TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on May 2, 2011, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the April 4, 2011, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   DISCUSSION ITEM: On Line Learning and Millar Library (interim reports)
   Nominations Open for Presiding Officer Pro Tem, 2011-12 PSU Faculty Senate
D. Unfinished Business
E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Consent Agenda
      2. Proposed Joint Resolution of the Faculty Senate and the AAUP
F. Question Period
   1. Questions for the Administration
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report 16:00
   Provost’s Report
      1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee – Hickey
      2. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee – Absher
      3. Annual Report of the Library Committee – Merrow
      4. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee – Miller
      5. Annual Report of the University Studies Council - Fallon
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the APRIL 4, 2011 Meeting
   E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda Items
   G-1 Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee
   G-2 Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
   G-3 Annual Report of the Library Committee
   G-4 Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
   G-5 Annual Report of the University Studies Council
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 4, 2011
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Feng for Feng, Gerwing for George, Blekic for Barham, Holt for Kominz.

Members Absent: Baccar, Carter, Elzanowski, Farr, Hagge, Karavanic, Keller, Latiolais, Maier, Munson, Preston, Pejcinovic, Rueter, Ryder, Sterling.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2011, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Burns, Danielson and Flores were present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Discussion Item: items in this meeting having to do with the proposed Steering resolution, VP Fink’s report and Provost Koch’s report, and the draft resolution, constitute this month’s discussion items.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda
JOHNSON/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular proposals as published “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposed Resolution of the Faculty Senate

HINES noted that the proposal was removed from the April Agenda. She explained that it would be returned to the Agenda in May, after Senate consideration of VP Fink’s report today, discussion with the administration, and further editing by the Steering Committee.

Comments followed VP Fink’s presentation. JOHNSON noted that inputs need to be balanced with outcomes and accomplishments. SCHECHTER requested elaboration on the resolution’s postponement. HINES noted that the original document was somewhat hasty and the Steering Committee wants to get this right, with respect to shared governance and communication. FINK noted that he encourages input into the results of the Research report, especially with respect to ‘stretch goals.’ C.BROWN noted that aspirational goals identified as such are very important, in order to make the goals obtainable. BUTLER stated that a baseline would be hard to establish because of the budget situation.

3. EPC Recommendation to Approve Department of Indigenous Nations Studies

JOHNSON/LUCKETT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the department name change to “Indigenous Nations Studies” proposal as published in “E-3” and the supplemental memo provided on 1 April (attached).

SEPPALAINEN queried, with respect to the justification, if he included in this department, since as a Finn he is indigenous and is a descendant of peoples who experienced colonization by Russians and Swedes for five centuries. JOHNSON indicated the committee did not discuss this aspect of the request. PIERCE asked if this would affect the name of the Native American Center, as student fees contributed to the construction and they had a voice in the name. HINES recognized Cornel Pewewardy who stated he would ensure the advisory committee of the center keeps this item in mind.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. EPC Recommendation to Approve Prefix for Library

JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Library prefix proposal as published in “E-4.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. EPC Recommendation to Approve Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling
JOHNSON/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling proposal as listed in “E-5.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

6. Proposal for the Minor in Medieval Studies

DAASCH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor in Medieval Studies proposal as listed in “E-6.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL noted that College Station Housing Project is underway and received some good press last week, reminding that we are leasing the land and we will own the building after 65 years. Princeton’s Guide to Colleges and Universities included PSU for the first time, which will contribute to our out of state recruiting efforts. Regarding OUS restructuring proposals, the bill is now in the Ways and Means Committee, progress probably helped by the withdrawal last week of the two U of Oregon bills relating to the issue. Ways and Means is also holding hearings on the budget, and heard testimony this week from Presiding Officer Hines. Ways and Means has reinstated some of the education items that the governor had cut from his proposal, which would help the universities indirectly. Regarding proposed tuition increases for next year, the new compact would include student input into the decision, and this activity was incorporated into this year’s proposals as well. Already this year we are at the level of philanthropy we reached last year, including gifts to Business and Social Work. As the economy slowly improves, we hope to see greater increases as a result of efforts by VP Aylmer.

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported on activity at the Board level having to do with definitions of faculty titles, noting that this is an item subject to the Oregon Administrative Rules. He continued that work done on this campus by AAUP and the administration in the last few years is informing his discussions with the provosts. A few additional faculty ranks have been proposed to underpin career advancement in the non-tenure related ranks, and the proposal includes renaming certain positions (attached).

MacCORMACK asked questions about current faculty holding the current ranks. KOCH noted that our intent is not to separate graduate and undergraduate instruction,
and that new hires would negotiate the new ranks. M.TAYLOR queried, given the discussions that took place here, if the administration is satisfied with the ‘lecturer’ title, and would we be amenable to propose something different. KOCH stated no. MURPHY asked if the issue of soft funding is incorporated into the proposal for research titles. KOCH stated yes. MARRONGELES asked if tenure is related to predominantly teaching lines. KOCH stated no, it would violate our promotion and tenure guidelines. LUCKETT asked for Koch to comment on the negative outcome of raises for fixed term faculty. KOCH stated that he has not seen anyone at PSU being fired for being paid too much. ARANTE asked if lecturers would have no scholarly agenda. KOCH stated that is correct. AGORSAH asked if the entry point would change for ranked faculty. KOCH stated no. SCHECHTER asked how “ABD” hires would be handled. KOCH stated it would be specified in the letter of offer. SCHECHTER asked for a definition of the ‘Distinguished’ rank. KOCH stated that we would define it. DAASCH asked if this would require revamping the P&T Guidelines. KOCH stated that we could conceivably do an addendum as we did for the research faculty, but this would require discussion.

Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships

FINK presented a report on the state of and next steps for research at PSU, based on a recent survey of research faculty (attached). He commenced by saying that the goal of his office is to: Make faculty research a more positive experience; Support established research agenda and develop new strategic opportunities (P-20, OHSU, Intel, PGE; new AVP); Make PSU’s administrative processes more supportive of research (self-studies, ERA deployment, communication); and, Help establish PSU as the Leading urban-serving university. ______ asked for clarification of “urban-serving.” WIEWEL noted that the term has evolved from “urban 13” to denote the nature of those universities that fit the characteristics of the setting we are in. He presented the survey of principle investigators. He concluded by discussing next steps: Develop transparent RSP processes and procedures; Define roles and responsibilities for research administration campus-wide; Move towards electronic research administration; and, Establish Strategic Partnership office.

SCHECHTER urged that the office use multiple strategies to urge and disseminate opportunities. ______ yielded to Mary King, who noted that turnover in the research office has been a major obstacle to effectiveness. Assoc Vice President Systma noted that the office has moved to a team approach in response to this problem.

1. Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE ACCEPT this report of the administration, published in “G-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE ACCEPT this report of the administration, published in “G-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 16:42
Proposed Changes in OAR of Instructional Faculty Ranks

- Academic ranks are authorized through Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 580-020-0005
- Desire at several OUS institutions for additional faculty ranks that parallel the tenure-related ranks
- These appointments are a permanent part of higher education
- We (PSU) have been working on this for two years
- Currently, Instructor ranks “lead to” Professorial ranks
- No clear path for promotion beyond Assistant Professor for fixed term faculty who do not have a scholarly expectation

Provost Council has developed a proposal for expanding the faculty ranks to address the range of faculty activities and appointments

Proposed Changes in OAR of Instructional Faculty Ranks

- Proposed titles are commonly used at other institutions
- The new ranks address a number of positions and faculty activities that have evolved to be very important
- Once approved, ranks would be available to all OUS institutions to adopt (or not)
- Each campus would have to develop specific definitions for each rank and the process and criteria for promotion
- Input we are seeking at this point:
  - Are the “concepts” correct?
  - What (who) have we forgotten?
Proposed Changes in OAR of Instructional Faculty Ranks

**Nontenure-related faculty ranks**

**Lecturer series** (terminal degree, teach in UG and GR programs)
- Senior Lecturer II
- Senior Lecturer I
- Lecturer

**Instructor series** (teach in UG programs)
- Senior Instructor II
- Senior Instructor I
- Instructor

**Clinical Professor/Professor of Practice** (clinical or professional instruction)
- CP/PP
- Associate CP/PP
- Assistant CP/PP

**Tenure-related faculty ranks**

**Tenure-track and tenured series**
- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
(Also creates the title “Distinguished Professor” that can be used at the institution’s discretion)

The following untenured ranks are also addressed in the document
- Research Assistant series
- Research Associate series
- Librarian series

Document also address use of the terms:
- Fellow
- Affiliate faculty

Comments?
Research and Strategic Partnerships Report
PSU Faculty Senate

Jonathan Fink
Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships
April 4, 2011

RSP Goals

• Make faculty research a more positive experience
• Support established research agenda and develop new strategic opportunities (P-20, OHSU, Intel, PGE; new AVP)
• Make PSU’s administrative processes more supportive of research (self-studies, ERA deployment, communication)
• Help establish PSU as the leading urban-serving university

Outline

• Goals of RSP
• Results of Principal Investigator Survey
• Next steps

Principal Investigator Survey

Distribution of survey respondents by unit
Effectiveness of Pre-award administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (IRB, IACUC, etc)</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>21.3% (17)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposals</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>20.7% (18)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAF processing</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.2% (26)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to pre-award staff</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>26.9% (29)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely solutions to problems</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>24.3% (24)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAS processing</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>21.6% (21)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget preparation</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>21.7% (21)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in processes and procedures</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.05 (2)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on funding opportunities</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2.2% (2)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recently completed compliance review found we are okay now but must expand staffing, training, and monitoring to accommodate expected research growth.

Effectiveness of Post-award administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to RAPs</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.1% (20)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely solutions to problems</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.87 (28)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project set-up (assign index number)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.26 (22)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and personnel management</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.01 (25)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on processes and procedures</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>1.91 (17)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reporting</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.71 (15)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New consolidated grant budget report that includes payroll and expenditure detail and unspent balance available since January

RA is working on sending budget information automatically each month for each index – expected to be available by July.

