

# Faculty Senate, 2 December 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.

Introduction of amendments to Faculty Constitution

[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

Faculty Senate will meet on **2 December 2019** at **3:00 p.m.** in **Cramer Hall 53.**

**AGENDA (Revised)**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.3-4]
    - \* 1. Minutes of the 4 November 2019 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
  - B. Announcements
    - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
    - 2. Announcements from Secretary
    - 3. Presentation by J. Podrabsky, Interim Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies
  - C. Discussion: research and budget
  - D. Unfinished Business
    - \* 1. New series of teaching professor ranks (AHC-ANTTF)
  - E. New Business
    - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC) – *Consent Agenda*
    - \* 2. New courses – SPH retroactive curricular review (GC)
    - \* 3. New program: MPH in Biostatistics – SPH retroactive curricular review (GC)
    - \* 4. New program: MPH in Epidemiology – SPH retroactive curricular review (GC)
    - \* 5. Resolution on support of research at PSU (Steering)
    - \* 6. Proposed amendments to Faculty Constitution: updating antiquated language  
See procedural note in Attachment E-6.
  - F. Question Period
  - G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
    - 1. President's report
    - 2. Provost's report
    - \* 3. Quarterly report from Educational Policy Committee – *Consent Agenda*
    - \* 4. Annual report from Committee on Committees – *Consent Agenda*
  - 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, 4 November 2019 – *Consent Agenda*
  - E.1.a.b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *Consent Agenda*
  - E.2. Curricular proposals (summaries) –SPH retroactive review
  - E.3. MPH in Biostatistics – SPH retroactive review
  - E.4. MPH in Epidemiology – SPH retroactive review
  - E.5. Resolution on support of research at PSU
  - E.6. Proposed constitutional amendments
  - G.3. EPC quarterly report – *Consent Agenda*
  - G.4. COC annual report – *Consent Agenda*

# 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
			†Karavanic, Karen	CMP	2020
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Arts &amp; Letters (6)</b>			<b>Library (1)</b>		
Dolidon, Annabelle	WLL	2020	†Emery, Jill	LIB	2020
†Greco, Gina	WLL	2021	<b>School of Public Health (2)</b>		
Holt, Jon	WLL	2021	*Izumi, Betty	CH	2021
<i>Limbu, Bishopal</i>	ENG	2022	†Labissiere, Yves	CH	2022
†Thorne, Steven	WLL	2022	<b>School of Social Work (4)</b>		
Watanabe, Suwako	WLL	2020	Bryson, Stephanie	SSW	2020
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Sciences (7)</b>			May, Edward	SSW	2021
<i>Eppley, Sarah</i>	BIO	2022	Mosier, Miranda	SSW	2020
Fountain, Robert	MTH	2021	†Oswald, Mary	RRI	2022
George, Linda	ESM	2020	<b>College of Urban and Public Affairs (5)</b>		
†Jedynak, Bruno	MTH	2022	Chaillé, Peter	PAD	2020
†Lafferriere, Beatriz	MTH	2022	†Eastin, Josh	PS	2021
Palmiter, Jeanette	MTH	2020	*Henderson, Kelsey	CCJ	2020
Thanheiser, Eva	MTH	2021	<i>Kinsella, David</i>	PS	2022
<b>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences–Social Sciences (7)</b>			*Tinkler, Sarah	ECN	2021
*Ajibade, Idowu	GGR	2020	<b>Other Instructional (3)</b>		
Fritz, Charlotte	PSY	2021	†Lindsay, Susan	IELP	2020
<i>Gamburd, Michele</i>	ANT	2022	Lupro, Michael	UNST	2021
Hsu, Chia Yin	HST	2020	Newlands, Sarah	UNST	2021
*Lafrenz, Martin	GGR	2020	<b>All Others (9)</b>		
†Meyer, Claudia	SPHR	2021	Baccar, Cindy	REG	2020
†Reitenauer, Vicki	WGSS	2022	Broussard, Scott	ACS	2021
<b>The School of Business (4)</b>			Faaleava, Toeutu	OAA	2020
†Dimond, Michael	SB	2020	*Fiorillo, Marie	ACS	2020
Hansen, David	SB	2021	<i>Flores, Greg</i>	ACS	2022
<i>Loney, Jennifer</i>	SB	2022	<i>Harris, Randi</i>	OAI	2022
<i>Sanchez, Becky</i>	SB	2022	Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2021
<b>College of Education (3)</b>			<i>Kennedy, Karen</i>	ACS	2022
†Farahmandpur, Ramin	ELP	2022	†Matlick, Nick	REG	2021
Sugimoto, Amanda	C&I	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, 4 November 2019

**Presiding Officer:** Isabel Jaén Portillo

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

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

**Alternate present:** Steven Boyce for Thanheiser.

**Senators absent:** Ajibade, Fritz, Lindsay, May, Meyer, Sanchez.

**Ex-officio members present:** Adler, Beyler, Bielavitz, Boyce (also as alternate), Burgess, Bynum, Carpenter, Chabon, Gibson, Jaén Portillo, Jeffords, Loikith, Lockett, Lynn, Maddox, Podrabsky, Sager, Spencer, Webb, Wooster, Zonoozy.

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

**1. Minutes of the 7 October 2019 meeting** were **approved** with the following corrections: Senators Harris and Lafferriere were present; typographical correction in p. 2, paragraph 6: FARAHMANDPUR.

**2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for October** was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

### **B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

JAÉN PORTILLO thanked all those who responded to the survey preparatory to the Faculty Meeting (Symposium) on Wednesday [November 6<sup>th</sup>]. She encouraged senators to encourage their colleagues to attend. She envisioned this as a first stage of a discussion our administration and governance processes: our experience of how has helped or hindered our work; ideas for improvement; and discerning what information we need for the next phase. We anticipate that there will be two more meetings in winter in spring terms. In the second meeting we hope to look at information that we have gathered regarding our institution and others; at the third meeting, we hope to arrive at some outcomes. We saw interesting suggestions in the survey, such as a process for review of administrators, or recommendations to the Board of Trustees for the hiring process of the next president.

JAÉN indicated that PERCY, as President of the Faculty, would open the meeting. The meeting will be structured so that people can if they needed to come and go: two open sessions for small group discussions followed by reports back to the group as a whole. Discussion topics will likely include: structure of the administration; shared governance; review of the administration; equity, diversity, and inclusion; appointments and continuity; compensation; and state of research and interdisciplinary collaboration. A working lunch will be provided courtesy of the President's Office.

## 2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER announced that, because he had received five requests for voting by secret ballot, clickers would be used henceforth for voting.

## 3. Work in progress on new budget model

JAÉN introduced David MADDUX, Interim Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning to give an overview of work in progress on the new Office of Academic Affairs [OAA] budget model. She had asked him to help us answer questions such as: How will the new model help faculty in their work of research and teaching, in ways conducive to student and faculty success? How will it reward collaboration? How do we insure that there are adequate resources for faculty, graduate, and undergraduate research, with equity across fields, including both science and humanities? How do we strengthen programs? How do we avoid negative competition among units?

MADDUX said that, in twenty-five or thirty years of consulting on academic budget models, he had worked with many types of institutions, from University of California campuses to historically Black colleges to small liberal arts schools. He therefore had table many reference points for options and contexts.

MADDUX summarized the performance-based budgeting [PBB] model, adopted in 2015. Its basic principle is to reward units for generating the revenue that the institution depends on. General fund distribution rests on student credit hour production, as well as the state's allocation allocation matrix. Currently the state emphasizes degrees awarded more than student credit hours. Some subventions and subsidies are built into the model; it's not "every tub on its own bottom" as, famously, at Harvard. The allocation goes to colleges/schools; deans are then responsible for allocations to specific departments, individual faculty lines, etc.

MADDUX noted that PBB was implemented during some very tough years, and OAA moved towards across-the-board approaches to reducing budgets. It's now hard for many to see connections between PBB principles and actual specific budgets. Growing units don't necessarily see a corresponding increase in resources, which can run into problems with accreditation, staffing classes, etc. The other side is that bringing money to those units requires taking it from others.

MADDUX said that when JEFFORDS became Provost [fall 2018], she found that the extant budget didn't necessarily reflect the values that were important to PSU.

With all that in mind, MADDUX said, we embarked on finding a new model for OAA: more responsive to changes in activity levels, more reflective of factors that contribute to success. In conversations with the deans, it emerged that retention is a very important strategy for breaking the revenue bind we're in. Most models don't account for student success. They are very transactional: if a student gets a degree, money goes there. Student success is more collaborative; more people have a role in it.

