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Nominations for 2019-20
Presiding Officer Elect
To: Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
From: Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty  

Faculty Senate will meet on 6 May 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in Cramer Hall 53.

AGENDA

A. Roll Call and Consent Agenda [see also E.1, G.5-10]
   * 1. Minutes of the 1 April 2019 meeting – Consent Agenda  
   * 2. Minutes of the 22 April 2019 special meeting – Consent Agenda  
   * 3. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for April – Consent Agenda

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

C. Discussion: None

D. Unfinished Business
   * 1. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center (EPC)

E. New Business
   * 1. Curricular proposals (UCC) – Consent Agenda

F. Question Period: None

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   1. President’s report  
   2. Provost’s report  
   3. Report of Associate Vice President, Global Diversity & Inclusion
   * 4. Report of Student President, ASPSU
   * 5. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee – Consent Agenda
   * 6. Annual Report of Honors Council – Consent Agenda
   * 7. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board – Consent Agenda
   * 8. Annual Report of Scholastic Standards Committee– Consent Agenda
   * 10. Annual Report of University Writing Council– Consent Agenda

H. Adjournment

* See the following attachments.
   A.1. Minutes of the meeting of 1 April 2019 – Consent Agenda
   A.2. Minutes of the special meeting of 22 April 2019 – Consent Agenda
   A.3. April Notice of Senate Actions and OAA Response – Consent Agenda
D.1. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center
E.1.b. Curricular proposals (summaries) [note: there is no E.1.a] – Consent Agenda.

Complete curricular proposals are on-line:

G.4. ASPSU Annual Report
G.5. GSAC Annual Report – Consent Agenda
G.6. HC Annual Report – Consent Agenda
G.7. IAB Annual Report – Consent Agenda
G.8. SSC Annual Report – Consent Agenda
G.9. USC Annual Report – Consent Agenda
G.10. UWC Annual Report – Consent Agenda
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Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 April 2019

Presiding Officer: Thomas Luckett
Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators Present:

Alternates Present:
Brad Hansen for Dillard, Max Nielsen-Pincus for George, Maude Hines for Reese, Steven Boyce for Thanheiser.

Senators Absent:
Fountain, Henderson, Martinez Thompson, Mathwick, Matlick, McBride, Recktenwald, Sorensen, Thieman.

Ex-officio Members Present:
Allen, Beyler, Bielavitz, Boyce (also as alternate), Bynum, Carlson, Chang, Clark, Davidova, Duh, Hines (also as alternate), Jaén Portillo, Jeffords, Percy, Popp, Shoureshi, Woods, Zonoozy.

[Note: item G.1, President’s Report, was moved to follow B.1.]

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.
   1. Minutes of the 4 March 2019 meeting were approved as part of the Consent Agenda.
   2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for March was received as part of the Consent Agenda.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

LUCKETT pointed out three annual reports in the Packet: from Institutional Assessment Council, Academic Advising Council, and Internationalization Council. Members of those committees were recognized.

LUCKETT said that it was possible that there might be journalists with cameras present. Previously, some senators expressed concerns about photos of them being taken and circulated. The Vanguard agreed that they would accommodate this; the Oregonian said also that we could contact them about such concerns.

Leadership of AAUP and Faculty Senate, LUCKETT said, had sent a joint letter to Governor Brown with recommendations for the Faculty member of the Board of Trustees when HINES’s term ends in June. AAUP and Faculty Senate leadership conducted independent surveys, both of which resulted in three names. Two names were common to both lists; the other two names, it was rapidly agreed, were also good candidates. Therefore four names were presented to the Governor: Michael CLARK (ENG), Linda GEORGE (ESM), G. L. A. HARRIS (PA), and Yves LABISSIERE (SPH). We believed
that any of them would be an excellent choice. He was grateful that there were highly qualified Faculty willing to take on this difficult job.

LUCKETT previously encouraged senators to read the Margolis Healy report on campus policing. Steering Committee plans to call a special session of Senate to discuss the report, probably on April 22nd.

LUCKETT contextualized April Agenda Attachment G.6, a draft of the proposed Copyright Policy. Two years ago an ad-hoc committee developed a draft policy on copyright, particularly looking at faculty control of research and syllabi. Senate recommended this policy. Office of General Counsel has come up with a new draft, with considerable changes from the earlier version. Brad HANSEN, who’s been involved in this, had concerns and invited senators’ feedback on the issue.

LUCKETT related an issue that had emerged during spring break. Our accrediting agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities [NWCCU], is undertaking a review of standards, and posted a draft revision for comment. One goal is streamlining; another is focusing on student success. Many clauses have been eliminated or condensed. Faculty leadership at several campuses noticed that clauses relating to academic freedom and faculty control of the curriculum had apparently been taken out, resulting in expressions of concern. NWCCU extended the comment deadline through April 15th. Steering Committee is working an a collective comment. There will be a second comment period in summer. This morning, LUCKETT said, he received a message from the NWCCU president, in which he said inter alia that based on feedback so far they had decided to include “appropriate language” on academic freedom and faculty governance. Bill Harbaugh at University of Oregon had suggested that NWCCU’s initial move was in response to pressure from the Department of Education, but LUCKETT sees no evidence for that.

FIORILLO asked if this is happening nationally. LUCKETT: no. FIORILLO thought it curious, then, that it’s happening in the Northwest. LUCKETT had asked NWCCU whether they knew of any Federal guidelines on this subject; the answer was no. If we want to advocate for academic freedom, we should say why it is important to student success.

LUCKETT encouraged senators to think about nominations for Steering Committee and Presiding Officer Elect. Both current senators and newly elected senators are eligible.

G. REPORTS

1. President’s report – moved here from its usual place

[For slides, see Appendix G.1.]

SHOURESHI wished senators a happy spring term and Nu Ruoz (Persian New Year).

On enrollment, SHOURESHI reported that for spring term the number of students is down 1.4%, credit hours down 1%, mostly for non-resident and graduate students. Colleges seeing increases are MCECS, COTA, SPH, and SB. He is more concerned about next fall, because completed applications and admissions are down 10% compared to last year, and deposits down 20%. We are stable in the number of transfer students.
SHOURESHI reported on the admitted students event on March 23rd, which had over 800 in attendance. There was good integration between admissions and the academic side. Enrollment Management is planning further activities—for example, buying names of high school sophomores and juniors, especially in Portland.

SHOURESHI expressed appreciation for organizers and attendees at the March 18th budget forum. The following day, he was in Salem meeting with legislative leadership. He conveyed that PSU is different from other state universities because of our demographics. Every dollar that the state contributes has a major impact; every dollar they do not provide is an increase in student debt. Jennifer Williamson, House Majority Leader, is an champion for PSU. We want legislators to see that we focus on opportunity, access, and success. But we have to work on retention and graduation. Every percentage point increase in retention translates into at least $1 million in revenue.

He reminded senators that April 16th is PSU day at the Capitol.

SHOURESHI understood that later in the session there would be consideration of a resolution [E.2]. He understood the concerns [of faculty]; it is also a concern for him. In forty years in academia, he had never faced something like this. The documents provided to the media are public, and will be made available to Steering Committee or whatever body Senate determines. We are at PSU because we believe in truth and the value of facts. The facts as shown in the documents are very different from the representations in the Oregonian article. He would be more than happy to answer any questions from senators. As he said at the March meeting, he has nothing to hide. His intention is to make sure PSU is successful and make sure our students are successful. He respected the plans for a reasonable, responsible, and collegial approach.

SHOURESHI acknowledged that budget uncertainties had created anxiety—also for him. We are trying to fill a gap of $20-26 million for next year. What are the immediate, short-term, and long-term pictures?

Referring to slide 8, SHOURESHI broke down state funding as related to mission and outcome. This is why, for example, OIT gets roughly three times per student than PSU. In the minds of the legislature, a focus on engineering and technology costs more. There are also funds from other state programs [slide 9]. For example, PSU has received $3.2 million annually from the Engineering Technology Sustaining Funds, from Oregon Solutions $1.2 million; from the Sports Lottery, $1.1 million [slide 10]–altogether roughly $5 million. The Governor’s proposed budget zeroes these. Over five years, the Oregon Opportunity Grant has provided $28 million [slide 11]. Total budget for PSU for 2017-18 was around $577 million, as compared to over $1 billion for U of O and over $1.2 billion for OSU [slide 12]. Of PSU’s roughly 28,000 students, around 21,000 are Oregonians. PSU’s annual tuition is $2100 and $2600 less than U of O and OSU, respectively. Multiplying those numbers gives a difference of $43-$58 million. They benefit by charging more, but PSU wants to remain an access university, and has a majority of in-state students. OSU is in a position to not raise tuition more than 5%.

SHOURESHI: we have to convince legislators to invest more in PSU as the access university educating Oregonians. PSU’s story is supporting low-income students.
SHOURESHI continued: we are looking at all kinds of cost containment measures. There is an Efficiency Task Force looking into resource use. Hiring must be strategic. We have eliminated some administrative positions and frozen administrative salaries.

SHOURESHI included among long-term strategies co-ops, innovative degree programs, and fundraising [slide 17]. Increasing retention will also have an impact. Fundraising has had success [slide 18].

SHOURESHI noted upcoming changes in the Board of Trustees: in addition to the faculty member, these include the staff member and three community positions.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS – continued

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER reminded senators about the opt-in survey for Faculty elections, now open. Several divisions currently lacked sufficient candidates for Senate.

C. DISCUSSION – none

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals – Consent Agenda

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 objection before the end of Roll Call.

2. Resolution requesting information on administrative leadership (Steering)

GRECO/CLARK moved the resolution as stated in April Agenda Attachment E.2. LUCKETT gave some background: Steering Committee members had been contacted by several Faculty members asking Senate to look further in some way—though are a variety of possible ways to proceed—into the circumstances that led to the publication of Jeff Manning’s article [on March 3rd]. Steering Committee discussed possible over a week. Simultaneously, AAUP Executive Council issued a statement that they are reserving judgment, and that more information was needed. LUCKETT believed this reflected also the feeling in Steering Committee. A survey of anonymous origin was circulated, which received a fair number of signatures, calling for an item on this topic to be added to the Senate agenda. The result of the petition was never actually presented to Senate leadership. In any event, the point became moot because Steering Committee was deciding on such an agenda item. LUCKETT explained that a petition of a sufficient number of Faculty [10%] can place an item on the agenda.

LUCKETT said resolution sought Senate’s support to ask the Office of General Counsel to provide Steering Committee with the documents given to the Oregonian so that we can form our own judgment. Steering Committee was here not advising Senate what to do, but rather seeking the advice of Senate, which could be expressed in a variety of ways. The resolution could be voted for or against, amended, or postponed.
LUCKETT reminded senators that the Board had commissioned two audits, one on financial and one on personnel matters. He understood that once these were completed at least executive summaries would be presented.

GRECO supported the motion: we need to look at facts and not make a [premature] judgment. She wanted to see the same documents as the Oregonian. At a minimum there is problem of perception; if it is only a problem of perception, the only way to put it to rest is for Faculty to look at the facts and come to a conclusion.

BEYLER stated that he had received five requests that voting be by secret ballot–namely, by clickers–and so this would be the practice for the remainder of the year.

The resolution as given in April Agenda Attachment E.2 was approved (45 yes, 5 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

LUPRO observed the documents would go to Steering, and asked what the outcome would be: a summary to Senate? LUCKETT said that remained to be determined by Senate. The point of this motion was to obtain the document. In fact anyone could submit a document request and obtain them, but Steering Committee believed it would be helpful to have a mandate from Senate.

3. New program proposal: Minor in Climate Change Science and Adaptation (CLAS via UCC)

EMERY/MITCHELL moved approval of the proposal as summarized in Attachment E.3 and specified in the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS).

LUCKETT recognized Paul LOIKITH (GGR) to give background. The minor was put together jointly by Geography and Environmental Science and Management. It combines physical science and policy studies, reflected in two tracks. It has a critical mass of courses for a robust minor, drawing on several departments, not only the above two.

KARAVANIC asked if they had considered courses from Civil and Environmental Engineering. LOIKITH: yes. Most of the relevant courses were at the graduate level, and for undergraduate courses there were often prerequisites that created issues [for the minor]. noted that institutional economics is also of interest to many historians.

