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MEMORANDUM

September 19, 1990

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on October 1, 1990, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 1990, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   Employee Assistance Program Information -- T. Moore

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. Fall Term 1990 Registration Report -- Tufts

F. Unfinished Business
   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph j -- Edner

G. New Business
   *1. Request for Name Change within HPE -- Schendel
   *2. Proposal for Initiation of Center for Software Quality Research -- Erzurumlu
   3. Comments by President Ramaley
   4. Caucus by CLAS Senators to Elect Committee on Committees Member -- Beeson

H. Adjournment
   *The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the June 4, 1990, Senate Meeting*
   F1 Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph j**
   G1 Request for Name Change within HPE**
   G2 Proposal for Initiation of Center for Software Quality Research**

Senators are reminded that they need to turn in the name of an alternate who would attend when necessary. Please submit to the Secretary to the Faculty by October 1, 1990.

Your name

Alternate's name

Dept.

Dept.

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 1, 1990
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Wolk for Bowlden, Rhyne for Finley, Petrie for McElroy, Midson for Olmsted.

Members Absent: Casperson, Cooper, Dawson, Ellis, Lowry, Manning, Tuttle.

Ex-officio Members Present: Erzurumlu, Everhart, Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Martino, Oh, Paudler, Pfingsten, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 4, 1990, meeting were accepted after the name of David Johnson was changed to Ansel Johnson as a member of the Steering Committee on page 48. DAILY observed that Powell's report of a 29% increase in IFC monies for the support of athletics over the past six years was actually a 61% increase (p. 48).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

EDNER made the following announcements:

1. When you speak on the Senate floor, please identify yourself by name and department.

2. Please give to the Secretary to the Faculty the name of your alternate. When you cannot attend, please pass your senate mailing on to the alternate and ask the person to attend in your place.

3. If you arrive at the Senate meeting after role has been taken, inform the Secretary to the Faculty in writing that you were present.
4. If you make motions or amendments during Senate meetings, please write them out and hand them to the Secretary when you make them.

5. The Senate is looking for a volunteer to assist Dean Jack Schendel in chairing the PSU United Way campaign. If no one volunteers, the Steering Committee will designate possible candidates.

6. The K-House reception following Senate meetings was discussed briefly. Attendance has been low, and the Steering Committee will make a decision about how to proceed.

TERRY JONES from the Employee Assistance Program explained the services available to faculty and all PSU employees; seven days a week, 24 hours a day. It is a confidential service provided by mental health professionals at sites outside of the University. They are on a retainer contract, paid by the University. He emphasized that EAP phone numbers should be posted in visible places in department offices, and employees should be reminded of this free service available to all for assistance with work-related problems such as stress or productivity, or personal problems such as marital or chemical dependencies.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President RAMALEY was welcomed to the Senate. She said she hoped to know everyone by name soon and would come to most Senate meetings to make formal reports. She presented a new planning exercise and explained its two-year stages. A subcommittee of the UPC, augmented by chairpersons of University committees, faculty and student leadership, will be asked to carry out the exercise, which will result in an academic plan and campus management priorities. The process will be organized and chaired by the Provost (see the attachments to these minutes for further details).

RAMALEY also commented on the governor's budget. There appears to be strong support in the budget for higher education and faculty salaries and for supporting the development and delivery of higher education in the metropolitan area. $1M is designated to support the work of the Council of College Presidents in the Portland area. $5M is identified for the collaboratively developed graduate schools for engineering. $2.5M is listed to fund whatever the Governor's Commission identifies, with PSU serving as the hub of Portland-wide collaborations. $1M is to go to initiative expansion, and other monies are identified for student loans and engineering research facilities; considerable debate is occurring about where to place the latter. PSU engineering is in drastic need of new and central facilities; programs are now housed in seven different buildings. RAMALEY
said that comments have already been made about the budget focusing too much on Portland.

