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Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 8, 2008
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Ex-officio Members

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 2, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:08. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Kohles was present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda of October 6, 2008:

G.3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of October 3-4 at SOU - Carter

WALTON, Faculty Development Chair, noted that the Professional Travel Grant Deadline have been moved up to November 6 (Winter), and February 5 (Spring).
BRODOWICZ, Committee on Committees Chair, requested the Senate caucuses of ED, LAS, and SBA to meet at the end of the Senate meeting to each elect a new representative to the committee, and forward him those names by email.

Conversation with the President

WIEWEL noted he is making every effort to get to know PSU and our region in depth as quickly as possible. He continued that at the State Board meeting, the state’s budget problems were acknowledged, but that the Governor is very supportive of education and higher education, and wants to move resources beyond essential support. He noted that also at the meeting there was discussion of converting the OUS to the semester system. The conclusion for the time being is that while there are advantages, they are outweighed by the tremendous cost of the conversion. WEIWEL noted that the university will be doing feasibility studies for our next capital campaign, including a readiness study, etc., and also a study of what should be the institutional priorities for the campaign.

WIEWEL presented three questions for conversation. The first was whether the Five Themes presented in the Symposium on 23 September seem to be the right themes. The second was whether our articulated planning process makes sense. The third was whether the planning process related to the Miller Foundation grant for Sustainability is clear to people and seems to be the right process.

KOHLES asked the President to comment on the future of our relationship with OHSU. WIEWEL noted that the leaderships have not met yet, but have a meeting planned in the near future to discuss that, and in particular to discuss whether the collaborative process should be structured differently that the way it is being done now. There is a clear sense that there is enthusiasm on both sides about what is going on, and we want to continue that. WIEWEL continued that related to that, we are working on identifying a place where all of the organizations in the Portland region involved in sustainability might come to be housed together, hopefully here or near here, and OHSU concurs.

LUCKETT noted that there is rumor that OU and OSU are trying to prevent the sustainability center from being located at PSU. WIEWEL noted that he didn’t know anything about such a thing. The funding for such a building would come through bonds requested by the system. Although there was considerable discussion of locations, at the moment everything points to doing it adjacent to campus, if and when the bonds are requested.

MURPHY asked what the long term plans are for enrollment growth in that there is discussion of enrollment in the “mid 30’s” but not where we will put that many students. WIEWEL noted that that was not a goal ever formally adopted by the university, and that he needs to learn more, but would be more inclined to focus on increases in quality. He noted that we do like being the biggest, but that doesn’t necessarily require that we grow to 35,000.
MILLER-JONES noted that the Governor and Legislature have projections for 2025 that 40% of Oregonians have obtained bachelor and associate degrees. If we were to achieve that, it would mean enrolling upwards of 80,000 additional students in the system. The question becomes what is PSU’s response to that, especially considering the fact that students who are currently the 25-30% of high school graduates who go on to college are typically the students who are “better prepared” than many of the other students who are projected to be enrolled in this matrix. PSU needs to think seriously about the question of growth and how we would accommodate students coming in, especially students who are underrepresented in the current population. WIEWEL noted that he particularly agreed with the latter point and the issues of student experience, and graduation and retention rates. He continued that there are issues of funding and support around this discussion; for example, we are not currently being funded at the actual rate.

BRENNAN asked, regarding access and enrollment growth, if there are plans to provide incentives for faculty to develop technology-delivered courses. WIEWEL stated that the Provost and Dean of Extended Studies are working on figuring out how both organizationally and substantively, we can best address this, including the appointment of a committee to assist.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to Amend the PSU Faculty Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4), g) Faculty Development Committee

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BEYLER/JAGODNIK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent Agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported that enrollments have increased by 4-4.5 % headcount and by 9% student credit hours. We had some indication that this was going to happen last spring and were able to make some accommodation for it, if not quite enough. Since the last
Senate meeting several PSU programs have been approved by the State Board, including the Master of Architecture, the Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering, and the PSU-OHSU joint MBA in Healthcare Management, and several Graduate Certificates. With regard to Sustainability and funding around the Miller grant, we have held one general meeting for faculty interested in participating in this process, and a second meeting is planned for tomorrow. Additional meetings are planned for the deans, students and community members and at least one more meeting with faculty, to develop a long-range vision along with short-term investment strategies. Some very short term decisions for this year will be developed after these preliminary discussions and after a set of criteria have been devised from these discussions. You are encouraged to make your colleagues aware of this activity, as we intend to make it as inclusive as we can make it.

This weekend is the Academic Affairs unit retreat, and includes the President and three faculty leaders, the Presiding Officer, the EPC Chair, and the Chair Elect of the Budget Committee. This is a time where we try to concentrate on what is coming up for the next year, and try to identify priorities and initiatives. The topics will be related to the President’s Five Themes and how they relate to our priorities over the past few years. Regarding the previous conversation about growth and size, it is incumbent on us to refine our approach to these pressures.

KOCH introduced Jackie Balzer, the new Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and noted that Dick Knight will be serving as Interim Dean of ECS.

KOCH noted that the other item of interest from the Board meeting last week, is the proposal for automatic admission to the OUS, as it relates to the development of the new high school graduation requirements. There obviously needs to be discussion of this.

KOCH concluded that he would be forwarding additional materials on initiatives around student retention, and around program planning apart from sustainability.

1. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

SMALLMAN presented the report for the committee and thanked the membership. The report is available on the committee web page at www.oit.pdx.edu (bottom of the page).


STEVENS presented the report for the council, and thanked the committee members for their contributions. She noted that added to five learning outcomes identified in the previous year, the committee added two more and voted in spring 2008 to endorse the seven. They will continue to work on outcomes and recommendations for how they will be assessed campus wide (Summary attached, and full report forwarded to Senate members via e-mail on October 16, 2008).

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of October 3-4 at SOU

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, October 6, 2008
CARTER presented the report for the IFS Senators (attached).

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:18.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 3, 2008
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Flower for Fallon, ______ for Fritzsche, Shearer for Jiao, L. Mercer, Messer, Murphy, Neal, Nissen, Pierce.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

p. 1 "Members of the 2008-09 Senate Present:" Richard Byler, Ex officio; Brennan (not Bennett) for Talbot; Barham was not present; Korbek is no longer with the university.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the agenda:

Chancellor’s Report
Changes in Senate/Committee representation since October 6, 2008: Kent Lall replaces James Morris and Juliette Stoering replaces Eru Korbek on Senate. Sukhwant Jhaj replaces Ann Fallon on the Committee on Committees. Ellen Bassett (CUPA-USP) replaces Judy Sobel on UCC; Becky Sanchez (SBA) is appointed to the Deadline Appeals Board; Scott Marshall (SBA) replaces Sully Taylor on the Graduate Council; and Barbara Brower (GEOG-CLAS) is appointed to EPC.

President’s Conversation

WIEWEL reported to the Senate after “G-1.” WIEWEL noted that the economic climate is challenging for the budget. As a result the request for bonds to build the Business School will not go forward in this biennium, but this is not critical, as we weren’t close to having the matching funds yet. We remain committed to this building. The Portland Sustainability Institute project goes forward, and it is very likely that it will be on or adjacent to the campus. On the operating side of the budget, the governor continues to be supportive and hopes to meet the essential budget. It is not clear how our request for all enrollment dollars will be received, and this doesn’t bode well for any of the other initiatives we were hoping for. Programmatically, we have started the PSU-PPS Task Force and we expect a report by Christmas. We also are working with community colleges in the area. OSU is talking about a School of Public Health that would be a joint venture, and we will be having interesting discussions.

