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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 4, 1999, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll  
* B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 7, 1998, Meeting  

President's Report  

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  

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. Collins Group Capital Campaign Feasibility Study - Martha Sloca Richards, Oregon Regional Manager of the Collins Group  
*2 University Curriculum Committee Annual Report - Molander  
*3. Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report - Ketcheson for Fuller  
4. University Assessment Team - Davidson & Ketcheson  

F. Unfinished Business  
*1 Constitutional Amendment, Art.V, Sec. 4.j) Graduate Council  
*2. ARC Proposal for Baccalaureate Degree Description - Wetzel  
*3. ARC Proposal for B.A. Degree Requirement - Wetzel  

G. New Business  
*1. Faculty Nominees for Governor's Appointment to the State Board - Cease  
*2. Graduate Council Course/Program Proposals, including M.S. in Systems Science, M.A.T. in Foreign Language, and CLAS Course/Program Proposals - Terdal  
*3. University Curriculum Committee Program Proposal for Certificate in Biotechnology - Molander  

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:  
B Minutes of the December 7, 1998, Senate Meeting  
E2 University Curriculum Committee Annual Report  
E3 Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report  
F1 Constitutional Amendment, Art.V, Sec. 4.j) Graduate Council  
F2 ARC Proposal for Baccalaureate Degree Description  
F3 ARC Proposal for B.A. Degree Requirement  
G1 Faculty Nominees for Governor's Appointment to the State Board  
G2 Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals, including M.S. Systems Science, M.A.T. in Foreign Language, and CLAS Course/Program Proposals  
G3 Certificate in Biotechnology Program Proposal
Minutes:

Faculty Senate Meeting, December 7, 1998

Presiding Officer: Ronald C. Cease
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The Minutes of the November 2, 1998 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

John Cooper has been elected to serve as President of Interinstitutional Faculty Senate for 1999.

The letter from the Steering Committee to the PEBB Board, per the Senate charge at the November Senate Meeting, will be attached to the December minutes.
The Secretary has recorded the following changes in Senate and committee appointments since 2 November:

Mary Cumpston has been appointed alternate member to the Student Conduct Committee.

Senators were reminded that nominations for faculty representation to the State Board should be directed to the Steering Committee no later than 12:00 noon, on 14 December.

CEASE noted that Eugene Enneking, Presiding Officer Pro Tem, will take the gavel at 3:45 as Cease is involved in the orientation for new legislators being held in the Vanport Room.

CHANGES IN TODAY’S AGENDA:

President Bernstine will be in attendance and report for the Administration.

Added to today’s Agenda will be E.7. Report of the IFS Meeting of 3-4 December, by Craig Wollner.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE noted that the new budget model is not fully funded in the Governor’s budget request, so we don’t know yet how much funding there will be. Hopefully, the model itself will stay intact, and the question will be which aspects will be funded this biennium, and which will be funded next biennium.

BERNSTINE noted the Campus Climate Commission report was published on 20 November. He thanked the commission and the Chair, Dalton Miller-Jones, for a thoughtful and incisive report. The report has been distributed before the Winter Break so that there is time to think about it. BERNSTINE stated that next term he plans to work with the Advisory Council on how to implement the recommendations of the report. Several recommendations require additional resources, but the new budget model may make that circumstance a possibility.

BERNSTINE previewed the remarks to be made by the Vice President for University Relations in E1, noting that the connection between the upcoming capital campaign, and academic program and mission is a major key to success.

CEASE noted that the Governor’s budget proposal is less than the OUS request, but the Senate majority’s is $30. million more than the Gov’s for higher education. Democrats
have a larger agenda, therefore a lower higher education budget. All our lobbying groups, including IFS, AOF, AAUP, and OUS itself, will work for better funding.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. PSU Foundation & Office of University Relations

Director Jan Kurtz presented the Annual Foundation Report to the Faculty Senate. KURTZ noted that working for CLAS before she became Foundation Director provided her with a good knowledge of our academic functions and she is acquainted many faculty. KURTZ described the coordination between the Foundation and University Development. The Board is a major contributor to development efforts, and several new members have just started their terms. Foundation staff process gifts and Development staff solicit gifts. There are $9 million in endowment and $15 million in net assets to date, and these figures are indicated in the overheads (attached). The rate of increase in private support is due to Gary Withers’s leadership.

WITHERS noted that 1997-98 was another record setting year in our fund raising history, using overhead illustration (attached). Leadership, mission, and financial stability are the three reasons for giving. Presidential transitions frequently result in a drop in income, but this was not the case with Dan Bernstine’s arrival. The recent thrust of the development office has been to work with donors giving six and seven figure gifts, in order to jump-start the program, and to work for alumni major giving. Our "centralized-decentralized" system is characterized by fundraising officers located in the colleges and schools, and requires careful coordination.