RAMALEY discussed the new promotion and tenure guidelines which she reviewed and added to in order to make them reflective of PSU's urban mission. She said that faculty portfolios must reflect our concept of scholarship and service, which she described as the creative bringing together of people and ideas. Thus scholarship can occur in the classroom in teaching; it can occur in rendering community service or doing applied research; and it can happen in pure or new research or creative work. The guidelines have been revised to reflect this thinking. She announced that the Provost will deal with how we support faculty who are coming up for tenure and promotion considerations. What is also missing still is how we work with new faculty when they first get here and what help we can give them at the mid-term review.

The President explained that the internal management directive on scientific and scholarly misconduct, sent out in the Senate mailing, was issued because PSU was out of compliance for not having such a statement. Faculty who want to respond to or give input regarding the statement should contact Bill Savery, she said.

RAMALEY talked about the E-Board's release of monies for faculty salary increases, described in the hand-out she distributed (see attachment to these minutes). PSU's share of the funds is $599,299. Of that amount, 20% is to go to engineering, mathematics, and related physical sciences faculties, and 20% to faculty teaching in international and related areas. The remaining money is to recognize faculty who have made especially meritorious contributions to teaching, research or community service. Market factors, salary compression and equity can be considerations.

LENDARIS asked for an elaboration of "urban," a concept he said he was hearing a lot about. RAMALEY said we would continue to explore our mission and the opportunities and limitations we have in this urban environment. She said many of our agendas tie in with national agendas and funding sources by federal agencies. PSU should become a real laboratory for the urban experience and should take advantage of the many opportunities for basic and applied research. She said the distinction between those two types of research doesn't seem to mean too much. In response to McKENZIE's question she said that the metropolitan area did include Clark County in Washington. She reported meeting with President Smith of WSU last month; they agreed to explore cooperation and avoid unnecessary duplication. She also reported that the Provost sits on Washington State's planning board, and a Washington representative is included in our planning process.
2. TUFTS reported that registration was up 3% over last year's fall quarter at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

FISHER/ASHBAUGH moved "acceptance of the constitutional amendment of Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph j." HARDT reported that the Advisory Council had reviewed the proposed amendment and had made slight stylistic changes, to preserve the style of the rest of the Faculty Constitution. As revised, the amendment would read:

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 Vice President for Student Affairs.

The amendment was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. A. JOHNSON proposed a vote of thanks to last year's Senate officers and Steering Committee: John Cooper, Nancy Chapman, Rick Hardt, Marvin Beeson, Mary Constans, Janice Jackson, and Janet Wright.

The motion was approved by a round of applause.

2. Dean Schendel presented the request for a name change for the School of Health and Physical Education to "School of Health and Human Performance." He explained that historically physical education was associated with preparation for teaching, coaching and intercollegiate athletics. But the profession has evolved over the years, and the proposed title is also used at UO, OSU, and the University of Florida, among other places.

BECKER moved "to approve the change as presented."

The motion was passed.

3. Dean Erzurumlu introduced the proposal for the initiation of the Center for Software Quality Research saying that we need a central point which serves the local industry. Questions regarding the proposal dealt largely with funding issues. HARRISON explained that the computer science department budget will fund one graduate student for the first year and portions of one professor. He speculated that industry contributions will take over more and more of the funding; if contributions don't come in, the Center will be reduced.
KOCOAGLU/A. JOHNSON moved "the approval of the proposed center."

The motion was approved.

4. MILLNER introduced what he called an issue of national significance, the exposure of students to a diverse range of ethnic, cultural and gender-based perspectives as part of their general education requirements. He said that this discussion has taken place at PSU before, but no action has ever been taken. His motion charges the ARC to bring the Senate a report with related recommendations by May 1991. ARC is also charged to invite active participation of appropriate individuals in its deliberations.

A. JOHNSON/CUMPSTON moved the entire motion presented by Millner. (See G3).

The motion was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:33.
Planning Exercise

Purpose: The University has conducted several strategic planning exercises over the past decade, two of which, A Strategic Plan for the 1980's and A Plan for the 1990's, provide a valuable basis for reexamining our progress and our mission as we enter a new stage of development.

