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THE LAST REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE PSU FACULTY SENATE IS JUNE 4, 2007, AT 3:00 P.M. SHARP. PLEASE RESERVE TWO HOURS ON YOUR CALENDAR FOR THIS MEETING AND PROVIDE FOR YOUR ALTERNATE TO ATTEND IF YOU WILL BE ABSENT DURING ANY PORTION OF THE MEETING. IF THE AGENDA IS NOT CONCLUDED, THE MEETING MUST BE CONTINUED ON MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2007, AT 3:00 P.M., IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THE BUSINESS OF THE 2006-07 ACADEMIC YEAR.

In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Senate Agendas are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have sufficient notice of curricular proposals, and time to review and research all action items. If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate.
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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 June 4, 2007, at 15:00 in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 7, 2007, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

*ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER FOR THE 2007-08 PSU FACULTY SENATE

President's Report
Provost's Report

D. Unfinished Business

*ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM, 2007-08 PSU FACULTY SENATE

E. New Business
*1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals – Miksch
*2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals – Ostlund/Miksch
*3. Graduate Council Course Proposals - Ostlund
*4. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, 4., 4) h Teacher Education Committee
*5. Focus the Nation Resolution – Ervin

*ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE 2007-08 PSU FACULTY SENATE

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
*1. University Studies Council – McBride/Latiolais
2. Budget Committee Annual Report – R. Johnson
*3. Educational Policies Committee Annual Report – Hansen
4. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report – Rodriguez
*5. Graduate Council Annual Report – Ostlund
*6. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Annual Report – Miksch
7. Committee on Committees Annual Report - Rueter

H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:
B. Minutes of the May 7, 2007, Meeting
E-1 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Proposals
E-2. Graduate Council and Curriculum Committee Joint Proposals
E-3 Graduate Council Course Proposals
E-4 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV, 4., 4) h Teacher Education Committee
E-5 Focus the Nation Resolution
G-1 University Studies Council
G-3 Educational Policies Committee Annual Report
G-5 Graduate Council Annual Report – Ostlund
G-6 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Annual Report

Secretary to the Faculty
andrewscolliers@pdx.edu • 341CH • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4499
D. SENATE MEETINGS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS SCHEDULE FOR 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE REPORTS</th>
<th>SENATE MEETING*</th>
<th>STEERING COMMITTEE MTG**</th>
<th>WRITTEN ITEMS DUE FOR SENATE MAILING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None Scheduled</td>
<td>November 5, 2007</td>
<td>October 8, 2007</td>
<td>October 11, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports from: Budget Committee Committee on Committees Curriculum Committee Educational Policies Committee Faculty Development Committee Graduate Council University Studies Council</td>
<td>June 2, 2008</td>
<td>May 12, 2008</td>
<td>May 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Senate Meetings are the first Monday of the month during the academic calendar in CH53 (3-5 p.m.)
** Steering Committee meetings are the second Monday of the month during the academic calendar in CH336 (3-5 p.m)
***Note special meeting time in observance of Rev. Martin Luther King Birthday Holiday.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2007
Presiding Officer: Kathi Ketcheson
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Changes to the Agenda:
The President will not make a report.
The Vice President for Finance and Administration will make a report.

Changes in Senate/Committee appointments since April 2, 2007:
T. Dillon, CLAS (ENG) has resigned from the Faculty Senate, eff 4/21/07.
His replacement is Ma-Ji Rhee, FLL.
Provost’s Report

KOCH made several announcements. The State Board approved two graduate certificates in Education, Student Affairs in Higher Education and Teaching Adult Learners. The Chancellor has announced that there will be a PSU Presidential Search, and James Francesconi will chair the search committee.

KOCH continued, the State Board is going through a portfolio review of every campus, checking for mission, and the match of mission to outcomes. In the meantime, they are concerned about approving any new programs while they are undergoing that process. Rather than a moratorium, which was our fear, there is now a new policy in place where any programs coming forward will be carefully scrutinized based on their match to the strategic objectives of the institution, and with regard to their budgetary impact, the budgetary support required, and whether the institution is in a position to provide the support. In this regard, although most programs come up through the faculty, as it should be, there are now these two questions of match to the strategies of the institution, and budgetary implications. In future, we will be providing an internal process for monitoring program development and curricular initiatives, so that we can track them with respect to mission and budget.

KOCH reminded that a survey is being conducted of faculty on Promotion and Tenure experiences. This is the second iteration of a project started by Sherrill Gelmon and Susan Agre-Kippenhan. The deadline will be extended for a week to May 11.

