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Minutes:

Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Gelles for Ellis, Fahey for Hoffman, Savery for Koch, Halvorson for Lewis.

Members Absent: Bleiler, Bodegom, Chaille, Erskine, Fuller, Gelmon, George, Goslin, L. Johnson, R. Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Latiolais, Lowry, Powell, Pratt, Reynolds, Shireman, Wosley-George.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The Minutes of the June 4, 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine, in accordance with normal governance procedures, has ratified the action of the Senate at the June 7, 1999 meeting:

Approval of the Graduate Council Course Proposals including Changes in the M.S. in Civil Engineering; the Ph.D. in Technology Management; the Ph.D. in Civil Engineering.

Changes in Senate/Committee Memberships Since 7 June:

Note: Original pagination began with the June 1999 minutes (with some errors). [1]

Linda Parshall resigned from Senate Effective June 30, 1999. Her replacement, is Paul Latiolais.

Don Moor retired effective June 30, 1999. His original replacement Gavin Bjork also retired this summer. The position will be filled by Kenneth Ames.

Devorah Lieberman and Kimberly Brown resigned from Senate effective 16 September, to take positions as Vice Provosts. Their replacements are John Rueter and Robert Fountain, respectively.

David Turcic is being replaced in the Senate by Cynthia Brown, as he is on a three-term sabbatical.

Gloria Faine, who filled Noordhoff’s ED position in the Senate, has resigned from the university and will be replaced in the position by Dannelle Stevens.

Pat Squire replaces Arezu Movahed, who has left the University.

The Faculty Senate conducts its business in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order. If anyone wishes to serve as 1999-2000 Parliamentarian, please notify the Secretary to the Faculty.

SESTAK reviewed the New Budget Model Forum, co-hosted by PSU-AAUP, Faculty Senate, PSU’s IFS Senators, and Association of Oregon Faculties, which was held 10-12 a.m., Saturday, 2 October 1999. Jay Kenton presented an overview of the model, panelists were Sy Adler, Ron Cease, Gene Enneking, Stan Hillman, and Barbara Sestak, and Sarah Andrews-Collier moderated. Approximately 50 faculty members were in attendance. Topics which emerged in these opening discussions were: Departments competing with each other, performance differences, the yo-yo effect, internal competition for students, increase R&D, reserves to cover enrollment fluctuations, assessment and accountability, the political nature of budgets, internal vs. external application of the model, the model applied to existing versus new programs, implementation processes, department by department models, identifying potential areas of growth vs. those that are already "maxed out," how some programs subsidize the activities of other, the impact on excellence, fiscal measurements for activities such as writing, distribution requirements, etc., and the more intangible issues such as ethics, leadership, etc. The forum was intended to kick off a conversation that will continue over the year, with the Budget Committee and UPC acting as the major representatives of Faculty Senate.
President's Report

BERNSTINE stated he wouldn't repeat convocation remarks, except to recap by saying that this is an exciting time for PSU, and in many ways, the window of opportunity we have been looking for. The real challenge for us as an institution, is whether we can seize that opportunity and make the very best of it. He is excited about the new budget model, although as Barbara Sestak pointed out, there is still a number of questions to be addressed. On balance, PSU has a golden opportunity to grow, grow intelligently, be deliberate about it growth, and to maximize what we have here on the park blocks for the community.

We also have some unfinished business to take care of. Devorah Lieberman has agreed to direct the implementation of the Campus Climate Study recommendations. There are three action councils now in place and we are looking forward to recommendations. We are pleased to welcome Mary Kay Tetreault, and are looking forward to working with her in the years to come. Also, the Capital Campaign is moving forward, although there is a long process to go. The Collins Groups was very helpful in executing the feasibility study. As the campaign proceeds it will move to the status of major undertaking in the future months. The campaign will be valuable because it will force us to increase the engagement of our alumni, and the engagement of the business community, and continue to improve the perception of PSU by outsiders, which, notably, has already been found to be better than internal perceptions. There is substantial hard work ahead, but we can make the very best of a great opportunity.

Provost's Report

(The following is an approximate transcript of the Provost's remarks.)

"I'm delighted for the opportunity to talk with you this afternoon, and I look forward to getting to know all of you.

I want to make a few remarks today about how I envision working with Barbara and the Faculty Senate to set and pursue our common agenda, because I've learned that a Provost working closely with a Faculty Senate really works for good institutional strength and growth. I came to Portland State on August first, which is just two months, and I thought I would talk about the things I've learned since I've been here. First, I've come to the conclusion that PSU is a more vital institution than I perceived it to be when I interviewed here and made the decision to accept the President's offer.

It is important that we all understand why we have captured the imagination of so many throughout the country, and, I now can say, the world. I just returned from Japan yesterday
and I was struck by how the people I met at Waseda University in Tokyo and Hokkaido University in Sapporo were very interested in the kinds of things we are doing here.

- From my perspective, I think we have done that because we have reasserted our urban mission. I am reminded of the President's remarks at Convocation. He said his vision is that we will be a university so thoroughly engaged with the community that each time an issue comes up in Portland or in the region, people will say, 'What does Portland State - or some program at Portland State - have to offer to this critical question?'

- We have also captured people's imaginations because we have designed a university studies program that places students at the center of learning, and, also, uses the city as the center of the university.

- I also think we've captured imaginations because we have said that what we're doing here, the institutional transformation were engaged in, is scholarly work. That is a very appropriate thing to do in a university, but to be conscious of that and to remind ourselves of that is very important. We have done much to combine the best of teaching and research universities. As we have done that, we have also seen a dramatic increase in our external funding, by 25% in only one year, to support faculty research and student learning.

As the President said, fortunately we are in an overall economic climate in which, thanks to the President and George Pernsteiner, and the work of the faculty and staff, we received a 12.5% increase to our budget - the largest of any institution in the OUS system. We are also beginning a capital campaign which will increase our external support. Another thing that is to our credit is that we are witnessing sizable enrollment growth, an approximate 5.75% increase over last year. (TETREAULT yielded to ALLEN for an enrollment report. ALLEN stated we are up in overall SCH by 5%, we are up in carrying load, we are up in new students by 10%, and we are up in Freshman by 15%.)

From where I stand, it seems as though the stars are appropriately aligned to deliver on the promise of Portland State. (Lest you think that I've spent too much time in California and like a previous First Lady, can't make any decision until I consult my astrologer, let me assure that is not the case.) What I think we have the opportunity to do is really create a new urban university for the 21st century. What I think is very, very important for us not to do is to seek to reproduce what exists elsewhere, to mirror ourselves after other universities in the country, but to ask ourselves, 'What is possible here, at this particular time, in this particular location, with our particular history?' Speaking as someone who has lived in California for the past 12 years, I see we have so many things going for us here, and we need to be really thoughtful about how to maximize those things.
What do I think we need to get from here to there, if you will?

- One of the most important things we need to do is to engage in a civic discourse about our mission and purposes and possibilities. There is a wonderful tradition here, from everything I've heard, of people talking together. I think the Saturday Budget Forum was an example of that, and I know Michael Reardon did much to nurture that tradition in the campus community. But what are the things we need to be talking about?

- We need to set clear priorities and we need to tie them to budget allocations. You can have all the good ideas in the world but if you can't afford them, and if you're not paying attention to how you are using your resources, you are not going to get from here to there.

- I have learned in the last two months that substantial good work has already been done, and it needs to be taken up. For example, the Commission on Campus Climate and Life recommendations are a wonderful blueprint for the institution, and I am interested in taking that up with others. The three CADS Task Forces last year, on University Studies, on internal and academic program development and review, and on research and instructional development, also produced important recommendations. Another important report I have just reviewed is from the committee on graduate education. We have many things we have already done, and I do not have to start from scratch. The agenda of the institution is quite fully laid out.

The President has identified three initiatives from the Campus Climate recommendations that have significant impact on students' experiences - diversity, assessment and advisement. Action committees have been established for each area, and I have learned that the operative word for the President is "action." These initiatives are all the business of the faculty, for example, recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty and a diverse student body. The recent Assessment Symposium demonstrated that assessment is integral to faculty teaching and student learning. Advising is a joint partnership within and among student affairs and academic affairs. Finally, another critical item, signaled also in the Campus Climate Report, is the issue of academic quality.

I know the Faculty Senate has requested a decision regarding the administrative structure, cost effectiveness, sustain ability and ownership of University Studies, and I have begun to work on that.

- As I have thought about it, I think that those conversations need to be nested within the larger issue of undergraduate education overall, including the Climate
recommendations and CADS recommendations, especially those related to program review. What would be the purposes of program review, why would we do it, what would it tell us, how would it help us to set our course, how would it inform the way we allocate resources?

- There is also the important question of graduate education. Many in the university community feel that we need to give similar attention to graduate education, (which is particularly important since additional funding for graduate enrollment has been capped according to '98-99 and '99-00 enrollments, whichever is lower, except for teacher education and engineering. If we are over enrolled, whereas other campuses are under enrolled, we can have their dollars, so this becomes an important question.) A priority in the next biennium will be funding enrollment growth and funding graduate enrollment, as economic development. All of this makes our use of the reports of the relevant task forces even more of an imperative.

I would like to close with some thoughts about the new budget model, and I look forward to reviewing the report of Saturday's budget forum, but I first yield to George Pernsteiner for his remarks on the budget. (see remarks under Vice President's Report) You can see how well positioned we are, however, at the same time, there are many places for the money to be spent.

We are well positioned in the new budget model with our enrollment advances, and we now have more responsibility for the use of our resources. However, there are positive as well as negative aspects to an enrollment driven budget model. As we grow we must make sure that we attend to our academic values. We also need to think in more sophisticated ways about enrollment management, and how it changes faculty work. How much do we want to grow, and where? What growth do we want in undergraduate programs and what growth in graduate programs? How do we balance enrollment with quality? How does growth relate to retention and recruitment? How can we maximize the relationship between enrollment growth and faculty compensation?

We are an institution with a full agenda, we are situated in a good budget climate, and we have many people committed to taking up that agenda: the President, myself, EXCom, CADS, Faculty Senate, Department Chairs and faculty, Academic Professionals and staff, and alumni and students as well. From where I stand, it looks as though the future is ours. I especially look forward to working with the Faculty Senate to set and achieve our common agenda. Thank you.”

Vice President's Report

Minutes, Faculty Senate Meeting October 4, 1999
PERNSTEINER thanked the Senate for faculty participation in the university's legislative initiatives, which resulted in additional funding during the last session. Our budget increase, 12.5% ($15. mil.) is the largest in the system. Not only will we be able to make roster adjustments, but we will also increase S&S allocations. We will be able to fund new cohorts of students in teacher education, financial analysis, and construction management. We will increase funding in University Studies due to the increase in Freshmen enrollment. The urban center will open early in 2000, hopefully, and will have substantial operating costs, but we will be able to cover operational costs from increases. We will also be able to address laboratory upgrades, deferred maintenance issues, student services needs, the diversity, assessment and advising issues of the Campus Climate report, and launch our Capital Campaign. We will also be building our reserves to protect for enrollment uncertainty. Those are the areas where we will place our resources in order to build the base which will enable us to look to the future. TETREAULT added that in places where enrollment remains strong, faculty search requests will be considered.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 1-2 October 1999

COOPER reported on the IFS Meeting held at LaGrande on 1-2 October 1999 (attached). Four major items in the report were that under the new budget model: salaries will be set by the institutions, not the system; Eastern Oregon will be providing tuition remission for one dependent per faculty and staff member; performance indicators are the next hurdle in implementing the model; and, the political implications of a centralized vs. decentralized system.