The Governor's Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Portland is now working on its final report, which it expects to issue in early November, 1990. Throughout the testimony to the Commission, there has been a call to affirm the special urban mission of Portland State as the only comprehensive public university in the greater Portland area. To prepare for the outcome of the Commission's work, we must revisit our plans for Portland State University, using the original planning document for the 1980's as a base, and build an agenda for our institution as we prepare to respond to the growing educational needs of the greater Portland area.

Approach: A subcommittee of the University Planning Council, augmented by the chairs of the appropriate faculty governance committees to be selected in consultation with the Senate Steering Committee, along with representatives of faculty, staff and student leadership, will be asked to review the Strategic Plan for the 1980s, the mission statement and Plan for the 1990s, and eventually the final report of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education, in order to update our plans based on the experience of the past decade. The process will be organized and chaired by the Provost. Staff support will be provided from the Office of Institutional Research and the Provost's Office. The result will be a set of strategic decisions that will serve as a basis for the further interpretation and expression of our unique position as the only institution with the responsibility to take the broad view of the needs of the greater Portland area, and to work together with other educational institutions and community representatives to respond to community needs.

Charge to the Planning Subcommittee: The Committee will be asked to prepare a set of strategic decisions for Portland State University, based upon a review of the progress we have made over the past decade in implementing our previous strategic plans, prepared in 1983 and 1988. Using these decisions as a guide, the Committee will be asked to recommend a set of campus priorities for achieving a supportive environment for our research, teaching and service activities:
The Committee will be asked to suggest a set of specific steps that should be taken over the next biennium, and a schedule for implementation of these steps to reinforce our position as the major urban university in the State System, and to initiate or support a series of educational, research and service programs that are responsive to the needs of the greater Portland area. The Committee will be asked to suggest a range of options that can be financed through internal reallocation and use of discretionary funds, through new resources from the state, and through fundraising efforts directed at community and national sponsoring agencies and corporate leaders.

Finally, the Committee will be asked to comment on whether we are optimally organized to support the increasingly interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of our programs, and to serve as the lead institution in the greater Portland area to organize and sustain a series of interinstitutional cooperative activities that will benefit this region and the State of Oregon. In reflecting upon how we are organized, the Committee should also consider effective incentive and support structures to attract faculty and staff to participate in interdisciplinary and interinstitutional ventures.
Stages in Institutional Planning

Year 1 Explore our mission and create an academic plan and campus management priorities.

Year 2 Establish a cycle of planning, budget preparation, and program review.

YEAR ONE

Mission seminars

MISSION

VALUES, PHILOSOPHY

ACADEMIC PLAN

CAMPUS MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES

SPACE MANAGEMENT AND FACILITIES PLAN

FINANCIAL PLAN

1. State legislative agenda
2. Federal agenda
3. Effective management of campus resources
4. Fundraising from community philanthropic groups, others
5. Sponsored funding

COMMUNICATION PLAN

Why?

What?

How and When?

Where?

To create supportive environment
YEAT TWO

**Modifications**
- of academic plan

**New priorities**
- CAMPUS MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES & SPACE PLAN

**PLANNING REVIEW**
- Proposals for revision of academic plan & campus mgt. priorities

**EVALUATION OF PROGRESS**
- Internal and through external program reviews & accreditation process

**CREATION OF FUNDRAISING AGENDA AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY**
- (FRIEND-RAISING)

**EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS**
- Revisions of messages, types of communication
PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION GUIDELINES
E-BOARD FUNDS FOR SALARY INCREASES

Portland State University has received notice of its share of the E-Board monies for faculty salary increases (see attached memo from Chancellor's Office, September 7, 1990). These guidelines are applicable to full-time faculty involved in teaching and research. The salary increases will begin in December and are retroactive to the beginning of the 1990-91 contract year.

1. SALARY FUNDS AVAILABLE

The following salary funds are available for distribution to the faculty groups indicated. The corresponding Other Payroll Expenses (OPE) will follow the salary distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and related physical sciences</td>
<td>$138,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in internationally related educational and research programs</td>
<td>$115,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit, Contribution, Salary Compression, Market and Retention factors</td>
<td>$345,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$599,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. GUIDELINES FOR DISTRIBUTION

The Office of the Chancellor has provided guidance on the understanding reached with the E-Board about the intended use of these funds and the criteria to be used in distributing the salary increases. The following guidelines and criteria are in accordance with legislative intent.