KOCH discussed the Academic Priorities project, briefly reviewing the process and conclusions to date, and the four priorities that were identified (attachment/overhead). With regard to Improving Student Success, we need to improve our retention rate, and we need to do this by enhancing student engagement. This will be the topic of the fall symposium and in conjunction, we have invited AACU President Carol Geary Schneider to visit us. The handout aligns four academic priorities with four directives to support them, and goes on to illustrate how we plan to map the remainder of the effort. The next meeting will be June 1, 2007, 2:30 - 5:00 p.m. This is hard work, however if we can aggregate our efforts so that we can communicate our effectiveness to the external community, it can’t help but benefit both communities.

BURNS asked if PSU could present our portfolio internally before presenting it to the board. KOCH noted he would have every intention of doing that but timing may not permit it; although we are scheduled to present at the October 4-5 board meeting, there is a possibility we will be moved up to the September 6-7 board meeting.

KETCHESON reminded that we have the PSU Portfolio, where much of this information already resides.
Dalton Miller-Jones, State Board of Higher Education

MILLER-JONES noted that one of the significant factors in the retention issue just discussed by the Provost is students’ preparation coming into the university. Part of his responsibility on the state board is serving on a sub-committee around participation and retention, to try to develop a better understanding on the board’s part of what we faculty already know. On May 11, 2007, Friday, there is a meeting in Eugene to review the proposed new Diploma requirements of the State Department of Education. There are some improvements in this proposal, for example increased arts requirements; however, there are also some potentially negative implications, for example, a stepping back towards the Carnegie requirements. PSU faculty are expert at this activity, and are urged to consider attending this meeting, especially those representing the core diploma disciplines. Faculty can contact him at daltonmj@pdx.edu.

Vice Presidents’ Report

DESROCHERS noted that with respect to Prof. Miller-Jones’s remarks. There are several other board committees and strategic initiatives that deserve our attention. One of them is called the Portland Agenda, to be chaired by James Francesconi, and will assess the metro region for services including higher education. There is another called the Governor’s sub-committee, dealing with the overall structure of the OUS. Regarding the latter, even though we hope to see the governor’s budget restored, the board still wants to explore the structure.

DESROCHERS noted that we anticipate having to present the Portfolio in September. She also noted that there is a valuable report on the FADM web page about the university and economic development. Lastly, she noted that we are engaged in developing a tool that will help us exhibit our contribution to the economic goals of the region.

DESROCHERS thanked faculty and staff for their contribution to the effort in Salem in the past several weeks.

RUETER asked how “portfolio” is defined. DESROCHERS stated that the board mean, what each institution is delivering by way of programs and purposes. KOCH stated that the analogy is an investment portfolio. DESROCHERS added that they are trying to understand each institution as a unique entity. RUETER noted that he hopes they take the time to understand the uncounted assets, which don’t show up in portfolios. For example, one of the ways we have developed new curriculum has been on the back of tenured faculty and long-term staff and they haven’t any gotten credit for that. The board wants to come in and count stuff, and there’s lots of stuff they could miss.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2007
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Undergraduate Curriculum Proposals

MIKSCH presented the proposals for the committee.

FLOWER/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE new courses, Liberal Arts and Sciences, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION TO APPROVE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/FLOWER MOVED TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE THE MOTION TO APPROVE the BA/BS in Film, Department of Theater Arts, Fine and Performing Arts, as listed in "E-1."

THE MOTION TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE PASSED by majority hand vote, no abstentions.

MIKSCH noted that the proposal has been revised to include the change in title to BA/BS in Film, a comprehensive list of courses, and a longer list of the faculty involved in the implementation of the major. TATE added that the proposal also indicates that an advisory committee of FPA and CLAS faculty is indicated to recommend to the Deans and Chair on changes and additions to the major.

MEDOVOI stated that his primary objection to the proposal is that film is a very large area of study, that it requires the involvement of a very wide group of disciplines and departments. He said, there are close to two dozen faculty on campus who do work in the area of film and a film major should be a joint enterprise that brings in all these areas of expertise and builds the best possible and richest approach to film possible at to PSU. He continued, the changes made have not addressed that objection. The name has been changed to Film, but I'm not sure what the intention for that was. The list of elective courses is quite a bit longer, but doesn't fundamentally change the structure of the major. There is a list of faculty involved, but from the point of view of curriculum and administration, it is still a major that emanates and is restricted to the approach of one department. He said, I think that we can produce a much stronger film major here at PSU and I was hopeful that we could negotiate a process where we would get to a point where we would have a much wider, stronger major to put forward, but very little seems to have happened unfortunately over the two months. And so, again, the fact that we have not rebuilt this means that there are serious deficiencies, for example, I still believe that there is an international approach to film that desperately needs to be part of this major; there is a question of genre and conventions approaches that needs to be represented in a core way, race, gender and sexuality as central concerns, that you can find in many departments in CLAS. There are approximately fifteen tenure line faculty outside Theater Arts, and about five fixed term faculty who bring all kinds of expertise in film, so I would propose re-tabling this measure so that we can seriously try to re-negotiate it in a way that will give us the strongest possible film program, and I recognize
that that will require resending it to the UCC, but if we do that we will set film studies up on the strongest possible footing.

