

# Faculty Senate, 4 November 2019



In accordance with the Bylaws, the agenda and supporting documents are sent to senators and ex-officio members in advance of meetings so that members of Senate can consider action items, study documents, and confer with colleagues. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full curricular proposals are available through the Online Curriculum Management System:

[pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard](http://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard)

If there are questions or concerns about agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay Senate business.

Items on the *Consent Agenda* are **approved** (proposals or motions) or **received** (reports) without further discussion, unless a senator gives notice to the Secretary in writing prior to the meeting, or from the floor prior to the end of **roll call**. Any senator may pull any item from the *Consent Agenda* for separate consideration, provided timely notice is given.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of any **alternate**. An alternate is a faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator who is empowered to act on the senator's behalf in discussions and votes. An alternate may represent only one senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than three meetings consecutively will be dropped from the Senate roster.

[www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate](http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate)

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



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

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

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1]
  - \* 1. Minutes of the 7 October 2019 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for October – *Consent Agenda*
- B. Announcements
  - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - 3. Work in progress on new budget model (D. Maddox)
- C. Discussion: budget and curriculum
- D. Unfinished Business: none
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC) – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 2. New courses – School of Public Health retroactive curricular review (SPH via GC)
  - \* 3. Changing review period for NTT faculty after continuous appointment from three to five years (AHC-ANTTF)
  - \* 4. New series of teaching professor ranks (AHC-ANTTF)
- F. Question Period
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
  - 1. President's report
  - 2. Provost's report
  - 3. Report from Violet Gibson, ASPSU President
- H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments. Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**

<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>

- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 7 October 2019 – *Consent Agenda*
- A.2. October Notice of Senate Actions – *Consent Agenda*
- E.1.b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *Consent Agenda* (Note: there is no E.1.a.)
- E.2. Curricular proposals (summaries) – SPH retroactive review  
(Note: internal numbering uses E.1.c.; however, this appears as a separate agenda item, E.2.)
- E.3. Proposed motion on period of review for NTT faculty after continuous appointment
- E.4. Proposed motion on new teaching professor ranks

# PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE, 2019-20

## STEERING COMMITTEE

Isabel Jaén Portillo, Presiding Officer

Michele Gamburd, Presiding Officer Elect • Thomas Lockett, Past Presiding Officer

*Elected Members:* Rowanna Carpenter (2020) • Jill Emery (2021) • Jon Holt (2021) • Michael Lupro (2020)

*Ex-Officio Members:* Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty • Rowanna Carpenter, Senior IFS Rep.

Karen Karvanic & Susan Lindsay, Co-chairs, Comm. on Committees • Yves Labissiere, Faculty member of Board of Trustees

## FACULTY SENATE ROSTER (60)

<b>College of the Arts (4)</b>			<b>Maseeh College of Engineering &amp; Computer Sci. (5)</b>		
*Dillard, Chuck	MUS	2020	Anderson, Tim	ETM	2021
James, Meredith	A+D	2020	Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata	ECE	2021
†Magaldi, Karin	TA	2021	<i>Duncan, Donald</i>	ECE	2022
TBD		2020	<i>Feng, Wu-chang</i>	CMP	2022
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Arts &amp; Letters (6)</b>			†Karavanic, Karen	CMP	2020
Dolidon, Annabelle	WLL	2020	<b>Library (1)</b>		
†Greco, Gina	WLL	2021	†Emery, Jill	LIB	2020
Holt, Jon	WLL	2021	<b>School of Public Health (2)</b>		
<i>Limbu, Bishopal</i>	ENG	2022	*Izumi, Betty	CH	2021
†Thorne, Steven	WLL	2022	†Labissiere, Yves	CH	2022
Watanabe, Suwako	WLL	2020	<b>School of Social Work (4)</b>		
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Sciences (7)</b>			Bryson, Stephanie	SSW	2020
<i>Eppley, Sarah</i>	BIO	2022	May, Edward	SSW	2021
Fountain, Robert	MTH	2021	Mosier, Miranda	SSW	2020
George, Linda	ESM	2020	†Oswald, Mary	RRI	2022
†Jedynak, Bruno	MTH	2022	<b>College of Urban and Public Affairs (5)</b>		
†Lafferriere, Beatriz	MTH	2022	Chaillé, Peter	PAD	2020
Palmiter, Jeanette	MTH	2020	†Eastin, Josh	PS	2021
Thanheiser, Eva	MTH	2021	*Henderson, Kelsey	CCJ	2020
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Social Sciences (7)</b>			<i>Kinsella, David</i>	PS	2022
*Ajibade, Idowu	GGR	2020	*Tinkler, Sarah	ECN	2021
Fritz, Charlotte	PSY	2021	<b>Other Instructional (3)</b>		
<i>Gamburd, Michele</i>	ANT	2022	†Lindsay, Susan	IELP	2020
Hsu, Chia Yin	HST	2020	Lupro, Michael	UNST	2021
*Lafrenz, Martin	GGR	2020	Newlands, Sarah	UNST	2021
†Meyer, Claudia	SPHR	2021	<b>All Others (9)</b>		
†Reitenauer, Vicki	WGSS	2022	Baccar, Cindy	REG	2020
<b>The School of Business (4)</b>			Broussard, Scott	ACS	2021
†Dimond, Michael	SB	2020	Faaleava, Toeutu	OAA	2020
Hansen, David	SB	2021	*Fiorillo, Marie	ACS	2020
<i>Loney, Jennifer</i>	SB	2022	<i>Flores, Greg</i>	ACS	2022
<i>Sanchez, Becky</i>	SB	2022	<i>Harris, Randi</i>	OAI	2022
<b>College of Education (3)</b>			Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2021
†Farahmandpur, Ramin	ELP	2022	<i>Kennedy, Karen</i>	ACS	2022
Sugimoto, Amanda	C&I	2021	†Matlick, Nick	REG	2021
Thieman, Gayle	C&I	2020			
[vacant]		2020			

-----  
*Newly elected senators in italics*

\* Interim appointment

† Member of Committee on Committees

**Date: 10 October 2019**

## EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF FACULTY SENATE, 2019-20

Ex-officio members of Faculty Senate include certain administrators, elected Faculty officers, and chairs of constitutional committees. Administrative ex-officio members are ineligible to be elected senators. Ex-officio members do not vote (unless they are also elected senators), but may make motions and participate in Senate discussions without further recognition.

