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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on February 3, 2003, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the January 6, 2003, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   President’s Report & President’s Initiatives Timelines

D. Unfinished Business
   1. Vision, Values and Priorities Recommendations – Burns

E. New Business

F. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   Provost’s Report
   1. Sustainability Initiative Presentation – Shinn, Ervin and Crim
   *2. Curriculum Committee Interim Report – Elteto
   *3. Graduate Council Interim Report – Koch
   4. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Quarterly Report – Burns

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   C President’s Initiatives Timelines
   G2 Curriculum Committee Interim Report
   G3 Graduate Council Interim Report

Secretary to the Faculty
andrewscolliers@pdx.edu • 341CH • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4499
2002-03 Roster: FACULTY SENATE

**** '02-03 SENATE STEERING CMTTEE. ****
Presiding Officer: S. Gelmon
Presiding Officer Pro tem: C. Shinn
Steering Committee: J. Rueter, P. Wetzel, C. Wollner & Jian Wang (Comm on Comm Chair) Ex officio

****** '02-03 PSU FACULTY SENATE ******

Liberal Arts and Sciences
Ames, Kenneth  ANTH  2003
Bleiler, Steven  MTH  2003
*Brower, Barbara (for Gilbert)  GEOG  2003
*Fischer, William (for Holloway)  FLL  2003
*Haaken, Janice (for Reece)  PSY  2003
*Hillman, Stan (for Adajian)  BIO  2003
*Luckett, Tom (for Bjork)  HST  2003
Mercer, Lorraine  ENG  2003
Palmiter, Jeanette  St. John, Primus  ANTH  2005
*Roer, John  SOC  2005
*Shusterman, Gwen  MTH  2005
Wanjala, John  OMB  2005

Engineering and Computer Science
Daasch, W Robert  ECE  2003
Lall, Kent  CE  2003
Casperson, Lee  ECE  2004
Hall, Douglas  ECE  2004
Brown, Cynthia  CMPS  2005
Morris, James  ECE  2005
Spolek, Graig  ME  2005

Fine and Performing Arts
Fosque, Walton  ART  2003
Knights, Clive  ARCH  2004
Kristof, Jane  ART  2004
Agre-Kippenhan, Susan  ART  2005
Wattenberg, Richard  TA  2005

Extended Studies
*Harmon, Steven (for Feeley)  XS-SS  2003
Robinson, Rebecca  XS-IS  2004
Cormman, Patricia  XS  2005

Other Instructional
* __________ (for Labiisse)  UNST  2003
Wollner, Craig  IMS  2004
*Dillon, Grace (for Balshem)  UNST  2005
Wheeler, Lawrence  HON  2005

Social Work
Hunter, Richard  SSW  2003
Balbott, Maria  SSW  2003
Lehman, Constance  SSW  2004
Nissen, Laura  SSW  2004
*Nash, James  SSW  2005

Urban and Public Affairs
Brodowicz, Gary  PHE  2003
Shinn, Craig  PA  2003
Gelman, Sherrill  PA  2004
Jolin, Annette  JUST  2004
Gelles, Ema  PA  2005
*N Prince, Tracy (for Michael)  UPA  2005
Seltzer, Ethan  IMS  2005

Interim appointments indicated with a star
January 14, 2003
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 6, 2003
Presiding Officer: Sherril Gelmon
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Fountain for Butler, Ruedas for Hillman, Schmidt for King, Burchard for Peigah.

Members Absent: Andres, Bleiler, Brower, Daasch, Dillon, Glanville, Haaken, Hunter, Jivanjee, Johnson, Kretovich, Lall, Lehman, Luckett, Mercer, O'Halloran, Palmier, Pfeiffer, Prince, Rhee, St. John, Talbott, Thompson.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of December 2, 2002, were approved with the following corrections:

- November 4, 2002, Butler was present.
- December 2, 2002, Butler was present.

In the attachment for the January 6, 2003 agenda, "D-2", which was proposed at the previous meeting, there are two typos. Under 3), b), replace the second to the last word "is" with the word "in." Under 3), c), replace the word "adapt" with the word "adopt."
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C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Additions to today's Agenda:

- C. Announcements: "Vice President for University Relations"
- F. Question Period: "1. Question for Administrators - for President Bernstine"

Deletions to today's Agenda:

- G. 3 President's Initiatives Timelines

Changes in Senate/committee memberships since Dec. 6, 2002:

- Lynn Santelmann, LING, replaces Tom Biolsi as CLAS Senator.
- John Erdman replaces Mark Gregory on the Library Committee.