Effectiveness of Post-award administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to RAPs</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>20.1% (20)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely solutions to problems</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.87 (28)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project set-up (assign index number)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.26 (22)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and personnel management</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.01 (25)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on processes and procedures</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>1.91 (17)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reporting</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.71 (15)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Create on-line tutorials for PIs
### Effectiveness of Post-award administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average Count</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
<th>Least effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to RAPs</td>
<td>20.2% (13)</td>
<td>34.8% (5)</td>
<td>38.2% (5)</td>
<td>6.7% (0)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely solutions to problems</td>
<td>17.4% (16)</td>
<td>43.5% (40)</td>
<td>33.7% (31)</td>
<td>5.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project set-up (assign index number)</td>
<td>16.1% (15)</td>
<td>47.3% (44)</td>
<td>31.2% (29)</td>
<td>5.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and personnel management</td>
<td>28.0% (23)</td>
<td>43.9% (36)</td>
<td>26.8% (22)</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on processes and procedures</td>
<td>35.6% (31)</td>
<td>40.2% (35)</td>
<td>21.8% (19)</td>
<td>2.3% (2)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reporting</td>
<td>47.2% (40)</td>
<td>37.8% (34)</td>
<td>12.1% (11)</td>
<td>3.3% (3)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revise HR policies with research needs in mind

### Effectiveness of Post-award administrative functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average Count</th>
<th>Most effective</th>
<th>Least effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to RAPs</td>
<td>20.2% (13)</td>
<td>34.8% (5)</td>
<td>38.2% (5)</td>
<td>6.7% (0)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely solutions to problems</td>
<td>17.4% (16)</td>
<td>43.5% (40)</td>
<td>33.7% (31)</td>
<td>5.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project set-up (assign index number)</td>
<td>16.1% (15)</td>
<td>47.3% (44)</td>
<td>31.2% (29)</td>
<td>5.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and personnel management</td>
<td>28.0% (23)</td>
<td>43.9% (36)</td>
<td>26.8% (22)</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on processes and procedures</td>
<td>35.6% (31)</td>
<td>40.2% (35)</td>
<td>21.8% (19)</td>
<td>2.3% (2)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reporting</td>
<td>47.2% (40)</td>
<td>37.8% (34)</td>
<td>12.1% (11)</td>
<td>3.3% (3)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More and better trained RAPs

### Rate the importance of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>MOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More timely budget reports</td>
<td>8.7% (8)</td>
<td>21.7% (20)</td>
<td>69.6% (64)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to write proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.5% (15)</td>
<td>71.4% (65)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentive to do more research</td>
<td>11.2% (10)</td>
<td>22.5% (20)</td>
<td>66.3% (60)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load</td>
<td>23.1% (21)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
<td>58.2% (53)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on post-award policies</td>
<td>16.7% (15)</td>
<td>53.3% (48)</td>
<td>30.0% (27)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award policies</td>
<td>20.5% (18)</td>
<td>55.6% (50)</td>
<td>24.8% (22)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (11)</td>
<td>26.5% (23)</td>
<td>61.4% (56)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Research Accounting</td>
<td>27.5% (25)</td>
<td>48.9% (44)</td>
<td>24.2% (22)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>31.5% (30)</td>
<td>35.1% (31)</td>
<td>29.8% (28)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Pre-award</td>
<td>10.9% (20)</td>
<td>46.8% (44)</td>
<td>42.3% (39)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on research compliance</td>
<td>13.3% (10)</td>
<td>54.7% (49)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAST

More and better-trained RAPs
Evaluate benefits of merging Pre- and Post-award offices

### Rate the importance of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>MOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More timely budget reports</td>
<td>8.7% (8)</td>
<td>21.7% (20)</td>
<td>69.6% (64)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to write proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.5% (15)</td>
<td>71.4% (65)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentive to do more research</td>
<td>11.2% (10)</td>
<td>22.5% (20)</td>
<td>66.3% (60)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load</td>
<td>23.1% (21)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
<td>58.2% (53)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on post-award policies</td>
<td>16.7% (15)</td>
<td>53.3% (48)</td>
<td>30.0% (27)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award policies</td>
<td>20.5% (18)</td>
<td>55.6% (50)</td>
<td>24.8% (22)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (11)</td>
<td>26.5% (23)</td>
<td>61.4% (56)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Research Accounting</td>
<td>27.5% (25)</td>
<td>48.9% (44)</td>
<td>24.2% (22)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>31.5% (30)</td>
<td>35.1% (31)</td>
<td>29.8% (28)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Pre-award</td>
<td>10.9% (20)</td>
<td>46.8% (44)</td>
<td>42.3% (39)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on research compliance</td>
<td>13.3% (10)</td>
<td>54.7% (49)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEAST

More and better-trained RAPs
Evaluate benefits of merging Pre- and Post-award offices
**Rate the importance of items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More timely budget reports</td>
<td>8.7% (8)</td>
<td>21.7% (20)</td>
<td>69.6% (64)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to write proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.5% (15)</td>
<td>67.4% (60)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentive to do more research</td>
<td>11.2% (10)</td>
<td>22.5% (20)</td>
<td>66.3% (58)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load</td>
<td>23.1% (23)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
<td>58.2% (53)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on post-award policies</td>
<td>16.7% (15)</td>
<td>53.3% (48)</td>
<td>30.0% (27)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award policies</td>
<td>20.0% (18)</td>
<td>55.6% (50)</td>
<td>24.4% (22)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify post-doc benefit cost</td>
<td>22.1% (21)</td>
<td>36.9% (33)</td>
<td>23.1% (21)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Research Accounting</td>
<td>27.5% (25)</td>
<td>48.4% (44)</td>
<td>24.2% (22)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>15.1% (13)</td>
<td>35.1% (31)</td>
<td>29.8% (26)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Pre-award</td>
<td>10.9% (9)</td>
<td>40.8% (44)</td>
<td>22.3% (21)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on research compliance</td>
<td>33.3% (30)</td>
<td>54.4% (49)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Develop PSU-wide Indirect Cost Return policy that includes return to PIs
Clarity splitting ICR to Co-is from different depts & colleges to promote collaboration