The Collins Group, a consulting firm, has been retained to analyze PSU’s readiness for our first capital campaign, and their review schedule is illustrated in the overhead (attached). Internally, they will analyze our preparedness, and externally, they will poll our donor pool for potential support. Finally, they will reconcile these two components and recommend how they will interact. The campaign itself is still several years away.
2. Graduate Council Annual Report

TERDAL presented the report and took questions.

BULMAN asked if there is a set of criteria for certificate programs. TERDAL noted that the June Senate gave Graduate Council approval oversight for summer session and that approval criteria was the same, regardless. COOPER asked if new programs are being reviewed in relation to the new budget model? TERDAL stated that all graduate programs need review for this reason, and the committee needs to take a larger role than just approving individual programs. ZELICK noted that all of these new proposals are in the high cost area of the new budget model.

The Presiding Office accepted the report for Senate and thanked the committee for their work this year.

3. Library Committee Annual Report

BARTON presented the report. He noted that a major issue for the Library is the rising serials budget as part of the acquisitions budget, and that more information on that issue will be forthcoming. BARTON also noted that an ad hoc group of faculty met with the Library Committee regarding delivery of services.

BULMAN asked, regarding item #3, how was the cost overrun being funded. PFINGSTEN replied that the Provost gave the Library $30,000 in access funding this year, and over $60,000 last year. In the last two years, CWSP staffing has evaporated, and these are only temporary solutions to the staffing problem.

MOOR asked about the serials subscriptions pilot project. BARTON stated it shows that serials are useful for 1-5 years only in the Sciences. PFINGSTEN noted that is where the pilot project is because of cost increases, however, they know that back materials are more important in disciplines such as History, etc., depending on discipline. BARTON noted on-line journals do not work as a substitute as they can be most costly that the print versions. PFINGSTEN noted that by June there will be a better idea of how it is working.

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

4. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

BARHAM presented the report, indicating the proposed motion at the conclusion
of the report. A. JOHNSON proposed a friendly amendment to add "I"s to the motion as well.

BARHAM/A. JOHNSON MOVED "the 1999 SSC, in conjunction with OIRP, investigate both the use of "X"s and "I"s, and the possibility of establishing a satisfactory progress policy and subsequently make a policy recommendation to the Senate regarding this matter."

BECKER asked if there is a sense that people sign up for credit just to get parking. BARHAM stated that is not likely as you must pay tuition before getting parking passes.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer Pro Tem accepted the report for the Senate and thanked the committee for the year's work.

5. University Planning Council Quarterly Report

BODEGOM reported for Wells, who was detained. He noted the committee will be taking up several items in the coming months, including Intellectual Property, and UnSt Task Force Recommendation items.

The Presiding Officer Pro Tem accepted the report for the Senate.


CEASE reported, after "E7", on the assignments that the Senate Steering Committee has made for review of the Recommendations of the University Studies Task Force. They consist, by item number of charges to the following committees and administrative areas:

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

1. Steps should be taken to assure that our students receive broad exposure to mathematics, science, writing, and other subjects important in a liberal education. Whether these issues of breadth can or should be addressed entirely within the University Studies program is a crucial issue for the University to decide. Assigned to UCC and ARC.
2. **Steps should be taken to assure that faculty from all schools and colleges of the University participate in the program at all levels.** Request for review sent to the Council of Academic Deans.

3. **The current clusters should be reevaluated with the goal of strengthening interdisciplinarity and fostering cohesion.** Assigned to UCC and ARC

4. **The University should develop a comprehensive assessment plan that will include all aspects of our academic programs, including University Studies, so that data on student outcomes can be systematically gathered.** This will require identifying key individuals throughout the university whose primary responsibility is assessment. The individuals must be given the status and authority to make assessment a university priority. Request forwarded to Vice Provost Davidson to provide description of correlation between this item and the Assessment Initiative to be presented to the January Senate Meeting.

**BUDGET AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

5. **The University needs to reevaluate the location of University Studies within the university structure in order to improve academic and administrative oversight of the program.** Assigned to UPC

6. **The organization of University Studies should be clarified so that the chain of command and the duties and responsibilities are known.** Assigned to UPC

7. **University Studies budgets should be planned in coordination with other units, especially, but not only, CLAS. Compensation to units for faculty participation should be funded according to an agreed upon and consistent formula.** Assigned to Budget Committee

8. **The costs of University Studies should be delineated so that all expenses are known.** Assigned to Budget Committee

9. **We recommend that the Faculty Senate develop and clarify procedures to facilitate the integration of University Studies into the existing system of university governance.** Assigned to UPC

A. **JOHNSON asked if the Campus Climate Commission would receive similar scrutiny.** CEASE stated the Steering Committee will take up this question.
7. **Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 4-5 December**

WOLLNER gave a brief report after "E1," noting that the full report would be included with the January Senate Agenda Mailing(attached). CEASE, also an IFS Senator, added that under the new budget model, internal decision making will have a greater influence on outcomes than at present.