CATEGORY A: Engineering and related Physical Sciences.

A portion of the funds (approximately 20%) is to be set aside specifically for faculty in this category. These funds will be distributed to faculty in the Departments listed below on the basis of the following criteria:

Research productivity, funded research, involvement with industry, involvement in the improvement of science and math education, and the recruitment of students to the field of engineering.

School of Engineering
Mathematics
Chemistry
Geology
Physics
Environmental Science and Resources
CATEGORY B: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH
A second portion of the allocation (20%) is to be distributed to faculty who have a primary teaching and research interest in and who participate actively in internationally related educational and research programs. All teaching and research faculty, including those in engineering and the related physical sciences can be considered for this salary increase on the basis of a significant contribution to our international programs. A fund for this purpose will be retained in the Provost's Office and the Deans should propose candidates to receive salary increases based on the following criteria: quality instruction in core international courses; research productivity; and community service in areas related to international affairs.

CATEGORY C: MARKET FACTORS, COMPRESSION AND EQUITY:
The remaining portion of the funds (60%) are to be used to recognize faculty who have made especially meritorious contributions to research, teaching or community service, whose work is especially relevant to our mission as an urban university and/or whose current salary is seriously out of line with market conditions. Particular concern will be given to the situation of faculty in those departments where market conditions have required significantly higher starting salaries and consequently severe salary compression may have occurred. All faculty, whether or not they were considered in Categories A and/or B are eligible for consideration in Category C.

Funds to be used to recognize meritorious performance or to relieve salary inequities due to compression or inversion created by recent hiring will be distributed by the Provost to the academic programs using the following guidelines:

(1) Current competitiveness of the salaries in the unit, in comparison to average salaries for similar disciplines at comparable institutions including the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

(2) Recent experiences of the unit in attracting strong candidates for available positions and in recruiting new faculty.

(3) Productivity of the unit based on research activity, teaching loads and community service involvement.

(4) Recent patterns of faculty turnover due to resignations or recent experience with recruitment of our faculty by other institutions.

3. PROCESS OF REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

The Deans will review the contributions of eligible members of the teaching and research faculty and will make recommendations to the Provost. Faculty who are not recommended may request a written explanation from the appropriate Dean and may appeal recommendations to the Provost and thence to the President if desired.

Further discussions will be held with the AAUP Council to determine the nature and form of departmental involvement in the process for recommending faculty for these salary adjustments; and within the constraints of the legislative intent the established procedures for salary recommendations will be followed.
May 14, 1990

TO: Faculty Senate

Fr: Sheldon Edner, Chair
    Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, Section 4, Paragraph j

Current wording:    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, and one representing All Other faculty.

Amended wording:   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, and one representing All Other faculty. In addition, two graduate students shall be appointed upon recommendation by the Dean of Students.*

*New title: Vice President for Student Affairs
REQUEST FOR NAME CHANGE:
SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

As a result of approximately three years of deliberation, the School of Health and Physical Education is requesting changes in the names of each department and the school. The requested changes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Title</th>
<th>Proposed Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Department of Health Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physical Education</td>
<td>Department of Exercise Science, and Sport Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>School of Health and Human Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of Health:** The request for adding the word "Studies" to the title of the department is based on the fact that the department is an academic unit. It should not be confused with the State Health Division or the Student Health Service but frequently is. Addition of the word "Studies" will more clearly identify the department as an academic unit encompassing all its interests and responsibilities; hence, the Department of Health Studies (HS).

**Department of Physical Education:** Historically, departments of physical education were identified with the teaching of sports/fitness skills, preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers and coaches, and, in many instances, intercollegiate athletics. Evolutionary changes in the professional field, greater sophistication in the discipline, and development of sub-disciplines as a result of increasing specialization have produced the need for a change in title.

**School of Health and Physical Education**
The title which most appropriately encompasses all of the school's programs and services, including the two academic departments, is Health and Human Performance (HHP). This a title which is frequently used by similar units in universities elsewhere, and it connotes the fields of study and the activities included in the scope of the school's responsibilities.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF THE CENTER FOR SOFTWARE QUALITY RESEARCH

1. **Title of the center.** The title of the Center will be the Center for Software Quality Research (CSQR).