<i>Adler, Sy</i>	<i>Interim Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs</i>
<i>Allen, Clifford</i>	<i>Dean, The School of Business</i>
Baccar, Cindy*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
<i>Bangsberg, David</i>	<i>Dean, OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health</i>
<i>Beyler, Richard</i>	<i>Secretary to the Faculty</i>
<i>Bielavitz, Thomas</i>	<i>Dean, University Library</i>
Boyce, Steven	Co-chair, Budget Committee
Burgess, David	Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Board
<i>Bynum, Leroy, Jr.</i>	<i>Dean, College of the Arts</i>
<i>Carlson, Matthew</i>	<i>Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</i>
Caron, Julie	<i>Interim Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion</i>
Carpenter, Rowanna	Steering Committee (2018-20); IFS (Jan. 2020-Dec. 2022)
<i>Chabon, Shelly</i>	<i>Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development</i>
Coleman, Claudia	Chair, Honors Council
<i>Coll, Jose</i>	<i>Dean, School of Social Work</i>
<i>Corsi, Richard</i>	<i>Dean, Maseeh College of Engineering &amp; Computer Science</i>
Cruzan, Mitchell	Co-Chair, Budget Committee Committees
Duh, Geoffrey	Chair, Academic Requirements Committee
Epstein, Josh	Chair, General Student Affairs Committee
Gamburd, Michele*	Presiding Officer Elect, Advisory Council (2019-21)
<i>Gibson, Violet</i>	<i>President, ASPSU</i>
Ginley, Susan	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Greco, Gina*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
Hansen, David*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
Harrison, Paloma	Co-chair, Scholastic Standards Committee
Hendricks, Arthur	Co-chair, Educational Policy Committee
Jaén Portillo, Isabel	Presiding Officer
<i>Jeffords, Susan</i>	<i>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</i>
Kirtley, Suan	Chair, University Writing Council
<i>Knepfle, Chuck</i>	<i>Vice President for Enrollment Management</i>
Labissiere, Yves*	Advisory Council (2019-21); IFS (Jun. 2019-Dec. 2021); Faculty Trustee
Loikith, Paul	Chair, Graduate Council
Luckett, Thomas	Past Presiding Officer
<i>Lynn, Marvin</i>	<i>Dean, College of Education</i>
<i>Maddox, David</i>	<i>Interim Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning</i>
Merrow, Kathleen	Chair, Academic Quality Committee
Millay, Lea	Chair, Library Committee
Miller, Michele	Co-chair, Scholastic Standards Committee
<i>Percy, Stephen</i>	<i>Interim President</i>
<i>Podrabsky, Jason</i>	<i>Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies</i>
<i>Reynolds, Kevin</i>	<i>Vice President for Finance and Administration</i>
Sager, Alexander	Co-chair, Educational Policy Committee
Sanchez, Becky*	IFS (Sep. 2019-Dec. 2020)
Spencer, Randy	Chair, University Studies Council
<i>Toppe, Michele</i>	<i>Vice Provost for Student Affairs &amp; Dean of Student Life</i>
Webb, Rachel	Advisory Council (2019-21)
<i>Wooster, Rossitza</i>	<i>Dean, Graduate School</i>
Zonoozy, Khalil	Adjunct faculty representative Chair, Faculty Development Committee

\* Also an elected senator • *Administrative members in italics* • Date:23 September 2019

## Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 October 2019

**Presiding Officer:** Isabel Jaén Portillo

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Anderson, Baccar, Broussard, Bryson, Chaillé, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Dillard, Dimond, Dolidon, Duncan, Eastin, Emery, Eppley, Faaleava, Farahmandpur, Feng, Fiorillo, Flores, Fountain, Fritz, Gamburd, George, Greco, Harris, Henderson, Holt, Hsu, Ingersoll, Izumi, James, Jedynek, Karavanic, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Lafrenz, Limbu, Lindsay, Loney, Magaldi, Matlick, May, Meyer, Mosier, Newlands, Oschwald, Palmiter, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Thanheiser, Thieman, Thorne, Tinkler, Watanabe

**Senators absent:** Hansen, Kennedy, Sugimoto, Thieman

**Ex-officio members present:** Adler, Beyler, Bielavitz, Burgess, Carpenter, Chabon, Duh, Gibson, Jaén Portillo, Kneple, Loikith, Luckett, Lynn, Percy, Toppe, Webb, Wooster, Zonoozy

**\$ ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA.** The meeting was **called to order** at 3:02 p.m.

**Minutes of the 3 June 2019 meeting** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

**OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for - X Q H** was **received** as part of the *Agenda*.

### %ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### **Announcements from Presiding Officer**

JAÉN PORTILLO welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the year. She thanked senators for their trust, recognized newly elected senators, and valued contributions of colleagues on the Steering Committee. LUCKETT had agreed to be parliamentarian. She appreciated PERCY's stepping into the role of President. She thanked other members of the administration, and recognized hard work of the bargaining team. JAÉN saw the work of Senate, and shared governance generally, to revolve around academic quality for the benefit our students and our communities. This was particularly important as we face financial challenges. In this climate, faculty, administrators, and trustees must work together to ensure that resources are distributed flexibly and fairly, that the quality of education we provide does not suffer, and that our University will continue to serve our community.

