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

The Faculty Senate will meet on 4 February 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in Cramer Hall 53.

AGENDA

A. Roll Call and Consent Agenda [see also E.1, G.6, G.7]
* 1. Minutes of the 7 January 2019 meeting – consent agenda
* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for January– consent agenda

B. Announcements
  1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  2. Announcements from Secretary

C. Discussion – none

D. Unfinished Business – none

E. New Business
* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – consent agenda
* 2. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Open Access Publication (Steering Committee)

F. Questions for Administrators
* 1. Faculty salaries of former administrators – postponed from January
* 2. Physics Department PhD program

G. Reports from Administrators and Committees
  1. President’s report
  2. Provost’s report
  3. Report from Kevin Neely, Assoc. Vice Pres. for Government Relations
  4. Report from Luis Balderas-Villagrana, Pres. of ASPSU
  5. IFS report
* 6. Recommendation of Academic Calendar Committee – consent agenda
* 7. Faculty Development Committee semi-annual report – consent agenda

H. Adjournment

* See the following attachments.
  A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 7 January 2019 – consent agenda
  A.2. January Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – consent agenda
  E.1.a,b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – consent agenda. Complete curricular proposals are on-line:
  E.2. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Open Access Publication (Steering Committee)
  F.1. Question regarding faculty salaries for former administrators
  F.2. Question regarding the Physics Department PhD program
  G.6. Recommendation of Academic Calendar Committee – consent agenda
  G.7. Faculty Development Committee semi-annual report – consent agenda
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Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 January 2019

Presiding Officer: Thomas Luckett
Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators Present:
Anderson, Baccar, Brown, Carpenter, Chaillé, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Craven, Cruzan, Cunningham, Dillard, Dimond, Dolidon, Emery, Faaleava, Fiorillo, Fountain, George, Geschke, Greco, Hansen, Henderson, Holt, Hsu, Ingersoll, James, Karavanic, Labrecque, Lafrenz, Lindsay, Luckett, Lupro, Magaldi, Martinez Thompson, Matlick, May, McBride, Meyer, Mitchell, Newlands, Nishishiba, O'Banion, Palmiter, Podrabsky, Maude Hines for Reese, Schechter, Sugimoto, Thanheiser, Thieman, Walsh, Watanabe, Yeigh

Alternates Present:
Michael Taylor for Bryson, Maude Hines for Reese, Julie Hackett for Sorensen

Senators Absent:
Broussard, de la Cruz, Eastin, Fritz, Mathwick, Messer, Recktenwald, C. Reynolds, Siderius

Ex-officio Members Present:
Allen, Balderas-Villagrana, Beyler, Bielavitz, Bynum, Clark, Davidova, Duh, Hines (also as alternate), Jaén Portillo, Jeffords, Jhaj, Kennedy, Ketcheson, Lafferriere, Lynn, Maier, McLellan, Popp, Woods, Wooster

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.

1. Minutes of the 3 December 2018 meeting – P. 34, paragraph 6 should end “link money to SCH.” With this correction, the minutes were approved as part of the consent agenda

2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for December – received as part of the consent agenda

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

LUCKETT called attention to the prior announcement that Sukhwant JHAJ, Vice President for Academic Innovation, Planning, and Partnerships and Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management, will be leaving PSU at the end of the academic year for a position at Arizona State University. LUCKETT expressed appreciation for JHAJ’s years of service to the University, and said that he had benefitted from JHAJ’s collaboration, patient goodwill, and untiring devotion to the best interests of our students. [Applause.]

A Question to Administrators had been submitted over the winter break. Due to the holiday and other scheduling contingencies, and with the agreement of the senator who posed the question, the response will be deferred till February:

In view of budgetary pressures described by President Shoureshi and the hold on faculty hires now in place at several PSU schools and colleges, is the practice of administrators returning to faculty positions at their full administrative salaries under review?
Paying full salaries to administrators after they return to schools and colleges reduces funds available for other faculty lines and increases salary inequities that PSU has sought to reduce in recent AAUP-PSU contracts.

Robert C. Liebman, Senator

LUCKETT said that in February we would be hearing more from the Government Relations office about issues relating to the proposed state higher education budget.