Convocation will take place on January 16, 2003, at 1600 in Smith Memorial Union Ballroom.

PSU Advocates Legislative Training Day is Saturday, January 10, 2003. For questions, call Patricia Squire, ALUM.

The Presiding Officer recognized Julie Schmid, AAUP Chapter Coordinator, who leaves PSU on January 15, 2003, to join the national office of AAUP, and thanked her for her good works here. Applause.

The Presiding Officer noted that the Steering Committee has considered the resolution forwarded by William Fischer, CLAS faculty senator. The committee felt that this resolution does not substantially differ from the resolution passed in October nor does it move the issue forward in any way.

President's Report

BERNSTINE noted that at Convocation, he plans to outline some measures to be put in place to help us reposition the university and continue our upward trajectory, despite the outcome of the ballot measure. We are trying to get ahead of the curve in terms of our projections for state support, both in the short term and the long term.
BERNSTINE introduced Chancellor Richard Jarvis, noting that he will be teaching at PSU in Spring 2003.

Chancellor's Report

JARVIS discussed where we are going in the next legislative session. We had a tough fall, including notice from the OSSHE Board in December that we must take another reduction in January because of November revenue projections. The system as a whole is short by $60 million from where we left the last legislative session. Should Measure 28 be unsuccessful, that will represent a further reduction to the OUS system of another $27 million, approximately. Conceivably, there could be an $88 million reduction by February or March, which is 10-11% of the OUS system budget. To put this in context, if we look at the 1990's, there were significant budgetary advances, and substantial enrollment growth. The budget of the system went up slightly over 30 points in terms of state appropriated dollars. However, the budget adjusted for inflation showed a 4% decrease, while enrollment went up by approximately 17%. That represents a 20-point swing in terms of the productivity of the OUS system. We are in a very dire budgetary circumstance. The question will be how are we going to meet and continue both access and quality, and preserve an infrastructure on which we depend. We must make that case clearly and convincingly in the upcoming legislative session. We must establish the fact that, much as we want to, we are in a budgetary circumstance which is making that increasingly difficult to do. We have to make the quality of our operations a key part of the discussions this spring, and make very clear what we mean by that.

It is good that there is strong demand for our programs and our institutions, and there is more potential demand than we have as yet acknowledged. The current budget situation is suppressing citizens' demand, due to increased tuition and reduced financial aid. It is very important for us to be clear that we know what quality means in the academic enterprise, and that we know what it takes to deliver quality academic programs. We need to look to a longer future and get a commitment out of this spring's efforts. The governor's budget proposals will be very limited because they are controlled by revenue, however, we have to move that discussion on and focus it back towards access, quality, and growth.

RUETER asked what measures should be used to demonstrate quality. JARVIS stated that we consider a simple and pragmatic approach. There will be two or three more restricted budget cycles, and we have to make it clear that we know there is a relationship between the amount of students we are serving and our ability to serve them in ways we believe are appropriate to the enterprise. There are various measures, for example, retention, the number of students graduated, the number of students admitted to graduate schools, the performance of the faculty with respect to teaching and research productivity, comparisons with peer institutions, etc. That is all that any sector of state government is capable of doing; we talk about the ability to deliver service in a timely way, the satisfaction of clientele, and the reputational standing among and in comparison to our peers. Absent a perfect measure, a group of
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measures can show that we are on a positive trajectory when we are funded at a reasonable level. When funding dwindles and enrollment increases, we come under too much pressure. Establish the relationship between numbers and the ability to deliver the full range of services. We need to have good answers.

HICKEY asked, in making the case for preserving quality, if there is a list of core elements that must be maintained. JARVIS stated we would proceed as usual, for example, by examining our vision statement, and our teaching, research and service missions, service being the toughest to enumerate in many ways. We continue to enroll students, but the question is whether it is a different group of students as we become less and less affordable.

