confirm that all eligible faculty have been considered

b. review positive and negative recommendations and the supporting materials of the faculty member in question. The chairs will make a separate recommendation, adding their own written narrative to the committee's. The Chair's narrative must address and review all areas of the dossier submitted by the faculty member. If the recommendation of the chair differs significantly from the committee's recommendation, the chair shall state in writing the reason for the specific differences.

The department chair informs each faculty member in a timely manner in writing of the departmental committee's and of his/her own recommendations. The faculty members should be given the opportunity to review their files before they are forwarded to the Dean and should indicate they have done so by signing the "Appraisal Signature and Recommendation Form". A copy of the complete appraisal and any additional material added by the department chair should be in the file for review by the affected faculty member. The department chair must discuss with a faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the departmental committee and the department chair. If a department member questions either departmental recommendation, he/she may request a reconsideration of that recommendation.

5. Procedures for Reconsideration of Department Decision

Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of department action, the faculty member must give written notice of intent to request a reconsideration of the recommendation.

If the request is for reconsideration of the departmental committee recommendation, both the committee chair and the department chair must be notified and the department chair must return all appraisal materials promptly to the committee chair. Otherwise, only the department chair need be notified in writing.

The review may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever supportive material is pertinent. The supportive materials must be submitted to the committee chair, or department chair, as appropriate, within two weeks of written notification of intention to request the reconsideration.

All materials submitted by a faculty member shall become part of the appraisal document. The departmental committee and/or department chair, as appropriate, shall consider the materials presented by the faculty member. The committee chair and/or department chair may attach to the appraisal additional documentation or statements with their recommendation(s). The department chair shall forward the appraisal, which shall then proceed through the normal administrative review procedure in a timely manner.

6. Chair's Report to the Dean

The department chair must submit the following to the Dean:

- a. statement of assurance that all eligible non-tenure track faculty have been reviewed;
- b. recommendation form for each faculty member; and,
- c. the committee's and the chair's written narratives for all faculty members who have received positive or negative recommendation for continuous appointment.
- d. if requests for reconsideration are made, all materials submitted with the request for reconsideration and the committee's and/or the department chairs response after reconsideration.

Upon receipt of the Dean's decision, the chair must inform the faculty member of that recommendation in a timely manner.

7. Responsibilities of the Dean or Equivalent Administrator

The Dean shall use an advisory group for review and evaluation of the recommendations from the department chairs and departmental committees. The size and composition of this group shall be at the discretion of the Dean. The Dean is responsible for making the decision to approve or deny continuous appointment.

All actions taken by the Dean must be reported in a timely manner to the appropriate department chair and chairperson of the appropriate promotion and tenure committee. If the department chair or the chairperson of the promotion and tenure committee requests a conference with the Dean within five days of being notified by the Dean, a conference shall be held before the Dean makes a decision. If the Dean's decision differs from the recommendation of either the departmental committee or department chair, the Dean must notify the affected faculty member in writing of the decision and state the reason for the specific difference. The affected faculty member may seek a

meeting with the Dean prior to the finalization of any decision that differs with the recommendation of the departmental committee. The Dean shall provide the affected faculty member with a copy of any material added to the file. The affected faculty member may attach a statement in response to the action of the Dean.

8. Appeals to the Provost

A faculty member may appeal an adverse decision by the Dean to the Provost by submitting an appeal within ten working days of notice of the Dean's decision. The faculty member's appeal must state the basis for the appeal. The faculty member may request a conference with the Provost as part of the appeal process. If a conference is requested, the Provost is to meet with the faculty member before deciding the appeal.

The Provost is to provide a final decision on the appeal in writing to the faculty member and Dean.

I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment

Non-tenure track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment are to be evaluated after three years of continuous appointment and then after every three years following the last evaluation or promotion¹⁸

The departmental guidelines must provide that the materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation following continuous appointment should, at minimum, include the following:

- A cumulative ~~annual~~ self-appraisal that reflects the areas of work as described in the NTT instructional faculty member's job description and highlights activities and achievement;
- Current curriculum vitae following applicable sections of the PSU Promotion and Tenure format approved by the Provost;
- Appropriate and relevant quantitative and/or qualitative summaries of student evaluations as defined for this purpose by the department (i.e., mean and standard deviation, or median and interquartile range), or appropriate assessments of teaching since the last review;
- Representative syllabi and/or other pedagogical materials from the review period.

The departmental guidelines must provide that materials submitted by a faculty member for evaluation following continuous appointment may include, but are not limited to:

- Peer evaluation of teaching and curricular innovation;
- Description of professional development activities intended to advance job performance;
- A reflective analysis of student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
- Evidence of ability to work effectively with individuals from and topics related to diverse populations;
- Evidence of service activities related to unit mission.

In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the faculty member and department chair or

¹⁸ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2 f.

chair equivalent will meet to discuss the deficiencies identified in the review. Following the meeting, the chair will develop a remediation plan to address the deficiencies. If the faculty member disagrees with the remediation plan, the faculty member may appeal to the dean or the dean's designee, who shall review the plan and make the final decision regarding the contents of the plan. The remediation plan is to be developed before the end of the academic year in which the unsatisfactory evaluation occurred. If the chair and faculty member identify resources that would assist with the remediation plan, a request for access to such resources will be made to and considered by the Dean. Resource unavailability could result in modification or extension of the remediation plan.¹⁹

Progress on the remediation plan is to be assessed and communicated on a regular basis during the subsequent academic year. At a minimum, the chair and the faculty member will meet near the beginning of the fall term to review the remediation plan and near the end of the fall term to review the faculty member's progress on the remediation plan. Prior to the end of fall term, the chair is to provide the faculty member with a written assessment of progress on the remediation plan, including identification of any issues that have not yet been successfully remediated.

At any point in the process, the chair can determine that the remediation plan has been successfully completed, at which time the chair shall notify the faculty member and conclude the remediation process.

Around the end of the winter term of the academic year following the unsatisfactory evaluation, the chair is to notify the faculty member whether the remediation plan has been successfully completed. If the plan has not been successfully completed, the chair may either extend the plan for an additional academic term or provide the faculty member with notice of termination. A remediation plan may be extended by the chair for up to three academic terms. A notice of termination provided under this section shall be provided to the member, Dean, Provost, and the Association and shall be effective no sooner than the end of the subsequent academic term.

....

¹⁹ 2016-2019 CBA, Sec. 2 g (also including following three paragraphs).

