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Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 2, 2006
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Hook for Black, Maty for Farquhar, Biehler for Fritzsche, Gitleman for Livneh, Santleman for Reder, Damis for Works.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 5, 2006, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following correction, p. 73, item 4., correct $50,00 to $50,000.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

ADDED TO THE DAY’S AGENDA: D.1. Question to Administrators

DELETED FROM THE DAY’S AGENDA:

E-1 Course Proposal - Withdrawn by Univ. Curriculum Committee (USP 569)

Changes to Senate and Committee memberships since June 6, 2006:
Erik Sanchez replaces Larry Crawshaw on the Senate (June 2007)
Jennifer Perlmutter replaces Dalton Miller-Jones on the Senate (June 2009)
Mark Gregory has been replaced in the Senate by David Santen (June 2008)

Michael Flower replaces Dalton Miller-Jones on the Advisory Council (June 2008)

Craig Wollner replaces Dalton Miller-Jones on the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (December 2008)

Danielle Stevens has been elected in caucus to represent ED on the Committee on Committees.

The Presiding Officer briefly reviewed Senate meeting protocol.

President's Report

BERNSTINE welcomed the faculty back for the 2006-07 academic year, and in particular Senator and Professor Teresa Bulman, survivor of a serious illness during the summer hiatus.

We are preparing ourselves for the next legislative session, including the potential impact of the ballot measures. BERNSTINE noted the departure from his staff of Jennifer Williamson, Government Relations, who will be joining the Oregon Dept. of Education.

Provost's Report

KOCH welcomed the faculty back, and noted he had several items to discuss, the first being changes in the Office of Academic Affairs. Carol Mack has succeeded Michael Driscoll to become Vice Provost for Academic Administration and Planning. Due to the departure of Terrell Rhodes, Shawn Smallman has been appointed to serve as Interim Vice Provost for Instruction and Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Other changes include, the Center for Academic Excellence will report to Vice Provost Smallman. Candace Reynolds will serve as the CAE faculty in residence for Teaching and Learning, and Kevin Kecskes will continue as Director of Community-University Partnerships. Five instructional designers from OIT have been moved to Academic Affairs. Searches are underway for the Faculty in Residence for Assessment and the Faculty In Resident For Teaching and Learning.

KOCH briefly discussed the agenda for the annual Symposium, which has been moved to January 12, 2006. Several Ex officio members of the Senate, including Deans and Vice Presidents, returned from a retreat on planning academic priorities, to attend this meeting. Their discussions will continue across the fall, to culminate in the Symposium agenda. A summary of the retreat will be released as soon as it can be transcribed.
KOCH noted that Sukhwant Jhaj has been appointed interim director for two years of the University Studies Program. He also noted he looks forward to working with the new University Studies Council.

KOCH noted that Nancy Koroloff and Dee Wendler facilitated a study of Research and Sponsored Projects at PSU, and he intends to move forward to implement recommendations, as appropriate. The report is available on the Graduate Studies web page, and faculty are encouraged to review it.

KOCH noted that we would work hard this year to make Assessment consistent and comprehensive. It will move from initiative status to an administrative council with a charge to encourage, manage and evaluate activities. We need to confront the issues of learning goals at all levels of the institution, not just lower levels. We will be aggressive in this activity, as is required by our accreditation report.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

2. Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

OSTLUND and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

CARTER/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE USP 4/575, Sustainable Cities and Regions (3), Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-2.”

STEVENS queried how a workshop differs from other courses. OSTLUND stated it is a form of practicum. SUSSMAN stated it is project oriented. WALLLACK noted that it involves teams of students working on community projects. COLLIER asked if we have other four credits workshops in the university or is this a new category. OSTLUND noted the Graduate Council didn’t discuss this question.

COLLIER/STEVENS MOVED THE SENATE TABLE the proposal, and refer it back to Graduate Council for a clarification on its workshop status.

MANDAVILLE noted that this is a normal process to describe a course of this nature. CLLUCAS noted that Mandaville’s comment captures the notion of student teamwork. TATE noted that Theater Arts has had workshops of this nature on their books for many years, and the title is appropriate. WOLLNER noted that the name of the course is a convention of planning programs.

STEVENS noted that GSED courses of this nature are presume suspect by the graduate office, and have been refused for a lack of theoretical components.
RUETER noted that a quick survey of the PSU Bulletin indicates that there are at least 30-40 courses of this nature listed therein.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO TABLE failed by majority voice vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED, by majority voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Policy Proposal for Incomplete Grades

OSTLUND introduced the proposal to change the graduate Incomplete regulation, noting the Senate’s amendment of the undergraduate policy at the May 2006 meeting.

BULMAN/ RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as listed in “E-3.”

C. BROWN spoke against the proposal, noting she appreciated the passion for symmetry but felt that this would be the kiss of death for graduate students, who have many fewer degree requirements than undergraduates, in most instances. Giving a graduate student an “F” is almost tantamount to preventing her/him from attaining a 3.0 GPA. It would be excessive punishment.

ZELICK noted he agreed with Brown for slightly different reasons. For example, in his program there are field season issues that often span a period of more than the one-year timeframe.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE FAILED, by majority voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Question for Provost Koch from the Senate Steering Committee:
“What is the status of our international student recruiting efforts and, specifically, what have been the results so far?”

KOCH stated that this question is about our international recruiting activities. As background information, the initiative has been in place for some time. There are a number of international students and faculty on campus each year, but the focus of this discussion is on matriculating students. The efforts to recruit have increased in recent years. This speaks to the goals of the initiative, but also has a byproduct in tuition income. Resources have been added to the office of international students and recruiting, particularly in Asia and the Middle East. We have developed some strong relationships with educational advisors in Asia and Middle Eastern countries. One other activity has been recruiting these students.
from community colleges and local high schools. The increase of applications was 25% since last year, with a mix of 50% graduate and undergraduate, particularly from Japan, India, China, and Korea.

SHUSTERMAN asked if support is being improved for these students, with their increased numbers. KOCH stated that the office has been working to improve services. LUTHER noted she is the Assistant Director of International Student Services, and problems may be directed to her.

MANDAVILLE asked if the number of advisors has increased to match the increased headcount. LUTHER stated no. MANDAVILLE stated the question is whether the university is going to skim by, praying that things don’t crack. KOCH stated we are trying to build back the infrastructure for student affairs as well as increase international student support.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

None.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1550.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes:

Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Bertini, C. Brown, K. Brown, Buddress, Farquhar, Farr, Hagge. R. Johnson, Kapoor, Kim, Kominz, Luther, Mandaville, Mathwick, McBride, Messer, Reder, Shapiro, Stevens, Weasel,


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2006, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 1505. The minutes were approved, after the Provost’s Report, with the following corrections:

In attendance on October 2, 2006: Stephen Wadley; Gilliland (Sp.) for Livneh; Damis (Sp.) for Works.

p. 1, C. Announcements, Para. 2, to read: “E-1 Course Proposal – Withdrawn by the Graduate Council (USP 569)”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

ADDED TO THE AGENDA:

G. 2. Report of the Academic Appeals Committee on deadlines.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since October 2, 2006:

Devon Allen has been appointed to the University Studies Council to replace Brad Hansen, FPA

KETCHESON discussed the results of the Faculty Senate on-line survey she conducted in October. There was a 20% overall response rate to two items, questions to ask of administrators, and subjects for senate discussion items. She noted that the Steering Committee would organize the questions and discussion items and schedule them for future senate meetings. The following items are listed in response order:

- Mix of tenure-related and fixed term faculty
- Infrastructure and support for research
- Growth in graduate education
- General Growth issues:
  - Ensuring quality
  - Need for additional classroom space
  - Faculty workload issues
  - Student support (international students)
  - Student recruitment
  - Faculty compensation
  - Fundraising/new campaign
- Faculty gathering space
- Proposals for OH&SU/Portland State merger

President’s Report

The report was cancelled as the President was in Salem.

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that the recent accreditation report included four recommendations, three to which we have responded, to date, including campus communication and priority setting, and disposal of hazardous waste. With respect to the recommendation on assessment, the President has established an administrative committee called the Institutional Assessment Council whose membership will be appointed shortly (attached).

KOCH noted that the PhD in Sociology, tentatively approved by the Provost’s Council, has now undergone an external evaluation, the results of which will be reviewed at the January meeting of the Provost’s Council.
KOCH noted that the process of identifying academic priorities continues to move forward in preparation for the all-faculty symposium on January 12, 2007.

KOCH noted that the Faculty Activity Survey would be conducted in the next few weeks. There have been considerable revisions to the form from last year’s, and it will be sent to the various classes of full-time faculty.

D. Unfinished Business

None

E. New Business

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

BUTLER (for Ostlund) presented the proposals for the council.

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Graduate Certificate in Infant Toddler Mental Health: A Relationship-based Approach, and related new courses (4), in EDUCATION, as listed in “E-1.”

BLACK asked, with respect to assessment, how the program would ensure whom to award the degrees, if the program is entirely on-line. CRESS yielded to Munson, who noted that the program involves personal contact with students and rigorous, multiple forms of evaluation. LIVNEH notes there is a plan for the entire program for assessment of student learning, and yielded to Munson, who stated that the instructor could tell from personal contact whether the persons are one and the same. LIVNEH noted that there is a professional development seminar going on throughout the duration of the program and a practicum piece that includes personal and recorded contacts.

BROWN requested a clarification of the relationship between Education and Extended Studies. LIVNEH noted that they are in partnership; the program is offered as a self-support program because it is risky and expensive to develop, but if it becomes a stable program, it could ideally be moved to in-load status. This program is for credit, as opposed to other programs and courses that Extended Studies offers that are not for credit.

SCHECHTER asked why courses are offered for three credits, rather than four. LIVNEH noted that this is based on the amount and format of content delivery per term, as well as the fact that graduate courses in Education are predominantly three credits.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/BRUNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course, SW 596 Development and Utilization of Collaborative Partnerships to Support Infants, Toddlers, and Their Families (3), SOCIAL WORK, as listed in “E-1.”
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals

BUTLER (for Ostlund) and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

BURNS/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course proposals in Economics (4), LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, as listed in “E-2.”

ELZANOWSKI noted with respect to EC 469, that a pre-requisite, MTH 241 is not currently being offered, and there are no plans to offer it.

SUSSMAN MOVED that courses, EC 4/573 and 4/574 be amended to delete the word “prerequisite” following the word “recommended.” There was no second.

RUETER and MIKSCH noted that the new curricular approval form covers this item.

BODEGOM/ELZANOWKI MOVED TO DELETE MTH 241 from EC 469, Prerequisites.

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED TO TABLE the course, ED 4/569.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by majority voice vote.

ELZANOWSKI requested a clarification of why ED 4/551 was a change rather than a new course proposal. MIKSCH noted that the committee did not see the requested changes as warranting a dropped and new course proposal.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE COURSES in Liberal Arts and Sciences (3) passed by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER/LALL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course, ECE 4/517 Nanoelectronics (4), ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCES, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

MIKSCH introduced the proposals for the committee, noting that HST 4/561 as listed on the Minor in Judaic Studies is awaiting approval by the Graduate Council.

WETZEL/LIEBMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Judaic Studies, and JST 201, ENG 330, and HST 344, LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, as listed in E-3.”
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two additional courses, RUS 331 and SCI 354, LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RECTENWALD/LALL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one course, ECE 241, COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


HANSEN presented the proposal for the committee.

TALBOTTFLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Proposal to Transition the Child and Family Studies Program from Liberal Arts and Sciences to Social Work, as listed in “E-4.”

INGERSOLL asked what should happen to the name of Social Work, if an undergraduate program is being added. HANSEN noted that another proposal around that issue would be forthcoming later in the year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. Question Period

1. Question for Provost Koch from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee:
   How is self-support being used to offer courses, and what is its role in relationship to in load course offerings?

KOCH introduced the item, outlining his intent to discuss the history, current practice and future of the policy with the use of prepared slides (attached). He described the varied costs involved in offering courses. He noted that we have offered non-credit self support courses for a long period of time, and more recently, during a period of limited funding, we introduced for-credit self support courses, to 1) offer courses we couldn’t afford to offer in-load, and 2) to provide a mechanism for departments to fund things that the E&G budget wouldn’t fund. The condition on offering self-support for-credit courses is that these courses are permitted only if the academic unit meets the student credit hour targets that are assigned to the unit, so that the central operations of the institution are not adversely impacted.