MADDUX became interested Virginia Tech's model, which involves pools based on faculty qualities and student success. It's detached from clean formulas based on credit hours. In Florida, the state rewards retention, and this affects how institutions (such as University of South Florida) act. However, we don't want to simply replicate those models. The working group commissioned by the Provost includes representatives from

all the schools/colleges as well as from revenue-supporting units that report to OAA. They will consult the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and Faculty Senate as a whole. The Provost is charged to allocate resources, and in turn has charged us for giving her the framework within which she will make those decisions. The task is to determine how funds are allocated to the colleges. There is some interest in creating something that will articulate to departments, but that will be up to the deans. Using retention, for example, at the department level becomes problematic.

Currently they are working with seven pools, MADDOX said. Their respective size and criteria will be an important discussion. The seven pools now under consideration are: tuition revenue generated, degrees and certificates awarded, student success, overall unit financial performance, barriers to attendance, non-general fund revenue generated, and community engagement. It's likely that some will be combined or eliminated. The pools can recognize student success beyond simply chasing student credit hours, which is not very effective. We need to define and test metrics.

MADDOX said it unlikely we will have a complete model by the end of the academic year, but will use these principles as much as possible to inform the fiscal year 2021 budget. We will try not to use an across-the-board approach.

MADDOX concluded: that while not every goal can be achieved through a budget model, we can do more than merely reward credit hours; a budget model does not eliminate the need for collaborative decision making and good judgment; a budget model should not be used to produce radical change.

### **C. DISCUSSION: budget and curriculum**

GRECO asked about the timeline, because by now the only movable things for next year are retirements and adjunct appointments. MADDOX: we operate under many constraints, and must have realistic timeline. If the goal is that funding should move in a certain way, it won't happen instantly. What does it take then to get us from here to there? In the short run, we are going to be pressed to make the necessary adjustments. There is no easy answer.

FARAHMANDPUR: is it based on a growth model? We have heard over the last few years that enrollment is declining. An assumption that schools and colleges will be generating more enrollment goes against the national trend. MADDOX: we are not assuming enrollment growth, though we hope to do some things to reverse that trend. We are testing under a zero-sum basis. Some programs have seen growth in demand for their programs, others have seen shrinkage. Part of the challenge is to adjust where the resources are; implementation is then another challenge.

DUNCAN: is "student success" code for "retention"? MADDOX: we are struggling with that. Retention is part of it, but we have also been looking at other indicators such as DFW rates. He and Kathy KETCHESON (OIRP) are working on determining relevant student success metrics. Another indicator might be rate of credit accumulation. Retention is part but not all of it. DUNCAN asked because engineering is a difficult major, so retention may be low. What about post-graduation gainful employment? MADDOX: that's interesting, if we could work with it. Maybe we can measure absolute values, but it may also be interesting to measure change. Part of the student success effort is to get better.

HOLT said that a major constraint is HECC's [Higher Education Coordinating Commission] focus on graduation rates. MADDIX responded that the HECC formula has three elements. About 50% is how many degrees are awarded in certain fields. 30%-40% is how many student credit hours are produced. Neither involves graduation or retention rates. The remainder is called mission differentiation, which primarily concerns the regional campuses, but also research. A difficulty is that under HECC we're competing against other institutions. Actions don't necessarily accrue to our benefit predictably. He thinks we ought to just reward the values are important to us. HOLT had heard that hard data about graduation rates is the holy grail, but he's now told, no? MADDIX said it does matter to us in many ways, but doesn't factor directly into the HECC formula. JEFFORDS interjected that the only way we benefit from the HECC formula, because it's a fixed pie, is if we do better and the other institutions don't. [Laughter.] JEFFORDS, responding: Right? We [have to] take somebody else's [piece of] pie. It's unlike Florida, where if you improve in absolute numbers you are rewarded for that. If everybody does better at the same rate, we all get the same amount of money. MADDIX: that's why we talk about change in rates of student success. They're our values, regardless of how Salem apportions money.

KARAVANIC was concerned because many of our students are part-time. Therefore measures such as rate of credit accumulation or graduation within a given time frame may be problematic. These measures don't match the actual experience of our students. MADDIX agreed: we have a lot of work to do on that. Rate of credit accumulation would have to be adjusted for FTE [full-time enrollment] status, if we were to use it.

GAMBURD believed it better to measure important things imprecisely, than unimportant things precisely. How could we reward things like collaborative research, interdisciplinarity, research experiences with undergraduates, etc.? MADDIX suggested the best way to handle that is to centralize resources, allowing the provost an allocation based on some assessment of those things. It may not be possible to measure, say, collaboration, which could take many forms. Maybe you also want to discourage bad behavior, such as courses that prevent students from crossing departmental boundaries. It might be difficult to do that in a formula, but could be factored into an assessment. It is easier to if there are abundant resources. Rewarding specific types of educational experiences gets very complicated. He would be interested in hearing suggestions for a different route to get there.

JEDYNAK asked if he plans to disclose the actual formula. MADDIX: yes.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE liked numbers, but was concerned about relying too much on quantitative measures such as number of degrees, retention, etc. They can be manipulated. How do we address that? MADDIX: the alternative to using something numeric is using the provost's discretion. The provost is capable of doing so, but it lacks transparency even when the decision-maker tries to articulate reasons. It's unpredictable, which makes planning difficult. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE: can we measure quality? MADDIX: we need volume metrics. You may be do a few things at a very high level of quality, but also need to put people in the classroom to pay for it. It may be possible, for example, to weight credits from different schools differently, or create discretionary pools. What would quality funding look like? If a certain quality is necessary for graduation, what about when the student is still on the way there? Presumably the quality of the degree relates to success in the marketplace, and thus indirectly to whether students come to the school.



JAMES said that in her college, areas had been negatively affected by budget [decisions] for a number of cycles and under different models. What about looking at gainful employment or national rankings? This will be the third budget model in around six years. There are inequities in rewarding people who are hitting the mark. MADDOX: to differentiate for quality in one area is to imply a lack of quality in another area. But, yes, we could create a quality pool with metrics such as membership in national academies, etc. There are state funding models that work that way. JAMES: it's disingenuous to say that to give to someone you have to take from someone else, because the reverse is also true if someone should be getting something but isn't. MADDOX: this is easy if the pie is growing, but we can't assume that. Quality will be factored into the conversations over the next several months.

JAÉN closed the discussion for now, but it would be a major topic throughout the year.

#### D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – *none*

#### E. NEW BUSINESS

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

The changes to courses and dropped courses listed in **November 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)

EMERY/HOLT **moved** approval, with effect retroactive to AY 2016-17, of the new courses listed in **November Agenda Attachment E-2**. JAÉN reminded senators of the context: in previous meetings [June, October 2019] we considered SPH courses that had been functioning in the OHSU curriculum but never officially approved by PSU's curricular process. The **motion** to approve the courses listed in **Attachment E-2** was **approved** (44 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

##### 3. **Changing review period for NTT faculty after continuous appointment from three to five years (AHC-ANTTF)**

HOLT/PALMITER **moved** the proposal given in **November Agenda Attachment E-3**.

PALMITER gave some background: in spring 2018 Faculty Senate created a task force [Ad-Hoc Committee] on Advancement of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty [AHC-ANTTF]. The group consisted of two administrators, three tenure-track members, two non-tenure-track members, and two members representing AAUP. There had previously been an ad-hoc committee to look at tenure-track teaching positions [but did not go in that direction]. The current committee proposes: first, to make PCAR (post-continuous appointment review) more parallel to PTR (post-tenure review); second, a new series of ranks for non-tenure-track faculty on continuous appointment: Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor.

(PALMITER thought we should find an alternative to “non-tenure-track”: rather than referring to people by what they aren't, we should find a way to refer to what they are.)

PALMITER indicated that input from town-hall meetings had been incorporated.

THIEMAN gave more of the context. Much of this had been introduced the May 2019

meeting, and there had been good questions at that time. There are two pathways for advancement for faculty on continuous appointment: the Instructor series, and the Professorial (Clinical Professor or Professor of Practice) series. The latter is reserved for those who have professional licenses or are engaged in clinical practice. In either track, faculty are hired primarily to teach, and promotion is based primarily on excellence and innovation in teaching, curriculum, and pedagogical development.

THIEMAN stated that the committee's research revealed an inequity in expectations and compensation for instructional faculty. In many cases, those in instructor ranks are doing the same work as those in the professorial ranks, but with lower salaries and no opportunities for advancement. Senior Instructor IIs have often been at PSU for many years, and doing the work of Assistant, Associate, or full Professors of Practice. There is a lack of uniformity of access: some schools were easily able to adopt the professorial ranks, and instructors were easily able to enter them. Some units, however, were unable to adopt them, or had no one who qualified. In sum, the committee's view was that there is a gap in the ranks available to instructional faculty who are doing good work and responsible for the success of our students.