2. **The location of the center in the institutional administrative structure.** The Center for Software Quality Research will report to the Computer Science Department, School of Engineering.

3. **Objectives and functions of the center.** The Center for Software Quality Research (CSQR) has two objectives: (1) To advance the state of the art in software quality through a planned program of research focused upon the needs of the local computer software industry, and (2) to maintain a vigorous technology-transfer program to ensure that research results, both those of CSQR programs as well as results from the wider research community, are available to the local software industry. The research goals of CSQR will be met by identification and support of relevant research efforts at Portland State and other Oregon research universities. The Director, the Advisory Board, and participating Affiliate Members, will be responsible for identifying and encouraging research efforts that relate to the goals and objectives of CSQR. Participating Affiliate Members may support a research project in return for early access to the results. The technology-transfer goals will be met in three ways within CSQR. CSQR will organize conferences and workshops. CSQR will publish a technical report series, and periodic research summaries. Finally, CSQR will maintain two libraries: one of technical reports and hard-to-find informal publications from industrial and academic research groups; and one of public domain software tools related to software quality, along with tutorial materials on their use.

4. **Resources needed.** Initial personnel resources will include a half-time graduate student and a part-time director, selected from the appropriate faculty. The Center for Software Quality Research will occupy offices and laboratory space in the Fish and Wildlife Building on 5th and Mill Streets. For the foreseeable future, CSQR's need for computing resources will be accommodated by the Computer Science Department's computing facilities.

5. **Funding requirements and sources for the center.** The initial year will require a $48,000 budget with the Computer Science Department furnishing approximately 60% of the amount with the rest provided by industrial affiliates. Subsequent years will see an increase in the budget amount and a corresponding decrease in the Computer Science Department contribution as additional affiliates become involved in the Center. It is expected that by the fourth year, the Center will be totally self-supporting. The details of these budgets and sources are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 FTE graduate student w/OPE</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 FTE Faculty (director) w/OPE</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space rental</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>$48,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 FTE Secretarial position w/OPE</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE graduate student w/OPE</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 FTE Faculty (director) w/OPE</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space rental</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>$66,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year 3  
1.0 FTE Secretarial position  $20,000  
1.0 FTE graduate student  $16,000  
.3 FTE Faculty (director)  $20,000  
supplies  $10,000  
Space Rental  $10,000  
Total  $76,000  

Increases in time of secretarial position and graduate student help will be based on industry support. The sources for this budget include funds from both the PSU Computer Science Department as well as funds from local industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of funding</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Department (63%)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry funding (37%)</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Department (45%)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry funding (55%)</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Department (13%)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry funding (87%)</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Relationship of the proposed center to the institutional mission.** The mission of Portland State University includes providing teaching and research support to high-technology industries in the Portland area. Software Quality is an area of significant importance to local industry, as evidenced by the existence of the NorthWest Software Quality Conference, organized by Portland-area companies, and by the interest several companies have shown in CSQR. PSU, supported by its grant from Tektronix to hire and support faculty in Software Engineering, is the state's leader in this area. CSQR will enable PSU faculty to bring their expertise, and that of other Oregon faculty as appropriate, to local industry.

7. **Long-range goals and plans for the center.** CSQR will continue its dual role of original software quality research and technology transfer for as long as the need exists. Our long-range goal is to become the leading center for software quality research and education in the western United States. Any expansion in activities will be driven by increased industrial participation (and therefore increased industrial funding).

8. **Relationship of CSQR to programs at other institutions in the state.** CSQR will be unique in Oregon. Its concentration of faculty in software quality exists only at PSU, and the primary industrial need lies in the Portland Metropolitan area. CSQR will, of course, welcome participation in its programs by researchers at other state institutions.