F. **Unfinished Business**

None

G. **New Business**

1. **Proposed Constitutional Amendment - Art. IV, Sec. 4. j) Graduate Council**

TERDAL/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Constitutional Amendment("G1").

TERDAL reviewed the Graduate Council’s rationale for proposing the amendment, stating that the Graduate Study Task Force Report had recommended that members of this committee be directly involved with graduate education.

BULMAN asked for an explanation of the rationale for the second new sentence in the amendment. TERDAL stated it is there to help facilitate identification of graduate faculty.

A. JOHNSON/BULMAN MOVED deletion of the second new sentence in the Amendment.

MOOR stated that this sentence in incongruous in the Constitution, and that the use of "desirable" is also not good. WAMSER stated we don’t want to exclude faculty who may become involved in graduate education in the future.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

COOPER noted that the term "involved with" is also vague, and suggested it be replaced with "engaged in." SETTLE stated that seriousness of purpose should be the criteria for membership; otherwise we get what we deserve.
There was no further discussion, and ENNEKING noted that the amendment will be forwarded to Advisory Council, and be returned to the January Meeting of Faculty Senate for action.

2. **Program Proposal for Ph.D. in Computer Science & M.S. in Financial Analysis**

TERDAL noted that she would divide the approvals into two motions.

TERDAL/BULMAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Ph.D. in Computer Science.

TERDAL introduced the spokesperson for the proposal, Cynthia Brown, CS Chair. She indicated the proposal is externally market driven, by students and employers, and internally, it is desirable to enrich the scholarly climate for research faculty.

A. JOHNSON asked if Systems Science was currently offering this degree, to which question the reply was no. ZELICK asked if it is intended that grants will provide the third year of support, to which question the reply was yes. At present the ratio of funded to non-funded third year students is approximately 12 to 40, with six teaching assistantships.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

TERDAL/R.JOHNSON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the M.S. in Financial Analysis, including course proposals/changes.

TERDAL introduced the spokesperson for the proposal, Scott Dawson, SBA Assoc. Dean for Graduate Programs.

BULMAN asked if the two additional faculty positions are funded by the enlarged head count, to which question the reply was yes. This degree is aimed at the new 5th year accounting requirement which will be in place next year.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. **ARC Recommendation for B.S. Notation**

WETZEL/______ MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the recommendation("G3").
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BULMAN asked if Geography courses could be included if they have lab components. WETZEL stated, conditionally, yes if they are shown to fulfill the requirement, but it would require committee approval.

MOOR/FULLER MOVED TO AMEND the notation to read, "Unless otherwise specified, courses taken to satisfy the B.S. Degree Requirement for lab/field work must be designated to have a lab/field work component and must have one of the following department or program prefixes: BIOL, CHEM, ESR, GEOL, PHY and SCI."

MOOR noted there is a case to be made for a limited list of courses. DRISCOLL noted that the spirit of the new B.S. requirement was to use the prefixes of the Science distribution, and stated he disagrees with the motion unless it indicates that.

WAMSER stated the motion still does not define the boundaries of the distribution area. BULMAN stated that GEOG could fit into this definition.

BARHAM stated her understanding of the SCI requirement passes last year was that it be in Science. MOOR noted that courses should count in only one distribution area. AJOHNSON noted this is similar to other cross-listing problems.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BROWN noted that if courses are not listed in the Bulletin, the list could get lost or altered. BARHAM stated she disagrees with listing courses in the Course Schedules.

BULMAN/BURNS MOVED to table the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
Public Employees Benefit Board  
775 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310  

Dear Board Members,

The Faculty Senate, at their Meeting of 2 November, charged the Senate Steering Committee to communicate the dissatisfaction of the PSU Faculty with developments related to the SEBB/BUBB merger. In this first year of the new PEBB Benefits program, we were assured that for 1999 we would be protected from changes as a result of the merger, and that our concerns about future changes would be addressed when Benefits were negotiated for 2000. The PSU Faculty have expressed a growing sense of alarm as a result of recent events, and aside from protection from the ~10% cost increase for 1999, we have begun to suspect that future Benefits will undergo serious erosion.