HICKEY asked if direction would be given on programs such as the Bend expansion, engineering initiatives, etc. JARVIS stated that leadership is always drawn into judgments about targeted programs when they want to get the conversation back to the base budget. Targeted programs, for example engineering, are relatively small additions to the base budget. It is useful to build on the success of engineering, not least because of the business community support, but it is a small piece of the entire system of 76-78 thousand students. A danger is to get drawn into the specifics of targeted programs, which are like easy little sound bites. Lastly, the value of faculty themselves, and the anecdotal input they make to the legislative process should not be underestimated.

SHUSTERMAN noted that in the recent budget crisis in California, it became virtually impossible to complete a degree in less than five years, and we are very close to no longer being able to offer four year degree as well. Is might be useful to run those numbers for the legislature. JARVIS agreed and continued that when we speak of access, that translates in most people’s minds as a student who can't get into a particular institution, but that we also need to express it with respect to getting through and out of a particular institution.

_______ asked if there is a possibility of enrollment caps, and a conflict with respect to educating Oregonians versus out-of-state students. JARVIS stated that “enrollment caps” is a politically charged concept. Enrollment is capped by costs, for example the opportunity grant is providing 11% of college costs for less than half the individuals who quality for it. A sign that says “Don’t Apply” is one of many ways to keep students out. The reality is, whether we are providing access with respect to finances, scheduling, programs, etc. Given our funding levels, we are overstressed and overstretched. Campus by campus, we have to look at what programs we can admit students to, where we can responsibly let them in, and how they can work their way through each institution. Enrollment will get more constrained in the short term. The biggest worry, however, is that there is no commitment from the state to go beyond this. If the state is not willing to forecast the long term, it can at least make a commitment to providing access to all academically qualified Oregonians, or make a commitment to when you can get to that position. The analysis that went into the projected enrollment of 100,000 students by 2010 was somewhat generalized,
however, it moves the argument in the direction of having the discussion and making the necessary commitments.

RAFFO asked how the Chancellor would make the case for university versus social programs? JARVIS stated that he only makes the case for higher education, and does not bring other worthy causes into it. We want to be a set of solutions for some of the state's problems, and do not want to compete with the others. This includes the community colleges, and K-12. The best thing we can do is to be clear that we represent the public good and that this is a public investment. Additionally, we should not be bracketed by the notion that students should foot the bill themselves, or that we should be privatized.

WALLACE stated that students have been working very hard, and looking at the deal very critically. The students have a perspective that is different than that of the Chancellor, although they are working with the Chancellor.

Naming of Epler Residence Hall

WITHERS announced that the Naming Committee has named the residence hall currently under construction on the site of the former Birmingham building. It will be named Epler Residence Hall, for Stephen Epler, the founding director of Vanport. This recognition fulfills the longtime wishes of a number of university supporters, to recognize Stephen Epler’s visionary contribution to the development of PSU.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, m)

WETZEL/BURNS MOVED the Senate take the item off the table.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

The Presiding Officer opened the floor for debate.

HICKEY noted that the effect of the amendment is to suppress the planning component of the committee charge.

GELMON noted that the Steering Committee doesn’t want the committee to become dormant when planning is not going on, as happened recently. Whether or not the amendment passes, the committee feels that the Senate needs to reanimate the committee.

SHINN noted that planning is obviously a priority and is not being neglected.

KETCHESON stated the committee would still have trouble as to what it is supposed to do; therefore, it is important to keep planning in the foreground.
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GELMON noted that conditions have changed recently, and there are several issues not related to planning that are already in place for this committee to take up. We are currently experiencing a gap around issues of educational policy.

KETCHESON noted she reiterated her previous comment.

ROSENGRANT asked for a clarification regarding the membership on the committee of the Budget Committee Chair. GELMON noted that budgetary issues are directly linked to educational policy, especially in the current climate. This is not a change in committee membership.

CABELLY noted he is in favor of reactivating the committee, but is uncomfortable with the elimination of the words “university” and “planning.”

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION PASSED by the required two-thirds majority vote, 48 in favor, 17 against, and 4 abstentions.

SHINN/BURNS MOVED the Senate reactivate the committee as re-named.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

2. Vision, Values and Priorities Recommendations

WETZEL/MANDAVILLE MOVED the Senate take the item off the table.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BURNS noted the ad hoc committee still has not reviewed the unfinished portions of the priorities.