The first of the two motions is simpler, THIEMAN said. It makes the review after continuous appointment more analogous to post-tenure review, and also eases the workload for departments that have many such appointments.

KARAVANIC asked for clarification about when the count of years begins. THIEMAN: when NTT faculty are hired, they are reviewed annually for six years. Thereafter, they can apply for continuous appointment. The recommendation is about the subsequent review period.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE thought that PTR was also every three years—she had just done the process. Several people responded: no, it's five. HANSEN: PTR is on a five-year cycle, so that every year 20% of the average group is reviewed every year.

FARAHMANDPUR asked if change in salary was part of the motion. PALMITER: something that would have to be negotiated by AAUP. Whatever one might hope, it's not part of the Senate resolution. HANSEN confirmed that something similar happened with the PTR process when it was approved. PALMITER added that with the current three-year cycle, there is no salary increase.

GRECO said that when continuous appointment was initially bargained, the three-year period arose because the administration seemed to feel anxiety about the change. They wanted frequent review. She thought that there is now no reason for anxiety and that it makes sense to put both types of review on the five-year cycle.

LAFFERRIERE noted that no effective date was indicated. When would it be applicable? THIEMAN didn't know when, once a policy is approved, it goes into effect—maybe the following academic year? Some people had already submitted portfolios for 2019-20. We have to give both administration and faculty time to make arrangements.

CHABON noted that the three-year term was something agreed to by both administration and the union: that's how things get into the contract. About the next question, since the review process is already underway for this year, nothing will happen until new guidelines have been written. For tenure-track faculty, the five-year cycle is university-

wide guideline; there should be no units operating with a different cycle. The first group included two years' worth of reviews; that might have caused some confusion.

LUCKETT noted that tenure-track faculty, before tenure, undergo a third year review: was this the source of confusion? THIEMAN: here the subject is post-continuous-appointment review, parallel to post-tenure review.

CHABON asked whether the committee gave consideration to whether the criteria will remain the same. THIEMAN said the committee didn't discuss it, but as one of people who wrote that policy several years ago, she believed that it to be rigorous.

The **motion** as given in **Attachment E-3** was **approved** (44 yes, 4 no, 2 abstain, recorded by clicker).

#### 4. New series of teaching professor ranks (AHC-ANTTF)

LABISSIERE/HOLT **moved** the proposal given in **November Agenda Attachment E-4**.

THIEMAN said that a considerable portion of our faculty are currently in a rank system that does not reward excellence or innovation in teaching, or supporting the university's mission. AHC-ANTTF therefore recommended creation of a series of ranks for teaching professor: Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor. The committee arrived at this proposal by looking at ranks at other universities.

PALMITER: we currently have faculty in the Instructor ranks who are teaching graduate-level courses, on graduate committees—maybe despite what it said in the original contract—and essentially doing work that we expect of tenured faculty. Many have Ph.D.'s. These proposed ranks are not in the old OARs [Oregon Administrative Rules].

THIEMAN: they don't need to be. If Faculty Senate approves them, they go the Board, and if the Board approves them they would then be subject to bargaining.

LUCKETT observed that passing the motion today would have no immediate consequence. The motion amends the standard to create the ranks in theory, but doesn't amend the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines [P&T] for implementation, to provide a mechanism to access them. PALMITER: current faculty might be grandfathered in, or new faculty might be hired into them. LUCKETT: yes, but it requires amendment P&T. The present motion is the easy part; the complicated discussion would be later on.

THIEMAN noted that the specific wording of the rank descriptions included input from the town halls: required credentials and expectations; for the higher ranks, years of experience and time at PSU.

HANSEN indicated that when the Professor of Practice ranks were introduced, a letter of agreement [between union and administration] provided for a transition period, pending final approval of the guidelines.

KARAVANIC appreciated the work that had gone into this, but wanted to ask: how would the public interpret the title "Teaching Professor"? Would this to be taken to imply that others are not teaching? She didn't want people to think that she doesn't teach because she doesn't have that in her title. THIEMAN: it emphasizes the primary function of the role. KARAVANIC: why not Professor of Practice? THIEMAN said

that Professor of Practice and Clinical Professor series are for those with professional licenses or a clinical background. We created those when still under the OARs.

JEDNYAK had concern about the requirement for a minimum number of years at PSU for promotion. How would this affect people hired from the outside? THIEMAN understood that in some colleges people could be hired into the [various extant] NTTF ranks. The committee provided guidance for people who are already here; she didn't know what flexibility deans have to hire into different ranks.

THORNE supported validation of the critically important work of instructional faculty. He agreed that NTTF is a terrible label. He had just written [a recommendation letter] for a Professor of Practice at another institution who was doing functions of a traditional tenure-track. What bothers him is the awkward, inflexible approach to categorizing academic professionals. There could be times in career when someone doesn't produce scholarship at the same rate as earlier; that's fine, but maybe swap with colleagues and teach more. He realized this is a very unpopular idea. If someone wants to teach more and research less, should they feel guilty about it? Rethinking what it means to be an academic professional, generally, is tied to this question. THIEMAN noted that the Teaching Professor ranks do not require traditional scholarship—though many in those positions do scholarship of teaching and learning. PALMITER said that currently Instructors and Senior Instructors cannot be PIs [principal investigators] on a grant. PODRABSKY: that's not correct. Anyone in any faculty rank can be a PI; some are automatically eligible, and some need to apply for an exception to the rule.

GRECO shared the concern about a “teaching” label implying that others don't teach. She suggested using Professor of Clinical Practice for those who need certification, and Professor of Practice for those who don't. PALMITER said the committee originally wanted to do this, but were told that in CLAS no one meets this criteria. [Interjection: that's not correct.] GRECO: can you change the definition? THIEMAN thought it was an artifact from when those ranks were originally created under the OARs. She urged continuing the conversation about what these ranks would be called, but focus this discussion on establishing a middle path, whatever it's called. CHABON clarified that there are a few departments in CLAS that have clinical professorships, such as Speech & Hearing Sciences. These ranks were designed to be narrowly applied.

DOLIDON: the descriptions include things like excellence in teaching, working with graduate students, national recognition, curriculum development, participation in shared governance—these should be tenured people. PALMITER agreed, but the reality is that the University is not hiring as many people into tenure-track positions. Maybe we need to go back to the budget model. DOLIDON: so it's a move to save money—we are trying to have quality people but pay them less. THIEMAN disagreed. We have important faculty who are needed to teach; that is their core purpose. The [criteria for] teaching professor incorporate what they see many people actually doing. We are trying to provide these colleagues with a set of ranks that recognizes their professional expertise. These kinds of question should be taken into account when we revise P&T.

JEFFORDS wondered if the criterion for Teaching Professor for four years experience at PSU meant that people could not be hired from outside into that position. THIEMAN: that wasn't the intent. JEFFORDS: the language is confusing. PALMITER: we took

the language from the tenure-track rank [definitions]. THIEMAN agreed it would be necessary to address this. JEFFORDS imagined a case of someone at another institution, who embodied all of the qualities we want, and who wanted to be hired at that rank. It seemingly precluded recruiting someone in this way. THIEMAN understood that deans could hire into higher ranks when bringing in someone from outside. JEFFORDS wondered if we want to create policies for which, immediately, there are exceptions. CARPENTER pointed out that the sentence begins with “typically”—we are covered.

GEORGE wondered about calling it a “middle path.” Is it actually six ranks, starting at Instructor and going to Teaching Professor? THIEMAN: no. GEORGE thought that for the Professor of Practice ranks, the salaries are the same [as for regular Professor ranks]. THIEMAN recognized Jennifer KERNS, who had compared salaries for various ranks. KERNS thought that [Senate] was supposed to avoid discussions about salary. Currently AAUP had negotiated that the minimums for all the various professorial rank series are the same. Regarding terminology: many people who are Senior Instructor II wonder what this means if they have a Ph.D., much experience, etc. It does hinder their getting grants, even if they are formally eligible.

LUCKETT pointed out that there is a Research Professor series—mostly people in grant-funded positions—and this has never been thought to imply that the rest of us aren’t doing research. Therefore fear about implications of the “teaching” label isn’t serious.