Attachment E.1.b

April 6, 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**.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Change to Existing Courses

E.1.b.1

- CE 474/574 Unit Operations of Environmental Engineering, 4 credits – change prereqs

E.1.b.2

- CE 485/585 Environmental Cleanup and Restoration, 4 credits – change prereqs

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 Courses

E.1.c.1

- Mus 225 Music Technology Lab (1)
Introduction to the practical skills of navigating a recording studio, live recording set-up, and amplified music context. Basic music and audio production skills are presented. Some peripheral issues, including acoustics, software and hardware operation, mixing and archiving, session management are addressed. This course is repeatable up to a maximum of 6 credits.

E.1.c.2

- Mus 245 SAMP I: Audio Recording (3)
Thorough study of digital audio recording and the signal chain from theoretical, technical, and practical perspectives. Students will learn the practical skills of an audio technician through live recording of sounds, musical instruments, and human voices. Topics include digital audio theory; microphone properties, applications, and ideal placements; and tools and techniques used to acquire robust and clear documentation of sound.

E.1.c.3

- Mus 247 SAMP III: Studio Production (3)
Recording and producing song-length musical products. Utilizing a series of increasingly complex assignments, students will work through the music production process from inception to distribution. The course includes an examination of the commercial music production business. Prerequisite: Mus 246 or permission of instructor.

E.1.c.4

- Mus 344 Sonic Arts and Music Production Laptop Ensemble (1)
An ensemble of humans, laptops, controllers, and speakers. Ensemble members both compose and perform in the ensemble, exploring computer-mediated instrument design, sound synthesis, programming, live interactive performance, and incorporation of visual media. Explorations culminate in public performance. May be repeated up to a maximum of six credits. Prerequisite: Mus 247 or permission of instructor.

E.1.c.5

- Mus 346 SAMP V: Music with Visual Media (3)
Examines music and sound design created to support the visual image. Topics include film scoring technology and technique, creating and editing dialogue and sound effects, working with animation, interfacing with film editors, and the film and video audio post-production business. Prerequisites: Mus 247 and Mus 345.

E.1.c.6

- Mus 347 SAMP VI: Integrated Sound Arts (3)
Incorporates recording techniques, studio production, visual media, sound design, electronic composition, and live interactive performance. Introduces new contexts including iOS, cloud-based music collaboration, DIY electronic instrument building, and live interactive installations using sensor-based technology. Students complete creative projects in collaboration with community partners in the arts or business world. Prerequisite: Mus 346 or permission of instructor.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**New Courses**

E.1.c.7

- WS 320U Introduction to Girls' Studies (4)
An overview of the field of girls' studies in the U.S., including the ways definitions of girlhood change depending on contexts of race, class, ethnic or national identity, gender identity and sexual orientation. Explores gendered ideals and negotiations of girlhood, concepts of girls' empowerment, theory and research methods.

E.1.c.8

- WS 349U Gender and International Development (4)
Examines how the material benefits of globalization and development projects are not shared equally across gender(s). Evaluates how development theory and practice address poverty, health, environment, sexuality, population, domestic/paid work. Also examines the emergence of civil society; patterns of violence and political participation globally. This is the same course as Intl 349U and may be taken only once for credit.

E.1.c.9

- WS 381 Queer of Color Theorizing and Perspectives (4)
Utilizing critical race, feminist, queer, decolonial, and materialist analyses, queer of color theories highlight the intersections of race, sexuality, and nations. An overview of the development and foundational approaches to queer of color critiques, as well as an opportunity to apply these theories to contemporary issues. Prerequisite: WS 360 or WS 305.

E.1.c.10

- WS 382U Transgender Studies (4)
Focus on contemporary transgender lives and politics; it is an introduction to the field of Transgender Studies. Analyze lived realities and academic scholarship. Topics may include: transgender history, health care justice, violence and discrimination, the prison-industrial complex, and exclusion and inclusion in feminist and LGBTQ politics.

E.1.c.11

- WS 482 Topics in Transnational Sexuality (4)
An examination of how sexualities are understood within a transnational frame of analysis. Topics include the sexual politics of migration, tourism and desire, colonialism and its lingering effects, militarization and sexuality, transnational biopolitics of sexuality, and the politics of global gay rights discourse. Prerequisite: junior standing.

March 9, 2017

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**.

**Graduate School of Education and the
College of the Liberal Arts and Sciences**

New Program

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR

Certificate in Career and Community Studies

Overview:

Traditionally, young Americans with intellectual disabilities (ID) have been excluded from post-secondary educational and career/work experiences that would allow them to prepare for work and community life together with their fellow non-disabled citizens. In Oregon and across the nation, most students with ID complete their K-12 education with their nondisabled peers --- but at graduation they are set on a segregated path that limits their opportunities for the rest of their lives. Despite an individual's ability or desire, most citizens with ID are denied access to postsecondary education and find themselves isolated and disenfranchised from meaningful careers and becoming active contributors to their communities. As a result, many have been relegated to daily lives of segregation and missed opportunities as they stagnate in sheltered workshops. However, through federal and state initiatives, this long-standing inequity is changing.

Reflecting national trends, segregation into sheltered workshops for Oregonians with ID was challenged in 2012 through a class action suit which was settled in 2015. The suit resulted in Governor Executive Orders 13-04 (2013) and 15-01 (2015), establishing that Oregon's social service agencies, including Vocational Rehabilitation, would provide Oregonians with intellectual disabilities a path to integrated, competitive employment through career exploration, job development and job supports.

Access to postsecondary education for students with ID is also changing. At a national level, students with ID are now eligible for certain forms of financial aid to attend college, through the national Think College project, which has funded Think College Inclusion Oregon.

In November of 2015, PSU received a five-year grant for the Think College Inclusion Oregon (TCIO) project. The CCS Certificate program at PSU will be the first of its kind at a 4-year residential university in Oregon. PSU joins Virginia Commonwealth University, Indiana University, Ohio State, UCLA, University of Arizona, Colorado State, and others in leading the nation to expand access to college for students with ID. Every university program combines academic and employment experiences, and students are required to work and further develop their employment competencies while attending their academic institutions. In comparison to their peers, young adults with ID are more likely to achieve integrated employment during and after completing an inclusive college & employment certificate (<http://www.thinkcollege.net>).

In the long-standing tradition of PSU's university-community partnerships, eight key state agencies and nonprofit organizations are actively working with PSU in this effort. Community partners committed to supporting PSU in the provision of the CCS Certificate include the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Oregon's Employment First initiative, Department of Human Services, Portland Public Schools, Oregon Department of Education, Northwest Down's Syndrome Association, and Community Visions, Inc. The CCS Certificate is a joint proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and the Graduate School of Education (GSE). An essential partner is PSU's University Studies program (UNST), through which students completing the CCS Certificate will participate in their initial academic classes with other PSU students.