TATE stated that one of the key things about this whole process is that there has been a tremendous demand for a film major, and we are trying to respond to that demand. The spirit of the proposal is clearly not proprietary; it is not trying to restrict people. The spirit of the proposal originally included the option of students incorporating into their study, courses from a range of departments. That is simply made more explicit in this proposal. The opportunities to explore international film, criticism, history, and practice are all there. These are things that students want to take advantage of. There is no reason to suppose that it won’t be possible at some time, to add to this major a track in critical film studies, which is more in keeping with what Professor Medovoi is talking about. I think it important that we get something started and established. We were talking earlier about the fact that there is a move to stop or look again at new program proposals. I think we have a solid one and if we go forward the chances for approval are good. It could become the basis for subsequent proposals in the area of film. The time is now; the time has come for this proposal to go forward.

STOVALL yielded to Michael Clark. CLARK stated he agreed with Professor Tate and appreciate all his efforts, but it would be stronger if we incorporate ___________ now. That element needs to be addressed.

SCHERCHTER asked for clarification regarding course numbering for two sequences. MIKSCH noted that the committee identified a numbering problem. At the committee’s request, the department has forwarded proposals to renumber for the courses in question. SCHERCHTER stated that this situation doesn’t help her to think through the questions raised, for example, is this American cinema or a broader enterprise.

STEVEN asked how many new courses the degree proposal includes. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that it requested approval of one new course, TA 480 Film Theory, which the Senate did in March 2007.

SUSSMAN noted that there is an existing minor in film studies among three departments, Communication, English and Theater Arts, and queried why the proposal didn’t build more on the existing minor. Also, there are no Communications faculty listed even though they participate in the film studies minor, and in general there are other programs as well who have contributed. It is ________ CLAS contributes the overwhelming majority of student credit hours and courses in film studies, both those that are formally called film studies in one way or another, or those that are lodged in the larger context of media studies. It doesn’t make a lot of sense that there is this unilateral department approach, when the nature of film studies itself is so broadly defined in American society. Not only is there aesthetics and criticism, but __________, historical analysis, sociological analysis, and these are represented in many of the courses across the university. I can’t imagine that one department could independently offer a major without a joint approach for something which lends itself intrinsically to what
film studies is in American society or internationally. Going back to the issue of inclusiveness of departments or faculty is boldly missing.

ANDREWS-COLLIER stated that Comm was omitted from the revised summary because the department didn’t submit an update of courses and faculty in time for publication. Otherwise, the courses listed are exactly the same list of electives as for the minor. The Theater Arts department went back after the Senate meeting in March and carefully updated this list in conjunction with the Chairs of English and Comm, to meet deadlines for Senate publication. SUSSMAN stated he is the person who runs media studies in Comm and he was never consulted.

FLOWER stated we have already heard several times characterizations such as “narrow” and things of that sort. He noted his understanding is that discussions about this were begun a long time ago. Faculty were told this at the last meeting; we were assured of it, and had every reasons to believe that there was considerable consultation. We are mystified by accusations of no consultation. We were told last time that there was discussion and consultation, and now it is being characterized as not so much.