2. PSU Capital Campaign

Gary Withers introduced Stuart Grover and Martha Richards of the Collins Group, to preview the Capital Campaign. WITHERS reviewed the past year's activities. Four goals were developed by a smaller group, and eventually adopted by the CADS: 1) maintaining and enhancing a quality learning environment (ex. Campus Climate initiatives); 2) maintaining and enhancing national and regional distinction in targeted areas; 3) enriching and serving the region through partnerships; and, 4) internationalizing the university culture. Withers met with Deans to determine program priorities, and the following categories or packages were developed: 1) Integrated science, engineering, and technology initiative; 2) Innovative business and
management programs, 3) excellence in the arts & humanities, 4) improving the quality of life: social work, education, and urban and public affairs, 5) improving campus-wide resources and learning opportunities, 6) improving student success, and community access.

Martha Richards described the sub-groups under the major headings. Ms. Richards stated that 71 potential initiatives were identified and previewed with individuals identified as having the potential for making decisions related to 6-7 figure gifts. The primary project descriptions were divided into four strategic areas: 1) building a faculty of distinction (faculty endowment); 2) opening the door to every student (scholarships); 3) building a quality learning environment (bricks & mortar); and, 4) resources for academic programs (current and new program initiatives).

Dr. Grover discussed internal readiness, which includes human resources, facilities, etc., and “the developmental frame of mind.” The preliminary analysis conducted 5 years ago by the Collins Group indicated that, as regards the latter category, PSU was not ready. When that internal survey was recently repeated, the conclusion had altered. An external survey was also conducted, with favorable results; therefore, the community perception is in synchronicity with the university's mission. Furthermore, the survey group identified the combined values of both access and excellence, and emphasized the important role PSU faculty and students will play in mastering a technological future.

Richards asked the group of individual informants described previously to rank four areas, scholarship, faculty, bricks & mortar, and academic programs, and the almost universal rating was, 1) faculty, 2) students - tied with - bricks & mortar, and, 3) academic programs, the latter possibly coming in low because the survey de linked programs from faculty. There is a very strong sense that the university is the faculty. Each informant was asked to rate the 71 initiatives in four categories. In every area, faculty and faculty endowments scored high. Graduate and undergraduate scholarships and assistantships ranked high in every area except SBA. Renovating the Library is a given(it has the highest score of any initiative suggested). Facilities for engineering, math, and science are seen as very important for the community, and technology and distance learning are seen as something which should be available to every student. Respondents also liked innovation in technology management programs, helping businesses survive, etc. They liked programs that serve as a laboratory, such as Environmental Science and Portland Institute for Metropolitan Studies, and, to a person, they all wanted better writers.

The survey of alumni produced similar results, although alumni understood better the connection between faculty and programs, so that bricks & mortar ended up in last
place. They too emphasize the importance of engineering and technology, etc. Notably, they think that the state is providing more than 50% of our support, and this figure was higher in some cases. Dr. Grover continued the 'potential donor' group supports partnerships and want to see PSU leverage the strengths of programs with substantial reputations already, such as in UPA, SSW and GSE. They also want to see technology applied to what students are learning so they are prepared for the future. They want PSU to be the urban university model for the future. They want a university of leadership, they want to hear about leadership and experience it from PSU, and they want PSU to provide a clear and visionary voice about its role for the future.

Dr. Grover outlined what has to be done before the campaign starts. Proposals suggested for inclusion in the campaign, some of which did not receive strong responses in the feedback, total three times the amount of the campaign target. The next step is a reconciliation process in which feedback will be solicited from the community and the campus to reduce the proposals. PSU must emerge from that process with a coherent campaign, a unified vision, and a united leadership and faculty. WITHERS stated that a committee will undertake to reconcile the list of proposals developed internally with the information gathered externally. The group will meet in October, and in early November, they will commence testing a preliminary prioritized list. Ms. Richards noted that the reconciliation process must be concluded in a timely manner to avoid the risk of stalling. The priorities must be identified and the external leaders must be identified, before the priorities are finalized. A campaign steering committee will then be identified, and get underway, but activity will remain behind the scenes, until a critical stage has been reached. WITHERS concluded the campaign has not begun, the priorities are not identified, and the volunteer leadership is not in place. The campus community is requested to keep this an internal conversation until we are notified otherwise.

BRENNER asked if the goal was less than it should be. WITHERS stated that this is a realistic and strategic goal for a first campaign, and if we raise more, all the better. Dr. Grover added that, to date, we have not identified a major gift (in excess of $5 million), which is a requirement for larger campaigns to be successful. On the other hand, this campaign will be the largest ever in Portland.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal for January Response Date to ARC's Writing Proposal
KETCHESON/FARR MOVED the report from the Provost on the implementation of the ARC recommendations regarding writing assessment should be postponed until January to allow sufficient time for the details of the implementation plan to be set in place.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. **NEW BUSINESS**

None

H. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 1, 1999
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Jacob for Carter, Hagge for Collins, Yatchmenoff for Holliday, Toppe for Hopp, Elteto for Kern, Cress for Williams, Wollner.

Members Absent: Cooper, Corcoran, M. Enneking, Erskine, Goucher, R. Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Lowry, Rectenwald, Reynolds, Shireman, Walsh.


NOTICE: There is no recorded transcript of this meeting. Please review carefully.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The Minutes of the October 4, 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved, after the Provost's Report, as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

BUDGET DISCUSSION updates:

- A narrative of the proceedings of the October 2nd Budget Forum is included in the November 1999 issue of "Unities," the AAUP newsletter.
The Steering Committee has charged the Budget committee to monitor developments with the new budget model, including allocation of this year's budget, strategic budget planning, and procedures for reviewing next year's budget. The Budget Committee has received the budget from the Vice President, and has been directed to break into subcommittees by Stan Hillman to investigate the following:

1. What strategic budgeting process would work that would include faculty input via the Budget Committee?

2. How does current program funding correspond to RAM model projections, and what are the educational implications of imbalances from both a student and faculty workload perspective?

3. Are the strategic investments of the new $15.6 million dollars consistent with sustainable revenue generation under the RAM Model?

4. What are some creative avenues that will allow for ownership and incentives for departments in using the RAM model to everyone's advantage?

CHANGES IN SENATE/COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS SINCE 4 OCTOBER:

Tom Biolsi has resigned from the Advisory Council. His replacement is Pat Wetzel. Jack Cooper has resigned from the Advisory Council. His replacement is Jan Haaken.

President's Report

President Bernstine presented Devorah Lieberman with a plaque in honor of her award from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education as 1999 Oregon Professor of the Year.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT announced that forth week enrollment is up 5.3% SCH and 6.% FTE in regular programs. She noted that adjustments have been made in the academic budget, including $500,000 allotted for science and engineering teaching/lab upgrades. Five faculty positions have been added, consistent with strategic priorities, including Director of the Hatfield School, graphic design, and 3 in CLAS.
1. **ASPSU**

YOUNG introduced Mary Cunningham, ASPSU representative to the Oregon Student Association board, and described the goals that the ASPSU leadership have set for this year. ASPSU worked with OSA during the last Legislative session, the most recent activity being retention of student eligibility for the Oregon Health Plan. A bone marrow campaign drive is coming up soon. Drunk driving will be an issue this year. Another issue will be recruitment of students and faculty of color, with the goal to have PSU adopt a Diversity Plan with a goal of 15% students of color (the ration is currently 7.4%). In the area of recycling, they are working on better access and coordination. They are also working on extending Library and computer lab access during finals, etc.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

A. JOHNSON asked that a representative from the Administration comment on the citation (included in the November Senate mailing) in the IFS report of 2 October by Bill Anslow that salary rates will be set by campuses locally. PERNSTEINER replied that there is a new Board policy which allows campuses to set salaries within guidelines that the Chancellor would prescribe, and that Anslow approves the proposals for the Board. BRENNER asked if all the new moneys are allocated, how can any of those funds be used for salary. PERNSTEINER stated that there is a reserve in the budget for salary adjustment.

E. **REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

1. **Provost's Response to Recommendations in the Report on Univ. Studies Program requested by the Senate in the 7 June 1999 Motion**

The Provost presented her response to Senate, after her report. TETREAULT stated she is in the process of talking to a number of people regarding University Studies, including what should be its location and cost. Regarding assessment of University Studies, it makes sense to put it into the context of our overall Assessment initiatives. Regarding the budget, progress has been made in systematizing faculty lines to departments. TETREAULT stated there is continued discussion regarding the issue of fair, etc. participation in the program.

GELMON asked the Provost to comment on Curriculum Committee participation. TETREAULT noted that UCC needs to maintain close communications with University Studies assessment, as well as assessment overall. CRAWSHAW noted that University Studies" is a very different animal and that it is not clear to both faculty and students that it is working. "Therefore, it should be reviewed separately,
not in the larger context. BECKER stated she took the Provost's remarks in a different way, that all courses will have assessment and it will be published. BALSHEM asked if the Provost envisioned a more thorough and ongoing assessment process for the university. TETREAULT stated she is listening to the Assessment Council's advisement on how to proceed.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Proposals for Graduate Certificate Programs (2) in Systems Science and two new graduate courses

EDER presented the proposals, recommending they be divided into two motions.

A. JOHNSON/BRENNER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new course proposals listed in "G1", item A.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BRENNER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new graduate certificate programs listed in "G1", item B.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Scholastic Standards Committee Motion to Change University Requirements Related to Academic Standing

BARHAM introduced the item for ARC, and presented the following additional information:

Fall 1998 New Admits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen New Admits</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer New Admits</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Admits</td>
<td>2839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Probation (PSU GPA <2.0) after Fall Term  
N= 267 (9.4%)  

Freshmen N=122 (12%)  
Transfer N=145 (8%)  

Status of these Students--End of Spring 1999 Term  

Freshmen (N=122)  
Academically disqualified (winter or spring terms)  
N=60 (49.2%)  

Transfers (N=145)  
Academically disqualified (winter or spring terms)  
N=62 (42.7%)  

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G2."

A. JOHNSON noted that the time span was shortened in a previous Senate action, as the policy was being ignored because it was felt that the time line was too long. BRENNAN noted the terminology change of the new language, so that "warning" is added. She also noted that the language will be different for undergraduate and graduate students, and that this will be confusing. In response to a comment by BRENNER, FORTMILLER noted that this doesn't preclude the petition process. RUETER asked who is the target student group. BARHAM stated that it is transfers more than Freshmen, and that if we are to be a access institution, we have to be prepared to intervene. BECKER noted this is now a budget issue as well. ALLEN stated that the faculty set the requirements, so that intervention is a key factor. MERCER spoke in favor of the motion, commending the SSC efforts in the last several years regarding these issues.

