Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 2009

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation
Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet April 2009" (2009). Faculty Senate Monthly Packets. 92.
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/92

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Cress and Webb were in attendance for the March faculty senate meeting.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Added to the Agenda: E-8 Proposal for Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Process/Criteria for Program Review.

Removed from the Curricular Consent Agenda: E.1.a.1.
Changes in Senate and Committee representation since March 2, 2009: Darrell Brown is appointed interim chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Linda George replaces Heejun Chang on the Academic Requirements Committee. Tugrul Daim replaces Linda George on the Publications Board.

Flower reminded the Senate that the culminating work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Participation in Governance includes three events in the next several weeks. Details are available at their website.

President's Remarks

WIEWEL noted that with respect to the budget situation, that tomorrow the legislature will release data on the effects of a 30% budget cut. Although we don’t anticipate a 30% cut, we do anticipate a 20% cut, and tuition increases that will be in the double digits for both years of the biennium. The results for PSU will be significant, although not devastating.

WIEWEL presented the 2009 campus performance report (attached) and noted that it is also available on the Faculty Senate website: http://web.pdx.edu/~facusen/ under Documents. He noted that we hope to make improvements on two items in particular, our graduation rates, and our student-faculty ratio.

RUTH asked if data was available on the student-faculty ratio of all full-time faculty, not just tenure-related. WIEWEL stated yes. MacCORMACK asked, regarding proposals for tuition increase, ___________. WIEWEL stated that the governor’s proposed budget was below the essential budget level to begin with. Additionally, we must return 30% to financial aid. GEORGE asked what the target is for the six-year graduation rate. KETCHESON stated that there is none set, but our peers are at about 45%. WIEWEL stated that 45-50% is a reasonable number to strive for. He concluded he feels very good about the plans we have in place, but feels very worried, given the fiscal climate, about our ability to carry them out.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, IV., 4), 4) h. Teacher Education Committee

The item was tabled.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOK/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1” with the exception of item E.1.a.1.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BODEGOM/GEORGE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE item “E.1.a.1.”
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RUETER noted he disagreed with the title, specifically use of the word “environmental,” and asked for the rationale. “GEORGE stated that it is the name of the textbook. WIEWEL noted he thought it was appropriate in the context of Urban Planning.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal for the Minor in Aging Services

CARTER/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E.2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal for Concentration in Aging Services within the Health Studies Major

CARTER/HARMON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E.3.”

noted that there is a typographical error in the proposal, regarding “PSY 311.” HARMON noted the correction for UCC.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

4. Proposal for Certificate of Advanced Proficiency in Russian

RUETER/HICKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E.4.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

5. Proposal by EPC for Approval of Programs, Centers, etc.

BOWMAN/GEORGE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal as listed in “E-5” with revisions to the flowchart as indicated on the overhead.

BOWMAN noted that this is intended to apply to any academic unit, and reviewed the details of the flowchart. He differentiated this activity from curricular programs which are the domain of graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees.

HANSEN asked if the current review process would disappear. FEYERHERM stated that the defect with this proposal chart, is that the only way to abolish a center is to ask the faculty involved to abolish itself. BOWMAN stated that there
is no complete documentation of the former process. HANSEN stated that he could provide it.

BOWMAN reminded that this document embraces all academic units, such as the library, etc., not just curricular programs.

FEYERHERM reiterated his previous remark. SMALLMAN stated he echoed Feyerherm’s concern, noting that a 1-2 faculty unit could block the intention of the faculty as a whole.

FEYERHERM/HOOK MOVED that the first two boxes, top, left, be changed from diamonds to rectangles, permitting consultation and comment, but not veto.

MUSSEY noted her concern, as she is one of those people that fall in a small unit. WIEWEL noted that there is the assumption that the Provost will consult with Finance and Administration, amongst others, and this is not reflected in the current chart. BOWMAN noted that most if not all of those parties are represented on the Budget Committee and would be notices through the connection with the EPC.

MUSSEY reiterated her concern that this can facilitate the elimination of small units. This is especially problematic in a time such as this when there are budgetary pressures to cut.

HANSEN, and noted that this is very different from the old process, as the path for eliminating a program has been introduced. KOCH noted, yes, the elimination piece is new, however, we need something that is this specific because we need a process that is more transparent when we confront difficult decisions.

MUSSEY yielded to Gamburd. GAMBURD urged that there be a way to differentiate changes made for curricular as opposed to budgetary reasons. If reductions are being made because the university can’t afford to run programs that it is running, then Article 22 of the Collective Bargaining Contract should be invoked.

__________ proposed that creating and eliminating are two different activities, and this process can’t handle both. RUTH stated, nonetheless, we don’t have time for a more thoughtful process in this budgetary climate. The question for the larger group is how can shared governance be ensured.

BRODOWICZ queried if a hypothetical unit with one each of tenure-related, fixed-term, and adjunct faculty, were eliminated, where the tenure-related faculty would go.

RUETER spoke against the amendment, noting that we are assuming the faculty in the unit would object. The original proposal places the onus on the administration to make some accommodation for their approval, for example to
buy the tenure lines out. BROWN expressed his disagreement. RUETER noted that it is rational and fair, to buy out tenure, just as other’s are bought out by the university.

TOLMACH stated he echoed the remarks that elimination should be separated.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED (on the amendment).

HANSEN/BLEILER MOVED TO TABLE the motion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 45 in favor, 15 against, 9 abstentions.

6. Amendment to the Constitution, IV., 4)., 4. M. Educational Policy Committee

The proposal was removed from the agenda by the Presiding Officer.

7. Resolution for Shared Governance

HICKEY presented the resolution for the Steering Committee.

REESE/RUTH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE THE RESOLUTION as listed in “E-7, with the insertion of “the Steering Committee” between “and” and “may call.”

