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The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on March 1, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the February 1, 2010, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Discussion Item: Online Learning
D. Unfinished Business
E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda – Brown and Beyler
F. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report
   Provost’s Report
   *1. Educational Policies Committee Quarterly Report – Bowman
   *2. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report – Farr
   3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution
   *4. Campus Climate Committee Report - Studer
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included:
B. Minutes of the Meeting of January 4, 2010 and attachments
E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
G-1 Educational Policies Committee Report
G-2 Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report
G-4 Campus Climate Committee Report - Studer
### 2009-10 PSU Faculty Senate Roster

#### 2009-10 Steering Committee
- **Presiding Office:** Maude Hines
- **Presiding Officer Pro tem:** Tom Luckett
- **Secretary:** Sarah Andrews-Collier
- **Steering Committee (4):** Rob Daasch, Linda George, Brad Hansen, Juliette Stoering

**Ex officio (Comm on Comm)** Gerardo Lafferriere

#### 2009-10 Faculty Senate (115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Ames, Kenneth</td>
<td>ANTH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleiler, Steven</td>
<td>MTH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Fountain, Robert</td>
<td>MTH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller, Steven</td>
<td>FLL 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, David</td>
<td>EST 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalil, Aslam</td>
<td>PHY 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Lafferriere, Gerardo</td>
<td>MTH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Robert</td>
<td>CLAS 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussey, Ann</td>
<td>WS 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Collier, Peter (Padin)</td>
<td>SOC 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmiter, Jeanette</td>
<td>MTH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Weingrad, Michael (Johnson)</td>
<td>EST 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth, Jennifer</td>
<td>ENG 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Walton, Linda</td>
<td>HST 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Duncan</td>
<td>ENG 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, Linda</td>
<td>ESR 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines, Maude</td>
<td>ENG 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckett, Thomas</td>
<td>HST 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Lorraine</td>
<td>ENG 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Michael</td>
<td>BIO 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueter, John</td>
<td>ESR 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez, Fernando</td>
<td>FLL 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seppalainen, Tom</td>
<td>PHIL 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shusterman, Gwendolyn</td>
<td>CHEM 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamser, Carl</td>
<td>CHEM 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arante, Jacqueline</td>
<td>ENG 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balshem, Martha</td>
<td>SOC 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brower, Barbara</td>
<td>GEOG 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Burns, Scott</td>
<td>GEOL 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Virginia</td>
<td>ANTH 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, Michael</td>
<td>GEOL 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson, Susan</td>
<td>ENG 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamburd, Michele</td>
<td>ANTH 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Greg</td>
<td>ENG 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latioias, Paul</td>
<td>MTH 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Halloran, Joyce</td>
<td>MTH 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schechter, Patricia</td>
<td>HST 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetzel, Patricia</td>
<td>FLL 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instructional (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhaj, Sukhwant</td>
<td>UNST 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†MacCormack, Alan</td>
<td>UNST 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimble, Anmarie</td>
<td>UNST 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson-Nathe, Benjamin</td>
<td>CFS 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Daniel</td>
<td>SSW 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroloff, Nancy</td>
<td>ORSP 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller, Thomas</td>
<td>SSW 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Oschwald, Mary (Nissen)</td>
<td>SSW 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Michael</td>
<td>CFS 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry, Ann</td>
<td>SSW 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Pamela</td>
<td>SSW 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, James</td>
<td>SSW 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Public Affairs (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelmon, Sherrill</td>
<td>PA 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Neal</td>
<td>PA 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Farquhar, Stephanie (Dill)</td>
<td>SCH 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsella, David</td>
<td>PS 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal, Margaret</td>
<td>IOA 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carder, Paula</td>
<td>IOA 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henning, Kris</td>
<td>JUST 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratham, James</td>
<td>CUS 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interim appointments**
- †Member of Committee on Committees

12/16/09
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, February 1, 2010

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 1, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Fung, Knight, Mack, Smallman, Wiewel.

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 4, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
Farquhar, Geiger for Gamburd, and Shusterman were present January 4, 2010.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda:
   F.1. Question for the President
   G.3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of Jan 8/9

Deleted from the Agenda:
   Provost’s Report

Other:
   ARANTE spoke about changes to and encouraged faculty to join Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF).
   FARR introduced and yielded to incoming football coach Nigel Burton, who
spoke briefly about instilling integrity and responsibility in his players.