A major cause for concern is the abrupt elimination of the "Blue Cross Plan 3." Moreover, this elimination took place without timely notice to current users that it was to be discontinued, and with no prior warning to potential new subscribers. Doubts about the failure of PEBB to recognize the needs of faculty were further raised over issues of preferred vs. participating providers, and efforts to present Co-Pay plan(s) as preferable or comparable to the old Plan 3, with insubstantial evidence. Although our location in Portland affords us a degree of choice not available to our colleagues statewide, we experience a higher cost-of-living; however, certain PSU faculty were still inclined to the more expensive Plan 3 as it afforded more personal choice of physician.

In response to concerns voiced by faculty earlier this Fall, PEBB indicated that a Survey would be included in the Benefits package mailing, in order to solicit feedback for future decision making. At the Meeting of 2 November of the Faculty Senate, copies of the Survey were distributed. There was general consensus that the Survey was ineffective, that it was not intended to solicit significant feedback from faculty, and that it was inconsequential to the degree that it was entirely overlooked by most. Subsequently, the OUS system has responded with preparations to conduct its own survey in December, and the outcomes of both efforts remain to be seen.

A further unsettling factor is that it has taken until early November, after pressure from many sides, to obtain assurance that the "cafeteria plan," cash back, and opt out features will continue in coming years. It is still unclear as to whether we will be left with only HMO-style plans, with fewer and fewer options.
This chain of events has caused a lack of credibility on the part of PEBB’s planning process, and a sense of pessimism as regards Benefits plans for 2000 and beyond. Oregon higher education is rated 39th in the nation in earnings, and PSU faculty wages and compensation are rated in the lowest fifth percentile in the nation (Academe, Mar-Apr, 1998). The short term effect of eroded benefits is perceived as the equivalent of a reduction in pay. In the long term we would anticipate serious implications for morale, retention and recruitment.

We look forward to the opportunity to be involved in development of future Benefits packages.

Sincerely,

Ron Cease

PSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Ronald C. Cease, President
Eugene Enneking, President Pro Tem
Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary
Walter Ellis
Marjorie Terdql
Kathi Ketcheson
Carol Mack
J. Kent Lall, ex officio

c: President Daniel O. Bernstine
    Provost Michael F. Reardon
    Chancellor Joseph W. Cox
    OUS Board Members
Friday, 4 December

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate met at Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) in December 1998. Senators were welcomed at the Friday afternoon session by Dr. Peter Kohler, president. President Kohler spoke at length about the OHSU budget model, its benefits and pitfalls. He noted that the institution's research budget was more than $100 million this year.

IFS next heard from Associate Vice Chancellor Diane Vines who discussed the Oregon Emerging Business Initiative. This partnership among government, the private sector, and higher education is designed to make the state one of the top three emerging business regions in the world. The benchmark for that occurrence will be five straight years of double-digit growth. She said that Oregon is behind in research and development and, as a result, small business is languishing. Part of the answer is small business incubators which will nourish businesses she referred to as "gazelles"—presumably those concerns able to leap ahead in their development programs and take their place as drivers of the state economy. Currently, she noted, state and local policies discourage growth because of high capital gains taxes and there are other reasons for the slow pace of growth of smaller firms. A key to making the initiative work, she said, will be the mobilization of Oregon's intellectual capital, developing internships, and supporting workforce development activities, all of which will come to a great extent from OUS institutions.

Dr. Vines also discussed public opinion research underway by OUS designed to elicit what students and parents think of OUS.

Sarah Witte, the IFS observer at the Academic Council reported on the discussion among the provosts at their recent meeting about the problem of second language requirements at the community colleges. They may need special subsidies to have multiple languages on campus. Another issue of concern to the provosts is the transferability among the campuses of general education courses. This has become a problem among all the institutions. It was also discussed among the provosts that there is a heavy campaign emanating from central Oregon to build a four-year campus at Bend.

IFS also met with newly elected state legislators, Senator Rick Metzger (D-Welches) and Representative Max Williams (R-Tigard). Each made a presentation to the group and answered questions about their attitude to higher education. They were both highly supportive.

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Shirley Clark addressed IFS next. Her remarks centered mainly on the issue of post-tenure review. The issue has been persistently raised by two OUS board members. It was suggested that in the current environment of emphasis on assessment and performance indicators throughout education, as well as the reorganization of the system resulting in redefinition of the duties and responsibilities of the chancellor and the more frequent review of the institution presidents, the rise of this issue to the top of the board's agenda was perhaps inevitable.
Dr. Clark said that the board has been reminded that there has been post-tenure review all along and that board members are well aware that the tenure process is rigorous, but they are interested to know what happens to enforce rigor after tenure. The chancellor, she noted, has chosen to meet their concerns with an offensive strategy that will head off interference from the board and the public. The result is a draft study of post-tenure review available from OUS or the PSU IFS representatives.