RUETER asked why can't intervention begin over winter break and keep a two-term plan. BARHAM relied that there are registration problems. KOCH stated that early intervention makes better sense--in three quarters, they get deeper into the mire. LEWIS stated students with low GPA's need orientation early on, not intervention later. STEVENS noted that the diversity issues are supported with earlier intervention - end loading is not good. CRAWSHAW, stated that he agreed with BRENNER's earlier remark, regarding pressure on faculty to refrain from flunking students. LEWIS asked if we couldn't require a workshop the first week of winter quarter. STEVENS requested we have more data on this, whether or not this is passed. FARR stated he supported the motion, as it is well written and written by the people who do this every day.
THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote, excepting one nay.

BRENNAN/BALSHEM MOVED the Faculty Senate refer the new academic standing policy to the Graduate Council for its review, with the possible end of having consistent academic standing language for the whole university.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, December 6, 1999

Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Seely for Fortmiller, Halvorson for Lewis, Hein for Squire

Members Absent: Carter, Corcoran, Crawshaw, Ellis, Fuller, Heying, Holliday, L. Johnson, R. Johnson, Kiam, Lowry, Miller-Jones, Neal, Shireman, Sussman, Taggart, Walsh, Watne, Wetzel, Wollner.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The minutes of the November 1, 1999 Meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved, after the Provost's Report, with the following corrections:

p. 20: G.2., 1st sentence, replace "ARC" with SSC
p. 21: G.2., in the first paragraph of discussion:
--delete the last half of the first sentence (after the comma).
--delete the 4th sentence, beginning "In response to a comment by Brenner..."
--in the 6th sentence, beginning "Barham stated that ...", replace "it is transfers more than Freshmen," with "the target group is both transfers and freshmen,"

Minutes. Faculty Senate Meeting December 6, 1999
--in the 8th sentence, beginning "Allen stated...", it should read "the Faculty set the admission requirements..."

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the November 1, 1999, meeting, according to normal governance procedures:

Certificate in Computer Modeling & Simulation, SYSC
Certificate in Computational Intelligence, SYSC
New courses: USP 537/637 Economics of Urban Transportation
SYSC 557/657 Artificial Life

Faculty Development Committee RFP's were distributed in campus mail this week, with the assistance of Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP.

Changes in Senate/Committee Appointments since 1 November:

Marjorie Enneking has resigned from Senate. Her replacement is Tom Dieterich, LING.
Candyce Reynolds has moved divisions, from All Others to CLAS, and therefore resigned her Senate seat. Her replacement is Esther O'Grady.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted she would begin by summarizing what she learned in her first quarter at PSU. TETREAULT stated she is very impressed with the quality of the faculty; and how many people in the institution care deeply about it and she appreciates the President's commitment to the institution. Good administration is based on a relationship of mutuality, as well as knowing what each individual brings to the job. Based on this year's experience with approvals for faculty appointments, the Provost and the Deans plan to review proposals for Fall 2001 new hires this Spring, rather than next year. TETREAULT stated she is taking very seriously the Senate's request for her to review recommendations related to the University Studies program, and she has spoken with many people regarding the issues.

TETREAULT indicated that certain structures are being put into place at this time. The first regards strategic priorities. A "Strategic Resource Plan" was drafted and reviewed by the Deans and recently the draft was shared with the Budget Committee. The document was developed so that we can achieve consensus and clarity about what our resource priorities are and will be. This will become the criteria by which we will make
budget decisions. It is designed to reflect both what we are and what we should be. Faculty can obtain copies through their department chairs and are encouraged to comment on the plan. The second structure involves budgeting. Working with Deans, the Budget Committee, and others, the Vice President for Finance & Administration and the Provost have developed a Budget Process to guide deliberations and allocations for next year and future years. Again, an effort has been made to establish clarity about priorities, enrollment targets, and resources. Although the new budget model is enrollment-based, we must take two things into account: our vision of what we can be, and our priorities. Enrollment is not the only issue. In January and February, budgeting activity will begin, and in March, executive groups, for example, Provost and Deans, Deans and Dept. Chairs, etc., will finalize proposals for 2000-2001. When the proposals have been reviewed there will be hearings that include the Executive Committee and the Budget Committee. The final decisions will be communicated to the university community by May or June. At an appropriate time, assessment of those decisions will also take place.

In summary, we are trying to develop broad based discussions and a clear process. In subsequent years, we would expect to start the process in Fall quarter.

Two other items of importance are articulating a vision for graduate education and developing an appropriate plan, should it become a priority in the next biennium. This activity has started with a review of the Report by the Task Committee on Graduate Education.

A. JOHNSON noted that year after year we are unable to make budget decisions in a schedule which acknowledges the March bulletin deadlines. TETREAULT noted she understands the problem, and would like people to share their ideas about it. She stated that enrollment is up 6.8% for Winter 2000, and continues strong for the present. Even under opportune conditions, we will most likely have to do a certain amount of forecasting. ZELICK asked for a clarification regarding graduate education. PERNSTEINER noted that graduate enrollment is capped statewide except for a few targeted programs, including our ED program. BLEILER asked if we aren't better off to fill the empty seats in graduate classes so that our enrollment increases. TETREAULT stated yes, but we must remember there is substantially more to graduate education than seat time.

FISHER asked when the deadline will be for requests for new faculty for Fall 2001. Tetreault stated that March will be the deadline for Deans' requests. BECKER asked if the quota for new enrollment we have been given keeps rolling up in subsequent years. TETREAULT stated, no. PERNSTEINER stated that the Chancellor sets the quota each year, based on data such as projected high school graduates, etc. This year it was 6.2% and the preliminary figure for next year is 5%. Given enrollments statewide this past
fall, the latter figure will probably not hold up. TETREAULT added that she is working on better methods for predicting enrollment for future years.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Report of the IFS Meeting of 3-4 December 1999

The Presiding Officer recognized Jack Cooper to present the report, noting his imminent retirement from the university and his many services to the faculty over the years. Cooper was greeted by the assembly with sustained applause in his honor. The report is attached.

BLEILER/GOSLIN MOVED the Faculty Senate support the resolution concerning PEBB benefits coverage which IFS passed at the meeting (see attached).

KOCH noted that, regarding the foreign travel issue, the problem exists for faculty traveling inside the U.S., as well as abroad, and also applies to our dependents.

BECKER noted that the travel issue is in addition to the overall deterioration of benefits this year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Annual Report

GELMON presented the report for the committee. SESTAK accepted the report for the Senate.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED, the UCC recommendation: that the new course proposal form be modified to require individuals proposing new courses to indicate that the course is anticipated to become part of an existing junior cluster. The changes to the form will include 1) name of the cluster, 2) how this course fits into the existing cluster, and 3) signature from the University studies committee chair (in addition to the usual authorizing signatures).
THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the UCC recommendation: that a process be established whereby UCC will approve proposals for addition/deletion of existing courses to approved clusters three times per year (January, May and October). Information provided to UCC will include the name of the cluster, a list of existing classes already approved for the cluster, the name and number of course(s) to be added/dropped, a rationale for this action, signatures of all appropriate curricular officials and the University Studies committee chair.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED "the Faculty Senate charge the Steering Committee to form an ad hoc committee to analyze the merits and barriers of continued use of cross-listed courses and omnibus numbers, with specific attention to:

- What is best for assisting students to identify and register for courses?
- What is most helpful for faculty advising?
- What is the most beneficial for University Studies?
- What will assist in allocation of credit hours?
- What produces the most useful transcript of courses taken?
- What are the implications for the implementation of DARS and for Institutional Research?

This committee should report back to the Senate by the May Senate meeting with specific recommendations."

KOCH asked for what the purpose the motion had been proposed. GELMON stated that auditing and student understanding/comprehension are the principle reasons. ZELICK stated that the committee composition suggested by UCC amounted to the "tail wagging the dog" and urged that CLAS be represented on the committee. BRENNER agreed, noting that graduate faculty should also be represented. HOLLOWAY stated, as former UCC Chair, that this is a difficult and not new issue. PRATT suggested, as former UCC Chair, that Holloway be named to the group, and that the omnibus numbered courses are the bigger of the two problems.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
3. **Graduate Council Annual Report**

BURNS presented the report for Eder, who was unable to attend. BRENNER and ENNEKING asked for clarification regarding the need for a graduate student conduct policy.

FEYERHERM noted that the statement in the OAR's applies to undergraduates.

BRENNER noted the on-line service for investigating plagiarism. HOPP noted that the PSU reference librarians have graciously performed this service in the past.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

4. **Library Committee Annual Report**

ZELICK presented the report and took questions.

FARR questioned the remark in the report concerning dissatisfaction with library services. ZELICK stated there was some evidence for his statement. FARR noted that the report contained strong language considering the lack of data to support it.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

5. **Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report**

DIETERICH presented the report for Barham, who was unable to attend.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate request that the Provost, in conjunction with the Council of Academic Deans, inform the PSU instructional faculty about the appropriate use of “X’s and ‘I’s” in the grading system. This information should also be made available to all new and continuing faculty on a regular basis. All means necessary should be used to alert faculty of this concern.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
6. University Planning Council Quarterly Report

LATIOLAIS presented the report for Limbaugh, who was unable to attend.

A. JOHNSON asked if water quality was included in the Facilities discussion. MERCER asked if air quality in Neuberger Hall was included in the Facilities discussion.

SESTAK accepted the report for the Senate.

F. Unfinished Business

None

G. New Business

1. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Changes/Proposals

GELMON presented the proposals, noting that Senators should strike courses numbered MTH490/590 through MTH 496/596 (top of page 2) from the list.

BLEILER/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve the proposals ("G1") as revised.

ERSKINE asked if Art Department proposals were denied. GELMON stated they will be forwarded next month.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Name Change: Dept. of Communication

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G2," the name change as proposed.

A. JOHNSON noted that Journalism falls under such a rubric. HOLLOWAY agreed that this designation crosses over with new areas in English. FARR stated he agreed with A. Johnson - the implication is that the title is too broad and slightly misleading. BURNS and LATIOLAIS noted, on the other hand, that this is becoming a common department name across the country. ERSKINE stated the title is too broad, and overlaps into media curricula in Art.

THE QUESTION was called.
THE MOTION PASSED by a vote of 32 in favor, 11 opposed, and 10 abstentions.

3. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

BURNS introduced the proposals for Eder, who was out of town.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G3," graduate course changes and proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 10, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Bowman for Beasley, Putnam for Brennan, Morgan for Heying.


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The Minutes of the December 6, 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

CHANGES IN SENATE AND COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS SINCE 6 December 1999:

Lewis Goslin, SBA retired from the university effective 31 December. His Senate replacement is Robert Eder, SBA (June 2001). John Cooper retired from the university effective 31 December. His replacement (June 2001) will be selected in the Spring 2000 Faculty Elections. Dick Pratt (for Weikel) has resigned from Senate to assume the position of Vice Provost. His replacement (June 2001) will be selected in the Spring 2000 Faculty Elections.
Mindy Holliday resigned, effective this meeting, the Chair of the Committee on Committees. Dilafruz Williams was elected to serve as Chair, effective immediately.