The CCS certificate includes objectives and outcomes in planning and goal-setting, academic learning, career and employment, community living, and social and community engagement. (See Section 5. Outcomes, Quality Assessment and Student Experience, a. Expected learning outcomes of the certificate). Two national and six Oregon-based community agencies and organizations are committed to partnering with the PSU Certificate in Career and Community Studies to provide resources, supports and services to students to achieve these learning outcomes (see Section 6a. Certificate Integration and Collaboration. - External Partners).

The programmatic focus of this pre-baccalaureate certificate is to develop knowledge and competencies for adult life and employment through inclusive academic, career development/employment, and social/community engagement experiences. Each student's CCS certificate program of study begins by establishing an Individual College and Career Plan (ICCP) that includes the student's employment and independent living goals and the inclusive academic, career, and independent living experiences. This plan will establish goals which will lead to meaningful, integrated employment after certificate completion. The CCS certificate culminates in an ePortfolio summarizing the student's academic and career/employment experiences and competencies.

Evidence of Need:

During the TCIO grant period from 2016-2021, only thirty-five students will be enrolled in the PSU CCS Certificate, so that this new certificate can be developed and implemented in a high quality and successful manner. After that period, it is anticipated that the program will continue to accept a limited number of students in order to continue a sustainable and successful program at PSU. That said, the need for the CCS Certificate in Oregon is great and will be of interest to two groups of Oregon's citizens with ID.

Potential adult students (21 and older). Historically Oregon citizens with ID have never had an opportunity to develop and demonstrate their ability to contribute to our community and their employability to mainstream employers. The Oregon Employment First initiative has identified over 9000 adult Oregonians who never had an opportunity to seek employment in integrated work settings. It is likely that some of these adults will be interested in the combined college and employment experience in the CCS certificate program.

Students age 18-21 in public school transition programs. Some students in public school receiving special education services continue as public school students between the ages of 18-21 in order to learn employment and community living skills. The TCIO grant project has initially partnered with Portland Public Schools (PPS) to include in the CCS Certificate some PPS students with ID ages 18-21. These students will be dual-enrolled in PPS and in the PSU CCS Certificate. As we learn from the implementation of the CCS Certificate in year 1 and 2, a few students from other area school districts may also be able to apply.

In 2014, 3916 students ages 5-18 attending Oregon schools were students with an intellectual disability. Approximately 300 of these students complete high school annually, and it is likely that some portion of them may seek a post-secondary education program. (Oregon Department of Education Annual Report Card 2014-15, <http://www.ode.state.or.us/data/annreportcard/rptcard2015.pdf>).

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:

Coursework	Minimum Credits
<p>University Studies (UNST) Coursework (graded or audited)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student will select UNST courses in consultation with advisor. • Most students will complete one year of Freshman Inquiry (5 for-a-grade or audited credits per term, 15 credits total) in Year One. • However, other University Studies courses (including Sophomore Inquiry and Senior Capstone) may be substituted, as determined through consultation with UNST coordinators and advisors. • Through consultation with DRC specialist the manner of participation (for grade or audited) will be determined. 	15 credits
<p>Elective Coursework (graded or audited)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will complete one course per term in years two, three, and four within a coordinated plan of study that supports the student's academic interests and continued development toward their career goals. • Electives can include additional coursework in UNST beyond the 15 required credits noted above (e.g. additional FRINQ or SINQ and Capstone) • Electives can include Practicum or Internships related to career goals. • The <u>minimum</u> number of for-a -grade or audited credits in Year Two, Three and Four is 4 credits per term (12 per year). • Through consultation with DRC specialist the manner of participation (for grade or audited) will be determined. 	36 credits
<p>ED 402: CCS Independent Study</p> <p>In this course students identify goals in the areas of academic studies, career/employment, independent living and social/community engagement that are important to their success after college. Students then engage in learning activities, monitor their goal attainment, and document their accomplishments in an ePortfolio. Students enroll in 2 credits of CCS Independent Study (ED 402) in each term of attendance. (Six for-a-grade or audited credits a year, 24 credits over four years). (see Section 1.d. for additional information)</p> <p><u>In CCS Independent Study, students will:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through individual advising, student's manner of participation (graded or audited) in ED 402 will be determined. • Develop an Individual College and Career Plan (ICCP) with a focus on their career goals and preparation for current and future employment. • Determine goals in the four areas of: academic studies, career / employment, independent living, and social/community engagement. (see Section 5.a. For example of skills in these goal areas). • Create an ePortfolio to document learning experiences through academic courses, employment and college/community engagement. • Engage in learning activities to reach those goals. • Self assess goal attainment, including gathering feedback from others. • Document learning experiences and goal attainment in ePortfolio. • In final year submit ePortfolio for evaluation by faculty. • In final year share ePortfolio with prospective and/or current employers. <p>ePortfolio. Students reflect on and document their academic, career development and employment, community living and social/community engagement learning experiences and competencies. ePortfolios may include course-based artifacts (including course assignments and work products), presentations, videos, feedback from faculty and employers, self-assessments of goal attainment, and other elements that demonstrate the student's accomplishments and competencies. The final ePortfolio is evaluated by faculty who teach the ED 402 Independent Study course.</p>	24 credits
TOTAL CREDITS (graded or audited)	75 credits

Guidelines for Academic Advising:

- Students select courses in consultation with advisor.
- The CCS is an individualized Program of Study developed with the student and describes the student's academic and career goals and the courses and other activities they will engage in to accomplish those goals.
- PSU courses (UNST and electives) are selected that support the student's goals.

How Students Participate in Courses:

- The method in which students participate in courses will be determined by the student, in consultation with their advisors.
- Students may enroll for a grade, but in most cases, they will audit courses with a Learning Plan (see below).

Guidelines for Auditing of Courses:

- Students will need permission of the faculty member to audit a course.
- Students will, in consultation with their CCS advisor determine the critical content and skills they wish to gain from the course and how to engage in that learning as an auditing student.
- The CCS advisor and student (with input from faculty) will develop a Learning Plan outlining the assignments to be completed (may include some of the same assignments as in syllabus, some individualized assignments, and some alternative assignments) as they audit the course.
- The faculty member will decide to what extent they will provide feedback to the students auditing with a Learning Plan. A brief rubric-based assessment will be used to establish satisfactory/unsatisfactory performance on the assignments in the Learning Plan.
- Faculty member will indicate in BANNER when they post grades for the course whether or not the student audited the course (existing procedure).

How are students in the CCS supported in their academic coursework?

- The PSU Disability Resource Center (DRC) meets with students and determines needed accommodations, including adaptive technology (text-to-speech and speech-to-text tools, writing support, audio notes, etc.) which help students learn and apply course content.
- Students' academic workload is managed by enrolling (for audit or credit) in only one academic course per term.
- The CCS advisor uses the Learning Plan to help the student organize and carry out assignment completion.
- Each CCS student also meets weekly with a CCS academic coach.
- CCS academic coaches are PSU students in pre-education or other fields enrolled in an academic coaching practicum/internship, where they receive ongoing training and supervision.