Bill Wyatt, Chief of Staff to Governor Kitzhaber, was the last speaker of the day. He observed that the Governor has tried to clothe his educational agenda in, as it were, “cradle to grave” rhetoric. However, he intends to go into the 1999 session with targeted and specific higher education investments. The Governor, he said, recognizes that higher education is the one area of the state budget where there has been a real dollar decline in investment over the decade. The Governor now wants to “shift the paradigm” and focus more on the benefits of higher education to students. He has put in his new budget $15 million for a tuition freeze, $8 million for targeted investments, and $5 million for faculty recruitment and retention. The total education budget of $73 million reflects a higher percentage increase than any of his other line budgets. Noting that Senate President Brady Adams’ new budget for higher education is higher than Kitzhaber’s and that it showed overall comparability with the Governor’s, Wyatt took it as a sign that he is not interested in a budget fight in the upcoming session.

On the subject of the next session, Wyatt expressed concern about the learning curve of the new members of the Oregon House. While the Senate is more competitive for the Democrats because of a more even balance (the Republicans lost three seats in the last election), the House, which is overwhelmingly Republican and conservative, could be problematic because of the newness of so many members and their doctrinaire stance.

Wyatt also was also uneasy about the state’s economy. “We are in a period of [economic] volatility,” he asserted, a fact illustrated by the drop of $250 million in the last income tax collections. According to his understanding, the next revenue forecast is also projected to be low. It was in this context, with a “gray cloud on the horizon” fiscally portending a period of volatility, that he promised higher education would be the leading issue for funding in the next legislature.

Saturday, 5 December

The session opened with a proposal for an IFS web page which was adopted by the body.

There was a discussion of the post-tenure review situation and IFS approved of its handling to this point by the chancellor. Kemble Yates, outgoing president of IFS, agreed to speak to Shirley Clark and the board in his final speech to them about this issue, giving the faculty view of the matter.

New IFS officers were elected with John Cooper of PSU becoming President Carroll De
Kock of OSU to serve as Vice President; Marion Schrocke of WOU to become Secretary, and Elaine Deutschman of OIT to assume the role of observer at the Academic Council.

Reports were given by senators about the reception of the IFS proposal to mediate the selection of the "faculty member on the state board." Having heard favorably from the campuses, IFS determined to set up a committee, with the concurrence of the faculty senates, to screen and forward no less than two and no more than three nominees to the Governor. The committee, with the approval of the campuses, would consist of the presidents of IFS, AOF, the statewide AAUP, and from each campus, with nominees having been gathered from each campus.

The guests for the session were Grattan Kerans, legislative counsel to the chancellor, and Mark Nelson, lobbyist for AOF. Kerans discussed the new lobbying guidelines for state employees, the keys of which were that faculty should try to avoid being required to register as a lobbyist. The new standards for having to register are clear: spending more than $100 per calendar quarter on lobbying activities (except for gas, food, and lodging), and spending more than 24 hours of meeting time with legislators in a calendar quarter.

Nelson gave an analysis of the legislative elections. The key to the outcome of the next session, he said, will be the House, because of the Republicans' three-seat loss in the Senate. He characterized Brady Adams as supportive of higher education. Adams, he asserted, sees higher education as a place where money could be well spent, more so than in the K-12 arena. Neil Bryant of the Senate is also a supporter of higher education and Nelson predicted that he would play a major role in the crafting of the budget in the Republican caucus. He cautioned, however, that Bryant will push strongly for a new institution in Bend. Noting that the Senate possessed enough leadership in traditional friends such as Len Hannon, Tom Hartung, and Verne Duncan, Nelson was confident that the Senate would not be an obstacle.

He was sanguine also about the attitude of Lynn Snodgrass, the new Speaker of the House. Higher education is not a target for her. But there are pitfalls for higher education in its relationship with the Republican dominated House, including the conservatives' dislike of OSPIRG, and the possibility that persons unfriendly to higher education will get key committee chairmanships.

Nelson also pointed out that Governor Kitzhaber is not a particular champion of higher education. He said that higher education is not one of Kitzhaber's top four priorities. In the end, Nelson suggested that no more than nine people would decide the higher education budget: five people on the joint ways-and-means committee, the Senate president, the Senate and House education committee chairmen, and the Speaker.