The motion was approved (46 yes, 2 no, 1 abstain).

4. New program proposal: Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution (CLAS via GC)

WOODS made a distinction from a degree proposal. Conflict Resolution is currently doing an overhaul of their MA/MS program. CLARK/WATANABE moved the proposal as summarized in April Agenda Attachment E.4 and specified in OCMS.

WOODS said the aim of the certificate was to support retention of students by providing on- and off-ramps to the master’s degree program. For example, if they decided that they were not able to pursue the full MA/MS, this allowed for completion of another, smaller credential. It also provided Conflict Resolution credentials for other students on campus who did not wish obtain a full degree in the subject. This applied to people working in many fields. Graduate Council saw this as a low-risk proposal, since it didn’t depend on adding new courses; it would buttress the existing MA/MS program.

The motion was approved (45 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain).
5. New center proposal: Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative (EPC)

LUCKETT gave some background for this and the subsequent item. Last year President SHOURESHI organized a process by which faculty could propose new centers to receive start-up funding. Two were chosen from among many proposals, and announced at the beginning of October. There is at PSU a separate approval process for centers and institutes which goes through Faculty governance bodies, specifically Budget Committee [BC], Educational Policy Committee [EPC], and Senate. Next time we create such centers, we want to better integrate the approval processes. Now we’ve had the directors of the centers submit proposals to EPC, which has recommended approvals with provisions given in April Agenda Attachments E.5-6: acknowledgement from the administration that future proposals will follow this approval process; approval by Senate to any changes in the original scope of work; and annual reports to BC and EPC.

MAY/______ moved creation of a new center, the Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative, with conditions as specified by EPC recommendations in April Agenda Attachment E.5.

LUCKETT recognized Marisa ZAPATA, director of the center, to speak to the proposal. It is a multi- and interdisciplinary effort to address homelessness around PSU, the region, and the country. It seeks to bring people on campus together to think about innovative ways to prevent and address homelessness. Philanthropic gifts of around $940,000 had been received. Project ideas are coming in every day; stakeholders are desperate for faculty willing to work on these issues in the function or research and teaching. There is also opportunity for class projects.

JAMES asked if there is a detailed budget, including direct and indirect costs. ZAPATA: yes. LUCKETT: this had been submitted and approved by BC. ZAPATA said it included $500,000 per year from the University for three years. They had given BC several versions of the budget, from a modest version to a “unicorns and rainbows” scenario. LUCKETT noted that there was already a commitment from the administration of $1.5 million. ZAPATA: but no more than that.

ZONOOOZY voiced support. It was surprising that as a major urban research university we did not have it before. ZAPATA: it is [only] the second one in the country.

GRECO wondered if they were considering the increasing [rate of] homelessness among our student population. ZAPATA: one of the first projects aimed at better understanding homelessness among our students and staff. A study will be launched this summer about housing insecurity among students and staff, as well as how people living on our campus who are not necessarily part of PSU are using our resources in order to survive. They are putting together an application to try to leverage Federal dollars to provide relevant student services. SCHECHTER agreed that a focus on students is important. ZAPATA: it is essential. They had received interest from other campuses and community partners.

O’BANION asked if they were integrated with the groups working on food insecurity on campus. ZAPATA: yes, they are partnering with them.

KARAVANIC: since PCC faces some of the same issues, there might be a synergy working with them. ZAPATA agreed; they had been in touch with PCC about the project mentioned earlier, discussing how to obtain data and implement it. They were also
bringing in a national expert on the topic, and seeking ways to adapt relevant instruments from elsewhere—for example, University of Washington and Temple University.

The motion was approved (43 yes, 6 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

5. **New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center (EPC)**

KARAVANIC/ANDERSON moved creation of a new center, the *Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative*, with conditions as specified by EPC recommendations in *April Agenda Attachment E.6*.

LUCKETT said that unfortunately the director of the center, Jon FINK, was unable to be here. Upon a question by LUCKETT, D. MAIER said that although he was a member of the center, he didn’t wish to speak to the proposal comprehensively. He instead moved postponement of consideration until the May meeting; seconded by GRECO.

SCHECHTER observed that sometimes a delay like this, even if there are good intentions, can create blowback and anxiety. Do we know that the people concerned know that it is being postponed? D. MAIER: yes, the motion is at the request of the director of the center. LUCKETT confirmed this; however, if senators feel they are ready to vote today they can do so, but if they wait they can ask pertinent questions of FINK. GRECO believed it would be good to have someone who can speak to the proposal, because the findings [in the report] are mixed—for example, regarding specific educational and grant opportunities. She would like to hear how the center would answer these questions. BROWN: that the director wishes to postpone counts for a lot.

The motion to postpone was approved (40 yes, 6 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

F. **QUESTION PERIOD** – none

G. **REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

1. **President’s report** – moved above between items B.1 and B.2

2. **Provost’s Report**

Reverting to LUCKETT’s comments on NWCCU earlier, JEFFORDS noted that NWCCU are revisiting their and streamlining the process; in addition to the conversation about academic freedom, they are seeking feedback on the changes to the standards. The proposal is available OAA website; feedback can be provided to NWCCU directly or passed to Brian SANDLIN (OAA).

On accreditation, JEFFORDS said that she and Janelle VOEGELE were working with units developing assessment plans for student learning. The annual assessment update, a brief questionnaire, will be going out shortly. Then she will report how close we are to reaching the 50% goal. Last week, she met with visitor from the Council of Graduate Schools who had been invited here by Dean WOOSTER. They gave good feedback on best practices for graduate programs; however, they professed to be “shocked” about the status of assessment. The national standard is increasingly that graduate students expect to see information about outcomes for programs to which they are applying.

JEFFORDS reported on the search for the Dean of the School of Social Work. The first finalist was here today; the others would be coming over the next few days. One
committee member, an external community partner, said it was a point of pride that people of this caliber were finalists for the job.

JEFFORDS said that the search for a Vice-President of Enrollment Management is also moving forward. A review of candidates is not underway.

Another search, JEFFORDS said, is for the Dean of the Library. She met with Library faculty and staff regarding pros and cons of a national vs. an internal search. She believed that they would soon be moving forward with an internal search. WOOSTER had agreed to lead the search.

JEFFORDS is meeting with colleges to prepare for a 2.4% to 4% budget cut. She appreciates how painful those scenarios will be; however, given the numbers that SHOURESHI, short of dramatic changes from the state, we will need to address a budget shortfall. She’d also met with the co-chairs of BC, and looked forward to feedback from that committee. There are several possibilities to address budget, but one important way is to increase retention and graduation rates. This is part of our mission to academic integrity, but it also helps with our budget.

LYNN called attention to the upcoming forums for the SSW Dean search.

BROWN: given budget pressures, the earlier resolution [E.1], the Oregonian article, etc., is there a common talking point when candidates ask questions. JEFFORDS said this was a fair question. The search firm has asked the same thing. Her response would be that we are recruiting someone to PSU and to a particular school. The powerful draw here is this institution and its mission; the faculty, staff, and students of the school; the colleagues who are the deans; the work of this institution. We want to focus on that, not on newspaper articles. The draw isn’t one individual, it’s this place, what we stand for, and the work that we do. LYNN agreed. Another thing we talked about is that the Board is handling the issue. JEFFORDS agreed with the tenor of the previous discussion that it is not our place to jump to conclusions absent information and opportunity to deliberate. LYNN said that no one so far has asked about this. There was more interest in the accreditation issue. JEFFORDS: yes, she hears this everywhere she goes.

INGERSOLL appreciated the steps JEFFORDS had taken to communicate to students about accreditation. Are we also communicating with prospective students, especially given that confirmations are down 20%? JEFFORDS acknowledged that it is a good point. She will talk with the interim VP of Enrollment Management about getting right information in front of prospective students and families. She hopes to dispel uncertainties. She appreciated the deans who had come to the admitted students event.

3. Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council

Because of the current focus on assessment, LUCKETT had asked chair of the Institutional Assessment Council (IAC), Janelle VOEGELE, to discuss what departments can do and what Senate can do to help. [For slides, see Appendix G.3.]

VOEGELE gave some context to the current assessment situation. We are not starting from scratch. In 2014, IAC was recommissioned, and worked then with a consultant to do an institutional scan. It showed appreciation for groundwork on assessment, such as that by then-chair CARPENTER. But there were also concerns: consistency, expectations, and resources.
IAC created an action plan, VOGFELE continued. The first item was to work with partners to develop support structures and put processes in place for faculty. Then, they sought to identify relevant offices and clarify roles. Her office, OAI, provides resources but does not set policy. We now have a program assessment rubric and template, adapted from NWCCU; it clarifies what is expected in a program assessment plan. This is new, and we can expect further modifications. IAC, collaborating with OAA, modified the assessment guidelines in academic program review [APR], so that they are aligned, consistent, and transparent. IAC also provided feedback to departments on the assessment section of APR. OAI receives annual summaries, gives feedback, and suggests resources; it’s intended as formative. Departments shouldn’t have to wait seven years [for the accreditation cycle], or have to figure out each year what to do. The goal for the IAC website is to provide robust, vibrant resources—particularly usable examples.

Addressing the first of the two main questions, VOGFELE said senators should encourage districts, departments, and programs to make or revise assessment plans as soon as possible. Initial plans do not have to be perfect; often they are in progress, but this opens up a dialogue for progress. It’s also key to get early feedback as plans evolve; OAI is available to do this.

How can Faculty Senate help? VOGFELE noted things that are already happening. IAC is linking to appropriate Faculty committees. It’s hoped that assessment updates can continue, including sharing exciting work across campus. Senate should advocate approaches grounded in the assumptions of the learning organization. IAC appreciates the direct and specific way Senate has been addressing NWCCU directives; at the same time, it would be good if senators can articulate to colleagues how assessment enhances our work and values as an institution. What we need for reporting will be there as a result. We should celebrate what we are learning about ourselves as an institution.

SCHECHTER thanked VOGFELE and OIA for their approachable, instructive leadership. She appreciated the patient attitude. We don’t have to do this alone in our units; we have dedicated and talented people to help us. VOGFELE pointed to members of IAC also as helpful resources.

CLARK seconded SCHECHTER’s comment. How do we know when assessment is working? VOGFELE responded that, at the program level it’s a matter of collecting the appropriate evidence to answer the questions they want to ask—what is valuable for students? At the institutional level, IAC is working on a process whereby as we have more reports, we can make comparisons across programs and over years to show both similarities and differences. This will tell an institutional story.

C. MEYER wondered about examples, direct and indirect measures, etc. She was looking for a rubric. VOGFELE: it’s not called a rubric, but that’s essentially what it is.

GRECO thanked VOGFELE for saying that it’s always a work in progress. In her department she told people that perfection will paralyze us. We need to move forward, and it will get better. VOGFELE said that IAC definitely takes this stance. We want encourage the view that it’s OK to find something unexpected.
LUCKETT added that Ken AMES, former chair of Anthropology, once said that their departmental goal was to earn about a B, not an A. He saw this as a healthy attitude. D. MEIER: get rid of that incomplete! [Laughter and applause.]

The following two annual reports from committees were received as part of the Consent Agenda. See April Agenda Attachments G.4 and G.5, respectively.

5. Annual Report of Internationalization Council
6. Draft of proposed Copyright Policy
   
   This policy draft was received as part of the Consent Agenda [cf. item B.1, Announcements from Presiding Officer].