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

8. Resolution for an Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Process and Criteria for Program Review

RUTH/GOUGH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-8 ” as follows:

Whereas, PSU expects a significant revenue shortfall of as much as 30% at the state level, and
Whereas, The administration considers it prudent to consider all available strategies, including the review of programs, and has asked us to consider the formation of an ad hoc committee to develop "a process and set of criteria to be used generally as part of program review but specifically taking into account the possibility that program evaluation may lead to program reduction and elimination as part of our current or impending budget reductions,

Resolved, That an ad hoc committee be created, composed of one member each from the Educational Policy, Budget, Academic Requirements, Undergraduate Curriculum and Senate Steering Committees, the Advisory and Graduate Councils, (to be chosen by the Committee on Committees), and administrators (to be chosen by the administration).

Additional Information: The administration recommends the following representatives: Carol Mack, academic administration and planning; Shawn Smallman, undergraduate studies and curriculum, Delys Ostlund, graduate studies; Kathi Ketcheson, data acquisition and analysis, Steve Harmon, staff support and knowledge of academic program processes. This group would begin meeting immediately and seek to develop a draft process and set of criteria for consideration no later than the June 2009 Faculty Senate meeting with an interim report in May.
KOCH noted that he approached the Steering Committee about this matter, as there is no process short of retrenchment, for eliminating degree programs or academic units. A regular process should look more like program review (which we have been trying to institute for at least fifteen years), and because of our unusual budgetary situation, we need to address this issue now. Retrenchment has some very significant outcomes, including the elimination of tenure-related faculty lines. There are ways short of retrenchment to address the curriculum, and we need to explore them. Although things are theoretical at the moment, there will no doubt be budget reductions after June. We need a transparent process, consultation, and a set of criteria for how programs are evaluated. Expensive programs have an impact on the collective, for example, so we need a process and a set of criteria to evaluate programs.

KOCH continued, a Board moratorium has been placed on new programs or program elimination until at least September. The Board is also examining low enrollment classes and programs, directed primarily at the regional campuses. But all campuses have been charged to draft an enrollment and class-size policy. Additionally, the Board has already specified that programs that generate less than five degrees will be subject to further review by the Board.

WALTON asked KOCH stated he hopes this will lead to a regularized process, in addition to the short term issue.

RUTH stated she was in favor of adding an interim report in May. CABELLY stated he was against adding the extra workload in the short time window.

D. HANSEN yielded to Gamburd. GAMBURD urged that if budget is involved, then Article 22 be invoked. KOCH reiterated that the proposal is not about retrenchment. HICKEY reminded that the committee is only reviewing process, and the decision to invoke Article 22 is somewhere along that continuum. GELMON reminded that this is just a simple motion to form a short-term ad hoc committee, and we shouldn’t complicate it.

RUTH reiterated that this needs to be shared governance, not just feel like it. PARADIS spoke in favor of the motion, stating that presently there is nothing for units and roles such as the ones she occupies.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.
G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

The provost referenced his remarks with respect to item E.8.

1. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

   The report was tabled.

2. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report

   The report was tabled.

3. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of April 3 and 4 at Western Oregon University

   The Presiding Officer accepted the report from IFS Senator Duncan Carter for the Senate (attached).

H. ADJOURNMENT

   The meeting was adjourned at 17:03.
Report on Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting
April 3-4, Western Oregon University

The IFS normally meets for two half-days, with the Friday meeting devoted to “external” matters—legislators, the Chancellor, officials from the host institution, and the like, and the Saturday meeting devoted to “internal” matters—IFS business, campus reports and discussion of current issues common to our campuses.

This Friday meeting included presentations by Bob Turner of OUS (assessment and other issues), David McDonald from WOU/OUS (admissions), WOU Provost Kent Neely (how WOU is facing the budgetary situation), and Chancellor Pernsteiner. Oregon State Senate President Peter Courtney was scheduled but had to withdraw.

- Bob Turner (OUS) is working on a state-level Learning Outcomes and Assessment Task Force. While their mission is entirely clear, they are planning a series of campus visits and are interested in attracting a broad spectrum of faculty to talk about assessment. They are concerned that there is a disconnect between those spearheading assessment and the rank and file among the faculty. They are especially interested in what institutions are doing to “close the loop” between assessment and curricular change.

  Turner also spoke about state-level efforts to standardize the credit hours awarded by institutions by students who bring in International Baccalaureate diplomas or coursework. (Parallels earlier effort to standardize credits awarded for AP scores.)

- David McDonald (WOU/OUS) talked about trends and initiatives in admissions. WOU is growing enrollment more through retention than recruitment. Among their strategies are a week-long new student orientation and advising students to find a major very early in their careers. He noted the impact of the economy on enrollment patterns—getting more interest, but a decrease in non-residents. On the other hand, he is expecting more local students to stay at home. Admitted students are up 20% over this point last year but non-residents are down 5%.

  McDonald spoke of OUS’s new “common admissions” strategy, which will be effective for fall, 2010. The new application form will include a question something like, “Would you consider admission to other OUS institutions?” If a student who says “yes” is not admitted by his/her first choice school, he/she may be admitted by another OUS institution.

  A new collaborative effort formed by Oregon and SOU employs similar logic.
A student not admitted to Oregon may be admitted to Southern, with the promise of transfer to Oregon as a junior. There has apparently even been talk of bussing these students to Oregon football games (and other events) to help them maintain a sense of connection. (What next? T-shirts and baseball caps?)

- Kent Neely, WOU Provost, spoke about how WOU is dealing with the financial situation. Neely emphasized the constraints he faced: can’t make the operation much more efficient, and yet very limited revenue sources. Unlike business, we can’t bring a new product to market quickly. He listed ten separate steps he was considering. He asserted that tuition increases above 7% have a negative impact on enrollment. WOU plans to devote 30% of any tuition increase to increases in financial aid to students. WOU’s goals in dealing with all this: sustain a 10% fund balance, insure student success, and keep our workforce intact.