LUCKETT reverted to an issue raised in December: recommendations to the Governor for appointment of a new Faculty member of the Board of Trustees [BoT]. We hope to send these recommendations in early February. A survey was sent at the beginning of break, and will be re-circulated this week. It asks three questions (it’s not necessary to answer all three): whom you would recommend to serve and why, what qualities you see for an effective trustee, and suggestions for the process of making the recommendations. It is important to note that it is not a formal nomination.

HINES, the present Faculty BoT member, summarized the duties. It is designed to provide a Faculty perspective on the Board, not a Faculty representation on the Board. It’s expected that the member act as a [full] Board member and not look only at how questions affect Faculty. Much of the work is actually done in committees: Executive & Audit, Budget & Administration, and Academic & Student Affairs. To be confidently informed on questions, she felt was important to attend committee meetings, and not only the committee to which she had been assigned. Board members are often requested or invited attend various other events and meetings. The Faculty BoT member is also an ex officio member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committees [and therefore an ex officio member of Faculty Senate itself]. You should expect receive questions and criticism (constructive and non-constructive) from members of the campus community. To do the job competently is a substantial time commitment. LUCKETT: is there a course release? HINES: Karen MARRONGELLE [previous Dean of CLAS] had provided for one course release per term.

BEYLER said that for technical reasons it would be easier to send what would formally be a different second survey; responses to both surveys would be collated.

LUCKETT noted the announcement that the launch of the new PSU website had been postponed to a later date, yet to be determined.

2. **Announcements from Secretary** – *none*

C. **DISCUSSION** – *none*

D. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on International Collaborations (Steering)**

   Because LUCKETT was the main author of the next motion, he ceded the gavel to JAEN PORTILLO. DIMOND/GRECO moved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships as specified in January Agenda Attachment D.1.

   LUCKETT noted that the text being presented here is slightly different from that introduced in December, which we postponed. Changes were made due to feedback from various members of the administration. The aim is to investigate academic freedom in
international partnerships. The thinking behind this proposal comes in part from last year’s discussion of the Confucius Institute, but it is not limited to that specific case. In that discussion difficulties arose in part because we had no distinct policy on the subject. LUCKETT had learned from Ron WITCZAK, Executive Director of International Affairs, that in forming contracts for international collaborations he had been including in many of them language concerning academic freedom. There is, however, no general policy. Other universities across the nation have been developing such policies; UNESCO had produced a well-researched report. The committee would look at best practices in this field and make recommendations to Faculty Senate. The Internationalization Council, which is also interested in this topic, is an administrative committee; what’s proposed here is specifically a Faculty Senate committee. LUCKETT clarified that the proposal is not about students, but about faculty: faculty from abroad coming here, and our faculty going abroad, with respect to safeguarding academic freedom for those participating in the partnership.

BROWN: there have been major differences among colleges about expectations. It will difficult for one committee to capture the breadth of those differences.

The motion was approved (28 yes, 3 no, 11 abstain, by show of hands). LUCKETT resumed the gavel.

2. Constitutional amendment on opt-out elections

LUCKETT reviewed the status: the proposed constitutional amendment as found in January Agenda Attachment D.2 was introduced in December. Today, changes could not be entertained unless the vote on the final text were postponed till the next meeting. The Advisory Council had suggested two stylistic changes, which were (in LUCKETT’s view) not substantive. The proposed amendment would return the process for Faculty Senate elections to an “opt-out” model for candidacy. LUCKETT urged senators consider this as a genuine question; there were advantages and disadvantages to both systems. The advantage of the opt-in model is a more committed group of candidates. The advantage of the opt-out model is avoiding having too few candidates, which has been a problem in some divisions in recent years. The Advisory Council’s suggested changes have to do with reference to the “certified” list of Faculty, which is defined elsewhere in the Constitution; the other has to do with an ambiguity in the word “final.”

It was asked: Is there a third option? LUCKETT: what might this might be? The proposal is in effect for a primary election followed by a final election. There has to be a first round to narrow the field down to a manageable pool. HINES suggested that a third option could be that if a unit does not provide enough candidates, they are switched to an opt-out system. TAYLOR observed that the opt-out model would perhaps mean that new candidates might become involved. He was, however, confused by the terminology about “nomination” as opposed to “election.” BEYLER: there is another paragraph about the final election not stated in the proposal because it is unchanged. This is what LUCKETT meant by a “primary” election—called here the nomination stage—followed by the main election. Everyone is in the pool unless they opt out; there is a first round to choose two times X nominations for X open positions; then a final election.