Julie Smith has been appointed Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee. Carol Mack has been appointed to fill the vacant ED position on the Budget Committee. Patty Mamula and Walt Fosque have been appointed to fill vacant positions on the Graduation Program Board. Tom Seppalainen (PHIL) has been appointed to replace Byron Haines, who retired effective December 1999, on Committee for the Care of Research Animals.

Calendar Year Committee appointments for 2000:

Curriculum Committee: Sherril Gelmon has been reappointed as Chair. Yves Labissiere (UNST), Geraldo Lafferrière (MTH) Kathy Merrow (HON), and Monique Busch (SSW) have been appointed to replace R. Blazak, D. Holloway and D. Yatchmenoff.

Graduate Council: Robert Eder has been reappointed as Chair. Shelly Reece (ENG), Herman Migliore (EAS), and Gerald Mildner (UPA) have been appointed to replace F. Schuler and D. Smith.

Library Committee: Marilyn Shotola (MUS) and Tim Anderson (EMP) have been appointed to replace A. Fraser and R. Forbes.

Scholastic Standards Committee: Tom Dieterich (LING) has been appointed Chair. Laura Shier (LING) has been appointed.

SESTAK announced the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on Omnibus-numbered and Cross-listed Courses, which was selected by the Steering Committee as charged by the Senate. The members are:

Chair: David Holloway (ENG)  
Members: Sy Adler (USP), Joel Bluestone (MUS), Johanna Brenner (WS), Scott Burns (GEOL), Candace Goucher (BST), Roy Koch (CE), Marjorie Terdal (LING), Mary Ann Barham (IASC). Consultants: OIRP Representative, Cheryl Ramette (UNST), Angela Garbarino (ADM/DR), Cindy Baccar (Degree Audit, DARS lead person), Linda Devereaux (OAA) Robert Tufts (RO). Ex Officio: Dick Pratt (OAA), Kim Brown (Intnl. Affairs).

The committee is schedule to report at the May 2000 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the December 1, 1999, 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):

- Curriculum Committee Course and Program Changes/Proposals as revised to exclude MTH 486/586 through MTH 496/596.
- Name change of the Dept. of Speech Communication to the Department of Communication.
- Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals from the Graduate School of Education, including:
  
  Revision of Ed.D. (Educational Leadership) Program

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

None

E. **REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

1. **Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report**

KETCHESON presented the report for Brad Hansen, who resigned from the university effective the end of Fall Term. Faculty Development Grant proposals must now include funding for graduate tuition remission, if requested, as a result of the new budget model. The deadline for proposals is 15 February 2000.

SESTAK accepted the report for Senate.

F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Provost’s Review of Senate Recommendations Regarding University Studies and Writing Requirements**

TETREAULT welcomed the faculty back from Winter break, and indicated that her remarks have been prepared in two parts, University Studies and Writing, and she would take questions after each. Two memoranda which include the texts of her remarks will be distributed to the campus the next day (attached).
TETREAULT prefaced her remarks with several comments: "It is really not my style to have to make a decision of this importance in such a short time - after having been in the community only one quarter, but I felt that it was something that the Faculty Senate requested of me. So it was incumbent on me to move more quickly than I normally would because I am a great student of, and respectful of, faculty and academic culture. When you are new in a place you want to make sure they know that you understand that. I also want to thank all of you who preceded me, who have done very good work in taking up the critical and important issues related to University Studies. They really go to the heart of what we are about here, in terms of educating students, and in terms of thinking about disciplinary perspectives versus more general education perspectives. I spent considerable time reading reports and consulting very widely and broadly, and was impressed throughout with the careful work of everybody involved. And I found that this exercise, if you will, enabled me not only to think through a decision that I could convey to you, but also to identify many of the issues that have emerged because of our strong University Studies program."

After the Provost's remarks on University Studies, HOLLOWAY stated that, without taking sides with the Provost's decisions, he commended her thoughtful comments and noted they touched on the major issues and concerns the faculty have regarding the program. TETREAULT thanked Holloway, noting that is important to know what people think about the decisions she has to make.

BURNS asked what would be the timeline for moving the program to OAA. TETREAULT stated that the program reporting would begin immediately, and the budget will be moved at the end of the fiscal year. She also noted that Dean Kaiser has taken the initiative regarding the budget issues in CLAS, and has begun to address them in a very positive way.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

GELMON introduced the proposals for Curriculum Committee.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G1", items 1-4.

A. JOHNSON stated that the lack of course descriptions make it impossible for Senators to adequately determine the validity of proposals. Her requested that, in future, they be included. BRENNER seconded Johnson's remarks.
THE MOTION PASSED by 50 In Favor to 0 Against, with 7 Abstentions.

2. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

EDER introduced the proposals for Graduate Council, indicating the following corrections to the document:

Part A. There is no FINL 574.

Part C. ANTH 442/542 Contemp. Amer. Indian Policy (4 credit hours), not (3). Foreign Language course prefixes are FL, not FLL.
Course Title corrections: FL 448/548 Major Figures in World Literature
FL 449/549 Major Topics in World Literature.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G2" as corrected.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

BURNS requested, as a procedural note, that committee appointment notices be forwarded to those administrative units which do business with those committees, e.g. Graduate Council and Office of Graduate Studies.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 7, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Bjork for Bleiler, Jacob for Carter, Feeney for Herrington, Perrin for Mercer, Kaufman for Miller-Jones.


Ex-officio Members Present: Dunbar for Alberty, Andrews-Collier.

NOTE: There is no taped transcript of this meeting.

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The Minutes of the January 10, 2000, meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The Presiding Officer noted that the meeting would proceed in spite of the lack of recording equipment.

The Presiding Officer added the following to today's Agenda, during questions from the floor:

G. 2. Lack of Settlement of Collective Bargaining Contract
President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the January 10, 2000, meeting, in accordance with normal governance procedures:

Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals from the School of Business Administration and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

CHANGES IN SENATE/COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS SINCE JANUARY 10, 2000:

William Tate has been appointed to fill the vacant position on the Graduation Program Board. Kent Lall has been appointed Acting Chair of Intercollegiate Athletic Board. Sharon Elteeto is appointed to the vacant Library position on University Curriculum Committee. is appointed to replace Emily de la Cruz on the Faculty Development Committee. Martin Strecjk is appointed to replace Michelle Gamburd on the Faculty Development Committee. Nancy Benson is appointed to replace Emily de la Cruz on the Teacher Education Committee. Martha Works is appointed Acting Chair of Faculty Development Committee.

Provost’s Report

None

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

There were no administrators in attendance.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

A. JOHNSON expressed deep concern at the progress of collective bargaining, and requested comment.

HICKEY stated that progress has been retarded because the administration arrives at bargaining sessions not prepared to bargain; they have not responded to proposals, and were not prepared at two mediation sessions held thus far. A. JOHNSON stated that, even though he is a department chair, he has no inclination to teach Spring term if the university can't settle on a contract. BRENNER stated the administration has held to the state's package but that Vice Pres. Pernsteiner previously stated the university has contingency funds for more
spending; there should be a mechanism for the Senate to express their concern. SESTAK declared this issue added to today's Senate Agenda, as item G.2.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES


Ron Cease was recognized to present his report on the meeting (attached). He also distributed two letters from Assoc. of Oregon Faculties, the first to Tom Imeson regarding the issue of faculty compensation as regards Board review of Presidents, and the second to all faculty regarding stalled implementation of tuition reduction for faculty dependents (attached).

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposal for CSF 480/580.

EDER presented "GI", a proposal for CFS 480/580.

BRENNER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the course. CARTER stated he supports the proposal. It will allow the faculty member, Carol Morgaine, to teach graduate and position her course for the Interdisciplinary M.A. Program which is being developed.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Lack of Settlement of the Collective Bargaining Contract

BRENNER/A.JOHNSON MOVED "RESOLVED: The PSU Faculty Senate supports the timely conclusion of bargaining between the AAUP and the PSU administration, including a substantial increase in faculty salaries to address the gaps which exist between current PSU salaries and salaries at appropriate comparator institutions, including University of Oregon and Oregon State University."

CRAWSHAW stated he supports the position of PSU-AAUP. BRENNER stated the Senate needs to go on record on this issue. BRENNAN asked why the issue of Faculty Salary Compression was not included in the motion. BRENNER
stated he didn't want to complicate the motion; the important words are "substantial" and "timely." WOLLNER stated it is most important the Senate doesn't lose sight of the issue of the administration's breach of "good faith bargaining." BEASLEY stated the motion does not take into account market forces, for example, in her discipline, and that "comparator institutions" is a better argument. BRENNER stated the list of comparator institutions provided by OUS is insulting. HICKEY noted that the issue of "timeliness" is appropriate to the present mediation process. EDER suggested the Senate decide an appropriate response to the university administration, and that the Steering Committee develop the proposal. CRAWSHAW noted the administration didn't take Classified Staff seriously in those negotiations, until the staff took firm action. EDER stated that was a good point.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote, with the exception of one abstention.

SUSSMAN/WOLLNER MOVED "the Senate Steering Committee report to the March 6, 2000 Senate meeting with strategies as to how the Senate can respond to the lack of bargaining action."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote, with the exception of one abstention.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 6, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Jacob for Carter, Fahey for Hoffman, Hein for Squire, Paradis for Thompson.

Members Absent: Ames, Balshem, Biolsi, Bleiler, Chaille, Corcoran, George, Goucher, R. Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Lowry, Miller-Jones, Stevens, Walsh, Williams, Wollner, Wosley-George.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m. The Minutes of the February 7, 2000 meeting were approved with the following correction:

Watne was in attendance.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine, in accordance with normal governance procedures, approved the actions of the Faculty Senate at the meeting of February 7, 2000:

CFS 480/580 Societal Infl. on Professional Practice (4)
Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since 7 February 2000:

Tom Luba has been appointed to the vacant XS position on FDC; Joan Strouse has been appointed to the Faculty Development Committee to replace Emily de la Cruz; Dirgham Sbait has been appointed to the vacant position on General Student Affairs Committee.

Additions to this day's Senate Agenda:

Added - President's Report

E1. UPC Quarterly Report - hardcopy for Senators and Ex-officio members

G1. Graduate Council - additional information packet for voting members.

President's Report

BERNSTINE called the attention of the assembly to his letter of Friday, 3 March, describing outcomes of the Retreat held with the Executive Committee and the Council of Academic Deans on 7 February. BERNSTINE noted that we are not moving to the "WAC" athletic conference, contrary to recent media speculation. BERNSTINE reviewed the request made to the Board regarding the use of firearms by campus security personnel. It is not a matter of guns on campus, but of gaining Board autonomy from the Legislature so that campuses can make appropriate choices. There was no event on campus having to do with public safety which precipitated the request. BERNSTINE stressed that the Administration is very interested in resolving collective bargaining issues through the mediation process which is currently underway. BERNSTINE noted that the OUS system has proposed several alternatives to the current PEBB system, including separation of faculty from the group.