KOCH continued, the assumption is that if the course is self-support it will generate at least enough money to pay for itself, and the department can use
the balance to fund local priorities. The student doesn’t necessarily know which of these courses is self-support. The administrative fee is currently 12%, however the overhead for the entire university is about 50% (and what we are allowed to charge for indirects is somewhat less than that, at 42%). In the past, there was some difficulty in monitoring self-support caveats, particularly whether a program has met targets before offering self-support for-credit courses, and consequently, the policy was adjusted. There are now three kinds of for-credit courses, 1) in-load courses, paid for by E&G funding, 2) courses in self-support programs, for example the just approved on-line certificate and/or others which pay rent off site, etc. (these do not allow staff fee remissions, etc.), and 3) Hybrid self support (HSS) courses which look just like a regular class, including sometimes being taught by regular faculty, but don’t count towards enrollment targets.

KOCH reviewed the issues. Quality is not particularly at stake. As we move down the road towards the entire OUS system being self-support, however, the notion of the self-support class being different from an in-load class is disappearing. If it is not appropriate to start new programs this way, we may not be able to start new programs. The self-support programs and hybrid self support classes are just an extension of what we were already doing on this campus. In many cases, they are a response to a need in the community on a short or long-term basis. And, the administrative fee probably doesn’t cover costs. There is, however, a significant new problem which may make all of the above irrelevant. It may be that our in-load SCH targets are not even sufficient to meet the expenses we have, so that it would never be the case that self-support courses are appropriate, unless possibly we turn around the system and use self-support courses to fund the base of the institution.

FRITZSCHE asked a question about indirect costs. DESROCHERS noted that we have just done an analysis of indirect costs, irrespective of federal mandates, to determine an administrative formula that accurately reflects costs.

COLLIER asked, with respect to the goal to increase the size of the university, if the target would be so high that we will never be able to meet it. KOCH noted that he is saying exactly this.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
None

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of October 5-6 at SOU
BURNS presented the report for the IFS Senators. He noted that minutes of meetings are on-line at the address listed in the agenda, and called particular attention to the following:

1) IFS Minutes http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html
2) OUS 2006 Plan for 2025 http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddcc060908-LRP.pdf
3) Potential impact of measures on the November election ballot
5) Updated list of comparator institution salaries (attached)
6) OUS 2007-09 Budget Proposal (see OUS website)
7) Proposed revisions to tax deferred investment plan
8) New campus presidents
9) PSU faculty presence at IFS – Board Coffee on Nov. 3, 2006;
10) Emerging issues with respect to Advanced Placement courses.

2. Report of the Academic Appeals Committee on Deadlines

The report was tabled, as Lehman was not in the hall.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1630.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 4, 2006
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Hook for Black, Barton for Knights, Santelmann for Reder.

Members Absent: Bertini, K. Brown, Cotrell, T. Dillon, Farquhar, R. Johnson, Kapoor, Kim, Labissiere, Lall, Mandaville, Mathwick, Medovoi, Messer, Paynter, Powers, Reese, Shapiro, Tate.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 6, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 1506. The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda: Chancellor’s Report

Changes in Senate/Committee Memberships since December 4, 2006:

Erna Gelles, UPA, has resigned from the Faculty Development Committee.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE noted that the Chancellor will discuss the Governor’s budget for OUS, released this day, and he noted that there has been only one other year when an
increase was proposed. BERNSTINE stressed that the big challenge would be if we can hold it, and the Chancellor will need strong faculty support to make that happen. In that regard, he noted that Debbie Murdock, PSU’s chief government relations officer, is progressing very well, but that she will out for a while. In her absence, distinguished alumnus Dick Feeney, past recipient of the Outstanding Alumnus Award and former lobbyist for Tri Met, will endeavor to fill her shoes.

Chancellor’s Report

The Chancellor reported after “E-2.” He noted that he scheduled his visit to talk about optional retirement plan offerings, but he also wanted to discuss the Governor’s Budget for 2007-09. The principal message is that the economy is better and we want to keep it better by investing in education, and not just K-12, but from Head Start through post-doctorate and research endeavors. Last week’s revenue forecast was robust and we hope they will continue to be. Housing sales have declined but other forms of real estate have not, and population, jobs, and the economy are all growing in the state. We have great reason for optimism, but we need to tinge or frame it with Oregon’s historical reality.

PERNSTEINER noted that the first investment will be for Head Start, through the corporate minimum tax. Head Start is important because education is a continuum. The next investment is proposed for the Shared Responsibility model, formerly known as the Oregon Opportunity Grant, also through the corporate minimum tax. The next proposals are linked to more traditional revenue sources and include increases in K-12 and Higher Education. The proposals for Higher Education include increasing faculty salaries, improving the student-faculty ratio, enrollment growth, stabilizing regional campus budgets, building and renovation funding, and related capital investments. On recommendation of the Oregon Innovation Council, the Governor has proposed substantial investments in research. The Governor has also proposed an increase in ETIC to be distributed to the three major universities.

Additionally, we have proposed a legislative concept that we can keep our own cash, and some other innovations that would enhance resources, and enable us more flexibility and fewer visits to the E-Board. The OUS has withdrawn some proposals, for example, changes to PEBB, PERS contributions, and retirement plans, so that we can all work together in the legislature on this budget, students, faculty, and staff.

BURNS asked if there were differences between the Board’s original versus the Governor’s present budget proposals. PERNSTEINER noted that many things were moved around with a resulting budget of $946.2 Million versus the originally proposed figure of $974. Million.

BALSHEM noted that we narrowly missed a major catastrophe in the election, and that this could be interpreted as just another example of ebb and flow in the Oregon economy. PERNSTEINER stressed that we have not seen the last recession in history, but that this is an opportunity to plan for the future so that we won’t decimate programs in the next downturn.
MEIER asked the Chancellor to comment on a potential merger of OHSU and PSU. PERNSTEINER noted that there is still interest in the Legislature, and that therefore the OUS would issue an RFP to research the notion.

_______ asked for comment on the funding model. PERNSTEINER noted that there are very few areas of the budget with any flexibility to address funding the model.

PERSTEINER introduced Denise Yunker of OUS, and briefly discussed the proposed changes for optional and elective retirement plans (OUS slides attached). We have to make changes in the next twelve months, due to IRS regulations that take effect in 2008. Approximately one-sixth of eligible OUS employees are currently participating. There are currently sixteen vendors and there is no assistance in the selection process. We are trying to make it easier for employees to take advantage of these plans. We propose the record keeper and custodian be centralized. We have an investment committee comprised of members from each campus, and we are establishing an advisory committee composed of two faculty from each campus to advise on design of the system, and advise the investment committee on the approach to investment in each of the categories.

FRITSCHIE noted that he used to contribute to these plans but stopped as a result of insufficient salary.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. New Business

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

FLOWER/WOLLNER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Urban and Public Affairs and Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

FOSQUE asked for a clarification regarding the total number of credit hours. WALLACK yielded to SELTZER who noted that the certificate requirement specifies a minimum of 27 credits. BARTON concurred.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.
BARHAM/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, course changes and a program change in Biology, Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

BULMAN asked for an explanation of the program change in Biology. MIKSCH noted that the change is minor, and has to do with advances in areas of course content. RUETER noted that three courses were added, Evolution being of particular note, and one course was dropped.

WAMSER noted that Chemistry might not have been notified that Biochemistry was being dropped. RUETER noted that the proposal went through the CLAS Curriculum Committee. WAMSER reiterated his concern, noting that Chemistry can barely handle their own biochemistry majors.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/WEASEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new courses in Education, as listed in “E-2.”

CLUCAS queried if Education has contacted Political Science about this course, as there is significant overlap. MIKSCH noted that Education was very forthcoming about possible course duplication. LIVNEH noted that these courses have been in process for at least six to eight months, and presumably, the questions have been asked. Additionally, the courses have been offered for 4-5 years as 410U’s in the Leadership for Change Cluster. MIKSCH read from the proposal. CLUCAS noted that there is overlap in what she read. RUETER noted that Regina Lawrence from Political Science was last year’s chair, which assumes significant representation from Political Science. CLUCAS stated he would prefer if the course were referred back to committee, noting that Lawrence is not an expert on international political economy, and may not have understood the duplication. LIVNEH reminded that this course is from last year’s work, and requested that, at the least, the course should be split from the other that is proposed so as not to delay the latter. CLUCAS noted that irrespective of last year, our function as a Faculty Senate is to give overlap a clear airing. Timeliness should not be a condition for approval. CLUCAS noted also that, contrary to the proposal description on the overhead, there is no PA 454; the course is PS 454. MEIER asked if there was any comment in the full proposal about PS 454. MIKSCH stated no.

CLUCAS/JACOB MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION BY DELETING EPFA 448.

THE MOTION FAILED by 34 in favor and 36 against.

D. BROWN requested that the same information be shared with respect to the second course, EPFA 450. MIKSCH noted that there was none.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.
F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for Vice President Desrochers

How is FADM working with OAA to make decisions about space utilization, particularly given the upcoming renovation projects across campus?

DESROCHERS began by echoing the Chancellor’s remarks about the budget, and noting that backfilling for enrollment growth is a very big priority.

DESROCHERS responded to the question by describing the university’s activities in domain of space utilization, especially as it relates to classrooms. She included slides (attached).

NOTE: There is no transcript of the meeting from this point.
LIEBMAN noted that there is great concern for instructional support during this transition. The spaces in the Unitas Building are not ready for classes, and the faculty need IR staff for maintenance of the equipment. It appears that there are not enough hands, now and for the future. DESROCHERS noted

CLUCAS asked what percentage of our buildings are being leased. DESROCHERS stated that thee are not as many as you would think. Additionally, DEQ and Public Health are finally leaving. The USGS is moving in, but that is a very good fit with certain of our programs.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Quarterly Report of the Education Policies Committee

In the absence of the Chair, the report was tabled.

2. Report of the Academic Appeals Committee on Deadlines

The report was tabled.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1705.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes:
Faculty Senate Meeting, January 8, 2007

Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Rad for Bertini, Walsh for Fritzsche, Hook for Maier,


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2006, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following correction: Jacob was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

ADDED to today’s agenda:

Report of the Academic Appeals Committee - Lehman

Provost’s Report

KOCH welcomed back the faculty. He noted that the Provost’s Council at their meeting of January 2, 2007, have approved the Ph.D. in Sociology-Social Inequality, and will forward it to the State Board for approval. He reminded the assembly that the 2006-07 Symposium is Friday, January 12, 2007.
D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

HANSEN presented the report for the committee.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

FLOWER/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Ph.D. in Chemistry and the new course CH 694, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CLUCAS/CARTER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course, USP 569, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-1.”

WORKS noted that Geography convened with Economics, with respect to rewrites, so that the differences are clear. The department is satisfied that the process worked.

2. Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Joint Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committees.

FARR/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course EC 4/569, Liberal Arts and Sciences as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses ARCH 4/521 and ARCH 4/532, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

RUETER and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

FARR/BULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Elementary Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”
NELSON expressed concern that this proposal is nearly identical to the Child and Family Studies major and requested a clarification on the coordination and evident duplication.

JACOB noted that the Teacher Education Committee received this proposal from Robert Mercer, and discussed it for 1.5 years, including gathering input from all G-TEP advisors and members of the Graduate School of Education. A member of the Child and Family Services faculty was on the committee. The committee tried to be as democratic and thorough as possible.

MORGATINE noted that she sat as a visitor on the committee. She noted that the language in the program overview is misleading for two reasons. In the second paragraph, it indicates that all advising is done by CLAS advisors, however, Child and Family Studies also does this advising. The rest of the paragraph is likewise misleading in that for a long time there has been a Child and Family Studies major with an Elementary Ed specialization.

FARR expressed disagreement with Morgaine, noting that the CLAS office has an advisor dedicated to pre-education in a more general sense. This isn't meant to compete with Child and Family Studies, but only an attempt to respond to the past shift away from undergraduate education training, filling what CLAS faculty see as a need. SHUSTINAN yielded to Dilafruz Williams who stated she was also on the Teacher Education Committee during the development of this minor. She noted she agrees with Farr, noting that there is an unmet need at the undergraduate level. Many future teachers come from Liberal Arts and Sciences, where they are majoring in a CLAS discipline at the undergraduate level.