SESTAK stated that there were several meetings this spring with the three chairs, and there was a meeting last year at which they all talked about the TV studio, what our plans were, and what we would like to do. This year, before the proposal was given to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), it was given to the English and Communications departments so that we could get their input before it moved out of FPA. There was another meeting before the March Senate meeting, there have been several meetings since that time, and we have talked to various people in other departments, for example Foreign Languages, as well as other people as well. In terms of trying to come to a consensus, not everybody is happy with the final results. But what we have here, right now, is a list of existing courses within the departments that the chairs have said they anticipate will continue to be offered, and they can say that with certainty. We know that there is interest in having other new courses developed and approved, but one of the things is that from the beginning, we want to be sure that if we offered courses they were actually on the books, that they have been taught before, and that they occur in regular rotation of at least once every two years. There are some other areas that could be developed in the future, and for that reason FPA is absolutely committed to forming this advisory group, as we say specifically in the proposal, to develop tracks. We responded back from the Senate comments last time, we took it back to the UCC, we took it back through the Steering Committee. We went through the curricular process. It is something that is a unified whole at the moment and we anticipate growth in the future as additional resources may be given to individual departments. We have in FPA two full-time tenure-related faculty lines dedicated to teaching film. There are a lot of other faculty who teach film courses, and there are faculty who use film to teach a different discipline, so there is certainly interest in it. Why is this film, not analysis or criticism? We are looking at expanding this in the future in a variety of ways, for example, we met with Dale Wahl, CEO of Laika Entertainment, where we talked about the variety and range of internships, workforce issues, production issues, and other types of
things that can start to develop from something like this. They are going to be one of the biggest companies here in Portland, and doing film, and they are extremely interested in not just the analysis of film, but also animation, acting, music, management, etc. What this does is provide a start that is actually different from the U of Oregon film certificate program. It is important for animation and other pieces that FPA have, and we know for a fact that U of O would like to bring this up to their Portland program. Quite frankly, we have cohesion here and a start of something that can move forward, and once its been approved as a major, then we can internally go on and develop tracks when we know we have the resources as individual departments commit to them over time. There is a lot of interest to do that, FPA is committed to it, and I personally guarantee that we will make sure that that work moves forward. We have committed here to tenure related full-time film lines. We have a core and that core can change, but we have the existing resources.

Hickey queried if it is correct to say that this program doesn’t displace the minor, and additionally that the individuals involved in the minor could continue to develop that program into a major based on that conception and there would be no barriers even if it were not to be housed in FPA. MIKSCH stated yes on both counts, and that that is one of the reasons that Theater Arts changed the name of the degree, in case CLAS departments wanted to use the term film studies.

Kapoor asked for a clarification on courses and faculty. MIKSCH reiterated that there was one new course, approved in March. SESTAK reiterated that there are two tenure-related faculty lines with 100% of their loads in film. Kapoor stated she wished to see more synergy with the media studies cluster, where some people teach film studies as part of their load. It seems elitist to see film studies as a stand alone major from media studies.

Bodegom asked for clarification on the animation curriculum that was discussed. SESTAK noted there is an Art minor in animation called time-based art, and the relevant courses are listed in the proposal.

Arante stated that English found that students need a beginning 200-level writing about film course for the minor. This is her course but it isn’t here, nor is her course about contemporary Chinese film which speaks to the international issue raised before. ANDREWS-COLLIER stated that some courses weren’t forwarded in time for inclusion in the document.

Reese yielded to Michael Clark. CLARK stated he wasn’t expecting to be yielded to, but noted he tried to talk to Theater Arts last fall about an interdisciplinary proposal __________ and was explicitly told that they we’re going alone. If that’s the proposal, one possibility is that we have two different distinct programs here; that’s one thing to think about, that one would be critical study of films __________. We could do that. Some schools do that. Another possibility would be to table and try to bring it together again.
ANGELL stated that it seems to him that most film programs are in film or fine and performing arts schools, so it makes sense for the program in to be FPA unless it were primarily criticism and theory. At a time when we are evaluating our academic priorities, the idea that we could formulate two competing film majors is absurd. Can’t we all just get along?

KAISER stated he wanted to respond to Flower’s point. He noted that when the minor in film studies was being developed, it originally came to him as a single unit proposal. We specifically took it away from that unit, and said that we would not in the college allow the program to move forward without our blessing until they talked to interested parties in film studies. KAISER stated he personally went on behalf of film studies to the then dean of Fine and Performing Arts, to discuss the possibility of that program and to be assured that his concerns and objections were coordinated with us. He personally made sure in terms of the process, he didn’t just, for example, leave an unanswered phone message. KAISER stated, from our perspective, the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of this program demanded that we bring all the resources to the minor. This is a comment simply about process.

RUETER asked for reiteration of the changes in the proposal. MIKSCH stated that the main change is that they have made clear what was previously only implied. There is a clear list of what the elective courses are. Additionally, the title was changed and they added language to describe an advisory board.

SHUSTERMANN asked if this is about people feeling excluded. What we are hearing is that one group is saying that they consulted, and others are saying that they weren’t consulted. What is clear is that a group put forward a proposal, and there is nothing that prevented the existing film studies minor cohort from putting together a major and putting forward a program. So I’m a little confused. A group of people got together and put together a proposal that is being objected to by a group of people who didn’t put together a proposal. It seems like a solid proposal. It seems like the proposal includes the film studies minor, so I don’t know what the argument is about.

WATTENBERG stated that his department vacated the word “studies” and that there is a reason for that. The analogy to what we are doing here is theatre. There are many faculties who teach courses that include drama, as opposed to theatre. Similarly, we are talking here about film as an art form, not cultural or critical studies. Eventually, there could be two different departments, as we are basically talking about two different types of programs here. Our program can temporarily house critical studies, and it would then at least have a place to be.