BERNSTINE also indicated that PERS will be raising reserves in response to actuarial recommendations that it be protected from market fluctuations. BERNSTINE noted that OGI negotiations with OSU are in very elementary stages and Ed Nelson, OGI President, has indicated that PSU will be a player in these negotiations. EAS will be strengthening our collaborations with OGI in the meantime. BERNSTINE discussed the Capital Campaign, noting that this is only our first campaign, and others will inevitably follow. This campaign focusses on Engineering, Science & Technology, but also on faculty excellence, student access, and academic programs. A wish list which began at $250 million has been pared down to a comprehensive campaign of under $100 million. Faculty are encouraged to join in the support of the campaign.
CEASE asked the President to comment on the approval of tuition for dependents. BERNSTINE stated that there will be a two-year trial program in the OUS system, and details will follow.

HICKEY asked the President to comment on the propriety of asking AAUP to alter a document authored by the Faculty Senate, in reference to the Administration's collective bargaining proposal that AAUP remove fixed term faculty and Academic Professionals from the Promotion & Tenure Guidelines. BERNSTINE declined to comment because of restrictions based on federal and state law.

Provost’s Report

TETREAULT discussed two issues, budget and enrollment. The budget calculated for next year, if we have 3% enrollment growth, would include $2,450,819 for access, and $1,458,953 in new funding. If we have a 5% enrollment increase, new funding would be $3,045,008. In CADS, discussions are underway having to do with planning questions such as how to fund research, services and supplies, and technology. The budget calendar has been set, with proposals due in OAA on 15 March, followed by hearings for Deans and Vice Provosts, and hearings for the Executive Committee which include participation by the Budget Committee in early May. Hearings for access funds, were being held simultaneously with the internal CADS hearings for new monies.

TETREAULT discussed enrollment management, noting that last Fall she saw both the importance of enrollment relative to the budget and the need to balance enrollment concerns with our academic values. The university was considering bringing in a consultant but due to the complexity of the issues (19 questions were developed around the topic), it was decided that we would turn to experts for specific issues, and rely on internal resources for planning. TETREAULT yielded to ALLEN who stated that a policy oversight committee, small in size, is being formed to insure the coordination of the multiple questions and groups.

WETZEL asked if the questions could be circulated. TETREAULT stated, yes (see OAA Home Page, reference documents). D. JOHNSON asked the Provost to comment on the budget model and issues of maximum enrollment, as some departments appear to be fighting over students already. For example, what will be the impact of the RAM on team/interdisciplinary teaching. TETREAULT noted that there is serious concern at the OAA and CADS levels to protect innovative teaching and prevent internal competition. RUETER asked if distributive education was included in these discussions. TETREAULT stated yes.
D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. University Planning Council Quarterly Report

The report was tabled as the Chair was not present.

2. Steering Committee Report on Strategies to Conclude Successful Bargaining

SESTAK introduced the item (distributed), and requested the motion.

D. JOHNSON/SUSSMAN MOVED: "Resolved: Because of the existence of collective bargaining at PSU, responsibility for negotiating work issues is in the hands of PSU-AAUP, not the Faculty Senate. It is important for members of the Senate to understand the union's authority to negotiate for faculty, and it is in this regard that we offer the following:

The Faculty Senate wants to acknowledge and voice the faculty's deep concern about the pace and substance of contract negotiations. The Senate requests that if a contract is not agreed upon by April 6, 2000, representatives of PSU-AAUP and the Administration come to the April Senate meeting to describe separately prospects for settlement."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Reconciliation Committee and Capital Campaign

WITHERS prefaced his report by noting that the OGI Materials Science Program will be transferring to PSU's Engineering School, effective immediately.

WITHERS reported on the conclusions of the Reconciliation Team. As indicated previously, there will be four categories, Capital projects, faculty excellence, scholarships, and program development. Capital projects proposals, totaling approximately $50 million include an EAS building (to be located over the parking structure south of the 4th Avenue Building, EAS equipment, science laboratory renovations, technology improvements, Stott Center, Library, and FPA laboratories renovations, and, and residence facility remodel. Faculty
development proposals totaling $11.88 million, include endowed professorships for each academic unit, endowment for the Hatfield School, and funding awards for teaching excellence. Program proposals totaling $10.7 million include endowments for Ptd. Metropolitan Studies, Writing, and Jewish Studies, University, and funding for Outreach Initiatives and the Native American Center. Proposals for scholarships total $13.375 million. Proposals for unrestricted gifts total $5 million.

BRENNER asked Withers to comment on the role of research excellence. WITHERS stated that it is considered to be a product of investment and capital. TETREAULT added that we assume it is tied to the proposals for endowed professorships.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Proposal for Revision of Academic Standing Policy

EDER presented the proposal, and took questions.

The report was accepted for the Senate by the Presiding Officer.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Proposals for Course & Program Changes

SESTAK noted, during Announcements, that copies of the Addendum to Graduate Council Report (G1) had been distributed to Senators only. EDER introduced the item, indicating the typographical errors, and recommending division into six motions. Typographical errors are as follows:

"G.1.", p. 3, E., strike "CLAS" and replace with "UPA."
"G.1.", p. 3, E., PA 541 is (3) credits, not (4).
"G.1.", p. 3, E., PA ____ is (2-4) credits, not (4-2).
"G.1.", p. 4. G., courses with "G" prefix should be "GEOL" prefix.
"G.1.", p. 4. G., GEOL 465/565, retitle "Glacial Geomorphology."

Note also, there is no part "F."

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", A., MA/MS program changes by the Dept. of Speech Communications.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

Minutes, Faculty Senate Meeting March 6, 2000
A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", B., Graduate Certificate in Professional Communications (Dept. of Speech Communications).

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", part C., Computer Science Course Changes.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", part D., MFA in Art New Course, and Course and Program Changes.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", E., PA/PS Course Proposals and Changes, as corrected.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED the Senate approve "G.1.", G., Other CLAS New Course and Course Change Proposals as corrected.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 3, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Jacob for Carter, Worsh for Hopp, Halverson for Lewis.

Members Absent: Ames, Beasley, Biolsi, Chaille, Corcoran, Ellis, Farr, Fountain, George, Holloway, R. Johnson, Kiam, Miller-Jones, Rectenwald, Rogers, Watne, Wollner, Wosley-George.

Ex-officio

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m. The Minutes of the March 6, 2000 Meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved with the following correction:


C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the Senate passed at the March 6, 2000 meeting, in accordance with normal governance procedures:
• Graduate Council Proposals for Course and Program Changes as corrected on the floor from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Urban and Public Affairs, the School of Fine & Performing Arts, and the School of Engineering.

CHANGES IN SENATE/COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS SINCE 6 MARCH 2000:

Mary Ann Barham has been appointed to the Curriculum Committee. Rudy Barton, ARCH replaces Sarah Andrews-Collier as FPA representative to the Budget Committee. Cynthia Brown is Acting Chair of the University Studies Committee for Spring 2000.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE has been moved from the May to the June Senate meeting to accommodate their reporting on the new budget process, which includes hearings scheduled for early May.

CHANGES IN TODAY'S SENATE AGENDA:

Added to the Agenda: D.1. Responses by the Administration and PSU-AAUP as regards prospects for settlement, as requested by Senate motion on March 6, 2000.

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Report is rescheduled for May 2000.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT announced the establishment of the Enrollment Management Policy Oversight Committee with the purpose of reviewing all issues of enrollment management. Janine Allen is appointed Chair, and the members appointed are Barbara Sestak for Faculty Senate, Lois Becker for Academic Department Chairs, Mike Driscoll for CADS, Agnes Hoffman for Enrollment and Student Services, Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP, Mary Kay Tetreault, George Pernsteiner, and Jay Kenton.

TETREAULT noted that recommendations for membership were solicited from the Advisory Council and the Senate Steering Committee.

TETREAULT announced that as of today, enrollment for Spring term 2000 is up 5.29% from this date in Spring term 1999.

TETREAULT noted that the new budget process it is on schedule and OAA internal hearings will begin 4 April.
TETREAULT requested Senators and Ex officio members reserve their calendars on April 27 at 12:00 noon, for the presentation on faculty work by Al Guskin. TETREAULT indicated that the announcement for the newly created position of Vice Provost for Curriculum appears in "The Chronicle" this week, and urged faculty to communicate the position description to qualified candidates.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Responses by the Administration and PSU-AAUP as regards prospects for settlement.

PRATT representing the Administration, was selected to speak first by coin toss.

PRATT displayed an overhead which included his major points. The administration has four bargaining goals and we are committed to reaching a fair and equitable settlement. The two parties agreed to extend the old contract in April 1999 until completion of a successor agreement. The details of bargaining are confidential, a previous requirement of collective bargaining in Oregon, and past practice at PSU. The two parties have been meeting regularly with the mediator since mid-January, although more frequent meetings would be preferable. Most of the substantial issues are resolved. The stuff's that's left, the money issue, is the hard stuff.

Gary Brodowicz, PSU-AAUP Vice President for Collective Bargaining, read prepared remarks (attached).

HEYING asked Pratt what he thinks is a timeline for a settlement. PRATT stated he does not feel as pessimistic as Brodowicz, and that there is a good chance that bargaining will be concluded by the end of the month.

POWELL asked if PSU chose to include Vice Chancellor Sicotte on their team. Brodowicz stated that yes, that would be the assumption, and yielded to Pratt. PRATT stated they are in general agreement with the Chancellor's office that be represented at the table.

HOLLIDAY asked if there is new money coming in, as has been indicated this year, then why would that item fall into the category of "hard stuff," and where is the money going. PRATT stated that a lot of that money has gone into new faculty salaries; the answer regarding the rest of those monies is more complicated.
HEYING asked for a clarification regarding who the faculty are bargaining with, the university or the Chancellor. PRATT stated that faculty are bargaining with PSU.

BRENNER asked if OSU and UO have received their salary packages and do we know what they are? PRATT stated it is not confidential. KENTON stated that his understanding is that the OSU package is 2% on 1/1/00 and 3% on 1/1/01, and that it is "self-funded," and the UO package is 2% on 1/1/00 and 5% on 11/1/00, and it is "self-funded."

BRENNER requested that data be supplied for the entire system to the Faculty Senate, and noted that this is our opportunity to live up to the autonomy that the Legislature has invested in us. Since our salaries are lower and our cola higher, we need a salary improvement package that is reasonable, instead of just using the funding to new hires.

HEYING noted that at the AAUP Meeting for Legislators last Friday, one speaker said that OUS doesn't want our salaries gains to be higher than the other campuses, because that would attest to the power of collective bargaining and AAUP, and asked if Pratt had a response to that. PRATT stated that it is an assertion, but he has no knowledge of an organized plan.

ZELICK asked if the bargaining timeline has deadlines. BRODOWICZ noted that Pratt sounds more optimistic, possibly because he hasn't been at this as long, but the mediator wants results.

___________ asked Brodowicz to comment on the question, have Academic Professional negotiations ended up as part of the "hard stuff." BRODOWICZ stated, yes, however their issues won't be completely resolved in this round of bargaining.