STEVENS noted this proposal is useful in that it lists a detailed set of courses for students to take. REPP asked for a clarification on the large size of this minor at 54 credits. JACOB yielded to Williams who noted that the committee researched minors at PSU and found a range from 30 to 72 credits. FARR noted that these are the classes that students need to take in order to proceed efficiently through the graduate program.

NELSON reiterated that this is nearly identical to Child and Family Studies major, emphasis in elementary education, and reiterated her dismay.

BARHAM noted that elementary education does not require a particular major, so the advantage of the minor is that the student can major in any area and supplement the major with this minor rather than being restricted to a major in Child and Family Studies. This is not competition; it just allows students more options.

MORGATINE requested that the final catalog wording clarify that the major in Child and Family Studies is available. BULMAN noted that the wording in question would not show up anywhere, except in this proposal. RAD suggested
that a clarification in the catalog would be useful, nevertheless. FARR reminded that neither the major or the minor are required to pursue the graduate program.

SHUSTERMAN cautioned that the proposal does not indicate the infrequency at which some of these courses are currently being offered.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINOR was approved 45 in favor, 18 against, and 6 abstentions.

HICKEY/MEDOVOI MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE PER 330 and 341, and SP 389, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER/WORKS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE program changes in three certificate programs, European Studies, Latin-American Studies, and Middle-East Studies, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in "E-3."

MIKSCH noted the proposed changes are clerical, to reflect credit allocation schemes.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LALL/DEVLETIAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the B.S. in Environmental Engineering, Engineering and Computer Sciences, as listed in "E-3."

BARHAM noted that certain course numbers at the Freshman and Sophomore level need correcting.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LALL/DEVLETIAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change in the B.S. in Mechanical Engineering, Engineering and Computer Sciences, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

   Question for Provost Koch from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee
   How is OAA responding to the shortage in classroom space and support for instructional technology, and its resulting impact on the curriculum, brought on by enrollment growth, scheduled construction or remodeling projects, and budget reductions?
KOCH noted that Desrochers provided a good description of space issues at the last meeting. Since then, the Governor’s budget has been released, which includes proposed space improvements. As we know, Shattuck Hall is already undergoing renovation, and the Emergency Board has approved the bonds to rebuild the PCAT block. The Governor’s budget proposes renovations to Lincoln Hall and SB II as well.

The latest issues around space problems have to do with the closing of Shattuck Hall for one year, the demolition of the PCAT block, and the move of classes and offices to the UNITAS building. OIT reports that the technology is up and running in the Unitas Building, and will continue to make improvements there.

There will be continued work on space issues, especially with respect to looking at space that is not in general classrooms. We are working on a project to identify a software system, which will allow the entire campus to access all rooms for possible scheduling.

With regard to instructional technology, we will revisit the staff reductions and personnel changes undertaken last year. We are working through a series of classroom technology upgrades as fast as possible, including using external contractors. If the deferred maintenance piece of the Governor’s budget is approved in the legislature, that will also allow for additional improvements. If faculty have issues, they are encouraged to contact the Help Desk.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

STOERING, for Rodriguez, presented the report.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.


SQUIRE presented the report for the committee.

MANDAVILLE asked if Athletics would schedule three Division I teams again. SQUIRE stated no. MARIANI stated that there would be one next year. REDER asked what are major budgetary issues. SQUIRE stated that securing external funding from the private sector is a major emphasis. SCHECHTER asked if there has been any interest in student union organizing. SQUIRE stated no. MANDAVILLE asked of there were additional monies allocated to marketing. MARIANI stated that funds have been expended on a bulletin board on the
freeway and advertisements in The Portland Tribune. SQUIRE stated that the marketing budget is something that the new Athletic Director will address.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of Dec 8-9 at PSU

BURNS presented the report for the Senators, and discussed the Governor’s budget and some of the developments at the state board meeting. He noted that proposals are part of a five-biennium budget, especially with respect to salary improvements. The strategy for success with this budget is to have a unified voice at the legislature. The big question at the Ways and Means Committee in March will be how we propose to spend the increases. The Chancellor is going to stress the student-faculty ratio and in conjunction with that, the IFS will emphasize quality. It is important to keep in personal touch with your legislators.

Two items of importance that were discussed at the board meeting on Friday were a proposed sales tax and the proposed PSU-OHSU merger.

HICKEY asked if the board is committed to funding PSU’s current enrollment. DESROCHERS noted that there is a discussion going on about what the base year should be, and there is no decision how the dollars will be allocated to the university system. PSU is urging for the current base year, of course. BALSHEM asked about the status of SOU. Burns noted that their new President has indicated that they are downsizing to match their current enrollment.

SQUIRE urged faculty to participate in the activities of the Alumni Advocates, including the Lobby Day in Salem scheduled for March.

DESROCHERS pledged to provide more specifics about the budget at the next Senate meeting.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Report of the Academic Appeals Committee

LEHMAN reported for the committee, noting that the committee does not rule on deadlines, but only on grade changes. He noted that the student petition success rate is about one in three. He gave several suggestions for avoiding the process including providing an explicit syllabus, carefully defining the participation component, and mentoring non-tenure track faculty as the data shows more challenges are made against them.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, February 5, 2007

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 5, 2007
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2007, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The minutes were approved as published, with the following correction:

page numbering for the January minutes should be corrected to read, 18 through 23.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda:

F.1. Provost’s Response to Request for Current Budget Information
G.2. Report of the IFS Meeting of February 2-3, 2007 at OSU
The Presiding Officer reminded that Senators were sent the following email requesting names for the four working groups of the academic planning and priorities effort:

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee encourages your participation in the Provost's academic planning and priorities effort. We invite you to join one of the working groups that have been formed around four priority areas:

- Improve student success through engaged learning experiences
- Expand innovative scholarship/creative activities that address regional issues and have global significance
- Enhance educational opportunity in the Portland Metropolitan Region
- Advance selected programs that establish our leadership

Please indicate your interest in serving on one of these groups by completing the interest form at this address:

http://survey.oit.pdx.edu/ss/wsb.dlllbujs/plancommittee.htm?ID=148659

This link provides a message from the Provost and a full description of the process. The Steering Committee and President's Advisory Council will recommend a group of 16 to 20 faculty from amongst those who express interest. Please submit your form by Friday, February 9 so that the committees will have time to make appointments before the first working group meeting.

Thank you for your willingness to ensure faculty participation in this important effort.

Kathi A. Ketcheson
Faculty Senate Presiding Officer, 2006-2007

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that there was an 89% response rate to the Faculty Activity Survey, thanked the Senate for participation, and asked senators to extend that thanks to their colleagues. KOCH noted that at their meeting on Friday, the State Board of Higher Education passed the Sociology Ph.D. Additionally, the Provost’s Council approved the Executive M.P.A. and the Graduate Certificate in Software Engineering, to be forwarded for board approval. KOCH thanked senators for their participation in the academic planning and priorities symposium on 12 February.

KOCH reported on the progress of 2006-07 PSU enrollments. The total Fall 2006 enrollments were up a little over 1%, however the in load headcount and SCH were both down 1% and self support headcount and SCH were up. For Winter 2007, headcount and SCH are up 1%, however the in load headcount and SCH are down ¼-1 ½%. Again, the self-support numbers are up. Our projections don’t match these figures due to the drops in inload enrollment, which raises issues associated with the self support system.

CRESS asked that revision be made to the Faculty Surveys to improve clarity with respect to sabbatical leaves, etc. KETCHESON noted that the Deans were asked to review the data and provide such information. At the aggregate level, the information isn’t collected.

Vice President’s Report

The Vice President was unable to attend due to illness.
D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Curricular Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

WETZEL/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE changes to the Graduate Certificate in Applied Statistics, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FOUNTAIN/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Mathematics, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. GC and UCC Curricular Proposals

OSTLUND and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

HICKEY/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CARTER/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote with one abstention.

3. University Curriculum Committee Curricular Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

BARHAM/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE changes to the BA/BS in Black Studies, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”

D. BROWN asked how the program enforces the advisor relationship cited in the proposed change. AGORSAH noted that there are specific times in the major experience when students must meet with their advisors.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
WETZEL/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the BA/BS in Arts Studies including three new courses, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-3."

BARHAM noted that the majority of listed Art courses are designated as being offered for majors only, and asked if students would have access to them. MIKSCH noted that the courses were approved by the chairs for enrollment by students in the new major. INGERSOLL noted that there is some similarity to the General Studies Arts & Letters option and asked who will be advising these students. MIKSCH noted that advising, etc. for the Arts Studies major will be through the FPA Dean’s office.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FOSQUE/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course in Music, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-3."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Request of the Provost and Vice President for Current Budget Update

KOCH gave a brief overview of the Governor’s Recommended 2007-09 Budget (attachment), which can be accessed in total on the state webpage and/or directly at http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/BAM/GRB0709.shtml. He noted that the OUS has been operating at a deficit for the last two biennia; therefore the extra monies in the Governor’s Proposed Budget may not look like much when all is said and done. He also reminded that the Governor’s Proposed Budget is the best-case scenario, and snags are already developing around one of the tax proposals. Therefore, we will have to address possible shortfalls to that budget as well as past under-funding. Undergraduate tuition is off the table. If the governor’s budget is approved, we are still short by $3 Million. Additionally, we need to build up the fund balance to an acceptable level. We can pursue two strategies, new revenue or new cuts. Ideally, we would like to find new revenues, and we would also like to identify a few strategic investments.

KOCH reviewed the PSU 2007-08 budget process, which is similar to last year. Deans are requested to submit budget requests by 16 February. The deans’ council is developing university-wide strategies, but given the economic constraints, the list of opportunities is not very long. We don’t want to reduce staffing any more and we don’t want to reduce instructional capacity. Every 1% of enrollment is approximately $800,000. Diversifying enrollment is an option. Another option would be to institute differential graduate tuition where programs could support that. Looking carefully at and increasing where possible certain class sizes, especially Junior and Senior cluster classes, is one of the least objectionable solutions.
BURNS noted that the report to the board noted that our fund balance was much higher that Koch indicated. KOCH stated that it wouldn’t be by the end of the year.

ZELICK asked about the impact of the federal timber subsidy issue that was headlined on Friday, and also if Distance Learning programs could help enrollment figures. KOCH stated he believed the former issue doesn’t affect all this. With respect to Distance Learning, KOCH noted that we are rolling out a program in Criminal Justice for example, but development of good programs takes some time.

LIEBMAN asked about diversifying the enrollment mix and if there is a negative impact of revenue streams that are captured by the metro community colleges. KOCH noted that in answer to the first question, PSU is recruiting 100 out of state high achieving freshmen for next year with a scholarship offer, and we are actively recruiting international students. With respect to competition for enrollment we are in the business of collaborating with the community colleges; we must be a good partner.

ARANTE asked for a clarification about the disposition of the proposed $8 Million for faculty salary improvement. KOCH noted that the funds are for salary, not compensation, and would be distributed according to directions from the Chancellor’s Office.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. OUS Campus Discussions on General Education

SMALLMAN presented a brief update on SB 342 and the working groups formed in response to the bill’s charge to establish common educational outcomes for the entire OUS system, as briefly outlined in “G-1.” This is being mandated but it is also an opportunity both internally and at the system wide level to establish a faculty led procedure for determining outcomes and addressing transfer issues. There are two PSU meetings scheduled in the coming weeks.

SHUSTEREMAN noted that this discussion includes more than just the first year of general education as we define it at PSU. SMALLMAN agreed, noting that it is fair to say that a lot of this is being done to address screening issues with the community colleges. The legislature is frustrated, for example, that the OTM was established but is not addressing the 100+ problem courses like ceramics that don’t transfer everywhere.
RUETER noted that this is micromanaging and we need to push back. SMALLMAN stated that we are lucky with this legislation in that it doesn’t mandate the outcomes, etc. RUETER noted we should take a strong stance; for example, stop using numbers and use course descriptors. FOSQUE noted that the community colleges are not offering courses that meet the transfer requirement, and as we add courses it increases the problem.