How are faculty supported to teach PSU students completing the CCS Certificate?

- Faculty can determine the degree of support they desire from the CCS Coordinator/Advisor.
- The CCS Advisor is available to faculty to answer questions, receive instructions regarding the course and assignments, convey information to the academic coach and student, etc.
- The goal of the CCS advisor and coach is to support both the faculty and the student by providing the student the additional support they may need to understand the course content, break down and complete assignments, etc.
- Faculty are also supported by a faculty support coordinator who connects them to additional resources, including those available through the Office of Academic Innovation. The faculty support coordinator meets 1:1 with faculty, and the faculty also meet together with the coordinator at least once per term to share their best practices and offer mutual support.

General Student Affairs Committee: 2016-17 Annual Report

Committee chair: Claudia Irla, LIB

Committee Members: Jennifer Anderson, ED; Pamela Dusschee (SBA), Josh Epstein, ENG; Erik Geschke, ART; Nickolas Hash, student, Kristi Kang, IELP; Jose Rojas, student; Mae Saslaw, student.

This committee is charged by the Faculty Senate to:

- 1) Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets and student discipline.
- 2) Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs and long-range planning, e.g., student employment, educational activities, counseling, safety, health service and extra-curricular programming
- 3) Nominate the recipients of the President's Awards each spring term

The committee met four times throughout the year. Spring term will be dedicated to the review of nominations and selection of the President's Awards.

Advisory capacity: The committee was not contacted for advisory services. However, the committee did meet with Dana Tasson, the Executive Director of SHAC, to learn more about SHAC services and identify ways GSAC can assist.

President's Awards: In Spring 2016, the committee participated in the review and selection of the President's Awards. The process will be the same this year, with the review being conducted in spring term. The committee will select the "best of the best" awards from amongst the winners for each college/school for Academic Achievement, Community Engagement and University Service for the undergraduate, master's and doctoral levels in each category. President's Awards will be selected in May 2017 and awarded in June 2017.

Review and recommendation capacity: Stakeholder Meetings

ACTIONS completed:

- Last year, the committee targeted student engagement on Senate Committees as an important initiative. Since the Secretary to the Faculty worked with ASPSU this year to increase student participation, we did not pursue this topic.
- Met with Dana Tasson, the Executive Director of SHAC, to learn more about SHAC services and identify ways GSAC can assist. In discussion, GSAC members suggested that SHAC:
 - Continue working with Shelly Chabon to reach out to the Associate and Assistant Deans and Department Chairs.
 - Explore the use of D2L widgets to showcase services.
 - Provide the Library with brochures describing services for placement at the circulation desk and other service areas.
 - Explore outreach and programming opportunities with the Library.
- The Committee also met with Johannes DeGruyter, Executive Director of the Office of Academic Innovation (OAI), to discuss how GSAC can assist with the lack of centralized student support for cultivating the understanding of software applications/platforms. In discussion, GSAC members

suggested:

- OAI, Library, Learning Center, Advising and Career Services, and/or other student services partner to develop pop-up sessions on specific topics such as digital identity, PebblePad and personal learning spaces, plagiarism, etc.
 - Schedule these sessions in conjunction with other events such as career fairs, midterm stress relief events, and the Portland State of Mind.
 - Involve students in their creation so that they will appeal to other students.
 - Vary the delivery — eye-catching handouts, workshops, computer displays, etc.
 - Avoid having sessions around orientation as the incoming students are already saturated with the information they receive.
- OAI explore the creation of general D2L modules covering these topics, adapting existing work when appropriate.
- Reviewed process for nominating Student Achievement and President's Awards.

ACTIONS to be taken in spring and summer terms:

Select President's Awards

RECOMMENDATIONS to 2017-18 committee chair:

- Build engagement with EMSA and other PSU stakeholders to ensure General Student Affairs Committee adds value to PSU Mission.
- Work to increase student participation on faculty committees through improved communications and interaction with students.
- Reach out to EMSA for committee member (perhaps ex-officio) to assist in identifying policies and procedures open for review as related to the charter.
- With the potential increase to tuition, identify campus and other resources students can use to reduce costs.
- Refine criteria for determining the "best of the best."

Honors Council 2016-2017 Annual Report to the PSU Faculty Senate

The Honors Council makes policy recommendations and establishes general standards for the University Honors Program and departmental honors tracks; coordinates review of new Honors courses; and reviews campus-wide resources, practices, and services for high-achieving students.

Council chair:

Lee Shaker (COM)

Council members:

Michael Bartlett (BIO)
Travis Bell (ARC)
Todd Bodner (PSY)
Cornelia Coleman (HON)
Erin Flynn (SSW)
Hollie Hix-Small (GSE)
Bin Jiang (MTH)
Ann Mestrovich (ACS)
Robert Schroeder (LIB)
Nina Spiegel (JST)
David Stuart (CHE)
Chirstina Sun (CH)
Christof Teuscher (ECE)
Ellen West (SBA)
Lawrence Wheeler (HON)
Kim Williams (POL)

Student members:

Thomas Geffner
Jose Rojas Fallas

Consultants:

Joel Bettridge
Shelly Chabon
Steve Harmon
Betsy Natter (Interim Honors College Director)

Overview:

As of Fall, 2016, 720 students were enrolled in the Honors College (UHC). Scholarships for these students currently total \$350k/year—increasing this amount is a priority as we seek to attract excellent students. Recent data shows that 43% of Honors students go directly into graduate or professional school upon graduation; another 40% enroll within two years of graduation.

Council Business:

Building on last year's efforts, the Honors Council focused on two primary tasks in AY16-17: recruitment of a new director for the Honors College and a continuing review of the senior thesis process for undergraduates in the Honors College.

As of April 1st, 2017 the Honors College Director Search Committee (Chair: John Ott) has identified four applicants for the position that have been invited to PSU for a campus visit. These visits will roughly take place between April 17th and April 27th. Several members of the Honors Council are serving on this search committee and the Council as a whole provided feedback at the start of the process. During the campus visits, Council members will have opportunity to interact with the candidates.

Meanwhile, the Honors College's dramatic growth in recent years created some challenges around the traditional culminating thesis (advised in tandem by a writing instructor from Honors and a subject specialist from outside of Honors). Concern about miscommunication in prior years spurred Honors faculty to spearhead several reforms for AY16-17 including:

- Requiring students to solicit and confirm thesis advisor from academic departments earlier in the process;
- Revising required documentation to encourage students to stay in better touch with advisor—and receive periodic signatures from—throughout the process.
- The development of a Handbook—available to students and faculty—that better delineates role of Honors instructor, departmental advisor, and student.
- Clearer articulation of deadlines throughout process to students (and advisors).
- Shifting teaching loads for Honors faculty such that thesis continuation course now taught by a mix of Honors faculty—not a single, dedicated NTTF instructor.