LePORE stated that if you look at the national picture, film studies and film are regularly housed in fine arts, and a certain degree of focus is required. What is more logical is that it may need to take two tracks.

MEDOVOI stated he disagreed, that it is an error to say that film studies is generally housed in fine arts around the country. There are a lot of different
models and typically they have long lists of affiliated faculty. It is housed in many different places, in arts, humanities, communications. English; there are a lot of different models. What concerns me here is that PSU is not the most resource rich university, and I don’t think we can pull off more than one film major here. The minor was collaborative and interdisciplinary precisely because we were trying to pool all our resources, and to bring all these areas of expertise together to build the strongest curriculum we could have. The important difference in the way that this major is conceived and the minor was conceived is that every core course is out of the Theater Arts department, and that excludes by definition, the possibility of media studies, critical analysis, theory from other disciplinary positions being part of the general set of approaches. It impoverishes the possibilities here. Wattenberg suggested that the direction that this major aims to go is in the direction of film art, but if you look at the courses, they are in theory, history, etc. It is in general taking a critical, historical, theoretical approach but only with the resources of one department rather than the resources of the entire university. That is a huge loss. I’m motivated here, not because I feel excluded, but because I care enough about film and media studies and the future of those fields at PSU to see this want to be put forth on the strongest possible foot. I’m afraid we will start out with a severely ________ program. We have the resources here; theater arts brings very important approaches to the table, but at least the minor brought those in conversation and into a curriculum that also took into account the other 15-20 faculty on campus that bring the other forms of film studies in. So if this goes through in the present form, I’m very fearful that we won’t have a kind of rich film major, but it will be too late to propose a different kind of film major that brings those other approaches to bear. It seems to me that this is a certain kind of moment of truth because we either rework this proposal into something that has the richest possible version and put it forward, or if we approve this then I don’t know what will happen. I have very little certainty about whether the future of film studies... The last thing I want to say here is I’m not sure why we are in such a rush. That’s the thing that I don’t understand. I don’t see why we can’t take a few more months. There have been some proposals in the works for example, another track was proposed for critical film and media studies putting together a curriculum from all the other parts of the university along with theater arts approaches and that track would greatly enrich the existing proposal. Or we could go about it in a different way. I know the deans had a conversation about developing this as a joint major beginning with a set of core courses which was much more interdisciplinary and moved out into tracks. That’s a viable approach too so I don’t see why we can’t take the couple of months that it takes to think it through, work it out and do it right, so by the time we actually get this thing put forward, we have the strongest program that we can. I don’t understand why we have to approve a version that many faculty are unhappy with today.

KETCHESON called time.

TATE stated that Professor Medovoi has had lengthy time to express his particular point of view. The idea that this has happened within the last few days is, well,... This proposal was carefully developed, and generated and put forward, and has existed for months. It is only at the last minute so to speak that we get this concern from Professor Medovoi that we haven’t consulted enough, that it isn’t
strong enough. If you join them now you are going to end up with mush. This proposal has the basis for adding tracks, moving in other directions, and so on. It is not being restrictive at all; it is a way of getting something started on which we can build. As was pointed out, we put forward this proposal and it isn’t until the final hours that suddenly other proposals are put forward. The time is now to do this, not to wait and have a major, maybe, come together sometime next year or the year following. We need to move now and we need to act on this proposal in a positive way.

KETCHESON noted she approved of the comment about brevity, and would take two more speakers only.

REDER/MAIER MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE FAILED by 34 in favor, 29 opposed, 7 abstentions.

KOCH stated that he would have wished to say something between the motion to table and that vote, because tabling would have been the wrong thing to do at this point. I spent some time in recent days thinking about this and talking to the various people involved, and it seems like we have a couple of options here. First, if anyone would have asked my opinion, I think an integrated program would be the way to go, but my sense is that between now and next month, there is no way to make that happen. So what we have before us is a proposal by FPA to generate a film program with a commitment to looking at how that program might be broadened to a more integrated program in the future. A yes vote means you think that is a reasonable idea. I can imagine that there are both control and trust issues involved in this; this is a big jump that everybody has to take, from putting a program in a particular academic unit and then assuming that everybody is going to work in a way that is going to allow for much broader participation beyond that unit. The other option would be to have an integrated program. What I don’t think we want is to call it an integrated program but have two completely un-integrated, separated tracks that are operated by two different groups of people. If that were the case, then we might as well have two different programs. Bringing up another point: when I go to meet my colleagues, the Provosts at the other institutions, they would want to know why we want to have two film programs instead of just one. And they will be familiar with this type of issue, I’m sure. It’s a much harder case to make. My final comment is that going forward with what we want to do in this program is largely uncharted territory. If you vote no, you are saying to start over again. If you vote yes, we are talking about having some sort of multi-disciplinary program that may or may not be located in a particular academic unit. There have been discussions in this body for a long period of time about where degree programs ought to be housed. We have approved some that go across departments, but are in the same college. We haven’t approved programs that go across colleges that I know of. And there is the governance issue to deal with as well. A number of things are associated with this that will have to be worked out, however you choose to go forward. At this point the issue is whether you want them worked out with the program in place that you see in front of you or whether you want to stop and start all over again, and try to create an integrated program. I
am not going to tell you how to vote. There is a pretty clear choice between the two alternatives for moving forward, and when you vote it’s a matter of those two alternatives.