SCHECHTER noted that we are in the crossfire of two competing economies, which are mutually exclusive. One is the local economy of legitimation through size, and one is the national economy of legitimation through prestige. Faculty are feeling the strain of that in their work.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of February 2-3, 2007 at Oregon State University

BURNS reported for the Senators, noting that complete minutes can be found at the IIFS website: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html

BURNS thanked Michael Cummings for his service last year, and welcomed his replacement Duncan Carter. BURNS noted that the Legislative fiscal office has requested the Chancellor prioritize a list of reductions in the Governor’s Proposed Budget totaling $80 Million, in the event of a reduced budget outcome. If there were a reduction of that scale, the budget would end up being no larger than in the current biennium, which hasn’t been sufficient.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 5, 2007
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2007, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:08. The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to Agenda

There is NO G-3 in the packets. It was not mailed.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since February 5, 2007
Eff. 2.20.07, Chris Borgmeier, SPED, has been appointed to the ED vacancy on the Graduate Council. Eff. 2.20.07, Helen Young, SPED, has been appointed to the ED vacancy on the Faculty Development Committee.

M. Pullman, SBA, has resigned from the UNST Council.

Other

The Presiding Officer welcomed Debbie Murdock back to the Senate. Applause.

Senators were reminded of meeting protocols, which include, only members may participate, members must raise a hand to be recognized, members must state your name, and members must provide written copies of all motions to the secretary.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE greeted the Senate and gave a quick update on activities in Salem. April 10 is PSU day at the Capitol. Please mark your calendar and attend if you can. Your legislators need to hear from you, know who you are, and learn what kind of work you do.

Provost’s Report

KOCH commenced with the introduction of the new PSU football coach, Jerry Glanville. Applause.

KOCH gave a brief report on events at the Board meeting on 2 February. The Graduate Certificate in Software Engineering was approved. Additionally, the Provosts Council approved the Masters of Music in Jazz Studies and it will now have an external review. KOCH briefly reported on the working groups on PSU campus priorities, which will have a joint meeting on April 4. KOCH noted that the budget process, listed on the website at www.pdx.edu/budget/, and emphasized that the focus is on revenue enhancements as there is very little to reduce in the way of costs. KOCH noted that the Vice President would comment on the study to merge PSU with OHSU.

Vice President’s Report

DESROCHERS reminded that this study in being undertaken in response to the proposal by Rep. Mitch Greenlick to merge the two institutions, made approximately two years ago. She is the point person for PSU, and together with our OHSU counterpart and the Chancellor’s office, they have selected a consulting group, the Learning Alliance, which is associated with the Higher Education Institute at the U. of Pennsylvania. Their work is underway, and they are about midway through the research portion of the process. The aim is to have a first look ready for the Chancellor in April, so that he could have something to transmit to this legislative session.
LUCKETT asked if this work would include an analysis of the collective bargaining agreements at each. DESROCHERS said, yes, that would have to be included as amongst other things, they are very reflective of our vastly different cultures.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

WETZEL/MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, PA, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

2. GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND and MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

BURNS/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, GEOG and HST, and course changes MTH, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE ArH course changes, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-2.”

3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

BODEGOM/MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE Changes to the Cluster List, University Studies, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTON TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BULMAN/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Geographic Information Systems/Science, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTON TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BODEGOM/MANDAVILLE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a new course, Stat, and a course change, Hst, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”
ZELICK noted the language “may include” is problematic.

BARHAM noted the language “on-line” is new here and do we want to include this as it would require on-line delivery. STEVENS noted that this begs the question of where we make the type of instruction known. SHUSTERMAN added that _______________. ELZANOWSKI representing Math (Chair), withdrew the word “on line” from the course description in “E-3.”

JOHNSON reminded that the PSU Bulletin and the Schedule of Classes have two different functions in representing courses and programs.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED with the deletion of “on line” from the course description, by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/LEPORE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the BA/BS in Film Studies, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-3.”

MEDOVOI stated he appreciated the effort to put together a film studies major at PSU, but would like to express a major objection to the proposal in its current form. There is an existing disciplinary minor, originally put together out of a 2002 meeting of 30 people that was held when it was clear that there were multiple stakeholders in the university. There was a great deal of interest to allow the greatest possible participation in the field, and the end of that was the interdisciplinary minor which provides a meeting of humanities, social science and arts methods. This proposal represents the truncating of film studies, doesn’t recognize the interdisciplinary path that was taken, and will result in the loss of participation of many of the full time faculty across the university. He wants to see a proposal that will continue that broad participation, and invites everybody across camps who has a stake in film studies to be a partner, and will follow in the footsteps of the existing minor.

SUSSMAN noted he coordinates the Media Studies cluster which includes 8 department including Theater Arts, and supports the comment just made that there is a lot of collaboration going on, particularly in film studies. He noted he was not aware of this development until he received the agenda. He asked how many tenure lines are dedicated to this new major. MIKSCH noted that there is a search concluding for a film studies line. SESTAK noted that there is a new dedicated faculty line in film studies in FPA as part of the strategic re-investment process, there are other tenured faculty in Theater Arts who are committed to substantial teaching in the film studies program, and the English, Communications, etc. faculty who are currently associated with the minor are incorporated in this proposal.

(Speaker not a member of the Senate; recognized in error) SANCHEZ noted he was recently hired to teach literature and film, and stated that his department likes the proposal and would like to be included. The Spanish section of FLL recently hosted a film festival.
MIKSCH noted that all of the 16 elective credits in the major could be from other departments. Perhaps the summary didn’t do a good job of showing what the electives look like, but this proposal wouldn’t have the same worth without them.

BULMAN asked what is the film studies curriculum and how it is defined. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that there is a list of courses jointly maintained by English, Communications, and Theater Arts, which the proposal references and which is listed in the catalog and department web pages. If a department wishes to have a course included in the minor, it can approach the coordinator in English with a proposal.

BULMAN reiterated that she wanted to know what the film studies curriculum is. TATE noted that the major proposal lists specific courses for the core of the major in film studies, and directly references the list of courses for the minor that are available as major electives. In all deference to the comments that have been made by the film people here, the assumption that this is not a multiple-disciplinary proposal is an error. An attempt has been made to allow those departments who have an interest in pursuing film studies to include those courses in this major, and there is certainly possible continued involvement in the film studies minor. This doesn’t bring about the end of the minor; it seems that there’s been a lacuna of what has been available at Portland State. For several years various departments have talked about putting forward a film studies major proposal, and Theater Arts has just simply gone forward and done it. This doesn’t exclude other people from offering courses. If anything, it provides a focus and a certain visibility for film studies at Portland State that it doesn’t presently have.

WETZEL noted that on a practical level it seems odd to have a minor in one college department and a major in another college and department. This shows all of us how hard it is to work with the existing structures of the university to do something that is interdisciplinary. If this goes through, it seems it would be possible for someone to get a BA in Film Studies and a minor in English in film studies.

STEVENS stated that it would help to know that international films are part of this major. TATE noted that international films are part of several of the courses offered. It is also part of the intent of the minor and this major proposal, that in the FLL departments, film is offered. Some examples of our past offerings are Japanese and Indian cinema. There is an acute awareness on our part of the international nature of film and that it would be an integral part of this degree.

STOVALL suggested that the Senate table the proposal for further discussion, and get the stakeholders together to determine what allocation of resources should be here, because it is obviously a good thing for us to pursue. At the graduate level in the writing program, they have underway a national film studies journal already funded that fits nicely into this picture, and they need to know how all of that as well as their current undergraduate offerings in film studies are going to fit into this. There needs to be and we don’t see it in this picture.
HICKEY stated ________. One might take the International Studies program as a model, so it would make it clear to students that there is that opening. On paper, it invites students to do that construction. It is a little more labor intensive, and requires some advising, but it is an open program in that way.

KOMINZ stated that he would like to see at least one course on filmmaking. ________ in this day and age, the ability to create focused short films is absolutely critical. He doesn't see one offered in the 7 core courses.

WATTENBERG stated that, regarding international scope in this program, Film History I, II, III, 12 hours of the course courseWORK, is a history of film, not American /English film, in the same way History of Art is not restricted to American/ English art, but includes the entire gamut of art. We are loosing the point here, that, yes, a lot of people use film in our courses, but film is not literature, it is art, and there are students out there who would like to major in the art. Regarding filmmaking, we have a course in Acting for the Camera and we would like to develop in the direction of production and performance in the next few years. This would most appropriately be housed in the theatre program, not English or other literature programs. That is what we do. We do performance. I guess I have some problem here. I am getting the sense from this body that theatre is not an appropriate place to house a film program, because it has not approached all the other possible departments. All are welcome here. There is room here in the sense that there are elective courses and they are on a clear list, as cited in the proposal. It's not a matter of students having to construct that; that list includes those courses, if you go through the appropriate channels to have courses listed on it.

REESE stated she supported her English colleague's suggestion to table the proposal, so that the document submitted can be more truly representative of the interdisciplinary intention which doesn’t come through clearly at this point, and would also like to see a more complete listing of the courses that would be included from all the various departments, for example, we see listed in these core classes, courses that also exist in the English department. If it were truly an interdisciplinary major, if it must be this class, that class could be fulfilled in either department. As far as production, we have a very strong relationship with the Northwest Film studies Center, where students for credit at PSU are able to take courses in production there, and so that exists to some degree at this point.

SESTAK reminded that the minor is across two schools, not just one. There were a variety of different meetings with English and Comm in terms of talking with them when this proposal came out and more recently. There was a concern about a variety of issues, with production as one of them as a matter of fact. This deliberately isn’t a production degree. Even though we may want to get there, in part because the English department is concerned about that, we are not immediately heading there. Regarding some of these concerns about duplication, as with who teaches Shakespeare, or Structures for Architecture and Engineering, there are a whole series of different approaches. We all come at it from a very
different direction. As we looked at this, all we were trying to do is get the major started and off the ground. We have tenure lines dedicated to this to get it moving, to which things can be added and changed, but for which there is a focus. There has been an effort to do something else for several years and nothing solidified. One of the things we talked to the English department about was their writing program, which is more related to analysis and is very different from what we want to do. This program is interdisciplinary in that we are incorporating those courses that are available through the minor list. We are moving this along because there is a student demand and a student need for this type of program. This is a way to focus something and grow it. There are resources being provided from a school specifically for this, and there are other resources from other schools that can be a part of it. We would love to see this initiative grow in a variety of different directions in the future, but this is the way to get started.

(Speaker not a member of the Senate; recognized in error) _________ the point has been made that film studies can be an interdisciplinary subject, and 40 credits in one department and 16-or-less credits in all other departments is not an interdisciplinary major. I’m concerned that a major of this sort, so narrowly defined, will preclude any future major that is being developed by a liberal arts conglomeration will be possible to develop.

SUSSMAN noted that there are 6 faculty in Speech who are teaching Media Studies and _________ welcome the aspect that theatre would bring that other departments can’t bring, but it is a broad field. There are stakeholders and it should be a shared project.

TATE stated he supports Wattenberg’s and Sestak’s remarks. This is an attempt to get something started. Film studies has been on the table and discussed and we have had a minor for a number of years. It disturbs and concerns one, that people are thinking of this so territorially, that somehow Theater is going to take on film studies and everybody else is going to have to get out of the area. That is clearly not the case. The gentleman from Speech mentioned media studies; we are talking here about film studies, specifically. We are talking about trying to get something off the ground and started, around which a lot of things can then cluster. If we continue to insist that we have to be interdisciplinary, we have to get all the players involved, it comes to this - there were a lot of people involved in the film minor discussion, which gradually came down to only a few people in three departments. If film studies is going to have a future at Portland State, it needs a department to step forward, to serve as a kind of lynchpin. I can assure all that this department is not narrow in the sense that it is going to try to exclude anyone. We are going to try to incorporate as many options as possible. To obstruct this motion at this point is inappropriate.

SUSSMAN/REESE MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

WETZEL queried if we can add to the motion that the people involved in film studies come together and come up with a clearer distinction between what the
people in Fine and Performing Arts are doing and what Liberal Arts is doing, and how the territory is being looked at overall.

HICKEY noted that as the program does need a home, it makes good sense that it be Fine and Performing Arts, and there are some things that didn’t get discussed, can we put a deadline on the motion to table, and request that we report back at the next senate meeting, so that we can move the program forward.

MANDAVILLE asked if there is any reason why, if this program is approved, that the interdisciplinary program can’t continue to exist. There doesn’t seem to be any conflict in having two programs, although there is potential conflict here, witness what is going on in this room. By passing this, perhaps those on the books will be required to cooperate.

WAMSER noted that the proposal has a strategic problem, and he would hate to see it fail. The asterisk doesn’t provide enough information about the other courses, which are the interdisciplinary ones. He urged that having a new major with a very high demand doesn’t necessarily preclude other departments coming forward with new majors in media studies, analysis of film, or whatever is appropriate to that department.

