Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 3, 2005
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Balshem, Bleiler, Bulman, Fletcher, Grant, Hunter, Isaacson, Kapoor, Lall, Lawrence, Mathwick, Meekisho, Stoering, Thao, Wosley-George, Yachmenoff.


A. ROLL

The meeting was called to order at 1504. The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since June 6, 2005:

Faculty Senate: Tonantzin Oceguera replaces Dan Fortmiller, who is now Ex officio and therefore ineligible to serve, eff. Sept 20, 2005. Craig Wollner replaces Melody Rose.

Committee on Committees new members: Leonard Shapiro (ECS), Jon Mandaville (CLAS), Dee Thompson (AO), _________ (FPA).
Committees: Misty Hamideh has resigned from AAA. Jeff Gerwing has resigned from the Budget Committee.

CARTER thanked Senators again for his election. He noted that response to the Steering Committee survey soliciting the issues of importance to the Senate has been very good. Seventy-three people have responded to date, with the number one issue being salary, number two being the balance between fixed-term and tenure track faculty, and number three being growth-related issues, for example class size, space, scheduling, etc. CARTER noted he would resend the solicitation again in the coming week.

CARTER briefly reviewed Faculty Senate protocols.

CARTER noted, in accordance with normal governance procedures, President Bernstine approved actions of the PSU Faculty Senate meeting at the June 6/13, 2005 meeting.

CARTER recognized ANGELL who reminded Senators to take the Integrated Marketing Survey, and urged Senators to participate in faculty focus groups on 21 October. CARTER urged Senators to participate, noting the primary importance of faculty in shaping the university's public face.

President's Report

BERNSTINE welcomed the faculty back. He noted that, as he said at Convocation, there was a good effort to stop the disinvestment in higher education in the final Legislative budget, however the $4 Million increase in funding is offset by a $7 Million increase in expenses at Portland State. Final budget numbers will not be available until Fall 2005 enrollment is tallied. BERNSTINE noted he is aware that faculty are concerned about salaries and he is committed to ensuring that contract negotiations are concluded as quickly as possible. He yielded to Sherril Gelmon to discuss the Accreditation site visit.

GELMON discussed the Accreditation visit and urged faculty to review the Self-study and attend the open campus meeting for faculty during the site visit on 24 October (attachment). In response to a question, she noted that the “PSU Portfolio” report, is entirely electronic and she thanked Kathi Ketcheson and her staff for their fine work. Applause.

K. BROWN asked if the site visit would be cancelled if contract negotiations were not concluded. RHODES stated no, as the self-study is for the previous ten years, not including this year.

Provost's Report

KOCH welcomed the faculty and noted that he has been requested by the Presiding Officer to say a few remarks about what he wants to work on this year. He also has several announcements.
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KOCH noted he talked with people about the state of the institution after he started work this summer. Two issues that came to the fore were research administration and the need for improvement of the processes involved. He will be working with Vice Provost Feyerherm and Vice President Desrochers to improve the pre- and post-award processes.

Aside from the ongoing discussions about Extended Studies, there is a larger issue about whether and how to extend the PSU campus. We have an acute shortage of space. There are discussions in progress about offering PSU courses on the community college campuses in addition to Chemeketa. There are some newer efforts in that regard, with respect to offering graduate engineering programs in Washington County. Additionally, on-line instruction is a strategy for extending the campus.

KOCH noted he is very concerned about faculty salaries, and the balance between types of faculty previously mentioned today. He noted that the other major concern is around enrollment increases and how we can respond to that problem by addressing the mix of students. We are heading in the direction of no state support within a decade so we need to proceed to decide how we can change the model for funding the institution. And we all know we can’t improve what we are doing without resources.

KOCH announced he has formed a small ad hoc committee to review technology transfer and intellectual property development. The membership, selected for their specific expertise in these issues is as follows: Don McClave (chair), Dick Knight, (vice-chair), Melissa Appleyard, SBA, Steve Benight, CLAS, Dan Hammerstrom, ECS, Jim Houston, SBA. Dean Scott Dawson, SBA, Bill Hostetler, GSR, and Jon Clemens, Sharp Technology Ventures. Hopefully, another group will also be convened to review educational and instructional technology.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

F. NEW BUSINESS

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology

RHODES reported for the committee on their activities over the past year and distributed an abstract (attachment). He noted the web address of the committee is www.acait.pdx.edu.
2. Report (Interim) of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C. BROWN presented the report ("G-2") with committee member Ken Peterson, noting that in short the report discusses the committee’s summer activities, which include initial findings and a process outline. She noted the committee web address listed in the report, is in error, indicating that the "www" should not be included. She concluded, Fall term will be about gathering information and Winter term will be about deliberations and forwarding recommendations.

CARTER moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for no more than thirty minutes, to discuss the University Studies program.

CARTER called the meeting back to order and thanked the members for their participation in gathering input for the committee.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1628.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 7, 2005
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: J Smith for Becker, Collins for Hagge, Fountain for Johnson, Barton for Knights, Ott for Mandaville, Carlson for Padin, Toth for Shapiro, Magaldi for Tate, Paradis for Thompson.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 3, 2005, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 1503. The minutes were approved as published, after “D.2.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to the November 7, 2005 Agenda:

Item “E.1.” is deleted.

Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since October 3, 2005:

Walton Fosque has been elected to the Committee on Committees by the FPA caucus.
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Brad Hansen, FPA, has been appointed to the Educational Policies Committee.

Richard Wattenberg, FPA, has been appointed to the Budget Committee.

Sandy Wiscarson, ED, has resigned from the Educational Policies Committee.

Benefits Update - Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) spokesperson Bill Linden

With respect to retirement and PERS, the 2005 legislative session was uneventful; the bills that have resulted in various PERS lawsuits were passed in the previous session. The most recent decision in the Oregon Supreme Court was the City of Eugene case. Subsequently AOF filed another case, the “White” case, which is pending in Multnomah County Circuit Court and will probably take another two to three years before it is completely finished. Additionally, there is a case still alive in the Federal 9th Circuit Court, the “Henderson” case that is scheduled for a decision in a couple of years. There is one additional potential case that could be filed in Multnomah County.

The other retirement-related litigation had to do with the Optional Retirement Plan used by approximately 2700 faculty members in the OUS system. It was successful in restoring the same employer contribution rate as that for PERS, but we expect that in future biennia, there will be attempts to reverse this.

With respect to health benefits and PEBB, the AOF position is that faculty benefits have been diminished. There is authority under a bill passed in 2001 for the OUS to withdraw from PEBB and create our own health plan. Our Governor is not inclined to exercise this option, therefore OUS has been constrained to date.

CUMMINGS asked, with respect to the timing for placing money in the individual accounts, where the money is and who is making the interest on it in the interim. LINDEN remarked that this is probably a lawsuit waiting to happen. Some of the delay is understandable, but the time has really passed for a transition period to be complete.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE briefly discussed the points made at the Accreditation exit Interview. Generally, the team was quite positive. PSU received a number of commendations, including the general understanding of faculty and staff of the university’s mission, including our commitment to sustainability, our understanding of the need to diversify revenue streams, our efforts to wean ourself from economic dependency, and the University Studies program. There are also a number of recommendations that will appear in the report, for example, one related to hazardous waste. There will be some comments about our need to bolster our infrastructure as we continue to grow our research at such a dramatic rate. A draft of the report will probably be delivered in another week or so. There will be opportunities to comment on the report when it arrives. The commission will adopt its recommendations in January.
CARTER introduced the Provost’s budget report, noting that the recent faculty survey indicated that salaries were the most important issue. Therefore the Steering Committee decided that a discussion of long-term strategies for salary improvements would be in this year’s agenda, after contract negotiations are concluded. In the short term, we will undertake discussions of other budgetary issues. The Provost has been requested to speak to this issue first, after which, Vice President Cathy Dyck will speak and then Ray Johnson, Budget Committee Chair.

**Provost’s Report**

KOCH started with several announcements. Dean Robert Sylvester has decided to step down and Assoc. Vice Provost Barbara Sestak has been appointed interim dean, in consultation with the faculty through the department chairs. Planning for a search is underway. Nancy Koroloff has been appointed to replace Sestak as Assoc. Vice Provost for Research and Sponsored Projects. Our Capital Construction Proposal for future biennia, a new requirement, was approved at the OUS board meeting on Friday (attached, slides 1-3). Included for 2007-09 are deferred maintenance and renovation of Science Building II, and Social Work relocation into a Student Recreation Center to be constructed on the PCAT block. Included for 2009-11, are funding proposals for expansions of Science and Engineering, Business Administration and the Library. This being mindful that capital construction projects require a 50% match, and that the board will decide which proposals to forward to the legislature.

KOCH yielded to Vice President Dyck, noting that the budget update would have two purposes, to provide a broad overview of the university budget, and provide specific information about this year’s budget (attached, slide 4).

DYCK reviewed the university budget components (attached, slides 5-13). She then reviewed revenue for 2005-06 with certain comparisons to the prior biennium (attached, slide 14-15).

KOCH reviewed the Education and General Fund Budget expenses and funding sources for 2005-06 (attached, slide 16-18), noting that these slides appear on the Budget office homepage. He particularly noted that the total 2005-06 E&G Funding Sources include Use of Fund Balance for $5,949,982, in other words, spending down reserves. KOCH reviewed a comparison of wage expense as a percentage of total E&G over the last three years (attached, slide 19). He concluded with final observations, noting that using the fund balance can only be a one-year solution and next year’s budget will have to address the $6 Million shortfall. He also directing faculty to the web address for the 2005-06 budget exhibit (attached, slide 20-21).

KOCH yielded to Ray Johnson, Budget Committee. JOHNSON noted the committee has had one meeting this year. They briefly discussed several issues associated with state appropriations. Funding at PSU is frozen at 2002-03 enrollment levels; however, PSU has grown faster than any other institution. Revenue is coming more and more from tuition and less from state appropriations. The role of the Budget Committee is not to set the day-to-day budget but to provide a voice on the overall budget and the faculty view on fairness of the overall budget. Last year tuition and fees were
discussed and the committee made a variety of recommendations, which were thoughtfully considered. This year, the committee will again talk about tuition and fees. Winter quarter, they will discuss a variety of issues including enrollment projections for 2006-07. We have to find a way to make the $6 Million reduction permanent. The question is what will be the process. If we are able to grow our way through some of that, we may not have to come up with the full $6 Million. A theme that came out of last year’s meetings, which the committee continues to keep as a priority is that we have no way of knowing whether a unit is over or under funded, and we need to develop an internal allocation model. When we talk about issues of equity, we need to recognize that not every unit costs the same and not every unit has the same mission.

BRENNAN asked with reference to slide 19, why the percentage of salary and wages went up. DYCK stated that OPE increases have driven up the percentage of costs for salary and wages.

STEVENS noted there has been no reward for enrollment increases and queried if this is a disincentive. BERNSTINE stated that we lobbied very hard to be rewarded for enrollment growth. We lost the argument in the Legislature when it decided to buy down tuition in this cycle. As a result of that action, the board made a decision not to change the funding in this cycle. We were in the awkward position of arguing against buying down tuition. PSU and EOU tried to make the argument to recalculate, but we didn’t succeed. The other five institutions would have gone underwater.

COLLIER asked if that calls into question the strategy to grow enrollment. BERNSTINE stated the reverse is also valid. We have to become more tuition dependent because those students bring those dollars with them. We need to change the mix of students. The real question is if we want to make the decision not to grow, and then we will not to have that revenue and will then take deeper cuts. The growth strategy has at least allowed us to maintain current operations, with potential to do more. At some point the Legislature will make a decision not to buy down tuition and fund students who are in the system, and we will be in a position to benefit from that. We are poised to go into the next legislative session with all of the institutions arguing that the dollars should follow the students and the growth of the system must be rewarded.

FOUNTAIN queried if the growth is a Ponzi scheme? BERNSTINE stated we have to be strategic about our growth. For example, we need to collaborate with the community colleges. It’s about trying to be strategic about the mix of students. We are becoming more like private institutions, that is to say, we are more tuition dependent. The state contribution as a percentage of our total budget is not going to improve.

JACKSON asked if there are restrictions on reserves. DYCK stated that they are there to offset tuition shortfalls, and utility costs, for example.

FLOWER asked if the budget allocation criteria would have public discussions this year. JOHNSON stated he would report to the Senate regularly on that item. He also
referenced the Budget Committee Annual Report from June 2005, which contains their work to date on that item.

SHUSTERMAN noted there are places where she has questions and would like more information, and queried what would be the mechanism for that. With respect to the exponential growth in research, the traditional model is that research faculty do less teaching, so it doesn’t look like indirect costs offset increasing instructional costs. CARTER requested she send an email to him as Presiding Officer, and the Steering Committee will attempt to have it answered. He noted, for example, that the issue that came up fourth in the fall faculty survey he conducted, was the lack of support of infrastructure for research.

FOSQUE asked if there is a movement toward privatization. BERNSTINE noted that the tuition buy-down has been a deliberate strategy to keep the costs to students down, but it hasn’t been balanced by giving the universities more money to keep the same services and salaries and so on, and this has become the major challenge. The board is having a retreat December 1 and 2. The board members coordinating the retreat have indicated that a number of issues will be discussed, and that everything is on the table including structural issues, for example, whether we ought to be privatized as a system, whether certain campuses ought to move out of the system, etc. Those are issues that will be discussed over the next year or so. The practicality is that we are privatized whether we want to be or not, when only 15% of the budget comes from the legislature. The question is whether there are other benefits of privatization that we don’t currently get, for example, we don’t get to determine tuition - or determine our benefits package, as was mentioned earlier.

CARTER thanked the Provost, the Vice President and the Budget Committee Chair for their reports. Applause.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Representatives of the Administration

There were no questions.

2. Questions from the Floor to the Chair

K. BROWN asked if the Writing proposal would be returned to the Senate. CARTER stated, yes, after a decision has been made as to whether it is separable from other issues, for example, the University Studies review.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

F. NEW BUSINESS
1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7-8, 2005

BURNS distributed a handout (attached) containing a summary of the minutes, and slides from a presentation made by Robert Turner, IFS Presiding Officer, to the OUS Board Meeting on Friday, November 4, 2005. With respect to the latter, the IFS has serious concerns about reduction in academic quality based on their work for the last four months. Turner and Burns will attend the board retreat to represent the IFS concerns.