**Rate the importance of items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More timely budget reports</td>
<td>8.7% (8)</td>
<td>21.7% (20)</td>
<td>69.6% (64)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to write proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.5% (15)</td>
<td>67.4% (60)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentive to do more research</td>
<td>11.2% (10)</td>
<td>22.5% (20)</td>
<td>66.3% (58)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load</td>
<td>23.1% (23)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
<td>58.2% (53)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on post-award policies</td>
<td>16.7% (15)</td>
<td>53.3% (48)</td>
<td>30.0% (27)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award policies</td>
<td>20.0% (18)</td>
<td>55.6% (50)</td>
<td>24.4% (22)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify post-doc benefit cost</td>
<td>32.1% (27)</td>
<td>36.9% (33)</td>
<td>23.1% (21)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Research Accounting</td>
<td>27.5% (25)</td>
<td>48.4% (44)</td>
<td>24.2% (22)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>35.1% (30)</td>
<td>35.1% (31)</td>
<td>29.8% (26)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Pre-award</td>
<td>30.0% (29)</td>
<td>46.8% (44)</td>
<td>22.3% (21)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on research compliance</td>
<td>33.3% (30)</td>
<td>54.4% (49)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work with deans to increase the number of partial teaching FTEs
Increase Research Stimulus Awards to allow for teaching buyouts
Establish guidelines for teaching buyout cost across campus

**Rate the importance of items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More timely budget reports</td>
<td>8.7% (8)</td>
<td>21.7% (20)</td>
<td>69.6% (64)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to write proposals</td>
<td>12.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.5% (15)</td>
<td>67.4% (60)</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentive to do more research</td>
<td>11.2% (10)</td>
<td>22.5% (20)</td>
<td>66.3% (58)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load</td>
<td>23.1% (23)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
<td>58.2% (53)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on post-award policies</td>
<td>16.7% (15)</td>
<td>53.3% (48)</td>
<td>30.0% (27)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better info on pre-award policies</td>
<td>20.0% (18)</td>
<td>55.6% (50)</td>
<td>24.4% (22)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify post-doc benefit cost</td>
<td>22.1% (21)</td>
<td>36.9% (33)</td>
<td>23.1% (21)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on Research Accounting</td>
<td>10.9% (9)</td>
<td>40.8% (44)</td>
<td>22.3% (21)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding funding opportunities</td>
<td>33.3% (30)</td>
<td>54.4% (49)</td>
<td>12.2% (11)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examine options for post-doc employment
Funding Agency
PI/RAP
Notify PI of score/award (informal)
RSP
RSP (cont.)
Research Accounting
Current Grants and Contracts
Pre-Award Process – 2
SAS
Generate OPAS form – incl. default Index and guarantee $
Attach e-mail notification
Review/score proposal
Obtain signatures – PI, Chair, Dean
Send to RSP
Notify University (formal)
If more information needed, provide to agency
If denied, review comments
Update Excel
If denied, move file from pending to denied
If awarded, celebrate
If awarded, match award to proposal
Pull pending file
Accept award – sign and return letter
Verify docs – e.g. budget
Update Filemaker – e.g. awarded, etc.
Scan award docs
Print routing slip from Filemaker
Save to shared drive (available to ARNOLD)
Create record in ARNOLD
When complete, move from RSP queue to Research Acct’g queue
Print all docs and create "blue folder"
Enter additional data in ARNOLD (populates SADIE)
Send to Specialized Acct’g Services via ARNOLD
Reenter data in Banner – incl Index #
Send Index # to RA
Send e-mail to PI/RAP w/ Index #
Back-and-forth
Determine if contract
Search for PIAF (if not found, contact PI/RAP)
Negotiate Ts & Cs and sign
"Ideal" Grants and Contracts
Pre-Award Process
Current Grants and Contracts
Pre-Award Process – 2
"Hub"
Single source of info
Web-based
Real-time
24/7
Enter preliminary info
When ready, route through approval queue – e.g. dept chair, dean, etc.
When complete, PI clicks "finalize"
Update hub (at every stage in process)
Agency review and returns decision
Auto-route to RSP
If informal approval received, auto-trigger pre-award spending process
PI/RAP/RSP update status w/ decision
Auto-route to Contracts to review
If needed, execute contract
Auto-route to RA
Accept award
Auto-pass award to Banner
RA assigns Index # in Banner
Auto-pass Index # back to hub
IDEAS:
• Auto-ping various parties at specific stages in the process – e.g. HR, tuition remission, etc.
• Beta test hub w/ one School and/or one agency – e.g. Engineering and/or grants.gov
• R/8/)'6%12(4*6(2/41%,-.%62'5/**/*%(4C%62'5/C02/*%%
• R/`4/%2')/*%(4C%2/*6'4*3B3)39/*%+'2%2/*/(25@%(CA343*12(9'4%5(A60*FD3C/%
• >'8/%1'D(2C*%/)/512'435%2/*/(25@%(CA343*12(9'4%
• L*1(B)3*@%-12(1/:35%.(214/2*@36*%'a5/%

RSP Next Steps
• Develop transparent RSP processes and procedures
• Define roles and responsibilities for research administration campus-wide
• Move towards electronic research administration
• Establish Strategic Partnerships office
DATE: April 12, 2011
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Drake Mitchell, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2010-11 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**Undergraduate Studies**