BURNS noted that settlements on the various campuses has been a topic at IFS and he expects to be receiving that data at Saturday's meeting.

HEYING/A. JOHNSON MOVED (after G.6.) that if bargaining is not concluded by the next Senate meeting on 1 May 2000, the Administration and PSU-AAUP return to Senate to each respond to the question of what are the prospects for settlement.

THE MOTON PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

WETZEL presented the report for the committee, noting they had a more manageable workload this year, as compared to last.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.

F. Unfinished Business

1. University Planning Council Quarterly Report

LIMBAUGH presented the report for the committee, noting that they have meetings scheduled this quarter for new business items, a review of the logistics of classroom space allocation, and a review of the vision statement on the future of higher education.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.

G. New Business

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, Sec. 4., 4), m) University Planning Council

SESTAK indicated that this "housekeeping" amendment has been proposed because the President does not have an external advisory board, so UPC can't be represented there.

2. Amendment to the Constitution. Art. V, Sec.1., 1) Ex-officio Membership

SESTAK indicated that this "housekeeping" amendment has been proposed in order to facilitate communication between Faculty Senate and our IFS representatives, who are often serving as Senators but not always.

BURNS spoke in favor of this amendment, noting that the IFS has already discussed asking campuses to take this step for this same reason.
3. Amendment to the Constitution, Art. V., Sec. 2., 1) Determination of Divisional Representation

SESTAK indicated that this "housekeeping" amendment has been proposed to bring this part of the Constitution in line with changes in the definition of faculty made by Constitutional Amendment in 1994.

Hearing no further discussion SESTAK noted that the three Amendments will be forwarded to the Advisory Council for review, in accord with Art. VIII.

4. M.A. in Intnl. Studies and Intnl. Studies Graduate Course (2) Proposals

EDER presented the proposal, noting that this is a CLAS program.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the M.A. in Intnl. Studies and Intnl. Studies Graduate Course (2) Proposals.

BRENNAN asked what the administrative costs would be and where the program will be located. EDER stated it is a CLAS program, with involvement from other divisions as well. Administrative costs will be .2 FTE, and under Intnl. Affairs in OAA. BRENNAN asked for a clarification regarding the Library costs. K. BROWN stated they are a one-time expense to add materials we are lacking.

REUTER asked for a clarification regarding the Foreign Language proficiency. EDER stated the 48 hours coursework is the minimum proficiency requirement, but it could be higher. BROWN stated that it was based on the undergraduate proficiency, which is third year, plus professional proficiency.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Curriculum Committee Course Changes/Proposals

GELMON presented the proposals ("G5"), noting that she would recommend their division into eight motions.

GELMON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE 2. Economics proposals.

CHAPMAN asked about 2., f. and g, and the replacement of 399U-numbered courses. GELMON stated they will still be "U" courses if ECON requests approval, and tentatively, approval will be streamlined for such changes.
A. JOHNSON noted that this is an example of the ongoing confusion resulting from the "U" not showing up in the course catalog. BARHAM asked a question about the credit changes for majors and minors in 2., c. GELMON stated they were caused by changes in hours on specific courses. BRENNER asked if a course would replace the dropped course in 2. a. EC 421/521. No response was available.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE 7. Geology proposals, with the correction to part 7.. o.: course number is GEOL 458/558.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE 8. Political Science undergraduate proposals.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE 12. c. including the attached proposal dated 17 February 2000, from Michael Flower, "Summary of additions to UNST clusters."
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REUTER requested an interpretation regarding what can be the smallest sized cluster. PATTON stated the few small clusters are viable clusters in that the courses are offered frequently. She agreed, on the other hand, that American Studies is a very large, overly broad cluster, and noted that the UnSt Committee is looking at this.

WORKS asked what is the basis for deleting classes, as two classes in her department have been dropped without their knowledge. GELMON stated the cluster coordinators are responsible for confirming cluster courses. REUTER asked how is it that 200-level courses qualify for a junior-level cluster.

PATTON stated they are in small departments and are allowed special dispensation.

WORKS reiterated that ANTH 431 and GEOG 360U are still in clusters but do not appear in this document.

BLEILER stated that the present discussion leads him to believe that this document has been forwarded prematurely.

HICKEY noted there is an error in the European Studies cluster as well. RUS 399U, 1000 Years of Russian Culture and Russian film are actually two separate courses.

MERCER cautioned there will be advising problems if the list is not approved so it can be included in the class schedule.

REUTER stated this list could be put on the web, regardless of publication deadlines, but that he urged a review of the policy which allows inclusion of 200-level courses.

REUTER/HEYING MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 31 in favor and 17 against.

A. JOHNSON/REUTER MOVED the list be reviewed especially as regards the approval of 200-level courses and be returned to Senate no later than June 2000.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

6. Curriculum Committee Recommendations on University Studies Clusters
GELMON/BURNS moved "G6," part 1., Changes in clusters. REUTER suggested that agrarian calendars are anachronistic. GELMON stated that, to the contrary, students need something that doesn't change every term. BARHAM concurred.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

GELMON/BURNS moved "G6," part 2., Counting of courses for clusters and/or majors.

GELMON noted that the Bulletin, p. 63 indicates that "Upper division cluster course may not be used to fulfill a student's major or program requirements," however, the statement is generally ignored. WETZEL agreed that departments ignore the policy but asked why this issue came up at UCC.

ENNEKING stated that African Studies and Women's Studies are examples of areas where all courses are in the major and both major and a cluster can be taken.

LATIOLAIIS added that it is also possible for students to take a course twice, for major and cluster credit, so strong language would be helpful. BRENNER expressed opposition to this.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BRENNER/ZELICK MOVED the Academic Requirements Committee review and recommend appropriate measures to prevent undergraduates in the future from pursuing clusters in the same area discipline as his/her major program.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON distributed a questionnaire to Senators regarding the substance of curriculum proposals to be presented to Senate. BRENNAN noted that the Senate retains the right to approved curriculum and asked the purpose of this questionnaire.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 1, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL CALL

NOTE: There is no transcript for this meeting from G.1. to adjournment.

The meeting was called to order at 3:09 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of April 3, 2000 were approved as amended.

Page 53, “NOTE: There is no transcript for this meeting from F.1. to adjournment.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. Added to Senate Agenda:

Minutes, Faculty Senate May 1, 2000
D.1. Question for Administrators (Pratt and Brodowicz) from the PSU Faculty Senate: "What are the prospects for contract settlement?"

Announcement from Affirmative Action regarding Hate Crimes

2. Postponed to the Next Senate Agenda:

   Provost's Report

   E.2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report (representative not available)


3. Senate Steering Committee is appointing two Ad Hoc Committees, with membership to be announced at the June Senate Meeting. Both committees will be directed to carry out charges during Fall 2000 and report to the Senate by the December 2000 meeting. Please contact the Secretary to the Faculty if you have nominations or are interested in being appointed to either committee:

   1. Ad Hoc Committee to Review the PSU Grievance Procedures
   2. Ad Hom Committee to Review Faculty Senate Apportionment (PSU Faculty Constitution)

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. **Question for the PSU Administration and PSU-AAUP from the PSU Faculty Senate** - "What are the prospects for contract settlement?"

   Gary Brodowicz, Vice President for Collective Bargaining, PSU-AAUP, was recognized by the Presiding Officer to present for PSU-AAUP. BRODOWICZ read prepared remarks (attached). (Applause)

   PRATT, presenting for the PSU Administration, read prepared remarks (attached).

   HEYING stated that in spite of his regard for the Vice Provost he disagrees with the Administration's figures and takes issue with the accusation that faculty are not paying attention to budget and salary issues. Taking into account cost of living increases, he is being asked to take a cut of $2400. per year. He disagreed
that faculty were not being responsible. PRATT stated that the lowest faculty increase in the next seven to eight months in the full package that the Administration is offering is 6.5%. HEYING countered that that would depend on the cost of living not increasing, and does not take into account the deteriorating PEBB benefits nor the fact that Portland's cost of living is higher than the national average (cited). PRATT stated “we are dangerously close to asking if we can continue to add faculty” to distribute the expanding workload.

ENNEKING asked if, in the OUS, we spend the most on instruction in actual dollars or by percentage? PRATT stated that we spend more money on instruction and less on services, proportionately, than any other institution in the system.

HICKEY yielded to Judith Wilde, who stated that, contrary to Pratt’s assertions, the cut in her medical benefits will outdistance her raise, not including cost of living increases, and asked PRATT to respond. She also asked how, according to Pratt, the Administration was going to commit to "working more with instructors." PRATT stated that the Administration has agreed to look at the way they do contracting with Instructors. They have been buffeted by OUS for some years as to the length of contracts, and limited by the Chancellor's office, in written rules, to one year. We are all in agreement about the limitations of our participation in PEBB, but given that the Governor has influenced how PEBB is managed, we are all hampered. PRATT yielded to PERNSTEINER.

PERNSTEINER stated we have negotiated a one-year freeze in PEBB costs to try to find a way to avoid the drastic increases which will start to occur next year. We need to find a different way to look at benefits for all statewide employees, not just the university faculties. Drugs, for example, are driving much of the increase, and we must consider merging with other public groups to enlarge the group negotiating for that benefit. HICKEY commented that, according to Denise Yunker, what has happened is that the PEBB board has given us a $.5 million credit for underwriting the increased cost, but PSU has said that it will cost them $750,000. Additionally, the only thing that PSU-AAUP is allowed to negotiate is the dollar amount, not the package.

HICKEY yielded to Gary Brodowicz, who asked “if resources at PSU are in fact limited, would you say that it is unlikely that there will be any further allocations to Athletics.” (Applause) PRATT stated that the Senate will hear about that issue when the Senate Budget Committee reports next month; “it is all part of the complex landscape.”

BECKER stated that the notion of costs being contained by the group size doesn't apply as regards her spouse's employer; it is a company with
approximately 1000 employees and provides over 90% coverage. Additionally, many OUS employees are opting out because the plans offered to their spouses are better than ours. PERNSTEINER stated that part of the problem is dictated by the PEBB philosophy. We could do better by withdrawing only in the short run, because we are a younger population, but we are aging and will catch up with those demographics.

ZELICK stated that if the entire operating budget last year was approximately $205 million, than $1 million is less than a percent of our operating costs, and the administration should give serious consideration to a faculty salary request of that magnitude. PERNSTEINER stated that in 1995 he discussed for the Faculty Senate the budget and the choices which had to be made between reducing the number of faculty or taking reductions elsewhere and spending down the fund balance. The administration chose the latter course. The fund balance is now under $1 million, but that was done to preserve the university as we thought it had to be to meet the demands of this decade. If funding is increased, we will try to have a level of fiscal solvency that will keep us from being on the ropes again. We need to put money in the bank. Every other institution has at least $6 million in the bank, and we have more students than any of them. It is important to pay faculty as much as we possibly can over the long term, and that is what we are trying to reach agreement on.