Applause.

HINES announced the Steering Committee’s establishment of the Faculty Senate Discussion Forum (wiki) located on the Senate webpage, www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate with the aide of Steve Harmon, OAA.

DAASCH led a brief navigation demonstration.

HINES announced that the March Discussion Item topic would be Online Learning, and directed the assembly to the Discussion Forum page provided for input before the meeting.

HINES listed other Discussion Item topics under consideration by the Steering Committee: OUS reorganization, student retention, erosion of tenure, proposal for administrative review, the library collection, establishment of administrative feedback, faculty participation in planning, Extended Studies.

HINES noted the Writing Committee does not plan to request their prior proposal be taken off the table. JACOB added that a revised motion has already been forwarded to the Academic Requirements Committee.

1. Discussion Item: Shared Governance

The discussion item was conducted in three parts, coinciding with three topics outlined by the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution (see attachment G-2).

Part 1. MacCORMACK introduced the Ad Hoc Committee and outline the issues in the report document, part 1, Agenda Setting.

BURNS spoke in favor of course release for the presiding officer. HINES noted that the Provost has funded course release this year, and MacCORMACK noted that the committee wants to ensure this is institutionalized. CARTER remarked that the union chief negotiator already has course release. C. BROWN spoke in favor, noting that these changes would make the Senate more effective, and the Presiding Office would take the lead in this scenario.

Part 2. BUTLER outlined the issues in the report document, part 2, Communications.

HOOK spoke in favor, noting that more faculty would become engaged if the agendas were set long-range. BROWER spoke in favor of increased reporting outlets to improve information dissemination. _________ also spoke in favor, as a way to increase communication effectiveness. HARMON spoke in favor of replacing truant senators sooner than the current rule of a three-quarter absence. BUTLER stated that improvement in communication should improve the transition into leadership roles by newer faculty. C.BROWN stated that a natural recruitment point is at the awarding of tenure.
Part 3. LIEBMAN outlined the issues in the report document, part 3, Eligibility. This portion was conducted as a committee of the whole, and is not recorded. There was general approval of the proposals.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

HOOK/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Curricula Consent Agenda as listed in “E.1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for President Wiewel

“The draft whitepaper on "Restructuring PSU's Relationship with the State" calls for a "Student-based funding model for state allocations," and asserts, "funding should be based on the number of students educated" (pp. 4, 13). Will PSU apply the same principle internally to guide the allocation of funds among academic divisions?”

Submitted by:
Martha Hickey, Chair, International Studies Dept.
Thomas Luckett, Chair, History Dept.
Jennifer Ruth, Chair, English Dept.
Tom Seppalainen, Chair, Philosophy Dept.

WIEWEL responded, after his regular report: “There will never be a direct one-to-one relationship between the student credit hours generated by a department and the funding received. There are at least two major reasons for this. First, while we are partly funded by the state on a per student-credit-hour basis, classroom teaching is only part of the mission we carry out on behalf of the state and region: we are also very actively involved in research, workforce development and other activities essential to address the economic and social needs of the region and the state. Second, while state funding is based on a model that acknowledges the differential costs of various programs, it only contributes a small fraction of the funding required to run the institution. Tuition, which funds the majority of our educational operation, is largely the same for most undergraduate and graduate programs, regardless of the program cost.

As a result, internal redistribution of resources is, and for the foreseeable future will be, required to meet differential program costs as well as the expectations of the external community, including the legislature.
There is a relationship between enrollment and the allocation of academic resources, particularly as relates to new faculty positions and resources to serve new students in the short term. Over the past few years, we have allocated a significant number of faculty positions to departments that generate substantial credit hours – either directly or through the UNST staffing initiative. There are never sufficient resources to fully staff every department with a sufficient number of tenure line, or even fulltime, faculty, but preference has been given to those units that contribute significant student credit hours and also those that graduate a large number of majors.

I agree with those who believe more needs to be done to ensure that our limited resources are allocated both equitably and rationally, however. Based on recommendations of the LTIFS committee and my own interest in more effective allocation of resources, we are forming a committee that will help develop a comprehensive set of principles for internal budget allocation based on an understanding of the financial structure of the institution and our expectations for state funding in the future. Certainly, productivity in terms of students taught will play a key role in the allocation scheme that is developed, but it will not be the only consideration given our interest in achieving a number of strategic objectives that change over time. Faculty will, of course, be represented and the Ad hoc committee process will be followed.”