Enrollment numbers are up to approximately 27,000, representing an increase in student credit hours of ~9.4%. These figures relate directly to campus planning, an item we discussed last month. We have engaged consultants to plan for predicted 30,000 student and/or 42,000 student scenarios. With the results of these exercises, we will be clearly be able to say that with the larger student body, we would need an entire extra campus.

WIEWEL concluded that he continues to be excited to be here and learns more every day. The quality of the work going on here, the enthusiasm of faculty and students, and the support of external constituencies speak to the insurmountable opportunities that we have here.

__________ thanked Wiewel, noting __________. Applause.

Chancellor’s Report

PERNSTEINER noted that for at least the next several months there would be budget uncertainty. The OUS system is currently successful and enrollment is up substantially. We are well on our way to achieving the board’s strategic vision of several years ago, to raise the education level of Oregonians to be successful and competitive in the 21st century. He thanked the assembly for their efforts in this regard. He noted that we did a good job without very much and was hoping to get us more, but we may have to continue with the current resource base. The major Board priority in July for the 2009-11 biennium was student success. We want to reach out to students who have not been served well in the past; we want to bring them in, help
them to succeed, and get degrees. The state has changed radically in the last 20 years and that demands that we involve students and family differently than before if we want students to be successful. See, for example, Dalton Miller-Jones’s committee activities around underserved students. Our request to the governor was to fund the essential budget level and to give us full funding for past and future enrollment growth.

PERNSTEINER noted that the November revenue forecast will reflect the overall economy and the referenda on the 4 November ballot, and will be less optimistic than the last. Despite this, we know we are under a moral and political obligation to improve the success of students. We will focus our attention on instruction and student services, but that may mean that we will have to deemphasize administration, public services, and other non-instructional areas. We may in fact have to begin to reinvent how we do our core business. Begin to think about how we will reinvent ourselves—about the kinds of expenditure reductions and revenue enhancements that might be possible if our focus is to improve student success. If this country is to be successful, it must reinvent education and reinvest in education. Regarding the latter, the message that we have been providing the campaigns in the last few weeks, is that if we can’t do it with state money we need to do it with both state and federal money.

RUTH asked if this discussion included the student loan situation. PERNSTEINER stated that some of that $700 million needs to be used to free up the liquidity in the student loan market. On a side note, we will try to keep tuition increases as low as we can. _______ asked if by reinventing, one of the areas being considered is the use of technology for delivery. PERSTEINER stated that initiatives would be contingent on student success. COLLIER stated that he likes the idea of reinventing the way we do business, however, it may also be that we are doing many things right now and its more a matter of the federal government reversing the disinvestments of the 1980’s than reinventing ourselves. PERNSTEINER stated that they might be more willing to invest in different approaches that work for the long term. For the short term, we need massive increases in student aid and capital investment. The governor will do the best by us as he can with the next legislature, because he sees us as key to the future of the state. The governor may also invest as much as he can in capital funds as a job-generating thing. Because many agencies will also be competing for funds, we will need as much help as we can get from faculty and students to beat the drum for more higher ed funding. We will find the way to improve student success but we need the legislature’s help to make it happen.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. New Business

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

SHEBLE/GOUGH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular consent agenda, as listed in “E-1.”
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. EPC Proposal Regarding Departments in the School of Education

BOWMAN/LIVNEH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal to rename departments in the School of Education, as listed in “E-2.”

RUETER asked for a clarification of the process. BOWMAN noted that the proposal was forwarded from the department to the dean and the Provost forwarded it to the Educational Policy Committee; it is a request for a structural change. KOCH added that it doesn’t have to go to the State Board. LAFFERIERE asked BOWMAN stated that they already have separate prefixes. LIVNEH clarified in detail the request for the change.

HINES asked for a clarification of budget ramifications. BOWMAN noted that budgets are already separate; the only item is a slight increase in remuneration of the new second chair.

BLEILER asked for a clarification about the process of approving such a change. KOCH noted that he observed the shared governance process by forwarding this to the Senate.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

F. Question Period

None.

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

Provost’s Report

KOCH reminded that the first RFP is out with respect to the Miller Foundation Gift for Sustainability, and there will be another in spring. Enrollment fall term is up to almost 27,000.

1. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation

FLOWER presented the report for the committee (attached). Focus groups were conducted over the summer, under the direction of Bob Liebman, and a survey will be distributed shortly to all faculty senate-eligible employees, around 1100 people. Please note the link in the Agenda that will take readers to literature surveys regarding the question of faculty participation.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.
Minutes:
Faculty Senate Meeting, December 1, 2008

Presiding Officer:
Robert Mercer

Secretary:
Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present:

Alternates Present:
Bauch for Accetta, Zelick for Bodegom, Stevens for Chaille, Hatfield for Gough, Blekic for Ingersoll, Pejcinovic for Jiao, Shearer for Khalil, Thomas for Webb.

Members Absent:

Ex-officio Members Present:

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:13. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
    Thomas Keller was in attendance.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in the day’s agenda: Mack will report for Koch.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since November 3, 2008:
replaces Tinkler, LAS, and Rob Bertini replaces Prasad, ESC on the Faculty Development Committee.

FLOWER reminded that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation and Governance has a survey in progress. Thus far, approximately 25% of faculty have responded. The survey concludes on December 14.

President’s Discussion

WIEWEL commenced by noting our pleasant surprise at the quantity of press coverage of his Thanksgiving Dinner hosted for international students. He also noted that PSU is featured in Portland Monthly magazine in an article on higher education. He thanked University Relations. WIEWEL noted that faculty member Lisa Zurk has secured a grant of $450,000 from the Murdock Foundation, one of the largest ever awarded to a single faculty member. WIEWEL noted an error in the recent Vanguard article about giving to the university, stating that the correct figure is $21 Million. WIEWEL congratulated six PSU Fulbright recipients, Michael Clark, Stephanie Farquhar, John Gallup, Christina Hulbe, Pui Tak Leung, and James Morris. He also congratulated the Women’s Volleyball Team for going to the NCAA tournament next week.

WIEWEL discussed the Governor’s recommended 2009-11 higher education budget, released today. He prefaced his remarks by noting that the cut required of PSU for this year is approximately $2.2 Million. We haven’t decided exactly how to take the cut, but it will be probably come from some mixture of central and unit reserves. He continued, subsequent revenue forecasts may effect the 2009-11 recommendations, however, higher education currently comes out better than any other state agency. The higher education budget is about 2.7% higher than the current budget, although it is slightly lower than the Essential Budget Level. A large component is affordability, and the budget assumes an increase in tuition of 3.6% and a large increase, 54%, in Oregon Opportunity Grants. The budget is based on the expectation that the OUS will continue to increase enrollment. Regarding capital construction, considerable funds have been proposed for deferred maintenance and capital construction. Noteworthy for us are proposed funds for a life science complex, an Oregon Center for Sustainability, a south waterfront corporate complex for technology, and the PSU steam loop. This proposal is separate from proposals made to the federal transition team that may be successful. There are also proposals for research, for example ONAME. Regarding salaries, funding is proposed for classified step increases (only).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, December 3, 2008
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HARMON/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE curricular recommendations of the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal from ARC to Drop Freshman Transfer Transition Requirement

HICKEY presented the proposal for the committee and took questions.

JHAJ/RUTH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal.

WALTON asked for a clarification, if the change was retroactive. HICKEY stated it is, although the course will be offered for the remainder of this academic year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

MACK noted that the Provost has extended an invitation to make nominations for the honorary degree.

1. Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report

BOWMAN presented the report for the committee adding that Brower has joined the committee since the start of the year.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report

JACOB presented the report for the committee and took questions.