EASTIN: is the intent to replace the Instructor ranks? THIEMAN: no. EASTIN: then how does it address the inequities you’ve identified? THIEMAN: previously when new ranks were created, there was opportunity for qualified people to promote into them. However, Senior Instructors I & II have no place to go; they generally can’t move into the Clinical or Professor of Practice ranks. EASTIN: so it would be like applying for a new position? CHABON: the last time that ranks were added, it was not a promotional opportunity, but rather a chance for re-classification. Reverting to GEORGE’s question, are we now looking at six promotional opportunities? KERNS: the vision was to re-rank people—say, Senior Instructor I would apply to become Teaching Assistant Professor. CHABON: the semantics were unclear. KERNS: as THIEMAN has said, a department could hire at the Teaching Assistant Professor rank, skipping the Instructor Series.

FARAHMANDPUR observed that [many] tenure-track faculty teach 27 credits [annually]. It’s not commonly known that we all work under the baseline assumption of 45 credits [annually]; if tenure-track faculty teach 27 credits, service and research are the equivalent of 9 credits each. For NTTF, it’s 36 and 9. There has been an objective way to measure this; he’s not sure if this still stands. One reason that we modified the latest contract was to give appropriate recognition to these areas.

WEBB noted that other universities have Teaching Professor positions, and apparently don’t worry about the nomenclature. She also noted that continuous appointment comes after six years of annual reviews. Someone hired at the Senior Instructor II level—not uncommon—undergoes these six years of review, but thereafter there is no opportunity for promotion. The committee intended to find a resolution for this situation.

PALMITER/THIEMAN **moved the previous question** (moved to close debate). The motion was **not approved**, lacking a 2/3 supermajority (24 yes, 23 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

HANSEN wondered if there were still others who wanted to speak. BEYLER: yes. JAÉN's was concerned that there seemed to be a need for further discussion.

KARAVANIC/ZONOOZY **moved to postpone** until the next meeting. The motion was **approved** (46 yes, 3 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

#### **F. QUESTION PERIOD** – *none*

#### **G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

##### **1. President's report** – *none, as PERCY was out of town.*

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

JEFFORDS, referring to the earlier discussion, clarified that the project under discussion was for the OAA budget, around 66% of the University's overall budget. The Budget Committee had been a fabulous discussion partner.

JEFFORDS hoped that everyone had seen information about the student success work being launched. Opportunities for engagement will include poster sessions, town halls, and updates to Senate. JEFFORDS said that this was, for her, without question the most important work that we have to do this year and in the coming years: intentionally supporting success of our students. It speaks also to many of the questions that came up in the [budget model] discussion. We need hold ourselves accountable for this work.

Work on accreditation continues, JEFFORDS said. We do not expect to hear a response from [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities] until January; when we receive that, she will then share it with Faculty Senate.

##### **3. Report from ASPSU President**

ASPSU President Violet GIBSON reviewed their initiatives for this year. One major item is food insecurity. Many student groups had approached her about this issue including, surprisingly, athletes and employees of the food pantry. She believed that there is a misrepresentation that athletes are all taken care of, whereas some couldn't get [adequate] food or work under reasonable accommodations from their coaches.

Regarding student success, GIBSON planned to create committee with a diverse group of students, including representation from the cultural resource centers, to better understand what it means to make higher education accessible for these diverse communities.

GIBSON turned to tuition. The state government made K-12 education a priority. ASPSU supports this, but hopes that in the short [legislative] session a pot of money for higher education can be created. They will advocate for this, working closely with Kevin NEELEY (Government Relations) and the Oregon Student Association [OSA].

This led GIBSON to another issue: OSA contributions are about 50% of ASPSU's budget. They are a state-wide lobbying group. ASPSU has been tracking whether to stay with this arrangement. Oregon State recently left the OSA, which made PSU the largest contributor. If PSU leaves that would probably mean the end of the organization.

Another important focus, GIBSON continued, is campus public safety. The *Vanguard* had recently called attention to safety issues in Smith [SMSU] and the parking structures. Access hours to SMSU had been restricted, which had an impact on student groups and

community events. GIBSON observed that are there houseless students as well as houseless community members, and believed it's wrong to shoo people away without providing adequate resources. For houseless students it is important to offer tangible on-campus resources; for community members, referral to services throughout the city. She had been talking with President PERCY about the parking structures. Many students had reached out to her with concerns about feeling unsafe, hit-and-run incidents, robberies, etc. There are no cameras, signs, or other deterrents. Lighting in the Park Blocks, and the availability of police escorts, are similar issues.

On the question of arming campus police, GIBSON said that happened to Jason WASHINGTON was an absolute tragedy. She thought that the President and Board had handled the issue well, and in this regard had the support of student government. They were working on getting information on the decision out to students, and getting feedback on how they feel about it. ASPSU does not want to exacerbate students being fearful of police on campus. Her belief is that campus officers want to keep us safe; they understand that what happened was a tragedy and a mistake.

GIBSON: there is a narrative of students vs. administration, which she hopes to get rid of this year. She was working with the President's Office, UCOMM, etc. to take advantage of available resources; ASPSU was working with rather than against administration.

Faculty would probably agree, GIBSON said, that student engagement is relatively low. Should we move toward being a traditional school, or embrace being non-traditional? She heard from students on both sides of this issue—for example, regarding the athletics. The [ASPSU] Student Life Director is working with Athletics to come up with initiatives. GIBSON believed that PSU lacks a sense of community, but that with increased support for transportation and food, increased support from faculty and administration, financial and other kinds of support for students in difficult situations, this could change.

GIBSON called attention the resolution from the [ASPSU] Academic Affairs Committee in support of OER [Open-Access Educational Resources] and textbook affordability. One specific item was a call to change the course listing from “no cost” to “low cost,” hoping that this would encourage usage of low-cost materials. Course materials, GIBSON said, can be a burden of hundreds of dollars per course, in some cases.

GIBSON concluded by saying that students and faculty are the core of the university; working together, they can't be ignored.

GAMBURD noted that when Senate previously discussed the OER, there was uncertainty about what constituted “low-cost” whereas everyone knew what “no-cost” meant. This was largely the reason for that decision. How low is low? GIBSON observed that the term referred to required items, and went beyond textbooks. JEFFORDS believed that, around the state, the standard was \$50 or under. BACCAR said that it varied: \$30, \$50. JEFFORDS said we could adopt our own definition. BACCAR agreed with GIBSON that it should incorporate all kinds of materials.

## H. ADJOURNMENT

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

## 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.

November 6, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: December 2019 Consent Agenda

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

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

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

## **College of Education**

### **New Courses**

#### E.1.a.1

- CI 550 Teacher Leadership, 3 credits  
Teacher Leadership is a course for educators, particularly K-12 teachers, curriculum developers, mentors, coaches, and other leaders, who would like to learn more about how to be effective leaders in their school agencies. There is a focus on successfully meeting the needs of a diverse student population and promoting equity and social justice.

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.a.2

- ITP 530 Student Teaching I, Middle Level, 4-8 credits – change title to Student Teaching I, Middle/High School, change description, change credit hours to 8 credits

#### E.1.a.3

- ITP 531 Student Teaching II, Middle Level, 9-13 credits – change title to Student Teaching II, Middle/High School, change description, change credit hours to 13 credits

#### E.1.a.4

- ITP 532 Student Teaching I, High School, 4-8 credits – change title to Student Teaching I, Art/Music/PE K-12, change description, change credit hours to 8 credits

#### E.1.a.5

- ITP 533 Student Teaching II, High School 9-13 credits – change title to Student Teaching II: Art/Music/PE K-12, change description, change credit hours to 13 credits

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

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.a.6

- SpHr 540 Multicultural Topics in Communication Disorders, 4 credits – change description, change credit hours to 2 credits

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

## **School of Public Health**

### **Change to Existing Programs**

#### E.1.a.7

- Biostatistics Graduate Certificate – remove course from core requirement (reducing credit requirement from 18 credits to 15 credits) and reduce elective credit requirement from 12 credits to 9 credits; overall certificate credit hour requirement reduced from 30 credits to 24 credits

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

November 6, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: December 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>

## **School of Business**

### **New Courses**

#### E.1.b.1

- BA 327 Data Analysis & Visualization, 2 credits  
This course is required of all business students in order for them to have basic competency in Data Analytics and be able to succeed in 400-level discipline specific Data Analytics courses as well as for them to perform well in the BA 495 Capstone class. Using a large dataset from industry, this two-credit combined-lab-and-lecture course will give students experience with tools while walking them through the data analytics cycle in order to prepare students for the work force, and their 400-level SB coursework.  
Prerequisite: BA 325.

#### E.1.b.2

- GSCM 310 Introduction to Supply Chain Management of Food and Beverage Systems, 4 credits  
This survey course covers food and beverage supply chain management from production of raw materials through to consumers. Food supply chain managers must address food safety, climate change, diminishing resources, stakeholder values, waste management, sourcing, logistics, and multiple operational changes. The course includes economic, social and environmental perspectives.