LIVNEH asked how this committee would relate to the Senate Budget Committee. WIEWEL stated that the Senate Budget Committee reviews budgets based on current criteria, but this committee’s charge is to determine changes in guiding principles. At PSU the current process is good, but the criteria may need change. BURNS asked how the passage of Measures 66 and 67 would affect the current budget. WIEWEL stated they would wait to see what the Legislature does before accessing the reserves that we have accumulated. LUCKETT noted that budget office internal reporting of SCH revenues versus cost indicate that CLAS and FPA are generally in the lead, producing about 170% of funds allocated, and some other professional schools about 160%, business about 135% and at the opposite end, MCECS is in the red at about 90%. He urged that the committee consider, while recognizing that there must be cross allocation of funds, whether these numbers aren’t too far out of balance. WIEWEL stated that yes, this is the kind of issues the committee will address.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported after “C.” He noted that Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) awarded PSU the 2010 Award for Excellence in Learning
Outcomes, recognizing work in University Studies and Honors. He noted that sponsored research awards are up 15% over last year at this date. He noted that the Student Recreation Center has won LEED Gold Certification. He discussed his recent trip to Washington with the mayor to secure funding for the proposed Oregon Sustainability Center on the block east of SRC. A direct result of the meeting is that the Secretary of HUD will be coming to PSU to make the announcement about a new competitive program for sustainable communities. For energy efficiencies in the Fourth Avenue Building, the university was awarded $313,000 by Portland’s Energy Trust. At the January OUS Board meeting, they approved our request to purchase Market Center Building for $24 Million, they approved the BA/BS in Earth Sciences degree, and they authorized us to seek an additional $4.5 million in Other Funds expenditure limitation on PSU’s Lincoln Hall project expansion during the February 2010 Legislative Supplemental Session. Regarding, OUS restructuring, he recently met with faculty, student and alumni committees, and the Governor’s “reset” committee, but noted that nothing will really happen until the gubernatorial election is over. WIEWEL stated that restructuring could provide some possible opportunities for PSU, and there are no serious downsides. There are things we should be very careful of; for example, the Virginia model indicates certain negatives.

HINES asked Viewel to discuss his views on shared governance, especially the issue of how to communicate faculty input in addition to the mechanism provided by the Educational Policy Committee. WIEWEL stated he has happily lived with many models of shared governance, for example, he was a member of a research institute that ran on a participatory democratic model and he has worked for a Chancellor where there was none. He continued, one of the frequent confusions about shared governance is the lack of clarity about layers, sectors, and forms of control. Faculty clearly control course content, but there are higher levels not subject to faculty control which may still receive faculty input, and other levels where there is no reasonable expectation of faculty consultation. The lack of clarity is one of the reasons why people get unhappy, because they feel that they should have been consulted, but someone else felt that it was out of their domain. Faculty may feel disdissed and administrators may feel harassed, and in periods of growth and times of crisis, these misunderstandings may multiply. It is, for example, unclear how faculty relate to real estate issues. Another problematic issue involves representation and accountability, for example, who the individual or unit in question is representing, or accountable to. Lastly, universities develop individual cultures, and the changing nature of this university in recent times, for example, has not been matched by changes in governance structures, as witnessed by the work of the ad hoc committee of the Senate.

1. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students

ALLEN presented the report for the committee after G-3, noting that the charge to the committee is very broad and they have organized their work to date by formulating a list of questions(G-1 attached). She noted that the lack of data is hindering their effectiveness. She entertained comment via her email address: allenj@pdx.edu
2. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

LIEBMAN presented the report for the committee constructed in the form of three topics of discussion which were distributed across the course of the Senate meeting, each followed by a discussion period as transcribed in C.1. Shared Governance(attachment G-2).

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 8/9 January at PSU.

RUETER reported for PSU’s Senators, noting that the IFS spent the bulk of the meeting discussing the public corporation idea. He directed the Senate to the IFS minutes as well as the January 14, 2010 IFS Resolution regarding the proposal to reorganize OUS, e-mailed to the Senate membership last week (http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html). This resolution is on the Agenda of the Board Governance and Policy Committee, which meets Jan. 28, 2010. He also directed the membership to the PSU white paper, and noted that important factors for PSU are the ratio of our graduation rate versus those of UO and OUS, and the data provided by OUS indicates a doubling in size of the university.