TALBOTT asked what is the six-year graduation rate nationally. JACOB yielded to Lockwood who stated it is 46%, noting that PSU’s is slightly higher than the national.
The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Institutional Assessment Council Report

SMALLMAN, STEVENS AND WOLLNER presented the report for the council. SMALLMAN introduced the committee noting that if we have campus-wide learning outcomes in place, we will have come a long way towards satisfying the concerns of the accrediting body.

Note: recording damaged from this point.

Last week PSU was selected as a beta campus in the LEAP program, and will be receiving funds for initiatives in assessment. STEVENS described the process. WOLLNER reviewed answers to frequently asked questions, for example, there is still time to change the content. SMALLMAN stated that at the system level, the learning outcomes project is being directed by Elizabeth Zinsner, and WOLLNER noted that PSU is ahead of most of the system institutions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

MERCER declared a committee of the whole and informal discussion followed regarding the Assessment Council Report. MERCER declared the committee of the whole ended.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:54.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 5, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Smith for Cress, Flower for Fallon.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Cress and Keller were present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since 1 December 2008:

Changes in the day’s agenda:
   E.1.b. GC/UCC Curricular Proposals, is deleted as it is incorrect.
   E.4. has been withdrawn by the Steering Committee.
   E.1.a.1. has been removed from E.1. Curricular Consent Agenda, and placed on the regular agenda, after E.1.
President’s Report

WIEWEL greeted the assembly with best wishes for the New Year. He noted that the university is working to help the classified employees with work issues related to the weather closures. He reminded that in the offering we have a week of celebration to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, including a visit by Ambassador Andrew Young, an exhibit in Millar Library of Avel Gordly’s papers, musical performances, films and a panel discussion.

WIEWEL noted that Dr. David Perry, Dir. of the Great Cities Institute and Assoc. Chancellor for Great Cities Programs at U.Ill., Chicago, will be visiting the campus later this week. Dr. Perry has been invited as a consultant to meet with the campus and our community partners to review our community engagement practices, and investigate how we might garner greater visibility and recognition for these activities. WIEWEL noted that he would be participating in the Think Out Loud taping in SMSU ballroom.

WIEWEL discussed the current budget situation. The budget cut we have already taken, for $1.6 Million, was handled primarily by using reserve from the President’s Office, utilities, general reserves, and only about $250,000 from academic reserves. We will not be surprised to see further cuts in this biennium; however, we think that they will also on the whole be taken from reserves. WIEWEL continued, the next biennium would be the larger challenge. We are wrapping up a document that will lay out a proposed process for discussions, which will be very open and inclusive. Principles to guide us through the process will elaborate on principles developed last year: we will make budget decisions as much as possible based on strategic priorities; we will observe the Governor’s order to protect instruction, student services, and facilities management; and, as much as I am personally able, we will protect our ability, to generate externally funded research and our research infrastructure. We may have to rethink other activities we are engaged in, however meritorious, based on their costs-benefit ratio. WIEWEL stressed that he believes in letting managers manage to their budget, as discourages such things as hiring freezes, freezing travel, etc., within reason of course. Additionally, if cuts become serious, they will not be across the board.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda Process

PALMITER/LAFFERRIERE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the permanent adoption of the Curricular Consent Agenda, listed in “D-1.”

RUETER stated that he disagrees with the notion of including items on a consent agenda such as the Ph.D. in Physics proposal. BROWER noted she disliked the consent agenda because it dispatches items too quickly. TALBOTT spoke in favor of the motion, stating she liked not spending time on details. BROWN clarified that the motion is intended only for curricular proposals, new and/or changed.
SHUSTERMANN expressed worry that the senate could be overlooking important considerations. After being on the Senate for only two months, she is not yet sure it is working. Could we adopt a happy medium between the two extremes? RUETER stated he approves and trusts the committees, noting that they investigate the material in much greater depth. LAFFERIERRE

CARTER noted he is very much in favor of the proposal, noting that even the OSBHE approves Ph.D. programs in this manner. He urged that it was proposed as part of the effort to use the Senate’s time better during the second half of the year.

BROWN/AMES MOVED THE MOTION BE AMENDED, “to exclude approval of new programs from the Consent Agenda.”

FRITZSCHE stated it is hard to know what is non-controversial. HICKEY noted some of these issues may be addressed with the pending new Senate website and the new curricular website.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

HARMON reminded that the committees would be required to provide separate memos for the excluded items.

THE MOTION TO AMEND was approved by 43 in favor, 19 against and 6 abstentions.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PERMANENT ADOPTION OF THE CURRICULAR CONSENT AGENDA, AS AMENDED, was approved by 59 in favor and 2 against.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BODEGOM/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1” with the exception of “E.1.a.1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

1.a.1. Graduate Council Proposal for the Ph.D. in Applied Physics

RUETER/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Ph.D. in Applied Physics as listed in E.1.a.1.
asked what job prospects are for a Ph.D. in Physics. BODEGOM noted that the unemployment rate is on the order of 2%. BLEILER asked for a clarification on the committee membership described in the summary. BODEGOM noted that the Physics Department is required to abide by Graduate Studies policy. LAFFERRIERE asked a question about the program of study not addressed in the summary.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council Recommendation for Time Limits for Doctoral Programs

BODEGOM/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed time limits for doctoral programs, as specified in E-2.”

BURNS noted this proposal is long overdue and he strongly supports it.

MURPHY queried if this timeline was still very lenient. BEYLER stated, yes. MURPHY noted that productivity is reflected in lagging projects, therefore a gentle push is a good idea.

CARTER noted we need a more holistic approach to what is causing students to take too long to finish.

BLEILER yielded to Assoc. V.P. for Graduate Studies Ostlund. OSTLUND noted that there is currently no timeline mechanism for the doctoral programs other than advancement to candidacy, and this questions the credibility of the institution.

FRITZSCHE stated he is sympathetic to the position of the university, but he is also sympathetic to the type of student who attends PSU and the range of demands on their time.

NEAL urged that the Graduate office include clear notation that some programs may have shorter limits.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4)

LIVNEH/IAHJ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE proposed Amendment, as cited in “E-3.”

asked about the timelines involved. LIVNEH stated the intent is to have a parallel process with the curricular approval.

BODEGOM asked for a clarification as to the extent that program changes trigger a budget reviews. LIVNEH stated that an amendment to the proposal might be
needed here. BROWN noted that the proposal doesn’t indicate that the Budget Committee approves the proposals, in any case.

WIEWEL spoke in favor of the proposal.

HINES/BLEILER MOVED TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL, adding to item 3) “and report this to the Senate.”

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

JHAJ ______. BURNS suggested that the proposers consider setting a budget limit on the trigger to review a change. BOWMAN suggested adding other criteria unrelated to dollar figures. SHUSTERMAN noted that perhaps EPC reviews should have been considered in this change as well.

BLEILER/HICKEY MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost Report

KOCH reported after G.2. He related that 99 proposals totaling $7.3 Million were submitted for $1.4 Million available in Miller sustainability grants. Most of the proposals received strong reviews from the external reviewers. All but one school and nine departments in class were represented by proposals. A majority of the 19 awards were made to Engineering and Computer Sciences, based on the ability of the proposal to mobilize matching funds. These include unfunded bonded capacity for the engineering building, and to the extent that we bring external funds to those activities, there is a dollar for dollar match by the state. Jennifer Allen has begun to identify groups of faculty with similar proposals for the next round. We also have to evaluate the process to date. We have posted faculty position openings to be supported by the Miller funding, and we are searching for a permanent director. For questions, contact Jennifer Allen.