C. BROWN stated she supported the program for three reasons. First, it went through the process. I understand that people may not have been paying attention and only now realize what is happening, but still we have process for a reason. Second, it is very important that a program have a unit that owns it; it makes it much stronger. There are a lot of very good interdisciplinary programs, but to my own mind, better if possible to have it in one department, and this seems like a very reasonable choice. Third, and the most compelling reason is time, the idea of competition and that other people are moving into Portland with various kinds of film and animation programs, and that the state board is starting this whole portfolio business. If we hold off longer, by the time we actually get something going, there is a very real possibility that someone else will have a program in the Portland area, and it will be, well why do you want to have one too? Those are reasons I think it important to go forward now.

KETCHESON called the debate, and stated that the ballot would be secret.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BA/BS IN FILM PASSED by 48 in favor, 22 against, and 1 abstention.

KETCHESON noted that the Social Work item listed in “E-1” is tabled. The program is being called a Bachelor’s in Social Work, but it is a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work, and that is the degree we passed last month.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

HOTTLE presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

2. Advisory Council Annual Report

BURNS presented the report for the committee. He noted that there was no written report as there was nothing un-confidential that he was able to report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.
3. **General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report**

BLAZAK presented the report for the committee.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

4. **Intercollegiate Athletic board Annual Report**

SQUIRE presented the report for the committee, and introduced the new athletic director, Torre Chisolm.

ZELICK and SHARKOVA asked for clarification on the Athletics deficit. DESROCHERS stated that there is usually an Athletics deficit, which is covered by institutional subsidy, made to cover grants in aide and other parts of the program. That subsidy has ranged from $2 to $3 Million annually, and fluctuates dependent on revenues that the department has generated. We hope that in any given year that the Athletics Department will do better, however, in fact this program is about one-third supported from institutional resources, one third supported by student fees, and one-third supported by gate, lottery funds, etc. The expenditures of the department are reviewed in great detail by the committee and the institution, and we are the tightest ship in the Big Sky Conference. If we want to be in the conference and in this program, it is a reasonable budget. SQUIRE added that part of the reason we struggle with personnel retention is the tight budget. DESROCHERS added that the formula for lottery sources is changing, and we should be receiving more support from that, as a result.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

5. **Library Committee Annual Report**

ATKINSON presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

6. **Scholastic Standards Committee**

LONEY presented the report for the committee, and reminded of the several important policy changes affecting undergraduate students as of this year, regarding Incomplete Policy, Last Day to Add On-line, and Add-Drop Option Deadline. CLUCAS asked if there are any trends around Incomplete petition denials, etc. LONEY said that the only items treated with usual practice are requests which include physician documentation, and refund requests which include documentation that the student never attended a class. She reminded that
it is very important that faculty forward petitions directly to RO, and that faculty offer specific comments on petitions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

7. Teacher Education Committee

RUBEN presented the report for the committee, and noted that the committee composition needs to be altered to include Child and Family Studies. She noted that Child and Family Studies needs to be added to the committee representation. This requires a Constitutional amendment.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked the committee for their service.

8. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 6-7 April at WOU and Salem

BURNS presented the report for the IFS Senators. BURNS noted some important items before the legislature, including HB2579, which will add another faculty member to the state board, designating one representing the three large campuses and one representing the regional campuses. He also noted that the IFS met with legislators during their Salem portion of the meeting. He also noted the higher education report of the Oregon Student Association, which emphasizes the difficulty of getting classes and the student debt load. He also noted the current work on the Deferred Annuity changes and thanked three PSU representatives to the statewide ad hoc effort, Ray Johnson, John Settle, and Deb Jankowski. This will be Scott Burns’s last report.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate, and thanked Professor Burns for his long and outstanding service.