SPOLEK/MANDAVILLE MOVED to table the item.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Issues

REDER presented for the committee. Review of the “SEEMT” report causes the committee to recommend expansion of activity to properly address issues originally presented to them. Other voices need to be heard, so the committee is soliciting feedback via Rueter e-mail (rueterj@pdx.edu), and the Senate Listserv (fsenate@lists.pdx.edu), and will also conduct community forums. Senators are encouraged to submit questions as well as feedback, and additional participation will be welcome.
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals

KOCH presented the proposals for the council.

BURNS/HICKEY MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Non-thesis Option for the M.A. in Anthropology in “E-2.”

RUETER asked what is driving this proposal. AMES (ANTH) noted that the program has a need to expand on the applied side, for example, a tribal project proposal may actually be larger than the traditional thesis. This proposal parallels development in other institutions and states. REDER asked what is the mix of thesis versus non-thesis options in programs. AMES stated that one-half to two-thirds of degrees awarded are with Non-thesis Option.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WETZEL/ELTETO MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE two new Liberal Arts & Sciences courses, SOC 530 and SOC 541 in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MORRIS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE one new Engineering & Computer Sciences course, ECE 559 in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

FOSQUE/AGRE-KIPPENHAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the M.A. in Art History, and one new Art course, ARH 500 in “E-2.”

KOCH noted that the Graduate Council had concerns regarding funding of this degree, but also determined that it didn’t require the additional funding to be initially viable. REDER asked for clarification of the budget. KOCH noted that startup costs include dollars for publicity, library and slides, which are one time. Continued funding for a speaker series would come from a promised gift. The program needs additional funds for TA’s but Graduate council is comfortable that the faculty currently exists to offer the courses.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

SHUSTERMANN presented the proposals for Elteto, who was unable to attend due to illness.
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SHUSTERMAN/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE courses and program changes in Art in “E-2.”

SHUSTERMAN noted that this proposal has already been approved by Art’s national accrediting agency.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHUSTERMAN/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE four course proposals and a course number change in Liberal Arts and Sciences in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHUSTERMAN/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the new minor in Mathematics, Mathematics for Middle School Teachers in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

SHUSTERMAN/WETZEL MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE courses in Music in “E-2.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for Administrators

Submitted on December 30, 2002, for President Bernstine:

The PSU-AAUP Executive Council thought it would be useful for the Faculty Senate to try to get some sense of how the administration will be dealing with the budget crisis ahead (assuming that Ballot Measure 28 fails). I’m sure this will be a topic of discussion at future Senate meetings. However, the following question was submitted to me to try to relay to an appropriate administrator.

Two-part Question
Part A: Assuming that there will be cuts made at PSU, are there programs or units that are exempt from cuts (e.g., Center for Academic Excellence, etc.)?

Part B: If cuts are made, what will be the extent of the university's financial support of athletics?
Gary Brodowicz, PHE

BERNSTINE noted that with respect to the upcoming convocation, he plans to forward a plan whereby we will be able to deal with impending budgetary challenges. With respect to Part A of the question, no particular unit of the university will be exempt from scrutiny, from Athletics to Zoology. Not only will we be looking at things that we do, but also things we don’t do, but may want to
take advantage of in the future. Over the next few months we hope to spend the
time figuring out how to best position the university to take advantages of the
challenges in the future. With respect to Part B, the response is the same; no unit
will be exempt from cuts. On the other hand, however, current costs of units will
not be the only determining factor in continuing our trajectory.

BRODOWICZ noted that discussions from the last Senate meeting seemed to be
affecting morale, which is why the question was forwarded. The President has
responded to AAUP in the meantime, and that action is acknowledged and
appreciated. However, it should be known that morale continues to be an issue.

BERNSTINE noted that there was some apparent confusion around the Athletics
faculty, who didn’t get notices because they don’t require any notice. Other
notice letters met the legal requirement because nobody is to be exempt, and to
reiterate, no programmatic decision have been made.

2. Questions From The Floor For The Chair.

None.

G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND
COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

TETREAULT greeted the assembly and directed attention to the enrollment
management plan, entitled Proposal for Educating Oregon’s Population Center.
It is now on Portfolio Web site, and includes the numbers and rational. We are
now ready to discuss it unit by unit, and as a community. As part of the plan, it
will be returned to the Senate in June with modifications, as may be proposed.