HANSEN asked about the “no earlier” language for the timing of elections: is it intended to provide a two-week window, or could it be less than that? BEYLER: yes. The
language was transcribed from a previous version of the Constitution. As a practical matter, there has to be a certain amount of lead time between the two stages.

KARAVANIC suggested a system whereby if there are not sufficient opt-in candidates for a division, everyone becomes a candidate. LUCKETT: there will always be cases in which individuals have to opt-out, but ordinarily there is the assumption that Faculty are available for service. We don’t want to compel people to serve who genuinely can’t. GRECO liked KARAVANIC’s idea, but with the proviso that people who needed to could opt out. Why should units where there is a slate of interested candidates be compelled to change the model for units where there are not sufficient candidates? To prevent the same people serving all the time, the time before re-election could be increased from one year to, say, three. BEYLER: if we entertain changes, we can vote on those on those but not vote on the final wording till February. LUCKETT: or we could simply vote it down. GRECO: could we table it? BEYLER: if we don’t pass something by February, the change will not take effect this year. CLARK: can we change the form of the amendment today? LUCKETT: we had the opportunity to make changes in December. What is allowable today is an up-or-down vote.

PALMITER understood that the opt-out is being proposed because of certain units lacking candidates. If these units have decided that they do not want to be represented, why do we want to force them? Instead, we should emphasize to deans, department chairs, etc.: your unit is being represented. She disliked forcing people to serve as senators. LUCKETT: it’s not a matter of forcing anyone, because they can always opt out. GRECO: if there are units there are underrepresented, those units can say, or administrators can say: Senate is forcing units to follow decisions they didn’t participate in. It is a problem that it has been suggested that Senate lacks legitimacy because units don’t participate, and then they don’t want to follow the rules. The goal is to make sure Senate has strong representation. THIEMAN was in favor of changing the model; opt-out is more equitable and fosters more voices being heard.

WOODS asked if this applied to committee appointments as well. BEYLER: no, just elections. WOODS: on the committees, if units are not represented that means the workload falls on those who are represented, and negatively impacts the work. KARAVANIC said that Committee on Committees [CoC] is separately discussing this parallel issue. BEYLER said the Constitution empowers CoC to staff constitutional committees; how they do so is entirely up to them. The practice has been to distribute a survey which functions as a kind of opt-in procedure, but there’s no constitutional requirement for this.

It was asked if departments themselves could make the choice. PALMITER: we now have five options for possible modifications, but it appears we have to vote yes or no. Can we pursue other options if we vote no? [Crosstalk.] LUCKETT: yes, we can consider other options if we vote this down. CLARK asked for a simple restatement of the problem this is intended to solve. LUCKETT: to get a sufficient number of candidates, which has been a problem in some divisions. Also, to get new candidates. The problem it might create is senators who are unenthusiastic about serving.

The proposed amendment was not approved by the necessary two-thirds majority (30 yes, 16 no, 2 abstain).
BEYLER: as LUCKETT had stated, it would now be possible to pursue other options; however, as a practical matter, they would not take effect this year. He noted that as of this meeting, one division would be under-represented in Senate because a seat had become vacant and we have exhausted the list of candidates from last year. It was asked: which division? BEYLER: the School of Business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals – consent agenda

The new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs listed in January Agenda Attachment E.1 were approved as part of the consent agenda, there having been no objection before the end of Roll Call.

2. Proposed revision of UNST Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal (UNST Council)

LUPRO/EMERY moved the revision of the University Studies [UNST] Ethics and Social Responsibility Goal as specified in January Agenda Attachment E.2. DAVIDOVA, UNST Council chair, gave the background. The proposed change is both to title [to Ethics, Agency, and Community] and to content of one of the four curricular goals for UNST. Since 2015, UNST Council has been talking about revising the various goals in accord with the UNST mission statement and PSU Strategic Plan. Faculty Senate approved a change to the diversity goal in 2017. A new subcommittee began work on the Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal, including a review of scholarly literature, forums, and on-line survey. The rationale is to improve outdated and opaque language, and reconsider some concrete and narrow pedagogical prescriptions. UNST Council sees the new proposal as more consistent with changing curriculum, more appropriate to student demographics, and more inclusive in language.

DAVIDOVA introduced Randy SPENCER (co-chair of the subcommittee) for additional comment. SPENCER called attention to the summary of rationales and outcomes contained in the proposal [Attachment E.2].