9. Report of the Assoc/Asst Dean's Task Force on Classroom Scheduling

HOFFMAN presented the report for the task force, noting that we are in a crisis mode effective summer term, and describing some of the challenges we face with the loss of 18,000 square feet of classroom space, the equivalent of 180 class sections. If we don’t find more capacity students will not be able to get the courses they need to complete their programs, and we will lose the revenue needed to support their programs. The task force policy recommendations are included in the report, with the most notable recommendation being a proposal for construction projects in Cramer and Neuberger to convert several small rooms into four larger classrooms.

RUETER reminded that one of the definitions of engagement is the provision for “non-instructional” space for students to use for outside of class activities, and we shouldn’t eliminate it completely. LALL asked about using churches in the area.
HOFFMAN noted that there are a number of issues that make churches not a good idea. DESROCHERS noted that Mark Gregory is constantly looking for reasonably priced space in the immediate area.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Faculty Senate.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 17:08.
### Priority

**Student Success**: Make learning meaningful, relevant, and authentic through active engagement with faculty, other students, and significant issues affecting communities near and far. This engagement is an important element in a comprehensive approach to enhancing student learning, preparing students for success in their personal and professional lives, and supporting higher rates of retention, graduation, and applications for continuing degrees, certificates, and licenses.

Primary means of supporting students’ success include: (1) offering high quality programs that establish and achieve both institutional and programmatic learning outcomes; (2) assisting student integration into the experience of academic and university life; and (3) supporting students’ achievement of their academic goals.

### Directive

#### #1: Improve student success by increasing the rate of completion for undergraduate students.

#### #2: Identify specific and measurable undergraduate learning objectives integrated across majors and general education that demonstrate the value of students’ learning experiences, especially including the impact of engagement.

#### #3: Implement a process for advancing/nurturing high quality academic and scholarship programs that demonstrate Portland State’s leadership in engagement.

### Initiative

- Identify themes that reflect PSU’s academic strengths and leadership in addressing significant global and regional issues. Include these themes as part of the selection criteria for choosing programs.

### Indicator

### Target

### Approach

---
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**Improve Student Success through Engaged Learning Experiences**

Portland State seeks to make learning meaningful, relevant and authentic through active engagement with faculty, other students and significant issues affecting communities near and far. This engagement is an important element in a comprehensive approach to enhancing student learning, preparing students for success in their personal and professional lives, and supporting higher rates of retention, graduation, and applications for continuing degrees, certificates and licenses.

**Expand Innovative Scholarship/Creative Activities that Address Regional Issues and Have Global Significance**

An important and unique contribution of every university is the scholarly activity of the faculty and students resulting in new knowledge and creative works. Portland State embraces a broad notion of scholarship, using Boyer's concept of the scholarship of discovery, interpretation, integration and application. Through research at Portland State, we produce scholarship and creative works that have regional relevance and global significance. In alignment with our philosophy of engagement, we intend to undertake a substantial portion of our scholarly and creative work through collaborative partnerships, thus assuring the significance of the work and mutually leveraging knowledge and understanding.

**Enhance Opportunity in the Portland Metropolitan Region for Higher Education**

In keeping with Portland State's mission and values, we are committed to enhancing opportunities for higher education that serve Portland metropolitan citizens, agencies, and industries. Working specifically with our high schools and community colleges we will enhance educational pathways aimed at increasing the participation of underserved populations in higher education. Through engagement with our community partners we will provide a mix of innovative programs that simultaneously meet the needs of our diverse population of potential learners and the region itself.

**Advance Selected Programs that Establish Our Leadership**

This priority reflects a decision to create and nurture high quality research and academic programs that clearly demonstrate our leadership in engagement and differentiate Portland State on a national and international basis. In doing so, we will create a magnet for students and faculty, provide evidence of our leadership position, and build credibility and influence for programs beyond those selected for advancement.

Refer to Poster Session at [http://aanp.pdx.edu/NewsAndEvents](http://aanp.pdx.edu/NewsAndEvents) for the full working group reports on each priority.
Draft -- Academic Directives --Draft

1. Improve student success by increasing rate of completion for undergraduate students.
2. Identify specific and measurable undergraduate learning objectives integrated across majors and general education that demonstrate the value of students’ learning experiences, specifically including the impact of engagement.
3. Implement a process for advancing/nurturing high quality academic and scholarship programs that demonstrate Portland State’s leadership in engagement.
4. Develop and support pathway programs to increase participation in higher education for Portland’s diverse population.

Directive 3: Implement a process

Initiatives:
Identify themes that reflect PSU’s academic strengths and leadership in addressing significant global and regional issues. Include these themes as part of the selection criteria for choosing programs.
Identify programs for investment using the selection process and criteria established by the working groups.
May 14, 2007

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Bonnie Miksch
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**

- **Anth 335 Anthropology of Space and Place (4)** Space and place are foundational to human cognition, emotion, and experience, and yet we often take them for granted. This course examines the origins, development and contemporary variation of human senses of space, place, and environment in a variety of cultural settings around the world. Recommended: Anth 102.