In sum, Honors faculty are sanguine about the impact of these changes. Completions in Fall, 2016 and Winter, 2017 dramatically outpaced completions in Fall and Winter of preceding years—but most students still finish in Spring term (which will be the real test of the revised process).

The Council continues to gather information—particularly from the perspective of non-Honors faculty—on the functioning of the thesis system and challenges that they perceive. A key issue is that the expansion of the Honors College resulted in a large number of students who are in need of a thesis supervisor each year. These students naturally cluster within popular majors and typically seek an advisor within their major. Because the number of faculty within these departments does not always correspond to the number of students, this imbalance can put a great deal of pressure on advisors in certain departments. For example, Criminology & Criminal Justice (CCJ) has more than 700 FTE students, but only about 10 tenure-line faculty members (the majority of whom are assistant professors). Each advisee requires attention and there is a sense that this work is not properly valued for promotion and that other compensation is lacking. As a result of this burden, CCJ faculty have voted to no longer allow Honors students from their department. Other departments have not responded similarly, but the underlying issue is felt (and noted) by faculty outside of CCJ.

Faculty outside the Honors College flagged two additional, interrelated concerns with the Honors thesis. First, it is not clear to outside advisors what the expected parameters of a thesis are in different disciplines. Second, the current grading system gives advisors little flexibility for passing (or not passing) theses—often students' last requirement for graduation. Discussion among Honors faculty and Council members has begun to identify possible solutions to these challenges. Looking forward to next year, the Honors Council should prioritize the development of resolutions to address these structural concerns.

Ongoing business:

Looking forward, a significant area of concern is the fragmentation (and duplication) of Honors-related opportunities on PSU's campus. Between the Honors College, departmental honors tracks, Phi Kappa Phi, McNair, honors accorded at graduation by the university, and discipline-specific honors societies, there is a sense of confusion about purpose and communication. Nominally, the Honors Council is tasked with providing oversight for the departmental Honors tracks—but this has proven very difficult. Likely, there are opportunities for savings and efficiencies in this tangle and the Council may assist the incoming Honors Director (or another campus body) in this matter.

A related concern is that the Honors College does not always serve PSU's best and brightest. Perhaps due to the vagaries of serving so many transfer students, or perhaps simply because of miscommunication, many excellent PSU students are not a part of the UHC. There seems to be a one-way flow of students from Honors to University Studies when there could be a reciprocal relationship. In general, awareness and accessibility are areas to improve for the UHC. For example, as the University requires the development of new degree maps from individual departments on campus, we are concerned that Honors may often be omitted in the process (as University Studies requirements are touted).

Finally, as we look forward to the leadership of a new Director, we think there is an opportunity to continue to focus and refine the UHC's mission. To do so, data is imperative: who applies, who is admitted, how do students fare once enrolled, what do students do after graduating, etc. Along with the refinement of the UHC's mission, the purpose of the Honors Council should also be addressed. Much has changed regarding Honors at PSU in the past few years.

Attachment G.4

Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB)

Annual Report, April 2017

Members 2016-17 academic year

Chair: Randy Miller, PSC
Toeutu Faaleava, UNST
Derek Trethaway MME
Erin Merz CREC
Michael Smith ED (Added November 2014)
Zia Laboff Student representative

Ex-officio Members

Brian Janssen SALP NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative
Mark Rountree, Athletics Director (Left January 2017)
Valerie Cleary Athletics Director (Began January 2017)
Lisa Miller, Senior Associate Athletics Director/Senior Woman Administrator in Athletics
Matt Billings, Deputy Athletics Director

The Intercollegiate Athletics Board is charged by the Faculty Senate to:

- 1) Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University's program in intercollegiate athletics;
- 2) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

I. Athletic Department staff changes

- Mark Rountree announced that he would be leaving the department of Athletics in January 2017 for family reasons. Mark had been with the Athletic department staff since he began in January 2015. This departure led to the Presidential appointment of former Associate Athletic Director and SWA Valerie Cleary as the replacement for Mark Rountree. We wish to thank Mr. Rountree for the excellent job of reshaping the future of Athletics at Portland State.

II. IAB Oversight and Review as Required under the PSU NCAA Certification Agreement

Operating Principle 1.1 (O.P. 1.1---Institutional Control and Shared Responsibilities)

IAB has maintained an active role in policy and procedure development and revision in Athletics. It has reported on athletic policy issues and student-athletes' accomplishments, and has continued its review of student life and wellness issues such as: missed classes, food insecurity and the NCAA Academic Integrity policy.

- A request to examine and discuss the possibility of developing specific language related to the minimum GPA requirements for participation of student athletes or other students in

Attachment G.4

extracurricular activities at PSU. The committee discussed the University policy regarding grade change process and the potential for impact on student athlete eligibility. The NCAA requires that institutional policy for student participation in practice and contests be the final determinant as long as the student meets the NCAA minimums for GPA. It was agreed that a review of University policy as to how it meets the NCAA requirements was necessary.

- It was determined that this is handled on a departmental level across campus. Given the lack of a campus wide policy, the committee decided that this was the standard we would apply.
- The Athletic Department gathered figures from the other Big Sky institutions for comparison. It was determined that the Athletic Department would be maintaining a consistent approach to other schools in our conference by using the NCAA standards to determine return to participation.
- It was determined that there is a high degree of variability across the campus with regard to student participation in extra-curricular activities at Portland State. Since there was not a clear policy stipulating how students are allowed to engage in extra-curricular activities on campus and that it appears that the standard practice was that each department was responsible for determining their own standards it was decided at this time to use the NCAA minimum standards as the policy.
- The final language related to this policy was requested to be included in the 2017-18 Academic Year Student Athlete Handbook.

III. Discussion of new drug testing policy

- IAB reviewed and discussed the proposed new *PSU Athletics Drug Testing Policy*. Portland State University hired an independent firm to explore the Athletics Drug testing Policy and report back the findings. This investigation looked into the protocol for which athletes can be tested for drug use. The findings this of this investigation led to a task force being asked to work with the General Counsel office to develop a comprehensive drug testing policy for Portland State Athletics. The policy is in the final editing stages with an anticipated implementation date this summer pending a thorough legal review.

IV. Viking Pavilion construction:

- The demolition of much of the old Peter W Stott center has been completed. Construction of the Viking arena portion is well underway with anticipated completion of the project still set for early 2019.

Library Committee: 2016-17 Annual Report

According to the Faculty Governance Guide, “The Library Committee meets monthly. The faculty membership represents at least two each from Arts & Humanities, Science & Engineering, and Social Science.”