RUETER yielded to Dalton Miller-Jones who noted that funding is the fundamental premise of the two reports, but that in the last two legislative sessions, the universities have achieved better funding than previously because we worked as a unified front instead of competing with each other. If we go to an independent board, there is a real concern about getting a base budget that would be anywhere close to adequate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 17:08.
Challenges
- Charge of the committee is very broad.
- Who are high achieving students, how do we attract them, what do we offer them, and how do we prepare them for post-baccalaureate opportunities?

Who are the PSU's high achieving students?
- Students in the Honors Program and Departmental Honors Tracks are not consistently identified in the student information system.
- Limited data on the experiences of high achieving students and definition of high achieving has not been consistent.

Governance Issues
- What has been, and should be, the involvement of faculty governance structures in the curricular offerings to high achieving students through the Honors Program and Departmental Honors Track?
- Should there be a governance structure to provide on-going, systematic review of the offerings to high achieving students?

Recruitment Issues
- Is PSU among the choice set of institutions for high achieving students?
- What activities does the admissions office engage in to attract high achieving students? How do the admissions office, Honors Program, and academic units collaborate to attract high achieving students to PSU?
- Are high achieving students attracted to PSU because of programs the university offers them, or are we attracting students to these programs once they are recruited to PSU?
- Is PSU using scholarship dollars to attract high achieving students?
- How does a student know what PSU has to offer?

Curriculum
- What is the curriculum of the Honors Program? Should there be an alternative theme?
- Should there be a gateway or bridge to the upper division honors offerings for high achieving transfer students and other high achieving students not involved in the Honors Program?
- Which academic units offer honors tracks and what are the curricula?
- Survey of academic units
  - How do academic units identify high achieving students?
  - What do the academic units offer high achieving students?
  - What additional opportunities would they like to offer high achieving students?
  - What additional resources are needed?
- Should PSU offer an accelerated baccalaureate that is based upon demonstrated proficiency in general education outcomes?

Advising and Mentoring
- How does PSU prepare high achieving students for post baccalaureate opportunities that are the next steps appropriate next to the discipline, which may include graduate or professional school?
- How are students identify and prepared applied for scholarships and fellowships?
- What are the post-baccalaureate activities of high achieving students and how prepared are they for these activities?
For Faculty Senate meeting, 2/1/10

The Ad hoc committee on Constitutional Change will present three key recommendations from its 1/8 report to the Steering Committee.

1. **Focus the annual Senate agenda on the year’s most important matters.**
   The aim is for the Senate to operate in a strategic fashion to address institution-wide issues as a working partner with the administration in shared governance.
   1a. After new Senate leadership is seated in June, there should be a “visioning” retreat to prioritize matters for the coming year and schedule them in the monthly calendar. The visioning process should include key committee chairs. Soon after the retreat, Senate leadership and chairs of EPC and other key committees should meet with the administration in a joint planning process.
   1b. The Senate should use a large portion of the first Fall Senate meeting to define and discuss its strategic agenda for the year.
   1c. At the final Senate meeting, the outgoing Presiding Officer should report progress on the year’s agenda.
   1d. We recommend funding for a daylong retreat and for course release by the Presiding Officer.

2. **Communicate the purposes and priorities of the Senate**
   2a. We recommend an annual September letter from the Presiding Officer that describes the purposes of the Senate and its priorities for the coming year.
   2b. All faculty should be provided a Senate Handbook that expands on the existing Governance Guide to include discussion of the Senate’s mission, activities, and accomplishments.
   2c. We recommend that the Presiding Officer speak at Convocation to newly hired faculty to invite their participation in the Senate and faculty governance.
   2d. The Senate should encourage participation by all faculty in governance. Sitting senators should personally contact the newly hired and recently tenured and promoted to ensure a flow of new talent.
   2e. There should be an orientation for newly elected Senators that precedes the last Senate meeting.
   2f. The Faculty Senate website should be enhanced to make easier communication with officers and to post Senate calendars, agenda, and minutes.
   2g. Funding should be provided for web and office support for the Senate.