STEVENS noted she didn’t see anything about the balance of adjunct/fixed term faculty versus tenure lines. BURNS stated that that is one of the measures. STEVENS noted that the imbalance between regular and fixed term faculty causes decreases in faculty participation in governance. BURNS noted the IFS would agree with that.

BRENNAN asked for a clarification regarding Chancellor Pernsteiner’s remarks with respect to differential tuition. BURNS stated that the board is considering this for more expensive programs, for example, Engineering.

RUTER queried if there is an academic beauty committee to look at things you can’t measure. BURNS responded that he would ask IFS to take up that issue.

CARTER noted in conclusion that the issue of the ratio of tenure-line versus non-tenure line faculty is number two on the list of faculty concerns from the fall survey, second only to salaries.

2. Curriculum Committee Report on Oregon Transfer Module

LAWRENCE reported, after “D.2.” on developments regarding the Oregon Transfer Module. We are required to participate in this module, which includes providing a list of courses for students who want to transfer from PSU to other institutions that fit the a common general education requirement. The University Curriculum Committee has reviewed a list recommended by Vice Provost Rhodes and approved it. The list will be posted on the PSU webpage, on the Admissions page.

CUMMINGS queried if this list requires Senate approval. Lawrence yielded to RHODES for clarification, who noted that this if for outgoing students, and represents approved university courses that are presently used for first year general education purposes, so presumably not.

SHUSTERMAN asked if this needs to be included in advising for incoming students, and do we have to accept the courses from other campuses. RHODES stated, yes, on both counts and added we are currently taking these courses in transfer for first year general education requirements.
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H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1635.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 5, 2005
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Brown, Clucas, Endress, Farquhar, Feng, Fletcher, Fountain, Gillpatrick, Hunter, Isaacson, Dan. Johnson, Kapoor, Mathwick, Shapiro, Stevens, Watanabe, Wetzel,

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Christopherson, Desrocher, Diman, Driscoll, Feyerherm, Kaiser, LaTourette, McVeety, Murdoch, Nelson, Rhodes, Sestak, Spalding, Wallack

A. ROLL
*B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2005, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published, after item F.2.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The Senate Steering Committee is accepting nominations for a PSU faculty member to serve as OUS faculty representative to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education. In addition to the nomination, please provide confirmation of the candidate's willingness to serve and the candidate's current CV. All materials must be received by Friday, January 13. The Steering Committee will finalize a slate of nominees at their meeting of January 18, and forward the recommendation to the Chancellor the following day.
Draft copies of the Presiding Officer's Fall 2005 Survey of the Faculty will be distributed to Senators and Ex officio members of the Senate via listserv by the end of the day. There were 175 responses.

The Presiding Officer welcomed Vice President Lindsay Desrochers back to the faculty and the Senate. Applause. He also welcomed Interim Dean Barbara Sestak, who was unable to attend the November meeting. Applause.

There will be no Provost's Report, as he is out of town.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals and Program Proposal for Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering

WAKELAND introduced the proposals for the council.

BLEILER/BUDDRESS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering, Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science, listed in "E-1."

__________ asked if the number of fifteen full time faculty listed in the proposal is comparable to programs, nationally. _________ noted it is in the low middle range. _________ asked if the program plans to increase faculty. _________ stated that their strategic plan is to expand to twenty faculty within eight years.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


MERCER/BRENNAN MOVED THE SENATE TABLE THE MOTION, as course descriptions were not included.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MERCER/BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal for course changes in PHE 550, College of Urban and Public Affairs listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators
A copy of “F-1” Question for Administrators, dated 28 November and distributed by email to Senators and Ex officio members, and President Bernstine’s (out of town) response dated December 2, 2005, were distributed to the assembly (attached).

CUMMINGS asked with respect to the questions, if the university had received the accreditation report. DRISCOLL noted that the university received the draft of the report and that he didn’t know the date on which the report was be finalized. RHODES noted the response to the draft has already been returned and the official vote on the report is scheduled for January 10, 2006. The President has indicated that after that vote, the report will be shared with the university community. Overall, the report was positive and included eight commendations and four recommendations. The President might decide to let the draft report out, as the report is not likely to change between now and then, but it isn’t officially accepted until the vote on January 10.

BEASLEY asked for a clarification of the timeframe that was indicated in paragraph two, sentence four of the President’s memorandum. DRISCOLL stated that the Budget Committee would not meet again until January. BEASLEY asked if someone could comment on the Oregon University System (OUS) planning process timeframe. DYCK noted that the OUS Board just completed a two-day retreat and are planning to continue the process in February in place of the regular board meeting, in order to wrap it up.

JACKSON asked if it would be possible to see the accreditation report before the next Senate meeting, so it could be discussed then. BALSHEM noted that it is the usual case that accreditation agencies request university presidents not to make draft reports public. RHODES concurred.

RUETER queried if the accreditation report ss relevant. Framing the discussion and the overall timeframe are more important, than whether administrators are present. The Senate should just get started.

McBRIDE yielded the floor to Gary Brodowicz, PHE. BRODOWICZ asked if “E-1” could be read aloud for the benefit of the audience. ADLER was recognized to read the questions. The reading was followed by applause.

COLLIER requested a clarification on the permissibility of discussions during mediation, given that the President and Prof Adler appear to disagree on this item. DRISCOLL noted that mediation relaxes the ground rules but does not relax provisions for bargaining, for example the Vanguard did a more extensive article last week because the parties can talk to the press during mediation. JACKSON asked if the Senate could discuss the exhausted campus.

LATOILAIAS urged that the Senate could indeed discuss Prof. Adler’s first point, the Oregon University System’s failure to fund enrollment growth. This is yet
another example of finding a way to penalize PSU, to the advantage of our sister institutions.

PADIN noted he disagreed with the interpretation offered by Vice Provost Driscoll that answering these questions with a simple yes or no would violate bargaining. Equivocation on that type of questions indicates that there are serious grounds for feeling betrayed by the current administration. With regard to the last issue, whether PSU gets a fair shake in the Oregon University System, the minutes for the past several years give no indication that the PSU administration has spoken up for PSU. One wonders about what the priorities are as far as making a public case for the public university, and for this one specifically.

KLOTZ/RUTH MOVED "that President Bernstine be formally invited to attend our next meeting to address faculty members in response to the questions raised by Sy Adler in his communication of December 2."

KLOTZ noted that the President’s written response seems to be a very good example of what is frustrating many faculty members, which is a perception that the administration is stonewalling in the face of real discussion of the kinds of decisions that are being made about our campus, not only about the issues that are being negotiated but in terms of ____________ (coughing) and at what cost. We need to have some venue where we can have input into those decisions and we’re not finding it. Applause.

RUTH cited in “F-I” part two, “51% of the individuals offering instruction at PSU are now off the tenure line,” and queried if that issue could be included, so that the President and the Provost could respond. CARTER noted that the Steering Committee plans to address that item, referencing the Fall 2005 Survey of Faculty, which listed it as the second most important issue to faculty, after salary.

CARTER noted that the President is currently not scheduled to be at the January Senate meeting, as he will be traveling to the accreditation meeting.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR FOR THE CHAIR

REDER asked what is the role of the Budget Committee with respect to the issues raised in the Question for Administrators, and queried whether the Senate can interact more effectively with them. CARTER noted that Ray Johnson, Budget Committee Chair, was at the November meeting to discuss their role. DRISCOLL reiterated that Prof. Johnson’s remarks are contained in the November 2005 Senate minutes, page 7, which are included in today’s packet. He also directed Senators to the Budget Committee Annual Report included in the records of the June 2005 Faculty Senate Meeting.
SHUSTERMAN stated that this is not adequate. The questions that are being asked were not addressed at the last Senate meeting. There was a quick presentation but there wasn’t time for discussion.

CRAWSHAW noted he has served many times on the Budget Committee, and his experience was that many hours must be expended to understand the budget and the process. There were some very critical questions about where the money goes, and it was very hard to get answers on that, even in the Budget Committee. There isn’t any simple way to address that.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2-3 December 2005 at PSU

BURNS presented a summary of the proceedings, directing Senators to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) webpage where complete minutes are available, at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html. He noted that there has been a major change in the relationship between the state board and the faculty. They are now continuously asking for faculty input on many things. BURNS noted an example of this is that each faculty senate as well as the IFS has been asked to nominate a faculty member to replace Prof. Geri Richmond, OSU, on the board.

BURNS noted that IFS has been concentrating their efforts on issues of quality, and the relationship of quality to access. IFS gave a somewhat controversial draft report to the Board, but it has gotten discussions started. As we see the number of students in our classes going up, and the funding going down, we are concerned about the quality that is there. We are working with the Provosts, including making some changes to the draft report we submitted to them. The report is still very strong, and we will be presenting it to the faculty soon.

BURNS noted that the IFS are heavily engaged in the Board sub-committee work around SB 342, which mandates statewide learning outcomes. The Governor is pushing for “K-20” alignment, and we are involved in sub-committees around this issue as well.

BURNS welcomed aboard Dalton Miller-Jones, who will start his service in January 2006. Applause.

BURNS noted that at the board meeting, Jay Kenton presented a report on Other Personnel Expenses (OPE) which he had recently presented to a national gathering of state boards representatives. The average faculty OPE in the United States is 30%, however here in Oregon, faculty being in PEBB, it is 48%. Kenton also noted that even with the higher OPE, faculty are still considerably below in total compensation package.
BURNS continued that the three IFS representatives from Oregon State University indicated that their campus is in a major budget crisis. Word on the street is that they are $10 Million in the hole. They are undergoing mid-year budget cuts, including freezing vacant positions, cutting, etc. One cause is that they didn’t get rid of the tuition plateau, but another is the 8% salary increase, which the President awarded, but has said must be funded in the majority by colleges and departments. BURNS noted in conclusion that Jay Kenton noted at the board meeting that two campuses in the system have a negative fund balance.

COLLIER asked with respect to the slides from the November IFS report about academic quality indicators, if they are still in negotiation. BURNS stated yes, they are still being developed. The indicators are very hard to define and the good measure is hard to calculate.

RUTH asked if one measure is the relation of tenure-line to non tenure-line faculty. MacCORMACK asked BURNS noted that there is a strong group in the OSU board that wants to push for more funding. It was only for the retreat, that budgets were discussed based on a model of no new funding.

DILL noted it would be appropriate for PSU faculty to think seriously about faculty representation on the Board, and asked if there were any more specifics on the process. BURNS noted that nominations or interested faculty should email his/her CV to Duncan Carter or Sarah Andrews-Collier by 13 January.

CARTER noted that Scott Burns is stepping down from his role as IFS Senator as of the end of this month, and thanked him for his three-year term of service. CARTER also noted that Prof. Burns will be the President of IFS for 2006. Applause.

2. Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report

ELZANOWSKI presented the report for the committee and took questions.

MANDAVILLE asked, with respect to the last paragraph, when the committee will respond about faculty governance. ELZANOWSKI noted that the Senate’s charge is to respond by May 2006, although the charge is not specific with regard to action. The committee is moving as fast as it can, but wants to remain effective in their discussions.

LIVNEH asked for a clarification with respect to the issue of approval of on-line courses. ELZANOWSKI stated that last year’s Curriculum Committee recommended that there be an approval process for on-line courses. BRENNAN asked why the Graduate Council is not part of those discussions. ELZANOWSKI stated that the Graduate Council was also invited to participate last year on that sub-committee.
PADIN noted that the conversation about on-line courses and programs appears to be of broad interest to the faculty at large. It seems to fall squarely within the quality versus access discussion, which Burns related. He queried at which point it becomes a larger conversation, noting that the animus behind this question, is that it is widely known that on-line delivery is very attractive because it is perceived to be high profit–low cost under some circumstances, but it does tend to undermine quality of delivery under some circumstances. ELZANOWSKI stated the committee has not come to a determination yet that on-line courses need a different approval process. MANDAVILLE noted that the Senate could direct Educational Policies Committee to research the issue raised by Prof. Padin. WEBER queried whether the university has researched the market for on-line delivery, noting that where it becomes very competitive, there is an erosion of profits. ELZANOSKI reminded that the issue the committee is charged with is the approval process, not the other aspects of online delivery.

ANGELL noted that treating on-line education as a separate item is problematic as there is a spectrum of on-line components, for example there are very few courses that are completely off-line or completely on-line. We should treat every course with the same kind of attention to detail. MANDAVILLE asked how many on-line courses the university currently offers. GREGORY stated there are approximately twenty courses fully online, and 450-500 partly on line.

SHUSTERMAN reminded that this item was brought up by the group that approves courses, in other words, they stated they weren’t sure how to deal with this and requested a broader discussion. The committee needs to identify the issues before it is discussed in the full Senate. ELZANOWSKI noted that another objective was to deal with the issue before there are so many online courses, that the committee would be overwhelmed.

RUETER reminded that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) is one-half of this committee, or one-third if the Graduate Council shows up. The UCC won’t start working jointly on this issue until after seasonal course approvals are completed.

RUTH yielded to Jacqueline Arante, ENG. ARANTE asked if the committee would also include a review of the faculty demographic teaching online versus regular courses. RUETER replied that no piece of information is below his scrutiny level.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the committee.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1620.
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A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 5, 2005, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Town Hall Meeting to discuss the Draft Accreditation Report Wednesday, January 18, 3-5 p.m. in CH 53. A link to the draft report of the Accreditation Team is available on the PSU Portfolio, Executive Summary Page. Sponsored by the Faculty Senate.

PSU-AAUP informational forums about the proposed contract settlement, January 11, 12 and 17, 12 – 2 p.m. in SMSU 338.

All Others Caucus of the Faculty Senate is charged to elect their representative to the Committee on Committees, no later than the conclusion of the Senate meeting.
Changes in Senate/Committee memberships since December 5, 2005: Lorraine Mercer, CLAS has resigned from the Senate effective January 10. Her replacement will be Marek Elzanowski.