1. Institutional Assessment Council Report (continued)

STEVENS, RECTENWALD, and SMALLMAN presented additional information about Assessment that had been requested at the last Senate meeting, including handouts (attached) listing, 1) the campus wide learning objectives at OUS system campuses, and 2) a list of comparator universities having campus-wide learning objectives. SMALLMAN noted that our proposal is fairly consonant with other
OUS institutions. SMALLMAN continued, if we assert that we have seven
campus wide learning outcomes, we are not saying that every department
addresses them all; this is an institution-wide only commitment. He added that
Student Affairs would be a part of this conversation as well. He also added that
this is only a framework and can’t dictate departmental assessment activities.
Departments need the flexibility to serve their fields. RECTENWALD previewed
the committee website which will provide the committee history, literature
reviews, examples, and samples of best practices and guidelines. STEVENS
reminded that assessment needs to be flexible and nuanced across the university
to reflect our diversity, and she displayed examples of recent posters.

MERCER moved the assembly to a committee of the whole for several minutes
(the following remarks are summary only). JHAJ expressed his continue concern
that four of the seven goals are university studies goals, implying that University
Studies will carry the load on this project. MURPHY stated he supported JHAJ’s
remarks, noting that every campus except PSU indicates support of disciplinary
specific outcomes. He continued that we need to work on refining the definitions
of the outcomes. HINES reminded that the committee was going to supply a
matrix of how this would look from bottom to top, because faculty don’t
understand it, and faculty also need more detail to assure that there will not be
unforeseen budgetary repercussions. SHUSTERMAN noted she pledged to
provide the information, but forgot the file in her office.__________ asked that
there also be more sessions around the holistic view of learning outcomes. JHAJ
reiterated that he didn’t understand why we are resistant to including language
such as that cited in the LEAP document, to insure the explicit recognition of the
department contributions. LAFFERRIERE _____________. MERCER ended
the committee of the whole.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 5/6 December at PSU

Senators were directed to find the minutes of the meeting posted at
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.htm

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:10.
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, February 2, 2009

Presiding Officer:
Robert Mercer

Secretary:
Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present:

Alternates Present:

Members Absent:

Ex-officio Members Present:

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following correction: COLLIER was present at the January 5, 2009 Meeting.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to Agenda

Added D.1. Motion to take off the table item E.3 from the January 5, 2009 PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, Proposal to Amend the Constitution, IV., 4., 4) Budget Committee (as amended on January 5, 2009)

Added G.4. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation

Deleted G. 3 Preview of the PSU Portfolio

Changed E-2 The Academic Requirements Committee will substitute a motion with changes from their memorandum in the packet.
Changed G-2 There will be a report, but no proposal was mailed.

Announcements
Greg Jacob announced that proposed changes in the writing requirement would be submitted by the Writing Committee to the Academic Requirements Committee. It will involve 8 credits at the lower division and 4 credits at the upper division level.

Changes to Senate and Committee memberships since January 5, 2009
Jeff Fletcher replaced Candyce Reynolds on the Graduate Council. Marie Lewandowski, XS is appointed to the Faculty Development Committee.

President’s Conversation
WIEWEL noted that the turnout for the Senate meeting was very impressive. He continued, that his Inauguration is scheduled for May 1. It is intended to be modest but still recognize the stature of the institution.

WIEWEL noted that in his two visits to Salem, he has experienced very positive receptions from legislators regarding PSU. He continued that he is encouraged by the stimulus package proposals for the OUS and for PSU. It is still important to recognize that cutbacks may be inevitable. Colleges and schools have already been asked to reduce budgets by 3% and administrative units have been asked to reduce budgets 5% for 2008-09. For the 2009-11 biennium, units are being asked to plan for larger cutbacks, 12.5% for administrative units and 7.5%. These figures are based on the possibility of the state being required to take a 20% cut, requiring the campus to take approximately a 10% cut. We are in the process of forming a joint task force to consult with this process. Regarding the Oregon Opportunity Grant, we are giving the students starting this term 75% of what they would have received.

WIEWEL noted that we continue to move forward despite the difficult economic climate. The next round of sustainability RFPs will be announced shortly, and the engineering Dean’s search is moving to the next stage. We will continue to have fun developing new partnerships with corporations in the city.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. LIVNEH/JHAJ MOVED TO TAKE OFF THE TABLE item “E.3.” from the meeting of January 5, 2009, Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, IV., 4), 4, l.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

LIVNEH/JHAJ MOVED the proposal (amended on January 5, 2009) be amended as follows:

1) Renumber #4) through #7) to #5) through #8).
2) Insert: "#4) to read Analyze budgetary implications of the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities through submission of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the unit."
BLEILER noted that the old part #3) and the new part #4) appear redundant. BOWMAN noted that the new #4) is from the language in the charge of the Educational Policy Committee, and differentiates curricular as opposed to structural change. BLEILER queried if part #3) and part #4) were ambiguous. LIVNEH noted that the language is taken directly from the new OUS forms for program proposals.

COLLIER/HICKEY MOVED THE MOTION BE AMENDED, to insert “review of a” before “business plan.”

KOCH noted that the presumption that new programs have no cost is a detriment to the institution as a whole. The notion of the business plan, for lack of a better term, is to analyze not just the cost of new programs, but also the revenue they generate, to try to understand whether there are redistributions in the unit in question or in the institution in general. Therefore, financial as well as academic components are analyzed in the long-term interest of faculty and the administration.

THE AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LUCKETT noted that as departments don’t have control of budgets, he doesn’t understand how items #3) and #4) would work. Lacking the expertise, the practical effect will be to make all program change impossible.

TOLMACH asked for a clarification on the issue of what dollar figure should trigger a review. LIVNEH stated the Budget Committee could not come up with a hard and fast figure as it might vary considerably according to the issue at hand. JHAJ added that there is no figure at the OUS level either.

CABELLY/HICKEY MOVED THE MOTION BE AMENDED, to insert at the end of part #4), “and report to the Senate.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

THE MOTION TO AMEND “E-3” from the PSU Faculty Senate meeting of January 5, 2009, as amended at that meeting, PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer noted the amendment would be forwarded to the Advisory Council for the review specified by the Constitution, and will be returned to the March Senate meeting for debate and vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HICKEY/__________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE CURRICULAR CONSENT AGENDA as detailed in “E.1.”
THE MOTION PASSED BY unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal for Changes in Admissions Requirements (2010-11)

HICKEY introduced the proposal for the Academic Requirements Committee, noting that the following replaces the memorandum published as “E.2.” in the Agenda:

The ARC wishes to bring 3 changes to current admissions requirements for undergraduate students to the Faculty Senate for its consideration in February in order to allow for the possibility that the changes might be approved for 2010-2011 academic year. At its meeting on January 26 (when an additional change regarding the math admission requirement was withdrawn), ARC reached consensus and wishes to recommend these changes:

1. Entering transfer students with 30 or more credit hours will be required to have taken one writing course beginning with Writing 121 or its equivalent with a grade of C- or above.

2. Freshmen students who have met all subject requirements but whose entry GPA is lower than 3.0 will no longer be admitted alternatively on the sole basis of minimum 1000 SAT (Math+Critical Reading) or 21 ACT scores.

3. For admission to PSU the minimum overall average score for the Five Subtests on the GED examination will become 580.*

*Current standard is 460; all other OUS institutions require 510 or above. See attachment.

HICKEY/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the above recommended changes #1) through #3) in the PSU Admission requirement.

HOFFMAN noted that item #2) is intended to align PSU with peer institutions.

FARR asked if there is any analysis of how this would effect enrollment. HOFFMAN noted regarding item #2), that on average 50-150 students enter on the alternative path, and a few might not be admissible any longer unless they were to come in through the faculty review process. Some might meet the matrix standard, but analysis is not complete on this. She continued, regarding item #1), that students would enter with the same level of writing as upper division peers.