3. **Revise Senate representation and restore eligibility rules**
   3a. Restore the pre-1986 divisions of CLAS ((Arts & Letters, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences)
   3b. Merge Extended Studies (XS) with Other Instructional (OI) or AO to ensure it will have representation
3c. Restore eligibility in keeping with the Senate’s “primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.” In 1994, eligibility was extended to all holding a master’s degree regardless of their role in teaching, research, or educational support, with the intent of including student services. Since then, other unclassified positions have proliferated which have been interpreted as falling under that rubric but do not have specific responsibilities in the areas of curriculum, research, and student services.

3d. Consider changing from the current 1:10 ratio of Senators to eligibles to 1:20.

END

**Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution**
Established by the PSU Faculty Senate, June 2009, to report to the Senate as soon as possible. The committee will “propose changes to the constitution that bring it more in line with our current composition and circumstances.” Membership: Robert Liebman SOC (chair), Sy Adler UPA, Mary Ann Barham UASC, Virginia Butler ANTH, Jeanne Enders SBA, Mark Jones CS, Alan MacCormack UNST. Ex officio: Sarah Andrews–Collier, Duncan Carter.
Whereas the 2010 Oregon high school graduating class will be the largest in Oregon’s history.

Whereas Oregon Opportunity Grant requests have exceeded 2009-2010 allocated funds and requests for 2010-2011 already considerably outnumber those at the same time as the previous year.

Whereas enrollment in Oregon higher education institutions has increased greatly and is expected to increase further by 2025, while proportional state funding has considerably decreased.

Whereas under the current higher education structure and funding model in Oregon, The Oregon Goal: 40-40-20 is unachievable by 2025. The State of Oregon is unable to meet the higher education needs of Oregon citizens today or plan effectively to meet the needs of future Oregon students.

Any efforts to resolve these issues must be consistent with the following core principles:

A. Any restructuring of Public Higher Education must improve the education of all Oregon Students.

B. Any restructuring of Public Higher Education must be based on a careful examination of other reorganization attempts, such as restructuring of academic programs at OHSU.

C. Any restructuring plans of Public Higher Education must strengthen the unique opportunities provided by each Oregon public university.

D. The faculty in general and the IFS in particular must be involved every step of the way.

E. Public Higher Education Institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon.
January 29, 2010

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate Approval

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2009-10 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.a.1
- MA & MAT Foreign Language; French, German, Japanese, Spanish, eliminate requirement of third language.

**New Courses**

E.1.a.2
- ESR 591, Ecosystem services & sustainability: field project (4)
  Interdisciplinary course and field work. Provides a conceptual framework for addressing ecological, social and economic sustainability. Examining shifts in ecosystem services following development or removal of built environmental structures. Student projects evaluate and measure environmental, economic and social impacts (positive and negative) of the shift in services. Prerequisites: ESR 590.

E.1.a.3
- ESR 590, Ecosystem services & sustainability: Developing a toolkit (1)
  Ecosystem services provide a conceptual framework for addressing ecological, social and economic sustainability. Students will learn to use an interdisciplinary toolbox of methods and techniques useful for assessing various aspects of ecosystem services. Students will develop projects on ecosystem services assessments and valuation.

**Graduate School of Education**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.a.4
• GSE MA/MS Counselor Education; Couples, Marriage, and Family Counseling, change Couples, marriage and family counseling specialization name to Marital, couple, and family counseling specialization, reduce elective credit from 7 to 3 by adding two 2 credit required classes.

E.1.a.5
• GSE Community counseling specialization; change name to Clinical Mental Health Counseling Specialization, increase credits from 74 to 90.

E.1.a.6
• GSE Grad Certificate, Couples, Marriage, and Family Counseling, change name to Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling, and number of credits.

New Courses
E.1.a.7
• COUN 546, Grief and Loss (2)
Focus on developing knowledge and skills related to counseling individuals and families having experienced loss through death. Students will receive information about theories of grief, explore the neurobiology of the brain in relation to trauma, recognize factors that complicate grief and develop counseling strategies for working with these issues. Prerequisite: graduate standing.

E.1.a.8
• COUN 544, Consultation: Theory and Practice (2)
Focus on the theory and practice of consultation and collaboration with various populations (e.g., parents, families, clinical practitioners) and across a variety of settings, particularly mental health agencies and schools. Class time will include lecture/discussions, experiential exercises, and student group presentations. Prerequisites: graduate standing.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.9
• ME MSME, Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering, change course requirements.