REESE yielded to Michael Clark, Eng. He thanked William Tate for putting this forward because he has been a great supporter of the interdisciplinary minor and has worked closely together with Theater Arts and everyone else who has participated. One of the things that is going on is that in discussion with Sarah Andrews-Collier, was the idea that the English department, rather CLAS and the whole university, would put together an interdisciplinary major to emphasize critical studies, critical theory, media studies, a diverse array of approaches, and that this would be likely _______. That hasn’t worked or perhaps I misunderstood our fall discussion about film production _______, at least as we talked about last week. There has been a change in that sense in how this has been perceived and I would like to bring that to the attention of everyone else in the room right now, because there is a parallel major proposal that is now circulating in the English department in Critical Studies in Film that includes an interdisciplinary component.

_______ asked what the future of the motion would be if the vote were affirmative. The Presiding Officer stated that the Steering Committee would solicit comment from the Curriculum Committee after conferring with departments involved, and then bring the proposal back to the Senate.

THE MOTION TO TABLE passed by 44 in favor, 20 against, 6 abstentions.

LEPORE/TATE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Dance, including new courses, Dance, Dept. of Theater Arts, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-3.”
MIKSCH noted that this proposal is made possible by the transition of Prof. Judy Patton into the Department of Theater Arts. Several of the new courses in technique were already being offered.

FOSQUE asked for a clarification on the credits to be awarded for 7 Dance Laboratory courses. It doesn’t seem that the numbers add up. It was noted that each individual course is (2) credits. MIKSCH yielded to Judy Patton, FPA. PATTON reminded that often students in Dance would have exceeded course objectives in one or all of these courses when entering the program.

BULLMAN stated that the pre-requisites are inconsistent, and asked for clarification on number of credits and funding. SESTAK noted that funding is available to support the program and the department is already primed for this program development, having previously begun to offer courses with adjunct faculty, upgrade their dance studios, etc. MIKSCH reminded that the list looks long partly because they are frequently two-credit courses.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LEPORE/BARHAM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE program changes in Music and Theater, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, TA 480 and ArH 459, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVED PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

TALBOTT/COTTRELL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Bachelor of Social Work including new courses, Graduate School of Social Work, as listed in “E-3.”

BARHAM asked for a clarification on whether this is a Bachelor of Arts/Science or a Bachelor of Social Work. MIKSCH noted it is the latter. BARHAM asked for clarification if whether this would mean that students did not have to complete BAIBS requirements. NELSON stated that there was un-clarity about how credit hours work out, and presented an overhead. BARHAM stated this still didn’t answer her question, and stated this is misleading regarding where University Studies requirements fit in. BULMAN reiterated Barham’s confusion regarding the degree title, as it appeared differently in different parts of the proposal. NELSON stated that this is a BAIBS in Social Work.

SHUSTERMAN stated that the citation of the University Studies courses confuses, as this suggested double dipping. NELSON stated she didn’t know how 90 credits got on the document, but once it did she felt compelled to show that 90 credits were not required for the major. MAIER stated he was still confused about the
total number of requirements. NELSON stated it has to do with pre-requisites. BULMAN asked if the overhead was going to be substituted for the published document, because it is also confusing. NELSON stated that if the pre-requisites and the clusters were struck, that is what they are going on. BARHAM recommended that the program not cite the general education requirements. NELSON stated o.k. HICKEY stated that in FLL, the students are required to have completed the first two years; it is not required in the major. BACCAR stated that another model in SBA, is that _______. BARHAM urged that it be made explicit that students have to apply, and agreed with Baccar’s suggestion. _________. MICHAEL (Morgaine) stated that the pre-requisites could be taken care of ________. FOSQUE _________.

TALBOTT stated she is against the motion to table, as these are minor points. MANDAVILLE stated the Senate couldn’t approve something it doesn’t understand. NELSON stated she has a lot of community support for this and the overhead is clear; the confusion arose when we were over explaining and trying to show where University Studies fits in. C. BROWN noted that the contents are clear from the overhead, although the narrative is not, however, the latter can be fixed later.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by majority voice vote, with 3 abstentions.

CLUCAS/__________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change, BA/BS in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE the program change passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

HANSEN presented the report for the committee.

BARHAM asked for a clarification on the question regarding co-admission, specifically are there concerns about co-admission or about the broader issue of transferring students. It was clarified that the committee is looking at the transitioning of students from community colleges in all of its aspects.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.
HICKEY asked if she could step back, and ask if the committee is actually going to report to the Senate regarding the effect of the plateau. HANSEN replied, no, they have no plans at this point. LIEBMAN urged that there be follow-up on this issue, as the Senate has previously discussed problems in this area, specifically for Education, the MSW and the MFA, Art. Previously, Vice Provost Driscoll made a promise to track this issue for the senate. HANSEN reminded that from where they sit, there are many forces acting on enrollment, and even if we do find some problems, there may be no solutions. KETCHESON said that her office could provide the Senate with some data on what has happened. LIEBMAN stressed that part of the concern was the enormous burden that students bore because of credit requirements for in-service training, etc. He continued, that this discussion included proposals for differential tuition, etc.

2. Educational Policy Committee Report on Governance

HANSEN presented the report for the committee.

BULMAN asked for a clarification regarding item #8, with respect to the phrase “a sufficient majority.” HANSEN suggested that he strike the word, “sufficient.” He noted that there could be discrepancies between a committee roster and who attends.

SHUSTERMAN noted that #1, #4, #5, #7 are recommendations for the Senate as action items, although #1 has already been accomplished. SHARKOVA asked for a clarification about the timeline for the evaluation of centers. HANSEN stated he thinks it is included in process document.

KETCHESON requested that the committees in question discuss the recommendations of the committee, and come back to the senate with recommended proposals.

3. Report on OUS Proposed Optional Retirement Plan Changes

R. JOHNSON reported for the PSU members of the OUS ad hoc committee to review proposed optional retirement plan changes, who are he and John Suttle, SBA. He noted that there have been several campus meetings in the last month. The overwhelming concern across the OUS system is loosing access to TIAA-CREF. The second issue, related to personal retirement planning, is the loss of the relationship with the investment advisors. There was significant agreement in this ad hoc committee that there be no increase in fees with the change, and that there be significant retirement planning services available, and they have recommended these to OUS. This activity is not of the magnitude that people should contemplate moving up their retirements.

H. ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 17:03.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 2, 2007
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2007, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:10. The minutes were approved with the following correction:
   p. 33, para. 7, first sentence. Theater Arts is not part of the Media Studies Cluster

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the day’s agenda:

   E.6. Proposal for Name Change – School of Social Work

   F.1. Question for Provost Koch
Jacqueline Temple, Graduation Program Board Chair, introduced committee members, presented data on faculty Graduation attendance and requested senators to urge their colleagues to attend Graduation. They want to increase faculty attendance of 28% in 2006, by 40% for 2007.

President's Report

The President's Report was cancelled because he was not in attendance.

Provost's Report

KOCH noted that enrollment has rebounded slightly, being up approximately ½%. This is very important with respect to protecting our fund balance for this year. There will be a Part 2 of the faculty symposium held in January, to be held May 6, 2007 in the morning. At the last State Board meeting, the Provost's Council recommend that the MM in Jazz Studies receive an external review in preparation for board approval. KOCH also noted that he helped provide testimony last month on HB 3024, the PSU-OHSU “merger” bill, along with Chancellor Pernsteiner and Provost Hallock of OHSU.

Vice President for Finance Report

DESROCHERS and KOCH presented on the status of our Internal Budget Process 0708 and the proposed OUS budget for 2007-09. There are three goals with respect to our budget, to replenish the fund balance by approximately $3 Million, to address the recurring permanent short fall of approximately $3 Million, and to identify strategic investments, building on what was done last year. Regarding the status of the Governor's proposed budget for the next biennium, the Ways and Means Co-chairs presented their proposed reductions last week, reducing the Governor's budget by about 4%, and reducing the capital outlay by 83%. In the 4% reduction, about 2% of that is for general campus reductions, and 2% that targets specific programs. The community colleges saw a more substantial reduction as recommended by the Co-chairs. It is clear that the Governor's budget will not be realized, but it remains unclear how much ground we will be able to regain, especially with respect to the capital budget.

FLOWER asked what is the thinking about faculty-student ratios and salaries. DESROCHERS stated it is unclear. We are trying to get an understanding about these issues, however.

KOCH spoke to the issues of 2007-08 internal reductions, noting that there isn't much to cut and that more revenue is needed (overhead attached). He noted that our tuitions are lower than our colleagues in the state, therefore we are proposing several strategies including an increase in graduate tuition, a low residency MFA in FPA, increasing freshmen enrollment, instituting a course fee to cover SINQ mentors, and aggressive improvements in retention. We received $6 Million in requests for reinvestments, and they are prioritized on the list into two groups, neither having to do with academic programs, which we will wait on for the time being. All details are...
posted on the FADM Budget webpage. DESROCHERS concluded by cautioning that we mustn’t pit higher education against K-12, because we need to educate the state that there is a continuum in education.

R. JOHNSON thanked the administration for their transparency, and reminded Senators of the April 9 and 11 hearings, 1-2 p.m. on the proposed internal changes.

Vice Provost’s Report on Conflict of Interest Policies

FEYERHERM discussed the policies (overhead attached) noting that there is increasing pressure regarding outside employment and conflict of interest from state and federal interests, but that the policies remain the same as they have been. The collective bargaining agreement clearly recognizes outside engagement with community enterprise, however, we have to monitor the potential for conflict of interest by asking people to disclose their engagement. He noted that in the twelve years he has held in his job, not one of these proposals has been disapproved. The point is that this is not a control mechanism, but a mechanism for mutual protection, making certain that all of our activities are above board and will pass tests of internal audits. All faculty should be following this form, from OGSR, and no other.

Vice President for Development Report

McVEETY noted that Tuesday is PSU Day at the Capitol, and urged faculty to attend if possible and tell our story. She noted that a team of PSU faculty and staff have just returned from Saudi Arabia, where they met with a large contingent of PSU alumni, who funded the delegation’s visit. McVEETY concluded that University Communications is conducting a study on employee communications, and requested Senators to urge colleagues to participate.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the committee.

CLUCAS/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change, MA/MS Heath Studies and new courses, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-1.”

MANDAVILLE noted that PA 514 has a title that is confounding and requested an explanation of the purpose of the course. CLUCAS noted that the curriculum fits certain specific programs and has been well vetted in the college.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
WETZEL/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Social Work, as listed in “E-1.”

CLUCASt noted he objects to SSW 527, which sounds like a Political Science rather than a Social Work course, and requested a title change and some change to the course description so that it aligns with Social Work rather than Political Science. COTRELL noted that Social Work would be happy to comply, and work with PS to make the requested changes.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/MEDOVOI MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes, Social Work, as listed in “E-1.”

STEVENs asked why courses are being changed from 4 to 3 credits. COTRELL noted that Social Work, in anticipation of graduate program re-accreditation, needed to add several content areas, without increasing requirements, and it is easier to move the content around in three-hour modules. NELSON noted also that the four credit modules are not working well for the program, particularly around issues of courses that meet only once a week. WATTENBERG asked if this would affect teaching loads. NELSON noted that the credit load would remain the same.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. GC and UCC Joint Course and Program Proposals

OSTLUND/MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committees.

CARTER/MANDAVILLE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, HST, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LEPOREx/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, ART, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in “E-2” with a title correction to “Interactive Media Team.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

MANDAVILLE/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in History and Philosophy of Science, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”
THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CARTER/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change, BA/BS Environmental Physics Option, one course change and new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Scholastic Standards Committee - Proposal to Change Registration Deadlines

GOUGH presented the proposal for the committee.

BARHAM/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #1, as listed in “E-4:” …To move the last day to add a course without instructor permission from the end of the second week to the end of the first week of the term.”

BARHAM noted that current policy gives students the message that they can miss 20% of a course.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/COLLIER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #2, as listed in “E-4:” …To move the last day to change grading option from the end of the fifth week to the end of the seventh week of the term.”

COLLIER asked for an explanation of why we need this. GOUGH noted that students haven’t gotten their midterm grade by the end of the fifth week, so don’t have enough information on how they are going to do in a course.