BUDDRESS asked why we don’t want to require a grade higher than C- for #1).

HOFFMAN noted that this is the same minimum as our OUS peers. CABELLY asked if the Senate couldn’t request the Academic Requirements Committee to raise the minimum, irrespective of our peers. ALLEN urged that we consider what the minimum grade is for a native PSU Freshman and make that consistent with what we request of transfer students.

BROWER asked _______ regarding retention versus access. HOFFMAN responded that this should have very little impact on access. It may actually advantage underrepresented populations as that population may have lower scores on standardized test.
JHAJ reminded that if we focus only on access and not on success, we are not adequately serving our admitted students.

COLLIER noted he supported Hoffman's remarks and that this change is more supportive of students from underrepresented populations.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

MERCER relinquished the gavel to Presiding Officer Pro Tem Hines in order to present item. E.3. for the Senate Steering Committee and Undergraduate Studies.

3. Proposal to Review Honors Program and Honors-track Programs

MERCER presented the proposal (attached) in “E.3.” for the Steering Committee.

MERCER/REESE MOVED “The Faculty Senate requests that the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Advisory Council, appoint an ad hoc committee to examine University-wide resources and services for and practices in regard to high-achieving undergraduate students. The committee should convene by 6 March and give a preliminary report to the Senate at the June meeting; it should prepare a final report for the December 2009 Senate meeting.”

HICKEY asked if the committee would be provided with resources to carry out this review. SMALLMAN stated, yes.

LUCKETT asked what this review is for. MERCER stated that this is consistent with reviews being called for in almost every other area with regard to admission, retention and graduation rates.

JHAJ spoke in support of his colleagues in the Honors program, noting the scrutiny under which University Studies has been placed. It is hoped that the focus of the committee would be on the students and the ways in which to advocate for the program.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, February 2, 2009
1. **Academic Affairs Report on UNST Staffing Plan**

   SMALLMAN presented the report.

   The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. **Institutional Assessment Council Report**

   STEVENS presented an interim report, noting the campuswide student learning outcome that has been added, “Disciplinary and/or Professional Expertise.” She noted that the committee plans to bring a formal motion at the March, 2009 Senate meeting. The committee’s website, http://www.iac.pdx.edu/, is live and a comment line will be live within the week.

   The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation**

   FLOWER presented the report for the committee (attached).

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 2, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2008, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MERCER announced that the Steering Committee convened a joint meeting with several senate committees prior to the Senate meeting to discuss the Senate role in the budget reduction process especially with respect to summer responsibilities. The committee will provide the full Senate with a resolution next month and details at the May meeting regarding the summer plans. Senators are requested to forward comment in the meantime.
MERCER called for requests to remove items from the Curricular Consent Agenda. 
MUSSEY requested E.1.b.3. be removed.

President’s Report

WIEWEL discussed the budget. The reduction required of PSU for 2008-09 is about $7.9 Million. Final cuts range from 6% from the President’s Office, to 2.5% from LAS, to 1.5% from FPA, and other units have cuts of somewhere in between. The long-term fiscal strategies committee membership will be announced later this week. While the Budget Committee will work on budget recommendations, this committee will organize the process for soliciting proposals and do some of the initial vetting. Related to this has been a discussion about using furloughs for costs savings, although it is still unclear how the Governor’s charge will relate to the OUS. The highest-level managers will probably take the mandated four days, but it is unclear how days would be taken, etc. In the next biennium, it is highly likely that everybody will be assessed furloughs of some kind. Units have been directed to plan cuts for 2010-11, from 7.5% for academic units, to 12.5% for administrative units. We continue to hope that our actual cuts will not be quite as high and we can continue to be strategic. We will need to consult on these matters throughout the summer. The state stimulus package brought PSU $29. Million for the campus steam loop, SBII and SB remodeling, moving LAS to Cramer Hall, remodeling NH for new classrooms, etc.

In other matters, Wiewel appointed a committee to investigate the future of the wrestling program, and it will deliver a final report this week. The OSBHE board meeting is this week, and they are engaged in far reaching discussions about collaborations, efficiencies, common admissions application, the role of the regional campuses, etc. The interviews for the sustainability director position are in progress, and the engineering dean interviews will begin this week. The finalist for the UO president was announced today, Dr. Richard Lariviere From U Kansas. On Monday, PSU hosts a sold-out free lecture by Dr. Tom Friedman of the NY Times.

PSU Day, sponsored by PSU Advocates, is in Salem on March 12. The Provost’s Office next RFP is imminent. Congratulations to Veronica Dujon for the Alumni Association’s annual faculty award. Lastly, the omnibus bill on the Presidents’ desk contains an earmark for SB II for $330,000.

RUTH expressed her appreciation for the recent announcement establishing the long-term fiscal strategies committee, but expressed concern with respect to the comment in the memorandum regarding having to reevaluate models of traditional universities. She continued, that the traditional part of PSU works quite well, but we end up subsidizing the professional schools. She noted she is worried about CLAS in the general outlook for the future of the PSU economy, because it seems like for every dollar invested in CLAS, we make $1.87, but we end up subsidizing engineering, and differential tuition remains in units so it doesn’t come back to feed us. RUTH concluded, she is worried about sufficient CLAS representation on that committee as well as in the group that will actually be making the decisions. WIEWEL noted that CLAS will be very well represented, and that the language “traditional university model” is not intended to apply to one part of the operation, as Ruth has read it. Also, the decisions will be made through the shared governance process. There will be a
long period of discussion for all the options. The current budget model and the
distribution of resources between the schools and colleges is something that will be
discussable. The resources are a result of history and politics over time, rather than
pure rationality, however, changing the principles over time is possible. It is not
possible this year, but next fall we plan to initiate a process of rethinking the logic of
the budget and its allocation.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, IV., 4.1) Budget Committee

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

TALBOTT/LIVNEH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricular Consent
Agenda, as listed in “E.1.” with the exception of “E.1.b.3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

1.b.3. New Course Proposal: PS 471/571 Gender & Politics: A Comparative
Perspective (4)

AMES/MUSSEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.b.3.”

MUSSEY asked if Women and Politics will continue to be offered, or is it a
replacement for that course. ______ responded that this is a new course.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. UCC Program Proposal for the Minor in Music History

HANSEN/PATTON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Minor, as listed in
“E.2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV., 4.4) Teacher Education
Committee

PALMITER/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed
amendment, as listed in “E.3.”

BROWN recommended that the committee review the several typographical
errors.
PALMITER/BODEGOM MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Institutional Assessment Council Proposal for Campuswide Student Learning Objectives

BROWN/FARR MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as described in “E.4.”

KOCH spoke in favor of the motion. He noted that this project has been in the works for several years, and thanked those who have been involved, in particular the Institutional Assessment Council. This proposal reflects the collective faculty commitment to undergraduate education at PSU. The objective was to provide a relatively succinct statement of learning expectations for undergraduate students. The justifications include the research data on student success, and communicating externally what we expect of our undergraduates. We also want our learning outcomes to reflect what is unique about PSU, our institutional values, and in particular the opportunities that students have in attending the university in this particular place with our particular approach to education. Lastly, it didn’t go unnoticed that our accreditors indicated that we lacked university wide outcomes to attach and map the programmatic outcomes to. KOCH concluded that these outcomes are likely to evolve over time, but that this is a good place to begin articulating our expectations for undergraduate students.

HINES commented on certain grammar in the document.

RUETER asked for a clarification on the lines of authority with respect to who controls co-curricular activities, particularly as there are issues about the fact that they bypass the Senate committee structures. KOCH noted that Student Affairs organizes students in extracurricular activities around leadership, resident experiences, etc. in alignment with campuswide learning objectives that the faculty determine.