1. Library Committee Progress Report

WALTON introduced the report, after G.2., and yielded to Pfingsten to discuss the
details. The report is available in the Library web site at:

http://www.lib.pdx.edu/about/budget_model/outline.html

PFINGSTEN noted this report is a follow-up to the 2001 Senate Report and is a
proposal in response to issues raised in that report. Public forums are planned
to gather feedback on the recommendations. Details are available with the report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.

2. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of December 5-6
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BURNS presented the report. Draft minutes for the meeting are available on the IFS web site at:

http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/IFS-Min6Dec02.html

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.
## What Happens When a Presidential Initiative Matures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After accreditation, assessment of student learning continues at PSU. The location and infrastructure for these activities to be decided during 2003-2005, based upon experience during the accreditation review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002-2003- All departments engaged in assessment plans; By June 2003, all departments required to have an assessment plan and actively assessing student learning; linked to program review</td>
<td>All academic departments participating in the assessment initiative. Support for assessment: CAE, Graduate students, Associate Dean Liaisons, Assessment Resource Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003-2004- Work on assessment of student learning; self study</td>
<td>4 academic units post holistic-developmental advising plans All academic units complete advising plans by 3/31. IASC student website online DARS implemented Undergraduate Advising Handbook completed.</td>
<td>2004-2005- Student advising oversight committee established to assist departments with their student advising plan implementation. Continue reporting to the Vice Provost for Campus Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-2003- Gather input from campus community on goals International scholarship mini-grants administered Internationalization Faculty Development Activities implemented Korean Case Study completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Sharon Elteto  
Chair, University Curriculum Committee  

RE: Interim Report: University Curriculum Committee  

Current members:  
Sharon Elteto (Chair)  
Mary Ann Barham  
Barabara Brower  
Emily De La Cruz  
Beverly Fuller  
Bill Lepore  
Carol Litzenberger: On leave Fall Term  
Carol Morgaine  
Joy Rhodes  
Rebecca Robinson  
Gwen Shusterman  
Xiaoyu Song:  
Stephen Walton  

Activities for Fall Term 2002  
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee met three times this fall. During the first meeting on October 21, we discussed revising the process for reviewing proposals. The committee decided to divide the proposals with each of us reading in-depth and critiquing a selected number. We discussed the development of a guide or handbook that would provide directions for the reviewing of curriculum materials and, in general, fulfilling the committee’s charge. The UCC members are concerned with continuity and our ability to perform our tasks with a clear understanding of the process. We would also like to suggest redesigning the “Proposal For New Course” form to facilitate the committee’s work.

The second meeting on November 20 was dedicated to Art and Art History proposals. We met with Daniel Pirofsky who discussed changes in the Art program which reflect the need to allocate more resources to graphic design and digital media courses. Since the November meeting when we approved the changes in the Graphic Design program, Dan revealed to us that the NASAD (National Association of Schools of Art and Design) also reviewed this new curriculum and issued a favorable report. We also approved curricular changes in the requirements for Art History majors.

During the third meeting on December 6, we met with Kofi Agorsah and Darrell Millner regarding the proposed Black Studies major. After conferring with Kofi and Darrell, the committee voted to accept their proposal contingent on corrections and modifications. We also discussed other proposals from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and approved a number of them.
December 9, 2002

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate

From: Roy Koch, Chair Faculty Senate

Re: Interim annual report from the Graduate Council

Following is an interim annual report from the Graduate Council for the 2002 calendar year. Another report will be forthcoming at the end of the 2002-03 academic year to begin the academic year cycle.

The Graduate Council, having been a committee appointed on a calendar year basis, has been composed of the following members over the past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>Year served</th>
<th>Academic unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Andrews-Collier</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bowman</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>LIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Briggs</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Danielson</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin Davidson</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Eder</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Fraser</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>AOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gordon-Brannan</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Hillman</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Hoffman</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>AOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Koch</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Luba</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>XS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herm Migliore</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>ENGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Mildner</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>UPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Palmiter</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Philbrick</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reder</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Reece [resigned 9/01]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Shaughnessy</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Wakeland</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>AOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Wattenberg</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Wilde</td>
<td>01-02</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Year served</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shukhrat Arifdjanov</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>prof, M level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Weihoefner</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>clas, D level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would also like to acknowledge the assistance provided by the Committee's ex-officio members, Maureen, Orr-Eldred, William Feyerherm and Linda Devereaux.
Program and Course approvals

The Council has met approximately every other week during that period to address Graduate policy (relatively infrequently) and proposal for new graduate programs, program changes, new courses and course changes (primarily). In addition, a subcommittee of the Council with rotating membership reads and recommends on the disposition of graduate petitions.