FISCHER noted he would happily vote to abandon A-F grades and seat times for proficiency. This change couldn’t but fail to increase grade inflation. COLLIER noted that faculty are not giving timely feedback, and supports this proposal. ZELICK queried, why have any deadline, if students are playing this game. CLUCAS noted he supports the proposal because for some courses, students have never studied the subject before and have no idea how they will do. It isn’t about finessing GPAs, they are just trying to find their way. ANGELL ___________ RUETER reminded that faculty decide whether courses have the Pass/No pass option.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote, no abstentions.

5. Textbooks Resolution Proposal

BURNS introduced the proposal on behalf of the students, noting that it has been passed in the student senate. He noted that much of this is good practice, although not binding, and that Rep. David Wu is holding hearings on this in mid-April.
BURNS/BARHAM MOVED THE SENATE ADOPT the textbook resolution, as stated in “E-5.”

C. BROWN noted she supported the resolution. She cited outrageous increases in textbook prices, which a publisher representative advised her was due to the fact that faculty don’t care about book prices. MANDAVILLE noted he supported the proposal and urged dissemination of approval to campus parties.

MASTA noted that three years is a very long time to use the same edition of a book. BURNS noted that the intent is that this applies only where appropriate. ARANTE noted _______ CARTER noted that he has seen multiple used textbooks for a course that are re-sold desk copies, and faculty should not be reselling these back to bookstores. CASKEY queried if the Library has a large enough reserve area to support this reserve proposal.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote, with one abstention.

6. Educational Policies Committee – Proposal to Change the Name to School of Social Work

HANSEN presented the proposal, forwarded to the committee through the Senate Steering Committee.

TALBOTT/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the name change from Graduate School to School of Social Work.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Provost Koch

What has been the impact of the elimination of the tuition plateau on 1) student enrollment and progress toward the degree, and 2) university finances?

KOCH noted that there is no clear data on the direct effect of this on enrollment (slides attached). Carrying loads haven’t changed significantly. There was a slight jump in students trying to finish but that has flattened out. Tuition remission costs came to the university, thus adversely affecting three specific graduate programs requiring full-time enrollment, in Education, the MSW, and the MFA in Art. Enrollment growth has slowed but it isn’t related to the plateau. At the graduate level, part time enrollment continues to increase substantially. There has been an increase in tuition revenue, which is what the institution intended. KETCHESON added that drop rates have decreased slightly and that graduate carrying loads have lowered slightly.

NELSON stated that graduates in Social Work and Education provided this income with their larger requirements, and that this was inequitable. STEVENS
noted that she echoed Nelson’s sentiment, noting that the M.ED requires 56 credits. KOCH noted that those folks were held harmless this time.

HANSEN noted that the end of the plateau tears the heart out of a liberal education from a student morale point of view, as they can’t experiment or browse peripheral subject matter. KOCH noted that he disagrees, as this was an equity issue for the majority of students who are part time, and were subsidizing the full-time students.

MAIER noted that it would be useful to see what are the number of credits at graduation, and if they have gone down because of this. KOCH noted ________

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Graduate Council on Petitions

OSTLUND presented the report for the committee.

C. BROWN noted that she is concerned about the poor advising issue and that this is in effect, punishing the wrong person. OSTLUND stated that the committee is aware of that fact. FEYERHERM noted that graduate students are expected to be professionals and therefore need to learn how to read the catalog and make those distinctions. RUETER noted that this is an important issue, but that he disagrees w/ Feyerherm, because the catalog is not necessarily transparent, it is a couple of years out of date, and many including himself have an inability to read “catalog speak.” R. JOHNSON noted that it is common for students to use poor advising as an excuse, in order to gain an easy out. WATTENBERG _______. MacCORMACK _______. OSTLUND noted that the committee has reached their tolerance point. WETZEL noted that if there are extraordinary numbers of people petitioning the two categories that are handled administratively, retroactive add/drops and requests to convert 400 to 500 courses, then there is certainly something wrong with advising. She is in full support of the Graduate Council.

ZELICK queried, that with respect to the number of requests for extensions of “I” if the present term of one year is not long enough. OSTLUND noted that if the committee had that opinion, the report would have been worded to that effect.

HICKEY asked if bad advising is used as an excuse, does that advisor sign the petition? OSTLUND stated sometimes, and sometimes the petition is just rubber stamped by the department. WETZEL asked if there are units or individuals that can be identified as repeat offenders. OSTLUND stated, yes.

FREELS presented the first annual report of the council. She noted that the report includes a history of the attempts to improve undergraduate advising. She noted that the advising model adopted by the university was never fully implemented. She offered that the most critical item to look at is whether to move advising from voluntary to mandatory. There is a strong sense that as much improvement has been made as is possible under the voluntary model.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the institutional Assessment Council

KETCHESON reported briefly for the council, as Labissière was not present. She noted that he was named chair by the committee when they convened this past month, and that the committee will have more to say in a few months. There is an accreditation visitor scheduled in the fall to review progress with assessment.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:07.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2007
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to the Agenda:
The President will not make a report.
The Vice President for Finance and Administration will make a report.

Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since April 2, 2007:
T. Dillon, CLAS (ENG) has resigned from the Faculty Senate, eff 4/21/07.
His replacement is Ma-Ji Rhee, FLL.
Provost's Report

KOCH made several announcements. The State Board approved two graduate certificates in Education, Student Affairs in Higher Education and Teaching Adult Learners. The Chancellor has announced that there will be a PSU Presidential Search, and James Francesconi will chair the search committee.

KOCH continued, the State Board is going through a portfolio review of every campus, checking for mission, and the match of mission to outcomes. In the meantime, they are concerned about approving any new programs while they are undergoing that process. Rather than a moratorium, which was our fear, there is now a new policy in place where any programs coming forward will be carefully scrutinized based on their match to the strategic objectives of the institution, and with regard to their budgetary impact, the budgetary support required, and whether the institution is in a position to provide the support. In this regard, although most programs come up through the faculty, as it should be, there are now these two questions of match to the strategies of the institution, and budgetary implications. In future, we will be providing an internal process for monitoring program development and curricular initiatives, so that we can track them with respect to mission and budget.

KOCH reminded that a survey is being conducted of faculty on Promotion and Tenure experiences. This is the second iteration of a project started by Sherrill Gelmon and Susan Agre-Kippenhan. The deadline will be extended for a week to May 11.

KOCH discussed the Academic Priorities project, briefly reviewing the process and conclusions to date, and the four priorities that were identified (attachment/overhead). With regard to Improving Student Success, we need to improve our retention rate, and we need to do this by enhancing student engagement. This will be the topic of the fall symposium and in conjunction, we have invited AACU President Carol Geary Schneider to visit us. The handout aligns four academic priorities with four directives to support them, and goes on to illustrate how we plan to map the remainder of the effort. The next meeting will be June 1, 2007, 2:30 – 5:00 p.m. This is hard work, however if we can aggregate our efforts so that we can communicate our effectiveness to the external community, it can’t help but benefit both communities.

BURNS asked if PSU could present our portfolio internally before presenting it to the board. KOCH noted he would have every intention of doing that but timing may not permit it; although we are scheduled to present at the October 4-5 board meeting, there is a possibility we will be moved up to the September 6-7 board meeting.

KETCHESON reminded that we have the PSU Portfolio, where much of this information already resides.
Dalton Miller-Jones, State Board of Higher Education

MILLER-JONES noted that one of the significant factors in the retention issue just discussed by the Provost is students’ preparation coming into the university. Part of his responsibility on the state board is serving on a sub-committee around participation and retention, to try to develop a better understanding on the board’s part of what we faculty already know. On May 11, 2007, Friday, there is a meeting in Eugene to review the proposed new Diploma requirements of the State Department of Education. There are some improvements in this proposal, for example increased arts requirements; however, there are also some potentially negative implications, for example, a stepping back towards the Carnegie requirements. PSU faculty are expert at this activity, and are urged to consider attending this meeting, especially those representing the core diploma disciplines. Faculty can contact him at daltonmj@pdx.edu.

Vice Presidents’ Report

DESROCHERS noted that with respect to Prof. Miller-Jones’s remarks. There are several other board committees and strategic initiatives that deserve our attention. One of them is called the Portland Agenda, to be chaired by James Francesconi, and will assess the metro region for services including higher education. There is another called the Governor’s sub-committee, dealing with the overall structure of the OUS. Regarding the latter, even though we hope to see the governor’s budget restored, the board still wants to explore the structure.

DESROCHERS noted that we anticipate having to present the Portfolio in September. She also noted that there is a valuable report on the FADM web page about the university and economic development. Lastly, she noted that we are engaged in developing a tool that will help us exhibit our contribution to the economic goals of the region.

DESROCHERS thanked faculty and staff for their contribution to the effort in Salem in the past several weeks.

RUETER asked how “portfolio” is defined. DESROCHERS stated that the board mean, what each institution is delivering by way of programs and purposes. KOCH stated that the analogy is an investment portfolio. DESROCHERS added that they are trying to understand each institution as a unique entity. RUETER noted that he hopes they take the time to understand the uncounted assets, which don’t show up in portfolios. For example, one of the ways we have developed new curriculum has been on the back of tenured faculty and long-term staff and they haven’t any gotten credit for that. The board wants to come in and count stuff, and there’s lots of stuff they could miss.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

FLOWER/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/FLOWER MOVED TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE THE MOTION TO APPROVE the BA/BS in Film, Department of Theater Arts, Fine andPerforming Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE PASSED by majority hand vote, no abstentions.

MIKSCH noted that the proposal has been revised to include the change in title to BA/BS in Film, a comprehensive list of courses, and a longer list of the faculty involved in the implementation of the major. TATE added that the proposal also indicates that an advisory committee of FPA and CLAS faculty is indicated to recommend to the Deans and Chair on changes and additions to the major.

MEDOVOI stated that his primary objection to the proposal is that film is a very large area of study, that it requires the involvement of a very wide group of disciplines and departments. He said, there are close to two dozen faculty on campus who do work in the area of film and a film major should be a joint enterprise that brings in all these areas of expertise and builds the best possible and richest approach to film possible at to PSU. He continued, the changes made have not addressed that objection. The name has been changed to Film, but I’m not sure what the intention for that was. The list of elective courses is quite a bit longer, but doesn’t fundamentally change the structure of the major. There is a list of faculty involved, but from the point of view of curriculum and administration, it is still a major that emanates and is restricted to the approach of one department. He said, I think that we can produce a much stronger film major here at PSU and I was hopeful that we could negotiate a process where we would get to a point where we would have a much wider, stronger major to put forward, but very little seems to have happened unfortunately over the two months. And so, again, the fact that we have not rebuilt this means that there are serious deficiencies, for example, I still believe that there is an international approach to film that desperately needs to be part of this major; there is a question of genre and conventions approaches that needs to be represented in a core way, race, gender and sexuality as central concerns, that you can find in many departments in CLAS. There are approximately fifteen tenure line faculty outside Theater Arts, and about five fixed term faculty who bring all kinds of expertise in film, so I would propose re-tabling this measure so that we can seriously try to re-negotiate it in a way that will give us the strongest possible film program, and I recognize
that that will require resending it to the UCC, but if we do that we will set film studies up on the strongest possible footing.

TATE stated that one of the key things about this whole process is that there has been a tremendous demand for a film major, and we are trying to respond to that demand. The spirit of the proposal is clearly not proprietary; it is not trying to restrict people. The spirit of the proposal originally included the option of students incorporating into their study, courses from a range of departments. That is simply made more explicit in this proposal. The opportunities to explore international film, criticism, history, and practice are all there. These are things that students want to take advantage of. There is no reason to suppose that it won’t be possible at some time, to add to this major a track in critical film studies, which is more in keeping with what Professor Medovoi is talking about. I think it important that we get something started and established. We were talking earlier about the fact that there is a move to stop or look again at new program proposals. I think we have a solid one and if we go forward the chances for approval are good. It could become the basis for subsequent proposals in the area of film. The time is now; the time has come for this proposal to go forward.

STOVALL yielded to Michael Clark. CLARK stated he agreed with Professor Tate and appreciate all his efforts, but it would be stronger if we incorporate ________ now. That element needs to be addressed.

SCHECHTER asked for clarification regarding course numbering for two sequences. MIKSCH noted that the committee identified a numbering problem. At the committee’s request, the department has forwarded proposals to renumber for the courses in question. SCHECHTER stated that this situation doesn’t help her to think through the questions raised, for example, is this American cinema or a broader enterprise.

STEVENS asked how many new courses the degree proposal includes. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that it requested approval of one new course, TA 480 Film Theory, which the Senate did in March 2007.