- Chancellor Pemsteiner spoke in a similar vein. Our dire economy is likely to get worse, though not a lot. Unlikely to improve for at least a year. “What we see in May [economic forecast] is probably what we get. OUS has been asked to prepare for a 30% budget reduction (though we will probably not see cuts that deep). As part of the federal stimulus package, the feds have ruled that budgets for K-12 and higher education cannot dip below the 2005-06 level of state support. This is “phenomenal news,” the best protection we could hope for, because it links us to something the public cares about (K-12). Expects tuition to increase statewide by an average of 12%/year in each of the next two years. Of this, 30% will go back to students as need-based aid. State will not be in a position to pay PSU back for the money that had been promised for enrollment growth. The Board passed a five-point plan: (1) reaffirming the 30% financial aid, (2) determination to hold instruction, research and student services harmless, (3) will probably cut OSU-Cascade by 30%, (4) will probably cut smaller schools by less than 30%, (5) salary costs will be reduced by 4.6% [but does not say exactly how]. George made the point that even if our reduction is only 20%, we can’t expect to make up the bulk of it with tuition alone.

In the Saturday meeting we had a frank and open discussion on three topics: 1) the proposed 4.6% salary costs reduction; 2) the recommendation that lecture courses need to have more than 10 students (with many provisions for exceptions); and 3) the recommendation that degrees programs with graduating fewer than 5 students per year be examined closely for efficiencies. Of these, the last two issues were sent to us by the Chancellor for us to provide informative feedback on how to implement these without running into traps.

Respectfully submitted, Duncan Carter and John Rueter
Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units

1. Proposal*
2. Review & recommendation by faculty in affected unit(s)†
3. Review & recommendation by immediate supervisor‡
4. Reviewed by Provost, Dean, University Librarian or Vice-Provost?
   - Yes → Review by Council of Academic Deans
   - No → Revised
5. Reviewed by next higher level
   - Yes
   - No → Educational Policy Committee
6. Is unit a significant academic entity?
   - Yes → Revised
   - No → Budgetary analysis by Budget Committee
7. Only a minor alteration of unit?
   - Yes
   - No → Review by Educational Policy Committee
8. Review by Faculty Senate
   - Yes
   - No → Revised
Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination, or Alteration of Academic Units

Answer the appropriate questions below.

1. What is the name of the unit? Provide a brief history or justification for it.
2. How does the unit help Portland State University to achieve its themes/goals?
3. What are the objectives and planned outcomes for the unit?
4. What significant activities will take place within the unit?
5. Indicate the expected percentage of time and resources that will be allocated to each activity. Please include, if appropriate: courses to be offered, course development, research performed, community partnerships built, other (specify).
6. Why is a change needed to achieve these outcomes and to host these activities?
   a. What other units are already undertaking similar activities? Meet with these units and include documentation on the outcomes of these meetings.
   b. Why is a separate or changed identity and/or structure key to success in meeting the objectives and planned outcomes?
   c. How will these outcomes be measured and assessed? What benchmarks will be used to determine the success of the unit?
7. What is the proposed structure of the unit? Examples include: Where will it be housed? Will it become a separate administrative unit? Will it have its own support staff? How will faculty become affiliated with the unit? Will faculty FTE be assigned to the unit? What is the likely faculty composition (% tenure-track, % fixed-term, % adjunct)? According to what rules will faculty be evaluated for P&T?
8. Who will have administrative oversight for the unit?
9. When would the unit be established or the change be enacted? What is the period of time for the unit to operate (if it is not permanent)? Describe how the unit may evolve or expand.
10. What additional resources are needed for the unit? From where will these resources come? What revenue will the unit generate?
    a. Budget: Show all anticipated sources of revenue and expenditures.
    b. Space: Describe in detail the new space needs and where the unit would be situated.
    c. Staff: Describe all anticipated workers at all levels.
    d. Support Services: Describe necessary increased support services, such as additional laboratory equipment, library resources, or computers.
11. List the faculty proposing the change and their departmental affiliations.

Request prepared by: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by immediate supervisor: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by *: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by *: ___________________________ Date: __________
Reviewed by UBC Chair: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by EPC Chair: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by Senate Presiding Officer: ___________________________ Date: __________
Approved by Provost: ___________________________ Date: __________

* Signatures are required of administrators at each level above that of the immediate supervisor that approve the project prior to submission to CADS.

4/7/2009
April 9, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

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 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Changes to Existing Programs**

E.1.a.1
- FLL MA in Foreign Languages and Literatures, Delete UG courses.

E.1.a.2
- GEOG MA/MS, add GEOG 523 as requirement.

E.1.a.3
- TESOL MA, add LING 559 Introduction to Grad Study in Applied Linguistics as a requirement.

**New Courses**

E.1.a.4
- GEOG 523 Geographic Research and Applications (1)
Applications of theory and method in geography through discussion of faculty research; relates theoretical underpinnings of the discipline to faculty research agendas, broadens perspectives on geographical research questions. Required of all geography graduate students.

E.1.a.5
- HST 514 Graduate Research Colloquium (1)
Provides an opportunity for graduate students in history to engage in presentation and discussion of each other’s work under faculty guidance and to gain exposure to current developments in historical scholarship through presentations of faculty research. May be repeated for credit; however, only a maximum of three credits may be applied to graduate degree requirements. Recommended prerequisites: matriculation in graduate program in History.
E.1.a.6
- LING 559, Introduction to Graduate Study in Applied Linguistics (2)
  Introduction to graduate study in applied linguistics with an emphasis on critical
  reading, writing, and research skills needed for success in the MA TESOL
  program. Recommended prerequisite: Post-bac status.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.a.7
- CH 662, Chemical Kinetics, (3) - change credit hours to 4
E.1.a.8
- STAT 571, Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis, (3) - change prerequisites.