MURPHY commented on the tenor of these outcomes, that they declare students “will” achieve them, and as a parent of two and with twenty-three years of teaching experience, he knows this not to be true. There isn’t any way to dictate that students will do this. RUTH concurred, and added that using this language creates unnecessary resistance.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE queried if there is information on how we plan to measure these outcomes. KOCH replied that chairs recently mapped their program curriculum onto these outcomes, which is the first step. With that, we can see where the holes are between one level and another, and take next steps. The next project will be to see how successful we are. The Assessment Council will begin to develop rubrics for that.
COLLIER noted he wanted to return to the issue of “will” and recommend it be changed to “provide opportunity.” He continued, that students’ capacity and motivation are beyond our ability to achieve, and queried if we are doing the job of the modern university if we demand. It sets us up for liability regarding for example, graduating students who have not been successful.

JHAJ thanked the council for receiving input and adding the first outcome.

TALBOTT supported the motion, stating she liked language. She noted we should be sued if students graduate and can’t read. We aren’t saying every student will be excellent at all things. FARR concurred, noting that these are consistent with the language we use in course syllabi.

WAMSER reminded that if these outcomes were intended for graduate programs there would be no problem. The problem with the undergraduate degree is control. The issue comes back to who will have control over assessment.

LUCKETT suggested that outcomes be replaced with “goals.”

COLLIER reiterated that every department couldn’t do all these, while this language is so concrete that he has concerns about what we are committing ourselves to. If we don’t have the control of the graduate program and the money for assessment of this rigor isn’t there, why should we paint ourselves into a corner.

__________ queried, are people concerned about the language of the outcomes or the assessment.

MURPHY noted the Collier suggestion was excellent. Additionally, it should be noted that, for example, we absolutely couldn’t control social responsibility.

BODEGOM noted he supported substituting outcomes with goals.

STEVENS reminded that there are different components of the outcomes, some having to do with knowledge of and others having to do with holding the values. Whether the students acquire the latter, they start with the former.

BROWN noted that we need to identify the output measures not the input measures.

WOLLNER stated that we need to decide two things, do we want outcomes and do we want these. A vote would decide that. JHAJ concurred, noting that it is not the place of this body to throw out all the work that the committee has done.

_________/_________ MOVED TO CALL THE QUESTION.

THE MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION PASSED by 44 in favor, 32 opposed.
THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSAL AS LISTED IN "E-4" PASSED by a vote of 47 in favor, 23 opposed, 5 abstentions.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

There was no Provosts Report.

1. Educational Policies Committee

BOWMAN presented the report, in "G.1." for the committee.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report

WALTON reported for the committee, noting that 79 proposals have been submitted totaling $782,000 in requests.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board

JACOB presented the report, in "G.3." for the committee.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting of Feb. 6/7 at OSU

MERCER noted that Carter had to leave the meeting, and directed Senators to the IFS webpage for information. The minutes are attached herein.

The presiding officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Preview of the PSU Portfolio

MERCER introduced/yielded to Ellen Weeks, OIT, who did a short presentation on the Faculty Portfolio page before G.1.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Cress and Webb were in attendance for the March faculty senate meeting.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda: E-8 Proposal for Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Process/Criteria for Program Review.

Removed from the Curricular Consent Agenda: E.1.a.1.
Changes in Senate and Committee representation since March 2, 2009: Darrell Brown is appointed interim chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Linda George replaces Heejun Chang on the Academic Requirements Committee; Tugrul Daim replaces Linda George on the Publications Board.

Flower reminded the Senate that the culminating work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation in Governance includes three events in the next several weeks. Details are available at their website.

President's Remarks

WIEWEL noted that with respect to the budget situation, that tomorrow the legislature will release data on the effects of a 30% budget cut. Although we don’t anticipate a 30% cut, we do anticipate a 20% cut, and tuition increases that will be in the double digits for both years of the biennium. The results for PSU will be significant, although not devastating.

WIEWEL presented the 2009 campus performance report (attached) and noted that it is also available on the Faculty Senate website: http://web.pdx.edu/~facusen/ under Documents. He noted that we hope to make improvements on two items in particular, our graduation rates, and our student-faculty ratio.

RUTH asked if data was available on the student-faculty ratio of all full-time faculty, not just tenure-related. WIEWEL stated yes. MacCORMACK asked, regarding proposals for tuition increase, _______________. WIEWEL stated that the governor’s proposed budget was below the essential budget level to begin with. Additionally, we must return 30% to financial aid. GEORGE asked what the target is for the six-year graduation rate. KETCHESON stated that there is none set, but our peers are at about 45%. WIEWEL stated that 45-50% is a reasonable number to strive for. He concluded he feels very good about the plans we have in place, but feels very worried, given the fiscal climate, about our ability to carry them out.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

The item was tabled.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOK/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1” with the exception of item E.1.a.1.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BODEGOM/GEORGE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE item “E.1.a.1.”
RUETER noted he disagreed with the title, specifically use of the word "environmental," and asked for the rationale. "GEORGE stated that it is the name of the textbook. WIEWEL noted he thought it was appropriate in the context of Urban Planning.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal for the Minor in Aging Services

CARTER/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in "E.2."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal for Concentration in Aging Services within the Health Studies Major

CARTER/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in "E.3."

noted that there is a typographical error in the proposal, regarding "PSY 311." HARMON noted the correction for UCC.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal for Certificate of Advanced Proficiency in Russian

RUETER/HICKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in "E.4."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Proposal by EPC for Approval of Programs, Centers, etc.

BOWMAN/GEORGE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in "E-5" with revisions to the flowchart as indicated on the overhead.

BOWMAN noted that this is intended to apply to any academic unit, and reviewed the details of the flowchart. He differentiated this activity from curricular programs which are the domain of graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees.

HANSEN asked if the current review process would disappear. FEYERHERM stated that the defect with this proposal chart, is that the only way to abolish a center is to ask the faculty involved to abolish itself. BOWMAN stated that there
is no complete documentation of the former process. HANSEN stated that he could provide it.

BOWMAN reminded that this document embraces all academic units, such as the library, etc., not just curricular programs.

FEYERHERM reiterated his previous remark. SMALLMAN stated he echoed Feyerherm's concern, noting that a 1-2 faculty unit could block the intention of the faculty as a whole.

FEYERHERM/HOOK MOVED that the first two boxes, top, left, be changed from diamonds to rectangles, permitting consultation and comment, but not veto.

MUSSEY noted her concern, as she is one of those people that fall in a small unit. WIEWEL noted that there is the assumption that the Provost will consult with Finance and Administration, amongst others, and this is not reflected in the current chart. BOWMAN noted that most if not all of those parties are represented on the Budget Committee and would be notices through the connection with the EPC.

MUSSEY reiterated her concern that this can facilitate the elimination of small units. This is especially problematic in a time such as this when there are budgetary pressures to cut.

HANSEN, and noted that this is very different from the old process, as the path for eliminating a program has been introduced. KOCH noted, yes, the elimination piece is new, however, we need something that is this specific because we need a process that is more transparent when we confront difficult decisions.

MUSSEY yielded to Gamburd. GAMBURD urged that there be a way to differentiate changes made for curricular as opposed to budgetary reasons. If reductions are being made because the university can't afford to run programs that it is running, then Article 22 of the Collective Bargaining Contract should be invoked.

proposed that creating and eliminating are two different activities, and this process can't handle both. RUTH stated, nonetheless, we don't have time for a more thoughtful process in this budgetary climate. The question for the larger group is how can shared governance be ensured.