Requested prepared by: ___________________________  Date: 9/12/90  
Approved by Dean: ___________________________  Date: 9/12/90  
Approved by Provost: ___________________________  Date:  
Approved by President: ___________________________  Date:  

---

...
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC AND SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT

PREFACE

The Portland State University Procedures for Handling Allegations of Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct were developed by the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research in consultation with members of the academic administration and the Faculty Senate Presiding Officer to comply with federal requirements that the University have procedures in place for dealing with scientific misconduct.

The interim procedures are based upon those adopted by Oregon State University in November 1989. The original procedures were written to conform to the 1989 NIH policy and to follow National Science Foundation, Public Health Services and the Association of American Universities guidelines.

The procedures are intended to complement procedures already in effect, such as Oregon Administrative Rules, policies and procedures pertaining to animal welfare, human subjects, radiation safety, recombinant DNA, and drugs in the workplace. The procedures explicitly include scholarly conduct along with scientific conduct, and are therefore intended to apply broadly to PSU faculty and other investigators in the sciences, professional schools, humanities, and the arts.

September 1990
A. PURPOSE:

It is the purpose of these procedures to set forth guidelines for efficient disclosure and resolution of accusations of scientific and scholarly misconduct in a manner that (1) protects the public from the results of misconduct, (2) protects innocent scientists and scholars from harassment or interference with their academic freedom, and (3) protects from retribution the individual who, in good faith, presents evidence of misconduct.

B. DEFINITIONS:

1. *Scientific and scholarly misconduct* means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific or scholarly communities for proposing, conducting, or reporting research or other scholarly activity. The misconduct may appear in the content of a grant proposal, published manuscript, work of art, film, news release, or other expression of scientific or scholarly activity.

   Not covered by these procedures are substandard, careless research practices, or errors which are effectively dealt with by the peer review process for promotion, publication, and grant proposals.

2. The *complainant* is the individual who reports possible misconduct to the mediator.

3. The *mediator* in most situations will be the department chairperson or head of the unit in which the alleged misconduct has occurred. However, if the allegation involves the department chairperson or head or if the complainant is unsatisfied with the response, the alleged misconduct may be reported to the academic dean of the unit. A complainant who is unsatisfied by the response at this level may present the allegation to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research. If still unsatisfied the complainant may present the allegation to the Provost. The President of the University, who is the final institutional mediator, may be contacted by the complainant if responses at all other levels were found unsatisfactory.

4. The *respondent* is the individual accused of misconduct. This individual may be an employee or appointee of PSU or be under the supervision of a PSU employee or appointee.

5. The *adviser* is an individual appointed by the mediator to provide professional assistance in the inquiry.
6. The inquiry is informal information-gathering and fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct warrants an investigation.

7. The investigation is the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if misconduct has occurred.

8. The screening panel is an ad-hoc screening panel appointed in accordance with Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 577-41-30.

C. REPORTING OF ALLEGED SCIENTIFIC AND SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT:

1. Reports by any colleague, student, or unaffiliated individual who believes that scientific or scholarly misconduct has occurred should be made in accordance with OAR 577-41-015 in writing to the President and to the mediator.

2. The mediator must decide whether the allegation falls within the definition of scientific or scholarly misconduct.

3. Consultation between a complainant and the mediator must be in strict confidence to the extent permitted by state law and OSSHE regulations.

4. Within one week of receiving a written allegation, the mediator must file a report with the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research indicating whether or not an inquiry is appropriate. The report must include a summary of the allegation, the mediator's response, and an explanation of the response, but it should not include names or remarks that reveal the identity of the complainant or respondent.

5. If an inquiry is not appropriate, within one week of receiving the written allegation the mediator must explain this fact in writing to the complainant. The mediator should keep sufficient notes to explain how the situation was resolved, if called upon to do so at a later date.

6. Even though no further action appears warranted, the mediator ordinarily should inform the respondent of the allegation at this point, without disclosing the name of the complainant.

D. THE INQUIRY:

1. The purpose of the inquiry is to gather information and facts informally to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct warrants an investigation.

2. To protect the anonymity of the complainant all aspects must be conducted confidentially, to the extent permitted by state law and OSSHE regulation.
3. As soon as possible after determining that an allegation falls within the definition of scientific or scholarly misconduct, the mediator must notify the respondent in writing of the allegation and invite a response.