JAÉN continued: long-term goals are essential, beyond short-term crisis-fixing solutions. Two examples: striving to preserve, strengthen, and balance programs in all components of higher education, instead of shrinking them or making them disappear; and supporting faculty so that student can access the quality of education that they deserve. Faculty and students are the backbone of any university; the administration's role and purpose is then to support strategies for academic quality and student success. She hoped this year to engage faculty, staff, trustees, and students in a series of conversations about how we can move our University forward through shared governance.

JAÉN called attention to the upcoming town halls being held by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Advancement for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on October 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>.

JAÉN displayed a message that had been circulated by the Board of Trustees on postponing launching a presidential search [sent by e-mail to University community on 2 October; see **Appendix B.1**]. She greatly appreciated this statement of respect for shared governance, but noted that Steering Committee did not intend to conduct a formal review but rather to initiate a series of conversations, starting today and then continuing in a meeting of the Faculty in November.

## 2. **Announcements from Secretary**

BEYLER made procedural announcements about distribution of the monthly packet, formation of the Faculty Senate districts for the year, and determination of voting procedures (use of secret ballot follows upon request by five or more senators). BEYLER reviewed rules for placing items on the Senate agenda. Usually this was through referral by a constitutional committee (including Steering). Extraordinarily, the Presiding Officer can unilaterally place items on the agenda. A petition by Faculty members can also place an item on the agenda. Finally, a senator supported by two others “in open meeting” can place on the next month’s Senate agenda. He emphasized this because of questions in previous years, and because of something that came up during the summer. If a senator—perhaps at behest of constituents—is dissatisfied with the action or inaction of Senate or of a committee, this is a way to address the problem. Three senators acting together can say: “We want Faculty Senate to consider this issue.”

## 3. **New SLATE admissions system**

WOOSTER announced plans to upgrade admissions systems. In consultation with the Office of Information Technology, deans, the Registrar, Financial Aid Office, and other stakeholders, Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions had decided to implement the SLATE system. This represented, WOOSTER said, an improvement in students’ experience with the application process. It will provide real-time reporting and modelling for stakeholders. It will be supported by OIT and integrated with Banner. At the graduate level, the goal is to open SLATE for reviewing applicants on April 1st, and to complete processing of any CollegeNet applications by the end of June. She then introduced Chuck KNEPFLE, Vice President for Enrollment Management. KNEPFLE characterized SLATE as customer relations management software tailored for new students. The undergraduate side won’t affect faculty as much as the graduate side. It modernizes a system that is currently, in his view, on the primitive side. Undergraduate applications will go live in August 2020. KNEPFLE added that SLATE will enable more efficient and targeted recruiting.

FARAHMANDPUR asked about predictability: what does this program allow us to do? KNEPFLE said that [recruiting capabilities] are more on the communications side; it allows us to send targeted information to students, and is an interface for students to see where they are in the process. It will collect more data that will allow us to better predict who will enroll. FARAHMANDPUR asked about privacy issues: who exactly is collecting the data? KNEPFLE’s understanding was that data is provided by students in the application. As many other universities do, we also purchase names of students from testing services. International data privacy rules may have an impact; he was also aware of some pending legislation in California.

LUCKETT noted that the current system archives the previous applications, so that information on previously admitted students is available, e.g., transcripts. Will that information go away? WOOSTER thought that there is similar storage of data in SLATE. LUCKETT: but will we lose access to the old data? WOOSTER thought not, but could double-check with the implementation team. She mentioned that a chart showing the implementation process is on the OIT website.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked how much of the student data is collected voluntarily, and how much is required? KNEPFLE responded that the admission application indicates required and optional fields. We need certain information to make admissions decisions; we also have information we're required to collect for the state, that we may or may not use in the admissions process. The current plan is to eliminate about thirty items from the application: to collect the minimum amount of information necessary to make an admissions decision and to report accurately as required by government. She hoped that we are requiring students to submit more information that necessary. KNEPFLE said that part of the project is to slim down to only necessary items.

### **C. DISCUSSION: upcoming Faculty meeting on University leadership and governance**

LUCKETT reviewed background: last spring Steering Committee, following a Senate resolution, wrote a report on concerns with the administration and shared governance at PSU [see **June Agenda Attachment E.2**]. Circulating at the same time was a petition to convene a special meeting of the Faculty in the fall to discuss the administrative and governance structures at PSU. It seemed a particularly opportune time to have such a discussion, when much of our administration is interim and many questions about the future are open.

LUCKETT pointed out that the Faculty is a body defined in the Constitution [of the PSU Faculty]. Article IV, Section 3 contains provisions to call a special meeting of the Faculty. We aren't aware of any such meeting in the last fifty years. Originally this was how faculty governance worked; in the 1960s it was decided to create a Senate to meet regularly, but retain a provision to convene the whole Faculty. There are also regular meetings of the Faculty, such as Convocation. When it meets, assuming there is a quorum, its authority is superior to that of the Senate; we could hypothetically vote on a resolution which would take precedence over resolutions of the Senate. He did not expect that to happen, but it is a possibility. Such a meeting is presided over by the President of the University.

The petition gave the Steering Committee the task of scheduling such a meeting. We have reserved the Smith [SMSU] Ballroom for Wednesday, November 6<sup>th</sup> (but have not yet pinned down the hours), for a meeting of probably not more than three hours. It's envisioned that this will be something like the Winter Symposium. LUCKETT hoped that this would be one of a series of conversations; they may be meetings of other stakeholders. At this time, as JAÉN had remarked, the Steering Committee had no plans to issue a review as such.