**Cluster Course Changes**

*E.1.c.1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add New Cluster Course</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 363</td>
<td>Egyptian Archaeology: From the earliest humans to the Pyramid Age</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 312</td>
<td>Human Development in the Family Setting</td>
<td>Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 331</td>
<td>Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition Studies</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 332</td>
<td>History of Cinema and Narrative Media I</td>
<td>Popular Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 333</td>
<td>History of Cinema and Narrative Media II</td>
<td>Popular Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 304</td>
<td>19th Century Philosophy</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 331</td>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>Knowledge Rationality Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 350</td>
<td>International Ethics</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 355</td>
<td>Morality and Health Care</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpHr 365</td>
<td>Survey of Speech Language &amp; Hearing Disorders</td>
<td>Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSC 399*</td>
<td>Introduction to Agent-Based Modeling</td>
<td>Knowledge Rationality Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSC 399*</td>
<td>Modeling Socio-Ecological Systems</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP 386</td>
<td>Portland Past and Present</td>
<td>Understanding Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These courses change to permanent course number by AY 2012/13 or before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add Approved Cluster Class to New Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYSC 399U*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSC 399U*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These courses change to permanent course number by AY 2012/13 or before
### E.1.c.2.

The UNST Council has approved the delisting of the Archaeology and Media Studies from the list of approved clusters due to an insufficient number of courses available for students. Please complete the following actions on the courses in these clusters:

- In the Archaeology Cluster, please remove the U from BI 387U Vertebrate Zoology and BST 470U Topics; Caribbean Archaeology [Overseas Experience]. Add ANTH 350U Archaeological Method and Theory, ANTH 364U Pacific Northwest Prehistory, ANTH

---

#### Removals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUS 304</td>
<td>Music History (Medieval and Renaissance)</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 305</td>
<td>Music History (Baroque and Classical)</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 421U</td>
<td>19th Century Philosophy</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 450U</td>
<td>Ethics and International Justice</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 455U</td>
<td>Morality and Health Care</td>
<td>Morality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discrete Numbers Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BST 325U</td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity in Latin America</td>
<td>Global Perspectives (was 399U)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COURSE CLARIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 303U</td>
<td>Chicana/Latina Experience - Reinstated on list</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 303U</td>
<td>Chicana/Latina Experience - Reinstated on list</td>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 380U</td>
<td>Latinos in the Economy and Politics - Reinstated on list</td>
<td>Understanding Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 317U</td>
<td>Comm/Violence and Children</td>
<td>Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 352U</td>
<td>The City in Europe</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR 331U</td>
<td>Women and Gender in Turkey</td>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR 331U</td>
<td>Women and Gender in Turkey</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR 331U</td>
<td>Women and Gender in Turkey</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 326U</td>
<td>Cuba, Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRK 399U</td>
<td>Greek Comedy</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 333U</td>
<td>Medieval Philosophy</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 341U</td>
<td>Environment and Development in Latin America</td>
<td>Global Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 342U</td>
<td>Globalization and Conflict in Latin America</td>
<td>Global Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 351U</td>
<td>The City in Europe</td>
<td>Global Perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- In the Media Studies Cluster, please remove the Media Studies cluster designation/attribute, but keep the “U” as these courses are listed in other clusters: BST 424U African-American African Culture in Cinema, BST 427U African/American Films and Film Makers, MKT 340U Advertising, MUS 399U Modern Music Technology, PS 318U Media, Opinion and Voting, COMM 312U Media Literacy, COMM 399U Film Studies I, COMM 399U Film Studies II: International Film History, COMM 399U Film Studies III: Documentary and A. G. Film, COMM 420U Political Communication, COMM 422U Critical Theories of Mass Communication, COMM 427U Issues in International Communication, COMM 452U Gender and Race in the Media, USP 457U Information Cities and WR 416U Screenwriting.

Upon approval of the request to de-list the cluster above, we further ask that ARC then establish the following:

- A student who has taken the Archaeology SINQ can meet the cluster course requirements by taking one of more courses from the Interpreting the Past cluster. A student who has already taken the Archaeology SINQ, but still needs additional SINQ’s to meet UNST requirements, may count Interpreting the Past SINQ as one of their options. A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses listed in the Archaeology cluster may use those courses to meet the Interpreting the Past cluster course requirements. A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses listed in the Archaeology cluster, but are yet to meet the SINQ requirements, may meet the SINQ requirements by taking the Interpreting the Past SINQ. Other cases will be resolved on a case by case basis. Students should not be disadvantaged by having to take additional University Studies requirements because of this programmatic change. A student can only count the Interpreting the Past SINQ once to meet the UNST requirements.

- A student who has taken the Media Studies SINQ can meet the cluster course requirements by taking one of more courses from the Popular Culture cluster. A student who has already taken the Media Studies SINQ, but still needs additional SINQ’s to meet UNST
requirements, may count Popular Culture or Freedom SINQ as one of their options. A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses listed in the Media Studies cluster may use those courses to meet the Popular Culture cluster course requirements. A student who has taken previously approved cluster courses listed in the Media Studies cluster, but are yet to meet the SINQ requirements, may meet the SINQ requirements by taking the Popular Culture SINQ. Other cases will be resolved on a case by case basis. Students should not be disadvantaged by having to take additional University Studies requirements because of this programmatic change. A student can only count the Popular Culture SINQ once to meet the UNST requirements.
Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)

Annual Report
Date: April 11, 2011

Members, 2010-20101
Linda George, ESR
Martha W. Hickey, WLL/INTL – Chair
Agnes Hoffman, ADM
Becki Ingersoll, UASC
Sukhwant Jhaj, UNST
Jane Mercer, SCH
Robert Mercer, CLAS
Louise Paradis, CARC

Consultants
Mary Ann Barham, UASC
Angie Gabarino, ARR
Melody Rose, OAA

The ARC held its first formal meeting on September 27, 2011. From April 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, ARC reviewed 432 petitions. Of those, 400 were granted, 32 were denied. (The number is essentially unchanged from 2009-2010.) The majority of petitions were for University Studies waivers, primarily at the cluster level. (Waivers for the major are granted by Departments directly.) ARC also established guidelines for the extension of the 2001 catalogue and authorized the PSU Last Mile Committee (with two ARC members serving on it, as well as an ARC member-consultant) to act on its behalf to assist students in completing their final graduation requirements.