BRODOWICZ queried if a hypothetical unit with one each of tenure-related, fixed-term, and adjunct faculty, were eliminated, where the tenure-related faculty would go.

RUETER spoke against the amendment, noting that we are assuming the faculty in the unit would object. The original proposal places the onus on the administration to make some accommodation for their approval, for example to
buy the tenure lines out. BROWN expressed his disagreement. RUETER noted that it is rational and fair, to buy out tenure, just as other’s are bought out by the university.

TOLMACH stated he echoed the remarks that elimination should be separated.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED (on the amendment).

HANSEN/BLEILER MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 45 in favor, 15 against, 9 abstentions.

6. Amendment to the Constitution, IV., 4)., 4. M. Educational Policy Committee

The proposal was removed from the agenda by the Presiding Officer.

7. Resolution for Shared Governance

HICKEY presented the resolution for the Steering Committee.

REESE/RUTH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE RESOLUTION as listed in “E-7, with the insertion of “the Steering Committee” between “and” and “may call.”

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

8. Resolution for an Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Process and Criteria for Program Review

RUTH/GOUGH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-8” as follows:

Resolved, That an ad hoc committee be created, composed of one member each from the Educational Policy, Budget, Academic Requirements, Undergraduate Curriculum and Senate Steering Committees, the Advisory and Graduate Councils, (to be chosen by the Committee on Committees), and administrators (to be chosen by the administration).

Additional Information: The administration recommends the following representatives: Carol Mack, academic administration and planning; Shawn Smallman, undergraduate studies and curriculum, Delys Ostlund, graduate studies; Kathi Ketcheson, data acquisition and analysis, Steve Harmon, staff support and knowledge of academic program processes. This group would begin meeting immediately and seek to develop a draft process and set of criteria for consideration no later than the June 2009 Faculty Senate meeting with an interim report in May.
KOCH noted that he approached the Steering Committee about this matter, as there is no process short of retrenchment, for eliminating degree programs or academic units. A regular process should look more like program review (which we have been trying to institute for at least fifteen years), and because of our unusual budgetary situation, we need to address this issue now. Retrenchment has some very significant outcomes, including the elimination of tenure-related faculty lines. There are ways short of retrenchment to address the curriculum, and we need to explore them. Although things are theoretical at the moment, there will no doubt be budget reductions after June. We need a transparent process, consultation, and a set of criteria for how programs are evaluated. Expensive programs have an impact on the collective, for example, so we need a process and a set of criteria to evaluate programs.

KOCH continued, a Board moratorium has been placed on new programs or program elimination until at least September. The Board is also examining low enrollment classes and programs, directed primarily at the regional campuses, but all campuses have been charged to draft an enrollment and class-size policy. Additionally, the Board has already specified that programs that generate less than five degrees will be subject to further review by the Board.

WALTON asked __________________. KOCH stated he hopes this will lead to a regularized process, in addition to the short-term issue.

RUTH stated she was in favor of adding an interim report in May. CABELLY stated he was against adding the extra workload in the short time window.

D. HANSEN yielded to Gamburd. GAMBURD urged that if budget is involved, then Article 22 be invoked. KOCH reiterated that the proposal is not about retrenchment. HICKEY reminded that the committee is only reviewing process, and the decision to invoke Article 22 is somewhere along that continuum. GELMON reminded that this is just a simple motion to form a short-term ad hoc committee, and we shouldn’t complicate it.

RUTH reiterated that this needs to be shared governance, not just feel like it. PARADIS spoke in favor of the motion, stating that presently there is nothing for units and roles such as the ones she occupies.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.
G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

The provost referenced his remarks with respect to item E.8.

1. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

The report was tabled.

2. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report

The report was tabled.

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of April 3 and 4 at Western Oregon University

The Presiding Officer accepted the report from IFS Senator Duncan Carter for the Senate (attached).

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:03.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:06 p.m. The minutes were tabled pending review of the recording with respect to item “E.5.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

“D-1” TABLED until the June senate meeting.

Report of the Academic Advising Council, tabled in April, will be presented today.

Nominations for Presiding Officer of the 2009-10 PSU Faculty Senate
GEORGE/REESE nominated Maude Hines (nominations remain open through the start of the June Senate meeting).

President’s Report

DESROCHER presented the report for the president, who was not in attendance. She reviewed the process for budgetary decisions regarding reductions as well as the normal budget process. To date, colleges and schools have proposed budget reduction scenarios and certain differential tuitions, tuition increases have been proposed, and a proposal for salary reduction is under development. Additionally, the ad hoc long-range investment team chaired by Dean Kaiser (LTIFS) has recommended an FTE or salary reduction. These activities will be merged into a comprehensive proposal to be forwarded this month to the Deans, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, and the President. There will be public hearings May 20 and 22.

_________ requested a clarification regarding salary reduction proposals. DESROCHERS noted that the Governor has already proposed a “work furlough” in other words, days taken without pay, to SEIU. If he mandates this across the agencies, campus discussions would commence with AAUP and AFT.

DESROCHERS briefly reviewed the plan to respond to the H1N1 (swine) flu. She noted in particular, that we are an urban campus and respond in that context. She concluded, there are no suspected cases at PSU. _________ asked if there is a plan for class delivery if the university were to be closed. DESROCHERS stated that the team is monitoring such issues.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

BROWN and BEYLER presented the items for the committees.

CARTER/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1” Curricular Consent Agenda.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, IV., 4), 4. h) Teacher Education Committee

MERCER reviewed the course of this proposal. He noted that after a proposal was moved several months ago, it was tabled indefinitely as subsequent to that motion, there were a number of changes proposed.
JACOB/DEVLETIAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as described in “E-2.”

BLEILER/______________ MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, IV., 4), 4. m) Educational Policy Committee (tabled 4/6/09)

TABLED, as this follows on item D-1, also tabled.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that the High Achieving Student Ad Hoc Committee had their first meeting last week; therefore we will be requesting an extension of the reporting date. The Draft Policy for Low Enrollment Classes has been developed and it will be circulated to departments and shared with AAUP. The Ph.D. in Applied Physics has received OUS Provost Council approval, but is now on hold due to the OUS Board freeze on new programs.

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

HICKEY presented the report for the committee, noting a few corrections. She reminded that there are two changes of particular note, the deletion of Transfer Transition, and the addition of WR 121 for transfer students.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Advisory Council Annual Report

WALTON presented the report for the committee (attached).

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a report and spokesperson.

4. Intercollegiate Athletics Board Annual Report
JACOB presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Library Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a spokesperson.

6. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a spokesperson.

7. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a report text.

8. Writing Committee Report

JACOB presented the report, tabled from April, for the committee. The full report will be posted on the Senate web page.

9. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

FORTMILLER reported, after G.7. He reminded that mandatory advising will go into effect in Fall 2010, and discussed some of the parameters of this change. He discussed principles and advising tenets (attached).

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:40 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 1 & 8, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present

Alternates Present: Zelick for Bodegom, Flower for Fallon, Ediger for Fountain, Bowman for Howard, Taylor for Meinhold, Groth for Pierce, Burgess for Stoering,


Members Present


NOTE: THERE IS NO RECORDING OF THE JUNE MEETING.

A. ROLL: JUNE 1, 2009


The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: April: Jost Lottes alternated for Neal. Charman and Sailor were present. April: p. 35 (item E.5.) ADD, after Para. 3: “THE AMENDMENT PASSED by 36 in favor, 16 against, and 15 abstentions.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Election of Officers for the 2009-10 PSU Faculty Senate:
   Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
   Presiding Officer Pro tem: Tom Luckett
   Steering Committee: Rob Daasch, Linda George, Brad Hansen, Juliette Stoering.