4. The mediator, at his or her discretion, may seek the advice of one or more individuals, termed adviser(s), who should be professionally familiar with the nature of the area of alleged misconduct.

5. The mediator and adviser(s) must decide within 60 days of the initial allegation whether there is sufficient evidence of misconduct to proceed with a formal investigation. The mediator must report the results of the inquiry in writing to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research within this period. The report should include a discussion of the evidence, a summary of relevant interviews and a statement of the conclusions reached. The respondent shall be given a copy of the report and an opportunity to append written comments. If it is determined that no investigation is warranted, the report should not include names or remarks that reveal the identity of the complainant or respondent. If it is determined that an investigation is warranted, the mediator must also notify the respondent's immediate supervisor and academic dean.

6. The reasons for a decision not to proceed with an investigation must be documented in sufficient detail by the mediator to permit a later assessment of the reasons for determining that an investigation was not warranted. Such records should be maintained by the mediator for three years in a secure manner apart from the respondent's personnel file.

E. THE INVESTIGATION:

1. The purpose of an investigation is to examine all relevant facts formally to determine whether scientific or scholarly misconduct has occurred.

2. In accordance with OAR 577-41-030(2), a special ad hoc Screening Panel shall be appointed by the Advisory Council. The chairperson and at least two other members shall be tenured faculty members at PSU, and at least two members should have expertise in the area of alleged misconduct. In the event that two impartial experts are not available on the faculty, the Advisory Council may select outside experts to serve on the Screening Panel. The Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research must not be a member of the Screening Panel but should be available for advice if any member of the Screening Panel requests it. The respondent may be advised by a colleague or an attorney during the investigation.

3. The investigation must begin within 30 days of a notification of the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Research by the mediator. The Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) of the NIH/PHS and any other funding agency supporting the respondent's research must, at that time, be notified by the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Research of the intent to investigate. The investigation must be completed within 120 days unless extenuating circumstances, acceptable to the Screening Panel, OSI and any other funding agency, prevail.
4. The investigation must be conducted in such a manner that the respondent is aware of all the accusations and evidence, including the identity of the complainant, as early as possible, and shall be given the opportunity to respond. The investigation normally shall include examination of all documentation, including but not necessarily limited to relevant research data and proposals, publications, correspondence, and memoranda of telephone calls. Whenever possible, interviews should be conducted of all individuals involved either in making the allegation or against whom the allegation is made, as well as other individuals who might have information regarding key aspects of the allegations; complete summaries of these interviews should be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the investigatory file.

5. All parts of the investigation shall remain confidential to the extent permitted by state law and OSSHE regulation, unless the respondent requests in writing that the proceedings be open to the public.

6. After the respondent has been given an opportunity to comment on the findings the final report of the Screening Panel must be submitted in writing to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research within one week after the close of the investigation. The respondent and granting agencies shall also receive copies of the report. The Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research shall keep all written documents and other evidence used in the investigation together with the Screening Panel report in a confidential and secure file.

F. PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS:

Any disciplinary action shall be decided by the President of the University in accordance with the procedures of rule OAR 517-41-015.

G. REPORTING OF HAZARDS AND VIOLATIONS:

Notwithstanding any other provision in these procedures the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research shall notify OSI at any stage of the inquiry or investigation that any of the following conditions exist: (1) There is an immediate health hazard involved; (2) there is an immediate need to protect federal funds or equipment; (3) there is an immediate need to protect the interest of the person(s) making the allegations or of the individual(s) who is the subject of the allegations as well as his or her co-investigators and associates, if any; (4) it is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly; or (5) there is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violation, in which instance the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research must inform OSI within 24 hours of obtaining that information.

H. PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION:

No retaliation shall be taken against anyone who makes an allegation in good faith nor against a respondent who is cleared of all allegations.
Motion

Whereas a university education which does not expose students to a diverse range of ethnic, cultural and gender based perspectives, is not adequately preparing those students for future roles in an increasingly complex national and global community.

Whereas the current general education requirements at PSU do not include expectations that require such exposure to diverse ethnic, cultural and gender perspectives.