Today LUCKETT hoped to get input on what questions to discuss on the 6<sup>th</sup>. Based on previous discussions, he introduced five possibilities [see **Appendix C**]. 360-degree reviews of administrators are used at some other institutions; should we do so and what would we want to learn? As has emerged in several instances: what are pros and cons of internal vs. national searches? What are the fundamental functions of administrative leadership, and could we imagine alternative structures that could perform these functions? Given rapid

turnover in administrative ranks, how can we maintain continuity and institutional memory? What's the proper role of shared governance in general?

GRECO: how do we attract the best candidates, whether internal or external, through our compensation packages? What elements of compensation attract the wrong candidates?

KARAVANIC: coming out of this meeting, what would cause you to feel it was a success?

GAMBURD wanted to consider the composition of the Faculty. The academic freedom that comes from tenure is significant. She wondered how the move towards contingent faculty affects the nature of shared governance, and changes what people feel free to say and do. If the work of the Senate is confined to appointees with more than 0.5 FTE, and more and more teaching is done by people with less secure academic positions, how does that affect the participation in shared governance by those with a long-term investment in the institution?

LUCKETT said a survey will be circulated soon. BEYLER confirmed this, but given "survey fatigue" he urged senators to contact faculty directly to find out their views. The petition received 188 signatures—well above the 7.5% required—within a short span of time. After about a week and a half, we stopped collecting names. So in June, there was a considerable energy around this question. Time moves on; we all are busy; is that energy still there? Beyond a survey, personal contact may be a better way of tapping into that.

JEDYNAK wondered if there will be a resolution to vote on. LUCKETT: once the discussion is open, members of the assembly could make and second a motion, which would then be voted on. He didn't anticipate that Steering Committee would recommend a resolution; mostly he expected a discussion. But nothing would prevent a motion.

THORNE did not know of a non-hierarchical model. Shared governance confronts a hierarchical difference between faculty and administrative leadership. Are there heterarchical or rhizomatic structures that can still get work done and serve various functions, rather than a hierarchical arrangement? Though they might be out there, he didn't know of good models. It would be helpful to build from, or be informed about, alternative models of academic leadership. His anxiety about the upcoming meeting is that we don't know what were talking about, yet we continue talking. It would helpful if someone could say: here's a university that does this, with these virtues and these problems.

EPPLEY, similarly: we should look at best practices—what is working in other universities.

GAMBURD wished for background about what administrative leadership does for PSU. There are assumptions, for example about administrative bloat: is there contextualizing data? She wanted us to work from evidence before we start talking about alternatives.

FARAHMANDPUR: more data would be helpful: about turnover, administrative bloat, the state funding of higher education in Oregon and in the nation, projections of declining enrollment. This is important context.

JAÉN said that planning for the meeting would continue over the next few weeks, incorporating ideas expressed today and the ones we already have. We have to look at what is happening at our own institution, but also models beyond our institution, and then find our own way that works for our academic culture. She was not sure what the outcome can be, but we will build on the conversation to figure out the right path for us.

#### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none**



## E. NEW BUSINESS

### 1. Curricular proposals – *Consent Agenda*

The new courses listed in **October Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of Roll Call.

### 2. New courses – **School of Public Health retroactive curricular review** (SPH via GC)

JAÉN reminded senators of the discussion last academic year [June Minutes, p. 96].

KARAVANIC/EMERY moved **approval** of the new courses summarized in **October Agenda Attachment E.2** and proposed in full in [OCMS](#).

LOIKITH reviewed the situation: last year it came to the attention of Graduate Council [GC] that some courses in the SPH curriculum, and that had been functioning successfully at OHSU, had never received explicit approval from [PSU] Faculty Senate in the process of starting the joint program. GC fast-tracked the review, looking particularly at potential overlap with existing PSU courses. Around fifty such courses appeared before Senate last year; there are still some coming through with the requested overlap statements from PSU departments and programs.

The **new courses** summarized in **Attachment E.2** were **approved** (43 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, by show of hands).

## F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

## G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

### 1. President's report

PERCY welcomed senators at the start of the academic year. Since 1971 he had been on a college campus at the beginning of fall, in different roles, and felt this excitement. He had a chance to meet students moving in, on the first day of classes, and at the party in the Park Blocks. He was impressed with the diversity of students: the countries, places, ethnic and racial backgrounds represented. He welcomed the new Presiding Officer and the new ASPSU President [Gibson]—other new leadership, of which there is a lot now.

PERCY related that over the summer, PSU received a high ranking in social mobility from *US News and World Report*. This is based on the number of Pell Grant recipients who graduate. We are ranked highest in Oregon, and high throughout the Northwest. We should celebrate this hard work with our students. Some exciting NSF awards were received: a major math-science award, and one to study earthquake resilience in Nepal. He can't cover all the research grants; they represent a growth of about 8%-10% from a year ago. There is also great scholarship and creative expression going on that is not measured in metrics tied to external grant funding: books, plays, essays, etc.

PERCY reviewed the presentation at Convocation about student success. JEFFORDS had spent a year developing plans for coordinated, innovative thinking about student success. We want to triple down on that this year. We have always cared about student success, PERCY said, but we want to dig deeper and coordinate better, using innovation and data. We don't expect faculty to take on a new job, but rather in curriculum, advising, etc., keep in mind how to support our students. Some central initiatives include

creating hardship funds—many students are one unexpected financial crisis away from having to drop out—and developing integrated systems to address mental health needs.

A physical manifestation of this commitment, PERCY said, is the renovated and newly reopened Fariborz Maseeh Hall. In one place there is the financial wellness center, advisors, career services, registrar, OIT help desk; over the skybridge are various other support services, multicultural centers, etc. There are also several departments housed there. He was excited about the new Transfer and Returning Student Resource Center. His aspiration is that we become a national leader in student success innovations.