SUSSMAN noted that there is an existing minor in film studies among three departments, Communication, English and Theater Arts, and queried why the proposal didn’t build more on the existing minor. Also, there are no Communications faculty listed even though they participate in the film studies minor, and in general there are other programs as well who have contributed. It is ________ CLAS contributes the overwhelming majority of student credit hours and courses in film studies, both those that are formally called film studies in one way or another, or those that are lodged in the larger context of media studies. It doesn’t make a lot of sense that there is this unilateral department approach, when the nature of film studies itself is so broadly defined in American society. Not only is there aesthetics and criticism, but __________, historical analysis, sociological analysis, and these are represented in many of the courses across the university. I can’t imagine that one department could independently offer a major without a joint approach for something which lends itself intrinsically to what
film studies is in American society or internationally. Going back to the issue of inclusiveness of departments or faculty is boldly missing.

ANDREWS-COLLIER stated that Comm was omitted from the revised summary because the department didn’t submit an update of courses and faculty in time for publication. Otherwise, the courses listed are exactly the same list of electives as for the minor. The Theater Arts department went back after the Senate meeting in March and carefully updated this list in conjunction with the Chairs of English and Comm, to meet deadlines for Senate publication. SUSSMAN stated he is the person who runs media studies in Comm and he was never consulted.

FLOWER stated we have already heard several times characterizations such as “narrow” and things of that sort. He noted his understanding is that discussions about this were begun a long time ago. Faculty were told this at the last meeting; we were assured of it, and had every reasons to believe that there was considerable consultation. We are mystified by accusations of no consultation. We were told last time that there was discussion and consultation, and now it is being characterized as not so much.

SESTAK stated that there were several meetings this spring with the three chairs, and there was a meeting last year at which they all talked about the TV studio, what our plans were, and what we would like to do. This year, before the proposal was given to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), it was given to the English and Communications departments so that we could get their input before it moved out of FPA. There was another meeting before the March Senate meeting, there have been several meetings since that time, and we have talked to various people in other departments, for example Foreign Languages, as well as other people as well. In terms of trying to come to a consensus, not everybody is happy with the final results. But what we have here, right now, is a list of existing courses within the departments that the chairs have said they anticipate will continue to be offered, and they can say that with certainty. We know that there is interest in having other new courses developed and approved, but one of the things is that from the beginning, we want to be sure that if we offered courses they were actually on the books, that they have been taught before, and that they occur in regular rotation of at least once every two years. There are some other areas that could be developed in the future, and for that reason FPA is absolutely committed to forming this advisory group, as we say specifically in the proposal, to develop tracks. We responded back from the Senate comments last time, we took it back to the UCC, we took it back through the Steering Committee. We went through the curricular process. It is something that is a unified whole at the moment and we anticipate growth in the future as additional resources may be given to individual departments. We have in FPA two full-time tenure-related faculty lines dedicated to teaching film. There are a lot of other faculty who teach film courses, and there are faculty who use film to teach a different discipline, so there is certainly interest in it. Why is this film, not analysis or criticism? We are looking at expanding this in the future in a variety of ways, for example, we met with Dale Wahl, CEO of Laika Entertainment, where we talked about the variety and range of internships, workforce issues, production issues, and other types of
things that can start to develop from something like this. They are going to be one of the biggest companies here in Portland, and doing film, and they are extremely interested in not just the analysis of film, but also animation, acting, music, management, etc. What this does is provide a start that is actually different from the U of Oregon film certificate program. It is important for animation and other pieces that FPA have, and we know for a fact that U of O would like to bring this up to their Portland program. Quite frankly, we have cohesion here and a start of something that can move forward, and once its been approved as a major, then we can internally go on and develop tracks when we know we have the resources as individual departments commit to them over time. There is a lot of interest to do that, FPA is committed to it, and I personally guarantee that we will make sure that that work moves forward. We have committed here to tenure related full-time film lines. We have a core and that core can change, but we have the existing resources.

Hickey queried if it is correct to say that this program doesn’t displace the minor, and additionally that the individuals involved in the minor could continue to develop that program into a major based on that conception and there would be no barriers even if it were not to be housed in FPA. MIKSCH stated yes on both counts, and that that is one of the reasons that Theater Arts changed the name of the degree, in case CLAS departments wanted to use the term film studies.

Kapoor asked for a clarification on courses and faculty. MIKSCH reiterated that there was one new course, approved in March. SESTAK reiterated that there are two tenure-related faculty lines with 100% of their loads in film. Kapoor stated she wished to see more synergy with the media studies cluster, where some people teach film studies as part of their load. It seems elitist to see film studies as a stand alone major from media studies.

Bodegom asked for clarification on the animation curriculum that was discussed. SESTAK noted there is an Art minor in animation called time-based art, and the relevant courses are listed in the proposal.

Arante stated that English found that students need a beginning 200-level writing about film course for the minor. This is her course but it isn’t here, nor is her course about contemporary Chinese film which speaks to the international issue raised before. Andrews-Collier stated that some courses weren’t forwarded in time for inclusion in the document.

Reese yielded to Michael Clark. Clark stated he wasn’t expecting to be yielded to, but noted he tried to talk to Theater Arts last fall about an interdisciplinary proposal and was explicitly told that they we’re going alone. If that’s the proposal, one possibility is that we have two different distinct programs here, that’s one thing to think about, that one would be critical study of films. We could do that. Some schools do that. Another possibility would be to table and try to bring it together again.
ANGELL stated that it seems to him that most film programs are in film or fine and performing arts schools, so it makes sense for the program in to be FPA unless it were primarily criticism and theory. At a time when we are evaluating our academic priorities, the idea that we could formulate two competing film majors is absurd. Can’t we all just get along?

KAISER stated he wanted to respond to Flower’s point. He noted that when the minor in film studies was being developed, it originally came to him as a single unit proposal. We specifically took it away from that unit, and said that we would not in the college allow the program to move forward without our blessing until they talked to interested parties in film studies. KAISER stated he personally went on behalf of film studies to the then dean of Fine and Performing Arts, to discuss the possibility of that program and to be assured that his concerns and objections were coordinated with us. He personally made sure in terms of the process, he didn’t just, for example, leave an unanswered phone message. KAISER stated, from our perspective, the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of this program demanded that we bring all the resources to the minor. This is a comment simply about process.

RUETER asked for reiteration of the changes in the proposal. MIKSCH stated that the main change is that they have made clear what was previously only implied. There is a clear list of what the elective courses are. Additionally, the title was changed and they added language to describe an advisory board.

SHUSTERMANN asked if this is about people feeling excluded. What we are hearing is that one group is saying that they consulted, and others are saying that they weren’t consulted. What is clear is that a group put forward a proposal, and there is nothing that prevented the existing film studies minor cohort from putting together a major and putting forward a program. So I’m a little confused. A group of people got together and put together a proposal that is being objected to by a group of people who didn’t put together a proposal. It seems like a solid proposal. It seems like the proposal includes the film studies minor, so I don’t know what the argument is about.

WATTENBERG stated that his department vacated the word “studies” and that there is a reason for that. The analogy to what we are doing here is theatre. There are many faculties who teach courses that include drama, as opposed to theatre. Similarly, we are talking here about film as an art form, not cultural or critical studies. Eventually, there could be two different departments, as we are basically talking about two different types of programs here. Our program can temporarily house critical studies, and it would then at least have a place to be.

LePORE stated that if you look at the national picture, film studies and film are regularly housed in fine arts, and a certain degree of focus is required. What is more logical is that it may need to take two tracks.

MEDOVOI stated he disagreed, that it is an error to say that film studies is generally housed in fine arts around the country. There are a lot of different
models and typically they have long lists of affiliated faculty. It is housed in many different places, in arts, humanities, communications. English; there are a lot of different models. What concerns me here is that PSU is not the most resource rich university, and I don’t think we can pull off more than one film major here. The minor was collaborative and interdisciplinary precisely because we were trying to pool all our resources, and to bring all these areas of expertise together to build the strongest curriculum we could have. The important difference in the way that this major is conceived and the minor was conceived is that every core course is out of the Theater Arts department, and that excludes by definition, the possibility of media studies, critical analysis, theory from other disciplinary positions being part of the general set of approaches. It impoverishes the possibilities here. Wattenberg suggested that the direction that this major aims to go is in the direction of film art, but if you look at the courses, they are in theory, history, etc. It is in general taking a critical, historical, theoretical approach but only with the resources of one department rather than the resources of the entire university. That is a huge loss. I’m motivated here, not because I feel excluded, but because I care enough about film and media studies and the future of those fields at PSU to see this want to be put forth on the strongest possible foot. I’m afraid we will start out with a severely _______ program. We have the resources here; theater arts brings very important approaches to the table, but at least the minor brought those in conversation and into a curriculum that also took into account the other 15-20 faculty on campus that bring the other forms of film studies in. So if this goes through in the present form, I’m very fearful that we won’t have a kind of rich film major, but it will be too late to propose a different kind of film major that brings those other approaches to bear. It seems to me that this is a certain kind of moment of truth because we either rework this proposal into something that has the richest possible version and put it forward, or if we approve this then I don’t know what will happen. I have very little certainty about whether the future of film studies… The last thing I want to say here is I’m not sure why we are in such a rush. That’s the thing that I don’t understand. I don’t see why we can’t take a few more months. There have been some proposals in the works for example, another track was proposed for critical film and media studies putting together a curriculum from all the other parts of the university along with theater arts approaches and that track would greatly enrich the existing proposal. Or we could go about it in a different way. I know the deans had a conversation about developing this as a joint major beginning with a set of core courses which was much more interdisciplinary and moved out into tracks. That’s a viable approach too so I don’t see why we can’t take the couple of months that it takes to think it through, work it out and do it right, so by the time we actually get this thing put forward, we have the strongest program that we can. I don’t understand why we have to approve a version that many faculty are unhappy with today. KETCHESON called time.

TATE stated that Professor Medovoi has had lengthy time to express his particular point of view. The idea that this has happened within the last few days is, well,… This proposal was carefully developed, and generated and put forward, and has existed for months. It is only at the last minute so to speak that we get this concern from Professor Medovoi that we haven’t consulted enough, that it isn’t
strong enough. If you join them now you are going to end up with mush. This proposal has the basis for adding tracks, moving in other directions, and so on. It is not being restrictive at all; it is a way of getting something started on which we can build. As was pointed out, we put forward this proposal and it isn’t until the final hours that suddenly other proposals are put forward. The time is now to do this, not to wait and have a major, maybe, come together sometime next year or the year following. We need to move now and we need to act on this proposal in a positive way.

KETCHESON noted she approved of the comment about brevity, and would take two more speakers only.

REDER/MAIER MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE FAILED by 34 in favor, 29 opposed, 7 abstentions.

KOCH stated that he would have wished to say something between the motion to table and that vote, because tabling would have been the wrong thing to do at this point. I spent some time in recent days thinking about this and talking to the various people involved, and it seems like we have a couple of options here. First, if anyone would have asked my opinion, I think an integrated program would be the way to go, but my sense is that between now and next month, there is no way to make that happen. So what we have before us is a proposal by FPA to generate a film program with a commitment to looking at how that program might be broadened to a more integrated program in the future. A yes vote means you think that is a reasonable idea. I can imagine that there are both control and trust issues involved in this; this is a big jump that everybody has to take, from putting a program in a particular academic unit and then assuming that everybody is going to work in a way that is going to allow for much broader participation beyond that unit. The other option would be to have an integrated program. What I don’t think we want is to call it an integrated program but have two completely un-integrated, separated tracks that are operated by two different groups of people. If that were the case, then we might as well have two different programs. Bringing up another point: when I go to meet my colleagues, the Provosts at the other institutions, they would want to know why we want to have two film programs instead of just one. And they will be familiar with this type of issue, I’m sure. It’s a much harder case to make. My final comment is that going forward with what we want to do in this program is largely uncharted territory. If you vote no, you are saying to start over again. If you vote yes, we are talking about having some sort of multi-disciplinary program that may or may not be located in a particular academic unit. There have been discussions in this body for a long period of time about where degree programs ought to be housed. We have approved some that go across departments, but are in the same college. We haven’t approved programs that go across colleges that I know of. And there is the governance issue to deal with as well. A number of things are associated with this that will have to be worked out, however you choose to go forward. At this point the issue is whether you want them worked out with the program in place that you see in front of you or whether you want to stop and start all over again, and try to create an integrated program.
am not going to tell you how to vote. There is a pretty clear choice between the two alternatives for moving forward, and when you vote it’s a matter of those two alternatives.