BRENNER stated that "the university has just received the largest budget increase in his twenty-nine years on the faculty and finding the right balance as an art. However, when average Professor incomes are $2500 under the 10th percentile salary line, average Associate Professor incomes are $1700 under the 10th percentile, and Assistant Professor incomes are $200 plus over the 10th percentile, it is time for a signal that these people who generate the student credit hours--who generate the revenue, are worth stretching out a little longer. As you and the Association work to find that balance, give the faculty a signal that we are in fact valued. Proposing cost of living increases that don't measure up to cost of living for 20 out of my 29 years was not the signal that I was looking for. This year there is money. I would like to see the signal be given please." (Applause)

PRATT stated that he "thought that was the signal they were trying to send, in the sense that the numbers just described are the numbers on the table, and that we agreed with the Association that we should bring our salary structure into line with our competition at the national level. However, it will not happen in one contract period. We are trying to address inequities such as the ones of your 29 years, but it would be nice to have other hands to share in the work. That is the balance we are trying to strike."
HEYING requested the floor to make a motion, but consented with the request of the Presiding Officer to postpone his motion until the conclusion of other business.

HEYING/NEAL MOVED: "At the November Faculty Senate meeting, the Collins Group outlined the results of their survey of community leaders and their proposal for developing a $250 million capital campaign. On page 2 of their executive summary they state, “Community members believe that to be a great university, investments must be made in faculty first, in scholarships and academic programs next, then bricks and mortar.”

Representatives from the Collins Group also indicated that a capital campaign could not proceed without active commitment from the faculty in terms of donations and volunteer efforts. They informed us that it is a recognized strategy in fundraising that you must be able to show widespread financial support from within an institution before you can go outside to solicit donations.

Given that community leaders have identified investment in faculty as their first priority and recognizing that the capital campaign cannot be successful without faculty support, we resolve to withhold our support for the capital campaign until the Administration demonstrates in its contract offer that investment in faculty is its first priority."

RUETER stated that this motion is "shooting ourselves in the foot." HEYING stated he acknowledged that it is dangerous, but less dangerous than going on strike. The Administration needs to get the message.

EDER queried if the public will question an act that is contrary to the advancement of the university. HEYING stated that contrary to the recommendation, most of the campaign is directed at "bricks and mortar," and the next most important part is for endowed professorships, not the "worker bees."

FARR stated that the motion "is misplaced." The focus of the Capital Campaign is a different issue - "it is our campaign as well as the Administration's." RUETER queried if it is possible to place a "cash value on good faith";

MORGAN stated the premise of the proposal is problematic; it assumes the Administration has not bargained in good faith, and that is "not true." There has been agreement by both sides on compression, etc. HEYING queried if bargaining for more than a year indicated "good faith," and stated he disagreed with Morgan's premise.
A. JOHNSON/ENNEKING MOVED to table the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

WORKS presented the report, noting that there is a greater discrepancy between requests and available funds this year, as there are one-third more proposals and proposals must include graduate tuitions in the RAM budget.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

JIMERSON presented the report, noting this was a light year for this committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Report

BURNS referred Senators to the data in "E4" and discussed it in detail. He noted that the effect of RAM budgeting has been very negative for the smaller institutions, because the model is not funded to the full amount as yet. For example, OIT has cut salaries and well as halted new hiring, etc.

The University of Oregon Faculty Senate Budget Committee, working with the administration, has developed a five-year plan to raise their salaries (currently 82% of market-levels) to match comparator institutions.

BURNS stated that the IFS discussed the ballot initiatives and the impact they would have on higher education funding if passed. They also discussed full funding of the RAM budget as regards tuitions, salaries and infrastructure. IFS also heard from Gerry Richmond, the faculty representative to the State Board. Lastly, progress on the tuition waiver program was reviewed.

BURNS concluded by making two challenges: 1) to the administration, to collaborate with the faculty on salary proposals in a model similar to the University of Oregon's, and 2) to the Senate, to form an ad hoc committee to work with the Chancellor and the legislature.
TETREAULT stated she approves of the plan, and talked to Budget Committee as soon as she learned of it.

6. **Curriculum Committee Remarks Regarding the Use of 200-level Courses in University Studies (UNST) Clusters**

Committee member Margaret Everett was recognized, in GELMON's absence.

ZELICK asked if 200-level courses can be transferred into a cluster requirement? EVERETT yielded to Michael Flower who stated that competency in the subject in question must be clearly demonstrated for this to occur.

F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, Sec. 4., 4), m) University Planning Council**

BURNS/MERCER MOVED "F1" as published.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. **Amendment to the Constitution, Art. V, Sec.1., 1) Ex-officio membership**

BURNS/MERCER MOVED "F2" as published.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Amendment to the Constitution, Art. V., Sec. 2., 1) Determination of Divisional Representation**

BURNS/MERCER MOVED "F3" as published.

RUETER requested a clarification of the motion as regards its relation to issues of collective bargaining and membership in the collective bargaining unit. ANDREWS-COLLIER explained that the Constitutional language in question predates several significant changes made in the Constitution in the 1990's. For the purposes of faculty governance, previous to 1994, faculty were defined as full-time employees holding the ranks of Prof., Assoc. Prof., Assi. Prof., or Instructor. In that year the Constitution (Art. II) was amended to include in the definition of faculty all full-time unclassified employees in Extended Studies. In 1994-95, the Constitution (Art. II) was amended to the present definition, which includes all non-classified employees of the university, who hold an earned master's degree (criteria determined in consultation with the Provost). PSU-AAUP, the collective bargaining unit in
question, is defined as all full-time, unclassified employees of the university (regardless of education), who are not excluded as part of "management" according to the National Labor Relations Act (for example, Officers of the Administration, department chairs, directors, etc.).

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


EVERETT presented the proposals, indicating that Michael Flower and Robert Gould were present to answer questions about proposals.

WORKS/BURNS MOVED to approve the list, including changes presented in the meeting (attached).

A. JOHNSON/IBLEILER MOVED that 200-level courses be phased out of Upper Division Clusters after this year. EVERETT stated that the finding of the Curriculum Committee was that the 200-level PHIL courses were justified according to the numbering of the Philosophy Department, and there were no other exceptions, including transfer courses from community colleges. EVERETT yielded to GOULD who stated Byron Haines had been present and had prepared remarks to address this issue under E.6., but as it did not come up, he left the meeting. FLOWER stated he appreciated Johnson's argument, but asked is the Senate really wanted to "close the door completely." For example, disallowable transfer courses under 300. MERCER asked if we could wait to hear Byron Haines's remarks before coming to a decision, as it could cause the Philosophy Department withdrawal from University Studies. EVERETT stated there are three clusters which rely heavily on those courses. RUETER noted he advises students to stay with big clusters supported by big departments for just this reason.

A. JOHNSON/__________ MOVED TO TABLE the item.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals

EDER presented the proposals and recognized spokesperson Herman Migliore.

A. JOHNSON/MERCER MOVED that the six sections, A-F of "G1" be approved, serially.
BRENNER asked if there are copyright issues surrounding web-based courses. MIGLIORE noted that there are PSU guidelines, but some professors already owned some of their intellectual property. BRENNER asked if a precedent were being set here. ENNEKING queried if this wasn’t an issue falling in the domain of collective bargaining. HICKEY stated there is a new article which states agreement can be negotiated. ______ noted that where university-wide policies are well established, the faculty are better protected. HOLLIDAY stated there are no guidelines for negotiating agreements. ______ HEYING stated that the universities own the rights fully. PRATT stated he takes issue with what Hickey stated; we have generally agreed to _____________. [TRANSCRIPT STOPS HERE].

RUETER asked where the faculty involved in this curriculum are based. MIGLIORE stated some are here, some are on-line locally, and some are on-line regionally. RUETER commented that to “grow” programs with web based courses is problematic.

2. Curriculum Committee Proposals for Freshman Inquiry

A. JOHNSON/BRENNER MOVED the Senate approve the Curriculum Committee Proposals ("G2).

The MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. PSU Resolution Against Hate Crimes (added to Agenda)

VIEIRA noted that racist graffiti containing serious threats have been found on campus and that every effort is being made to identify the perpetrator as well as insure that students can feel safe on campus. He continued, referencing the Statement of Unity: "PSU supports the right of all people to learn and live safely and without fear. We will respond forthrightly to any event on campus that promotes or results in discrimination, hatred or violence against any person on the basis of race, religion, national origin, age, gender, ability or sexual orientation. We value diversity and reaffirm the common humanity of all people and the intrinsic value of every individual."

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 5, 2000
Presiding Officer: Barbara Sestak
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier

A. ROLL CALL


New Members Present: Franz, Glanville, Hagge, Sherman, Chenoweth, Lall, Fosque, Brodowicz, Reece, Rueter, Rosengrant, Shusterman, Gilbert, Holloway, Wang

Alternates Present: Dunbar for Albery, Brenner for George

Members Absent: Ames, Bleiler, Biolsi, Chaille, Chapman, Corcoran, Erskine, Fountain, Hoffman, L. Johnson, R. Johnson, Kiam, Lewis, Miller-Jones, Morgan, Walsh, Watne, Wollner, Wosley-George


B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the 1 May 2000 meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate were approved with the following corrections:

1) Tim Anderson was present.
2) P. 56, Para. 3, sentence 1 & 2, line 1-7:

Correct to read: BRENNER stated that "the university has just received the largest budget in his twenty-nine years on the faculty and finding the right balance is an art. However, when average Prof. incomes are $2500, under the 10th percentile salary line, average Assoc. Prof. incomes are $1700, under the 10th percentile, and Asst. Prof. incomes are $2000. Above 10th percentile, it is time for a signal that these people who generate the student credit hours - who generate the revenue - are worth stretching out FOR a little longer..."
C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to today's Senate Agenda:

- President's Report
- E.7 Report of the Meeting of 2 June 2000 - Burns

Hail & Farewell

The Presiding Officer welcomed new members of the PSU Faculty Senate.

Sherril Gelmon, Chair of Curriculum Committee and Robert Eder, Chair of Graduate Council were recognized to present a motion.

GELMON/EDER MOVED: The Graduate Council and the University Curriculum Committee have voted unanimously to recommend that the Faculty Senate acknowledge the 22 years of service that Bob Tufts has given to PSU as Registrar, with our special thanks for his support and wise counsel on the University Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council. Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate extend its appreciation to Bob Tufts, thank him for all his contributions, and wish him well in his future endeavors.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer noted the passing in Fall 1999 of Ex officio member of the Senate, Dean Roger Ahlbrandt, School of Business Administration.

The Presiding Officer noted the retirements from the University of Senators while in office during 1999-2000, Ann Weikel and Louis Goslin, who retired in December, and Jack Cooper, who was recognized at the January meeting.

The Presiding Officer noted that Ron Cease has submitted his resignation from IFS effective concurrent with his retirement from PSU in August 2000.

The Presiding Officer noted the departure from P.S.U. of several current Senators and Ex officio members: Candice Goucher has been appointed Professor of History & Coordinator of Liberal Arts at WSU-Vancouver; Robert Vieira has been appointed V. P. of Academic Affairs at OHSU; and, Bruce Taggart has been appointed Vice Pres. at Lehigh University (technologies and library).