President’s Report

The President reported after the Provost. BERNSTINE wished the assembly Happy New Year and welcomed everyone back. On January 18, he will lead a Town Hall meeting to discuss the Accreditation report. He and Vice Provost Rhodes would be leaving directly for Seattle to meet with the commission after the Senate meeting. In a previous Faculty Senate meeting, he briefly summarized the commendations and recommendations and concerns in the report. He noted that once Senators read the report, they will see that there are no major surprises. We are expecting a positive outcome, and the only question is whether we would be revisited in five years or get the full ten-year pass. We won’t know that for a few weeks after the meeting on Tuesday, but we don’t want to delay the town hall or reactions to the report, including developing action plans in response to concerns.

BERNSTINE stated he was sorry he missed the previous Senate meeting and noted he wanted to talk about the budget process and where we are headed. Some people were not satisfied with his statement that the Budget Committee is the appropriate place to deal with some of the serious challenges that we face, but he stands by it. Hopefully the administration will be able to develop a plan of action in collaboration with the Budget Committee. BERNSTINE stated that he has a Where’s Dan? decal and keeps it on his computer. To the extent that this slogan is a questioning of his commitment to increasing salaries for faculty and staff, he takes issue with it. We are all overworked and underpaid, and under tremendous stress that we are underpaid. The entire administration has been working very hard to continue to develop plans to increase salaries for faculty. In point of fact, to a certain extent, the slogan is a reflection of the strategy that he is using in response to the decision by the Chancellor and the Board not to recalibrate the budget and fund enrollment after this last legislative session. PSU made the argument in both the President’s Council and the Administrative Council that enrollment should have been funded. The reality was that the legislature didn’t fund enrollment; basically the legislature made a decision to buy down tuition rather than fund enrollment. The money was put into the hands of the students but the end result was that there was no increase in the appropriations for the campuses. A recalibration of budgets around enrollment would have meant that we would have been a winner, although not the largest. That would have been OSU, which would have received about $3.8 Million. PSU would have been second, receiving about $3 Million, and EOU would have been third, receiving a smaller sum, as they are a smaller institution. UO would have lost around $800,000, not an insignificant sum, but the reality was that two of the smaller institutions would have gone under. It was clear that neither the Chancellor nor the Board was going to allow these two to go bankrupt in exchange for funding enrollment at three others. The three presidents made a decision that it was a battle they couldn’t win, and therefore rather than continuing to alienate the board and the Chancellor’s office publicly, we would fight that battle another day. We are fighting that battle now. We are already
meeting with legislators to convince them to look at funding as it comes to the institutions, and the fact that although buying down tuition is a plus for higher ed, the reality is that it doesn't allow us to address the needs of the institutions because it doesn't put money into our budgets. BERNSTINE continued, describing how state appropriations increased through the late 1990's but since then, experienced steady erosion. At the same time our fixed costs rose dramatically, for example, in approximately the last decade salary costs rose 87% and OPE increased 115%. OPE is also now the largest share of our total budget, having increased from 20% to 23%. In terms of our fixed costs alone, if we had not pursued a growth strategy we wouldn't have been able to pay our bills, and that says nothing about the kinds of programs and initiatives that we have also been involved in, particularly after 2000.

BERNSTINE concluded that PSU must wean itself away from dependency on state support. The administration is going to work with the Budget Committee to look at the growth strategy, and in particular the whole question of how we are to deal with continuing erosion of state support. We have to develop strategies that allow us to continue on an upward trajectory, not only to be the university that we are, but also to be the university that we want to be. In order to do that, there are a number of strategies we will have to put in place, for example, growth in the number of students, growth in research, growth in philanthropic support, and growth in auxiliary enterprises. It is dealing with those variables and the complications of the budget that makes the Budget Committee the appropriate body with which to have at least some of the initial discussions. Those issues that are relevant to the academic enterprise and the Senate can be returned to this body for a broad and enlightened discussion about the challenges we continue to face. The basic issue is how we will position the university for the future to deal with the continued erosion of state support.

MEDOVOI asked what was the impulse behind the growth strategy. Many of the faculty are interested in hearing why at a moment of state budget crisis, with a fixed pot that all the universities are competing for, and an assumption that no campus will be allowed to sink, why we would pursue a growth strategy that leads classroom sizes to increases, SCH pressures to mount, and advising tasks to overwhelm us. Is there any way of understanding where this policy came from, and is there any rethinking of it at this point? BERNSTINE stated that firstly, it was not a policy developed by the administration; it was developed along with Budget Committees in the past. Also, tuition dependency is one of the challenges that any private institution faces, and we are becoming much more like a private institution. Tuition will become an increasingly important part of the formula for keeping the institution afloat and allowing us to continue to flourish. One question we have is what is the appropriate mix of students. Another question is what is the upper limit for enrollment, and is the upper limit higher if, for example, we work in conjunction with our community college partners to educate more students by delivering our programs in different ways. The growth strategy is only one piece of the equation, but the reality is that we wouldn't have been able to pay the bills if we hadn't grown our tuition income. We can't sustain that strategy forever; we have to make decisions about growth and about weaning ourselves from dependency on the state.
SCHECHTER asked why the three campuses couldn't politically back a budget strategy that would undermine the financial viability of two smaller campuses, particularly around the notion of the costs of propping up certain campuses. BERNSTINE reminded that we work not just with Portland legislators, and the smaller schools have very strong legislative support. Also, part of the reality is that in the metropolitan area, higher education is down the political agenda. In contrast, see for example Ashland, which has SOU and a state senator, Peter Courtney, who is the president of the senate and on the staff at that campus. The question is where you fight your battle. We are trying to educate legislators about the problem of trading off institutional budgets for buying down tuition. The presidents have to maintain their relations with all constituencies.

COLLIER asked where the issue of access fits into the discussion of increasing tuition. The Vision and Values focus groups several years ago indicated that people are still committed to access. BERNSTINE noted that this question speaks to issue of whether the legislature is really helping access by buying down tuition. If fixed costs continue to rise, for example, buying down tuition doesn't protect access. In conversations with legislators, to a one they all promote access to the detriment of all other priorities including quality. Access must work into our overall strategy. The final question is who will provide education.

REDER asked if we need a political strategy with the legislature to increase institutional support. How can we convince them we need more money when we show we are managing without. BERNSTINE stated that any new funding would likely be based on student headcount, and we can't necessarily cut back saying only that we can't afford to do it. The question is if we can generate broader legislative support, for example, a community college strategy might provide broader access, which would improve our standing.

REDER noted that it is this level of policy discussion that the Senate is asking to be involved in; this can't be done off to the side by a committee. BERNSTINE noted that the committee is a small enough group to work through the variables with, and then we can come back to the Senate and say look, these are the choices.

PADIN noted that he is confused with the language of this conversation; it laments the decline in public support for a public university and also speaks of hastening it. The framing of it as "weaning ourselves of dependency" suggests that PSU is a slothful, able-bodied welfare cheat. BERNSTINE stated that state support is now down to 15%, and other states such as Michigan and Wisconsin have preceded us in this reality. State dollars continue to shrink and this $3 Million incident is not so isolated. We need to have alternate sources of revenue so we can be in control of our own destiny. We are not really public any more, and it would be a mistake for us to design our destiny around state support. It is much more important for us to design our destiny around the assumption that this support will continue to erode. We are no different that most large public institutions. We must grow research, philanthropy, and other possible revenue streams.
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Provost’s Report

KOCH stated that he wanted to provide a response to the events and questions of the December meeting. He noted he was somewhat offended by the assumption that he doesn’t value the faculty of this institution. Nothing could be further from the truth. That being said, his responsibility is now to the whole institution, of which faculty are one part; he must look at the entire institutional budget. Having been a member of the faculty for a long period of time, he understands the financial situation that faculty find themselves in, and he will be working very diligently over time to address those issues.

KOCH discussed the questions from the December meeting with respect to certain comments about growth. As many people know, he has been at the very least curious and at most somewhat skeptical about the growth agenda over time. Everyone is aware that this is not a sustainable activity in the long run. After reviewing the situation we have found ourselves in, what we did over the last six or seven years appears to have been a logical strategy and the only viable approach to maintaining our current level of activities at the institution. He spent quite a bit of time looking at this, and concluded that this was the best of a bunch of bad options. We are better off than if we had chosen any other option, and given this, we need to focus our attention on the future. We need to grow the resource base of the institution without increasing the workload.

KOCH is working with the deans and VP Desrochers to identify and investigate several scenarios to enhance the resource base of the institution. They are not based on growing anything; rather they are based on changing policies that had evolved over a long period of time but had not changed in response to the changes in our external environment. We are looking at four things in particular that appear to have short-term value with respect to additional resources. One, our tuition and fee policy which came from a time when we were concerned about providing access to as many students as possible including students in Southwest Washington. We need to revisit that policy, as it may be a source of short-term revenue. Two, we remit a lot of tuitions and we have a lot of scholarship funds, and whereas tuition remission involves no money, scholarships are dollars from the foundation that go to the university for operations. We are looking at the relationship between these two pools in order to maximize the use of scholarship funds, which is real money. We are also looking at self-support courses and programs. Three, we are looking at staff and infrastructure support, for example, Student Affairs and Finance & Administration, which were the areas most neglected in recent years. We think a lot of that comes from the fact that we weren’t reflecting the value of those activities in “self support.” Four, for the longer term, we are seriously looking at our student mix. Given some interest in PSU regionally and nationally, we have had the opportunity to recruit non-resident students. That mix will have an impact on our revenues as well. We are keeping the Budget Committee informed of this activity. We will be producing some preliminary feasibility studies later this month, and will keep the Senate informed. All of this will be done in a consultative manner.
KOCH provided an update on recent proposals approved in the Faculty Senate. The Ph.D. in Biology was approved by the Provost’s Council for external review, and the external review has been completed, with a few questions but overall positive results. We hope to take this back to the Provost’s Council in February. The Ph.D. in Sociology has had its first reading at the Provost’s Council. In an effort to make it a more organic and coherent document, PSU took some liberties with the format of the state system, however, they sent it back to us and said we had to put it back in the traditional format. That has been done, and we have conducted some tentative internal review, which raised questions that we plan to address. The Ph.D. in Engineering & Technology Management has been approved by the Provost’s Council for external review, and the review committee has been identified.

KOCH concluded with a discussion of SB 342. OUS has begun to react to the requirements of SB 342, and it will require participation on the part of PSU (attachment, slide 1). SB 342 arose out of a number of concerns about articulation within the OUS and with the community colleges. Whether these were the result of real or perceived problems, we are required to respond to the bill. The first item we need to address is Section I. (1), (c) which states “Develop an outcome-based framework for articulation and transfer that is derived from a common understanding of the criteria for general education curricula (attachment, slide 2).” OUS, working with the Provosts and some additional faculty, have decided that if we look at general education throughout the system and try to develop some larger scale criteria for general education, this might provide a framework for an eventual look at all of the required elements, including the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM), Associate of Arts, etc. (attachment, side 3). A two-stage process has been proposed. The first stage is to identify broad outcomes, which we are well along the way to having done at PSU, given the work in University Studies some years ago. We also want to look at our outcomes as compared to other institutions’ outcomes, and try to develop a common set for the four and two-year institutions (attachment, side 4). The notion that this should be faculty driven is accepted by the system, so a committee is being formed to deal with this. The Provosts have been charged with identifying people from the campuses to participate in this process in six subcommittees that will meet at PSU on 9-10 February (attachment, slide 5). We will be calling on faculty in the next two weeks to request participation. Once this process is complete, the work will be brought back to the campuses for review. A second stage will involve matching courses at the campuses to the outcomes, so students will know how they are counted at other institutions. At the next Senate meeting, we are anticipating a more detailed discussion of SB 342, as there are several more aspects that may be of interest, as they deal with the organization of the curriculum. Terry Rhodes will lead that discussion.

Chancellor’s Report

CARTER welcomed the Chancellor for his first official meeting with the PSU Faculty Senate, and yielded the floor