School of Social Work

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.9
- SW 540, Human Behavior in the Social Environment: Micro Theory, (3) - change
  course description.
April 9, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown
    Interim-Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

    Richard Beyler
    Chair, Graduate Council

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

The following proposals have been approved by the University 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.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.1

- Bi 431/531 Recombinant DNA Techniques Laboratory (2) – change prerequisite to include Bi 235.

**School of Fine and Performing Arts**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.b.2

- ARCH 450/550, Advanced Architectural Structures, (4) - change course number to Arch 467/567, and prerequisites.

E.1.b.3

- ARCH 480/580, 481/581, 482/582 Architectural Design Studio VII, VIII, IX, (6,6,6) - change course number (separating 400 from 500 level) to Arch 580, 581, 582 and prerequisites.

E.1.b.4

- MUS 420/520, Analytical Techniques, (3) – separate 400 level from 500 level, change course numbers to Mus 422 Analytical Techniques (3) and Mus 520 Analytical Techniques (3), and change descriptions.

E.1.b.5

- MUS 481/581, 482/582, 483/583, Pedagogy, (3,3,3) – separate 400 level from 500 level, change course numbers to Mus 481, 482, 483 Pedagogy (3,3,3) and Mus 571, 572, 573 Pedagogy (3,3,3), and change course descriptions.

[end]
May 4, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown,
Interim 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.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.1.

- BA/BS in Communication Studies –
  - Changes the total number of required credits for the major from 56 to 64.
  - Adds and drops specific Communication courses in the requirements section.
  - Changes the number of required upper-division communication studies courses from 24 to 36 of which at least 16 must be in courses numbered 400 and above.
  - Reduces number of credits from 12 to 8 allowed from Communication studies courses numbered from 410 through 409.

E.1.c.2.

- BA in Geology –
  - Adds the BS option to the current BA.
  - Changes the name of the degree from BA in Geology to BA/BS in Earth Science.
  - Adds G203/G206 Historical Geology/Historical Geology Lab, G 314 Petrology, and G 318 Processes of Surface Environment as requirements.
  - Drops G 324 Computer Applications & Info Technology and G 322 Global Biogeochemical Cycles from required courses.
  - Replaces list of allowable courses with a general statement that excludes courses. The number of credits in this group remains at 12.
  - Changes in supporting classes provide a greater definition of expectations and are more closely aligned with the Integrated Science program.
  - Changes total number of required credits from 98-103 to 90-100.

E.1.c.3.

- BS in Geology –
  - Adds the BA option to the current BS.
- Adds G203/G206 Historical Geology/Historical Geology Lab, G 434 Structural Geology and Tectonics, and G 435 Stratigraphy and Sedimentation as requirements.
- Drops G 322 Global Biogeochemical Cycles from required courses.
- Changes total number of required credits from 109-114 to 110-115.

New courses

E.1.c.4.
- Comm 200 Principles of Communication (4)
  Introduces the skills and concepts students need for literacy in communication and provides a broad introduction to the perspectives on communication that will be encountered in upper-division Communication courses. Prerequisite for Comm 311, Comm 316, and Comm 326.

E.1.c.5.
- Comm 316 Individual and Social Relationships in Communication (4)
  This course provides students an in-depth look at social and relational approaches to Communication. This is one of three 300-level courses required for the Communication major, and provides the foundation for success in all 400-level Communication courses. Prerequisite: Comm 200.

E.1.c.6.
- Comm 326 Communication, Society, and Culture (4)
  This course provides students an in-depth look at social, cultural and institutional approaches to communication. This is one of three 300-level courses required for the Communication major, and provides the foundation for success in all 400-level Communication courses. Prerequisite: Comm 200.

E.1.c.7.
- G 203 Historical Geology (3)
  Earth’s history as revealed through the rock and fossil record. Emphasis on the physical and biological changes exhibited through time. Recommended prerequisites: G 201, G 202. Requires concurrent enrollment in G 206.

E.1.c.8.
- G 206 Historical Geology Lab (1)
  Earth’s history as revealed through the rock and fossil record. Emphasis on the physical and biological changes exhibited through time. Lab exercises stress the studies of fossils. Concurrent enrollment in G 203 required.

E.1.c.9.
- G 346 Exploring Mars (4)
  On-line course centered on the ongoing exploration of Mars. Topics follow an exploration timeline and include Mars’ geology, climate, potential for life, and habitability. Recommended prerequisites: G 201.

Changes to existing courses

E.1.c.10.
- G 435 Stratigraphy (4) – Change course title to Stratigraphy and Sedimentation; change credits from 4 to 5; change description.
Change to existing program
E.1.c.11.

- Minor in Real Estate Development –
  - Adds USP/Fin 360 Real Estate Finance I to required courses.
  - Drops USP 448 Real Estate Market Analysis from required courses.
  - Removes some courses from electives list.
  - Required credits for minor remain at 31.

New courses
E.1.c.12.

- PA 414 Civic Engagement: The Role of Social Institutions (4)
  Develops understanding of the role social institutions (nonprofit, public interest, volunteer) organizations play within the larger scheme of the American democratic system. Examines how socially sustainable communities are dependent on strong social institutions and their relationships with governing structures. Recommended prerequisite: PA 311.