PERCY announced a Presidential Fellows program. Fellows will work on a specific issues suggested by the President. It is a way to engage faculty in innovation. This year, Theodore VAN ALST will explore how to grow relationships and collaborations with Native American Tribes, and to be more successful in educating Native American students; Shirley JACKSON will look at re-establishing an ombuds program; Laura NISSEN will continue her work on a futuristic approach to higher education, leading a team of about thirty people; Lisa HAWASH will work on something he believed we needed to get back to: the equity lens articulated in our Strategic Plan.

PERCY looked forward to working [with Faculty Senate] on questions of governance. He had similar questions about the change in the composition of the faculty and enrollment patterns, and would try to share some data. (Summer term was down about 8%, and regular term about 4%.) On administrative turnover they were also looking at data; there were several idiosyncratic things, but probably also some patterns. He would also like to look at the diversity of our leadership.

PERCY re-introduced Chuck KNEPFLE, the new Vice President for Enrollment Management and welcomed him to PSU. [Applause.]

## **2. Provost's report**

JEFFORDS had asked CHABON to stand in for her today to introduce Brian SANDLIN, who is responsible in OAA for the University's accreditation and state authorization.

SANDLIN: the Provost had asked him to give an update on accreditation and the ad-report recently submitted to NWCCU. We are accredited, as we have been since 1965. There are many chances to improve before we risk losing accreditation. We are, however, “not in compliance.” That is based upon our year-seven report in 2015, which indicated two main problems. First, we did not publish all of our graduate-level student learning outcomes in easily accessible places for our students. Second, we were not actively assessing student learning in a comprehensive way across campus.

SANDLIN related what we are doing to address these problems. We published the graduate learning outcomes and are now in compliance. Assessment of student learning outcomes had been a different project. We created the annual assessment update to review programs' assessment activities: do you have an assessment plan, and are you doing it (provide an example)? Last year we reported that 36.5% of our academic programs were actively assessing student learning—a figure which brought us into non-compliance. In the ad-hoc report last month we reported that 58.4% programs were assessing student learning, an increase of 30 programs (17 graduate, 13 undergraduate). This shows success, but is not our final goal.

SANDLIN said that this improvement was in part due to the processes put in place—the annual update. Another reason is that the Provost has stressed in meetings with faculty, at Senate, etc., that assessment is a tool for improve our teaching. LUCKETT took initiative in his own department. WOOSTER had a leading role with graduate programs. SANDLIN also recognized the efforts of Janelle VOEGELE and Raiza DOTTIN in the Office of Academic Innovation; they are experts who can provide help. Kathi KETCHESON and colleagues in OIRP made improvements to the survey tool—repetition, analysis, archive. The dedication of deans, chair, directors, and faculty themselves was most important. They produce the evidence that we need.

Moving forward, does SANDLIN believe that the response to our ad-hoc report will be: nice job, your efforts are paying off, but keep going and provide another ad-hoc report in a year. We've committed to achieving 100% compliance.

SANDLIN noted that JEFFORDS had appointed several Faculty Fellows, two of whom will be helping with assessment and accreditation: G.L.A. HARRIS and Charles KLEIN.

WOOSTER shared that progress had been made at the graduate level towards the 100% compliance commitment. She had spoken with an external visitor from 2015; his impression was that we were not doing well at closing the loop. We may be doing good work, but need to show that we are using and responding to feedback. The Graduate School had appointed Mark WOODS as Graduate Education Leadership Fellow, and formed a team to collect and analyze data. They hope to visit with programs—ten this fall—to help them write learning outcomes, post them, and develop and assessment plan. This effort is tied to student success.

BEYLER called attention to the reports in the Packet, this month and most months; the committees are doing important work and their reports contain important information. He also urged senators to review the Minutes; in producing them, he frequently noticed thoughtful comments that had not really registered during the meeting itself.

PALMITER commented that she was pleased to see the appointment of Faculty Fellows by the President, Provost, and Graduate Dean. We are thereby drawing from faculty expertise, as opposed to spending money on outside consultants. Not only let knowledge serve the city, but also let knowledge serve the university.

*The following reports were **received** as part of the Consent Agenda. See **October Agenda Attachments G.3-4**.*

**3. Report from Committee on Work-Life Balance**

**4. Progress report form Digital City Testbed Center**

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:22 p.m.

After the meeting, **division caucuses** chose as members of Committee on Committees:

**CLAS-Sci:** Bruno JEDYNAK

**COE:** Ramin FARAHMANDPUR

*Oct. 2, 2019*

Dear Campus Community,

As we head into the fall term, the Board of Trustees wants to join others in welcoming you to Portland State, whether this is your first term as a student or your 30th year as a faculty member. A new academic year always promises fresh opportunities to learn, research, create and innovate.

It has been a busy and productive summer on campus. Dr. Stephen Percy has agreed to serve as interim president until such time as the Board of Trustees appoints a permanent president. We are grateful for his service and pleased with the steps he is taking to move PSU forward.

Over the coming months, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee will be studying issues such as the structure and recruitment of administrative leadership and the future of shared governance at PSU. The board has discussed taking up the issue of the presidential search in the Spring of 2020 out of consideration for the timeline for the Faculty Senate Steering Committee's review. We are committed to the principles of shared governance and look forward to the steering committee's findings.

The Board of Trustees' next meeting will be Oct. 10, 2019. Thank you for being valued members of the PSU community.

Sincerely,

Gregory Hinckley, chair  
Margaret D. Kirkpatrick, vice-chair

Planning the Special Meeting of the Faculty: Wednesday, 6 November 2019, "to discuss the structure of the administration and shared governance at Portland State"

**Question:** What questions should we discuss at the Special Meeting?

Some questions that we have thought of:

- 1) Should we institute annual 360-degree reviews of our principal administrative officers? If so, how and by whom would such reviews be conducted? What would we be trying to learn from such reviews?
- 2) Are the principal administrative officers best recruited internally or through national searches? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each approach?
- 3) What, primarily, do we look to administrative leadership to provide to the University? Can we imagine a different administrative structure for PSU—different from both our past practice and from the conventional practice at other institutions—that might work more effectively for us?
- 4) Given the rapid turnover in our highest administrative ranks, how can we achieve greater continuity of leadership and institutional memory in the University's administration?
- 5) What is the proper role of shared governance in the administration of the University, and how can we assure that best practices of shared governance will be followed?