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

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.b.3

- Geog 312U Climate Variability, 4 credits—change description and change title to Climate Variability and Change

#### E.1.b.4

- Sci 334U Climate Variability, 4 credits—change description and change title to Climate Variability and Change

\* 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.

## **School of Social Work**

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.b.5

- SW 351 Beginning Generalist Practice, 4 credits—change description and change title to Social Work Practice I

#### E.1.b.6

- SW 400 Field Placement and Seminar I-III, 4 credits—change description

#### E.1.b.7

- SW 430 Generalist Practice with Group, 3 credits—change description and change title to Social Work Practice II

#### E.1.b.8

- SW 432 Generalist Practice with Communities and Organizations, 3 credits—change description and change title to Social Work Practice IV

### **Drop Existing Course**

#### E.1.b.9

- SW 460 Senior Integrative Portfolio, 3 credits

## **College of Urban and Public Affairs**

### **Changes to Existing Courses**

#### E.1.b.10

- Ec 312 Macroeconomic Theory, 4 credits—change prerequisites

#### E.1.b.11

- Ec 435 Public Spending and Debt Policy, 4 credits—change prerequisites

#### E.1.b.12

- Ec 469 Introduction to Econometrics, 4 credits—change prerequisites

November 6, 2019

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: December 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)

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

## **School of Public Health**

### **New Courses**

#### E.2.a.1

- Bsta 510 Biostatistics Lab, 3 credits  
The course provides hands-on data analysis and/or biostatistical consulting experience to students outside classroom settings. Students will have opportunities to perform data analysis with inputs from faculty members. Students should have adequate skills in at least one statistical program among STATA, SAS or R and finished BSTA 512 Linear Models or equivalent. Students meet weekly for 1~2 hour with the course instructor for discussion on their projects and are required to have regular meetings with an assigned faculty advisor and/or consultee(s), if applicable. Students are expected to work individually or in a team of 2~3 on actual data analysis. In addition, there is weekly reading assignment. The workload will be at least 9 hours per week including all activities (classes, meetings, readings, coding, and analysis). Prerequisite: Bsta 512 Linear Models.

#### E.2.a.2.

- Bsta 512 Linear Models, 4 credits  
BSTA 512 is primarily designed for Biostatistics Graduate Certificate students in Department of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, and BSTA 612 for PhD students from Behavioral Neuroscience or other PhD programs. In this course, we will focus on Linear models that include Regressions Analysis and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). In conjunction with the conceptual and theoretical supporting the topics. For students of BSTA 612, extra homework problems and reading materials will be assigned along with one extra week of lecture on mixed-effects models for longitudinal/repeated measure data.

#### E.2.a.3

- Bsta 519 Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis, 3 credits  
This course is designed for students who have taken the basic applied statistical courses and wish to learn the more advanced statistical methods for longitudinal data. Longitudinal data consist of measurements of response variables at two or more points in time for many individuals. This course covers the statistical properties of longitudinal data and special challenges due to the repeated measurements on each individual,

exploratory methods and statistical models for longitudinal data as well as some exposure to estimation methods and statistical properties of coefficient estimates. For statistical methods, the course will briefly mention the traditional repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) approach for continuous data, and focus more on mixed effects model approach and estimation based on generalized estimating equation. Real life examples will be used to explain the concept and application of these models by using continuous, binary and count data. Homework assignments and final class project play a central role to understand and appropriately apply the methods covered in the course. Prerequisites: Bsta 511, Bsta 512, and Bsta 513.

## E.2.a.4

- Bsta 550 Intro to Probability, 3 credits  
This course is designed to introduce history, concepts and distributions in probability, Monte Carlo simulation techniques, and Markov chains. Student will also learn how to write R codes for various statistical computations and plots. Previous experience in R is not required. Prerequisite: Acceptance to MS in Biostatistics program.

## E.2.a.5

- Bsta 551 Mathematical Statistics I, 3 credits  
Mathematical Statistics I is the first course of a two term course (Bsta 551 & Bsta 552) covering the foundations of statistical inference. It is targeted to graduate students majoring in biostatistics and other disciplines requiring an understanding of statistical theory. The course starts with a review of the probability theory that is the basis for that inference. We will then focus on principles of data reduction and estimation (frequentist and Bayesian methods). We will also introduce hypothesis testing, time permitting. Prerequisite: Bsta 550 and differential and integral calculus.

## E.2.a.6

- Bsta 552 Mathematical Statistics II, 3 credits  
This second of a two sequence course provides theoretic foundation in biostatistics. Topics will include theory of probability, distributions of random variables, central limit theorem, sampling distributions, point and interval estimation, tests of hypotheses, analysis of variance. The two courses must be taken in sequence.

## E.2.a.7

- Bsta 612 Linear Models, 4 credits  
BSTA 512 is primarily designed for Biostatistics Graduate Certificate students in Department of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, and BSTA 612 for PhD students from Behavioral Neuroscience or other PhD programs. In this course, we will focus on Linear models that include Regressions Analysis and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). In conjunction with the conceptual and theoretical supporting the topics. For students of BSTA 612, extra homework problems and reading materials will be assigned along with one extra week of lecture on mixed-effects models for longitudinal/repeated measure data.

## E.2.a.8

- CPH 522 Communicating Public Health Data, 3 credits  
Traditionally, public health findings and surveillance data are disseminated through publications and reports designed for the academic and scientific community. Today,



with growing access to public health data for the general population, there is also the increasing risk of data being misunderstood, misused or poorly interpreted. Thus we have a significant role in synthesizing, interpreting and presenting data in ways that nonscientific audiences can understand and use. The purpose of this course is to explore public health surveillance systems; retrieve and analyze data for health disparities and inequities, and develop communication approaches regarding the findings for: the community at risk, the general public, policy makers, and the press. Principles of communicating scientific data to lay audiences and the concept of “place based approaches” as effective framing language will be explored. The strengths and limitations of various data presentation formats will be tested as students research different audiences and determine what data to use, the key messages, and how to present the data effectively.

#### E.2.a.9

- CPH 622 Communicating Public Health Data, 3 credits  
Traditionally, public health findings and surveillance data are disseminated through publications and reports designed for the academic and scientific community. Today, with growing access to public health data for the general population, there is also the increasing risk of data being misunderstood, misused or poorly interpreted. Thus we have a significant role in synthesizing, interpreting and presenting data in ways that nonscientific audiences can understand and use. The purpose of this course is to explore public health surveillance systems; retrieve and analyze data for health disparities and inequities, and develop communication approaches regarding the findings for: the community at risk, the general public, policy makers, and the press. Principles of communicating scientific data to lay audiences and the concept of “place based approaches” as effective framing language will be explored. The strengths and limitations of various data presentation formats will be tested as students research different audiences and determine what data to use, the key messages, and how to present the data effectively.

**Master of Public Health – Biostatistics****Program Description**

The MPH Biostatistics program provides training for biostatistics methods as they apply to public health. Courses in this program emphasize intermediate to advanced applied statistical methods and statistical programming commonly used in public health research and practice, and program competencies highlight population-based study design, analytic methods, data interpretation, and communication. Epidemiological study design and methods are also an important component of the training provided by this program. Graduates of the program will be equipped to pursue careers in local, state and federal agencies, health and medical centers, and research institutions.

**Learning Competencies**

Graduates will be able to:

- Apply appropriate principles of research design and population-based concepts to assess health problems.
- Apply appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze risk determinants of disease and health conditions.
- Apply descriptive and inferential statistical methods that are appropriate to the different study designs used in public health research.
- Interpret and summarize results and communicate them to lay and professional audiences, in the context of proper public health principles and concepts.
- Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of alternative research designs and analytic methods, and critically review and assess statistical analyses presented in public health literature.
- Apply basic ethical principles pertaining to the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of public health data.
- Identify cultural dimensions of conducting research, including culturally sensitive recruitment of study participants, and develop strategies for interpretation of data in the larger cultural context.