E.1.a.10
• ME MENG, Master of Engineering in Mechanical Engineering, change course requirements.

E.1.a.11
• OMSE, M.S.E., Graduate Certificate of Software Engineering, changes to existing program.

New Courses
E.1.a.12
• OMSE 517, Agile Software Development (3)
Designed for graduate level software engineering students who are interested in learning and applying the fundamentals of the Agile software development process in the real world. Explores Agile concepts both in theory and practice. Introduction to the principles and foundations of Agile Development, XP
(Extreme Programming) and the SCRUM methodology. Also introduces the students to day-to-day life on an Agile team. Expected preparation: OMSE 500.

E.1.a.13
- OMSE 534, Software Estimating (3)
  Software estimating techniques and tools enable the responsible software engineering manager to assess project feasibility, secure adequate budgets, and manage project tasks and schedules. The student learns how to make viable software estimates to consistently inform software project planning, scheduling, and oversight. The full range of software estimating methods and tools are explored. Prerequisites: OMSE 500, OMSE 511.

Change to Existing courses
E.1.a.14
- ETM 590/690, Engineering and Technology Management, 4 cr. Change description/prerequisites

E.1.a.15
January 27, 2010

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Richard Beyler  
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for Faculty Senate – Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at [http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com) and looking in the 2009-10 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**

E.1.b.1.  
• EC 461/561, The Economics of Empire and War (4)  
Historical and contemporary analyses of the economic motivations and consequences of imperialism and war, distinguishing formal and informal imperialism, with a particular focus on the recent history of the United States. Prerequisite: Junior Standing. Expected Preparation: Economics 201 and 202.

E.1.b.2  
• MTH 477/577, 478/578, Mathematical Control Theory I, II (3,3)  

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.3  
• EC 450/550, Third-World Economic Development, 4cr, change course title to Economics of Development, prerequisites.
E.1.b.4

- HST 485/585, 486/586, The Ottoman World and Modern Turkey, 4,4cr, separate 485/585 from 486/586, change title to Hst 485/585 Ottoman World and title to Hst 486/586 Modern Turkey, course descriptions.

E.1.b.5


College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses
E.1.b.6

- USP 496/596 Affordable Housing Finance (3)
  Introduction to the unique challenges of financing and developing affordable housing projects. The challenges and tools for financing rental as well as owner-occupied housing will be covered, and case studies will be used to illustrate the ways in which financing for affordable housing is created and used, and poses unique challenges for investors, jurisdictions, and community-based groups. Expected preparation: USP 312U.

School of Social Work

New Courses
E.1.b.7

- CFS 450/550, Youth and Youth Work (4)
  Emphasizes multiple lenses through which young people are seen and treated. Explores youth work principles, multiple youth work traditions, experiential/outdoor education, youth development, and other dimensions of youth work. Includes community-based component for application of theory. Intended for students planning careers in education, policy, and direct service with youth. Required course for Child & Family Studies Youth Worker specialization. Prerequisites: junior standing.
February 1, 2010

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown,
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the UCC, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2009-10 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.1.
• CS 345 Cyberculture: The Internet and Popular Culture (4) – change description.

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.c.2.
• BA/BS in History - develops a new sequence of a reading colloquium followed by a seminar in place of the requirement for two seminars. Students are required to take two courses as a sequence identified by letters (example: 405a and 407a).

E.1.c.3.
• BA in Foreign Languages – adds Arabic to existing majors in Foreign Languages and Literatures.

E.1.c.4.
• BA/BS in Physics – adds option in Biomedical Physics.

New Courses
E.1.c.5.
• Eng 333 Topics in Literature and Film (4)
  Study of the interplay between textual and cinematic representation: how these media have treated specific historical, social, and cultural phenomena, as well as the ways literature and film have inspired and influenced each other in terms of content, form, and audience.

E.1.c.6.
• Eng 334 Topics in Film Genres and Movements (4)
  Study of major aesthetic, cultural, and social movements in film.
E.1.c.7.
• ESR 230, 231 (4,4)
  Fundamentals of Environmental Chemistry I, II
  Basic concepts and principles of chemistry as it applies to environmental problems.
  Includes the nature of matter and chemical reactions, water chemistry, water pollution,
  atmospheric chemistry, soil chemistry, toxicological chemistry and industrial ecology.
  Examples are used that illustrate the social and economic importance of environmental
  chemistry. Prerequisites: ESR 230 for ESR 231.