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



To: Susan Jeffords, Provost  
Shelly Chabon, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

From: Portland State University Faculty Senate  
(Isabel Jaén Portillo, Presiding Officer; Richard Beyler, Secretary)

Date: 10 October 2019

Re: Notice of Senate Actions

At its regular meeting on 7 October 2019, Faculty Senate **approved** the curricular consent agenda with the new courses specified in Attachment E.1 to the October Agenda.

10-14-19: OAA concurs with the approved curricular consent agenda and new courses as specified.

Faculty Senate also voted to **approve** the new course proposals in the OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health specified in Attachment E.2, with effect retroactive to academic year 2016-17.

10-14-19: OAA concurs with the approved new course proposals as specified.

Divisional caucuses chose new members of the Committee on Committees as follows:

- CLAS-Sci: Bruno Jedynek (MTH)
- CoE: Ramin Farahmandpur (ELP)

10-14-19: OAA congratulates and thanks the new members of the Committee on Committees.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Isabel Jaen".

Isabel Jaen Portillo  
Presiding Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard H. Beyler".

Richard H. Beyler  
Secretary to the Faculty



Attachment B.3

# Academic Affairs Budget Model

November 4, 2019



- Implemented with FY15 budget
- Established principle that schools and colleges should be rewarded for generating the resources the entire institution depends on
  - Expenditure budgets took into account multiple factors, not just PBB revenue and expense attribution
  - Subventions/subsidies built into the model—“All for one and one for all” rather than “Every tub on its own bottom”
- General Fund budgets allocated to divisions/colleges through the PBB process—deans allocated to departments their own way



- PBB implemented during a period of tough budget years
- Budget allocations within Academic Affairs relied increasingly on across-the-board approaches
- Problems emerged
  - Schools that grew did not see corresponding increases in resources
  - Sense that PBB did not reflect full range of values that are critical to strength of PSU

- Want to move to a budget allocation model within Academic Affairs that is more responsive to changes in activity levels and reflects more of the factors critical to our success on all levels
- Learned about model Virginia Tech uses in its Academic Affairs division that divides allocation into different pools, some of which reflect student success and faculty characteristics
- Decided to develop a PSU version of this sort of model
- Provost charged a working group with representatives from each school, college, and major revenue supporting area to develop a model
  - Will get advice and guidance from ALT and FSBC, report out to the Provost
- Focus is on the model for making the decision about how to allocate General Fund budgets from the Division of Academic Affairs to the schools, colleges, and other units.

1. Tuition revenue generated
2. Degrees and certificates awarded
3. Student Success
4. Overall unit financial performance
5. Barriers to attendance
6. Non-General Fund revenue generated
7. Community engagement

Likely too many pools—will eliminate or combine some

- Have gotten first feedback from ALT and FSBC
- Need to define metrics more precisely and test them
- Will have final model by end of the academic year
- Will use principles from this model to inform FY21 budget development to the extent those principles are clear

# Things to remember

- Not every goal can be achieved by the budget allocation model
- Budget model does not replace leadership, collaborative decision-making, and judgment
- Budget model cannot be used to produce radical change
- Not all factors apply to all units
- Metrics and pools will focus on things the colleges and schools control
- The schools and colleges themselves will decide whether and how to apply the principles of this model to allocation decisions within the school/college
- Revenue supporting units need to be brought in somehow
- Other things going on while we work on this—response to enrollment shortfall, developing FY21 budget

October 09, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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

## **School of Business**

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.b.1

- Actg 335 Accounting Information Systems and Analytic Fundamentals, 4 credits – change Banner title from Actg Information Systems to AIS and Accounting Analytics

#### E.1.b.2

- BA 339 Operations and Quality Management, 0-4 credits – change title to Supply Chain Management

## **College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

### **Changes to Existing Course**

#### E.1.b.3

- Eng 327 Culture Imperialism and Globalization, 4 credits – change Banner title from Culture, Imper, Global to Culture, Imperialism, Global

### **Drop Existing Courses**

#### E.1.b.4

- Dane 316 Readings in Danish, 2 credits

#### E.1.b.5

- Dane 345U Hans Christian Andersen, 4 credits

#### E.1.b.6

- Dane 346U 20<sup>th</sup> Century Danish Women Writers, 4 credits

#### E.1.b.7

- Dane 347U Major Works in Danish Literature, 4 credits

#### E.1.b.8

- Dane 361U Danish Films from Dreyer to Dogmer, 4 credits

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

## E.1.b.9

- Ling 100 Grammar/Writing Level I (Low Beginning), 3 credits

## E.1.b.10

- Ling 103 Reading Level I (Low Beginning), 3 credits

## E.1.b.11

- Ling 113 Reading Level E (High Beginning), 3 credits

## E.1.b.12

- Ling 120 Grammar/Writing Level 2 (Low-Intermediate), 3 credits

## E.1.b.13

- Ling 123 Reading Level 2 (Low-Intermediate), 3 credits

## E.1.b.14

- Ling 130 Grammar/Writing Level 3 (Intermediate), 3 credits

## E.1.b.15

- Ling 133 Reading Level 3 (Intermediate), 3 credits

## E.1.b.16

- Ling 141 Grammar Level 4 (Upper-Intermediate), 3 credits

## **University Studies**

### **Changes to Existing Course**

## E.1.b.17

- UnSt 170 Multilingual FRINQ Lab, 2 credits – change title to Multilingual FRINQ/SINQ Lab, change description, and change credit hours to 1-2 credits

October 09, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: November 2019 School of Public Health Retroactive Curricular Review

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate for retroactive approval dating back to the 2016-17 academic year.