Kerans closed the discussion with a reminder about why the legislative session promises to be so important. With the advent of the new budget model and the market based, competitive system that characterizes Oregon higher education now, there is no fiscal center to OUS. Each president and provost must write a business plan and the funding will be at the campus level. Existing faculty must fight to ensure that monies are not expended largely for new programs and faculty, because that will be the greatest temptation for administrators seeking greater funding for the campus. Therefore, it is incumbent on us to fight for as big a higher education budget as
possible so that our beginning budgets will be adequate in the first place.
### PSU Development
Five Year Fundraising History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Number of donors</th>
<th>Record Major Gifts</th>
<th>Annual Fund (unrestricted)</th>
<th>Pres. Assoc. (unrestricted)</th>
<th>PSU Annual Gift Pledge Grand Totals*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>15,670</td>
<td>$1,500,000 Meyer Memorial $1,000,000 Keren Brown Wilson/ Michael DeShane</td>
<td>$403,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$8,300,000 (+ $1,900,000 in-kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>$1,000,000 Peter W. Stott $1,000,000 Kellogg Foundation $1,000,000 Meyer Memorial $500,000 Clark Foundation</td>
<td>$397,000</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$356,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/95</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>$250,000 Jeannine Cowles</td>
<td>$339,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes gifts from several other sources not listed above.
Total Gifts and Pledges 1993-1998

This chart may include some grants and contracts research funding.

*1996-97 figures have been restated.
The Collins Group - Timeline for Internal Assessment and Feasibility Study for PSU Capital Campaign

**STUDY TIMELINE FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Examine organization, internal assessment; convene team questionnaire, conduct interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarify needs, define proposed project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepare case statement, study instruments and compile interview list for external feasibility study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct personal interviews, focus groups, mail surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analyze findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prepare report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Present the report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 14, 1998

During the 1998 calendar year, the following faculty and staff served on the University
Curriculum Committee (UCC):

Earl Molander (SBA) Chair
Randy Blazak (SOC)
Barbara Brower (GEOG)
Christof Galli (LIB)
Sherrie Gradin (ENG)
David Holloway (ENG)
Susan Hopp (OSA)
Sherril Gelmon (UPA)
Ron Narode (ED)
Michael Driscoll (EAS)
Joel Bluestone (MUS)
Richard Dewey (XSB)

Ex-officio members were:

Linda Devereaux (OAA)
Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP)
Robert Tufts (RO)
James R. Pratt (ESR)

Charge: UCC is responsible for review of new programs and courses, revisions and deletions of
existing programs and courses, and development of policy on curricular affairs. UCC interacts
with the Graduate Council and the Academic Requirements Committee.

Activities During 1998: Most of the work of the UCC during 1998 involved routine review of
new course proposals, and revisions and deletions of existing courses. UCC approved one new
program, Certificate in Biotechnology, the new series of courses in Science Education, and made
major modifications to the Asian Art History concentration.

New courses and course changes were also approved in the following areas: Child and Family
Studies, Economics, English, Environmental Sciences and Resources, Foreign Languages and
Literatures, Geography, Geology, History, Physics, Psychology, Speech Communication,
Women's Studies, Business Administration, Civil Engineering, Political Science, and Urban
Studies and Planning.

The committee took a special interest in the protocols used in the University Studies program
for establishing new Clusters and Capstones and monitoring those already in existence. To date,
we have worked effectively with those responsible for the Capstone program to establish such
protocols and they are now in place. We are still awaiting a proposal from UnStud for a protocol
for Clusters.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Beverly Fuller, Chair
       Faculty Development Committee

RE: Semi-Annual Report

DATE: December 15, 1998

The Faculty Development Committee met on November 5 to discuss an addition to the RFP suggested by Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, William Feyerherm. The committee responded to the proposed wording of having recipients register with the Community of Science Program. The chair has approved the final wording.

It also was felt that faculty, in the past, have had too little time to respond to the RFP. Therefore, the committee decided faculty should have time over the holidays to develop their proposals so that the quality of the proposals might be even higher than in the past. The deadline for submitting proposals is February 15, 1999.

The RFP announcement is on the web. Faculty will receive a paper copy of the announcement.

Beverly Fuller, SBA, Chairperson
Kofi Agorsah, CLAS (BST)
Michelle Gamburd, CLAS (ANTH)
Leung Pui, CLAS (PHY)
Martha Works, CLAS (GEOG)
Jie Lin, CLAS (CHEM)
Brad Hansen, XS (XS-IS)
Sharon Elteto, LIB
Jeff Holland, LIB
Walton Fosque, SFPA (ART)
Wendelin Mueller, EAS (CE)
Emily de la Cruz, ED (Ed/Ci)
Kaye Exo, SSW (RRI)
Theresa Julnes-Rapida, UPA (PA)
Kathi Ketcheson, AO (OIRP)
Article IV. Organization of the Faculty.
Section 4, Faculty committees.

j) Graduate Council. This council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is desirable that the faculty appointees be selected from among faculty members with an involvement in graduate education.

The Council shall:
1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish procedures and regulations for graduate studies, and adjudicate petitions regarding graduate regulations.
2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or to its appropriate committees and to the Dean of Graduate Studies suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs.
3) Inform the Curriculum Committee concerning approval of all new graduate programs and all substantive changes in existing graduate programs and graduate courses, including its review of new courses and substantive changes in supporting courses.
4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing graduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed graduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.
5) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of graduate courses.
6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.
7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.