The fall 2010 ARC reviewed a PSU IELP comparison study of how other institutions have reconciled a new computer-based academic English language test designed to assess English language proficiency for university study, the Pearson Test, with other currently accepted tests. ARC concurred with the IELP recommended score of 60 for graduate students and 53 for undergraduate students. (This score aligns with PSU’s IELTS score requirement and is slightly higher than PSU’s iBT requirement.) ARC has requested a follow-up study by Admissions to determine if there have been any significant changes in student success at PSU.

In January 2011, after extensive review by the ad hoc X-grade Task Force chaired by Cindy Baccar, ARC joined the Scholastic Standards Committee and Graduate Office to recommend that X grades become permanent, and M grades change to X after one term, with change to either allowed only in cases of bona fide grading error and requiring department chair approval. The Senate approved the change.

In February 2011 Faculty Senate passed a Motion to allow the granting of two concurrent degrees (i.e. BA and BS, or BFA, BSW, BM, et. al. simultaneously) that ARC recommended. Effective Fall 2011 students must complete all the requirements in each degree and in each major and at least 36 credit hours beyond the 180 total required for a single Bachelor’s degree, but residence credit requirements will not change.

ARC looks forward to a report from the University Writing Committee to the Senate on the implementation of the new university 8 credit writing requirement by June 2011.
General Student Affairs Committee: 2010 - 2011 Annual Report

Committee Chair: Linda Ueki Absher

Committee Members:
Ethan Johnson
Michelle Miller
Emily Salisbury
Kristin Nieman

Student Members:
Laura Morency
Zahed Khuransani
Matthew Blasa
Jesse O’Brien

The committee is charged by the Faculty Senate to:

1) Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets, and student discipline.

2) Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs, and long-range planning, e.g., student employment, Educational Activities, counseling, health service and extra-curricular programming.

3) Nominate the recipients of the President’s Award for Community Service Awards.

The past year the committee met to review and nominate twelve (12) candidates for the President’s Award for Community Engagement as well as twelve (12) candidates for the President’s Award for University Service. Additionally the committee chair met with Jacqueline Balzer, Vice Provost for Student Affairs to discuss the current charge of the committee and recommendations from Senate Steering Committee regarding the committee consulting with her directly.

Future Agenda: The committee will meet to discuss working with Jacqueline Balzer in the future. The chair will also recommend to incoming chair that the committee should undertake a review and assessment of current activities against the committee’s original charge as outlined in the Faculty Governance Guide in light of the Student Affairs unit realignment.
To: Faculty Senate
Re: Library Committee Interim Annual Report
April 14, 2011
Committee Chair: Kathleen Merrow
Committee Members: Rudy Barton, Richard Beyler, Jack Corbett, Subhash Kochar, Donna
Philbrick, Yen-lin Wan (student representative)
Ex Officio: Adriene Lin, Tom Raffensperger

This year the committee has been working closely with the library staff to provide faculty input for the task of reimagining the future role of the library and conducting strategic planning for 2012-2013. While budgetary concerns are (and continue to be) a big problem, the need for a vision of the library has a broader base. The Millar Library is facing changes and challenges faced across the board by other university libraries and, indeed, universities overall due to the changing nature of scholarly communication and information delivery systems. Even to use the language of “information delivery” or “knowledge delivery” indicates this change.

Some view the rapid changes in digital technologies and the ubiquity of networked information as a sign that university libraries will be significantly downsized and will increasingly outsource materials in various ways. (For one example, see: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/09/24/libraries) In short, the shrinking of staffing and resources of all kinds is envisioned. We find this a negative way to approach the coming challenges; one driven by budgetary pressures rather than a creative reimagining of the role a strong library can play in the university. We as faculty want to be sure that the university not be seen as a mere information delivery system for outsourced materials, and want to reaffirm the high value of the library in the future, one that adapts to new technologies while retaining the valuable historical role of the library as the heart of the university, as a sharing platform for scholarly information, as a repository, as a teaching partner, and as a preserver of scholarly information.

We also feel it is important to recognize the different ways that the different disciplines use the library. There are significant and radical differences in the pace and the approach disciplines (say engineering and history) take to research and to what constitutes knowledge. We would not want this to be ignored in considerations of the future role of the library in acquisitions, holdings, and access to materials.

Faculty input to this is very important. Is is for this reason that we submit the draft (and please note that this is a working document that will undergo further changes and refinement among the library faculty and staff) of the library’s “Visioning Work” (see attached). The library committee has had some input already to this document. We invite further input from faculty.

Faculty may send comments directly to Kathleen Merrow at merrowk@pdx.edu.