Undergraduate Studies
E.1.c.12

Delete Cluster Courses from Approved List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 316U</td>
<td>Traditional East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 410U</td>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 417U</td>
<td>Indians of North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArH 429U</td>
<td>Women in the Visual Arts I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArH 430U</td>
<td>Women in the Visual Arts II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 303U</td>
<td>Chicana/Latina Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 380U</td>
<td>Latinos in the Economy and Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 399U</td>
<td>The History of Race in the New World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLA 399U</td>
<td>Working with Latino Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Ancient Greek Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Early Medieval Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Plato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Roman Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Roman Literature in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Medieval Vernacular Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 399U</td>
<td>Selected Topics: (e.g., French Civilization: Napoleon to WWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 407U</td>
<td>Selected Topics: (e.g., French Civilization: Napoleon to WWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 410U</td>
<td>Selected Topics: (e.g., French Civilization: Napoleon to WWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 407U</td>
<td>Seminar: Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 410U</td>
<td>Urban Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 399U</td>
<td>American Values/Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 399U</td>
<td>Culture, Religion, Politics: Jews and Judaism in America since WWII (344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 399U</td>
<td>Topics in Chinese Literature and Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 410U</td>
<td>Major Works: Variety of Topics (when content is appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 410U</td>
<td>Women in African History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 441U</td>
<td>American Environmental History II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 462U</td>
<td>Amazon Rainforest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 463U</td>
<td>Modern Brazilian History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 497U</td>
<td>Film and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 399U</td>
<td>African History Since 1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 399U</td>
<td>African History Before 1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 399U</td>
<td>Traditional Cultures of Africas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 410U</td>
<td>African Development Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 410U</td>
<td>Caribbean Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 410U</td>
<td>Politics of East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 410U</td>
<td>Japanese Anime: Memory, Nostalgia and Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 452U</td>
<td>Japanese Traditional Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER 331U</td>
<td>Persian Literature in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH 365U</td>
<td>Fractals, Chaos and Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE 410U</td>
<td>Topics in Health Promotions Campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE 410U</td>
<td>Women’s Health: Social and Biological Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 327U</td>
<td>Introduction to Quantitative Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 399U</td>
<td>American Values/Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 399U</td>
<td>Selected Topics (when content is appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 410U</td>
<td>Topic: Enfermedad Y on Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 348U</td>
<td>Science, Gender and Social Context II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 399U</td>
<td>Lesbian Space in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 407U</td>
<td>Family/Sex/Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Women’s Health: Social and Biological Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Women in East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Medieval Works in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Women in African History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Gender and Difference in Popular Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Women in Contemporary Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Medieval Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Power and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 410U</td>
<td>Psychology of Men and Masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 428U</td>
<td>Lesbian History in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 429U</td>
<td>Women in the Visual Arts I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 430U</td>
<td>Women in the Visual Arts II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 431U</td>
<td>Women in the Visual Arts III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 432U</td>
<td>Issues in Gender and Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 443U</td>
<td>British Women Writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 445U</td>
<td>American Women Writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 452U</td>
<td>Gender and Race in the Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 479U</td>
<td>Women and Organizational Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Text to be added underlined; text to be deleted struck through; text to be moved in italics.

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY
4) STANDING COMMITTEES

b) Teacher Education Committee. This committee shall operate on the general promise that teacher education is an all-university activity and responsibility. Specifically, teacher education programs are the responsibility of the Graduate School of Education, but many other units provide undergraduate programs that provide the subject matter content and other prerequisites required of applicants to the GSE teacher preparation program. In addition, other units provide a graduate course of study that includes licensure specific to their professional area.

The Teacher Education Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to coordinate the activities of the several schools, colleges and departments of the University which are directly involved in teacher education. It shall provide a communication link between the Graduate School of Education and those departments within the total University concerned with teacher education. The Committee shall analyze and make recommendations about teacher education program development and changes. It also shall deliberate and advise the School of Education on problems of admissions, graduation and academic standards and matters referred to by the Graduate School of Education, the University Senate, the University Faculty, or divisions of any of these units. Its activity, however, is not limited to referrals. It may initiate inquiries or recommendations from its own observations. The Committee shall report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

The Teacher Education Committee serves in an advisory capacity to coordinate the teacher preparation activities of the campus by providing a communication link between the Graduate School of Education and other units.

The Teacher Education Committee is specifically charged to (1) ensure that the subject matter content and prerequisites address relevant state and national standards, (2) provide input on admissions requirements, (3) facilitate the development of clear pathways to admission to Graduate School of Education teacher preparation programs, and (4) assist in the recruitment of teacher candidates. The committee shall report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

Membership. The Committee shall consist of sixteen seventeen members of the University Faculty, representative of each of the following departments or programs educating teacher candidates:
Business Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education and Counseling, Special Education, Counselor Education, Educational Leadership and Policy, Foundations of Administrative Studies, Educational Leadership and Policy, Community Health, Art, Speech and Hearing Sciences, English, Foreign Languages, the combined
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social science departments (Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology), the combined science departments (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Environmental Science and Management, and Physics), Engineering and Computer Science, Mathematics, Mathematics and Statistics, Theater Arts, Music, and Child and Family Studies, and two students recommended by the ASPSU Senate.

The Dean and Assistant Associate Dean of academic Affairs of the Graduate School of Education, and the Education Librarian, and the Assistant Dean for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences shall be ex-officio non-voting members, with the Assistant Associate Dean serving as committee secretary. One of the sixteen faculty voting members shall serve as chairperson. Each department of the University which educates teacher candidates is encouraged to create its own teacher education committee to work with the University Teacher Education Committee and with the Graduate School of Education.

Rationale

1) The definition of the TEC was revised to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the committee regarding teacher preparation and to simplify the language in the document.

2) The changes to the membership section reflect current University department names and position titles of ex-officio non-voting members.

April 16, 2009

Faculty Senate Member Signatures:
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Article IV: Organization of the Faculty

4) Standing Committees

m) Educational Policy Committee. The Educational Policy Committee shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Committee shall be composed of the chairperson of the Budget Committee, plus five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each of the other divisions, one classified member of PSU, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate). The chairperson shall be selected from the membership by the Committee on Committees. The Provost, the Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning shall serve as consultants at the request of the Committee. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee.

The Committee shall:

1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.

2) Take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, with appropriate consultation with other interested faculty committees, and with timely report or recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

3) Receive and consider Make recommendations to the Senate concerning the approval of proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, or other significant academic entities. All proposals must use the Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units.

4) In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University.

5) Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.

6) Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.

7) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term.