You may read the syllabi of these courses by going to the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS) (<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Additional-Documents>)

*[Note from Secretary: numbering in this document and in OCMS uses E.1.c...; however, this set of proposals appears on the Senate agenda and in the packet as a separate item, E.2.]*

## **New Courses**

### **E.1.c.1**

- Bsta 513 Categorical Data Analysis, 3 credits

Categorical Data Analysis is the third course in the required sequence for applied Biostatistics (Bsta 511, Bsta 512, Bsta 513 or Bsta 611, Bsta 612, Bsta 613). This course covers topics in categorical data analysis such as cross tabulation statistics, statistics for matched samples, and methods to assess confounding and interaction via stratified tables. Students will learn logistic regression, and relate results back to those found with stratified analyses. Similar to linear regression in Bsta 512/Bsta 612, topics for logistic regression will include parameter interpretation, statistical adjustment, variable selection techniques and model fit assessment. Students will have the opportunity to be exposed to other analysis methods, such as Poisson regression and multinomial logistic regression, etc. We will also learn some machine learning techniques other than logistic regression model. Most homework assignments for this course require the use of statistical software. This is the same course as Stat 577 and may be taken only once for credit.

### **E.1.c.2**

- Bsta 514 Survival Analysis, 3 credits

This course introduces students to analysis of survival (i.e. time-to-event) data, covering methods for estimation, hypothesis testing, and regression methods for censored data with covariates. Methods widely used in the health sciences are covered, including Kaplan-Meier (empirical) estimate of the survival function and its associated statistical tests. The Cox proportional hazards regression model is presented in detail, along with some extensions of this model. As time allows, other topics will be introduced including parametric survival models, frailty models and/or models incorporating competing risks. Power and sample size computations for time-to-event data will also be introduced. Most assignments will be completed using statistical computing software. Contextualizing results in the context of health sciences problems and research questions is stressed throughout the course. Expected preparation: An understanding of basic calculus is quite useful, but not (entirely) necessary.



Prerequisites: A standard pre-calculus course in probability & statistics (e.g. Bsta 511), a course in applied linear regression models (e.g. Bsta 512).

#### E.1.c.3

- Bsta 518 Spatial Data with GIS, 3 credits

Geographic information system (GIS) software is a powerful tool for assessment, decision-making, and information sharing. GIS provides a platform for the analysis of health data in relationship to population demographics, socioeconomic factors, surrounding social and health services, and the natural environment. The course will also cover basic statistical methods for the analysis of spatial data such as kriging and spatial clustering. Some statistical graphics may use R. The format of class will be intensive in-class session during the first two weeks of summer quarter and students are required to do homework and course projects with data sets throughout the quarter under the supervision of the instructor. Prerequisites: Bsta 525 or Bsta 511 and Bsta 512.

#### E.1.c.4

- Bsta 521 Bayesian Methods for Data Analysis, 3 credits

This course is an elective course for students in the MS, MPH and Graduate Certificate program in Biostatistics and may also be used as an elective course for students in MPH and PhD in Epidemiology programs and other programs, if they have taken the appropriate prerequisites. The methods students learned in the biostatistics applied and theoretical sequences were based on the “frequentist” method of statistical reasoning, where probability is understood to be the longrun frequency of a ‘repeatable’ event, and statistics that are computed are based on a specific study only. Bayesian methods are based on a different philosophy – that probability of an event is based on ALL information known at the time. Bayesian methods for data analysis enable one to combine information from previous similar and independent studies (prior information), with information from a new study, yielding updated inference for model parameters. This course will cover the concept of Bayesian analysis, posterior distribution, Bayesian inference and prediction, prior determination, one parameter and two parameter models, Bayesian hierarchical models, Bayesian computation, model criticism and selection as well as basic comparison of Bayesian and Frequentist Inferences. Real life examples in medical and health science will be used to explain the concept and application of Bayesian models. Prerequisites: Bsta 511, Bsta 512, and Bsta 550.

#### E.1.c.5

- Bsta 522 Statistical Learning and Big Data, 3 credits

This course is designed to introduce theory and methods for statistical learning and new emerging challenges in big data analysis. In recent years, statistical learning has played a crucial role in informatics and data science. Ever increasing data size creates new challenges for traditional statistical learning and this is an active research area. This course will cover traditional statistical learning methods as well as newer methods for such challenges. Expected preparation: Previous exposure to linear algebra and R. Prerequisite: Bsta 512.

#### E.1.c.6

- Bsta 613 Categorical Data Analysis, 3 credits

Categorical Data Analysis is the third course in the required sequence for applied Biostatistics (Bsta 511, Bsta 512, Bsta 513 or Bsta 611, Bsta 612, Bsta 613). This course

covers topics in categorical data analysis such as cross tabulation statistics, statistics for matched samples, and methods to assess confounding and interaction via stratified tables. Students will learn logistic regression, and relate results back to those found with stratified analyses. Similar to linear regression in Bsta 512/Bsta 612, topics for logistic regression will include parameter interpretation, statistical adjustment, variable selection techniques and model fit assessment. Students will have the opportunity to be exposed to other analysis methods, such as Poisson regression and multinomial logistic regression, etc. We will also learn some machine learning techniques other than logistic regression model. Most homework assignments for this course require the use of statistical software. This is the same course as Stat 577 and may be taken only once for credit.

## Attachment E.3

WHEREAS Post Continuous Appointment Review is founded on the principle that a strong and healthy university is one that supports, recognizes, and rewards faculty members throughout their careers for their contributions to the institution's mission.