Committee Chair: Susan Chan, MUS

Committee Members: Faculty members Elizabeth Almer, SBA; Desmond Cheung, HST; Carrie Collenberg-Gonzalez, WLL; Kevin Hill, PHL; Lea Millay, UNST; and Steven Wells, ESM; and student members Brent Finkbeiner and Lifa Teguh.

Consultants: Dean Marilyn Moody, LIB; Thomas Bielavitz, LIB; Michael Bowman, LIB; and Claudia Irla, LIB.

Meetings were held in October, February and March. There will be one more meeting in May.

In the meetings, library staff gave detailed updates on various areas of library services, with feedback and discussion among members.

Topics discussed include the following:

- **Budget:** For FY17 the library received a budget increase to absorb the cost of inflation on library materials. This has allowed the library to maintain currently levels of resources in support of student learning and faculty research. The library continues to review resources, making decisions in collaboration with the schools and colleges based on curriculum, use, cost and need.
- **Fundraising/Development:** The goal of raising \$300K has been reached.
- **Use of space:** The Library has been working with OIT on enhancing study rooms.
- **Open textbooks:** It is a priority for the Library to find ways to reduce costs for students on textbooks. Open textbooks has received support from donors and the Alumni Association.
- **Course reserves, including Textbooks on reserve:** Textbooks are purchased for various classes, and the system is heavily used by students.
- **PDXScholar:** It highlights research activities of faculty and students. There have been 1.7 million downloads.

- The Library website: The many and frequent updates were shared in the meetings
- Library security: As a result of a recent attack of a student in the library, measures have been taken to increase library security since this spring term. Access in the evening hours between 9-midnight, when the library closes, is limited to those with PSU ID. The information desk focuses on providing directional assistance to people entering the building, letting in those who come in after 9 pm and have forgotten their ID cards, and checking with people who set off the gates whether they have books they need to check out.
- Workshops: This includes stress relief workshops; topics are listed online.
- All gender and family restrooms: They are made available and more accessible on the third floor of the Library.

Dean Marilyn Moody distributed the Fall 2016 issue of the brochure *Portland State University Library Update: News for Supporters and Friends* in one of the meetings.

Issues on Committee membership were discussed and clarified via email communication with Richard Beyler. While there were no student members on the Committee at the beginning of the academic year, there are currently two.

Overall, the meetings provided an effective channel for communication between the Library staff and faculty and student members. Everyone on the Committee showed dedication to the important role of the Library and expressed interest in continuing to serve on the Committee for the next academic year.



Scholastic Standards Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate 2016-17

Chair: Paloma Harrison, CLAS

Faculty: Scott Broussard, CLAS
Michele Miller, IELP
Randy Zelick, BIO
Courtney Shiroma, UHRL
Jennifer Loney, SBA
Paula Harris, OIA
Derek Garton, MTH
Anna Pittioni, COTA
Jennifer Dahlin, SHAC

Ex- Officio: Nicolle DuPont, RO
Consultants: Sona Andrews, OAA
Sukhwant Jhaj, OAA

Students: none appointed

I. Committee Charge

- a. Develop and recommend academic standards to maintain the integrity of the undergraduate program and academic transcripts of the University.
- b. Develop, maintain and implement protocols regarding academic changes to undergraduate transcripts.
- c. Adjudicate undergraduate student petitions for academic reinstatement to the University.
- d. Report to the Senate at least once a year.
- e. Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of the Academic Requirements and Curriculum Committees, and the Graduate Council

II. Function of the Committee (petitions can be found at www.pdx.edu/registration/)

The committee reviews petitions for all retroactive changes to the undergraduate academic transcript including: adding courses, withdrawing from courses, dropping courses, refunding tuition, changing grading option and extending incomplete grades beyond one year. The committee also adjudicates petitions for academic reinstatement for any term.

The committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate on any changes, additions or policies that have impact on the academic transcript or academic/registration deadlines, including grading.

The committee is responsible for the academic standing policy and interventions therein such as the registration hold that is applied for undergraduate students on academic warning. Changes to any of these policies must be vetted by the SSC and approved by Faculty Senate.

III. Additional committee work this year:

- Coordinated with the Registrar's Office to publish meeting dates and petition submission deadlines online on a term-by-term basis; the committee chair communicates this to the PSU advising community each term.
- Presented petition review guidelines and helpful advising information at training session for newly-hired academic advisors.
- Revised and clarified language in the notice of academic dismissal and academic reinstatement petition instructions.

V. Petitions by the Number 2016-17 (April 2016-March 2017):

Attachment G.6

Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) 2016-17 annual report

Petition Type	2016-17	Granted	Denied	Pending
Reinstatement	118	79 (67%)	28	11
Refunds (half of these are a subset of drop requests)	187	131 (70%)	34	22
Add/Drop Overall (including add only, simultaneous add/drop, drop only no refund/withdrawals)	147	95 (65%)	41	11
Grade option changes	38	30 (79%)	7	1
Incomplete Extension	11	7 (64%)	2	2
TOTAL *Number is lower than sum of above as drops and refunds may be double counted.	479 <i>(versus 732 from 2015-16)</i>	317	106	56

Attachment G.7

2016/2017 UNST Council Report to Faculty Senate

Prepared by Joel Bettridge, Chair

Council membership: Joel Bettridge, Amy Spring, Ben Anderson-Nathe, Eleanor Erskine, Joseph Smith-Buani, Kimberly Willson-St Clair, Pedro Ferbel-Azcarate, Susan Masta, Michael Lupro, Rick Lockwood, Ingrid Anderson, Albert Spencer, Mau Nam Nguyen, Christof Teuscher, Evguenia Davidova, Oscar Fernandez

Ex-officio: Maurice Hamington, Mirela Blekic, Rowanna Carpenter

I. Curriculum

- A. The UNST Curriculum Committee (Chaired by Rowanna Carpenter) reviewed and recommended a number of courses for inclusion in various clusters, which the Council then reviewed and approved. The classes approved in the Fall and Winter terms are:

ANTH 376	The Neanderthals	Interpreting the Past
ENG 397	Digital Literary Studies	Design Thinking, Innovation, Entrepreneurship
ESM357	Business Solutions to Environmental Problems	Environmental Sustainability
G 343	Planets in our Solar System and Beyond	Global Environmental Change
INTL 349	Gender and International Development	Gender and Sexualities
INTL 375	Forced Migration and Exploitation	Global Perspectives
SOC 320	Globalization	Global Perspectives
WS 320	Intro to Girls' Studies	Gender and Sexualities
WS 382	Transgender Studies	Gender and Sexualities
WS 367	War, Sexual Violence, and Healing	Gender and Sexualities
WS 367	War, Sexual Violence, and Healing	Global Perspectives
PA 320	Introduction to Nonprofit Management	Leading Social Change
PAH 399/PHE 399	Health Policy	Healthy People/Healthy Places

- a. We expect a number of classes to also be approved by the end of the Spring term.