“I just came from the Oregon Business Summit, a conference sponsored by the Oregon Business Council and attended by 1200 people. The discussion was all about
the 21st century and the imperatives of a flat world and a global economy. There, it was all about the need to improve educational attainment, educational expectations and educational performance, or Oregonians will be left behind in the race that is the 21st century. Most of the members of the legislature were there, the governor was there, and our two senators were there. Most of the major corporations had their CEOs or other executive there. This is the fourth year they have been there, and the fourth year that the same message has been given. A former legislator came up to me as I was leaving and said that after hearing that the overwhelming consensus is that we need to focus our attention on education and that we need to focus our strategy on university-based research, he would feel a lot more optimistic if we hadn't been here before. The biggest problem we have in the state is that we haven't come to grips with the choices we have made as a state. This was the state of affairs in Oregon in 1989: the state investment per university student ranked 23rd in the country; the state and local investment per K-12 student was 8th in the country; the state and local investment per community college student was number one. Last year the K-12 investment fell to 43rd, community colleges are now around 14th, and we are fighting it out with New Hampshire for dead last in university investment. What happened in the 1990 tax revolt and in the shift that Measure 5 caused was a fundamental dislocation in this state. Until then, we could be characterized as a high tax, high service state. We were 9th or 10th in taxes per capita or taxes per $1,000 income. But we were a high service state and we prided ourselves, and our legislators prided themselves, on that balance. We have now become a low tax state, arguably somewhere around 41st to 43rd, but we have not yet come to grips with the level of service that we as Oregonians are willing to accept for the dollars that we are willing to pay. Until that happens, we will have the kinds of discussions that I just came in on the tail end of. They are not unique in this country – this is happening all over – they are just more pronounced in this state. The biggest problem that this creates is not for us, because as Dan said, we will find a way. As institutions, we will find a way to survive. We will find a way to do as well as is possible what it is we do. Regardless of any other metric you have, there are more faculty at PSU today than there were a dozen years ago. Yes, there are more students, but we increased system-wide, 20,000 students - 10,000 at PSU. We reduced the size of our faculty system-wide over that period of time. This is a problem not unique to Portland state; this is a challenge for all the state. We have managed as a state system in the last dozen years, with fewer faculty, to add 20,000 students. We have also increased markedly our funded research. We’re now getting almost to the point, and we may hit that point next year, in which our funded research exceeds our state appropriation. That’s a tribute to the faculty system-wide. The rate of growth here is the highest in the state, 91% over the last seven years, but it’s the highest by only a percent. We have many of our campuses doing very good work. Our graduation rates are up. The number of degrees and certificates we conferred last year, 19,000, is by far the highest in state history, and it will go up again this year. Our time to degree is down, our retention rates are up, and on every one of the metrics we typically look at for higher education we are doing better than we were ten years ago. We have found a way, but we have found a way to do it without state money. The board of Higher Ed is looking right now, in its strategic planning process, at what the world in Oregon might be like in 2025, a twenty-year plan for us. In 2025, if we serve only the same proportion of students coming out of high school as we serve today, our enrollment system-wide will have
to grow by 35,000 students. Unlike many states to the east and mid-west, our population is growing. We were the fastest growing of the Pacific states last year, in terms of population growth. Unlike in many of the eastern and mid-western states, our younger population, although not growing nearly as fast as our older population is in fact continuing to rise. It is a cause of optimism for our economy, a cause of optimism for our society, a cause of optimism for those of us who are in the education business. But if you look at the trends of investment. In this state, and you trend that forward twenty years, what does it say? If you even take the Governor’s proposal, which would guarantee a 10% per biennium growth in appropriations to the universities, K-12, and community colleges, what does that do? The state proportion of the total would either have to decline, in other words we have to find money someplace else in a higher proportion that we do today. That someplace else might be tuition, it might be grants, it might be gifts, it might be business activities, it might be partnerships - it might be almost anything. Or, as Dan talked about, we begin to look at limiting enrollment, and the board is very seriously concerned about and considering that. It is not something that would go unnoticed. We have been told by the leadership in Salem that there will be a penalty to pay if we limit enrollment because their expectation is that somehow we will find a way, even if they don’t. We can work on that expectation. We can build alliances with business leaders and others to maybe chip away at it, but long-term in this state, until we address the first question, what level of service we are actually willing to pay for, until we address that, we will not be able to deal with the fundamental question of what does it mean to be public education in this state. I don’t see that being addressed directly through our current political process. One of the things that the board is hopeful of doing is getting that issue squarely in front of the policy makers. I am not foolish enough to think that that will be addressed in a short period of time. I am not foolish enough to think it will be addressed successfully without what amounts to a public relations and education campaign that is aimed not only at policy makers but also at citizens. But I do think that there will be an opportunity to address it. In the meantime what do we face? We have some short term and some mid term things to seriously consider. In the short term, the governor continues to assert - and I believe that he will - increase the OUS budget by 10% in 07-09. That won’t even address our current operating level, but it will come a lot closer than any budget has since 1999. Secondly, I know that the board will work very carefully to figure out whether or not there should be a different compact with regard to tuition and financial aid than we have today. You can read into that, higher tuition and higher aid. That won’t be popular, but the alternative is an erosion of quality that I don’t believe this board is willing to countenance. Third, we will continue to increase the fundraising activities of all of our campuses. Last year we raised $150 Million in donations across the seven campuses. University of Oregon is in the middle of a capital campaign that started three years ago and has four years to run, a $600 Million campaign, and they have already raised $385 Million. The idea of trying to broaden our financial resources is one that we have taken on board. I think there is some cause for optimism. The board and I are well aware of the discontinuities that the budget agreements of ‘02-03 cause and by that I mean, the freezing of enrollment funding at the ‘02-03 level. What I will propose to the board for ‘05-07 is that we renormalize the RAM. Let me tell you what that will do, because I don’t want people to be overly optimistic or overly pessimistic. That will shift dollars within the same pool from the regional campuses to PSU and
OSU. The regional campuses cannot survive that cut, the dollars are too big - cuts of that magnitude call into questions their very existence and financial viability. My hope is that a proposal to refund the “regionals” as part of that normalization may be more politically salable than funding enrollment growth. We learned that last time. We went after enrollment growth money and we got all the way to the Senate with enrollment money, but in the House the decision was made that we can’t do that because that will hurt the regionals. Instead, we will give you more money than the Senate, but you can’t fund enrollment except at the ‘02-03 level. I will freely admit that I took $13 Million instead of $9.6 Million. I decided that in the short run, that was the better part of valor, even if in the long run, it was the wrong decision. It’s the kind of decision you make in the waning days of the legislative session or you get nothing. But, in the long run if we don’t address the issues of how much enrollment this state is really willing to pay for, we continue the fiction that educating students is free. It is not free and that is why I want to take a different tack this time, and that is why I want to make it clear in the short run to the decision-makers on the board, in the governor’s office, and in the legislature, the true cost of sustaining regional universities at the expense of this campus and Oregon State. Beyond the short term strategy, we have to come to grips in some fashion with what we as a state are willing to pay for. Maybe coming to grips with tuition and aid policy is a step towards that, because one of the things I’ve learned in Salem is that high tuition even if moderated by aid, is something that is anathema to most legislators. It’s a high-risk gamble which I don’t know if the board or the governor will be willing to take. That is something that will have to develop as we work through the strategic planning process. Just as is the question of whether or not we cap enrollments. Just as is the question of whether or not we change our legal relationship with the state, as OHSU has done. There are plusses and minuses to the latter, but they are not the ones you think about. The obvious plus is that we’re not as restricted by state requirements, and that’s true. The minus is that the state feels no responsibility for you because you’re not their creature. A plus is that we could move closer to market in faculty salaries, as OHSU has done, but the way they got there was by reducing benefits. That’s a tradeoff, and it’s a tradeoff we will be discussing. We raised it recently with IFS and with AOF. Are we willing to look at it, to improve faculty salaries, and will the state be willing to accept that tradeoff. There are a couple of reasons for that. The underlying philosophy of the state benefit package now is fully paid-by-employer healthcare. It is a fundamental belief of many of the people in Salem that that is the right policy choice for Oregon, but its expensive, and it would be more expensive for the state if we pulled out rather than staying in. Witness Virginia recently, which had to pay the state to pull out. We and our families are much healthier than other state employees, and if we pull out, their premium goes up. In the long run, if there isn’t a solution to the nation’s spiraling healthcare cost problem, then Virginia made the right choice to buy out in today’s dollars. If we do solve the national health care crisis, they made the wrong choice. But I have talked too long. Are there questions?”

GREGORY asked if it still makes sense to have the same mix of institutions in the state at all. PERNSTEINER noted that in rural parts of the state fewer young people are going to college today than in their parents’ generation. The students’ expectations are too low, and we’re not helping that with the way we are doing things now. There is a role for regional institutions, but it may or may not be the same as
they are now. For example, perhaps we should merge them with the community colleges in their regions, in order to create the kind of post-secondary connection they need. If local voters and taxpayers are willing to support local institutions, those institutions may have a better chance, although they would probably look different than they do now. Another option is to make them branches of the larger campuses. You don’t usually get a lot of savings that way, but we need to ask the question, what is the long term academic and financial viability and sustainability for those regions of the educational offerings we can provide. The PSU Social Work program provides an example of offering a regional program for limited duration. Another example of this is EOU, which is the fastest growing university in the state because they are creating centers all across the state which may have limited lives but fill a current need.

ANGELL asked how it makes sense for EOU to compete with other programs. PERNSTEINER stated that most of these programs are located where no one else is, for example, Hermiston. They are also located here in Portland, but so is virtually every other institution in the state, because the metropolitan area is still under-served.

K.BROWN noted that the traditional measures discussed earlier don’t appear to align with these “outside the box” solutions, and asked for a clarification. PERNSTEINER noted that at present it isn’t clear, but once the outline of the longterm plan is established a picture may emerge. Presently, legislators demand accountability and performance measures are everything, but in this state, they are willing to let us participate in what those measures and metrics will be. What we have to do is make sure that what we can provide and what they want to measure are as compatible as possible.

R.JOHNSON asked the Chancellor to elaborate on the age demographic issue and on support for graduate education. PERNSTEINER noted that in the last legislative session, for the very first time, research was not a four-letter word. That major milestone was due to the success of ONAME. Now, the legislature recognizes that graduate education is linked to research, and that we are not taking away from undergraduate education. Regarding enrollment demand, it will continue to go up for the next ten years, experience a slight dip, and then continue to grow, because we have a young population.

COLLIER asked if, since there is a national debate, have the states united in a strategy to pressure the federal government to re-invest in higher education. PERNSTEINER stated there are a lot of national coalitions, but until you get someone at the national level who is willing to be a champion, there will be no national solution. BRENNAN asked if planning is being done to address the emerging diversity in the state. PERNSTEINER stated that soon about one-third of K-12 students will be Latino and the state hasn’t come to accept or understand what impact this will have. OUS has several initiatives, asking the education deans to address the coming needs in teacher training around this issue, but we have yet to address some of the other changes in student populations, such as drug addictions, etc.
D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Curricular Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committee.

REDERFLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in the College of Arts and Sciences listed in “E-1” as follows: ANTH 333, CH 284, CH 285, CH 286, DANE 316, DANE 347, FL 335, FR 335, GRK 333, GRK 335, TUR 330, TUR 341, WR 413.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CRAWSHAW stated, with respect to the proposal for the BA/BS in Environment ___________, ________. CARTER noted that this technically was out of order as no motion had been made yet.

HANSENWORKS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the degree program change in the Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), College of Arts & Sciences, and the program change in the Bachelor of Music to add the emphasis in Music Education, School of Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

HICKEY asked about the omission of General Education electives and BA/BS requirements in the BM in Music Education. HANSEN stated this parallels the existing BM degree in Performance.

LIVNEH requested clarification with respect to the degree program’s relationship to the Graduate School of Education teacher education (G.T.E.P.) program, and certain language in the summary. It was provided. CARTER noted the language will be clear in the catalog.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETERBULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the degree program changes and name change to the BA/BS in “Environmental Sciences,” College of Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
REDER/LATIOLAIS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new degree program, BA/BS in Environmental Studies, College of Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

SHUSTERMAN stated with respect to several Chemistry courses, Two haven’t been offered for some time, and this is a bad fit. The degree is lacking in certain Chemistry courses and there are some structural issues.

BRENNAN/ BLEILER MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Academic Requirements Committee Proposal for Admission Requirements for Transfer Students

HARVEY presented the proposal for the committee, after “E.1.”

CUMMINGS/ BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Proposal for Admission Requirements for Transfer Students, cited in “D-4;”

The entry GPA for transfer students having 30 transferable credits, be set at 2.0 for all students who present an Oregon Transfer Module or a transferable Associate’s Degree. For those students transferring without the fundamental general education preparation of an associate’s degree or OTM, the minimum entry GPA is 2.25. This admission standard would apply to all students, regardless of their geographic residency. [Apart from entry GPA, International transfer students must also present proof of English proficiency (TOEFL or IELTS per the present policy.]

commented, regarding the disadvantage .

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C. BROWN briefly instructed Senators that they should view the ideas contained in the report as very tentative, and requested feedback in the form of attendance at the scheduled town halls, or to the committee at the web address, http://www.unstreview.groups.pdx.edu/

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1708.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 6, 2006
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Brown, Dill, Feng, Fischer, George, Knights, Mandaville, Mathwick, Medovoi, Mercer, Padin, Rectenwald, Sedivy, Sharkova, Stevens, Thao, Wadley, Watanabe, Weasel, Wollner, Wooley-George, Yuthas.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of January 9, 2006 were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Changes in the February 6, 2006 Agenda:
DELETE “E.2.”
ADD: Vice President’s Report after “G.4.”

Changes in Senate and committee appointments since January 9, 2006:
K Ketcheson replaces Robert Mercer, Advisory Council
Michael Cummings replaces R. Mercer, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (Dec. 2006)
Marek Elzanowski, MTH replaces L. Mercer, Faculty Senate, CLAS
Dae Y. Kim replaces S. Issaeson, Faculty Senate, GSED
William LePore, ART, replaces H. Fletcher, Faculty Senate, FPA
Jeanetter Palminter, MTH, replaces R. Mercer, Faculty Senate, CLAS
Serge Preston, MTH replaces Robert Mercer, Academic Requirements Committee
Lisa Dion replaces Tom Luba, Graduate Council, XS

Robert Mercer, Presiding Officer pro tem of the Senate has been transferred to the Chancellor’s Office for the next eighteen months, effective February 6, 2006, therefore his replacement will be elected at the next Senate meeting.

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at and the January 9, 2006, and the December 5, 2005, meetings, pursuant to the Oregon State Department of Higher Education Internal Management Directives 1.125 (Authority over Faculties and Committees) and 1.126 (Internal Governance):

- The entry GPA for transfer students having 30 transferable credits, is set at 2.0 for all students who present an Oregon Transfer Module or a transferable Associate’s Degree. For those students transferring without the fundamental general education preparation of an associate’s degree or OTM, the minimum entry GPA is 2.25. This admission standard would apply to all students, regardless of their geographic residency. [Apart from entry GPA, International transfer students must also present proof of English proficiency (TOEFL or IELTS per the present policy.]

- Degree program change in the Bachelor of Music, adding the emphasis in Music Education, School of Fine & Performing Arts.

- Degree program changes and name change to BA/BS in Environmental Sciences (formerly Environmental Studies), College of Arts & Sciences.

- Program change in the Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), College of Arts & Sciences.

- New courses in the College of Arts & Sciences: ANTH 333, CH 284, CH 285, CH 286, DANE 316, DANE 347, FL 335, GRK 333, GRK 335, TUR 330, TUR 341, WR 413.

- Course change in PHE 550, College of Urban and Public Affairs

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Program Proposal for the M.M. in Jazz Studies, and Course Proposals

WAKELAND presented the proposals for the committee.

WAMSER/GRANT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Master of Music in Jazz Studies, Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in “D-1.”
THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

LIVNEH/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new course proposals in EPFA, Education, listed in “D-1”: EPFA 582, EPFA 583, EPFA 573, EPFA 574, EPFA 575, EPFA 516/616, EPFA 517/617, and EPFA 519. as listed in “D-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SQUIRE/REUTER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new course proposals in Music, Fine & Performing Arts, listed in “D-1”: MUS 540, and MUS 567. as listed in “D-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposal for the BA/BS in Environmental Studies and Course Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committees, after “E.1.”

LATIOLAIS/BULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the BA/BS in Environmental Studies, Arts & Sciences, as listed in “D-2.”