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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### State Programs & One Time Funds

**2017-18 PUBLIC UNIVERSITY STATE PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ODU</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Initiatives</td>
<td>$ 168,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Innovation</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Research</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nanotechnology Institute</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 593,910</td>
<td>$ 88,800</td>
<td>$ 437,590</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
<td>$ 1,985,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 477,600</td>
<td>$ 2,054,520</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2017-18 PUBLIC UNIVERSITY TARGETED AND ONE TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ODU</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Watershed Research &amp; Management</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 477,600</td>
<td>$ 2,054,520</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nanotechnology Institute</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 3,196,930</td>
<td>$ 477,600</td>
<td>$ 2,054,520</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
<td>$ 12,097,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University</td>
<td>$ 6,393,860</td>
<td>$ 6,393,860</td>
<td>$ 955,200</td>
<td>$ 4,109,040</td>
<td>$ 24,195,800</td>
<td>$ 24,195,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oregon Opportunity Grant

**Oregon Opportunity Grants: Total Disbursements over time by Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>4-year public universities</th>
<th>Independent colleges and universities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$9,021,254</td>
<td>$9,856,520</td>
<td>$2,903,815</td>
<td>$21,781,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$9,312,891</td>
<td>$10,471,720</td>
<td>$3,312,910</td>
<td>$23,097,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$13,990,198</td>
<td>$14,406,494</td>
<td>$4,675,550</td>
<td>$33,072,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$15,083,712</td>
<td>$14,508,913</td>
<td>$5,063,649</td>
<td>$34,656,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$29,621,042</td>
<td>$32,481,568</td>
<td>$5,809,086</td>
<td>$68,002,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$43,408,248</td>
<td>$28,499,080</td>
<td>$4,664,202</td>
<td>$76,571,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$6,619,445</td>
<td>$9,774,401</td>
<td>$2,440,101</td>
<td>$18,833,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$19,227,760</td>
<td>$20,009,390</td>
<td>$4,103,573</td>
<td>$43,340,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$23,539,066</td>
<td>$23,955,074</td>
<td>$4,173,309</td>
<td>$51,647,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$24,043,194</td>
<td>$26,369,213</td>
<td>$4,520,399</td>
<td>$54,932,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HCC Office of Research and Data and Office of Student Access and Completion, 2016

### Sports Lottery

**2017-19 SPORTS LOTTERY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$456,620</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td>$1,138,783</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td>$4,119,996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$456,620</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td>$1,138,783</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td>$4,119,996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,119,996</td>
<td>$4,120,004</td>
<td>$8,240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Funding

**2017-18 INSTITUTION OPERATING BUDGETS (ALL SOURCES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public University Support Fund</td>
<td>$15,989,508</td>
<td>$26,074,852</td>
<td>$51,109,988</td>
<td>$89,052,388</td>
<td>$175,106,838</td>
<td>$260,830,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public University State Programs</td>
<td>$512,355</td>
<td>$1,202,961</td>
<td>$102,936,930</td>
<td>$5,211,952</td>
<td>$248,429</td>
<td>$2,319,979</td>
<td>$592,558,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted and One Time Funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$445,800</td>
<td>$368,790</td>
<td>$39,230</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$844,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Public Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,840</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State General Fund</td>
<td>$20,811,757</td>
<td>$27,200,394</td>
<td>$186,305,229</td>
<td>$195,205,084</td>
<td>$2,013,467,143</td>
<td>$2,013,467,143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Lottery</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$1,138,783</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$811,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Public Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,760,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,760,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State Lottery</td>
<td>$467,379</td>
<td>$11,760,000</td>
<td>$1,138,783</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$811,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State Education &amp; General Revenues</td>
<td>$19,315,085</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td>$19,468,069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State, Non-Education &amp; General Revenues</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td>$3,337,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Statewide Public Services</td>
<td>$24,062,895</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td>$25,679,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$55,419,675</td>
<td>$67,649,394</td>
<td>$37,907,863</td>
<td>$1,585,602</td>
<td>$5,993,359</td>
<td>$31,538,189</td>
<td>$198,090,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Funding Options
Main Strategy Is to Ask for More Funding

1. Increase PUSF (Shared)
2. New State Program (Independent)
3. One-time Funding (Independent)
4. Sports Lottery (Shared)
5. Oregon Opportunity Grant (Shared)

Cost Reduction Measures

- Efficiency Taskforce
- Strategic Hiring
- Elimination of Administrative Positions
- Several Proposals under Consideration
  - Salary Freeze of Top Executives

New Funding Options
PSU Has a Different Story
State Needs to Pay for PSU Mission

Possible options for increased funding

a. Low income tuition support;
b. Student success;
c. Adult attainment;
d. Other ideas

Long-Term Strategy

- We need to focus on what makes PSU Unique
- We need to develop innovative programs that attracts both non-traditional, as well as traditional students
  - Interdisciplinary programs
- We need to enhance our recruitment efforts regionally, nationally, and internationally
- We need to engage our alumni
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**Long-Term Strategy**

- COOP
- Non-Resident Students
- PSU
- Innovative Initiatives
- Fundraising

**Fundraising & Development**

- Currently Cultivating Four Eight Figure Major Gifts

- Since August 1, 2017:
  - 17 Principal gifts of a $1M+
  - 8 Portland Professorships

- $42.7M raised in FY2018, a Record at PSU

**Board Membership**

Thank you!
Questions?
Learning from Ourselves: Moving Forward with Program Assessment

Janelle Voegele, Director of Teaching, Learning and Assessment
Office of Academic Innovation (OAI)
Chair, Institutional Assessment Council
voegelej@pdx.edu

Context

- IAC scan of campus experiences with assessment (2014)
- Appreciation for groundwork in assessment so far
- Concerns:
  - Consistency
  - Gaps of time between assessment efforts
  - More specific expectations
  - How can programs get regular feedback on their assessment efforts?
- Resources
  - What’s good program assessment? How do we know?
  - Guidance on scope: can program assessment be effective within a specific, focused, manageable scope?

Senate Steering Questions

- Recommendations for programs
- How can Senate help?

IAC Actions

- Recommended and developed institutional support structures
  - OAA
  - OAI
  - IAC members’ constituent feedback
  - Senate Steering and committee feedback
  - Associate Deans, Chairs
  - Successful program models
  - Scholarly literature in assessment
- Clarified roles of various offices and groups working in assessment; alignment of efforts
### What is in place now?

- **Program assessment rubric and template**
  - Adapted from NWCCU
  - Available in APR guidelines and IAC website
  - Clarifies what is expected in a program assessment plan
  - Will be further modified with campus feedback
- **Modified APR assessment section guidelines to align with the program assessment rubric**
- **IAC feedback on Academic Program Review** (assessment section only)
  - IAC receives APR assessment sections from OAA
  - Program assessment rubric is used to give feedback
  - Congratulations, suggestions, links to resources, best practices, and relevant scholarship

### What should programs be doing?

- Make (or revise) an assessment plan
- Initial plans are often “in progress”
- Get early feedback
- Access resources (digital and staff)

### What is in place now, cont.

- **Annual Assessment Update & feedback**
  - OAI receives AAU summaries from OAA
  - OAI assessment staff give feedback to all programs each year
  - Program assessment rubric used to give feedback
  - Congratulations, suggestions, links to resources, best practices and relevant scholarship (tailored to specific programs at specific point in time)
- **Updated assessment resources on IAC website**
  - Goal: Increased campus program examples and templates
  - [https://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/](https://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/)

### How can Faculty Senate help?

- Facilitating collaborations between IAC and other Senate committees
- Time on Senate agenda for brief assessment updates
- Advocating approaches to assessment that are grounded in “learning organization” assumptions
  - What we do is grounded in what we value, what’s good for our programs, students and faculty. What we need for reporting is there as a result.
  - Ex: Senate members could attend campus assessment events and celebrations, encourage colleagues in their districts to share successes and examples.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Special Meeting, 22 April 2019

Presiding Officer: Thomas Luckett
Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators Present:

Alternates Present:
Ben Anderson-Nathe for May.

Senators Absent:

Ex-officio Members Present:
Beyler, Clark, Hines, Jaen Portillo, Jeffords, Percy, Popp, Shoureshi, Zonoozy.

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

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER called attention to the Faculty Committee Preference Survey, currently open. Barring unforeseen events, the ballot for Faculty elections will be circulated in about a week. At the May meeting, nominations will be open for Presiding Officer Elect.

We are missing a couple of clickers, so if you have one please return it to BEYLER’s History Department mailbox.


The report is accessible on-line at:

LUCKETT contextualized the discussion: we’ve been considering over the course of the academic year campus policing at PSU, including an open discussion at a special session of Senate in October. Today is intended to be a somewhat more structured discussion, with several guiding questions. He also called for discussion questions from the floor.

In fall, LUCKETT continued, the University commissioned two reviews by outside firms. One a top-to-bottom review of all aspects of policing since 2014, the year the decision was made to go to a sworn and armed police force campus. This was done by the Margolis Healy, and in October representatives came to campus and met with many of us. Their report was filed in mid-February. Since then there has been a Board of Trustees meeting with open comment. The other report was commissioned from OIR: a report specifically on the June shooting incident; unfortunately, the report has still not arrived. LUCKETT expressed disappointment that it had not yet been received: we ought to see it.
LUCKETT reported that the President’s Office, at the request of the Board of Trustees, convened an ad-hoc committee, the Review and Response Committee, to examine the Margolis Healy report, and make recommendations about its recommendations. It’s meeting once a week; faculty members include LUCKETT, JAEN PORTILLO, and Yves LABISSIERE; three members of the Board of Trustees; several staff members and students; and a member of the campus police force, Greg MARX.

There is also a standing committee, the University Public Safety Oversight Committee (UPSOC)—it had existed before, but this is a new name. This committee has been meeting about once a month. The Margolis Healy report contains a number of recommendations about this committee itself.

LUCKETT noted that since we’ve been discussing this issue for some time, some members of the campus community might be experiencing listening fatigue. His own view is that the University is now ready to act, if it can figure out how to act. The Board of Trustees is very interested in the advice of the Faculty. He believed this was a situation in which our voice will be listened to. There will be two upcoming Board meetings, on May 13th and on June 20th—these will not be devoted exclusively to campus policing.

Although this is special meeting, LUCKETT stated, it can do any of the things Senate meetings do. A member could, for example, offer a resolution of the topic (Steering has not done so), or resolve into a committee of the whole. Steering Committee had developed several discussion questions, and also had in mind several straw polls (not official votes).

LUCKETT wished to begin with a question that has preoccupied him over the year. Is there a way to bring (much of) the campus together around some kind of consensus or compromise, rather than leave this a binary issue.

ZONOOZY had submitted a proposal to gradually phase out armed officers and incorporate the participation of the community. Why should PSU be increasingly responsible, and foot the bill for the public safety for everybody in the neighborhood? LUCKETT: what would community policing look like? ZONOOZY: the community takes on the responsibility for the safety of themselves.

O’BANION believed that a compromise would be the hybrid model presented in the report: increase the proportion of unarmed public safety officers; not completely eliminate armed officers, but address the balance; include consideration of mental health issues; encourage engagement of CPSO [Campus Public Safety Office] the community.

CUNNINGHAM observed that over five years, faculty opinion has been given multiple times, mostly skepticism about armed officers. It had also previously been advocated to leverage faculty expertise more.

C. MEYER hoped to see a culture that we are all responsible for creating a safe environment on campus. Campus security could be part of that culture. She had gone to a de-escalation training; from her perspective she did not learn much about de-escalation. There was a large attendance, hence interest in creating a safer campus. Several students had requested safety training because of incidents in her building.

GRECO also, a couple of years ago, had along with some colleagues had a disappointing experience at a de-escalation training. If this could be done effectively, it would go a long way. She read in the report several ways in which the University could be liable if there
were no armed officers. She had initially been in favor of disarming the police on campus; however, she didn't want to exploit the personal tragedy as a “told you so” moment. Regarding the hybrid model, she still believed that fifty-fifty was too high a proportion of guns, but wondered about situations in which only a sworn officer could intervene in a situation, conduct investigations, etc.

WATANABE observed that “community” is a diffuse concept. We need to be informed about various perspectives within this community. Many faculty are only present on campus for a few hours per day. She is not so worried about safety during the day, but begins to feel unsafe after about 8:00. What then about students who live on campus? We should be proactively learn what happens on campus. LUCKETT: crime statistics are available.

JAEN PORTILLO thought that models might look good on paper, but we have to make sure that we can actually implement them, particularly in the current budget situation. It seems that investement called for [in 2014] was not really made; we don’t want to make the same mistake twice. She did not want another tragedy a few years from now because we didn’t make the investment in training, etc.

LUCKETT wondered whether reducing the role of sworn officers and advocating community policing presents a conflict, because the latter entails more contact with officers.