**Program of Study**

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Credits</b>
<b><i>Core Required Coursework (22 Credits)</i></b>		
BSTA 511	Estimation and Hypothesis Testing for Applied Biostatistics	4
EPI 512	Epidemiology I	4
ESHH 511	Concepts of Environmental Health	3
HSMP 574	Health Systems Organization	3
PHE 512	Principles of Health Behavior	3
Exam	Certified in Public Health Examination	0; Pass
CPH 513	Applied Practice Experience	1

BSTA 506	Integrative Learning Experience	4
Exam	Biostatistics Comprehensive Examination	0; Pass
<b>Program Required Coursework (28 Credits)</b>		
UNI 504*	Qualitative Methods for Health Professionals	2
BSTA 512	Linear Models	4
BSTA 513	Categorical Data Analysis	4
BSTA 515	Data Management and Analysis in SAS	3
BSTA 516	Design and Analysis of Surveys	3
BSTA 519	Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis	3
HSMP 573	Values & Ethics in Health	3
EPI 513	Epidemiology II (Methods)	4
EPI 566	Current Issues in Public Health	2
<b>Elective courses from the following (10 Credits)</b>		
BSTA 500	Reading and Research in Biostatistics	1-3
BSTA 514	Survival Analysis	3
BSTA 517	Statistical Methods in Clinical Trials	3
BSTA 521	Bayesian Methods for Data Analysis	3
BSTA 522	Statistical Learning and Big Data	3
BSTA 523	Design of Experiments: Statistical Principles of Research Design & Analysis	3
BSTA 524	Statistical Methods for Next Generation Sequencing Data	3
BSTA 550	Introduction to Probability	3
BSTA 551	Mathematical Statistics I	3
BSTA 552	Mathematical Statistics II	3
EPI 514	Epidemiology III	4
PHE 519	Introduction to the Etiology of Disease	3
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>60</b>

\* UNI 504 fulfills the CEPH requirements for the MPH degree on two foundational competencies: the Interprofessional Education Experience (IPE) and qualitative methods. Alternatively, students may take PHE 520 Qualitative Research Design (3 credits), or HSMP 588 Program Evaluation and Management in Health Services (3 credits), to fulfill the requirement for quantitative method; and a separate IPE course for the IPE competency. Consult your Academic Advisor about the choice of IPE course.

**Recommended Course Sequencing**

Always consult your Academic Advisor to determine the schedule that fits best for you. One recommended course sequence is as follows:

<b>Year 1</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
BSTA 511 Estimation and Hypothesis Testing (4)	BSTA 512 Linear Models (4)	BSTA 513 Categorical Data Analysis (4)	Elective (3) (e.g. BSTA 517 Stat Methods in Clinical Trials)
EPI 512 Epidemiology I (4)	EPI 513: Epidemiology II (4)	BSTA 516 Design and Analysis of Surveys (3)	

Core course: HSMP 574, PHE 512, or ESHH 511 (3)	Core course: HSMP 574, PHE 512, or ESHH 511 (3); <b>&amp;/or</b> EPI 566 Current Issues (2)	Core course: HSMP 574, PHE 512, or ESHH 511(3)	Written part of comprehensive exam
<b>Year 2</b>			
<b>Fall</b>		<b>Winter</b>	
<b>Spring</b>			
BSTA 519 Appld Longitudinal Data Analysis (3)	HSMP 573 Values/Ethics in Hlth (3)	BSTA 506 Integrative Learning Experience (4)	
BSTA 515 Data Mgmt and Analysis in SAS (3)	EPI 566 Current Issues in Public Health (2) – if not completed Yr 1	Elective*	
Core course: HSMP 574, PHE 512, or ESHH 511 (3) – if not completed Yr 1	CPH 513 Applied Lrning Exper (1)	Lab part of comprehensive exam	
UNI 504 Qualitative Methods (2)	Elective		

\*Depending on elective load in other terms

### Grading Requirements

Students are not permitted to progress through the BSTA 511-513 course sequence unless they achieve at least a B- in each of the courses.

### Comprehensive Exam

The MPH Biostatistics comprehensive exam assesses the student's ability to integrate statistical knowledge and skills covered from the different biostatistics courses. Students need to demonstrate mastery of the subject matter, skills of critical thinking and independent problem solving as well as interpretation of results in the context of a research question. The comprehensive examination comprises questions reflective of five required courses in Biostatistics:

1. BSTA 511 Estimation and Hypothesis Testing for Applied Biostatistics
2. BSTA 512 Linear Models
3. BSTA 513 Categorical Data Analysis
4. BSTA 516 Design and Analysis of Surveys
5. BSTA 519 Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis

Specifically, the examination will evaluate the following three program learning competencies:

1. Apply appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze social and other determinants of health.
2. Apply descriptive and inferential statistical methods that are appropriate to the different study designs used in public health research.
3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of alternative designs and analytic methods, and critically review and assess statistical analyses presented in public health literature.

The exam has two parts: the written part is closed book with three applied questions, and the lab part has two data analysis questions and one question to assess the appropriateness of the statistical methods used in a published journal article. The written part covers materials from the course sequence

BSTA 511-513, and the lab section covers materials from BSTA 516 and 519. Students are allowed to take each section of comprehensive exam only after they have completed the relevant course work.

The written part takes two hours and the lab part takes three hours, administered on separate days. Each year, students have two opportunities to take the examination, which will be scheduled on the Wednesday and Thursday of the second week of May, and the last week of August.

The comprehensive exam uses a Pass/No Pass grading system, and is based on pre-specified criteria determined by the comprehensive exam committee. Each student will have two opportunities to take the exam. Passing the exam is a requirement for graduation.

Students with questions regarding the comprehensive exam should contact Miguel Marino ([marinom@ohsu.edu](mailto:marinom@ohsu.edu)), the Chair of the Comprehensive Exam Committee, or Rochelle Fu ([fur@ohsu.edu](mailto:fur@ohsu.edu)), the Program Director.

### **Biostatistics & Design Program (BDP)**

The Biostatistics & Design Program (BDP) is one of the OHSU shared resource cores, and is hosted by the Biostatistics group. BDP provides biostatistics support to basic, clinical and population science at all phases of research from grant submission, protocol development, and study design to statistical analysis, interpretation of analysis results and manuscript preparation. Many biostatistics faculty are involved in BDP, and BDP also has many PhD and MS level staff providing statistical support and consultation. The BDP handles hundreds of research projects each year and provides many internship opportunities for students. Students should talk to the director of BDP, Dr. Jodi Lapidus, for internship opportunities.

### **Knight Cancer Institute Biostatistics Shared Resources (Knight BSR)**

The Knight Cancer Institute Biostatistics Shared Resource (Knight BSR) is supported by the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Center Support Grant. Knight BSR provides comprehensive and integrated biostatistics support to basic, clinical and population science researchers conducting cancer research at OHSU. The BSR also provides students with opportunities to work on ongoing cancer research projects. Students may contact the BSR Director (Dr. Tomi Mori) or Associate Director (Dr. Byung Park) for opportunities for an internship and/or work experience.

**Master of Public Health – Epidemiology**

The goal of the Epidemiology program is to provide training in the population perspective toward health care and disease prevention. Courses in this track emphasize the use of quantitative methods for analyzing and addressing health problems to support basic and applied research in public health and health care.

**Learning Competencies**

Graduates will be able to:

- Apply population-based concepts of epidemiology and risk determination to the assessment of health problems.
- Apply evidence-based knowledge of health determinants to public health issues.
- Apply and interpret a variety of statistical methods commonly used in medical and public health research.
- Propose and test a research hypothesis.
- Identify ethical principles problems that arise in public health policy decisions.
- Apply knowledge of cultural dimensions in conducting research, including culturally sensitive recruitment of study participants, and develop strategies for interpretation of data in the larger cultural context.
- Integrate and apply relevant literature in epidemiology to public health issues and policy.
- Communicate public health principles and concepts through various strategies across multiple sectors of the community.

**Program of Study**

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Credits</b>
<b><i>Core Required Coursework (22 Credits)</i></b>		
BSTA 511	Estimation and Hypothesis Testing for Applied Biostatistics	4
EPI 512	Epidemiology I	4
ESHH 511	Concepts of Environmental Health	3
HSMP 574	Health Systems Organization	3
PHE 512	Principles of Health Behavior	3
Exam	Certified in Public Health Examination	0; Pass
CPH 513	Applied Practice Experience	1
EPI 506	Integrative Learning Experience	4
<b><i>Program Required Coursework (27 Credits)</i></b>		
BSTA 512	Linear Models	4
BSTA 513	Categorical Data Analysis	4
EPI 513	Epidemiology II (Methods)	4

EPI 514	Epidemiology III (Causal Inference)	4
EPI 536	Epidemiologic Data Analysis & Interpretation	4
EPI 566	Current Issues in Public Health	2
HSMP 573	Values & Ethics in Health	3
UNI 504	Qualitative Methods for Health Professionals	2
<b><i>Commonly taken elective courses* (11 Credits)</i></b>		
BSTA 514	Survival Analysis	3
BSTA 515	Data Management & Analysis in SAS	3
BSTA 516	Design and Analysis of Surveys	3
BSTA 517	Statistical Methods in Clinical Trials	3
BSTA 519	Longitudinal Data Analysis	3
CPH 510	GIS & Public Health	3
CPH 521	Social Determinants of Health & Community Assessment	3
EPI 505	Reading and Conference	1-3
EPI 540	Introduction to Research Proposal & Design	3
EPI 556	HIV/AIDS Epidemiology	3
EPI 568	Infectious Disease Epidemiology	2
EPI 576	Chronic Disease Epidemiology	2
EPI 630	Epidemiology Journal Club	1
HSMP 510	Population Health: Policy and Practice Implications	3
PHE 510	Development Origins of Health and Disease Epidemiology	3
PHE 519	Introduction to the Etiology of Disease	3
PHE 522	Health and Social Inequalities	3
PHE 524	Social Epidemiology Methods & Theory	3
*Other courses may be approved by the MPH Epi Program Director.		
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>60</b>

## Recommended Course Sequencing

To maximize your educational experience, we recommend taking courses in the following sequence. Always consult your Faculty Advisor to determine the schedule that fits best for you.