HOLT, as someone who teaches Sophomore Inquiry and cluster classes, was pleased to see this revision: it keeps the spirit of the goal, but allows teachers to teach it as they want, rather than dictating pedagogy.

LUCKETT noted that this proposal is distinct from the campus-wide learning outcomes.

PALMITER wished to clarify that the change is only to one sentence and the new title. She wished for perhaps and example of how the changed sentence better. The rationale is that the previous language is vague. SPENCER said that one problem was, for example, the reference to group work–this led to students reducing the goal down to that aspect. This showed up in assessments. Qualitatively, they wanted to convey that ethics may include a more communitarian frame of reference. Adding agency to the title emphasizes responsibility and possibility to make ethical choices. DAVIDOVA: the change highlights the role of decision-making, as well as local and global communities.

CARPENTER said that changing the title and definition sets a number of things into motion: reviewing work, rubrics, exemplary assignments. It’s a matter of actualizing the goal within the classroom. The semantic change is impetus for other work.

NEWLANDS appreciated the work that had gone into this; she was delighted to see it.
THIEMAN was drawn to the previous title (Ethics & Social Responsibility), but liked the inclusion of choice and of local and global communities: it is more communicative.

HANSEN asked about the campus-wide learning outcomes. LUCKETT: there are eight of them; the first four are modelled after the UNST goals, but they are independent. HANSEN: so the campus-wide learning outcomes don’t drive what units are doing? LUCKETT: that may be something to revisit later. Units may have programmatically specific learning goals.

BROWN: in the second text, we see action–measurable things that students can do. She appreciated the reference to agency in the title; working with human-centered design, for example, she found the package very relevant. LUCKETT noted that agency is a sociological concept on which there is an extensive literature.

LUPRO thanked the committee for over a year of work. Analogizing from the previous goal revision, he saw it as a teaching opportunity in that, for example, not all students may be familiar with the concept of “agency.” In exploring it they can advance their understanding of their place in the world and the curriculum.

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

BEYLER overheard someone asking “Where are the clickers?” Voting in Senate is by secret ballot–which we had done using clickers–if [and only if] requested by five senators. There had not yet been such a request.

F. QUESTION PERIOD – see above, item B.1

G. REPORTS

1. Provost’s report

JEFFORDS hoped they had seen the solicitation for nominations for the annual [faculty] excellence awards.

She gave an update on various administrative searches. The search for Dean of SSW is progressing; we hope to have candidates on campus in February, and the committee is currently reviewing portfolios. In the search for the Dean of CLAS, there was been a delay in the process. It had been planned to launch the search in November, but following inquiries from some department chairs, and after meeting with chairs in December, she had decided to delay launch until spring term. A concern was that, the search not having been launched early in the fall, we might not have the candidate pool we hoped for. She also heard support for the current leadership as we are navigating a difficult situation, rather than recruiting candidates into that difficult situation.

CARLSON is willing to continue as interim dean. We intended to launch the search for the Dean of the Library in 2019, and are continuing on that path. The other search is for a new position, Vice President of Enrollment Management, with this role now separated from student affairs. We are working with a search firm that has expertise in this field; the committee has had its first meetings, an announcement will be appearing soon. She [JEFFORDS] is chairing the search.

JEFFORDS said that there was not good news coming from Salem about the budget, but mixed information–mixed about the degree of negativity. She planned to soon to share
with deans and academic leadership instructions to begin budget conversations and processes. She would share copies of this letter with the Budget Committee.

She wishes to think about the structure of the Office of Academic Affairs [OAA]. She did not see it as responsible to create new positions, but also wished to have faculty engagement with OAA. She therefore wished to revive the idea of faculty fellows serving in OAA as “Leadership Fellows”; and soon would be sending out a solicitation. At least one of these would be on the topic of assessment.

JEFFORDS had recently made a trip to China with other faculty and staff members: a visit to the Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications. There had been great faculty engagement in developing this potential partnership involving high-quality students. She had opportunity to meet with the deputy director of Hanban, which oversees the Confucius Institute; she shared the resolution and the concerns of Faculty Senate, had they had a robust conversation about those issues. The contract is being reviewed by the General Counsel’s office.