JAMES: it’s complicated. Employees cannot carry firearms, but there are concealed carry laws in the state. We are intermixed with the city of Portland. There are liability issues. Some students and faculty say that the presence of armed officers decreases rather than increases safety. The report seems to reify the divide we are talking about, rather than seeking a different paradigm. This body ought to look at prioritization among the many recommendations in the report and take a phased approach: things that everyone can agree upon; then things that cannot be decided right away. There are other vested interests. De-escalation training might be a place to start. LUCKETT: Steering Committee had also asked what are our priorities among the many recommendations, particularly in regard to funding.

SORENSEN liked the idea of prioritization. She was, however, dishearted by resource issues. Oregon State University’s campus safety is handled by the Oregon State Police; no one seems to be interested in helping us. It is a heavy lift given the systemic problems that the state faces around diversity, etc. Why can’t we get more attention for the work we’re trying to do? What can we do in the way of lobbying efforts?

LUCKETT recognized Ben BERRY, member of the Board of Trustees: he asked about the numbers of police officers with firearms and of security officers without firearms.

LUCKETT, based on a presentation to UPSOC, said that there are eight armed and sworn officers. This is roughly only half of the number that is budgeted. There are about six unarmed security officers–again, only about half of the number budgeted for. Adding more money to the budget for officers will not change things if we can’t recruit people to those positions. Greg MARX (CPSO) was recognized. He said we have four public safety officers on the street, five road patrol officers, two sergeants, and the chief. Our detective left.

LUCKETT suggested that we could increase the number of officers without increasing the budget, if we could find people to take those positions. One issue is salary; some officers seemingly view this as a kind of starter position. We need to think about how to make these positions more attractive. BERRY, following-up: are they working 24/7, in shifts?
LUCKETT believed there was considerable overtime. BERRY one issue to be that response time from Portland city police was often very long.

O’BANION observed that once had a sexual assault/violence detective on the force, who is no longer with us.

PALMITER wished to revisit the reasons the University decided to arm officers. A seemingly compelling argument at the time was that doing this was necessary in order to recruit officers. Are those reasons still relevant? She was unsure whether the end point of this meeting would be a specific proposal to vote on.

KARAVANIC wished to take into account practical aspects of policing. Is it safe for officers? Dividing up the duties seems to require being able to tell up front how dangerous a given situation is. Who would take the job under the conditions? Other practical issues include liability to the University and jurisdiction between PSU and city police. Perhaps a survey could reveal what are the barriers to hiring. PALMITER would like to hear from the current chief and officers.

REESE pointed out another reason for the decision was that sworn officers could make arrests. If we can’t attract people, but Portland police can, is it possible to partner with them in some way? LUCKETT: they [Portland police] have consistently refused.

HENDERSON understood this to be a larger issue, not unique to PSU. She agreed that these issues related to hiring need consideration. LUCKETT: it’s not just the number of applications, but also their qualifications.

CUNNINGHAM remembered from 2014 that hiring considerations were part of the push for having armed officers. She disagreed with the statement that there is no coordination with the city. It is mentioned in the report: there is a fair amount of coordination, because we don’t have resources on campus. LUCKETT: for example, the “holding cell” at PSU is only for very temporary use.

CLARK observed that today’s discussion is after the horse has left the barn; we are talking in different terms than five years ago. The city is awash in handguns. It is very easy to get a carry permit in Oregon and other states in the West. What would we do [consequently] to make this campus maximally safe—what price would we pay, both in terms of financial and personal costs? For example, would we be willing to devote a class session to de-escalation techniques? A further point: in his experience the presence of officers walking around, regardless of whether armed or unarmed, creates a sense of order.

B. ANDERSON-NATHE said that we have been speaking in a set of codes that have been used to marginalize certain voices. We talk about campus community as though there are clear good guys and bad guys—people to belong here and people who don’t. In the very next breath we say that the Park Blocks are city property, not PSU property. Therefore, a conservation about who gets to belong in public space is one that we don’t have. The report uses words such as houseless, unhoused, or homeless around a hundred times, nearly always in problematic senses, without ever opening up a conversation about how many our students—supposedly the good guys—are experiencing or have experienced homelessness. When we talk about public safety: for whom? He doesn’t disagree that for some people seeing a uniformed officer brings about a sense of order, but for other people it brings about a sense of active, real danger. When talking about public safety, we need to be clear about who is the
public and who is safe. Coordination of policing is already taking place: both PSU and Portland police arrived at the scene where Jason Washington was killed. In various areas, we are engaging in incomplete narratives. We need to entertain discussion in a meaningful, not in a trite, one-off way. Whose safety are we really concerned about? We should not limit the discussion to guns; the report lists a host of infrastructure problems at campus that contribute much more to students’ safety [or lack thereof] than the presence or absence of guns on campus. We haven’t done anything meaningful for five years; if we don’t start something at some point, we will keep ourselves in this place. He is tired not of discussion, but tired of [stasis].

LUCKETT: a question asked in Steering Committee was, what are the various meanings of “safety”? Does it mean different things to different people?

HINES: the report covers history on pp. 17-20 with some accuracy. Regarding REESE’s comments, she recalled that in 2014-15 we were frequently told that you can’t have sworn officers without arming them, but the report makes clear (p. 27) that it is possible to have sworn officers who are unarmed.

DOLIDON wished for clarity in terms. For example, she is not an American and this leads her to wonder if terms like “community” in “community policing” mean something different to foreign students. We all have a different understanding. Also, we just created two centers, one on homelessness and one on smart cities: couldn’t they come up with some creative and useful solutions? Since we agreed to create them, they might as well go to work.

GRECO: the report tells us much about lighting, cameras, etc. If we have budgeted positions going unfilled, it seems that the [unspent] money could go towards safety devices. It is desirable to distinguish between things that make people [merely] feel safe vs. those that actually do make them safer. Moving forward and healing some of the rift, an honest reckoning with the bill of goods we were sold [in 2014-15] is necessary–for example, the assertion that we cannot have sworn officers that are not armed. We were told that we had to deputize everyone. As Presiding Officer at the time, she had one-on-one conversations with President Wim WIEWEL and Vice-President Kevin REYNOLDS. She asked whether we could not have just a few sworn officers who could carry out investigations, etc., and keep the people walking around campus unarmed; this question was dismissed. We need to have a reckoning with such misinformation, which cannot be buried. LUCKETT: is going back to 2014 just of historical value? GRECO believed that reaching peace about decisions requires such a reckoning.

SHOURESHERI commented that besides the Review and Response Committee, people from the finance and risk management offices are assessing the [report’s] recommendations as to cost and the risks associated with not doing them. At the May 3rd meeting of the Board’s finance committee, we will look at putting adding some money to the [public safety] budget ona recurring basis; but there are some items (lighting, etc.) are one-time investments. It is essential to ask, what do we mean, collectively, by a safe campus?

LUCKETT proposed taking a straw poll about three basic options presented by the report: the current system (as it currently exists, not necessarily as intended by the Board), entirely eliminating armed officers on campus (which would be complicated by a bill that is likely to pass the state legislature which will restrict the authority of unarmed officers throughout the state), and the hybrid model. We will look at these on a five-point range: strongly agree, agree, unsure, disagree, strongly disagree.
QUESTION ONE. Do you favor the hybrid model, retaining some armed officers with a greater reliance on unarmed security officers?

[As BEYLER dealt with some technical difficulties, discussion continued:]

It was asked, what are the proportions? LUCKETT: the hybrid leaves some armed officers, but puts a greater reliance on unarmed security officers, particularly for routine patrolling–more than currently, but the exact number is still up in the air.)

(LUCKETT also read a question submitted from the floor: if the recommendations are not fully implemented, what would you be most concerned about losing.
O’BANION: the sexual assault detective. LUCKETT: we’ve currently lost it. O’BANION: the person holding the position for many years has left, but the position still exists. LUCKETT: this is an actual detective who can make arrests, etc.; it can’t be assigned to a security officer. A senator remarked that if we give up sworn officers, the police who would show up to make any arrests would not have specialized knowledge of or training related to our campus. GRECO: we should make a distinction between sworn and armed: they are not necessarily the same. LUCKETT said this is legally correct, but he was not sure whether it’s practically possible to recruit officers on this basis.

RESULTS [hybrid model]:
Strongly Agree, 18%; Agree, 39%; Unsure, 14%; Disagree, 14%; Strongly Disagree, 14%.

QUESTION TWO: Do you favor the current de facto system?

RESULTS:
Strongly Agree, 14%; Agree, 14%; Unsure, 7%; Disagree, 4%; Strongly Disagree, 61%.

QUESTION THREE: Do you favor an entirely disarmed security force?

RESULTS:
Strongly Agree, 29%; Agree, 15%; Unsure, 12%; Disagree, 15%; Strongly Disagree, 29%.

PALMITER pointed about that we had not defined what we mean by “weapon”: did it necessarily mean a lethal weapon, or could it be a pellet gun or similar?

PALMITER recognized Alex READ, member of ASPSU Student Senate and the Student Union. READ: the community has been left out of the decision-making process. Why are the Board of Trustees the ones who make the decision, when they are not necessarily on campus very often? As is recognized in the report, most people in the campus community do not favor armed security. While the presence guns means safety for some, for others and in particular marginalized folks, it means a dangerous and unsafe situation. CPSO is not well integrated into the community, either. We need to push for a decision: how many times have we met about this, how many committees and discussions?

READ presented a statement from the Student Union: Their proposal is that PSU entirely get rid of armed campus police. CPSO should revert back to unarmed security officers. They ask that PSU not contract with Portland police or any outside security company. They also ask that CPSO not be armed with non-lethal weapons. They favor investment in community-based alternatives and ask that PSU divert funds from campus police to community-based, non-police alternatives. They recommend consideration of student-led initiatives such as
performative justice efforts. They ask PSU for more investment in the care-taking needs of
the community, and for more student oversight of policy directions. Campus public safety
should be led by PSU students and faculty.

LUCKETT asked, if CPSO are not well integrated into the campus community, what better
integration would look like. READ said that since he does not favor CPSO, he doesn’t favor
integration. [The officers] don’t live on campus; they come from all over Portland. The
incentives for them are not very high and sometimes perceive the job as a jumping-off point.
The incentive to work with students is lacking.

LUCKETT noted that one point had to do with a question also raised in Steering Committee,
which also appeared in the Margolis Healy report: to give UPSOC much greater authority,
training, and ability to do actual oversight. Till now the committee has really not an
oversight committee at all, but rather advisory. What would [more oversight] entail?

CUNNINGHAM thought this session would focus on the report itself. A concern for her is
that many of its recommendations actually come from UPSOC or from the 2015
implementation report. LUCKETT: some of those recommendation were enacted, some
were not. CUNNINGHAM: many were not; however, her concern is that the Margolis
Healy report presents them as their recommendations, whereas many come from previous
faculty work. Maybe their task was to compile or echo previous statements, but the report
drew from uncompensated faculty efforts. LUCKETT: perhaps it’s just a convergence. But
several people have indeed asked, if we knew about these recommendations in 2014-15 and
didn’t act on them then, what is the hope that we will act on them now? CUNNINGHAM:
yes, and what did we pay for?

FAALEAVA connected the question about oversight to community policing. Oversight
means that we have responsibilities for safety, whether or not officers are armed.

LUCKETT pointed out that CPSO offers tours, ride-alongs, etc., for those who want to learn
more.

DOLIDON reverted to the question whether not arming police officers would mean not being
able to recruit them. Is what we are told [about this] accurate? The comment about not
wanting police, and police never being part of our community, seemed to her too strong.
One thing the report definitely revealed was a failure in the transition; we made a decision,
but it was very badly implemented. To correct this, training is essential; investment should
be made there. She is not against the police and in fact wants to see them around campus
more. She does not like the guns as part of their equipment, but she does not mind seeing
them, personally. A practical thing to work on right away could be de-escalation training. It
ought to be worked out how to make it better. The role of the oversight committee should
be to see that such changes are made.