REUTER noted that this degree proposal has gone through the appropriate internal channels to reach this point, and if the Senate approves it, it will be forwarded with additional letters of support to the OUS Provost’s Council. The current proposal responds to certain needs of both PSU and OUS, including more social science and less sciences courses, transferability within OUS, articulating the definition of a science course, etc. The committee who authored the degree worked very diligently to comprehensively address the several different tradeoffs and complications of the program.

CUMMINGS _____________. CRAWSHAW noted that his previous objection was that different skills are listed under the same criteria. In any major there are certain skills you must have but _________________. The worry was that for environmental policy, students need some grounding in some Chemistry and Biology. On the other hand, it is their program, and even though he disagrees with some of it, he doesn’t want to stand in the way.

SHUSTERMAN stated that Chemistry would feel better about the program removing the courses listed therein, as they may not be offered in the foreseeable future, in particular CHEM 160 and CHEM 170. REUTER noted that one of the issues here is that although the department may not be offering the courses, they are currently on our books, and the student entering with a similar course can obtain a better transfer evaluation if there is a discrete course to identify. SHUSTERMAN noted that, accordingly, she withdrew her objection.
THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER/LATIOLAIS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in CHEM, ENG, AND SWAH, Arts & Sciences, listed in “D-2” with the correction to CHEM 384, 385, 386 that the relevant courses should be listed as CH 334, 335, 336.

THE MOTION TO APPROVED PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GRANT/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in MuEd, Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in “D-2.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

WAKEFIELD and LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committees.

AGORSAH/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in SPAN and course change, HST 442/542, Arts & Sciences, listed in “D-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

HANSEN/TATE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in MuEd, Fine & Performing Arts, listed in “D-3” to include deletion of the wording “for students enrolled in the teacher education program” in course descriptions of MuEd 422/522, 423/523, as well as the previously approved courses MuEd 334, 336, 337, 338, 339.

LIVNEH reminded that the phrase “teacher education” refers to the graduate licensure and Maser’s programs. BULMAN asked if these courses are reserved only for Music Education majors. HANSEN clarified that baccalaureate students may take undergraduate MusEd courses in anticipation of eventual admission to a graduate program in teacher education.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals

WAKEFIELD presented the proposals for the committee, after “D.1.”

LATIOLAIS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes in Speech and Hearing Sciences, College of Arts & Sciences, SPHR 554, as listed in “E-1.”
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER/FOSQUE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes in CI and EPFA, Graduate School of Education, CI 550, CI 551, CI 552, CI 553, CI 554, CI 555, CI 556, CI 557, EPFA 521, EPFA 522, as listed in “E-1.”

CUMMINGS noted that this is a significant reduction in credit hours and requested the rationale for this change. CASKEY noted the intent is to be able to expand the course offerings without increasing the cost to students. The field time will be the same.

BULMAN queried that with respect to the EPFA courses, as the title and course description are both being changed for each, is this more than a course change. WAKELAND noted that the committee interpreted these changes as a clarification of each course, rather than making a substantial change for each, or the committee would have requested a complete course proposal.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committee, after “D-3.”

BURNS/WORKS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course changes and dropped courses in MUS, Fine & Performing Arts, listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

HANSEN/

MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change of the B.M. in Performance, Music, Fine & Performing Arts, listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/GRANT MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program new emphasis, B.M. in Composition, Music, Fine & Performing Arts, listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Faculty Development Committee Semi-annual Report
The Presiding Officer presented a supplement to the report, provided by the Office of Sponsored Research, as follows:

The deadline for Faculty Enhancement applications was Monday, January 23, 2006. The Committee received 53 applications with requested funds totaling $429,448. Of the 53 proposals, 35 were submitted by faculty from the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. Under CLAS, the Math and Physics departments submitted the greatest number of proposals, at 6 each. The Committee received 5 proposals each from the Graduate School of Education, Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Science and the College of Urban & Public Affairs. The Library and the Graduate School of Social Work submitted one application each.

There is $250,000 available for the faculty enhancement grant this year, up from $240,000 last year. Committee members have begun individual review of the applications and will meet at the end of February to allocate funds. Award announcements will be made mid-March.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for the committee.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of February 2-3 at UO

BURNS presented the report for the senators, directing the assembly to the complete draft minutes of the meeting of 2-3 February 2006, at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/dir06/IFS0304Feb06.html

BURNS noted that the Chancellor cautioned that a special session may occur and that the Heath and Human Services shortfall could cause cuts to other state agencies. BURNS noted that campuses are working on draft rules for Background Checks, as mandated recently by state legislation. BURNS briefly reviewed draft proposals described by Vice Chancellor Kenton for tuition and fees changes, and changes to retirement and PEBB. BURNS noted that three campuses have not yet settled their contracts, having offers lower than PSU’s, and that U of Oregon is embroiled in controversies around Westmoreland Apartments and cultural competency requirements. BURNS noted he is participating in the Board strategic planning activity that is concluding this month. BURNS noted that various IFS members are involved in the K-20 articulation activities in progress.

3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C. BROWN discussed the committee’s activities around the town halls in progress, and proposals that are emerging from the committee’s deliberations. The committee proposes the establishment of a constitutional committee for University Studies oversight. The largest issue is the middle portion of the curriculum, and there are currently three proposals to address that. (Attached: Items for Faculty Senate Discussion).

ANGELL queried if the proposed new committed shouldn’t be called General Education, rather than “University Studies.” BROWN stated that the focus is on
University Studies, and that they didn’t want to tangle the Honors Program in the net.

COLLIER noted that the minor option doesn’t appear herein, and asked for clarification. BROWN stated the committee has discarded this idea, because it locks out a number of majors with little flexibility and heavy requirements, and therefore is not viable.

R. JOHNSON noted the SINQ proposals are quite varied and asked for a clarification of the intent behind them. C.BROWN noted that the committee is trying to be goal oriented; they are trying to use the University Studies goals and come up with a plan that addresses the goals.

FLOWER noted that one of the critiques of the program is ___________. The second two options play havoc with coherence. BROWN noted that instead of coherence in the clusters, the idea is to require in each “U” class that it reflect the intellectual framework of that discipline. ___________ It is a different view of coherence – not a subject orientation, but an intellectual approach orientation. FLOWER noted that the previous work of the UNST committee was to encompass both, as is described in the handout, option A. Lots of lessons have been learned in ten years, and we need to take advantage of them. C.BROWN stated that option A is included for just that reason.

4. Budget Committee Interim Report

R. JOHNSON reported for the committee concurrently with the report on the budget of Vice President Desrochers assisted by Vice Provost for Budget and Personnel Driscoll, after “E.3.”

JOHNSON noted that the university is trying to identify a $4 to 6 Million budget cut. This year it is being covered by fund balances. The steps being taken to date are to put together a process collecting data and establishing a set of principles and parameters to guide budget reduction. This includes examining possible revenue enhancements. The Budget Committee has worked on a faculty activity report with the administration, to be completed in the near future by full time instructional faculty only. They are also working on the overall parameters. See the June 2005 Budget Committee Annual Report for a draft of the criteria. The challenge will be how you weigh these things with the diversity of missions and cost structures across units. Regarding yesterday’s Oregonian article, the committee will include in their work a review of the mix of tenure versus non-tenure related faculty

Vice President’s Report

DESROCHERS reported on budget deliberations for 2006-07, with the assistance of Vice Provost for Personnel & Budget Mike Driscoll and Budget Committee Chair Ray Johnson.
DESROCHERS yielded to Johnson who presented the Interim Report of the Budget Committee (see “G.4”). DESROCHERS continued, stressing that the first and greatest emphasis in this difficult work is being placed on revenue enhancement. She thanked the Provost and Vice Provost for their efforts to date, and thanked the Budget Committee for their preparatory work on this matter last year. There is at least one additional contingency, which is the Emergency Board meeting scheduled for April. They are looking at salary this year and next year. However the Heath and Human Services budget has become a big problem due to decisions made recently at the federal level.

DESROCHERS reviewed their budget schedule, noting that decisions are schedule to be made by the end of April. The larger problem is the long term, not just next year’s budget. We need to lay groundwork for all the work to be done on this issue.

DRISCOLL noted that faculty could follow budget deliberations using the Academic Affairs web address, oaa.pdx.edu, and then going to News and Events, 2006 Budget Process. At 4:30 today, all instructional faculty will be requested to submit an online survey, the Faculty Activity Report. DRISCOLL noted that this report is not an instrument for performance evaluation.

SCHECHTER asked who is the audience for this survey. DRISCOLL noted the audience is internal and refinement of the data will be managed through departmental channels.

OCEGUERA asked for a clarification of revenue enhancement. DESROCHERS noted that they are complex, but there are a variety of proposals, for example what should be the charge to non-resident students, what is the real cost of self-support courses including administrative overhead, what should be the student mix at the university with respect to revenue, and should fee remissions be more centralized at PSU. DRISCOLL noted another example is the potential for increases in scholarships. JOHNSON referenced a proposal being looked at in the Chancellor’s office for a new tuition model around high tuition/high aid.

BULMAN asked if the Athletic deficit was being considered. DRISCOLL stated that nothing is off the table. DESROCHERS reminded that there are important equities around Athletics enrollments.

JACKSON asked for clarification on the Activity Report. DRISCOLL noted that there isn’t one available for Academic Professionals etc.; at this point, it is being distributed to ranked faculty only. JACKSON asked if there is one for adjuncts. DRISCOLL stated it would be very complicated to survey that group due to the diversity involved. JOHNSON noted that the report only would collect what people are contractually hired to do.

REDER asked if there would be a role for unit heads to provide context. DRISCOLL stated that summaries would be by department and school, with management adding context. Additionally, there is a worksheet for the school/college level. We are still working on this part.
REDER asked for a view as to the proper role of the Senate. JOHNSON noted that budget decisions are made almost daily all over the campus. Time constraints prevent much of this work from being conducted at the Senate level, but the Budget Committee, on the other hand, can respond more nimbly. Our goal is to have thoughtful and timely input into the process. Ultimately, these are administrative decisions. REDER asked what issues the Vice President feels the faculty can contribute to. DESROCHERS noted that the Budget Committee provides the voice of Senate, and close ties are needed between the two. DRISCOLL added that certain issues, for example, the mix of students, have implications other than budgetary and faculty are important in providing a detailed analysis.

SHUSTERMAN noted that the Senate doesn’t allow for depth, and asked if a discussion list could be established. JOHNSON offered that Senators could forward comments to him directly, requesting that feedback be divided into short and longer-term budgetary issues.

5. Interim Report of Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technologies

Rhodes noted that the institution is poised to renew or change our contract with WebCT/Blackboard or possibly move to an Open Source alternative, the latter allowing us greater ability to influence the functionality of it for what we are doing on this campus. The decision has not been made. There was a small pilot on SAMLA during Fall term and this term there are about fifty courses moved into this product. In Spring, there will be another set of faculty using the new version of WebCT/Blackboard to test it as well. After these trials a decision will be made in the summer as to which way to go because we can’t afford to keep multiple systems running indefinitely.

WAKELAND asked how faculty would be invited to participate in the decision. RHODES and KETCHESON stated there would be an independent evaluation conducted based on surveys of the Winter and Spring term products. RHODES stated it would have to do with the IT standpoint as well. LIVNEH noted concern that with our delicate infrastructure, the open source software is problematic. GREGORY stated the commercial system has more costs associated with it than the open source side, but the balance would be used on development. The tradeoff is between self-management and commercial dependence. RHODES urged faculty to talk to their representatives on the committee.

6. Report on Oregon SB 300 and Oregon SB 342

RHODES noted that SB 342 has seven things we in higher ed are required to do, including community college transfer regulations, pathways from high school to higher education, seamless transfer for 100/200 level general education courses, and a uniform standard for evaluation, ATLAS. Additionally, there is a mandate for uniform standards for AP coursework. In SB 300, there is a mandate for early college for 11-12 grades for at risk students. The high schools and colleges have
to figure out who will pay for this. Returning to SB 342, there is a mandate for an outcome-based framework for general education. Five PSU faculty are representing the university at the first meeting on this issue, being held at PSU on February 11, 12.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.
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A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2006, MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following correction:

Yer Thao was in attendance.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Election Of Presiding Officer Pro Tem

John Rueter was elected Presiding Officer Pro Tem to replace Robert Mercer.
Hearing no nominee to fill the vacancy on the Steering Committee, CARTER concluded the item for the day.

Cameron Turner, ASPSU, presented on their initiative to increase student voter turnout, details being emailed to Senators subsequent the meeting.

Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since February 6, 2006:

Robert Mercer, CLAS has been replace in the Senate by Jeanette Palmiter (June 2006)
Robert Mercer has been replaced in the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (December 2006)

In accordance with normal governance procedures, President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the February 6, 2006, meeting, pursuant to the Oregon State Department of Higher Education Internal Management Directives 1.125 (Authority over Faculties and Committees) and 1.126 (Internal Governance):

M.M. in Jazz Studies; new courses in Music, MUS 540, and MUS 567; new courses in MusEd, MusEd 334, 336, 337, 338, 339, 422/522, 423/523, to include deletion of the wording "for students enrolled in the teacher education program" in course descriptions; course changes and dropped courses in Music; B.M. program change of the B.M. in Performance; B.M. program new emphasis, B.M. in Composition, Fine & Performing Arts.

New course proposals in EPFA, Education, EPFA 582, EPFA 583, EPFA 573, EPFA 574, EPFA 575, EPFA 516/616, EPFA 517/617, and EPFA 519; course changes in CI, CI 550, CI 551, CI 552, CI 553, CI 554, CI 555, CI 556, CI 557, and EPFA, EPFA 521, EPFA 522., Graduate School of Education

BA/BS in Environmental Studies; new courses in CHEM, ENG, SPAN and SWAH, with the correction to CHEM 384, 385, 386 that the relevant courses should be listed as CH 334, 335, 336; course change, History, HST 442/542 and Speech and Hearing Sciences, SPHR 554, College of Arts & Sciences.