BROWN asked about news reports regarding [problems for] Chinese students to study here. JEFFORDS said these concerns came up in conversations with Chinese institutions. We are trying stay on top of the situation

2. **Report of Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies**

MCLELLAN reported that the registration for grantsmanship training this morning, for graduate students, filled up within two hours. They have also announced Washington Fellows Training, which will take junior faculty to meet with grant managers.

Two new research centers are up and running, pending approval here, he reported.

MCLELLAN reported on the budget situation in the research office: they had been operating under an infusion of one-time dollars which was no longer available. In combination with the Governor’s projected state allocation, this meant a hit of around $700,000, about 10%. The operating budget had been adjusted accordingly. This will lead to a re-evaluation of procedures: how best to deliver service to faculty.

MCLELLAN noted that new Federal guidelines for human subjects review are coming into effect, which will change some of the ways we do things in human subjects research.

In addition to the excellence awards noted by JEFFORDS, there is a new award being offered: the Presidential Career Research Award, to recognize faculty who are at the top of their career and receiving national and international attention.

MCLELLAN solicited nomination of a senator to be a member of the Research Council, which is being reactivated.

He suggested that open access publication will be a topic that needs to be considered, especially in view of the European Union’s plan S, which mandating open access publications for public-funded research. This will impact about 20% of faculty in the US.

KARAVANIC asked about consequences of the federal government shutdown.

MCLELLAN: the NSF [National Science Foundation] shutdown obviously affects anyone who is waiting to hear about an award. Someone who’s already received an award should expect that to be set up. With the move to Kuali Research platform,
proposals should be submitted as usual, but that we shouldn’t expect any processing on the NSF side. KARAVANIC: the dilemma is that we can’t speak to program directors, but still have to follow deadlines. MCLELLAN: correct; it’s a challenge.

LUCKETT asked for comment on the draft policy on principal investigators [PIs] [January Packet Attachment G.2]. MCLELLAN said that this is being driven by NSF program managers, who are pushing that grants submitted by the University must be for someone employed by the University; the University must have some kind of leverage to ensure good behavior in the management of the grant. Certain directorates have been especially adamant, but we are having this conversation will all program managers. There will be a way to petition for exceptions for long-term prior arrangements.

DOLIDON said an issue with open source publication is that it is not commonly accepted for promotion because it is not peer reviewed. MCLELLAN: there are many peer-reviewed open-source journals. DOLIDON was referring to textbooks, for example. We are encouraged to do this kind of work, but it goes into the service portion of the CV. MCLELLAN acknowledged that this is a dilemma. He had participated in a workshop with around thirty universities, and representatives from NSF, NIH, and the White House. They know this is a game-changer, particularly the push by the European Union. Their view is that publishers will move more into data curation or data management, because this also comes from expectations of granting agencies. We will need to have a conversation about philosophy: will we be a closed campus, where our data is private, or an open campus? In both cases, we have to adjust to sponsor requirements, but philosophically this is a huge issue. Publishers see this wave coming. LUCKETT said we are working along with the Library on a proposal for action on this topic.

3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate report

CLARK presented a brief report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate [IFS], deferred from December. (Responding to questions, BEYLER indicated that PSU’s three representatives as of January are POPP, MCBRIDE, and O’BANION on an interim basis, CLARK having stepped down effective this month.)

CLARK said that IFS, with representative from the seven public universities, meets to discuss state-wide higher education issues. They seek to understand legislative initiatives, meet with legislators, etc. BEYLER noted that the senior representative–now POPP–serves ex-officio on Steering Committee.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 p.m.
To: Susan Jeffords, Provost  
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate  
(Thomas Luckett, Presiding Officer; Richard Beyler, Secretary)  
Date: 10 January 2019  
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

At its regular meeting on 7 January 2019, Faculty Senate approved the curricular consent agenda with the new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs given in Attachment E.1 to the January Agenda.

01-11-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs.

The Senate also voted to approve:

• Creation of an Ad-Hoc Committee on International Partnerships, as specified in Attachment D.2;
  01-11-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the creation of the Ad-Hoc Committee

• Revision of the Ethics and Responsibility Goal for University Studies, and its renaming as Ethics, Agency, and Community, as specified in Attachment E.2.
  01-11-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the revision and renaming of the goal.