LUCKETT recognized Officer Greg MARX. Could we have unarmed police? Yes;
however, the state of Oregon is down 500 officers. It is hard for us to recruit now; it would
be impossible to recruit then. Pay, while low, is not unbearably low: about $8/hour
difference relative to the rest of the area. He has been here for twenty years; most of his staff
are PSU graduates. They are invested in this institution. He loves this place. He wishes
[students and faculty] could see more of them, but there are long work stints already. He
would welcome ride-alongs or conversations about why he is here.
YEIGH stated that they have a hard time recruiting students of color in the College of Education. Exit surveys consistently talk about feeling safe or unsafe. When they are in K-12 schools, presence of officers can make them feel very unsafe. As PSU has more and more diverse students, we need to look at what makes people feel safe or unsafe, and what people’s previous experiences have been.

LUCKETT asked for senators’ specific impressions of the report itself.

JAEN PORTILLO saw the report as dealing primarily with opinion. She expected and hoped for more facts, such as comparisons with other similar institutions are doing.

C. MEYER had a similar reaction. One thing she learned from the report was how many structural changes, neutral in nature, could dramatically improve safety on campus: lighting, keycard access—things that require some resources, but less than armed bodies. Faculty Senate could promote those kinds of changes, while other issues are still being discussed. LUCKETT: such as [changing] doors that require stepping outside to lock them with a key.

GRECO: the report gave a scathing account of implementation. Many facts pointed to mistakes or malpractice on the part of the University’s administration in implementing the transition. That is not the fault of the officers, but of the institution. Before we consider which direction to go in, we need to see how to fix the malpractice revealed by the report.

LUCKETT noted the passages about community engagement (for example starting p. 52); some of this relates to resources, but there is also a lack of planning for fixing relationships with the campus community. The report observes that relationships with many groups on campus were strained already before the shooting of Jason Washington. It notes what while there are ample incidental opportunities for individual officers to establish relationships, there are not sufficient resources or plans for outreach efforts. Regarding JAEN’s desire for comparative data, he thought that this would be the hardest part of the study to do. We maybe can’t expect this from CPSO or from Margolis Healy. It requires people who are highly trained in sociology and criminology—happily, we have such people on our campus. We have local talent, but need to compensate them.

JAEN PORTILLO pointed to a lack of diversity among the preparers of the report. Their focus was on climate and opinion. The relevant expertise was not built into the report.

LUPRO noted that they had never before been asked about disarming police. They all had law enforcement backgrounds, not broader research backgrounds. It’s like asking water whether it should be wet. We have the period between the decision to arm officers and now. Were the predictions borne out? We know that the fears came to pass; did we get any gains in security? It seems that the recruitment was not solved. There has been a preponderance from student groups, faculty, etc., showing that arming officers is not helping. We are not making progress. LUCKETT: how do we know? LUPRO: he would like to know whether, from then to now, the things that were sold to us as alleged goods of arming officers have come to pass. To his knowledge, they haven’t. Safety is not better; he doubts the jurisdictional problem is improved. We know that the worst-case scenario did come to pass. The benefits of arming are still speculative. LUCKETT said it’s hard to come up with evidence. That’s why we need to compare with other institutions. LUPRO: what has happened with the crime rate? What has happened with jurisdictional conflicts? LUCKETT:
we need a time series. LUPRO: we’ve had an experimental period; he wants to see comparisons across this period.

JAEN PORTILLO has heard from faculty a need for information, for an account of what happened between then and now. We need to understand the specific differences between sworn and unsworn officers. There were many good ideas about safety that went beyond having armed bodies, as a colleague had said: lights, cameras, locks, etc. We need more information and discussion of what “safety” is. It would be useful to have priorities, a step-by-step process given the budget. The solution will not be in just a couple of months.

A senator suggested a straw poll about needing information. LUCKETT: we could do a poll, but he thought the outcome would be obvious. It seemed that one recommendation would be for more comparative information, both with other institutions and across time.

HINES recognized Jake JOHNSON, executive editor of the Pacific Sentinel [student newspaper]. JOHNSON agreed it was important to be very clear about what armed vs. disarmed means. The conversation often takes this to be all-or-nothing, but that may not be the case. Faculty should be recognized for their efforts five years ago, some of which were repeated in the report. He believed it was essential to recognize that background; the report was taking ideas and credibility from faculty work. Stealing people’s ideas is a way of making them feel unheard. He believed UPSOC should take on a real oversight role and be able to enact changes.

D, E, F, G. – none

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
To: Susan Jeffords, Provost
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
(Thomas Luckett, Presiding Officer; Richard Beyler, Secretary)
Date: 3 April 2019
Re: Notice of Senate Actions

At its regular meeting on 1 April 2019, Faculty Senate approved the curricular consent agenda with the new courses, dropped courses, changes to courses, changes to programs, and changes (additions and removals) to University Studies clusters specified in Attachment E.1 to the April Agenda.

04-01-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the new courses, dropped courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs, and changes (additions and removals) to University Studies clusters.

Faculty Senate voted to approve a resolution asking the University’s Office of General Counsel to provide Faculty Senate Steering Committee with copies of all documents obtained by the Oregonian in the course of its research for an article published on 3 March 2019, including documents not cited in the article, or obtained through any new Oregonian document request on the same subject.

04-01-19—OAA concurs with the approved resolution.

Faculty Senate also voted to approve:

• Creation of a new Undergraduate Minor in Climate Change Science and Adaptation, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as summarized in Attachment E.3 and detailed in the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS).

04-01-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the undergraduate minor.

• Creation of a new Graduate Certificate Conflict Resolution, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as summarized in Attachment E.4 and detailed in OCMS.

04-01-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the graduate certificate program.
Attachment A.3

• Creation of a new research center, the Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative, with conditions as recommended by the Educational Policy Committee in Attachment E.5.

          04-01-19—OAA concurs with the recommendation and approves the new research center.

Best regards,

Thomas M. Luckett                                      Richard H. Beyler
Presiding Officer                                      Secretary to the Faculty

Susan Jeffords, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Attachment D.1

Motion: that Faculty Senate approve the creation of a new center, the Digital City Testbed Center, with conditions as specified in the EPC memorandum to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee of 11 March 2019 given below.

*****

To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
From: Educational Policy Committee (EPC)  
Date: 3/11/19  
Subject: Digital City Testbed Center Proposal

The EPC has reviewed the proposal to establish the Digital City Testbed Center (DCTC) as a University research center, and reports to the Faculty Senate the following findings and recommendations:

Findings
1. The proposal is laudable and generally supportive of current PSU strategic goals and objectives.
2. If successful, DCTC may bring national recognition to PSU.
3. The center is a coordinating entity with respect to research activities.
4. Proposal is unclear as to educational opportunities relative to existing or new curriculum.
5. Specific outcomes are vague, or not yet determined.
6. Proposal is not specific as to the activities of DCTC personnel in support of the comparative assessments by non-DCTC faculty, staff and students.
7. Initially, few significant grant opportunities are identified.
8. MOU with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (RGS) limits seed funding to $1.5 million over three (3) years
9. Indirect costs incurred by DCTC to be funded by RGS.
10. Indirect cost recovery for externally funded programs and activities may not fully cover indirect costs, reducing otherwise available E&G funding.

Recommendation
Conditional approval subject to the following provisions:
1. Written acknowledgment from Administration that future proposals for Centers and Institutes will follow established Faculty Senate policies and procedures prior to funding.
2. Any changes in original scope of work will require Faculty Senate approval as per the Proposal for the Creation, Elimination, or Alteration of Academic Units (Centers and Institutes) process.
3. RGS will provide to the EPC and the Budget Committee a detailed annual report of the indirect costs of DCTC, its associated externally-funded programs and activities, and the corresponding indirect cost recovery of these costs.
April 5, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Drake Mitchell
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
RE: May 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.

**School of Business**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.b.1

- Business Administration B.A./B.S.— revising required courses and electives for the Finance option

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.b.2

- English B.A./B.S.—Clarifying language for one requirement

**New Courses**

E.1.b.3

- Psy 425 Psychology of Black Manhood in America, 4 credits
  Examines the psychological underpinnings of the Black male experience in American culture; looks at the “invisibility syndrome” and the impact of discrimination on mental, emotional, and physical health.  In addition, consideration will also be given to understanding the ways racism, medical neglect and malpractice, stereotypes, and various forms of trauma negatively impacts perceptions of self. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

E.1.b.4

- Psy 426 Psychology of Stigma & Social Inequality, 4 credits
  Investigates the ways in which individuals perceive, respond to, perpetuate, and work to dismantle stigma and social inequality. We will delve into classic and contemporary work, touching on topics including: why do we stigmatize? How and why do we justify social inequality? How do stigma and social inequality affect our health, well-being, and

* 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.
interactions with others? We will also think deeply about how to apply our knowledge to current social issues and policy. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

E.1.b.5

- Psy 463 Development and Education of Immigrant Children and Youth, 4 credits
  This undergraduate seminar course will focus on the development and education of children and youth from immigrant backgrounds, primarily in the U.S. The course readings are selected to be broad in scope but will focus on original scholarship and current research on the education and development of immigrant children and adolescents. The course will cover topics such as acculturation, ethnic identity, school experiences, and major sources of risk and resilience among children from immigrant backgrounds. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

E.1.b.6

- Span 311 Spanish Conversation, 4 credits
  Practice of spoken Spanish through conversation, interviews, and listening to or viewing Spanish language broadcasts. Special language focus chosen by instructor, such as: pronunciation, word choice, the subjunctive, the sequence of tenses, or special time expressions. Prerequisite: 8 credits of Span 301, 301H, 302, 302H, 303, or 303H.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.b.7

- ESM 221 Applied Environmental Studies: Problem Solving—change prerequisites

E.1.b.8

- SpHr 370 Phonetics and Acoustics—change prerequisites

E.1.b.9

- SpHr 371 Anatomy and Physiology of Speech and Swallowing—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.
2018-2019 ASPSU Final Report To Faculty Senate

Luis Balderas-Villagrana  President
Lelani Lealiiee  Vice President
Fatima V. Preciado Mendoza  Multicultural Affairs Director
Julieta Castro  Equal Rights Advocacy Director
Alex Dassise  Academic Affairs Director
Kyle Leslie-Christy  Student Life Director
Emily M. Korte  University Affairs Director
Gabby Pereira  Sustainability Affairs Director
Camilo Assad  Legislative Affairs Director
Jenna Oh  International Affairs Director

Student Fee Committee:
Donald Thompson III  Student Fee Committee Chair

Judicial Review Board:
Leona Yazdidoost  Judicial Review Board Chair

Executive Staff:
Roosevelt Sowka  Executive Staff Director
Hakan Kutgun  Operations Director
Sophia Voronoff  Publicity Affairs Director
**President**

The President worked to ensure that students at Portland State University were represented at all levels of the university. The President served on the following organizations/committees to serve and represent students: Tuition Review Advisory Committee (TRAC), University Public Safety Oversight Committee (UPSOC), Response and Review Committee, Oregon Student Association Board of Directors, Faculty Senate, SMSU Renovation Work Group, Honorary Degree Committee, and Diversity Action Council.

The President also met monthly to discuss students needs with the following individuals: PSU President, PROVOST, Vice-President of Finance & Administration, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Dean of Student Life, Vice-President of Global Diversity and Inclusion, among other formal meetings with different administrators across the university.

**Executive Actions:**
- Executive Action in the creation of the CPSO Ad Hoc Committee
- Executive Action in the creation of the Committee on Student Success

On his final days, the President will work with the new President-elect to ensure a proper transition of government. It has been an honor for Luis to serve as Student Body President.

**Vice President**

The Vice-President worked on ensuring that ASPSU functioned as a student government by creating calendars, assigning Senators to committees, chairing Senate meetings, and overall internal management of the organization. Represented the President in his absence. Worked with the Equal Rights Advocacy Committee to put on five days of events focused on fighting for survivors. Also worked with Illuminate to get more resources and programs.

**Academics Affairs Committee**

Academic Affairs Committee worked an open education campaign on campus to engage students and faculty. Also worked on mental health campaigns to provide more resources to students.