Rationale

These two changes are related to the proposed change in the process for the approval of the establishment, abolition and alteration of academic units.

1) The first change copies the initial language of one of the charges of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This is to make the new approval role of EPC clearer (like UCC's approval role in undergraduate curriculum matters).

2) The second change makes clear that divisions, centers, and institutes are significant academic entities. Currently that can be inferred from the title of the processes for the approval of academic units, but the new process has a generic title. There is thus nothing explicit that indicates the status of divisions, centers, or institutes.
Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)
Annual Report
Date: April 15, 2009

Members, 2008-2009
Heejun Chang, GEOG (Fall, Wntr)
Linda George, ESR (Spring)
Martha W. Hickey, FLL/INTL – Chair
Agnes Hoffman, ADM
Becki Ingersoll, UASC
Sukhwant Jhaj, UNST
Jane Mercer, SCH
Robert Mercer, CLAS
Louise Paradis, CARC
Ariel Shultz, student member (Wntr, Spr)
Wendy Stewart, LIB

Consultants
Shawn Smallman, OAA
Mary Ann Barham, UASC
Angie Garbarino, ARR

The ARC held its first formal meeting on October 13, 2008. From September 15, 2008 through March 31, 2009 ARC reviewed 195 petitions. Of those, 181 were granted, 14 were denied. For the four terms of the 2007-2008 academic year, ARC processed 377 petitions (down from 811 in 06-07).

The majority of petitions were for University Studies waivers, primarily at the cluster level, but there were also a fair number of requests to extend eligibility for the 2001-02 catalog. In early February 2009, ARC sent a memo to the UASC list serve and departmental advisers and chairs regarding the expiration of the 2001-02 catalog and along with it the possibility of using courses with the major prefix (including cross-listed courses) to satisfy cluster requirements.

ARC presented two motions for Senate consideration and these were adopted:

1) University Studies recommended the removal of the Transfer Transition requirement, a course designed as a replacement for FRINQ for Freshmen transfer students:
   - The Transfer Transition requirement for Freshmen transfer students (incoming students with 30-44 credits) will end, effective Winter term, 2009.

ARC concurred that course had come to more closely resemble a SINQ, both in terms of the student population served and instruction (and was often petitioned to count this way). The change is retroactive and applies to all currently admitted students. In conjunction with the elimination of Transfer Transition, ARC agreed that a newly designed 2-credit hybrid course for incoming advanced transfer students that was to be piloted winter and spring terms 2009 could substitute for a sophomore inquiry course for participating students required to take 2 or more SINQs (for the pilot terms only).
2) After consultation with PSU Admissions, Math and English departments, the ARC agreed to propose three changes to PSU admission requirements (beginning with the 2010-11 catalog):

- Entering transfer students with 30 or more credit hours will be required to have taken one writing course beginning with Writing 121 or its equivalent with a grade of C- or above.

- Freshmen students who have met all subject requirements but whose entry GPA is lower than 3.0 will no longer be admitted alternatively on the sole basis of minimum 1000 SAT (Math+ Critical Reading) or 21 ACT scores.

- For admission to PSU the minimum overall average score for the Five Subtests on the GED examination will become 580.

ARC considered and rejected a change to the Math admissions requirement which would have differentially affected PSU admitted Freshmen and Transfer students. But the writing requirement change creates a better balance of expectations for the two populations. There is an explicit focus on developing writing skills for Freshmen in the FRINQ sequence that has not been required at the lower-division level of Transfer students. (In addition, the Oregon Transfer Module stipulates two courses of college-level composition, so more students apply now with Writing 121 or its equivalent.)

With respect to the other two changes for entering Freshman, some concern was voiced about the mixed message regarding PSU’s historically open admissions. However, given current data on first-year student retention and success, ARC reached consensus on the changes recommended to standards for assessing college readiness. Agnes Hoffman reported that the alternative “matrix” of factors that PSU Admissions uses if grade point is below 3.0 (that includes SAT scores as one factor) has been demonstrated to be a better predictor of student success than relying solely on SAT or ACT scores. ARC also agreed that PSU’s currently published minimum GED score of 460 was far too low and noted that all OUS institutions require an average of 510 or more (with 580 the standard for OSU and U of O). In both cases, non-admitted students can still apply as transfer students.

In April ARC will be reviewing a report from Greg Jacob (ENG, Director of Writing) that calls for implementation of a university-wide writing requirement for possible referral to the Senate.
Date: April 13, 2009

To: Faculty Senate
From: Greg Jacob, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletic Board (IAB)
Members: Grant Farr, Walt Fosque, Chris Monsere, Pat Squire, Erica Lee-Johnson (student),
and Andrew Fuller (student); Ex-Officio: Chris Moore, Torre Chisholm, Barbara Dearing,
and Bob Lockwood.

Re: Annual Report

(The IAB shall 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, and the IAB shall report to the
Faculty Senate at least once each year.)

A special Task Force was created to look at the wrestling program. The memo asked for a
comprehensive report from the group by 2/16, and gave four options for the group to
consider: 1) keep program as is; 2) provide additional funding; 3) maintain NCAA status but
eliminate funding; and 4) convert the program to a club sport. After several weeks of
meetings and open forums, the Task Force recommended to the President that wrestling be
converted to a club sport.

On February 19 the committee approved the revised policy of the Student-Athlete Financial
Aid Appeals Process. See Bob Lockwood for details.

The IAB committee approved the 60% Task Force report, which will now be forwarded to
the President for consideration and action. The report is a long-term plan for improving
student-athlete graduation rates, so it would be acceptable to phase-in the various
recommendations overtime. The recommendations include a mixture of adjustments within
Athletics, partnership activities with other campus units, and funding requests for important
student-athlete support programs. They cover financial aid, academic advising, study hall,
coaches’ awareness of the program, life and educational skill programs, support for post-
graduation and post-eligibility planning, and partnership with PSU faculty.