Best regards,

Thomas M. Luckett  
Presiding Officer

Richard H. Beyler  
Secretary to the Faculty

Susan Jeffords, Ph.D.  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
January 15, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Mark Woods
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: February 2019 Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal, as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals, by going to the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS) Curriculum Dashboard (https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard) to access and review proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**

**E.1.a.1**
- *Ch 512a MODULE: Coordination Chemistry, 2 credits
  An exploration of bonding in metal complexes and the effect that bonding has on the properties of the complex. Including topics are: crystal field theory, molecular orbital theory, ligand field theory, pi-bonding, the chelate effect, electron counting. Prerequisite: Ch 511.

**E.1.a.2**
- *Ch 512b MODULE: Bioinorganic Chemistry, 2 credits
  This course examines the way in which coordination chemistry and biochemistry intersect. It will examine how the choice and/or coordination of particular metals affords properties beneficial to biological systems. Prerequisite: Ch 512a.

**School of Social Work**

**Changes to Existing Courses**

**E.1.a.3**
- SW 511 Foundation Field Placement and Seminar, 1-4 credits – change course description and change title to Field Seminar and Field Placement

**E.1.a.4**
- SW 512 Advanced Field Placement, 1-4 credits – change course description

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 400-level section please refer to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consent agenda memo.
January 15, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Drake Mitchell
        Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: February 2019 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 Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS) Curriculum Dashboard (https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard) to access and review proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.1
- Arch 225 Digital Graphics, 4 credits – change course description

E.1.b.2
- Mus 191 Group Lessons for Beginners, 2 credits – change title to Group Lessons for Beginners I: Piano, Guitar or Voice

E.1.b.3
- Mus 192 Group Lessons for Beginners, 2 credits – change title to Group Lessons for Beginners II: Piano, Guitar or Voice

E.1.b.4
- Mus 193 Group Lessons for Beginners, 2 credits – change title to Group Lessons for Beginners III: Piano, Guitar or Voice

E.1.b.5
- Mus 241 Composition I, 2 credits – change title to Composition II

E.1.b.6
- Mus 242 Composition I, 2 credits – change title to Composition III

E.1.b.7
- Mus 271 Jazz Improvisation, 2 credits – change title to Jazz Improvisation I

E.1.b.8
- Mus 272 Jazz Improvisation, 2 credits – change title to Jazz Improvisation II

E.1.b.9
- Mus 273 Jazz Improvisation, 2 credits – change title to Jazz Improvisation III

E.1.b.10
- Mus 291 Advanced Class Piano, 2 credits – change title to Advanced Class Piano I

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.

E.1.b.11
- Mus 292 Advanced Class Piano, 2 credits – change title to Advanced Class Piano II
E.1.b.12
- Mus 293 Advanced Class Piano, 2 credits – change title to Advanced Class Piano III

**Drop Existing Courses**

E.1.b.13
- Mus 185 Guitar Orchestra, 1 credit
E.1.b.14
- Mus 235 Wind and Percussion Instruments, 1 credit
E.1.b.15
- Mus 316 Harmonic and Structural Analysis, 2 credits
E.1.b.16
- Mus 319 Choral Arranging, 2 credits
E.1.b.17
- Mus 332 String Instruments and Vocal Techniques, 1 credit
E.1.b.18
- Mus 334 Vocal and Guitar Techniques, 1 credit
E.1.b.19
- Mus 385 Guitar Orchestra, 1 credit

**School of Business**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.20
- Actg 421 Introduction to Taxation, 4 credits – change course description and change title to Taxation
E.1.b.21
- Mktg 448 Digital Media Planning and Design, 4 credits – change course description and change title to Digital Media Planning and Analytics

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Course**

E.1.b.22
- *Ch 412a MODULE: Coordination Chemistry, 2 credits
  An exploration of bonding in metal complexes and the effect that bonding has on the properties of the complex. Including topics are: crystal field theory, molecular orbital theory, ligand field theory, pi-bonding, the chelate effect, electron counting. Prerequisite: Ch 411.

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
E.1.b.23
- *Ch 412b MODULE: Bioinorganic Chemistry, 2 credits
  This course examines the way in which coordination chemistry and biochemistry intersect. It will examine how the choice and/or coordination of particular metals affords properties beneficial to biological system. Prerequisite: Ch 412a.

E.1.b.24
- ChLa 345 Public Art: Mexican-American/Chicano Muralism, 4 credits
  Introduces the historical background of public art and mural creation from the mural movement origins in Mexico to current community mural movements in the United States. Identifies a wide range of mural styles and trends. Considers practical information, skills, and techniques. Applies this base knowledge to formulate and evaluate a personal approach to mural art in the development of a mural proposal. Create along with the instructor a local mural project and/or public art project.