**University Affairs Committee**

University Affairs Committee worked diligently and gave their advice and opinions on the best way to enhance the overall student experience through the continued collaboration between administration and student government to renovate the Smith Memorial Student Union. Also worked to actively place students on All-University Committees.
Multicultural Affairs Committee
Multicultural Affairs Committee was able to take over 30 students to the Oregon Students of Color conference held in Monmouth, OR at the Western Oregon University. The committee also established a successful relationship with student organizers from the MENASA initiative (Middle East/North Africa/South Asia). The MENASA initiative is part of the Cultural Resource Center’s five-year strategic plan. This year the ASPSU Student Fee Committee was able to grant sufficient funds to ensure the request for a MENASA director. Senators serving on this committee volunteered and helped celebrate PSU’s Native American Student Community Center’s 15th year anniversary. They were also assigned to connect with directors or staff from the various cultural resource centers, TRIO program, and BUILD EXITO. Finally, the committee worked on providing more resources to undocumented students.

International Affairs Committee
This committee worked on building a relationship with other groups and student organizations on campus. They reviewed anti-hate crime materials that are available on campus and strategic planning for ASPSU. Worked to motivate international students to participate and engage on campus.

Legislative Affairs Committee
Legislative Affairs Committee worked on a methodology for the Oregon Student Association on organizing on campus, outreach/research/support for disarming PSU statewide, and memos and advocacy for new perspectives in OSA. They also worked on OSCC workshops, creation and funding of OSA, a ten-point plan for ASPSU, and support for trans rights resolution with ERAC. Represented students on the Tuition Review Advisory Committee.

Sustainability Affairs Committee
Sustainability Affairs Committee worked with the sustainability groups on campus and has successfully gotten space for a community garden. The committee held events throughout May for Social Sustainability Month.

Student Life Committee
Student Life Committee worked on building relationships within housing, athletics, SALP, SHAC, and others on campus as well as event planning for the year. They were also able to plan and put together a midterm watch party as well as formulate the monthly newsletters for students. They hosted Broadway Actor: Josh Rivedal talk to PSU students on learning to live well in college.
Equal Rights Advocacy Committee
Equal Rights Advocacy Committee was able to work on creating liaisons between ERAC senators and resource centers and discuss campaigns including illuminate, recovery program, and disarm PSU. They were able to work with the ASPSU interns and successfully pass the first resolution of the 2018-2019 school year supporting trans rights. They worked on the Title IX resolution being passed and implemented, as well as continuing support for resource centers. Also worked on continuous support for campus-wide programs and beginning to build programming and educational opportunities for social justice awareness within ASPSU. They have also held five-day events focused on Fighting for Survivors.

Student Fee Committee
The Student Fee Committee worked for months and passed the Incidental Fee Budget for 2019-20. Worked and passed the Student Building Fee Budget.

Judicial Review Board
The Judicial Review Board worked on Constitutional changes, held meetings regarding attention request made against ASPSU, ASPSU Officers, Resolutions. Crafted the 2018-2019 ASPSU Annual Report.

Senate
The Senate passed resolutions, held forums for presenters across campus, discussed campus public safety, approved Constitutional changes, and approved the SFC proposed Student Incidental Fee Budget.

“It is an honor to have worked with the faculty senate to increase collaboration between the two organizations. Both Faculty Senate and ASPSU share many goals and it’s essential that we continue to work together to ensure success at Portland State University. Let Knowledge Serve the Students/Faculty of Portland State University” ~ President Balderas Villagrana
General Student Affairs Committee 2018-2019 Report

Committee Chair: Josh Epstein, Dept. of English (jepstein@pdx.edu)
Committee Members: Josh Epstein, ENG; Erik Geschke, ART; Melinda Holtzman, MCECS; Kristi Kang, IELP; Christopher Skinner, Admissions; Ryan Wagner, OAA
In Attendance: Michele Toppe, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Student Life

Committee Charge

This committee is charged by the Faculty Senate to:
1. Serve in an advisory capacity to Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) leadership in regard to strategic projects, outreach and initiatives
2. Review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs and long-range planning for EMSA.
3. Nominate the recipients of the President’s Awards each spring term

The committee has met four times (as of April 2019).

Overview

This report addresses three elements of GSAC’s charge and work over the past academic year.

I. Suspension of President’s Awards for 2018-2019
II. Revision of the GSAC Charge
III. Student Employee Survey

I. Suspension of the President’s Awards for 2018-2019

In past years, GSAC’s primary responsibility has been to adjudicate the President’s Awards. This year, in consultation with Vice Provost Toppe, GSAC decided to suspend the awards for one year. The past infrastructure for these awards was run through EMSA. Given the disbanding of EMSA, and related staffing issues in Student Affairs, we decided that a one-year hiatus would leave time to sort out how to make this process work within the new administrative structure. When these awards resume, we wish to work on making the awards more visible, more rewarding, and more complementary with awards given out at the department/college level. The committee intends to revisit this matter in the fall.

II. Revision of the GSAC Charge

Upon reviewing GSAC’s 2017-2018 report, the Faculty Secretary, Richard Beyler, contacted the chair to inquire about a revision of GSAC’s charge: either to give GSAC more responsibility (beyond the President’s Awards and other ad hoc tasks) or to delineate its responsibilities more narrowly. The committee has discussed this matter throughout the 2018-2019 year.

As the charge is obsolete already (viz. the reference to EMSA), this would be a good time for a renewed discussion: how can GSAC provide faculty oversight into policies and long-range planning related to student life and cocurricular engagement? We use the term “faculty” loosely to include advisory and other professional roles represented on the committee. This year
there were no students on GSAC; we would welcome the resumption of that practice. (GSAC may be able to advise the Senate on facilitating student involvement in committees generally.)

Vice Provost Toppe has been attending GSAC meetings this year, and the chair has continued meeting with her and student life offices on campuses. On the basis of these discussions, we submit that there remains a vital place for GSAC. In particular, there are many needs and opportunities for increasing the accessibility and visibility of student life resources on campus, and for creating conduits between faculty/students and various student life offices.

A common theme of our discussions has been that, as many resources as PSU offers, they often remain opaque to students who need them—and equally invisible to faculty who can and should be referring those students. Representatives of various student life offices (e.g. SHAC, the CARE team, Services for Students with Children, WRC, QRC, et al.) report that there are large segments of the faculty who have no idea these services even exist. This includes both tenure-track and non-tenure-track/contingent faculty, who are often assigned to classes with very little notice and without being oriented to available resources. We believe that all faculty (TTF, NTTF, and otherwise) would be receptive to orientations, informational sessions, and other outreach that would help them support their students, and themselves.

Vice Provost Toppe informed the committee of steps being taken to remedy this visibility issue, such as the creation of a centralized Student Life Resources website (https://sites.google.com/pdx.edu/studentliferesources/home). GSAC supports these efforts and believes it can be of service in generating more of them. There are likely targeted opportunities for informing faculty, e.g. new faculty orientations, department retreats, etc. There may also be possibilities for future studies, like the student employee survey we administered this year (see section III), assessing to what extent students and faculty are aware of the CARE team, DRC, resources for student parents, etc. (Whatever we may find in such a study, the very act of distributing the survey may itself help acquaint new people to these offices.)

GSAC can therefore continue offering robust faculty oversight on student affairs. We invite further discussions with the Senate on how this oversight can be codified in a revised charge.

III. Student Employee Survey

At the beginning of the 2018-2019 year, the Steering Committee requested that GSAC conduct a survey of student employees and compensated student leaders at PSU, “to help determine in what ways student employment is beneficial or detrimental to student success.” The committee did administer this survey, and is still reviewing the results. At present, we have received roughly 320 responses, a 12% response rate. Though we could have wished this rate to be higher, we are continuing to receive and review results. We can present a few general trends at this time.

Information about the Survey

The survey consisted of multiple-choice and written-response questions, guided by the Steering Committee’s suggestions. The list of student employees was given to the committee by Tom Luckett, who drew the information from Cognos/Datamaster. Before the survey was administered, the Human Subjects Research Review Committee confirmed that no IRB approval was needed. An initial request for help to OIRP did not bear much fruit, and the committee was left to its own devices in designing, administering, and interpreting the survey.
The survey was distributed and collected via Qualtrics. An informed consent disclaimer notified students that while Qualtrics would collect their names and data, that information would be kept confidential and excluded from our report.

The survey did ask students to identify their specific job organizations. However, in this report, the committee is reluctant to identify specific job centers as either exemplary or problematic. We are concerned that identifying specific job centers would compromise student confidentiality, especially given the relatively small quantity of negative feedback. Likewise, given the response rate, we feel that such data would be too spotty and anecdotal to use for any official findings. We are, however, open to further discussion with the Senate about the survey responses.

Survey Results

Students who took the survey report working an average of 14 hours a week in their primary job; those who work more than one job (roughly 21% of students) report working an additional 5-6 hours a week in the second job. When asked whether they were working as many hours as they had expected upon taking the job, 79% reported working as many hours as expected. The remaining 21% were split equally between those who work more hours than expected and those who work fewer. When asked whether they had needed to reduce their course-loads to accommodate PSU work schedules, 11% answered “Yes.”

The survey results indicate that a considerable majority of students believe their employment to be beneficial to their academic success. Roughly 72% of students surveyed described their employment as either “beneficial” or “very beneficial”; only 9.5% identified their employment as “detrimental” or “very detrimental” (the remaining 18.5% chose “neither beneficial nor detrimental”). In open-ended written responses, students identified a range of reasons for feeling that their employment was beneficial. A few emerged often:

- **Connections to academic coursework.** This was the most commonly noted benefit of working at PSU: students feel that their jobs help them develop knowledge and skills connected to their academic areas of focus.
- **Preparation for future career prospects,** including both skills (e.g. office skills, communication skills, laboratory work, etc.) and connections to a specific career path.
- Developing **responsible habits of work, organization, and time management.** Many students noted that their campus jobs helped, rather than hindered, their ability to balance schedules, set priorities, and advocate for themselves confidently.
- **Convenience of working close to campus.**
- **Connection to the campus community.** Several students found that their job helped them to make friends and to be more aware of activities and opportunities on campus.

These are listed in addition to the obvious financial benefits of working; for many students, attending PSU would be infeasible without their job.

The survey also inquired whether students would feel comfortable speaking with a supervisor if they needed to increase or decrease their hours. Roughly 85% of students responded that they would feel comfortable or very comfortable. Students were invited to explain in writing; of those who did, almost half praised their **supportive supervisors and flexible work environments;** roughly 1/3 mentioned supervisors who prioritized academics and made it clear that “school comes first.” (It is likely that an even higher number of students felt this way; not all students completed the written responses, and the responses were not directed by specific prompts.)
Areas of Concern

About 78% of students report that their campus jobs leave them enough or more than enough time to complete their coursework. The remaining 22% represents a sizable minority. In their written responses, students raised issues that affect not only PSU but Portland at large: namely, housing costs that make it impossible to earn enough to support oneself while keeping up with academics. Even students who generally feel that their campus work is beneficial (or at least not detrimental) to their academic success observe, for example, that they feel compelled to take more online courses to accommodate their work schedules, and to ask professors for extensions. Some students identify problems of stress, anxiety, and physical health resulting from pressure to maintain or increase their hours. Though some level of stress may be unavoidable on a college campus, some students remark that stress is “romanticized” to an unhealthy extent, whereas asking for help or relief is looked down upon. One student even reports being hospitalized for exhaustion and still feeling unable to adjust their schedule.

A small but significant number—roughly 10%—reported that they would feel uncomfortable or very uncomfortable speaking with a supervisor if they needed to change their hours. From those who explained their responses in writing, a few trends stand out:

- Of those who completed the written responses, a small but not insignificant number (14%) identified their supervisors or work environments as unsupportive or inflexible.
- A roughly equal number of students considered themselves to hold positions of responsibility (e.g. managerial positions), such that they felt pressure to maintain their hours or said they would "feel bad" about leaving their colleagues in the lurch.
- We also note a small number of students who identify having a special need, such as a physical or cognitive disability, that contributed to their feeling uncomfortable about speaking with their supervisors, or that affected the number of hours that they can work.
- Most complaints are directed at working too many hours rather than too few. A small number mention that being able to work longer hours on campus would make it easier to take classes without having to commute to jobs off campus. One student mentions having to drop out of school to hold down a job elsewhere. Most students appreciate the cap on work-study hours, as a way of encouraging them to balance jobs and academics, but there may be ways to accommodate exceptional cases for lifting this cap.