### Full-time

<b>Year One</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
BSTA 511 Estimation (4)	BSTA 512 Linear Models (4)	BSTA 513 Categorical Data Analysis (4)	
EPI 512 Epi I (4)	EPI 513 Epi II (4)	EPI 514 Epi III (4)	EPI 536: EpiData (4)
Chose one: PHE 512 Princ Hlth Bhvr (3) <b>or</b> ESHH 511 Env Hlth (3) <b>or</b> HSMP 574 Hlth Syst Org (3)	Chose one: PHE 512 Princ Hlth Bhvr (3) <b>or</b> ESHH 511^ Env Hlth (3) <b>or</b> HSMP 574^ Hlth Syst Org (3)  If schedule allows: EPI 566 Current Issues (2)	Chose one: PHE 512^ Princ Hlth Bhv (3) <b>or</b> ESHH 511 Env Hlth (3) <b>or</b> HSMP 574 Hlth Syst Org (3)	If schedule allows, choose from: ESHH 511^ Env Hlth (3) <b>or</b> HSMP 574^ Hlth Syst Org (3) <b>or</b> Elective*  CPH Exam (if all core courses complete)
<b>Year Two</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
HSMP 573 Values & Ethics in Health (1-3)	CPH 513 Appld Prac Exper (1)	EPI 506 Int Learning Exper (4)	
UNI 504 Qualitative Methods for Health Professionals (2)  Chose one (if not completed): PHE 512 Princ Hlth Bhvr (3) <b>or</b> ESHH 511 Env Hlth (3) <b>or</b> HSMP 574 Hlth Syst Org (3)	EPI 566 Current Iss (2) (if not taken in Yr1)  UNI 504 Qualitative Methods for Health Professionals (2) (if not taken)		
Elective*	Elective*	Electives* (as needed to complete 60-credit degree requirement)	
CPH Exam (if not taken summer term)	CPH Exam (if not taken; must pass before spring term to graduate in spring)		

\*There are 11 elective credits required for the MPH EPI program of study.

^online



*Part-time*

<b>Year One</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
BSTA 511 Estimation (4) Note: BSTA 511 is time-intensive. You may wish to take only one course this term.	BSTA 512 Linear Models (4) Note: You may wish to take only one course this term.	BSTA 513 Categorical Data Analysis (4) Note: You may wish to take only one course this term.	
Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPI 512 Epi I (4) (taking Epi I this term allows more flexibility, as it is a pre-req for many electives)</li> <li>Core course (PHE 512, ESHH 511, HSMP 574)</li> </ul>	Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512, ESHH 511<sup>^</sup>, or HSMP 574<sup>^</sup>)</li> <li>PHPM 566: Current Issues (2)</li> <li>Elective</li> </ul>	Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512<sup>^</sup>, ESHH 511, or HSMP 574)</li> <li>Elective</li> </ul>	As schedule allows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512<sup>^</sup> or HSMP 574<sup>^</sup>)</li> <li>Elective</li> </ul>
<b>Year Two</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
EPI 512 Epi I (4) (if not completed Yr1)	EPI 513 Epi II (4)	EPI 514 Epi III (4)	EPI 536 Epi Data Analysis (4)
Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512, ESHH 511, HSMP 574)</li> <li>HSMP 573 Ethics (3)</li> <li>UNI 504 Qualitative (2)</li> <li>Elective*</li> </ul>	Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512, ESHH 511<sup>^</sup>, or HSMP 574<sup>^</sup>)</li> <li>PHPM 566: Currnt Issues (2)</li> <li>HSMP 573 Ethics (3)</li> <li>UNI 504 Qualitative (2)</li> <li>Elective*</li> </ul>	Choose one: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512<sup>^</sup>, ESHH 511, or HSMP 574)</li> <li>Elective</li> </ul>	As schedule allows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core course (PHE 512<sup>^</sup> or HSMP 574<sup>^</sup>)</li> <li>Elective</li> </ul> CPH Exam (if all core courses complete)
<b>Year Three</b>			
<b>Fall</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>
Remaining core courses (PHE 512, ESHH 511, HSMP 574)  HSMP 573 Ethics (3) (if not taken)  UNI 504 Qualitative Methods for Hlth Prof (2) (if not taken)	CPH 513 Appl Prac Exper (1)  PHPM 566: Current Issues (2) (if not taken)  UNI 504 Qualitative Methods for Hlth Prof (2) (if not taken)	EPI 506 Integrative Learning Experience (4)	
Elective*	Elective*	Electives* (as needed to complete 60-credits)	
CPH Exam (if all core courses complete)	CPH Exam (if not taken; must pass before spring term to graduate in spring)		

\*There are 11 elective credits required for the MPH EPI program of study.

<sup>^</sup>online

# Attachment E.5

Steering Committee proposes the following resolution for consideration by Faculty Senate, 2 December 2019.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING THE STATE OF RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY**

WHEREAS Faculty Senate recognizes research endeavors at Portland State University to be based on these tenets:

- The university has a responsibility to both create and disseminate knowledge;
- Research is a fundamental higher education endeavor that faculty carry out with and for both undergraduate and graduate students; it ensures relevant, current, and high-quality teaching;
- Research activities directly and indirectly contribute to the community beyond the university;
- Research at the university must be supported equitably across all disciplines with attention to the needs of each field, which include (but are not restricted to) staff support for grant writing, course buyout for research time, funds for travel and conferencing, and funds for equipment;

and WHEREAS Faculty Senate observes that the following circumstances currently prevail:

- Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA) is now understaffed and operating at 65% capacity, endangering the success of current and future grant applications;
- Graduate research is shrinking due to lack of funding for Graduate Assistant positions;
- Mechanisms to support cross-college university-wide research and interdepartmental collaboration are needed for adequate interdisciplinary student exposure;
- Members of the Faculty have characterized the current lack of sufficient research support as a crisis:

The Faculty Senate, as the representative of the Faculty, **RESOLVES** that the administration examine carefully the kinds and levels of support for research at PSU and, taking into consideration the above mentioned tenets and circumstances, work closely with the Faculty (via the Faculty Senate and relevant constitutional Faculty committees) to:

- 1) Effectively address the immediate crisis in Sponsored Projects Administration;
- 2) Design a stable budget structure that addresses the research needs of the institution;
- 3) Envision a broader durable framework for supporting research at PSU.

# Attachment E.6

## Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Constitution December 2019

The Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty is hereby amended as follows.

- (1) In Article IV, Section 4.1, paragraph 3 (definition of Faculty Senate divisions),  
replace: Graduate School of Education [GSE]  
with: College of Education [COE]
- (2) In Article IV, Section 4.4.g (membership of Faculty Development Committee),  
delete: , two from the Library,

Text as amended:

This committee shall consist of six Faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions) and one from each of the other divisions.

- (3) In Article IV, Section 4.4.i (membership of General Student Affairs Committee),  
replace: Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs  
with: Vice Provost for Student Affairs
- (4) In Article V, Section 4.1 (disposition of new program proposals),  
replace: State Board of Higher Education  
with: Higher Education Coordinating Commission

Pursuant to Article VIII, paragraph 1, these proposed amendments are endorsed by Senators DOLIDON, EMERY, GAMBURD, GRECO, HOLT, KARAVANIC, LINDSAY, LUPRO, THORNE, and WATANABE.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rationale:** These amendments are proposed in order to update language in the Constitution that has become antiquated. No change of function is intended. Regarding amendment (2), the LIB Faculty Senator has advised that the historical contingency reflected in the current wording no longer pertains, and that Library faculty are amenable to the change from two members to one member.