E.1.c.8.
• Ph 337
  Physics in Biomedicine (4)
  The physics behind the most important medical instruments and technologies. A wide
  range of concepts from electromagnetism, optics, to quantum mechanics are used to
  explain the mechanisms behind ultrasound, endoscopy, optical microscopy, EKG,
  pacemaker, defibrillators, LASER eye surgery, microscopy, x-ray, radiation, CAT scan,
  PET scan, MRI, and more. Expected preparation: Ph 201, 203 or Ph 101, 102.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.9.
• Psy 342, 343
  Social Psychology I, II (4,4) – separates Psy 342 and Psy 343 into two separate courses,
  Social Psychology: Self, Attitudes and Social Influence and Social Psychology: Social
  Relationships and Groups, changes titles and changes descriptions.

E.1.c.10.
• Soc 342, 343
  Social Psychology I, II (4,4) – separates Soc 342 and Soc 343 into two separate courses,
  Social Psychology: Self, Attitudes and Social Influence and Social Psychology: Social
  Relationships and Groups, changes titles and changes descriptions.
Memorandum

Date: 11 February 2010

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

From: Michael Bowman, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Re: Educational Policy Committee Winter Quarter report

This report covers the activities of the Educational Policy Committee for Winter 2009.

Committee membership: Tim Anderson (ETM), Mirela Blekic (UNST), Michael Bowman (LIB, chair), Gary Brodowicz (SCH), Barbara Brower (GEOG), Liz Charman (ART), Vicki Cotrell (SSW), Maria Eldred (HR), John Erdman (MTH), Cathleen Gal (OGSR), Amy Greenstadt (ENG), Ray Johnson (SBA), Alan MacCormack (UNST), Randy Miller (SCH, Budget Committee representative), Jason Ranker (ED), Gwen Shusterman (CHEM), Amaya Taina (UG student representative), and Sarah Tinkler (ECON).

Charge: The charge of EPC is to “advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University.”

Accreditation: The proposed revised accreditation guidelines and schedule were passed by NWCCU in January and will be implemented.

Current Issues: The Committee has discussed three issues this quarter. The Committee will report to the Senate its conclusions/recommendations on each issue during Spring quarter. In some cases, the Committee may recommend that the Senate discuss the item in question.

1. The School of Extended Studies and the curriculum: The Committee is investigating the School’s interaction with faculty and curricula and has met with Mike Burton, Dean of the School of Extended Studies.
2. Faculty participation in planning for online learning: EPC is exploring how the faculty could best be involved in planning for online teaching and will present background information for the online learning discussion at this meeting.
3. Annual review letters from chairs being sent upwards in the P&T process: The Committee is discussing this situation, primarily focusing on process and what level of change requires an amendment to the guidelines.

Committee Assignments: Some committee members serve on other committees as representatives of EPC. Michael Bowman serves on the Budget Committee. Tim Anderson, Michael Bowman, and Ray Johnson serve on the Faculty Committee on OUS and PSU Structure.
Institutional Athletic Board  
Report to Faculty Senate  
March 1, 2010

Board Members: Grant Farr, CLAS, Chair  
Walton Fosque, ART, Melissa Trifilette, ADM, Chris Monsere, ECS, David Burgess, OIRP

Community Member:  Jim Mustard, Standard Insurance

Student Members:  Amirah Karim, Track and Carl Sommers, Football

Ex-officio Members
Torre Chisholm:  Athletic Director
Robert Lockwood, PSU Student Faculty Representative

**Charge of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board.**
This board shall be composed of five members of the Portland State University Faculty nominated by the Committee on Committees, three students nominated by the Student Senate, and one member representing the public, each to be appointed by the President of the University for terms s/he considers appropriate. Additionally, non-voting ex-officio members of the Board shall include the Vice President for Finance and Administration, Director of Athletics, Associate Director of Athletics, Faculty Athletics Representative (NCAA). The Board shall:
1) Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University’s program in men’s and women’s intercollegiate athletics.
2) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

**Athletics News:**
- Women’s Soccer won the regular season championship
- 31 student-athletes, including 9 football players, earned Academic All-Big Sky honors for Fall Sports teams. These are athletes who played in half the games and have a 3.2 or better cumulative GPA.
- Athletics has assumed management of the Peter Stott Center and is working with the School of Community Health to improve and expand Health and Physical Education class offerings in the building.
- PSU was recognized in the Chronicle of Higher Education for having a student-athlete graduation rate which exceeds the campus average by more than 20%.
- PSU has hired a new football head coach. Nigel Burton was an assistant coach at PSU in 2001 to 2003 and was recently the defensive coordinator at the University of Nevada Reno.
- Claire Faucher, a senior on the Women’s Basketball Team, has recently set a PSU and Big Sky record for assists.