Regarding the need to reduce course loads to accommodate their work schedules, 11% of students claimed to have done so. In written responses, some students claimed that they had considered that option, but felt that doing so would keep them from graduating on time and increase the cost of their education. Some students indicated other solutions, such as taking online classes to accommodate their schedules. Particular roles, such as compensated student leaders (RAs, etc.), note that their job requires them to maintain a full-time course load anyway.

Graduate student employees have additional pressures to reduce their course loads, however, and do not all feel well-served by the university. The lack of financial aid leads some graduate students to work more hours and reduce their course loads, which in turn increases the time to degree (and, in turn, expense and debt). Though not many grad students self-identified on the survey, some report feeling undervalued, not by their own departments but by the institution.

Summary of Findings

In sum, the survey indicates a generally positive view of student employment at PSU. Though the survey results did not identify any systemic problems, there are areas of concern for the
Senate to examine. PSU would do well to continue promoting student jobs that help students connect to the campus community and support their academic and career goals. We recommend that the Senate look into ways of codifying expectations for supervisors to communicate effectively with student employees about the need to prioritize academics, and to create a work environment where students feel comfortable adjusting their hours, without guilt or pressure. Students who feel that they are working in an unsupportive work environment should have recourse—and should be made aware of their recourse—without worrying about loss of work or other reprisals. Graduate students do not all feel well served by the institution, and the Senate may want to consider ways in which they can be better supported.

We note the trend of students taking online courses to accommodate their jobs. Online classes have their benefits, but if PSU is committed to its mission to serve the city through academics, student employment should continue connecting to the work done in the classroom—not squeezing out the time students have for classroom instruction. The connection between jobs and academics is a point of strength that we should aim to create for more student workers.

We note that for some students, stress is a health concern and not just an academic one. We also encourage the Senate to increase support for students with disabilities and other special needs; their concerns about employment likely dovetail with other academic, social, and medical issues affecting a vulnerable campus population.

A future, more targeted study—perhaps one run by OIRP, or by an office with more time and more robust statistical tools—could investigate these specific concerns in more detail.

**Conclusion of Annual Report**

**ACTIONS completed:**
- Administered a large-scale survey of PSU student employees, as requested by the Steering Committee, and compiled preliminary findings (still in progress).
- Suspended the President’s Awards for at least one year, pending our ability to reconstruct the infrastructure and nomination procedure formerly run out of EMSA.
- Met with Vice Provost Toppe and representatives from Student Life offices to discuss ways in which GSAC can provide faculty oversight and visibility for campus resources.

**ACTIONS to be taken in spring term:**
- Continue meeting with Vice Provost Toppe and Student Life representatives to discuss future opportunities for collaboration, and (as the Senate deems appropriate) continuing to revise the charge and define the scope of our faculty oversight.
- Continue reviewing student employee survey results.
- Select permanent chair for the 2019-2020 academic year.

**RECOMMENDATIONS to 2019-2020 committee chair:**
- Continue working with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to propose a revised role for GSAC and new language for the committee’s constitutional charge.
- In dialogue with Vice Provost Toppe and the Senate, reassess the President’s Awards, in a way that will (a) fit the new administrative structure and (b) make the awards more visible and more complementary with departmental and college-level honors.
Honors Council
2018-2019 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:
Cornelia Coleman (HON)

Council members:
Michael Bartlett (BIO)
Pelin Basci (WLL)
Todd Bodner (PSY)
Joseph Bohling (HST)
Debra Clemens (OIA)
Harrell Fletcher (A&D)
Erin Flynn (SSW)
Hollie Hix-Small (SpEd)
Bin Jiang (MTH)
Mauri Matsuda (CCJ)
Joan Petit (LIB)
Christina Sun (CH)
Christof Teuscher (ECE)
Lawrence Wheeler (HON)
Kim Williams (POL)

Student members:
Alex Meyers (HON)

Consultants:
Susan Jeffords (Provost)
Shelly Chabon (Dean of Interdisciplinary General Education and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development)
Brenda Glascott (Director of University Honors College)
Amy Spring (UNST Council Representative)

Council Business:
In Fall term the Honors Council met with Honors College Director to review results of the Honors College academic program review (APR). In their report, the reviewers questioned the role the HC plays in governance now that Honors has become a self-
governing academic unit. It was recommended both in the APR report provided by the external reviewers and in PSU’s response that a re-write of the charge of the Honors Council be done to reflect the change of UHC’s status from program to college. The Honors Council is currently in the process of reviewing these suggestions as they relate to the ongoing mission of the HC. It is expected that this work will continue into next year.
To: Portland State University Faculty Senate

Subject: Annual Report

From: Intercollegiate Athletics Board

Date: April 11, 2019

Members 2018-19 Academic Year:
   David Burgess, Chair, (OIRP); Toeutu Faaleava (MCNAIR); Bruce Irvin (General Public Rep);
   Karen Karavanic (CMPS), Michael Smith (COE); and Derek Tretheway (MME).

Ex-officio Members:
   Valerie Cleary, Director of Athletics; Dana Cappelucci, Associate Athletics Director;
   and Brian Janssen, Associate Director, SALP.

Faculty Senate charges the board to:
   • 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 men’s and women’s
     intercollegiate athletics.
   • Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

I. Budget:

   The Current Service Level (CSL) Based on FY19 General Fund Budget:
   Personnel Expenses: $15.5 million
   Service and Supplies Inflation: $1.6 million
   Estimated Recurring Innovation & Student Success Investments: $1.5 million
   Total Estimated Annual Expenditure: $18.6 million

   Review of Resources:
   Auxilliary/Non-E&G Revenue:
   2019: $2,470,364 (budget)
   General Fund and Student Fees:
   2019: $10,374,269 (budget)
   State Allocation and Foundation:
   2019: $1,527,131 (budget)
   Grand Total: $14,371,764 (budget)

   Big Sky Conference Expenses:
   PSU has the lowest expenses in all of the Big Sky Conference with $12.48M for the 2017-18 per
   NCAA Membership Financial Reporting Data (NAU and Northern Co show 2016-17 data).

II. Athletic Policy:
   PSU has no current policy changes. Note: Big Sky Conference is implementing a policy on serious
   misconduct. The Athletic Department has concerns about legal implications and PSU’s legal counsel
   is reviewing.

III. Compliance:
   The federal Department of Education requires universities to evaluate their varsity athletics
   departments for gender equity to determine if there is equity in the participation level as well in the
   resources provided to student athletes. This year the Gender Equity in Athletics Committee

---

1 Strategic Investment planning process underway – estimated completion March 2019.
(Committee) is evaluating the resources to determine if athletes are receiving the resources equitably. This includes collecting data on areas of scholarship, equipment and supplies, practice time and location, travel and food allowance, academic support services, coaches and other areas. The committee will be collecting data and conducting surveys of the athletes this academic year. Next academic year the committee will be analyzing the data and writing a report. The committee is made up of the Title IX Coordinator, representatives from the athletics department - including the Deputy Title IX Coordinator for athletics, a student athlete and a coach, rec sports, as well as the Faculty Athletics Representative, a faculty member, Director of OIRP, Assistant General Counsel.

IV. Academic Progress Rates (APR) The APR, or Academic Progress Rate, holds institutions accountable for the academic progress of their student-athletes through a team-based metric that accounts for the eligibility and retention of each student-athlete for each academic term:

APR results (Jan 2, 2019)

2017-18 (multi-year APR) – score of 930 or above required to compete in championships
- One (1) team with perfect (1,000) APR: men’s tennis.
- Remaining teams: M-BB (938), W-V (944), M-XC (955), W-GLF (955), M-FB (960), W-TRK (964), M-TRK (965), W-BB (970), W-XC (975), W-SB (984), W-SCR (984), & W-TEN (990).

2017-18 (single year APR) *

- Five (5) teams with perfect (1,000) APR: M-TEN, W-GLF, W-SB, W-SCR, & W-TEN.
- Remaining seven (7) teams: W-V (929), M-FB (937), M-BB (938), M-TRK (944), W-BB (950), W-TRK (955), and W-XC (958).

* M-XC redacted due to small size (3 or less student-athletes).

Federal Graduate Rates (FGR) At the time of this report review of FGR was not completed (will report in fall).

V. New Coach Hires:

- Zach Payne - Assistant Coach – Men’s Basketball Hired June 2018 – former assistant coach at Western Oregon University
- Danielle Walker – Assistant Coach – Women’s Volleyball Hired August 2018 – former graduate assistant coach at the University of Southern Mississippi

VI. Athletics Achievements:

Big Sky Conference Academic Honors (Spring 2018):

- Vikings place 44 on Spring Academic All-conference Teams. To be eligible, a student-athlete must have participated in at least half of the team's competitions, achieved a 3.2 cumulative grade point average, and completed at least one academic term at his/her current Big Sky institution.

- The Vikings had honorees in golf, tennis, track and field and softball. With these selections, PSU boasts 127 Academic All-Big Sky Conference awards among its 15 sports during the 2017-18 academic year.

- Here are Portland State’s Academic All-Big Sky Conference honorees:
Women's Golf
Tara Finigan – Jr. – Health Science
Valerie Hernandez – So. – Business
Windy Huang – Fr. – Exploratory Studies
Hannah Swanson – Sr. – Business

Men's Track and Field
Alex Cisneros – Jr. – Business: Accounting
Kamal-Craig Golaube – So. – Applied Health & Fitness
Austen Hvidsten – Jr. – Speech & Hearing Sciences
Kevin Luyamba – Jr. – Sciences
Viktor Moen – Jr. – Arts and Letters
Se Min Park – So. – Electrical Engineering
Jason Rac – So. – Geology
 Donté Robinson – Jr. – Applied Health and Fitness
Andy Solano – Fr. – Mathematics
Justin Wikler – Sr. – Health Science

Women's Track and Field
Katie Baxter – Sr. – Business
Alexis Buckhaults – Fr. – Applied Health and Fitness
Alana Chaplin – Sr. – Health Science
Megan Cornett – Fr. – Business
Natalie Cummings – Fr. – Chemistry
Taylor Elliott – Fr. – Psychology
Kaila Gibson – Jr. – Health Science
Meggie Karp – Fr. – Health Science
McKenna Martin – Fr. – Child, Youth & Fam. Stud.

Women's Track and Field Continued
Angela Mumford – So. – Community Health
Kristen O'Handley – Fr. – Business
Nicole Terry – Fr. – Health Science

Softball
Marissa Bruno – So. – Business: Management
Alyssa Burk – Jr. – Criminology & Criminal Justice
Riley Casper – So. – Applied Health & Fitness
Kortney Craker – Sr. – Applied Health & Fitness
Jessica Flanagan – So. – Applied Health & Fitness
Tayler Gunesch – So. – Business: Supply Chain Mgmt.
Rachel Menlove – Fr. – Health Science
Alexis Morrison – So. – Health Science

Men's Tennis
Tommy Edwards – Jr. – Business: Accounting
Otto Holtari – So. – Business: Accounting
Sam Roberts – So. – Business
Avery West – Sr. – Geology

Women's Tennis
Ashley Knecht – Jr. – Health Science
Siena Peri – Sr. – Business
Taylor Rees – Jr. – Business
Gerda Upeniece – Fr. – Business
Alli Valk – So. – Business
Eszter Zador – So. – Theater Arts

Big Sky Conference Academic Honors (Fall 2018):
Vikings place 56 on Fall Academic All-conference Teams. To be eligible, a student-athlete must have participated in at least half of the team's competitions, achieved a 3.2 cumulative grade point average, and completed at least one academic term at his/her current Big Sky institution.

The Vikings had 19 football, 15 cross-country, 15 soccer and 7 volleyball athletes honored.
Portland State's combined GPA of all student-athletes in the fall was 3.12. The average team GPA was 3.23.

The Vikings placed 40 total athletes on the President's and Dean's Lists, with an even split on each list. Students with a term GPA of 4.0 and a cumulative PSU GPA of 3.5 or better are placed on the President's List. Students with a term GPA of 3.75-3.99 and a cumulative PSU GPA of 3.5 or better are placed on the Dean's List.