**Procedural note:** Proposed amendments to the Faculty Constitution are introduced at a meeting of Faculty Senate upon endorsement by ten Senators. Modifications (amendments to the amendments) may be moved and voted on at that time. The Advisory Council then reviews the final text, including any approved modifications, “for proper form and numbering.” A vote on the final text, including any approved modifications, is then voted on at the next regular Faculty Senate meeting. This vote must be on the final text as reviewed by Advisory Council; additional modifications are not in order at this second reading. A two-thirds majority is required for approval of constitutional amendments.

To: Faculty Senate

From: Educational Policy Committee

Date: November 14, 2019

Subject: EPC Quarterly Report

Per the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty, the charge of the Educational Policy Committee is as follows:

The Committee shall:

- 1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.
- 2) Take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, with appropriate consultation with other interested faculty committees, and with timely report or recommendation to the Faculty Senate.
- 3) Make recommendations to the Senate concerning the approval of proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, or other significant academic entities. All proposals must use the Process for Creation, Elimination and Alteration of Academic Units.
- 4) In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University.
- 5) Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.
- 6) Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.
- 7) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term.

The EPC is a university-wide committee appointed, as follows, by the Committee on Committees:

Co-chairs: Alex Sagar (Phil) & Arthur Hendricks (Lib)

AO: Cynthia Baccar, REG (2016-)

COTA: Barbara Heilmair-Tanret

CLAS-AL: Alex Sager (2017-)

CLAS-AL: Tucker Childs

CLAS-Sci: Linda George (2019-)

CLAS-Sci: Ralf Widenhorn, PHY (2016-)

CLAS-SS: Hyeyoung Woo (2017-)

CLAS-SS: Friedrich Schuler (2019-)

CUPA, Leopoldo Rodriguez (2017-)

COE: Deborah Peterson

MCECS: Tim Anderson (2019-)

LIB: Arthur Hendricks (2013-)

OI:

SBA: David Hansen (2018-)

SPH: Lynne Messer (2018-)

SSW: Mollie Janssen

Ex officio: Mitchell Cruzan (BIO), Budget Committee, and two (2) students who have not yet been appointed by ASPSU.

Consultants:

Susan Jeffords, Provost

Andreen Morris, OAA

Kathi Ketcheson, Director, OIRP

Kevin Reynolds, Vice Pres. for Finance & Administration

Report:

During the fall term, the EPC continued unfinished work carried over from Spring term, such as Online Education Policy, the proposal to establish Indigenous Nations Studies as a Department, the procedure to impose a Moratorium (suspension) on Admission, and the Confucius Institute contract. No specific issues were brought to the EPC for evaluation from other Faculty Senate Committees.

Subcommittees are completing the reports generated by the EPC in 2016 regarding the state of online education at PSU. Last year the EPC carried out surveys, focus groups, and interviews of students, faculty, and administrators, as well as investigated questions around the cost of online education. An executive summary is being drafted to summarize the findings from the subcommittee reports. We expect to submit our reports in the winter 2020 academic term..

EPC reviewed and approved the proposal to establish Indigenous Nations Studies as a Department. Our review had been delayed last year due to questions about definitions of a program and department. The EPC determined that PSU does not have official definitions of what constitutes a program or a department. In order not to impose additional delays on Indigenous Nations Studies, we elected to move forward with our review.

EPC reviewed the procedure to impose a moratorium on programs and sent a memo to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

Last term, a subcommittee was formed to review the contract for the Confucius Institute. However, we learned that a new contract was being drafted that the subcommittee needed to review for its report, so no memo was sent to steering. EPC is waiting for clarity on the status of the new contract and looks forward to reviewing it as soon as possible.

**PSU Committee on Committees (CoC) Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

Prepared by Karen L. Karavanic and Susan Lindsay, Co-Chairs

<i>2018-2019 Membership</i>			
<i>Division</i>	<i>First</i>	<i>Last</i>	<i>Dept</i>
CLAS-AL	Suwako	Watanabe	WLL
CLAS-AL	Isabel	Jaén Portillo	WLL
CLAS-SCI	Drake	Mitchell	PH
CLAS-SCI	Jeanette/Rachel	Palmiter/Webb	MTH/STAT
CLAS-SS	Patricia	Schechter	HST
CLAS-SS	Heejun	Chang	GGR
SBA	Michael	Dimond	SBA
GSE	Candyce	Reynolds	GSE
MCECS	Karen	Karavanic	CMP
COTA	Marie	Florillo	COTA
LIB	Jill	Emery	LIB
SSW	Miranda	Cunningham	SSW
CUPA	Sheila	Martin	USP/IMS
AO	Nick	Matlick	OAA
OI	Susan	Lindsay	IELP
SPH	Lynne	Messer	SCH

**I. Committee charge (from PSU Faculty Constitution):**

*The Committee on Committees is responsible for (1) appointing the members and chairpersons of constitutional committees, (2) making recommendations to the President for numerous committees established by administrative action, and (3) ensuring appropriate divisional representation.*

**II. Summary of 2018-19 Activities**

**A. Regular Meetings held**

Meetings were held Fall, Winter, and Spring. The CoC divided the committees to be staffed among the committee members, so that one person acted as the main liaison between CoC and each specific committee chair. CoC members spoke with committee chairs to anticipate needs for the 2019-20 academic year where possible. Most of the work occurred upon receipt of the

Faculty Preference Survey in spring quarter, when bulk changes are made to most committees to replace outgoing constitutional committee members. This work continued to early fall.

#### B. Faculty Preference Survey (FPS)

The Faculty Preference Survey was sent to all faculty, requesting first, second, and third choices for committee appointments. The results were input to a Google Sheet and shared to the entire CoC for use in re-populating the committees.

### III. Suggested Minor Constitutional Changes

The CoC co-chairs met with the Steering Committee to discuss proposed minor constitutional changes. There are a number of small changes that fall into two categories: simple updates to reflect changes in names and organization at PSU; and changes to increase the clarity of committee structure, for example addition of a definition of consultant and *ex officio* to standardize across committees, with a clarification of whether each title implies voting privileges. The CoC will submit a detailed list to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for further consideration.

### IV. Suggested New Committees

#### A. University Research Committee (URC)

Recently, there has been an increased focus on research at Portland State University, with many high quality efforts gaining recognition, and many faculty eager to facilitate the very positive trajectory. Recently interest in undergraduate research across campus lead to formation of an *ad hoc* Committee to expeditiously allow discussion of the important topic. This pointed to a gap in our current set of committees, with no existing committee related to research among the PSU constitutional committees. That insight, together with the importance of research and the growing interest across campus, leads us to propose filling the gap.

The CoC recommends creation of a new Constitutional Committee: The University Research Committee (URC). With *ex officio* (non-voting) members to include the VP and Associate VP of Research, the Stated Purpose should include:

- Conduct an annual survey of the faculty regarding the infrastructure, training and services available to faculty for the conduct of research, including satisfaction, suggestions for improvement, and any obstacles identified by the faculty
- Prepare an annual summary report to the Senate on Ph.D. students across the University, including Department/College, Dissertation title, advisor, and employment if known; and a summary of totals by College/Division
- Evaluate undergraduate research opportunities and outcomes across the University.
- Work with relevant members of the administration to develop ideas and plans to improve and increase research across the University; and to suggest paths forward through challenges.

## B. Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee (ACIC)

Concerns raised by members of the administrative ACITAC Committee (*Academic Computing and Information Technologies Advisory Council*) lead CoC Chairs to consider a possible change related to faculty involvement in Academic Computing. The charge for the administrative committee ACITAC in the current Constitution is:

ACITAC provides academic advice, perspectives, and feedback to the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). The council is charged with providing academic input and feedback on information technology planning, policies and project portfolio.

CoC would like to raise a concern that the current structure of this committee precludes productive and efficient work, and seems not to accomplish the key goal of maintaining open communication between the faculty and the relevant administration. One example is the work to develop a new web site that completely excluded faculty, not just from decision making, but from any consideration in the proposed finished product. A second example is the replacement of D2L, of which many faculty are still unaware as we write this report.

We propose the disbandment of ACITAC.

The CoC recommends creation of a new Constitutional Committee: The Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee (ACIC). With *ex officio* (non-voting) members to include The Chief Information Officer, Associate Chief Information Officers, Chief Information Security Officer, Finance & Ops Associate Director, and the Academic Technology Senior Director, the Stated Purpose should include:

- Conduct and report on an annual survey of the faculty to determine their concerns, challenges, and success with the current PSU Information Technology.
- Report annually to the Faculty Senate.
- Serve as an interface between OIT and the Portland State Faculty, ensuring that faculty are informed, heard, and involved in OIT decisions for the University.

## C. Moving Forward

Creation of a new committee requires full discussion with, and consideration by, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Faculty Senate. The proposed new committees require a formal motion, discussion and debate, and approval by the Faculty Senate.