**********************************************************************

TO: Secretary to the Faculty
FR: John Cooper, Chair, Advisory Council
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 17:31:50 PST
Subject: Constitutional Amendment

The advisory council met and decided that the language of the proposed amendment should be directive rather than "philosophical." Consequently we recommend the following wording:

"The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees only from among faculty members with an involvement in graduate education."

We acknowledge that there is precedent for the language submitted to us in the Article IV.,4., g. on the Faculty Development Committee. That language should also be directive.

PSU Faculty Senate
January 4, 1999
The ARC proposes the following description for the Baccalaureate Degree at Portland State:

Portland State University is committed to providing for its students maximum opportunities for intellectual and creative development within the context of its urban and international mission. Students earning a baccalaureate degree will complete a rigorous program of study leading to mastery of the chosen field of study at the undergraduate level. In addition, Portland State University is committed to providing the foundation for continued learning after completing the baccalaureate degree. This foundation includes the capacity to engage in inquiry and critical thinking, to use various forms of communication for learning and expression, to gain an awareness of the broader human experience and its environment (local, national, and international), along with an ability to appreciate the responsibilities of individuals to themselves, each other, and community.

To accomplish these goals, the University requires all students to complete the requirements for the major, the University Studies Program or the Honors Program, the appropriate Bachelor's degree (Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, or Bachelor of Music), and a sufficient number of elective courses to complete all degree requirements.
The ARC proposes the following description for the BA degree:

For the Bachelor of Arts Degree: Students must complete 28 credits to include

-- a minimum of 12 credits in the arts and letters academic distribution area, with a minimum of 4 credits in the area of fine and performing arts,

-- a minimum of 12 credits in the science and/or social science distribution areas, with a minimum of 4 in the science distribution area,

and

-- 4 credits in a foreign language numbered 203 or higher.

Fiscal impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>#Graduated</th>
<th>Completed 1 or more courses in FPA</th>
<th>Completed 1 or more courses in Science*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>238 (+229)</td>
<td>384 (+83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>252 (+233)</td>
<td>381 (+104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>249 (+273)</td>
<td>361 (+161)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Biology, Center for Science Education, Chemistry, Environmental Science, Geology, Mathematics, Physics
PSU FACULTY NOMINEES FOR GOVERNOR’S APPOINTMENT
TO THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Slate of Candidates to be reduced from five to three by a vote of the PSU Faculty Senate at the 4 January 1999 meeting:

Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Professor of Theater Arts
School of Fine and Performing Arts
Secretary to the Faculty

Steven N. Brenner, Professor of Business Administration
School of Business Administration

Mary K. Kinnick, Professor of Education
Educational Policy, Foundations, and Administrative Studies
Graduate School of Education

Roy W. Koch, Professor of Civil Engineering
Civil Engineering and Environmental Sciences & Resources
School of Engineering and Computer Science

Craig Wollner, Professor of Social Science
University Studies Program, College of Arts and Sciences
Research Fellow, Institute for Metropolitan Studies
December 10, 1998
To: Faculty Senate
From: Marjorie Terdal, Chair, Graduate Council
Re: Recommendations for new graduate programs, courses, course changes

The following course and program proposals were reviewed by the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

**MS in Systems Science**
The Graduate Council approved this program with the stipulation that no recruiting of new students for the MS program take place until staffing conditions are fulfilled (i.e., hiring of two new Ph.D. Systems Science faculty). Also there must be an addendum to the proposal budget to show the addition of new faculty members.

*Program Overview:* The Systems Science MS program will maintain the focus on systems theory and applications of the current Systems Science Ph.D. program, in which the MS program is to be embedded. Currently anticipated concentration areas include (but not limited to) Systems Theory/Systems Approach, Adaptation & Complexity, and Information Processing. The MS in Systems Science will become operational immediately after authorization for students now in the Ph.D. Program who are qualified through having successfully completed the comprehensive Examination process (other Systems Science Ph.D. students could change to the MS track and take the required MS examinations at their next offering following completion of the required courses. (See above Graduate Council restriction on recruitment of new students for the program.)

*Rationale:* The Masters program is intended for students who might prefer to earn a Masters with a later option to continue towards a Ph.D. Students who initially did not think of working towards a Ph.D. may consider it after being exposed to the program. Ph.D. students who complete Comprehensive Examinations will receive a graduate degree that recognizes the substantial academic work completed to that point.