We should also note that there will be a Town Hall Meeting for faculty and students scheduled (time to be announced) to discuss these issues.
Visioning Work
Portland State Library's Unique Functions for the Next 5 Years
REVISED DRAFT 4/7/11
(Source: Visioning work from scenario planning sessions held Winter/Spring Terms 2011)

The Portland State University Library is the heart of the Portland State community, providing excellence and innovation in research, teaching, and learning support in a rapidly changing information age. Along with its significant collection of information resources, the University Library delivers a superlative instruction program dedicated to improving students’ academic success; offers outstanding special collections and archives featuring unique materials of regional and scholarly interest; and provides an extensive array of user-centered information services. Located in an iconic building in the beautiful South Park Blocks, the University Library serves the largest student body in the Oregon University System by providing collaborative study spaces and technology-enabled environments designed to enhance students’ learning experiences.

Core Themes

The Library is the campus’s main provider and steward of shared, high-quality information resources. Using an approach informed by discipline-specific needs, the Library continues to act as the main provider, manager, and preserver of shared, high-quality information resources, turning increasingly to electronic, demand-driven, and access-based models, while becoming less reliant on print collections stored on site. This function depends upon the Library’s strong collaboration with departmental faculty in order to ensure that diversity in scholarly practice is considered during decision making (e.g., humanities scholars’ heavier use of monographic materials published over longer time periods, or scientists’ heavier use of current journal articles, etc.). This function also includes a strategic focus on unique materials and data for campus repositories, digital collections, special collections, and archives, with the Library serving as original publisher of scholarly information when appropriate. It depends upon the Library’s leadership and extensive partnerships with other institutions, as universities move toward a greater use of regional repositories for access to materials held in common by academic libraries.

The Library provides the University with valuable information expertise in a rapidly changing information age. The Library serves as the University’s main expert and instructional resource for changing forms of academic information creation, discovery, content, and delivery. In this role, the Library helps the University achieve global excellence by providing leadership in the area of new scholarly communication models, which includes open access initiatives. The Library identifies and performs work related to customized systems, tools, and content which will improve information discovery and access. It acts as an important strategic partner in research collaborations, and contributes to the campus’s data management infrastructure, providing such services as research data curation, access, and preservation.

The Library is the campus’s collaborative teaching partner, working to improve students’ academic success and enhance educational opportunity. The Library is a collaborative teaching partner, working with departmental faculty to integrate information literacy into the curricula, and to provide teaching of information literacy skills and research strategies to students in all disciplines. The Library offers a superlative instruction and reference program in a variety of modalities that is reflected in campus-wide learning outcomes. It uses complementary technologies in its instruction program and in its learning spaces that will improve students’ academic success.

The Library is the main provider and manager of shared learning spaces on campus. The Library provides and manages an expanding array of technology- and resource-rich academic spaces for collaborative and individual learning in a shared academic environment. Library services are more effective when collocated with other academic services; to this end, the Library will continue to work with other campus units to improve academic services within its physical and virtual spaces, extending beyond the brick-and-mortar confines of the Millar building.
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Committee Charge: Scholastic Standards Committee
This committee develops and recommends academic standards with a view to maintaining the reputation of the undergraduate program of the University. It advises the Office of Admissions, Registration and Records in academic matters concerning transfer students or students seeking readmission after having had scholastic deficiencies. It assists undergraduate students who are having difficulty with scholastic regulations and adjudicates student petitions that request the waiving of regulations on suspensions (academic readmission).

2010-2011 Report
The primary focus of the committee’s efforts this year has been to tighten up the appeals process for the SSC. In response the committee has completed and implemented new revised SSC Petition forms for reinstatement and waiver of previous terms deadlines. Throughout this process we have worked closely with the staff of the office of Registration & Records to strive for a product that is clear, concise and easy to comprehend. Additionally, the committee spent a considerable amount of time on a joint resolution revising the X grade and M grade policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition Type</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Pending</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Incomplete</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report of the University Studies Council to the Faculty Senate – May 2011


The UNST Council began the year reviewing the reports of the previous councils as well as the report from the ad hoc UNST review committee from April 2006. From this we decided to work on three issues: faculty (including shared-lines and faculty housed wholly in UNST); sing/clusters—mostly focused on the work of the continuing reform; and then the BA/BS—looking at the relationship between general education requirements at PSU and in relationship to other OUS institutions.

Faculty Subcommittee:

Shared tenure-track lines:
The faculty subcommittee first reviewed a sample of memorandum of understandings from the new shared line positions. The subcommittee then met with Michael Flower, in his capacity as Freshman Inquiry Coordinator, Sukhwant Jhaj, Director of University Studies, and Melody Rose, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Instruction. The subcommittee arrived at a concise set of recommendations to help support shared faculty in two ways. The first is aimed at reducing uncertainty regarding the evaluation process and addressing perceived inequities in comparison with other junior faculty at PSU. The second is directed toward providing resources in support of these shared tenure-line faculty’s preparation for promotion and tenure review.

[a] The committee recommends that the Council of Academic Chairs entertain as a major topic of discussion the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) by shared faculty (support for and evaluation of). The primary aims of such a discussion would be to raise the salience of this issue among departmental leaders, and to encourage the development of explicit, systematic, and internally consistent policies in the weighing and assessment of SoTL.

[b] As a related measure, we recommend the clear communication to shared faculty of expectations concerning SoTL and that these be incorporated into existing departmental mentoring procedures.

[c] We recommend that departments hosting shared faculty adapt their annual review processes to require consultation with Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) representatives on faculty members’ efforts in SoTL, if SoTL is part of the faculty’s research agenda. This recommendation has two objectives: with CAE’s qualified input, faculty members will enjoy the benefit of concrete developmental advice going forward, and secondly, faculty members will get a clearer idea of how their SoTL contributions are likely to be regarded in promotion and tenure.