The Task Force recommends using annual APR numbers as a short-term success
measurement tool for the recommendations. The APR scores eligibility and retention from
term to term and year to year. Many of the recommendations are intended to improve
student-athlete success and progress towards degrees. While not perfectly aligned, these
improvements will show positive results in APR scores. It might also be worthwhile for
Athletics to host a second round of student-athlete focus groups after the various
recommendations have been implemented for a year to determine which changes are having
the most impact.
The Task Force's charge called for discussion and consideration for the implementation of the recommendations. Many of the recommendations directly under Athletics control have already been put in place. Athletics will initiate discussions on the recommendations that necessitate partnership and cooperation from other campus units; however, positive action will likely require Presidential leadership to the involved units. The Task Force understands that the financial recommendations are problematic given the current budget climate. The total combined recommendations have an annual cost of $387,240, of which $282,000 could be funded by fee remission. Additionally, there is $82,250 in recommended one-time expenses. Athletics has taken the lead in securing some of these funds from the Student Fee Committee and was allotted $136,000 for 2009-10.

Given, the various challenges related to implementation, the Task Force recommends the creation of an Implementation Committee to plan and oversee this process. The Committee would be comprised of five (5) members of the Task Force and would meet quarterly over the next two academic years to verify that the recommendations are enacted.

The Task Force members appreciate the opportunity to be a part of this review and planning. The process was educational and informative. The Athletic program is a source of pride and distinction for the University, and it is appropriate that Portland State display a commitment to student-athlete success. The recommendations above represent the University's commitment to the academic portion of their experience. Please accept them with the Task Force's full recommendation.

The IAB also discussed were the changes to the academic monitoring program. In a continuing effort to enhance academic performance, improve retention, and promote graduation, student athletes who have demonstrated academic difficulties at Portland State will be required to attend additional monitored study hall hours. These students will be required to meet more frequently with the athletic academic advising staff, subject specific tutors, and the faculty athletic representative. The academic advising staff, located in the Stott Center, will also be expanding their efforts to keep in contact with faculty who have these students in their courses.
To: Faculty Senate  
Re: Library Committee Annual Report 2008-2009  
April 10, 2009  
Chair: Evguenia Davidova  
Committee members: Rudy Barton, Micki Caskey, Matt Livengood, Kathleen Merrow, Donna Philbrick, Ed Zaron, PJ Houser (student), Alexis Arrabito (student).  
Resource persons: Helen Spalding, Tom Raffensperger, Claudia Weston

The Library Committee, enlarged with six new members, began its meetings at the end of Fall Term and focused its attention on prospective budget cuts and several other issues, such as the Library quality survey (LibQUAL), the new Summit borrowing system, and safety and security.

**LibQUAL Survey**
Portland State Library participated in its third LibQUAL+ survey in Fall 2008 (previous surveys conducted in 2003 and 2006). The LibQUAL+ survey is sponsored by the Association for Research Libraries (ARL) and measures users’ perceptions of service quality; more than 500 libraries have participated worldwide. Some of the more salient results include:

- Library has improved in the eyes of undergraduate and graduate students since 2006
- Faculty and staff are not satisfied with the accessibility of Library resources or collections
- Information resources and tools for access are priorities for library users and are also the least satisfactory dimension
- Survey results accurately reflect library buying trends. Due to increasing publishing costs and budget restraints, the Library will not be able to satisfy faculty desires and focuses first on fulfilling undergraduate needs.
- Over time (2003-2008) expectations regarding electronic and print collections, ease of access, and a user-friendly website have increased.
- Expectations of and satisfaction with "Library as Place" are low. Students in particular request more and better Library space.

Detailed information can be found at [http://library.pdx.edu/surveymain.html](http://library.pdx.edu/surveymain.html).

The survey analysis captures both trends: an increased library use and users’ expectations as well as Library’s struggles to provide access to new and more resources due to already existing budget constrains.

**Budget Reduction**
The University Library faces a 12.5% (or more) budget cut in fiscal year 2009-10. Depending upon the 2009-11 budget the Library may have to take the following measures, with significant negative impacts on collections and services.

**Collections**
The Library $3,320,616 acquisitions budget may be reduced by $550,000 (-16%) in the project budget cut for which the Library is planning for the 2009-2011 biennium. The included graph (below) illustrates that with projected base materials budget allocations for 2009/10 below the 1998 level (in 1997/98 the Library received $2,842,549 in base funding), the Library’s purchasing power will be 40% of that needed to sustain 1998 levels of acquisition. Already in 2006, for example, Portland State Library's materials budget fell short of its comparators’ average by over $1.3 million. As a result of this reduction, greater emphasis will be placed on resources that meet the general information needs of the University community and less will be available for department-specific purposes. The consequences of potential cuts in the Library’s materials budget include:

- Fewer resources supporting University research goals in general, and particularly lessening the University’s ability to contribute to innovations in emerging science, technology, and entrepreneurship in a global economy.
• Reduced ability to support selected programs that establish the University’s leadership in areas such as Sustainability.

The impact of this severely limited ability to subscribe for major journals and databases will affect faculty in both access to current research and exposure of PSU student body to the latest achievements in disciplinary fields. For example, the Library does not subscribe to *The Journal of Biomechanics* due to its high cost (currently $4,033/year). It is one of the most important journals in its field. One faculty member in MME had 80 outstanding ILL requests for articles from this journal last year. The cost to the Library to request all of those articles would have been $1,600. The reason for the existing disproportionate disciplinary allocations for the science and technology can be attributed more directly to the cost of library materials than Portland State’s research base. During the 1980s and 1990s, the average price for science and technology journals inflated at a much higher rate than those in the arts and humanities and social sciences. As this trend continued, the portion of the materials budget allocated to science and technology grew while others shrank. This phenomenon was experienced by libraries throughout the world, not just Portland State.