II. Program

- A. large portion of the Council's work this year focused on completing work begun last year. The two major project brought to completion include:

Attachment G.7

- a. A revision to UNST Diversity Goal, which passed the Senate on March 6th. The new goal, now titled “Diversity, Equity and Social Justice,” reads: Students will explore and analyze identity, power relationships, and social justice in historical contexts and contemporary settings from multiple perspectives.
- b. The Council built on the teaching award created last year to recognize UNST teaching at the first-year program by creating a teaching award for Capstone classes.
- c. A review of the Chiron Studies program.
 1. As the 2013-2014 UNST Council report to the Faculty Senate indicates, “conditional approval” was granted for Chiron’s inclusion in UNST. As a part of that move, Chiron classes were designated as Pass/No pass classes and that they would only be offered at the 100-level. The conditional status of the approval prompted the Council to review the status of the relationship.
 2. In Spring of 2016 the Council met with Chiron leadership and began to collect information regarding how well Chiron’s shift into UNST has gone.
 3. Since joining forces, UNST has attempted to offer 48 Chiron sections, 17 (35%) of which have been cancelled due to low enrollment. An additional 10 sections finished the term with 10 or fewer students. A total of 381 students completed Chiron courses or an average of 12.3 students per course that was not cancelled.
 4. What emerged from the Council’s review of Chiron was an interest in better understanding how Chiron classes work within the current curriculum of PSU—in particular how they serve the students taking those classes for credit.
 5. To follow up on this question at the beginning of Fall 2016, the Council asked the Chiron leadership the following question: What is the academic advantage for students who take Chiron courses versus other PSU courses? In our meetings Chiron leadership clearly addressed the benefit for student instructors. However, it was less clear to the Council, given the current breadth of courses offered at PSU, how students benefit from the Chiron curriculum.
 6. The Council met with the Council Chiron leadership team in Winter 2017. What emerged from that conversation was a desire on the part of the Council and the Chiron leadership to find a new model for Chiron that allows it to thrive going forward. To this end, the Council asked Maurice Hamington, the Director of UNST, to call a meeting with Chiron Leadership and the UNST faculty to see if there are creative models for Chiron to achieve its mission and vision within a framework that better fits with UNST mission and vision. The meeting will take place in Spring 2017.

**University Writing Council
2016-7 Annual Report to the PSU Faculty Senate**

From the PSU Faculty Constitution, Article 4 Section 4: University Writing Council

This Committee shall consist of seven faculty members from across the University of whom no more than four would come from CLAS. The Committee shall also have four voting standing members: the Director of Rhetoric and Composition, the University Studies Writing Coordinator, the Director of the Writing Center, and a representative from IELP. Members will serve for two-year terms, with the possibility of continuing. The Committee shall: 1) Make recommendations to the Dean, Provost, and Faculty Senate on such matters as writing placement, guidelines, and staffing for teaching writing in UNST, WIC, and composition courses; 2) Offer recommendations for improving writing instruction across the university; 3) Initiate assessment of the teaching and learning of writing at PSU; 4) Support training of faculty, mentors, and WIC Assistants teaching writing; 5) Advise on budgeting writing instruction; 6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees; 7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, outlining committee activities.

Committee chair:

Kirtley, Susan (English)

Committee members:

Barber, Katrine (History)

Becker, William (Chemistry)

DeWeese, Dan (English)

Jaffee, Daniel (Sociology)

Knepler, Annie (University Studies)

Newton-Kalvert, Zapoura

Pickard, Elizabeth (Library)

Spitzer, Linnea (IELP)

Taylor, Sue (Art History)

Completed Business:

1. UWC members Annie Knepler, Linnea Spitzer, and Susan Kirtley submitted a Diversity Mini-grant proposal for a “Forum for Multilingual Writers” in January of 2017. Although the grant was not funded, we proceeded with the forum, which was held April 11th.
2. The UWC presented an Action Plan to Dean Marrongelle and the Academic Leadership team in December of 2016. The Provost asked ALT to identify priorities from the Action Plan and report to Dean Marrongelle. On March 6th, Dean Marrongelle sent some of these priorities to the UWC. However, given that only a few Deans responded to the request, the UWC requested an additional meeting with ALT. The follow-up meeting is scheduled for April 19th.

Ongoing business:

1. The University Writing Council will meet with ALT again on April 19th.

PSU Academic Program Review – Action Plan

School/College: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Program: Writing Across the University
Dean: Karen Marrongelle	Chair/Director: The University Writing Council

This Action Plan was developed by the University Writing Council in consultation with Associate Dean Matt Carlson and English Department Chair Paul Collins and represents a response to the WPA Consultant-Evaluator report as well as the UWC’s ideas for improving writing instruction at PSU. We have indicated references to the WPA Recommendations as well as PSU’s Strategic Plan as appropriate and shared summaries of these Recommendations and Initiatives at the end of this document in Appendices A & B.

Targeted Areas of Focus	Actions	Success Criteria	Timeline	Responsible Party
University-wide writing policy	Portland State University should include in its mission statement an explicit commitment to writing as a means of learning and representing learning. (WPA Rec #1)	Commitment to writing added to mission statement	Drafted in Winter 2017, Adopted by end of 2016-17	University Writing Council, Faculty Senate
	University Writing Committee and the Academic Leadership Team can provide significant leadership in improving writing instruction at Portland State University by structuring interaction on a regular basis (WPA Rec #4)	Regular meetings between UWC, Academic Leadership, and various stakeholders scheduled throughout the year	Beginning 2016-7, with regular meetings ongoing	UWC, Academic Leadership
	Portland State University should develop a Writing Inventory to determine current expectations, practices, and outcomes on campus	Targeted inventories conducted as part of developing a writing placement process (see below), and re-establishing Writing Intensive and Writing Across the Curriculum	Hire WAC Director by end of 2017-18, Placement process inventory by Winter 2019; WIC/WAC inventory by Spring 2019	University Writing Council; OAI, UNST, Orientation, Advising, Faculty Senate, WAC Director