Here are Portland State's Academic All-Big Sky Conference honorees:
**Football**
Anthony Adams – FR – Applied Health and Fitness
Houston Barnes – SR – Social Science
Kenton Bartlett – JR – Criminal Justice
Brady Brick – FR – History
Larry Brister – JR – Applied Health and Fitness
Jalani Eason** – SO – Communications
Daniel Giannossa – SO – History
Romeo Gunt – JR – Social Science
Nathan Hawthorne – SO – Business
Sirgeo Hoffman – JR – Applied Health and Fitness
Ryan Lesch – JR – Psychology
Ben Niesner* – SO – Applied Health and Fitness
Jake Porter – FR – Business
Jared Reed – FR – Communications
Shawn Richard – JR – Criminal Justice
Korbin Sorensen – SO – Economics
Mataio Talalemotu** – FR – Business
Noah Yunker* – SO – Business

**Volleyball**
Haley Glass** – SR – History
Mary Jo McBride – JR – Business
Toni McDougal – JR – Social Science
Jenna Mullen** – SR – Child and Family Studies
Maddy Reeb* – SO – Health Science
Mackenzie Sullivan – FR – Exploratory
Katy Wilson – SR – Criminal Justice

**Cross Country**
Liam Jemison – SO – Mathematics
Cody Jones – FR – Applied Health and Fitness
Jason Rae – JR – Geology
Drew Seidel** – FR – Electrical Engineering
Andy Solano* – SO – Mathematics
Ian Vickstrom – FR – Architecture
Phoebe Brown* – FR – Health Science
Sammy Burke – FR – Applied Health and Fitness
Kaila Gibson** – SR – Health Science
Phoebe Jacques* – FR – Applied Health and Fitness
Linnaea Kavulich** – FR – Biochemistry
McKenna Martin** – SO – Child & Family Studies
Hunter Storm – FR – Biology
Delaney White – SO – Political Science

**Soccer**
Abbie Faingold – SR – Criminal Justice
Liz Hansen* – SO – Business
Jadyn Harris – FR – Biology
Jacky Huchler** – SR – Child and Family Studies
Kasey Isobe – JR – Business
Molly Joyce – SO – Biochemistry
Morgan Matthews – SR – Arts and Letters
Maxine Nagramada – JR – Health Science
Sofi Papastamos – FR – Health Science
Tasi Poore – SO – Business
Tea Poore – SO – Health Science
Jade Raffalo** – JR – Criminal Justice
Regan Russell – JR – Psychology
Ellie Vasey – SO – Computer Science
Krystal de Ramos – SR – Communications

*Denotes Dean's List member
**Denotes President's List member
VII. Competition:

2017-2018 - Spring Sports
Women’s Golf: 3rd place, Big Sky Championship
Women’s Tennis: finished last place, regular season
Women’s Outdoor Track: Gold medal Steeplechase, Sarah Medved – SO – Pre-education
Women’s Softball: 3rd place Big Sky Tournament, 4th place regular season
Men’s Outdoor Track: Gold medal Decathlon, Dante Robinson – JR – Health Sciences
Men’s Tennis: Finished 5th place regular season, made it to the quarterfinals of Big Sky Championship

Tara Finigan – JR - Health Studies, 2018 all-conference 1st team honors Women’s Golf

2018-2019 – Fall and Winter Sports
Women’s Cross-country: 5th place Big Sky Tournament
Women’s Basketball: Big Sky Tournament Champions
Women’s Volleyball: Finished 10th place, regular season
Men’s Cross-country: 8th place, Big Sky Tournament
Men’s Football: Finished 9th place, regular season
Men’s Basketball: Finished 5th place, regular season
Men’s Indoor Track: Gold medal Heptathlon, Dante Robinson – JR – Health Sciences

Ashley Bolston – SR – Criminology and Criminal Justice, Big Sky Tournament MVP, Women’s Basketball
Courtney West – SR – Elementary Education, Big Sky Defensive Player of the Year, Women’s Basketball
Charlie Taumoepeau – JR – Social Science, All-Big Sky Conference 1st team honors, Football
Date: April 4, 2019

To: Faculty Senate

From: Paloma Harrison, Scholastic Standards Committee Chair

Re: Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee for the 2018-19 Academic Year

I. Membership
The Scholastic Standards Committee is a constitutional committee, and its members are appointed by the Committee on Committees. Membership for the 2018-19 Academic Year:

   Scott Broussard, ACS PW1
   Michele Miller, IELP
   Paloma Harrison, ACS PW4
   Jennifer Dahlin, SHAC
   Derek Garton, MTH
   Jennifer Loney, SBA
   Andrea Griggs, EEP
   Thomas Schumacher, CEN
   Liz Shatzer, ACS PW6
   Ryan Wagner, ACS PW2

II. Charge of the Scholastic Standards Committee, per the Constitution
   1. Develop and recommend academic standards to maintain the integrity of the undergraduate program and academic transcripts of the University.
   2. Develop, maintain, and implement protocols regarding academic changes to undergraduate transcripts.
   3. Adjudicate undergraduate student petitions for academic reinstatement to the University.
   4. Report to the Senate at least once a year.
   5. Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of the Academic Requirements and Curriculum Committees, and the Graduate Council.

III. Function of the Scholastic Standards Committee
The Scholastic Standards Committee maintains the integrity of student academic records at the undergraduate level and adjudicates on student petitions for changes to the record. This takes the form of requests for retroactive adds, drops, tuition refunds, and withdrawals; grade option changes and grade-to-grade changes; incomplete extensions; and reinstatement following academic dismissal.

The Committee also makes recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding any alteration of policy or standards that affect the transcript, registration deadlines, and academic standing. As
part of the Constitutional charge, the Committee is responsible for the undergraduate academic standing policy, and any proposed changes to it must be vetted by the Committee and approved by Faculty Senate.

IV. Activities
The Scholastic Standards Committee meets bi-weekly year-round, including one extra meeting at the start of each term. The main activity of the Committee is to read petitions and support materials, review previous petitions and academic records, and adjudicate on the petitions. The Committee saw a slight increase in the total number of petitions received in the 2018-19 AY, about a 9% increase over the previous year’s total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition Type</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop with Refund</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop Overall (including add, add/drop, drop no refund/withdrawals)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade option changes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Extension</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>662</strong></td>
<td><strong>512</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Gratitude
The Scholastic Standards Committee would like to acknowledge the invaluable, ongoing assistance and expertise provided by the Registrar’s Office, including but not limited to Stephanie Youngs and Luke Norman. And the chair would like to express appreciation for the continued support provided by former chair Michele Miller.
2018/2019 UNST Council Report to Faculty Senate

Prepared by Evguenia Davidova, Chair


Consultants: Rowanna Carpenter, Oscar Fernandez, Maurice Hamington, Michael Lupro

I. Curriculum

A. The UNST/Cluster Curriculum Committee (Chaired by Michael Lupro) reviewed and recommended a number of courses for inclusion in various clusters. The Council then reviewed and approved in the Fall and Winter the following courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Cluster(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARH 360</td>
<td>The Art of War: Representing the Crusades</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 302</td>
<td>Design is Everywhere</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking/Innovation/Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 385</td>
<td>Contemporary Literature</td>
<td>Examining Popular Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 387U</td>
<td>Women’s Literature</td>
<td>Families and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 397U</td>
<td>Digital Literary Studies</td>
<td>Freedom Privacy Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 309</td>
<td>The Roman Republic</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 310</td>
<td>The Roman Empire</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 345</td>
<td>Manga Now!</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 345</td>
<td>Manga Now!</td>
<td>Examining Popular Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 369U</td>
<td>Music and Social Change</td>
<td>Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 354</td>
<td>Introduction to Asian Politics</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 356U</td>
<td>Environmental Success Stories</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 356U</td>
<td>Environmental Success Stories</td>
<td>Science in the Social Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399</td>
<td>STEM Research: Working to Solve Today’s Problems</td>
<td>Science in Social Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399U</td>
<td>Green Roof Technology</td>
<td>Science in Social Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The following courses have been removed from UNST Clusters (the recommendation for removal was made by the Department):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Cluster(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BST 406U</td>
<td>Caribbean Overseas Program</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 412U</td>
<td>Oregon African American History</td>
<td>American Identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 414U</td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 414U</td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>American Identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Program

A. Encouraged by the successful revision of the old UNST Diversity Goal, now titled “Diversity, Equity and Social Justice,” this Fall the Council completed the revision of the UNST Ethics and Social Responsibility Goal, which was approved by the Faculty Senate in January 2019. The new title is “Ethics, Agency and Community.”

B. The Council has continued to expand the Awards for Teaching Excellence that recognize UNST teaching. The subcommittee has designed a FRINQ award (since 2016), Capstone award (since 2017), SINQ (since 2018), and this year there will be a Senior Inquiry award added for the first time. The Council also voted to develop a Cluster award within two years; the process for such an award is more complex and will require consultations with departments and other stakeholders.

III. Ongoing projects:

A. In Spring 2017, the Council endorsed a pilot project for developing a periodic cluster alignment review process. The cluster currently under review is Knowledge, Values, Rationality. So far, a rubric to review the UNST content in the cluster courses has been prepared, which assesses how the course learning outcomes align with the cluster and UNST outcomes. A survey and request for syllabi has been sent out to the respective instructors. In Winter 2019, the Council’s subcommittee reviewed all materials and in Spring will send the results to department chairs. Based on its findings, the subcommittee will make recommendations to the Council by the end of the year. The goal is to create a regular cycle of review/alignment. Two other clusters, Global Environmental Change and Gender and Sexualities, have volunteered to go through the process during the next academic year.

B. Some of the Council’s members formed a subcommittee to explore a possible revision of the UNST Communication goal.
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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:
Absher, Linda (Library)
Comer, Kate (English)
Glascott, Brenda (Honors)
Hartig, Alissa (Applied Linguistics)
DeWeese, Dan (English)
Jaffee, Daniel (Sociology)
Knepler, Annie (University Studies)
Larson, Kirsten (School of Business)
Miller, Hildy (English)
Spitzer, Linnea (IELP)

Completed Business:

In spring of 2018, the UWC designed and administered a survey of Deans, Chairs, and Directors regarding undergraduate and graduate student writing. Respondents were asked about their departments’ current handling of disciplinary writing instruction, areas of concern, and priorities for potential investment. A summary of responses follows, with more details available upon request:

- The most common methods for both undergraduate and graduate writing instruction are 1) writing-related outcomes in core/required courses, 2) referrals to Writing Center, and 3) resources and style guides.
- The highest ranked challenges for undergraduate student writers were 1) organizing for logical structure, 2-3) Developing argument [tied with] supporting argument with evidence 4) articulating research agenda, and 5) understanding audience/purpose/context. The highest ranked
challenges for graduate student writers were 1) articulating research agenda, 2) supporting argument with evidence, 3) adopting a critical stance, 4-6) organizing for logical structure [tied with] situating research in field [tied with] polishing grammar/mechanics.

- The preferred path for increased departmental support of undergraduate writing is to reinstate the WIC program with reduced class sizes and/or GA support for writing-intensive courses, and then either add a WIC designation to an existing requirement or develop a new WIC course. The preferred paths for increased departmental support of graduate writing were to offer more workshops outside coursework and/or develop new required or elective courses.

- Responses indicated support for making WIC courses a university requirement and expanding WIC to the grad level. There was also interest in 1-credit writing labs at both levels.

The UWC’s interpretation of survey results suggests the following:
1. Neither undergraduate nor graduate students are receiving significant direct instruction on writing in their disciplines.
2. Faculty perceptions about students’ writing challenges focus on higher-order concerns that would be best addressed in advanced/upper-division courses that emphasize disciplinary methods, genres, and conventions.
3. Investment in and expansion of the WIC program would address faculty concerns while serving students’ academic success and professional development.

**Ongoing Business:**

1. The UWC is working to articulate the learning objectives for classes fulfilling the writing requirement, including updated specifications for WIC designation.

2. The UWC investigated various dual credit programs at PSU and discovered that PSU was offering writing credit for the ABL-based program Willamette Promise without consulting with the UWC or other stakeholders on campus. The UWC met with various stakeholders to discuss this program. The UWC made a request to Provost Susan Jeffords that PSU refuse writing credit from ABL programs, including Willamette Promise, effective immediately and begin a discussion to establish a process for accepting credit from dual credit programs that includes faculty input.