Discussion Item - The Changing Balance Between Tenure-related and Non-tenure-related Faculty: Implications for the Present and for the Future

CARTER introduced the discussion item, noting that this is a national as well as a local concern. He reviewed the context, which is the survey he took on issues of importance to faculty in Fall 2005. CARTER read the preamble for the discussion item, which was previously distributed to the Senate via listserv:

"Faculty are concerned that the traditional faculty mix has been changing rapidly in recent years, at least partly in response to growth, with the result that we have more fixed-term and adjunct faculty than ever before and fewer faculty on tenure lines. What
CARTER noted that the format for discussion would be as follows: Pres. Sy Adler, AAUP and Dean Marvin Kaiser, CLAS, would present on the topic for five minutes each; Provost Roy Koch would respond for ten minutes; and, ten minutes of discussion would follow. He then moved the meeting to a committee of the whole for 30 minutes.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE noted that the Budget process for 2006-07 reductions is underway. He stated that the issues raised in the discussion item will be part of overall budget discussions. With regard to budget, it is worth noting that at the OUS Board meeting on Friday, there was a proposal to close one of the campuses in the system as a way to adjust budget shortfalls. He yielded to Vice President McVeety.

McVEETY reported on her recent trip to Asia, funded by the Alumni Association. Countries visited by the group included Thailand, Korea, Japan, and China. It can’t be stressed enough the important connection between the alumni and the faculty who were their instructors. The next trip will be to Kuwait.

MCVEETY reported that the Simon Benson event was a great success, and that it was announced at the event that the Building Our Future campaign is now at $104 Million, $4 Million over the goal. The highlight of the evening was the student speaker, Noor Sikhun, who introduced Queen Noor.

McVEETY concluded, that as previously urged by the faculty, the telephone directory would be revised to include individual listings. Applause.

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that all information on how the 2006-07 budget is being developed is available on the website for Academic Affairs, News and Events. The most recent memo to the Deans indicates that we anticipate a $6 Million budget shortfall next year, proposes principles and parameters to deal with budget allocations, and request budget proposals from the Deans due by 24 March. With respect to this issue, faculty are encourage to complete Faculty Activity Reports, and the deadline for doing so has been extended to 7 March. In addition to current needs, this will save the university from having to request this information in future for other purposes such as requests from OUS and the press, for example.

KOCH continued, the OUS Board approved the Ph.D. in Biology at their meeting last Thursday, and he thanked the Biology Department for all their
hard work on this proposal. The Provost’s Council approved the Ph.D. proposal in Sociology and will be scheduled for the external review.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE introduced the proposals for the committee, noting that most course proposals were tabled because course descriptions were not included in the agenda packet.

BURNS/ BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program change in Arts & Sciences, Minor in Foreign Languages and Literature, to add Turkish, as listed in “E-1” p. 3.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program changes in Business Administration, Information Systems Option, and Finance Option, as listed in “E-1” pp. 4-5.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/ BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Business Administration, ISQA 451 and ISQA 450, as listed in “E-1” p. 5.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/ BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new program in Urban and Public Affairs, Hatfield School of Government, Div of Political Science, Minor in Law and Legal Studies, as listed in “E-1” p. 6.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/ ANGELL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE changes in University Studies Clusters, additions and deletions of courses, as listed in “E-1” p. 1-2.

SHUSTERMAN requested that in future, these proposals include a summary of the cluster(s) in question.

FLOWER noted that departments continue to cooperate with the recommendation that courses be offered at the 300 rather than 400 level.
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council & Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

Tabled.

3. Graduate Council Course Proposals

WAKELAND presented the proposals for the committee, noting that new course proposals were tabled because course descriptions were not included in the agenda packet, and recommending that program proposals be approved conditionally with the approval of missing courses, where necessary.

BURNS/ BLEILER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the program changes in Liberal Arts & Sciences, Master of Arts in TESOL, and Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems, as listed in “E-3” p. 1.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BRENnan/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE CONDITIONALLY APPROVE the program change in Social Work, Master of Social Work, as listed in “E-3” p. 1, PENDING Senate approval of three new courses SW 539, SW 541, and SW 551.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BRENnan/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the course changes in Social Work, as listed in “E-3” p. 1, for courses SW 530, SW 531, SW 532, SW 540 and SW 550.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report

ELZANOWSKI reported for the committee, noting that the committee, as charged, is currently engaged in reviewing faculty governance, and is not prepared yet to report to the Senate on this matter. One item that they are currently working on is the document defining the creation of Centers. Another item they plan to work on next term is the composition of the Senate.
2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report

ROGERS presented the report for the committee. He noted that Terri Mariani has been appointed Interim Athletic Director as a result of Tom Burman’s resignation in January. He continued, that with the several changes in administration this year, the committee is behind, but hope to have a more thorough report ready by the June Senate meeting. ROGERS reminded that if faculty have academic concerns regarding Athletics, they should contact Kim Hottel, or Bob Lockwood, PSU’s NCAA representative. He also noted that the committee is seeking faculty interested in joining the committee next year.

BURNS noted that the IAB was placed on the schedule for quarterly reporting so that the faculty would have an ongoing sense of the cost of Athletics. ROGERS noted that the information needs to be more transparent, as currently the information being received is only with respect to what has been budgeted. Budgets are an artificial tool; we need to better understand how the money is being spent, how much is coming in, etc.

RUETER asked if there is a new eligibility rule that would change the transfer pattern. ROGERS noted that this is probably a reference to the Academic Progress Rate (APR), which is a way of tracking things. NCAA are moving in the direction of being able to track athletes coming in from junior colleges in a more meaningful way. The traditional metric has been focused on students coming in out of high school. We’re not sure if it penalizes universities bringing students in from junior colleges; we are watching it.

3. The PSU Student Portal

RHODES noted there is a new piece of technology being rolled out at PSU, which has extraordinary potential from an academic standpoint. All students coming to the university will be presented with a Portal, which will centralize all information they need at the university. This spring, there will be a soft rollout to three to four thousand students, and eventually it will be rolled out to all students, and then to all faculty. Eventually, everything will be in one place, with one password. He yielded to Mark Gregory.

GREGORY noted that most institutions in the country are going to this type of format so that everything isn’t scattered all over the web, but instead there will be one login. He briefly demonstrated the site and some of the resources on it and noted that faculty will be able to access it immediately, although it is only for students at this point (attached).

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1628.
Minutes:
Faculty Senate Meeting, April 3, 2006

Presiding Officer:
Duncan Carter

Secretary:
Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

Members Present:

Alternates Present:

Members Absent:

Ex-officio Members Present:

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2006, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 1506. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

Maty for Farquhar, and Sestak were in attendance on March 6, 2006.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Scott Burns, IFS President, distributed the Student Learning Outcomes for General Education summary document that was developed at the statewide meeting of February 2006 at PSU, as a partial response to SB 342. The website containing the full information as well as a place for comment is at:

http://www.ous.edu/aca/forums.html.
In accordance with normal governance procedures, President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the March 6, 2006, meeting, pursuant to the Oregon State Department of Higher Education Internal Management Directives 1.125 (Authority over Faculties and Committees) and 1.126 (Internal Governance):

Program changes in Liberal Arts & Sciences, Master of Arts in TESOL, Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems, add Minor in Turkish, FLL.

Program change in Social Work, Master of Social Work PENDING Senate approval of three new courses SW 539, SW 541, and SW 551, and course changes in Social Work, for courses SW 530, SW 531, SW 532, SW 540 and SW 550.

Program changes in Business Administration, Information Systems Option, and Finance Option, and new courses in Business Administration, ISQA 451 and ISQA 450.

New program in Urban and Public Affairs, Hatfield School of Government, Div of Political Science, Minor in Law and Legal Studies.

Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since March 6, 2006:

Dee Thompson, A.O. elected to the Comm. on Committees (2004-06)
Leopoldo Rodriguez, appointment to Chair, Faculty Development Committee, eff. 1 March 2006
Kimberly Hottel appointment to Academic Requirements Committee, eff. 13 February 2006.
Mary Ann Barham, appointment to Scholastic Standards Committee, to replace Liane Gough, eff. 16 March 2006.
Mary Ann Barham, resignation from Educational Policies Committee, eff. 22 March 2006

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted he had three items to announce. First, the administration is moving forward with the search for the VP for Student Affairs and the committee membership has been shared with the Advisory Council for comment. The intent is that the committee will include a representative from one of the community colleges. Second, a standing advising committee will be established and the Academic Advising Council charter has been shared with the Senate Steering Committee and forwarded to the Advisory Council for comment especially on the first charge of the committee, which is whether this committee should be administrative or constitutional. One of the principle objectives of the committee is the advancement of advising activities on campus. Third, two proposals for centers/institutes have been forwarded to the Steering Committee who has forwarded them to the Educational Policies Committee. They are the Center for Sustainable Processes and Practices, and the Center for Improvement of Child & Family Services.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals in “D-1” for the committee, noting that SBA course ISQA 430 Transportation (4) is DELETED. It will appear with a different title under today’s new business.
BURNS/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “D-1.”

MANDAVILLE commended the Department of Philosophy for the re-shaping of their curriculum. It looks very good, and several courses look very appealing.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CUMMINGS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses and course changes in Business Administration, as listed in “D-1,” with the exclusion of ISQA 430, as previously noted, and the exclusion of ISQA 450 and 451, which were approved in March.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CUMMINGS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses and course changes in Urban & Public Affairs, as listed in “D-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

WAKELAND and LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committees.

CUMMINGS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in “D-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/C. BROWN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Engineering & Computer Sciences, as listed in “D-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Curricular Proposals

WAKELAND presented the proposals for the Council.

BURNS/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new graduate courses in Social Work, as listed in “D-3.”

______ asked why these courses would be offered for three rather than four credits. BRENNAAN noted that the curriculum is being redesigned but the total program credit will stay the same, therefore certain courses are being reduced to three credits each.

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

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE introduced the proposals for the committee.

MANDAVILLE/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE three new courses in Liberal Arts & Sciences, and Business Administration, listed in “E-1.”

_______________ asked how ISQA 430 Industrial Transportation and Freight (4) differs from CE 453/553 Freight Transportation and Logistics (4). BERTINI noted that the CE course is looking from the infrastructure side and the ISQA courses are presumably from the firm’s point of view. ______________ noted that the ISQA course has to do with the industrial application of transportation activities, for example, how does a firm go about maximizing its logistics system. They are substantially different courses.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

REDER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, course changes, and Theater Arts program changes, Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

SHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification of why, given the kinds of changes, that the Theater Arts courses were changes and not new courses. LAWRENCE noted that in cases such as this, the committee carefully reviews the proposal to determine whether there are changes or whether they are new courses, before they approve the proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

REDER/BURNS moved the Senate approve one new course in Urban and Public Affairs, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council Certificate Proposal, Engineering & Computer Sciences

WAKELAND introduced the proposal for the committee, noting that it received very careful scrutiny by the committee due to the minimum number of credits required for the certificate.

C.BROWN/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the certificate proposal as listed in “E-2.”

MANDAVILLE asked if this program is so promising, why UO and OSU have withdrawn it. BROWN noted that the logistics of getting faculty to Metro area is the main reason, and secondly, OSU decided to tighten their mission around
excellence in research. Lastly, OGI lost their faculty member who taught this material, so they dropped it as well.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV, 4. n.

BROWN proposed the amendment for the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies. The committee feels very strongly that the curriculum of this program should be under the guidance of the Faculty Senate, requiring a constitutional committee, therefore this action item. The ad hoc committee has also listed other recommendations in their report, but the intent is that the standing committee would take up the rest of the proposals in the report if the Senate doesn’t enact them today.

REDER noted that the timing is problematic, as some Senators would like to discuss several items in the report. Additionally, an ASPSU petition is circulating at the meeting, requesting input on these findings.

C.BROWN/CUMMING MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed amendment to the Constitution, listed in “E-3.”

MANDAVILLE asked, with respect to the ASPSU petition, would input change the diversity or amount of student input already collected. C.BROWN noted that the committee conducted town hall meetings, contacted the student government (although they didn’t respond), and gathered some student input through advising questionnaires. The committee can’t be certain of the total input, however, the proposed constitutional amendment is separable from the committee report; there is no policy involved. Approving the constitutional committee will not preclude additional student comment. ______ noted that two undergraduate students participated in the ad hoc committees activities. MEDOVOI asked who has current oversight, and why does this committee have to be approved at this point instead of at the end of the process. C.BROWN noted that there is no established faculty oversight of the program. The council would have real authority derived from the Faculty Senate.

MORGANE queried what kind of unit the program is, and continued, that this question needs to be answered before we can figure how it relates to the Senate. She continued, recommending that the existing administrative committee recommend whether the program should report to the Faculty Senate. BROWN stated that whatever is decided, this program still ultimately needs to report to the Senate, as do all others in the university. This action doesn’t relate to structural questions.

LAWRENCE asked for comment on the provision that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee coordinates with this council. BROWN noted that this would be similar to the relationship it has with the Graduate Council.
MEDOVOI asked if his second question could be answered, about why the committee should be approved now instead of after the rest of the report has been discussed. C. BROWN reiterated that this is the only action item the ad hoc committee is proposing, and does not influence future implementation or not of any other recommendations in the report.

REDER asked for a clarification of the process with respect to the other recommendations and the role of the Senate in this process. C. BROWN noted it would be the same as the relationship as the Graduate Council’s relationship with the Senate with respect to policy. SHUSTERMAN reminded that the current committee is appointment by the administration, not the faculty, and the oversight of the curriculum constitutionally resides with the Faculty Senate.

CRAWSHAW noted that the term “involved” is problematic, with respect to the definition of the word. Additionally, involved implies narrow support from the faculty when in fact what is needed is broader faculty support.

CRAWSHAW/SHUSTERMAN MOVED TO DELETE the word “ONLY” from sentence #2.

MEDOVOI noted that striking the word doesn’t do any good. It still emphasizes there is a preference for people directly involved in general education. GRANT noted that striking the word “only” allows latitude for what involvement means, and that “interest” is not a strong enough word to promote participation. FISCHER noted that.

REDER/ANGELL MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION to amend the Constitution.