[d] We propose that the faculty candidate and departmental chairs work with CAE to consult outside reviewers on SoTL in tenure and promotion cases when they are needed. We view CAE as especially well-positioned to do this because as its leaders are expressly qualified to assist in this area and they stand as an independent party distinct from the department and University Studies.
Faculty whose academic home is primarily located in University Studies:

The idea of a faculty chair has been tabled for the moment.

In light of changes in UNST staffing structure, the faculty requested the Council examine and make recommendations on specific concerns, such as opportunities for promotion and the value of teaching in the university.

Sinq/Cluster Subcommittee:
In the third year of the sinq/cluster reform we have consolidated or reconfigured clusters according to the goals outlined in the 2009 and 2010 UNST Council final reports:

a. Richness - an adequate number of courses are included to ensure that sufficient sophomore and junior level courses in each cluster are offered each year. Previous UNST Council reports have identified the following parameters to ensure adequate offerings for students to complete their cluster requirement in a timely fashion:

   *Sophomore Inquiry Courses: A minimum of 15 sections of SINQ, or capacity for 550 students, need to be offered per cluster each year.*

   *Junior Cluster Courses: Each course on the list needs to be offered at least every other year. Total course offerings need to average at least 20 sections, or capacity for 700 students, per term, 2100 students per year.*

b. Interdisciplinarity – courses in each cluster are drawn from a minimum of three disciplines, with substantial contributions of courses from at least two.

c. Inquiry approach – each cluster contains courses that utilize inquiry-based approaches in their pedagogy.

d. Thematic coherence – the suite of courses included in the cluster represent a cohesive theme that does not have substantial overlap with themes represented by other clusters.

e. Assessment – each Cluster will develop and implement an annual assessment plan.

Beginning in the fall of 2011, UNST will offer 16 clusters. These are as follows:

- American Studies
- Community Studies
- Environmental Sustainability
- Family Studies
- Freedom, Privacy and Technology
- Global Environmental Change
- Global Perspectives
All of these clusters come close to meeting the first requirements for richness, at the very least. A thoroughgoing review of extant clusters and the ways in which they meet all of the characteristics identified above still needs to be completed. Towards this end, the subcommittee on Clusters has endorsed the requirement for each existing Cluster to engage in 'self study' for renewal as a Cluster using the proposal outline developed last year. This requires each Cluster Coordinator to form a group of faculty and to bring their review and proposal to the UNST Council by January 2013.

Resources that will be provided by UNST program include stipends for participating small groups (4-5 faculty) and staff support from the UNST Cluster Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator. For all clusters completing the process, the designated Cluster Coordinator will have a one-course release per year or an appropriate stipend.

**BA/BS and UNST subcommittee:**

The April 2006 report from the University Studies Review committee to the faculty senate made the following recommendation:

The current transfer articulation agreements with Oregon Universities for FRINQ allot 4 of the 15 credits for arts/humanities, 4 for social science, 4 for science, and 3 for writing. It is currently unclear how these allotments are implemented in theme design. We recommend modifying the theme proposal process to include discussion of how each of these areas will be addressed in the course. (Review report, 7).

In response to this suggestion we asked that two new freshman inquiry (frinq) course proposals this year include a discussion of how courses would meet these areas in their thematic design.

We also engaged in a longer conversation with the ARC, frinq faculty, OIRP and academic advisors on the history of this recommendation, the relationship of UNST requirements to the BA/BS requirements at PSU and a comparison of general education requirements between those at PSU and those at other OUS institutions.

We also examined the apparent disjunction in this policy: when a student who takes freshman inquiry and transfers to another Oregon institution, she/he meets the domain requirements for the BA or the BS. We do not recognize these courses as meeting those requirements internally at PSU. We were initially concerned that this dual requirement would increase time to graduation for PSU students. But we are more convinced that many students actually meet the degree requirements through their majors and through their cluster selections. While PSU does have these apparently additional requirements,
students who choose their courses judiciously can complete their BA and UNST requirements with approximately 69-70 credits and their BS and UNST requirements with 57 credits (Robert Mercer discussion with the UNST Council, March 2, 2011).

The current degree-mapping project underway may reveal places where students experience bottlenecks to completion. One suggestion that came about in our research was that students were struggling in majors with a high degree of requirements in their freshman and sophomore year. *It might be worthwhile to consider once again thinking of some sophomore inquiries as gateways to select majors.*

In order to continue this work in assisting students, the UNST Council requests that degree requirements conduct a batch analysis in order to study what courses students are taking and how they are applying these courses to their different degree requirements.

**Other Actions:**

UNST Council voted to recommend that all incoming freshman be required to take the writing placement exam.

UNST Council voted to approve two freshman inquiry courses: “Life Unlimited?” and “Globalization.”

UNST Council voted to approve the addition as well as the deletion of a slate of cluster courses in conformity with the guidelines for the 2009 UNST report. These moved to the UCC.

UNST Council continued to work with UCC to facilitate the process of approving courses. For the future the UCC asks that UNST include the following information with forwarded course recommendations: 1) What is the composition of clusters following the proposed additions/subtractions? 2) What is the record of conversation with the affected parties?

UNST Council will use the course tracking system for future course recommendations.

Finally UNST Council respectfully requests to be present at steering committee discussions of UNST related questions and that the chair be invited to planning activities for the faculty senate.