**Budget:**
The Athletic Department Budget was presented to the IAB at its fall meeting.
Athletics is operating on a total budget of $10,200,000 for 2009-10.
Primary funding sources are
• Student Fees ($3.2 million),
• Fee Remission ($1.9 million),
• Campus Support ($1.2 million),
• and external revenues ($3.9 million).

Primary expenditures are
• Scholarships ($3.4 million),
• Student-Athlete Support ($1.7 million),
• Sport Operating Expenses ($1.4 million),

60% Taskforce:
Last year the Athletic Department working with the IAB produced a series of recommendation on how to improve the academic performance of athletes. 24 of the 30 recommendation have already been accomplished.

APR Violations:
The Men’s Basketball team has been found to have unacceptable low APR scores (APR measures academic progress) and has been put on probation by the NCAA. The team has lost scholarships and practice time because of this. The taskforce that includes coaches, athletic academic advisors, and faculty has been formed to remedy this problem.

NCAA Reaccreditation:
Portland State University is undergoing NCAA reaccreditation this year. This is done on a ten year cycle. With the guidance of the NCAA, PSU is preparing an internal audit on our athletic program. To accomplish this we have formed for a Steering Committee and five subcommittees. The subcommittees include:
• Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance
• Academic Integrity
• Gender Issues
• Diversity Issues
• Student-Athlete Well-Being

A draft of this internal audit will be finished by early March and the internal report will be available online for the PSU faculty. The steering committee will then schedule a series of public forums at which faculty, students, and other members of Portland State University will be invited to comment on the audit. The website containing the internal audit will be made public soon and the times and dates of the public forums will be announced.

Recommendations:
In the process of conducting the internal audit for the NCAA a number of issues have arisen regarding athletics that may result in recommendations to the University to change or alter rules or procedures regarding athletic operations and oversight. Specifically the steering committee anticipates that there may be a recommendation to strengthen and expand the charge of the Institutional Athletic Board and, perhaps, to rethink it reporting responsibility. This recommendation would require a change in the PSU Faculty Constitution. A motion to do so may be brought to the Faculty Senate for its consideration at a subsequent meeting.
PSU Climate Action Plan

Key Questions for Faculty

In response to the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment, PSU has joined over 660 other institutions in developing a climate action plan. A discussion draft is available for review at: http://www.pdx.edu/sustainability/greening-our-campus

The PSU Campus Sustainability Office is facilitating a 6-month engagement process to apprise the campus community of the plan and provide opportunities for improvement. The most intensive effort to collect new information will end in March. Analysis, synthesis and communication phases will continue April-May.

An online survey is being created to capture faculty responses to the questions below. This should be ready by mid-February. In the meantime inquiries can be directed to Noelle Studer-Spevak or Fletcher Beaudoin at 503.725.8945, GreenCampus@pdx.edu.

General Questions

1) What are the major sections missing from the plan, or the areas that need substantial refinement?

2) What other plans, major guiding documents, and legislation should be referenced by the PSU climate action plan?

Faculty-Specific Questions

3) Context: Part 4 of the plan, “Research and Education” is a synthesis of CSP2 documents and has not been vetted by the wider PSU faculty population. Question: What do you suggest, in terms of additions, subtractions or refinements, for improving Part 4 of the plan, “Research and Education?”

4) Context: The breadth of research and activities at PSU holds tremendous potential for advancing the goals of this plan; however, further faculty input is necessary for capturing all of these opportunities. Question: What are some examples of faculty expertise, or intellectual resources on campus that could strengthen specific parts of the plan?

5) Context: The plan’s Introduction, and “Research and Education” sections mention developing the campus into a living laboratory; however, to achieve that goal, this theme must become integrated throughout Part 2 “Mitigation Strategies.” Question: What are some research opportunities for connecting students and faculty to real projects on campus that should be included in the plan?