THE MOTION TO TABLE FAILED by majority voice vote.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

CLUCAS asked for further clarification with respect to student input on the committee’s findings. BROWN noted that is was a question of opportunity as opposed to whether the students took advantage of it. There were three town halls with some but not a lot of student attendance, there were articles in the student paper, and there was a website to receive comment. A group of students were entertained during a committee meeting, at which they were free to give their opinions. Brown attempted to contact the student government, but it didn’t work out for whatever reason. Then, some questionnaires were administered during advising.

DEVANEY noted that to her knowledge, the student government didn’t receive any information about changes happening to University Studies. As soon as they found out about it through Faculty Senate meetings, they started expressing concerns, especially through the input of student mentors. All we are asking for is some other outlet by which students can express themselves for or against the
changes. BROWN noted that, additionally, the committee did a focus group with student mentors. She reminded that the only proposal in today's agenda is the constitutional amendment and the new committee would undoubtedly seek student input. CLUCAS asked if Brown extended an invitation to Erin Devaney or Ryan Klute. BROWN stated that she called two or three times to student government and there was no reply, however, she did have contact with Ryan Klute and he came to a meeting with a group of other students.

CUMMINGS reiterated that this proposal is not changing anything about the University Studies program; what is important is to separate the two issues. The committee is not changing University Studies. Any changes to University Studies must go through an established committee, and this proposal is to create that committee. This proposal is attempting to give more direct faculty oversight to this process and in fact formalize the role of students in the process. This proposal establishes the faculty’s responsibility to look at what changes are needed based on recommendations that have come from the ad hoc committee. The committee that results may reject any and all recommendations, as it chooses.

STEVENS noted that this would give more cohesion to University Studies to have this committee, for not only oversight, but also for foresight.

MANDAVILLE asked for a clarification with respect to item #3 in the report. BROWN noted that the committee was very careful with their language; for example, they did not propose formation of a department in their report.

ANGELL asked if this committee is exactly parallel to the Graduate Council. BROWN stated they are roughly the same in oversight, for example, the Graduate Council considers certificates and degree programs proposed by academic departments. In this case there is no individual department, and there will be no majors or programs. However, it does in a similar fashion, establish policy, provide faculty oversight, facilitate the mission, control quality, determine future direction, etc.

________ asked if the committee could treat the next month as a comment period and endeavor to gather further student comment. BROWN noted that in her talks with the students, they stated they would be satisfied only with a complete restart of the process and nothing less.

BRENNAN asked for further clarification of the timing of this proposal. BROWN stated that if we delay, any substantial changes to the program to improve it could be delayed by as much as two years based on the sequences of the academic calendar. The council needs to start its work next fall and it will take them months to get their heads around these issues.

The discussion was concluded, with the motion to be returned to the Senate at the May 1, 2006, meeting.
F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C.BROWN presented the report that was distributed electronically (attached), and thanked the committee for their work. She also noted that whoever was responsible for selecting the members did a good job. Applause. She continued, that this is a systems problem in that small isolated changes could have effects and ramifications far beyond what might be considered. She briefly outlined the major recommendations in the report.

LATIOLAIS queried that in retrospect, it seems we should have expected that the most muddled and least understood part of the program is the one that would get the least recommendations, and the part recognized as the most successful, seems to be getting the most profound recommendations for changes. For example, the proposal for change of seat time will decrease mentor interaction – one of the great successes. Another concern is that the report seems to recommend increasing the faculty workload, and the timing on this issue is also not good. BROWN noted that the committee explored the notion of far reaching changes for the cluster portion of the program, but found they didn’t have the time or expertise to address that part adequately. As far as the seat time around Freshman Inquiry is concerned, the course offers five credits, however the students spend only three hours a week with a faculty member. The laboratory model might be used for the mentor section, so that they spend two hours with students for one hour of credit, however there are issues around this problem, such as faculty workload, so that is why no formal motion is being made on such an issue. This is an example of the work left to be done.

RUETER noted he questioned the recommendation to appoint a new director, and asked what is the role of faculty governance in administration. It is a pretty harsh recommendation. BROWN noted that the committee was unanimous about the recommendation but reluctant to put this in the report. This could be interpreted as a recommendation that a formal process for selecting the director be employed, and if it comes up with the same person again, then great.

MORG AINE noted that this recommendation was a shameful action, when this director has led the program to national recognition. BROWN noted that the committee commended her for her hard work and accomplishments. MORG AINE noted that that sentiment is lost in this context.

ANGELL noted that this is one of our nationally renowned programs particularly for its innovation, and is concerned that some recommendations appear to reduce
the innovation of this program and take it back toward some previous distribution model. Additionally, in that general education is a discipline in itself, it seems a little odd that the faculty committee that is passing judgment on it has only one member from the discipline. BROWN noted that the committee’s charge and intention was to develop recommendations to strengthen not weaken the program, recognizing its innovative nature. Additionally, if you look at the Graduate Council, for example, if her program wants to have a graduate certificate, even though there is only one person from her college – not even her discipline – on the Graduate Council, they get to say yes or no to that graduate certificate. Therefore, it is quite comparable. The presumption would be that most people in the university recognize the value of this program and would want to help strengthen it. That would be the goal of this council. Achieving more of a relationship between the program and the rest of the university is very desirable, and that is a part of what this council would make happen.

CRAWSHAW noted that the nature of these comments make it very clear how diverse, politically charged and difficult the opinions are on this matter, and thanked the committee for doing a very good job. LATIOLAI noted he seconded that remark. **Applause.**

BURNS requested a reiteration of what should happen next. BROWN noted the committee is not asking the Senate to vote on these recommendations, but to forward them to council, which would be a new standing committee with teeth. Hopefully, they will have some effect on future directions as a lot of time and effort was put into the recommendations, but most of all we need a committee of the faculty that can go to the faculty with whatever, and the program must then respond as directed.

STEVENS noted that in light of Angell’s comments, as the committee knows the program the best, it would be good if the committee could list the program’s strengths. BROWN noted that the committee was trying to keep the report as brief as possible, and perhaps they were not as explicit as they could have been in stating that they want the program to stay, and by creating a special standing council, they are acknowledging it as a formal part of the university that will go forward in time.

KERRIGAN noted that with respect to Brown’s interchange with Rueter earlier about the director position, both review and recruitment were cited. She continued she would propose that there are multiple models for looking at the director position, one being listing out the position description and giving the person a performance evaluation, and then giving the person the opportunity to look at the goals ahead and their strengths and skills in meeting those goals ahead. Another direction is the word “recruitment,” and following what that presumes. As long as these are only recommendations, there is still the possibility of multiple paths to determine the outcome of this leadership position. BROWN noted that at this university there is very little support for administrative positions, and the university needs to take a look at this problem. KERRIGAN noted that this courtesy should be given to the person currently in the job.
OCEGUERA noted she supports the idea of a council that solidifies and formalizes the program, and also solidifies the participation of students in the program. The student government is just asking for a survey to express their concerns. BROWN stated that, to the contrary, the student government clearly indicated that the only thing that would satisfy them would be to start over from square one. OCEGUERA noted that Ryan Klute was a Senator not the current President, and there are so many more students than student government, who are not asking for a complete overhaul but just a chance to be surveyed.

BUDDRESS asked if, following on Oceguera’s comment, there are student evaluations from the University Studies courses, what are the results of those, and are the results in the report. BROWN noted that one of the reasons the report recommends formation of an assessment committee, was that they tried to get information like that from the program and it wasn’t readily available. The committee did what it could with the resources available, which was summary information provided by the program.

2. Budget Planning Discussion

CARTER presented the preliminary Budget Planning Recommendations for Ray Johnson, who was not available today (www.oaa.pdx.edu/BudgetPlanning2006). Comment will be taken in this meeting and there will be two forums for public comment later in the week. CARTER noted that Johnson requested he convey the following thoughts: while it is nobody’s idea of a good time to talk about budget cuts, the university can’t continue to spend more than it takes in; and, we should recognize that for the upcoming year, we are limited in the revenue strategies that we can use because of legislative tuition caps. We want to be sure that you know that the Faculty Senate Budget Committee has significant input into the information that was collected about the performance of the academic units, and the principles that should guide the budget process. The latter is the culmination of a process that has been bubbling up in the Budget Committee for at least three years, in an attempt to align budget decisions with our values and priorities.

JACKSON noted that the Library is assigned the largest cuts, with no reinvestment, and this is contrary to the accreditation recommendations. KOCH noted that there is one mistake in the document today. He continued, there is a primary objective to correct a structural issue, our expenses exceed our revenue. That being said, the Deans recommendations were reviewed with the objective of not impacting our ability to generate resources. When we got to the last few hundred thousand dollars, there were no areas left to cut with the exception of materials and acquisitions in the Library budget. This is a short-term alignment.

JACKSON said she had great concern because the cut translates to mean that the Library can buy no new books for the entire academic year. KOCH stated that of course this is a grave concern, but none of the alternatives were pleasant. JACKSON asked why $155,000 for a website was cited for investment. KOCH stated that within a few years, all of the business of PSU will be done through the
front page of the website. Right now there is one person, who happens to be in the
room, who is the PSU website. Not that he isn’t capable, but to manage a website
for an organization of several thousand employees and twenty-five thousand
students with one person, is not acceptable. It is not just a communication tool,
but it will be the way that people interact with all the things we do, for example,
we are about to roll out Portals for students and faculty. It was a decision made
about what we have to do immediately to meet immediate demands.

CASKEY stated that the Graduate School of Education fully understands why a
6% cut is proposed, as a result of their enrollment, but they also wonder why there
is no reinvestment. KOCH noted that the data drove the process, for example in
the School of Education the credit hours have decreased 12% over the last four
years, and the faculty FTE has increased 10%. Those lines are diverging from
each other and we can’t continue down that pathway, so for the short run, the
adjustment must be made and it was unclear where we would reinvest. CASKEY
noted that they made very targeted recommendations for reinvestments, having to
do with building diversity in programs and increasing credit hours. KOCH noted
that all programs together proposed a total of $12.5 Million. DESROCHERS
noted that they looked at all of the reinvestment proposals, and were only able to
take a very small group of items out of a whole bunch of very good ideas across
the institution.

COLLIER noted that Athletics took a $106,000 hit, but is not coming up in a
larger discussion. There was no question asked about what we are doing at this
level of competition with all the added cost. We have never had any positive
return on advancing to a higher division and at a time when we are making these
kinds of cuts; this needs to come back on the table. Applause. DESROCHERS
noted that Athletics was looked at, it was reduced heavily in the previous round,
and it is right on the brink of non-viability. COLLIER noted that we made these
changes in the mid-nineties when the economy was booming but as there is no
money coming in now, what are we doing playing on this level. For example, we
could have a better Library and a Division II football team. DESROCHERS noted
that there are 300 students from many states involved in Athletics, and when you
get right down to it, our investment is not as great as you would think.

FLOWER asked if there has been any effort to prioritize for the future the
remaining investment requests beyond what we could afford. KOCH stated yes,
to a degree. DESROCHERS stated yes, and this is a very good list we can work
with, with some additional review, in the future. The data that was acquired is
very valuable, and we intend to continue perfecting that database.

LIVNEH noted that a concern for Extended Studies is the increase from 10 to
12% of the charge on self-support programs. It is higher than the other OUS
institutions. DESROCHERS noted that there is a new policy coming along for
2008-09 that is directed towards realizing the actual cost, which will be much more complicated. For next year only, it will be raised the additional 2% as a way of addressing the shortfall.

___________ yielded to BEASLEY who noted there is an apparent disconnect between supporting the research infrastructure and cuts in the Library. KOCH stated that this is the plan for one year, and we know it doesn’t get us to the point of funding our activities. For example, we know that OIT can’t be reorganized every year to save $300,000. DESROCHERS noted she asked Mark Gregory to give serious thought as to how he could economize.

WOSLEY-GEORGE thanked the Provost and Vice President for their hard work on the project. She stated she is proud to be a member of the PSU faculty and especially the faculty of Counselor Education. A key thing that people look at is “how do I measure what is a good program to go to.” As we go forward, we need to give serious thought to how we want to been seen externally, and take into consideration how our programs are perceived.

MANDAVILLE queried _______ KOCH stated we can do that, but this is a short-term disruption that we still must deal with, for example, nobody asked for an increase in Service and Supply. DESROCHERS said that a faculty member at the Budget Committee meeting earlier in the day asked that we look at the S&S budget. MANDAVILLE noted that the Library always takes a cut, and it will never catch up.

GREGORY noted that OIT took the largest cut by percentage, except for Arts & Sciences, for the last five years.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1708.
Minutes:
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL CALL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3, 2006, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 1505. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
Halverson, Lall, and Watanabe were present.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

DRISCOLL announced on behalf of the university and PSU-AAUP that there would be two forums, May 15 and 16, in anticipation of developing Performance Review guidelines next year. The activity came out of the last contract negotiations, and these guidelines would be established next year. There is a draft document on the OAA web page, for faculty to review.
CARTER noted that Vice Provost Driscoll is attending his last Senate meeting, as he has accepted the position of Provost at U. of Alaska, Anchorage, and expressed the Senate's appreciation for his outstanding performance in his current position. Applause.

CARTER noted that the Alumni Association would be sponsoring a reception for the Faculty Senate after the June Senate meeting.

NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDING OFFICER FOR THE 2006-07 FACULTY SENATE:

BULMAN/STOERING nominated Kathi Ketcheson.
WAMSER/CRAWSHAW nominated Gwen Shusterman.

In accordance with normal governance procedures, President Bernstine has approved all the action of the Senate passed at the April 3, 2006, meeting, pursuant to the Oregon State Department of Higher Education Internal Management Directives 1.125 (Authority over Faculties and Committees) and 1.126 (Internal Governance).

Provost's Report

KOCH noted that the budget reduction recommendations have been forwarded to the President and they have been accepted as published. That document, available on the Academic Affairs web page, indicates some adjustments from the original proposal. The aggregate results of the Faculty Activity Report were used in the process, and as the survey will continue to be used in the future, it will be reviewed and refined before next year.

In response to the need for refinement of the Research infrastructure at the university, an ad hoc committee is being convened by Vice Provost Feyerherrm to look at current practices, the support we have for externally funded research, and to make recommendations on how we can improve processes and practices.

The OUS Provost's Council has approved the Environment Sciences and the Environment Studies degree program proposals and changes, and they are expected to be approved by the OSBHE at the upcoming meeting on May 5.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV, 4. n.)