Following is a list of new programs and program changes recommended for approval by the Council and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate:

New Programs
- MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies
- MS Materials Science and Engineering
- Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems
- Master of Architecture
- MA Art History

Program Changes
- MA/MS Conflict Resolution
- Master of Urban and Regional Planning
- MA/MS Speech and Hearing
- Ph.D. Social Work and Social Research
- MA/MS Writing – concentration in Book Publishing
- Master of Education
- MA/MS Chemistry

New courses and changes to existing courses
During the past 12 months, the Council has also approved 96 new courses and 27 changes to existing courses (including dropping 2 courses).

Petitions

Subcommittees of the Graduate Council have acted upon a total of 78 petitions. The distribution of these petitions among the various categories is presented in Table 1. This number and the approval rate is consistent with past years as shown in Table 2. Note that the most common petition is the extension of the 1 year limit on incomplete grades while the next most common is the request to waive the 15 credit hour limit on transfer credits.
### Table 1. Petitions acted on by the Graduate Council during the 2001-02 academic year and the results of that action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Petition Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Percent of Total Petitions</th>
<th>Percent Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>INCOMPLETES</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Waive one year deadline for incompleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CREDIT LEVELS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Change from P/NP to letter grade retroactively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DISQUALIFICATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Extend probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Readmission after one year disqualification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TRANSFER CREDITS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Accept non-graded transfer or reserve credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Accept non-graded transfer or reserve credit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>REGISTRATION PROBLEMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Retroactive registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIMITS ON COURSE TYPES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Waive University limit on 501 or 505 courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Waive university limits on omnibus courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>Waive university limits on 800-level courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Historic summary of number of petitions, approval rate and graduate degrees granted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Petitions</th>
<th>Percent approved</th>
<th>Grad Degree Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some policy and procedural issues and future discussion items

Transfer credits
In reviewing the petition categories and approval rates, the Council observed that nearly all petitions for approval of additional transfer credits were approved, bringing the current policy into question. After evaluating the current policy, the Grad Council is developing a proposal for a revised definition of what are currently called transfer credits into pre-admission credits and credits taken at other institutions, the latter of which will be called transfer credits. This proposal should reach the Senate in the next month or two.

Resource and Quality issues and concerns
In the course of discussion, particularly regarding new programs, but also new courses, there were a number of questions that consistently arose. These questions were most often related to the two common and closely related issues of resources and quality.

Budgetary requirements of new programs and courses. When a new program is presented to the Graduate Council for its review, there is almost always a request for some additional resources. Since the proposal has received approval through the Dean’s level, we are forced to assume that any budgetary requirements of the program will be addressed by the Dean. Where the requirements are modest, this is not a problem. Where the request is significant and it is clear the Dean could not address it through reallocation within the unit, the issue becomes more problematic. The Graduate Council cannot simply ignore the fact that there are insufficient faculty to staff a program when evaluating its feasibility and quality of the proposal. Where substantial resources are required for new program, we would like to see commitments for those resources from the appropriate level of the administration.

Faculty resources required to teach new courses and staff graduate programs. In the past year or so we have been asked to approve new courses and a few programs that are supported to some degree by adjunct faculty. Several graduate courses have been proposed and approved that we have no tenure-track or tenured faculty to teach. For a few programs, fixed term faculty support ranges from a portion of the program course requirements to the majority. We are uncomfortable with this situation but, again lacking guidance to the contrary, will continue to deal with this by deferring to the proposing department and school/college.

The quality of the graduate student experience. Related to the issue of budgetary and faculty resources is the issue of the quality of the graduate student experience. Again in evaluating various graduate program course proposal it is clear that many graduate students at Portland State do not have access to courses restricted only to graduate students. It is not clear to the Graduate Council that this is an intention of the faculty or an inadvertent consequence of changing to the 400/500 designation some time ago. Prior to that time, there was a limitation on the number of credits that a graduate student could take in courses that were equivalent to our current 400/500 designation.
In the absence of guidance from the Senate, the Graduate Council will continue with its present practices for approval of program by bringing these issues to the Senate as they arise.