WHEREAS Tenured faculty members shall undergo post-tenure review every five years after the award of tenure.

WHEREAS consistency in evaluation processes for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty creates administrative efficiencies and consistency across all types of faculty in the University.

**Be it resolved that the Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure Promotion and Merit Increases be amended as follows:**

### **V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL POSITIONS--CONTINUOUS APPOINTMENT--RELATED EVALUATIONS**

#### **I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment**

Non-tenure track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment are to be evaluated in the **fifth** year of continuous appointment and then every **five (5) years** following the last evaluation or promotion. Effective on \_\_\_\_\_.

I. Evaluation Following Continuous Appointment. Change to read: "Non-tenure track instructional faculty on a continuous appointment are to be evaluated ~~after three (3)~~ in the **fifth (5th) year** of continuous appointment and then every ~~three (3)~~ **five (5)** years following the last evaluation or promotion."

**Resolution to Amend PSU Standard 580-020-0005**

## WHEREAS:

Currently there are only two pathways for advancement for Non Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF): the Instructor series (Instructor, Senior Instructor I and Senior Instructor II) and the Practice/Clinical Professor Series (e.g. Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Professor of Practice). Non-tenure track faculty at Portland State University, both instructor ranks and Professor of Practice ranks, teach approximately one-third of the total student credit hours generated each quarter. The typical NTTF teaches 36 SCH in the academic calendar. These faculty have been hired by departments and colleges primarily to instruct PSU students, and their contracts do not stipulate maintaining an active research agenda. Promotion for NTTF ranks is based on excellence and innovation in teaching, and curricular and pedagogical development.

## WHEREAS:

Non Tenure Track Faculty who are teaching in the Instructional ranks are doing similar work as Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical ranks with different compensation and no opportunity to advance in rank or pay, eg., cost of living raises. For example, some NTTF faculty at the Instructor ranks are teaching graduate level courses and serving on graduate level thesis committees. This represents a campus-wide inequity. The Senior Instructor II minimum salary is close to Assistant Professor of Practice, but Instructors have not been allowed to advance through promotion to Associate Professor of Practice or to Professor of Practice, which are substantially higher.

## WHEREAS:

Currently there is no path for promotion above the level of Sr. Instructor II for NTTF who are not eligible for clinical or professional ranks. Faculty Senate minutes (Jan 2014) indicate that only "current NTTF faculty" (those hired before Sept. 16, 2014) may seek promotion to Asst Professor NTTF rank under grandfathering rules. For those faculty hired after September 16, 2014, including those with a terminal degree such as a Ph.D., their salaries have been capped at those of a Senior Instructor II regardless of their excellence as instructors. Since Faculty Senate did not vote on "Tenure for Teaching," there is no pathway for promotion beyond Senior Instructor II.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT FACULTY SENATE RECOMMEND THAT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES AMEND PSU STANDARD 580-020-0005 TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING NEW TEACHING PROFESSOR RANKS:**

**TEACHING PROFESSORS:** A non-tenure track faculty appointment for individuals whose primary work is in the areas of teaching, advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students. Faculty hired in this category must hold an advanced degree in a relevant field of specialization from an accredited program in their discipline. Ranks in this category in ascending order are Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor.

#### Description of Ranks

##### **Teaching Assistant Professor**

A non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) appointment for an individual whose responsibilities are primarily devoted to academic instruction, including teaching, advising, and mentoring at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels. Responsibilities may include making significant improvements to undergraduate courses and training graduate teaching assistants and adjuncts. Appointees to the rank of Teaching Assistant Professor will be required to hold an advanced degree related to instructional responsibilities (or its professional equivalent); in most cases, this is the Ed.D. or a PhD.

Expectations of the position are teaching, assessment, mentoring, advising and service. Appointments include significant responsibility for undergraduate and/or graduate education that include expertise and diversity in the discipline, participation in assessment, curriculum development or redesign. Ability to work with students and graduate teaching assistants/tutors of diverse populations and participation in departmental, college/school, or university service are required.

##### **Teaching Associate Professor**

A non-tenure track faculty position. Typically, being hired into or promoted to this position requires six years in rank as a Teaching Assistant Professor or similar experiences of teaching, advising, and mentoring in a higher education academic setting with a minimum of two years at PSU. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Teaching Associate Professor is based on demonstrated excellence in teaching, assessing, advising, and mentoring as well as contributions to innovative curriculum or pedagogy, and participation in governance and professionally-related service to the department, school/college, or university. Ability to work with students and graduate teaching assistants/tutors of diverse populations is required.

Criteria for promotion may also include strong student evaluations, observations of classroom teaching, demonstrated expertise in the development and delivery of instructional materials and assessment, ongoing engagement with the profession

through participation in professional organizations, grant activities or conference presentations.

### **Teaching Professor**

A non-tenure track faculty position. Typically, being hired into or promoted to this position requires a minimum of ten years of professional experience in higher education teaching, advising and mentoring with at least four years in rank as a Teaching Associate Professor, and a minimum of four years at Portland State University. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires demonstration of a sustained and consistent pattern of excellence in teaching, advising, and mentoring as well as contributions to innovative curriculum or pedagogy, and participation in governance and professionally-related service to the department, school/college, or university. Ability to work with students and graduate teaching assistants/tutors of diverse populations is required.

Criteria for promotion may also include excellence in educational innovation, assessment, curriculum development, course design and impact on student learning, significant contributions to the governance and professionally-related service to the university and/or community outreach, and state or national recognition in the professional field.

Scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) is not required but its application may be used as evidence of educational innovation and teaching excellence. Such evidence may be indicated by appointments as a reviewer of peer-reviewed journals, invited papers and presentations given beyond the state and region; honors, grants, awards; and committee service and leadership with professional associations.