IT WAS NOTED THAT THE AGENDA MAILING CONTAINS AN INCORRECT VERSION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT. Senators were directed to the correct version on the overhead:

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY. 4) Standing Committees and Their Functions. n) University Studies Council. This council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one from All Other faculty, one elected representative of the core University Studies faculty, two upper-division undergraduate students and, as consultants, the following or his/her representative: the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the immediate
administrator of the program, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees from among faculty members with an involvement in general education. The Council shall:

1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish procedures and regulations for University Studies.

2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or its appropriate committees and to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies suitable policies and standards for University Studies courses and programs.

3) Coordinate with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to bring forward recommendations to the Senate for new courses in the University Studies program.

4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, all aspects of the University Studies program and its assessment, and suggest needed changes to the appropriate administrators or faculty committees.

5) Advise the Senate and its committees on all aspects of University Studies.

6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.

7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, including a list of courses and program changes reviewed and approved.

REDER asked a question about the representation of University Studies on the committee. BROWN noted that the committee membership is specified by divisions, but that members of the divisions may also be University Studies participants. This part could always be amended later if faculty felt there was too little or too much representation.

LABISSIÈRE noted that _________ and that the scope of the committee as it reads, is very broad particularly with respect to “implementation.” It implies excessive micro-management. BROWN stated it is unlikely this committee has the time and/or energy to micromanage the committee; it is to provide guidelines and policy.

THE MOTION WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOICE VOTE with no abstentions.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committee.

TATE/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed Minor in Creative Industries, Fine & Performing Arts, as listed in “E-1.”

SHUSTERMANN asked for a clarification regarding the use of a capstone as a minor requirement. WETZEL noted that INTNL has a capstone that is a major requirement. C.BROWN noted that Engineering has a Capstone that is a major requirement. SHUSTERMANN _________.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
WETZEL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course in Economics, Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

WAKELAND/LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committees, noting that changes in EC 4/532 and EC 4/533 in particular, include eliminating the undergraduate courses.

BLEILER/BULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposed new courses and course changes in Economics, Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CLUCAS/_______ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course in Public Health Education, PHE 4/545, Urban & Public Affairs, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Curricular Proposals

WAKELAND presented the proposals for the committee.

RUETER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course in Economics, Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BULMAN/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses EPFA, Graduate School of Education, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

REYNOLDS/CLUCAS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the change to the Master of Public Health (option) and new courses and course change, Urban & Public Affairs, as listed in E-3.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal for Center for the Improvement of Child and Family Services

ELZANOWSKI presented the proposal for the committee.

BULMAN/GILPATRICK MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal, as listed in E-4.”
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THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. IV., 4, c)

LONEY presented the proposal which was authored by the Scholastic Standards Committee, noting that the intent is to update the constitution to reflect the committee's current activity.

GILPATRICK/BUDDRESS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal to amend the Constitution, as listed in “E-5.”

BURNS noted that he strongly recommended the Senate adopt these changes.

CARTER noted, that hearing no further discussion, the proposal would be forwarded to the Advisory Council for review and returned to the June meeting of the Faculty Senate for a final vote.

6. Scholastic Standards Committee Proposal to Change the “Incomplete” Regulation

LONEY presented the proposal for the committee.

REDER/AGORSAH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal to change the University grading regulations for “Incomplete” grades, as listed in E-6.”

WETZEL noted that this is penalizing a student for a faculty problem, and queried if it was really necessary to require the change of “T” to an “F” after one year. She continued, noting that faculty are very ill informed about what an Incomplete means. LONEY noted that the committee took that into consideration and continued, that the new Portals system would notify the student of the status of the incomplete.

WETZEL noted that we may be holding the students to a higher standard that we use for ourselves, for example, she has two incompletes on her PhD transcript.

CLUCAS noted that some universities have grading software that allows the instructor to list an alternative grade, not necessarily an “F” if the course is never completed.

HOFFMAN noted that freezing the grades on the transcript only 30 days after the degree is awarded is an excessive requirement. LONEY noted that the committee reviewed this proposal with the Records Office, who said it was “do-able.” HOFFMAN noted she disagreed with that assessment, noting that a grade change after 30 days does not impact a student’s ability to earn Honors or credits in residency. The graduation clearance has already occurred. The graduating student should not be disadvantaged in this manner, and the committee would most likely receive additional petitions that would have to be automatically granted.
WETZEL asked why it is important for all incompletes to become “F” grades after one year. LONEY yielded to MacCORMACK who stated that there is no institutional incentive for the faculty member or student to resolve matters in a timely way. Therefore, several years later the student may approach the faculty member and too much time has gone by to address the matter. LONEY reminded that this would not alter the petition process.

BLEILER noted that it is an issue of accountability, and the student should be accountable. If the student doesn't meet their end of the contract there should be consequences. CRAWSHAW noted that it is inconsistent at present and unfair to the student who completes the work but gets a poor grade, when compared to the student who doesn't show up for the final and gets an incomplete indefinitely.

REPP asked if there isn't any other way to resolve this problem rather than giving an “F” as that seems punitive. LONEY noted that the contract process would take effect along with the change, including notice by email to the student and faculty member.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority vote of hands with no abstentions.

7. Resolutions (2) of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review University Studies

C. BROWN presented the resolutions for the committee.

MAIER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE item #1, as listed in “E-7:"

Resolved, that the University Studies Council be staffed as soon as is practical, and in any case before the end of AY 05-06, and that it is encouraged to implement the recommendations of the University Studies Review Report in a timely and expeditious way, subject to due consideration and consultation with all affected parties.

BROWN noted that it would be good for the new committee to have a sense from the Senate that they should undertake their work as soon as possible.

ANGELL noted that the language seems stronger than this, as if the committee is required to implement the entire list of recommendations. BROWN noted that the term “subject to due consideration and consultation with all affected parties” is included to provide guidance on this issue.

RHODES noted he missed the last Senate meeting when the report was presented. He commended the committee for the work that they did and their acknowledgment and affirmation of the legitimacy of the program in our curricular structure by recommending the standing constitutional
committee. However, he noted his hope is that this report does not set a precedent for making specific comments about specific individuals or positions of programs across the campus. There is no other program across the campus that has undergone this kind of scrutiny over the years. There is no other example of the staffing of a program being scrutinized in this way. The leadership of the program has done a wonderful job of establishing this program and the respect of its faculty across the campus.

REDER asked why these resolutions are coming forward now, when the committee chair stated last month that only the constitutional amendment needed to be passed. C.BROWN noted that the word “implement” is unintended.

DILL/ANGELL MOVED that the word “implement” be replaced with “consider.”

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote, with no abstentions.

BLEILER/____ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE item #2, as listed in “E-7.”

Resolved, that the core faculty of UNST (that is, those with .5 or higher FTE appointment in UNST) are permitted and encouraged to elect a faculty chair as described in the UNST review report. The chair should lead the faculty in reviewing and revising their faculty governance procedures, which should be voted on early in Fall term of 2006.

______ asked why the faculty should be constrained to this particular structure. C.BROWN stated the committee believes this is the structure the faculty prefer as well as the fact that this parallels other governance structures on the campus.

WAMSER stated it doesn’t appear to restrict them.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote, with no abstentions.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

HARVEY presented the report for the committee.
WETZEL asked what is the issue around ASL language testing. HARVEY noted that the issue is around finding the tester, as it is for any language that is not taught at the university. WETZEL requested the report be amended to read that ASL currently counts towards the requirement.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Advisory Council Annual Report

LATIOLAIIS presented the report for the committee. He noted that if faculty have concerns they wish to present to the senior administration, they be reminded that three of the committee members would rotate on June 4.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

CARTER declared the report tabled, as no representative of the committee was in attendance to present it.

4. Library Committee Annual Report

ATKINSON presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

LONEY presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

JACOBS presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 7-8 April at Oregon Health Sciences University (http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html)

BURNS presented the report for the senior IFS senator, Michael Cummings. BURNS noted that senators should pay particular attention to the response of the IFS to the presentation by Vice Chancellor Jay Kenton regarding proposals to change the benefits package and shift benefit monies to salary monies.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.
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H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1640.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 5, 2006
Presiding Officer: Duncan Carter
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


NOTE: There is no recorded transcript of the meeting from item A. through item E.3.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 1, 2006, MEETING

The minutes of the May 1, 2006 meeting were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Members were reminded that a reception for the Faculty Senate, sponsored by the PSU Alumni Association, would follow the meeting at Simon Benson House.
FACULTY SENATE ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2006-07
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Gwen Shusterman
Steering Committee: Martha Balshem, Cheryl Livneh, Patricia Wetzel
Ex officio: John Rueter, Chair, Committee on Committees

SENATE CAUCUS ELECTION OF NEW REPRESENTATIVES TO THE
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES FOR 2006-07:
LAS – Kominz, Reese; AO – Cardenas; SBA – R. Johnson; OI – MacCormack; SSW – Jivanjee; UPA – Brodowicz; ED - ____________.

Members were reminded that incoming and returning Senators for 2006-07 vote in the election of Senate Officers, and Senators from the 2005-06 Senate vote on all other business of the meeting.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE announced that Professor Dalton Miller-Jones has been named by the Governor to serve on the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, pending legislative approval.

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that the PhD in Technology Management has been approved by the Provost’s Council, and forwarded to the State Board for Approval.

KOCH noted that at the just completed OSBHE board meeting, the Chancellor’s 2007-09 proposal was approved and that the board is well aware of under funding, which is no small step forward.

KOCH noted that there is a new Research Council in the state system structure and that Vice Provost Feyerherm will be PSU’s institutional representative.

KOCH concluded by noting that the tenor this year has been difficult, and stressing that we move into the future being more positive about our accomplishments.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., 4., 4) c) Scholastic Standards Committee

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

___________ presented the report in “D-1” for the committee.
The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals

LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committee.

BURNS/________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course proposal, JST 201, in Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE course and program changes in Urban & Public Affairs, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new courses in Education, EPFA 448 and EPFA 450, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WAMSER/SUSSMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, ME 372, and table the program change in ME, in Engineering & Computer Sciences, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by majority voice vote.

WAMSER/ELZANOWSKI MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new Minor in Photography, in Fine & Performing Arts, pending two course approvals, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals

WAKELAND and LAWRENCE presented the proposals for the committees.

BURNS/_______ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a new course and course change in Art, Fine & Performing Arts as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/_______ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses in Computer Sciences, Engineering & Computer Science, as listed in “E-2.”
PALMITER noted that there was a typographical error with respect to CS 445/545. The MTH prerequisite is MTH 261, not MTH 343.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/________ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new course, USP 4/538, in Urban & Public Affairs, as listed in “E-2.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Graduate Council Course Proposals

WAKELAND presented the proposals for the committee.

BURNS/TATE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new programs, one program change, and one new course in Liberal Arts & Sciences, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/BRENNAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new programs in Education, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS/REYNOLDS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new courses and one course change in ECE in Engineering & Computer Science, as listed in “E-3.”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FLOWER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE a program change and a new course in USP, Urban & Public Affairs.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

NOTE: Recorded transcript of the meeting commences here.

4. Proposal for Approval of Centers

ELZANOWSKI presented the proposal after E.5., noting that the version in “E-4” in the Senate Agenda mailing was replaced by a corrected version before the meeting.

BURNS/PALMITER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal.

________ commented that ________________ and noted the wording in E-5, page 3, item 6. could be improved. WETZEL concurred.
PALMITER noted that the form is specifically designed to inform the EPC as to the nature of the center, as opposed to other interdisciplinary entities. Hickey reiterated his previous comment and proposed the Senate add another question. Hickey proposed reordering certain of the questions to improve clarity. Dill noted that of greater importance is whether the center will be offering courses, not what percentage of time will be spent in that endeavor. Medovoi reminded that if a center doesn’t include courses, it wouldn’t come before the Senate. Elzanowski concurred.

Koch noted that that is not accurate.

Burns moved to amend the proposal by inserting “Course development” after “b.” and renumber remaining three headers.

Hansen stressed that the Senate keep the total proposal in mind and not fixate on a small point.

The question was called.

The motion to amend passed by unanimous voice vote.

The question was called.

The motion to approve passed by unanimous voice vote (final version, as amended on 6.5.06, attached).

5. Proposal for Center for Sustainable Processes & Practices

Elzanowski presented the proposal in “E-5” for the committee.

Burns/Morgaine moved the Senate approve the proposal.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

F. Question Period

There were no questions.

G. Reports from Officers of The Administration and Committees

1. Committee on Committees Annual Report

Rueter presented the report in “G-1” for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Budget Committee Annual Report
R. JOHNSON presented the report on "G-2" for the committee. The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Educational Policies Committee Annual Report

ELZANOWSKI presented the report on "G-3" for the committee. The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

RODRIGUEZ presented the report on "G-4" for the committee. He added that with respect to the Post Tenure Peer Awards, $50,000 was awarded to 18 applicants, and one application was refused.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Graduate Council Annual Report

WAKELAND presented the report on "G-5" for the committee and thanked Maureen Orr Eldred and Courtney Hansen for their support. He noted that there is a memorandum included in the report regarding the differentiation between 400/500 courses. He noted the work of Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee regarding revising Course Proposal forms and providing a chronological flowchart.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Intercollegiate Athletics Board Annual Report

ROGERS presented the report on "G-6" for the committee. The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

7. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Annual Report

LAWRENCE presented the report on "G-7" for the committee, noting in particular that a revised Course Proposal form and directions is available on the OAA website. The committee's eventual goal is to convert the entire process to electronic, and effective immediately, only one electronic copy will be required. The committee has provided, with the collaboration of Graduate Council, a list of deadlines.

SHUSTERTMAN queried how the Senate might secure clerical support for the committee. LAWRENCE noted that that priority is cited in the annual report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.
8. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 2-3 June at EOU

BURNS presented the report for the IFS Senators, noting that full minutes are available at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html. He noted, in particular, the Governor’s nomination of Dalton Miller-Jones to the State Board. He noted also the work the Chancellor’s office has done, in particular Jay Kenton, to foreground the higher ed budget and faculty compensation improvements, and directed Senators to the OUS web pages for details on the budget proposal for the next biennium.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1623.