	(WPA Rec #5)	courses. These inventories will require the leadership of a WAC Director as well as funding and resources (course releases, etc.)		
Undergraduate writing curriculum	Hire a Director of Writing Across the Curriculum (WPA Rec #7)	WAC Director hired	Develop job description 2016-17, hire by end of 2017-18 school year, with progress report and follow up meeting March 2017	CLAS, OAI
	Hire additional composition specialists in English, provide additional support for Dir. of Composition (WPA Recs #9 and #10)	English Dept. hires additional comp specialists	Initiate process in 2016-17 school year and ongoing	CLAS, Dept of English
	Create an effective placement process for all incoming students and assess the writing of incoming students (WPA Recs #3 and #8)	Placement process agreed upon and instituted	Explore writing placement 2016-2017; progress report Spring 2017 Create and implement writing placement 2017-2018; progress report, Spring 2018	OAI, UNST, Orientation, Advising, Faculty Senate
	Reinstate WIC program budget, train WIC faculty and assistants (WPA Recs # 3 & 6)	WIC program reinstated, faculty and assistants trained	Budget reinstated academic year 2017-18 and ongoing; faculty hired and assistants trained by Winter 2018	CLAS, Academic Affairs
	Set class size at recommended AWP/CCCC levels in courses that fulfill university writing requirements (Strategic Plan Initiatives: Improve Student Success and Enhance	Class sizes set at 20 /25in all courses that fulfill university writing requirements	By Fall 2017	All depts that offer requirement-fulfilling writing courses

	Educational Opportunity)			
	Explore possibilities for expanding bridge courses beyond the Multilingual FRINQ lab in University Studies (Strategic Plan Initiative: Achieve Global Excellence)	More bridge courses offered.	By the end of 2016-17 school year	UNST, IELP, Dept of English.
	Increase funding for Writing Center (WPA Rec #6)	WC budget increased	2017-18 budget	Academic Affairs
	The English Department needs to develop shared learning outcomes and means of assessing them in WR 121, 222, 323 (WPA Rec #11)	Shared Learning Outcomes Developed for WR 121, 222, and 323	New LOs developed for WR 121 in 2015-6, work with new faculty to develop LOs for WR 222 and 323 by end of 2017-18	ENG dept/WR faculty
	Offer more online and hybrid composition classes (WPA Rec #12)	More classes offered	English is offering additional online and hybrid classes	ENG Dept.
	University Studies must be held responsible for effective faculty practices and student learning outcomes in regards to writing instruction (WPA Rec #2)		UNST writing outcomes have already been developed and the written communication has been revised. UNST assesses written communication on a bi-yearly basis for FRINQ and has started to assess writing in SINQ. UNST provides faculty	UNST

			development to support writing instruction. Explore the possibility of expanding bridge courses beyond the multilingual FRINQ Lab (see above) 2016-17.	
Graduate student writing	Expand number of workshops & retreats offered on writing at graduate level (Strategic Plan Initiative: Improve Student Success)	Additional workshops and retreats offered	2016-17 academic year and ongoing	Office of Graduate Education, IELP
	Offer new writing courses for graduate students, including a 500 level course on best-practices in grad-level academic writing (Strategic Plan Initiative: Improve Student Success)	New writing courses for grad students approved	By Fall of 2017	Departments with grad programs, Dept of English & IELP
	Expand specialized tutoring for graduate students in Writing Center (Strategic Plan Initiative: Improve Student Success)	Additional hours for specialized tutoring offered	By start of 2016-17 academic year	Office of Graduate Education, Academic Affairs
Multilingual writers	Offer workshops for faculty on effective teaching practices for multilingual student writers (Strategic Plan Initiative: Achieve Global Excellence)	Faculty workshops offered	2016-17 and ongoing	IELP, UNST, University Writing Committee, OAI
	Develop and offer new courses for multilingual writers (Strategic Plan Initiative: Achieve Global Excellence)	New courses for multilingual writers approved	Beginning of 2017-18 academic year	UNST, Dept of English, IELP

Faculty and Advisor Support	Offer workshops for faculty teaching writing (WPA Rec #4 and 7)	Workshops for faculty teaching writing offered	Already in progress. Expanded 2016-17 academic year and ongoing	University Writing Committee, OAI, UNST, English
	Expand number of faculty with expertise in writing across the curriculum and multilingual writers (WPA Recs #7 and #9)	Additional faculty across campus involved in Writing Intensive Courses	Beginning 2016-17 academic year and ongoing	All depts
	Create an effective placement process for all incoming students (WPA Rec # 8)	Placement process agreed upon and instituted	By end of 2016-17 academic year	UWC, UNST, Orientation, Advising, Faculty Senate

Appendix A:

Summary of Recommendations from the WPA Consultant-Evaluator Report submitted by Barbara Cambridge and Charles Schuster in June 2014

Summary of Recommendations University-wide Responsibilities

Recommendation 1: Portland State University should include in its mission statement an explicit commitment to writing as a means of learning and representing learning.

Recommendation 2: If University Studies continues to receive funding for and assume responsibility for writing instruction, it must be held responsible for effective faculty practices and student learning outcomes.

Recommendation 3: Portland State University should assess writing of incoming freshmen, writing of transfer students, and writing in departmental clusters and capstones.

Recommendation 4: The University Writing Committee and the Academic Leadership Team can provide significant leadership in improving writing instruction at Portland State University by structuring interaction on a regular basis.

Recommendation 5: Portland State University should develop a Writing Inventory to determine current expectations, practices, and outcomes on campus. This Inventory is descriptive, not evaluative.

Recommendation 6: Because faculty members need to understand and use the Writing Center in more ways, the Writing Center needs more space and staffing and better ways to share goals and expertise.

Recommendation 7: Portland State University needs to create a new Writing-across-the-Curriculum program with a Director of Writing-across-the-Curriculum who provides the leadership and coordination needed for high quality and thorough writing instruction.

Recommendation 8: Placement into required writing courses and credit for prior learning must be done accurately.

English Department Responsibilities

Recommendation 9: The English Department needs to hire more faculty members with expertise in Rhetoric and Composition in the English department.

Recommendation 10: The English Department should hire or appoint additional administrative support for the Director of Rhetoric and Composition/Writing Intensive Courses Coordinator.

Recommendation 11: The English Department needs to develop shared learning outcomes and means of assessing them in WR 121, 222, 323.

Recommendation 12: By developing more online or hybrid writing courses including courses that incorporate media and digital components, the English Department will vitalize and extends its offerings for students.

Appendix B

PSU Strategic Plan Initiatives 2016-20:

Provide Civic Leadership Through Partnerships

Improve Student Success

Achieve Global Excellence

Enhance Educational Opportunity

Expand Resources and Improve Effectiveness

Signatures:

University Writing Council, Chair

Date

School/College Dean

Date

Dean of Graduate Studies (when applicable)

Date

Provost Office

Date

Action Plan Template

The template should be used for Action Plans to be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs as part of the Academic Program Review process. The information supplied in the action plan should be based on recommendations for improvement or development of the program according to the program's self-study and the External Review report. The action plan should indicate that processes are in place to support continuous development of the program.