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.b.25
- *Span 421 Major Topics: Peninsular Prose, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.26
- *Span 422 Major Topics: Peninsular Drama, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.27
- *Span 423 Major Topics: Peninsular Poetry, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.28
- *Span 427 Major Topics: Latin American Prose, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.29
- *Span 428 Major Topics: Latin American Drama, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.30
- *Span 429 Major Topics: Latin American Poetry, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.31
- *Span 430 Major Topics: Ibero-American Film, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.32
- *Span 434 Major Topics: Peninsular Multiple Genres, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.33
- *Span 436 Major Topics: Latin American Multiple Genres, 4 credits – change prerequisites

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
Proposal: Ad Hoc Committee on Open-Access Publication

Open-access* policies have become an important method in academia in supporting faculty research and scholarship. Examples of benefits to faculty in adopting an open access (OA) policy include:

- Open distribution of research increases the impact of a faculty member’s work. Studies have documented that articles available through open access are cited significantly more often.
- Open access policies enable greater discoverability and accessibility by other researchers and the public.
- Allow authors to retain certain rights to their works, without the need for the faculty member to negotiate directly with publishers while preserving author choice, consistency with copyright law, and academic freedom.
- Many funding agencies are requiring that the results of funded research be made publicly accessible upon publication. Having an OA policy and process in place makes faculty compliance with these requirements easier for the faculty member.

Motion recommended by the Senate Steering Committee:

An Ad Hoc Committee on Open-Access Publication shall be created to review PSU’s current open-access policies, to examine best practices in policies governing open-access publication, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the University regarding the development or revision of such a policy at Portland State. The Ad Hoc Committee on Open-Access Publication will make specific recommendations to Faculty Senate on these issues:

- The varieties of open-access policies that are currently in effect at other institutions, and which one is to be recommended for Portland State.
- Whether different policies are needed regarding the open-access publication of scholarship and the open-access publication of data.
- How open access publication should be counted toward tenure, promotion, merit, and post-tenure review, and whether Portland State’s Promotion & Tenure Guidelines need to be amended in this regard.
- The development of a FAQ to inform PSU faculty of the issues considered by the committee. This FAQ should include topics such as rationale for recommending or not recommending an open access policy, OA models considered, the impact on faculty copyright, and resources available when choosing venue of publication.
- Strategies for all departmental faculty serving on P&T committees to increase their understanding of the scholarly communication system and how openness has become one of its cornerstones.
The ad hoc committee will consist of six to eight members chosen by the Committee on Committees from among nominations by heads of academic units and self-nominations by faculty. The Committee should include members with expertise in intellectual property issues. The Committee shall also invite consultants with professional expertise, as needed, from departments such as Legal Counsel and Research and Graduate Studies. The ad hoc committee will present an interim report to Faculty Senate by the end of academic year 2018-2019, and a final report in academic year 2019-2020.

*For the purpose of this charge, we will use the definition of open access as defined by the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition: “Open Access is the free, immediate, online availability of research articles coupled with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment. Open Access ensures that anyone can access and use these results—to turn ideas into industries and breakthroughs into better lives.” Other forms of publication besides articles will also be considered.
To: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty  
12/28/18

Question for Administrators

In view of budgetary pressures described by President Shoureshi and the hold on faculty hires now in place at several PSU schools and colleges, is the practice of administrators returning to faculty positions at their full administrative salaries under review?

Paying full salaries to administrators after they return to schools and colleges reduces funds available for other faculty lines and increases salary inequities that PSU has sought to reduce in recent AAUP-PSU contracts.

Submitted for the January 7, 2019 meeting [postponed till February – Secretary]

Robert C Liebman, Senator
Question for the Provost

The following question was submitted by Faculty Senator Drake Mitchell on 28 January 2019 for the Faculty Senate meeting on 4 February 2019

As you are aware by now, this fall the Dean of the Graduate School paused applications to the Physics Ph.D. program without any consultation with the Physics Department. We would like Senate to know that after responses from Physics faculty, and Senate and PSU-AAUP leaders, the pause has been lifted.