*Course of Study:* Since the proposed Masters program is part of the existing Ph.D. program, no new courses are needed. The Master's program will comprise the first two years of study in the core Systems Science Ph.D. program. Students will be required to complete:

- 8 credits selected from SySc 511 (Systems Theory), SySc 512 (Quantitative Methods of Systems Science), SySc 513 (Systems Approach), and SySc 514 (System Dynamics), except the combination of 512 and 514.
- 20 additional credits of Systems Science courses
- 8 credits of approved electives
- 9 credits of thesis or 9 credits of approved electives.

Students selecting the thesis option will be required to pass an oral defense of their thesis. Students selecting the non-thesis option will be required to pass written comprehensive exams which cover two areas of Systems Science, in each of which the student will have taken a minimum of 16 hours of course work.

Additional information on this proposal is available from the Office of Graduate Studies.
MAT in Foreign Languages with Initial License Endorsement

Rationale: This program is designed for those who already have a B.A. in foreign Languages and have a teaching position in a school (with an emergency license) but don’t have a regular license. The program will meet the competencies required by Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

Course of Study: The program is a variation of an existent program (MAT in French, German, or Spanish). Requirements: Education 18 graduate credits
- CI 548 or FL 598 (Subject Field Methods or Foreign Language Methods)
- CI 548 (Adv Methods Reading & Comp)
- CI 512 (Teaching & Learning)
- CI 511 (Classroom Management)
- SPED 518 (Survey of Exceptional Learners)
- CI 509 (Practicum)
Spanish (or other foreign language) 32 graduate credits
- FL 509 (Practicum)
- 28 graduate credits in subject area
Admitted to the MAT Foreign Language program
Completion of prequisites and exams required for GTEP

Course Proposals from CLAS
- ESR 529 Applied Environmental Statistics (4 cr)
Changes in existing courses:
- ENG 507 Change catalog description to include variable topics, grad only
- WR 507 Change catalog description to include variable topics, grad only
- ENG 517 Change catalog description to include grad only, consent of instr.
- ENG 532,533,534 Change catalog description to include grad only, consent of Instructor
- PSY 521/621 Univariate Quantitative Methods Change from 4 cr to 5 cr; Change course description
- PSY 522/622 Multivariate Regression and Multivariate Quantitative Methods
  Change course number from 523/623; change title, description
  Change from 4 cr to 5 cr
- PSY 523/623 Factor Analysis and Covariance Structure Modeling
  Change course number from 524/624; change title, description
  Change from 4 cr to 5 cr
- Drop PSY 524/624 (absorbed in above changes)
Change in existing program:
MA/MS in speech communication: speech and Hearing Science--new options for completion, giving choice of 3 options for culminating experience (comprehensive examinations, master’s thesis, master’s project)
PROPOSAL FOR INITIATION OF A NEW INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM LEADING TO A CERTIFICATE IN BIOTECHNOLOGY

Proposal Summary

The proposed Certificate in Biotechnology Program is part of a 2 + 2 program already articulated between PSU and PCC to enable both PCC transfer and PSU Biology majors to obtain a BS degree in Biology with a Certificate in Biotechnology. Having the certificate indicated on the diploma will certify that such students have completed a rigorous training program in the sciences of biotechnology. This feature will greatly aid the employability of the graduates.

The objectives of the proposed program are two-fold: i) to provide the opportunity for students who have completed the two year Biotechnology Program at PCC to continue for a BS degree at PSU in the field of biotechnology; ii) to establish a baccalaureate track with specialization in biotechnology for PSU Biology students. This program will provide the training required for career opportunities in the biotechnology and molecular biology in both industry and in private and public research institutions. This program will help meet the demanding need for a baccalaureate education in biotechnology-related fields. The program is designed to capitalize on existing courses and faculty expertise at PSU with only little additional curriculum change. Students graduating from this program will have an added edge over those graduating from the two year biotechnology training from PCC in that they will be able to fill the need in industry and university research laboratories for qualified persons having more advanced training and research experience.

There are two groups of students to be served by this program: i) students transferring from PCC with an Associate of Applied Science degree in Biotechnology; ii) students entering PSU for a B.S. degree in Biology under Option III: Molecular biology/Biotechnology. It is estimated that 80-90% of students graduating from the two-year PCC program in biotechnology will desire to complete a four-year degree (the possibility of having this four-year option available to them was originally incorporated as an essential component of the PCC program). During the next several years, the PCC program projects that initially about 8 or 9 students will desire to transfer to the PSU four-year biotechnology program. In four or five years, this number is expected to be around 10-12 per year. Presently about 90 students are enrolled in Molecular Biology/Microbiology (Biotechnology) Option of the Biology Department. From the increasing interest shown in this option, a conservative estimate of the number of students per year selecting this option will increase from about 24 in 1998 to around 32 by the year 2000.

For further details, please refer to the full proposal.

Robert L. Millette
Professor of Biology
PSU Coordinator of the joint
PCC/PSU Biotechnology Program