The ramifications of these budget cuts also minimize the use of web links to articles from the PSU Databases in our syllabi and entail either impoverishment of teaching materials, or a drastic transfer of the cost upon students, or some form of violation of copyright regulations, or a combination of all. The Library Committee is worried about the scale of budget reduction that will affect not only research opportunities for faculty and graduate students but also successful retention of undergraduate students.

### PSU Library Acquisitions Budget Required to Maintain FY98 Buying Power Vs Actual

The graph shows the comparison between the actual acquisitions budget and the budget needed to maintain the FY98 buying power from 1997-98 to 2009-10.

### Library Personnel Reductions

Currently, Library staff is only 72% of the average of Portland State's peer institutions. The library has a staffing level of 5.75 per 1000 FTE students enrolled. The average staffing level among "Urban 21" academic libraries is 8.32 per 1000 FTE. Almost one million people use the Millar Library.
annually, and many more visit the Library's web site, telephone, and email for assistance. At the same time the number of hours open per week (93.5) is about 8% less than average and the annual visitor count is 6% higher than average. (Source: NCES Academic Libraries Survey 2006). This current level of under-staffing makes additional cuts in personnel very difficult without fundamentally reducing services and access.

The Library may need to eliminate, through attrition, three faculty librarian positions and reassign less experienced/specialized library faculty. The result will be a reduction in service levels while the replacements retool their skills. Possible layoffs of up to four classified staff will have a negative impact on turnaround time of materials processing, access to information resources, technology support, and organizational response to student and faculty needs. Circulation of materials, acquisitions of materials, inter-library borrowing, course reserves processing, re-shelving, and other services to students and staff will take longer.

Moreover, a potential cut of over 8,000 hours of student employee time will reduce Library hours, limiting student, faculty, and community access to library services and collections. The Library is the one of the largest public academic spaces at Portland State, and also houses a US Federal Depository Library that serves State and Federal institutions, non-profit organizations, and the public.

These cuts will reduce the Library's ability to effectively support student success, scholars' ability to achieve global excellence, and the University's ability to realize technology-based efficiencies and innovations.

**Summit Regional Catalog**

Summit is the library catalog for the Orbis Cascade Alliance, a consortium composed of academic libraries in the Pacific Northwest. Summit provides access to over 27 million items and is a popular and efficient way to significantly increase access to materials. In 2008, the previous technical platform for the Summit system became unavailable, requiring development of a new system for regional resource sharing. This highly complex task continues to require intensive staff time and significant changes to work flow and communications. The new beta Summit 2.0 catalog went live on December 1, 2008 and development will be completed in mid-2009. Some significant changes to Summit include:

- The Summit Catalog address, http://summit.orbiscascade.org/, will continue to work through a redirect temporarily, but the new address is: http://summit.worldcat.org/. Faculty members are advised to change links and bookmarks accordingly.
- For a limited time, renewal of Summit items is not possible. However, the initial loan period for regular materials has been expanded from three weeks to six weeks to try to make this change less disruptive. As soon as feasible, the capacity for renewing loans will be restored.
- Temporarily, direct links to Portland State's online journals and e-resources will not be visible in the new Summit system. Instead, please use the Library's local Library Catalog (Vikat) or our local Electronic Journals list to find these direct links.

**Library Safety and Security**

Students, staff, faculty members, and Library employees continue to express concern over security and personal safety in Millar Library. According to Campus Public Safety Office’s (CPSO) crime logs, incidents occurring at the Library have included larceny, burglary, assault, interfering with an officer, indecent exposure, trespass, harassment, aggravated animal abuse, etc. Property crime is common in Millar Library. Students and faculty have expressed particular concern about the basement and upper floors in the evenings. Due to budget cuts, CPSO is no longer able to fund part-time student security “observe and report” coverage at the entrance of the library. This important deterrent activity was scheduled several evenings per week, but has been eliminated. Usually, in all urban academic libraries the security desk is staffed for all open hours. In the coming fiscal year, despite the budget issues related above, the Library will try to re-allocate student worker hours to
provide some coverage of the security desk at the entrance to the Library for both personal safety and loss prevention activities.
On the brighter side is the fact of successful negotiation in leasing a new utility building. The current warehouse, where approximately 380,000 volumes are held, has sub-standard conditions for materials and employees.

Recommendations
The Library Committee suggests a careful re-consideration of upcoming Library budget cuts because they will have significant explicit and latent impacts on the quality of teaching and research at Portland State University. With fewer Library resources and staff, University faculty should expect less support for course preparation, reduced access to timely research materials, and a minimum of non-essential functions, such as advice on copyright and intellectual property rights.

The Library Committee encourages faculty members to be pro-active in working with Liaison Librarians assigned to their departments, as this will be necessary to guide the Library through the process of allocating reduced resources in the most equitable manner.

The University must develop a viable funding model for the Library. The current level of funding does not align with, and actually impedes, the University-wide emphasis on increased research and teaching at the graduate level. The Library Committee requests that the Faculty Senate adopts the following resolution:

WHEREAS,
(1) The Library faculty and staff have demonstrated that they are capable of using reduced resources to achieve positive outcomes for the student population at Portland State University;

(2) There is an increasing emphasis on research at Portland State University to support faculty and to increase the quality of both graduate and undergraduate education;

(3) The collections and staff of the Library provide direct support to research at Portland State University; and

(4) Under our current system research overhead funds collected and justified on the basis of library costs are not necessarily allocated towards actual library expenses. The practice of allocating a fixed percentage of overhead funds towards library expenses is not uncommon in other research institutions, such as the Idaho State University.

WE REQUEST that all avenues of library support be fully considered and exploited in-so-far as they support the mission of the Library as a service institution. Particularly, we request that the University allocate a fixed percentage (3%)\(^1\) of research-generated revenue ("F&A" or "overhead") to support the Library.

---

\(^1\) In FY06 3% of grant overhead would have been $179 000.