Other Announcements

The final two members of the Faculty Senate elected from the School of Social Work, effective 5 June 2000, are Diane Yakchmenoff and Maria Talbott.
The members of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee for Review of the Grievance Procedures are: Lois Becker, Gene Hakanson, Deborah Howe, William Kenny, Robert Liebman. The committee is charged by the Senate Steering Committee to commence their review Fall 2000.

The members of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee for Review of Senate Apportionment are Dan Fortmiller, Walton Fosque, David Johnson, Kathi Ketcheson, and a final member who has not yet confirmed. It is expected that the committee will conduct their work Fall 2000, and will be requested to report to the Senate by the December 2000 Senate meeting.

The Advisory Committee on Academic Information Technology proposed making a report to the Senate, which has been scheduled for the October Senate meeting.

A.Johnson noted that the Philosophy Department is planning to resubmit their 200-level course proposals for University Studies in Fall 2000.

Elections

Election of Officers for the 2000-01 PSU Faculty Senate (which took place as part of the proceedings of the June Senate Meeting):

- Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
- Presiding Officer Pro Tem: Robert Mercer
- Steering Committee: Duncan Carter, David Johnson, Charles Heying, Margaret Neal (Sarah Beasley, Chair of Comm. on Comm. ex officio)

Changes in Senate and Committee Appointments effective 5 June 2000:

Appointments to 2000-01 academic year Committees have been recorded by the Secretary and will appear in the 2000-01 PSU Faculty Governance Guide.

1. Faculty Senate Representative to Assessment Council

Sherril Gelmon, the Senate Representative to the Assessment Council, completes her Senate term today. Senators interested in replacing her on the Assessment Council are requested to contact the Secretary.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Bernstine noted that June celebrates the third anniversary of his appointment as President. He thanked all present for a wonderful and successful school year, and noted he is looking forward to the coming year to be successful as well. He stated he is particularly pleased that we were able to resolve salary issues, and hopes the overwhelming vote was a result of faculty support of where the university is trying to go with faculty salaries. As we conclude this year, he wants to renew his commitment to bring faculty salaries into line as quickly as possible.

Minutes, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, June 5, 2000
BERNSTINE introduced the new Dean of Business Administration, Scott Dawson.

BERNSTINE noted that, regarding our relationship with OGI and the other state institutions, thanks to some hard work we are still "in play," and there should be some good news in the near future.

BURNS asked the President to comment on the progress of the tuition remission policy for dependents. BERNSTINE stated it is planned to go into effect for Fall 2000, and will provide 10 credits per quarter. Details will be distributed to the university community during summer term.

BERNSTINE concluded by congratulating and thanking Stan Hillman and the Budget Committee for their work this year. It was a valuable process and a great opportunity to work together in terms of prioritizing our finances for the future.

PROVOST'S REPORT

TETREAULT noted she echoed the President's comments regarding our successes this year. She then discussed her first year at PSU, and this conversation was disseminated in a letter to the campus community several days later (attached).

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION & COMMITTEES

1. Advisory Council Annual Report

WETZEL presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Committee on Committees Annual Report

WILLIAMS presented the report for the committee, noting three names of committee members omitted from the report, Robert Mercer, David Holloway, and Eleanor Erskine.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

HOPP presented the report for Miars, noting that the committee would like to add their recognition of and thanks for Robert Vieira's service to the committee.
The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. University Planning Council Annual Report

LIMBAUGH presented the final quarterly report (attached).

A.JOHNSON noted the committee has previously discussed issues such as the campus plan. LIMBAUGH, stated, yes, they discussed the University District, but it is now apparently in the hands of another committee, thus the sense of redundancy. TETREAULT stated she is delighted with the notion of revitalizing the committee's mission.

5. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report Addendum

WORKS presented the report addendum (attached) and noted the committee had to complete a great deal of work in a very short time. WORKS stated that recipients would be notified imminently.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

6. Budget Committee Annual Report

HILLMAN presented the report, noting that David Johnson's name was omitted from the list of members.

The Presiding Officer accepted the annual report for the Senate.

7. Report of the IFS Meeting of 2 June 2000

BURNS presented the oral report after "G.5". IFS met with Sarah Hopkins Powell, Interim President of SOU. They have a new General Education program very similar to ours, and are going through a similar transition. SOU bargained and settled very early using "one on one" strategy and they did not have Joe Sicotte at the table. OUS Board issues at present include the Bend campus idea, which will be addressed at the June meeting, as well as developments with OGI. The effect of Sizemore initiatives were reviewed by Sen. Lenn Hannon(R. – Ashland), who also discussed the low rate of voter turnout in the college age population.

Regarding salary and compensation at the other campuses, WOU's settlement was not 19% as previously reported, but 22%. OSU are pressing their administration to revisit their salary package. EOU has a new President, and they have a new policy of faculty evaluation of administrators. As a result, one Dean resigned.

Steve Bender of the Legislative Fiscal Office will be visiting PSU imminently as part of developing his report on the new budget model. The IFS is monitoring a possible policy development, which would involve tuition payment on a credit by credit basis. Some of
the community colleges are concerned that we are attracting Freshmen away from their programs.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS


HILLMAN (continued from E.6.) discussed the committee's review of the new budget model (RAM) as charged by the Steering Committee. The committee posed five questions, which are indicated in the report. After interdicting question #1, he yielded to George Pernsteiner.

PERNSTEINER stated revenues are projected to increase another $1.6 million next year. He thanked the Budget Committee under Stan Hillman’s leadership for their ability to communicate. Collectively, they spent the entire year trying to project for next year’s budget. There were $6. million in requests for ‘00-01, of which $2.1 million the Budget Committee has given the highest priority. The following were approved this day and include: Increase the budget of the Government Relations by $61,000, for a policy analyst; Funding the increased cost of the growth in Bandwidth we need for internet access; $579,000 to increase the indirect cost rebates; $100,000 for a one-year trial of 24-hour/5-day per week library service; $27,000 increase for Student Affairs for the Governor’s sustainability initiative, which is one-half the request; $270,000 for the Capital Campaign and an international development officer; $325,000 for deferred maintenance, and $115,000 for equipment and laboratories. If our revenues exceed expected levels, we will add back to the latter two items to bring them up to last year’s allocation, as well as additional Development activities to support the Capital Campaign. Searches for the seven faculty positions proposed by the Provost will go forward in Fall 2000. The effect of adding those positions and funding the salary increases just negotiated will require, in the ‘01-02 year, a 2 – 2.5% enrollment increase and/or tuition increases. The above decisions have been made based upon current revenue assumptions. Enactment of measures recently placed on the November ballot would result in significant alterations to these plans.

PERNSTEINER thanked the Budget Committee for a budget process that went well, and he thanked the entire faculty for their teaching, research, and service, which is making next year’s budget projections possible.

BRENNER asked if there are contingency plans for passage of ballot initiatives. PERNSTEINER stated that the McIntyre initiative is not applicable to tuition, only fees, so it would be problematic but not be too destructive. However, passage of the Sizemore initiative would require a 30% state budget reduction in 2000 alone. For PSU, for example, that would amount to an approximate budget cut of $20 million, retroactive to July 2000. He stressed it is more important to keep doing well what we are doing, than to divert our energies to cutting strategies. We must not give the impression that we are unstable, or, as with past experience, we could become unstable.
HILLMAN discussed the committee’s conclusions as regards questions, #2 – 5, including relating them to the attachments F2-F8 in the report, and concluded with the Athletic program data. In most situations the Athletic program has not matched their projections for benefits to be accrued.

BRENNER asked if the 330 FTE in Athletics is included in income figures. HILLMAN stated that that income is not on these charts. Sterk met with the committee recently and argued that it should be; however, the Budget Committee disagreed. BRENNER expressed his disagreement with that choice. A.JOHNSON reiterated one more time that the charts reflect what was proposed versus what was realized.

HILLMAN concluded by thanking the Administration for their collaboration and openness, and reviewed the three actions recommended by the committee on page 4.

A.JOHNSON/ FISHER MOVED “Specific Actions Requested from the Senate (3),” in Item “E.6 1999-2000 Annual Report of the Senate Budget Committee,” p. 4:

1. That the Administration for being helpful and forthright to the senate Budget committee.
2. The variance in cost/revenue raises questions about the equitable distribution of resources to academic programs. Inequitable distribution of resources raises issues about the quality of the students’ academic experience and the faculty workload in departments with low and high ratios. The Senate should direct the Budget Committee, University Planning Council and any other appropriate committee in 2000/2001 to develop criteria for evaluating the quality of academic programs and assess whether this funding variance relates to quality variance.
3. The Senate should request that the Athletic Director work with the Budget Committee to assess the reasons for the shortfalls from projections in revenue generation and provide data on the student benefits that accrue from the athletic programs.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

LALL presented the report and took questions. SESTAK asked Lall to comment on why there has been difficulty in finding his successor. LALL stated it has to do with workload issues in that the committee will be heavily involved in the NCAA review this coming year.

A.JOHNSON noted the committee should monitor budgetary events. LALL responded that the NCAA accreditation review would dominate the committee’s attention in 2000-01.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.

3. Academic Requirements Committee Report on Cluster Credit

WETZEL presented the report for the committee
The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.

4. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Omnibus and Cross-Listed Courses

HOLLOWAY presented the report.

A JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED "Committee Recommendations for Crosslisting Policy at PSU", items #1 – 3, page 2.

GELMON asked if this applied to new or old courses. HOLLOWAY stated it is a department’s decision and this does not undo old ones. LATIOLAIS asked if credit goes to the department or to the faculty member. HOLLOWAY stated that FTE is a department issue.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON/BURNS MOVED "Committee Recommendations for Omnibus Numbered Courses, items #4 – 6, pp. 3-6.

BRENNAN noted this is a negative proposal, and a positive one is preferable. HOLLOWAY stated that what is there is already in place. A question was asked as to the involvement of graduate interdisciplinary faculty. HOLLOWAY stated they have been involved, for example Roy Koch was consulted.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Curriculum Committee Report on University Studies Assessment Plan

GELMON presented the report, after G.1., and asked Senators to review it over the summer.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curriculum Committee Recommendation Regarding Conflict Resolution Courses

A JOHNSON/LATIOLAIS MOVED the Senate approve CR 299, CR 399, CR 410: Special Studies, as part of the Graduate Program in Conflict Resolution.

HOLLOWAY asked why the course is numbered 299, when it is part of a graduate program. GELMON stated that graduate students are teaching the courses. RUETER asked how this was connected to University Studies, as they appear to get one item through such as this and then add others.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote (4 nays, no abstentions).
MERCER thanked Barbara Sestak for her leadership this year, and was joined by the Senate with unanimous applause.

SESTAK thanked outgoing Senators, the Senate, and the Senate Steering committee, Robert Mercer, Judy Patton, David Johnson, Kathi Ketcheson, and Dilafruz Williams. She also thanked Sarah Andrews-Collier.

The meeting and the 1999-2000 PSU Faculty Senate were adjourned at 5:07 p.m.