C. BROWN stated she supported the program for three reasons. First, it went through the process. I understand that people may not have been paying attention and only now realize what is happening, but still we have process for a reason. Second, it is very important that a program have a unit that owns it; it makes it much stronger. There are a lot of very good interdisciplinary programs, but to my own mind, better if possible to have it in one department, and this seems like a very reasonable choice. Third, and the most compelling reason is time, the idea of competition and that other people are moving into Portland with various kinds of film and animation programs, and that the state board is starting this whole portfolio business. If we hold off longer, by the time we actually get something going, there is a very real possibility that someone else will have a program in the Portland area, and it will be, well why do you want to have one too? Those are reasons I think it important to go forward now.

KETCHESON called the debate, and stated that the ballot would be secret.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BA/BS IN FILM PASSED by 48 in favor, 22 against, and 1 abstention.

KETCHESON noted that the Social Work item listed in “E-1” is tabled. The program is being called a Bachelor’s in Social Work, but it is a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work, and that is the degree we passed last month.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

HOTTEL presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

2. Advisory Council Annual Report

BURNS presented the report for the committee. He noted that there was no written report as there was nothing un-confidential that he was able to report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.
3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

BLAZAK presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

4. Intercollegiate Athletic board Annual Report

SQUIRE presented the report for the committee, and introduced the new athletic director, Torre Chisolm.

ZELICK and SHARKOVA asked for clarification on the Athletics deficit. DESROCHERS stated that there is usually an Athletics deficit, which is covered by institutional subsidy, made to cover grants in aide and other parts of the program. That subsidy has ranged from $2 to $3 Million annually, and fluctuates dependent on revenues that the department has generated. We hope that in any given year that the Athletics Department will do better, however, in fact this program is about one-third supported from institutional resources, one third supported by student fees, and one-third supported by gate, lottery funds, etc. The expenditures of the department are reviewed in great detail by the committee and the institution, and we are the tightest ship in the Big Sky Conference. If we want to be in the conference and in this program, it is a reasonable budget. SQUIRE added that part of the reason we struggle with personnel retention is the tight budget. DESROCHERS added that the formula for lottery sources is changing, and we should be receiving more support from that, as a result.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

5. Library Committee Annual Report

ATKINSON presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

6. Scholastic Standards Committee

LONEY presented the report for the committee, and reminded of the several important policy changes affecting undergraduate students as of this year, regarding Incomplete Policy, Last Day to Add On-line, and Add-Drop Option Deadline. CLUCAS asked if there are any trends around Incomplete petition denials, etc. LONEY said that the only items treated with usual practice are requests which include physician documentation, and refund requests which include documentation that the student never attended a class. She reminded that
it is very important that faculty forward petitions directly to RO, and that faculty offer specific comments on petitions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

7. Teacher Education Committee

RUBEN presented the report for the committee, and noted that the committee composition needs to be altered to include Child and Family Studies. She noted that Child and Family Studies needs to be added to the committee representation. This requires a Constitutional amendment.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

8. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 6-7 April at WOU and Salem

BURNS presented the report for the IFS Senators. BURNS noted some important items before the legislature, including HB2579, which will add another faculty member to the state board, designating one representing the three large campuses and one representing the regional campuses. He also noted that the IFS met with legislators during their Salem portion of the meeting. He also noted the higher education report of the Oregon Student Association, which emphasizes the difficulty of getting classes and the student debt load. He also noted the current work on the Deferred Annuity changes and thanked three PSU representatives to the statewide ad hoc effort, Ray Johnson, John Settle, and Deb Jankowski. This will be Scott Burns’s last report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked Professor Burns for his long and outstanding service.

9. Report of the Assoc/Asst Dean’s Task Force on Classroom Scheduling

HOFFMAN presented the report for the task force, noting that we are in a crisis mode effective summer term, and describing some of the challenges we face with the loss of 18,000 square feet of classroom space, the equivalent of 180 class sections. If we don’t find more capacity students will not be able to get the courses they need to complete their programs, and we will loose the revenue needed to support their programs. The task force policy recommendations are included in the report, with the most notable recommendation being a proposal for construction projects in Cramer and Neuberger to convert several small rooms into four larger classrooms.

RUETER reminded that one of the definitions of engagement is the provision for “non-instructional” space for students to use for outside of class activities, and we shouldn’t eliminate it completely. LALL asked about using churches in the area.
HOFFMAN noted that there are a number of issues that make churches not a good idea. DESROCHERS noted that Mark Gregory is constantly looking for reasonably priced space in the immediate area.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:08.
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A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Senators were reminded that at the doors there are copies of several reports that were not included in the mailing.
Election runoff results: MCECS - James Morris, SBA - Don Dickinson. LIB – there is a tie between Kenreich and Bielavitz and another election to be conducted in the next two weeks.

Added to Agenda, is an addition to E-1, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals (handout)

The Provost is hosting a Reception at Benson House after the meeting.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since May 5, 2007: Barbara Rubin, ED, was elected to the Senate in May, but has subsequently resigned and will be replaced by Emily Gilliland.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE 2007-08 PSU FACULTY SENATE**

Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Michael Flower
Steering Committee Members: Kathi Ketcheson, Jeanette Palmiter, Patricia Wetzel

**President’s Report**

BERNSTINE greeted the assembly and thanked all for another great school year. He said he would hold his remarks for the party on 4 June. He thanked all for their support of his presidency, as well as all the individual support he has received. It has been a great ten years. He will miss everyone very much, but knows the future of the university is very bright because of the people like those in this room that work at this institution. Sustained applause.

The Presiding Officer thanked him for his service, on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

**Provost’s Report**

KOCH thanked the assembly for their hard work this year. He also thanked those present who attended the spring symposium as part of the total 135 attendance.

KOCH noted that in late May, the CAE hosted an International Engagement workshop, bringing together faculty and leaders from across the US as well as foreign nations. The Center will offer the second annual institute next May, and will reserve several places on the agenda for PSU faculty.

KOCH announced the formation of the Internationalization Council, similar to the Advising, etc. councils. The membership roster will be forthcoming shortly.

KOCH noted that, regarding course management software, based on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology, the university would update Web CT to Blackboard, and continue to support both Web CT for the present. A project manager will be named to supervise further study for approximately three more years.
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D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

MIKSCH introduced the proposals for the committee, including an addendum of one new course in LAS and a program change in SBA (attached), after “E. 5.”

WETZEL/CARTER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-1 and the addendum.”

FOUNTAIN noted that the ESR course overlaps with Stat 243/244 courses. MIKSCH noted that the committee didn’t consult with Mathematics because this was one of best proposals ever submitted in terms of acknowledging course overlap. RUETER noted that irrespective of overlap, ESR requires these courses for their major, as program assessment indicated that they are needed.

ELZANOWSKI asked what assurance could Mathematics be given that this will continue. RUETER stated there is none but they are only talking about enrollment by 10-15 ESP majors.

BLEILER asked why students need to take this material twice. RUETER noted that statistics literacy is important to the program and students are not getting it before they arrive, for example, as part of their required high school curriculum.

ELZANOWSKI/MacCORMACK MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION, by tabling ESR 340 and referring the course proposal back to committee.

THE MOTION TO AMEND FAILED by majority hand vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by majority voice vote.

MEIER/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes, Engineering and Computer Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHUSTERMAN suggested that the Senate charge the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to review criteria for policy on course overlap next year. KETCHESON noted that that was an excellent idea. ELZANOWSKI agreed, noting that in this case there was no consultation of the Math department by the committee.
BROWN/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Business Administration program change, Business Administration, as listed in the “E-1” addendum.

THE MOTION TO APPROVED PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

OSTLUND introduced the proposals for the committees.

BLEILER/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses and course change, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

REDER/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new course and course changes, Business Administration, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CRESS/CASKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Education, as listed in “E-2.”

SCHECHTER asked what the status is of faculty teaching those courses.

LIVNEH noted that they are long-term adjunct faculty.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Course Proposals

OSTLUND presented the proposals for the council.

BARHAM/COLLIER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE program and course changes, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WOLLNER/CLUCAS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a program change and new course, Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, 4., 4) h Teacher Education Committee

COLLIER/BALSHEM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed amendment listed in “E-4.”
Hearing no discussion, the Presiding Officer noted that the proposed amendment will be forwarded to the Advisory Council as specified by the Constitution, and returned to the Senate for a vote in October 2007.

5. Focus the Nation Resolution

ERVIN introduced the proposal for the letter of endorsement in “E-5”, noting that this is a national non-partisan educational activity, which a group of PSU students and faculty are participating in.

MEDOVOI/ELZANOWSKI MOVED THE SENATE ENDORSE THE FOCUS THE NATION RESOLUTION, as stated in “E-5.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. University Studies Council Annual Report

McBRIDE/Latiolais introduced the report for the council (attached). Latiolais noted that it was a fabulous group of faculty in this the first year of the committee’s history. He noted that in addition to course and program approvals, the committee spent most of their time on reviewing how University Studies will go forward at PSU. He briefly reviewed the proposal for reform, and requested Senators submit comment to the website blog.

ZELICK asked for a clarification of the diagram, in particular “Faculty Participation.” FLOWER noted he is responsible for the website, and that he could change it to read “increase faculty participation.”

RUTH thanked the council for their work and the website, and asked what attention has been given to the larger problem of inadequate tenure line faculty to do regular department work, irrespective of University Studies issues.

McBRIDE noted that the committee’s charge is to address the needs of University Studies. Their hope is that now that there is a plan to focus faculty attention, that these are the very issues that may surface. She reminded that faculty need to get on to the site and comment about this and other issues.

RUETER noted he wanted to reiterate the point that if University Studies needs more tenure-line faculty involvement, it amplifies the fact that all the departments need tenure lines to staff various such duties. RUTH added that the program review cites program morale that is related to status of those University Studies
faculty who are not on tenure lines. LATIOLAI noted that the committee have discussed that issue, but reminded that it is the purview of the administration.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

2. Budget Committee Annual Report

Ray JOHNSON presented the report for the committee, after “G.7.”

JOHNSON thanked the administration for their cooperation on behalf of the committee. He also noted that key issues, aside from the required permanent and one-time cuts, are academic priorities for add-backs, the adverse impact of cuts in OIT, and the long-term lack of increases in S&S.

NOTE: There was no transcript for the remainder of the Senate meeting.

CARTER asked a question about the mix of tenure related and fixed term faculty.

DISROCHERS followed Johnson’s remarks with some comments. She thanked the Budget Committee for their engagement, noting it was due in part to Johnson’s effective leadership. She noted the current progress in the legislative budget proposal, including the positive impact of the improving revenue forecasts. She noted that the media’s support for higher education, especially by David Saranson, has had particular impact in this round of state funding. She noted that, in retrospect, we probably spent down OIT too much, and hopefully services will be restored in this area in the coming biennium.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

3. Educational Policies Committee Annual Report

HANSEN presented the report for the committee, including the report on academic quality, after “G.1.”

HICKEY asked if there was any exchange with the University Studies Council on data and analysis of transfer transition issues. HANSEN stated the committee hadn’t gotten to that issue.

BARHAM asked for a clarification of what the committee was looking at with respect to co-admission. JACOB asked for a clarification regarding the discussion of centers.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

4. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report
RODRIGUEZ presented the report for the committee (attached).

RODRIGUEZ noted that the increase in viable applications indicate that the committee could easily award a much greater amount of funds, and the committee strongly recommends an increase in funding for their work. The same is true of travel funds and post-tenure peer review.

MacCORMACK asked about how many requests were funded. RODRIGUEZ stated that it was about one-half.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

5. Graduate Council Annual Report

OSTLUND presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Annual Report

MIKSCH presented the report for the committee, before “G-1.” She noted that the number of new courses, etc. had increased, and this was one of the busiest years on record. She also noted that the committee experienced difficulty in reviewing new proposals in light of budgetary constraints.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

7. Committee on Committees Annual Report

RUETER presented the report for the committee. He stressed one item of importance with regard to faculty governance, and that is poor communication from committees back to their home schools and programs. Another item is lack of staffing and chairs for certain committees, for example, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Another item is the calendaring of the committee’s workload, which is largely in spring term. Another item is the lack of a standardized time for committee meetings.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year on behalf of the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 16:55 p.m.