Having received no questions regarding the Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report of April 6, the Presiding Officer has accepted the report for the Senate.

A joint meeting of the Steering Committees is scheduled for 15 June at 3 p.m.

Correction to the Agenda
Document G-9 should be labeled “G-11, Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee.”

Document D-1 should be labeled document E-5 (from the May meeting).
Add to the Agenda

E.3. Proposal for Center for Women, Politics and Public Policy (handout)
E.4. Revisions to Research Faculty Promotion & Tenure Process (handout)

Removed from the Curricular Consent Agenda by Request


President’s Report

WIEWEL presented an update on the next budget, which consists of about $7 Million less per year (overhead in attachment).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Process for the Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units

(This item is properly numbered “E.5.”)

BLEILER/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE PROCESS as listed in “E.5,” with the friendly amendment to change footnote #2 adding at the end of sentence #1, “review and make recommendations.”

HANSEN stated he commends the effort, however, this process was designed for building programs. He queried how it would be used for elimination of a unit, given the questions it poses. He urged that a separate set of questions for program elimination be developed. RUETER stated he supported Hansen’s remarks, noting that establishment and elimination are two very different processes. HANSEN reiterated that the detail is very important, in that we are facing the strong possibility of cuts in the coming year.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED BY 38 in favor, 24 against, and 10 abstentions.

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. 4, 4., m) Educational Policy Committee

BOWMAN/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the amendment as listed in “D.2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. 4, 4., h) Teacher Education Committee

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

SHUSTERMAN/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E.1.” as listed with the exception of the Certificate in Revitalizing Endangered Indigenous Languages.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution of the PSU Faculty Art. 4, 4, g) Faculty Development Committee

WALTON/AMES MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE AMENDMENT as listed in “E.2.”

CARTER commended the committee for moving the dates.

As proscribed by the Constitution, after Advisory Council review, the amendment will be returned to the floor on October 5, 2009.

3. Proposal for Center for Women, Politics and Public Policy

BOWMAN/GELMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as listed in “E.3.” (attached)

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Revisions to Research Faculty Promotion & Tenure Process

KOROLOFF presented the proposal on 8 June after “E.1.c.” (attached)

BLEILER/HICKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed revisions, as listed in “E.4.”

GAMBURD requested that the incorporation language be reviewed for errors and MACK agreed.

THE MOTION PASSED BY MAJORITY VOICE VOTE.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Budget Committee
LIVNEH presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees

BRODOWICZ presented the report for the committee, on 8 June after “E.4.”

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

JAGODNIK presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Annual Report of the Educational Policy Committee

BOWMAN presented the report for the committee after “G.10.”

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

WALTON presented the report after E. 2.

CARTER commended the committee for moving the award dates.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Annual Report of the Graduate Council

BEYLER presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Annual Report of the University Studies Council

CRUZAN (E-DISTRIBUTION 5/25/09) presented the report on 8 June after “G.8.” (attached)

HINES noted that the schedule is not timely. CRUZAN responded that it could be revised. HINES questioned how her course could fit the proposed cluster scheme.

JHAI ______________________ SEPPALAINEN ______________________

GELMON requested clarification as to how the reorganization relates to Sophomore Inquiry. CRUZAN noted that the SINQ would be decoupled from the clusters.
The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

8. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee

RUBEN presented the report for the committee on 8 June after “G.2.”

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.


DAVIDOVA presented the report (SEE MAY 4, 2009 MAILING) for the committee, on 8 June after “G.15.”

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

DAVIDOVA/MURPHY MOVED (from the report):

WHEREAS, (1) The Library faculty and staff have demonstrated that they are capable of using reduced resources to achieve positive outcomes for the student population at Portland State University;
(2) There is an increasing emphasis on research at Portland State University to support faculty and to increase the quality of both graduate and undergraduate education;
(3) The collections and staff of the Library provide direct support to research at Portland State University; and
(4) Under our current system research overhead funds collected and justified on the basis of library costs are not necessarily allocated towards actual library expenses. The practice of allocating a fixed percentage of overhead funds towards library expenses is not uncommon in other research institutions, such as the Idaho State University.
WE REQUEST that all avenues of library support be fully considered and exploited in-so-far as they support the mission of the Library as a service institution. Particularly, we request that the University allocate a fixed percentage (3%) [In FY06 3% of grant overhead would have been $179 000.] of research-generated revenue (“F&A” or “overhead”) to support the Library.

FEYERHERM spoke against the motion, stating that research on this item was in progress. CARTER asked if and when this would be shared. Feyerherm stated it would be available in November.

HICKEY spoke in favor of the resolution stating that it sends a strong signal from faculty. RUETER stated he supported the purpose but queried if the Senate should proceed with this motion. D. BROWN stated he agreed with Rueter.

BIELVITZ yielded to Sarah Beasley, LIB., who spoke in favor of the motion. noted that at least the Senate should expect the requested report on Finance & Administration. BLEILER reminded the body that the motion is a request. JHAJ stated he felt conflicted about how to proceed.

THE MOTION WAS TABLED by majority voice vote.

10. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
LONEY presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

The meeting was concluded at 5:05 p.m.

THE MEETING RESUMED ON JUNE 8, 2009, including roll call and announcements:

Provosts Report

KOCH gave a brief report on the State Board meeting, and budget developments.

E. NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

1.c. Certificate in Revitalizing Endangered Indigenous Languages

AMES/CARTER MOVED THE SENATE APROVE the Certificate in Revitalizing Endangered Indigenous Languages as listed in “E.1.c.”

GARRISON yielded to Kim Brown, LING, who reminded that this certificate is for all, not just Native American, indigenous languages.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES (CONTINUED)

11. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee

KOGAN presented the report for the committee on 8 June after “G.14.”

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

12. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Assess Faculty Participation & Empowerment

FLOWER presented the report for the committee. (Executive Summary attached)

HICKEY thanked the committee for their work, on behalf of the Senate.

FLOWER/HICKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE PROPOSED MOTION:

Whereas, PSU has grown significantly since the last revision of its Constitution, and
Whereas, the 2005 Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance, and the 2008-09 Ad Hoc Committee to Assess Faculty Participation and Empowerment both recommended the formation of a Constitutional Amendment Committee,
We move that an ad hoc committee be formed to propose changes to the constitution that bring it more in line with our current composition and circumstances.
THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the Senate.

13. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee for Procedures for Program Review

OSTLUND presented the report for the committee (attached). She emphasized that the highlights in their recommendations are that: 1) there should be a permanent Senate committee for this purpose; 2) there should be a standing work schedule, as outlines; and, 3) that in the case of exigency or retrenchment, steps 1–5 of the proposed schedule be implemented at any time needed.


FEYERHERM/SMALLMAN presented the Pre-submission and Approval processes for new program proposals (attachments). FEYERHERM called attention to the Pre-submission Process, and noted that in addition, the Approval Process includes some revisions, including a requirement to consult with the Library, Information Technology and the Budget Office. He also noted that after Senate action takes place on the program proposal; the Provost consults with the university budget team to ensure that resources continue to be available to implement a program. He concluded with a reminder that after a program is approved by the university it is still subject to OSBHE approval.

LIVNEH requested that Academic Affairs consult the Senate Budget Committee for a clarification regarding the role of the Budget Committee.

15. Report of the Committee on Long Term Institutional Fiscal Strategies (LTIFS)

KAISER presented the report for the committee on 8 June after “G.7” noting that it is available at http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/ltifs-report–and–clustered–recommendations

16. Report of the IFS meeting of June 4/5 at OHSU

The report was tabled and senators were instructed to consult the minutes, available at http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of 8 June was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.