Therefore be it moved that the Academic Requirements Committee be charged by the Faculty Senate with the following responsibilities:

1) To investigate the options and effectiveness of such curriculum and requirements previously put in place at other universities in the region and the nation;

2) to analyze current resources, curriculum structures, and circumstances at PSU relative to which options and alternatives best fit our local conditions; and

3) to report these findings with related recommendations to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner not to exceed the second meeting of the Spring Quarter 1991; and

4) to include in this investigation the full and active participation of other appropriate individuals from the University community who reflect the diversity of background and experience such curriculum would be expected to address.
PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION GUIDELINES  
E-BOARD FUNDS FOR SALARY INCREASES

Portland State University has received notice of its share of the E-Board monies for faculty salary increases (see attached memo from Chancellor’s Office, September 7, 1990). These guidelines are applicable to full time faculty involved in teaching and research. The salary increases will begin in December and are retroactive to the beginning of the 1990-91 contract year.

1. SALARY FUNDS AVAILABLE

The following salary funds are available for distribution to the faculty groups indicated. The corresponding Other Payroll Expenses (OPE) will follow the salary distribution.

- Engineering and related physical sciences $138,574
- Faculty in internationally related educational and research programs $115,181
- Merit, Contribution, Salary Compression, Market and Retention factors $345,544

Total: $599,299

2. GUIDELINES FOR DISTRIBUTION

The Office of the Chancellor has provided guidance on the understanding reached with the E-Board about the intended use of these funds and the criteria to be used in distributing the salary increases. The following guidelines and criteria are in accordance with legislative intent.

CATEGORY A: Engineering and related Physical Sciences.

A portion of the funds (approximately 20%) is to be set aside specifically for faculty in this category. These funds will be distributed to faculty in the Departments listed below on the basis of the following criteria:

- Research productivity, funded research, involvement with industry, involvement in the improvement of science and math education, and the recruitment of students to the field of engineering.

School of Engineering
- Mathematics
- Chemistry
- Geology
- Physics
- Environmental Science and Resources
CATEGOR Y B: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

A second portion of the allocation (20%) is to be distributed to faculty who have a primary teaching and research interest in and who participate actively in internationally related educational and research programs. All teaching and research faculty, including those in engineering and the related physical sciences can be considered for this salary increase on the basis of a significant contribution to our international programs. A fund for this purpose will be retained in the Provost’s Office and the Deans should propose candidates to receive salary increases based on the following criteria: quality instruction in core international courses; research productivity; and community service in areas related to international affairs.

CATEGOR Y C: MARKET FACTORS, COMPRESSION AND EQUITY:

The remaining portion of the funds (60%) are to be used to recognize faculty who have made especially meritorious contributions to research, teaching or community service, whose work is especially relevant to our mission as an urban university and/or whose current salary is seriously out of line with market conditions. Particular concern will be given to the situation of faculty in those departments where market conditions have required significantly higher starting salaries and consequently severe salary compression may have occurred. All faculty, whether or not they were considered in Categories A and/or B are eligible for consideration in Category C.

Funds to be used to recognize meritorious performance or to relieve salary inequities due to compression or inversion created by recent hiring will be distributed by the Provost to the academic programs using the following guidelines:

(1) Current competitiveness of the salaries in the unit, in comparison to average salaries for similar disciplines at comparable institutions including the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

(2) Recent experiences of the unit in attracting strong candidates for available positions and in recruiting new faculty.

(3) Productivity of the unit based on research activity, teaching loads and community service involvement.

(4) Recent patterns of faculty turnover due to resignations or recent experience with recruitment of our faculty by other institutions.

3. PROCESS OF REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

The Deans will review the contributions of eligible members of the teaching and research faculty and will make recommendations to the Provost. Faculty who are not recommended may request a written explanation from the appropriate Dean and may appeal recommendations to the Provost and thence to the President if desired.

Further discussions will be held with the AAUP Council to determine the nature and form of departmental involvement in the process for recommending faculty for these salary adjustments; and within the constraints of the legislative intent the established procedures for salary recommendations will be followed.