Question: Can we get assurances from you, as the chief academic officer, that this was an unfortunate mistake, and that the faculty of PSU can expect there will never again be a violation of faculty shared governance of this sort?
Academic Calendar Meeting (ACC) Meeting Notes

Date: December 19, 2018
Attendees: Cindy Baccar, Michele Toppe, Shelly Chabon, David Hansen, Amanda Nguyen, Yohlunda Mosley

Topic/Discussion/Considerations:
Fall 2019 term start date (Monday Sept. 30th) falls on the first day of Rosh Hashanah

The ACC engaged in a review of historical academic calendar patterns, looked at other OPU calendar practices, and considered the issue of altering the fall 2019 term start such that the first day of classes does not fall on one of the days of the Jewish holiday of Rosh Hashanah.

Recommendation #1: Rather than altering the start date of fall term, we continue to rely on the PSU Religious Accommodations Policy (RAP) to provide students with the flexibility to make personal choices with regard to their religious observance.
While no single thing was dipositive with regard to our recommendation, some of the considerations included:

- Starting fall term a day or two late would reduce the number of teaching days down to 45 or 46, when winter and spring have 49 teaching days.
- Starting the term a day or two early, at this late date is not possible for fall '19 given all the events/planning commitments already made.
- Starting the term a day or two early in future years comes with a set of implications that would need to be explored:
  - Faculty and GA contracts – would such a change raise any contractual questions?
  - Housing, Orientation and Welcome Week planning
  - Financial Aid distribution patterns
  - Disruption of the regular cadence/pattern of the term start/flow would likely introduce a measure of confusion to the community, especially for long term planning.
- Relying on the RAP avoids having to reckon with determining which major holidays of which religions warrant class closure, for which parts of a term (1st day? Finals?) and who decides?

Recommendation #2:
Initiate a purposeful communication campaign from either the Provost or OGDI (or combined) to ensure students, faculty and staff are aware of the RAP in general, and the particular circumstances of fall 2019.

Because this particular year, this particular holiday falls on both the Monday and Tuesday of week 1 of fall term, there is a special need and opportunity for PSU to re-focus attention on the RAP, by creating communication campaigns for both students, faculty and staff. This is seen as a good way to reflect, promote and reinforce the broad diversity values that PSU is committed to, and to remind faculty and others of the RAP policy and the need to be attentive to these
sorts of needs/requests from students and staff – throughout the term. Perhaps such campaigns should occur at the beginning of each new academic term, to ensure new students are aware of the policy, and to remind faculty to be aware/alert to such circumstances.

**Recommendation #3:** Consult with OGDI to determine if a review of the RAP is in order, to see if any clarification or more explicit guidance needs to be added, as it might relate to specific parts of a term or certain religious practices such as fasting, attendance, etc.
Dear Colleagues,

The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) for the 2018-2019 academic year includes 16 members from across campus, and the submission deadline is February 16, 2019.

In the fall, a group of the FDC members met to review the call for proposals, rubric to evaluate proposals, and the process for collecting the proposals. For the call, revisions to better clarify the requirements and items that would and would not be funded were made, along with improving its formatting. A template was also created and linked to the call, so individuals applying for these funds would have further guidance regarding the components required for a complete proposal.

Regarding the rubric, language in its dimension of “Impact of the research on the PI's career development, professional development, or scholarly agenda” was revised to better support faculty at the rank of full professor.

The Google Form used to collect proposals received the most attention. Based on feedback from both last year’s applicants and FDC members, it was indicated that having the proposals uploaded as one document instead of multiple parts would improve both the submission and review process. This year, the applicant’s name and email along with the title and abstract of his/her/their proposal is the only information that will be entered separate from the full proposal, which should follow the template provided in the call. One additional change to the Google Form based on feedback from last year regarded the publishing of the proposals that were funded. In response, this year’s Google Form includes a question that asks, “If funded, will you allow the FDC to publish your name, the name of your proposal, and your abstract to a PSU website?” At this point, 100% of individuals who submitted a proposal gave permission to publish that information.

The official call was sent out on December 7, 2018. Once the February 16th deadline passes, the FDC co-chairs will begin the review process, and they anticipate notifications being sent out in mid-May.

If any member of the Faculty Senate has additional questions or concerns about this year’s FDC or its process for collecting, reviewing, and funding proposals, they are encouraged to contact one of the co-chairs: Todd Cherner (tcherner@pdx.edu) and Kathi Ketcheson bukk@pdx.edu.