- **ESR 330 Environmental and Ecological Literacy (4)** Introduces a broad range of thought about ecology and the environment, including supporters and critics such as Aldo Leopold, David Orr, Bjorn Lomborg, E.O. Wilson and Thomas Berry. Addresses the idea of ecological literacy as a key aspect in education and understanding the environment. Recommended: ESR 220, 221, and 222.

- **ESR 340 Research Methods in Environmental Science (4)** Integrates quantitative skills into environmental research. This course introduces research methods commonly used in environmental studies with emphasis on environmental study designs, data analyses, and data interpretations.

- **ESR 342 Field Methods (2)** Presents crucial safety, field and research skills for environmental research. Presents different skill sets for different types of field work for example in lakes, wetlands, forests or marine environments. Students may count two sections of this class toward an Environmental Science or Environmental Studies major. Recommended: ESR 220 and 221.

**Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science**

**Change in Course**

- **ECE 441 Electrical Energy Systems Components (4)** – Minor change to course title and description
- **ECE 442 Electrical Energy Systems Protection and Control (4)** – Minor change to course title and change in course description.
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TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Bonnie Miksch
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

DeLys Ostlund
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council 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.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**
- ANTH 418/518 Environmental Anthropology, 4 credits
  Emphasizing key issues of environmental change, adaptation, conservation and sustainability, biocultural diversity, resilience, political ecology, and environmental justice, this course examines how the cross-cultural study of human-environmental relations can improve our understanding of contemporary environmental problems and their solutions.

- LING 417/517 and NAS 417 Maintenance and Revitalization of Endangered Languages, 4 credits
  General introduction to endangered language revitalization, with a focus on native languages of the Pacific Northwest. Topics include history of attempts to eradicate native languages and the effects on those languages and their communities; theoretical basis for revitalization; emerging tribal policies; and relations between linguists and native communities.

**Change in Existing Course**
- PH 425/525 Classical Mechanics II – change credit hours from 3 to 4

**School of Business Administration**

**New Course**
- FIN 440/540 Real Estate Valuation II, 4 credits

**Change in Existing Courses**
- FIN 439/539 Real Estate Appraisal, 3 credits – change course title to Real Estate Valuation I
- FIN 453/599 Real Estate Finance and Investments, 3 credits – change course number to 599 only (undergraduate section split off)
Graduate School of Education

New Courses

- EPFA 439/539 Developing Training Materials, 3 credits
  Focuses on the theories and skills necessary to plan, develop and use effective participant and presentation training materials that enhance adult learning. Emphasizes the linkage of instructional design, adult learning representational systems, and graphic design theories and how materials increase transfer of learning. Examines effective written communication, the selection and use of production methods, and project plans for training materials.

- EPFA 444/544 Instructional Design for Online Based Training, 3 credits
  Examines the adult learning instructional strategies, interactive techniques, information architecture, and user-interface design principles used in online training. Analyze audience learning and experience preferences, training requirements, and content objectives and use that information to choose appropriate online training strategies and methods.

- EPFA 445/545 Building Online Training, 4 credits
  Examines development methodologies/processes, principles of task identification, risk mitigation, technical architecture, creative tools, and project management strategies used in building on-line training courses. Apply learning theory and project management principles to development of online trainings.
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TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: DeLys Ostlund
       Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of New Graduate Council Items for Faculty Senate

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

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Program**
MA Anthropology
Reduction in Internship hours in order to bring the applied/policy track in line with the thesis track and correction of thesis vs. internship credits in applied/policy track.

**Change to Existing Courses**
- ENG 596 Problems and Methods of Literary Study – change credit hours from 5 to 4

**College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**Change to Existing Program**
Graduate Certificate in Real Estate Planning
Change one course from requirement to elective and increase the number of electives from two to three.

**New Course**
- USP 5xx Urban Economic Development Policy, 3 credits (the requested course number, 554, is currently being used; OAA will assign a number)
  This course analyzes urban economic development policy by building on an overall framework that demonstrates how urban economies create and distribute wealth and affect citizens’ quality of life. Federal, state, and local policies must pursue three broad objectives: 1. raising the area’s standard of living; 2. preserving and protecting environmental quality and quality-of-life; 3. reducing poverty and income inequality. This course provides students the ability to analyze and assess alternative policies through an understanding of the theoretical foundations of urban growth and decline; through the ability to apply analytical methods for assessing policy effectiveness; by examination of evidence of policy effectiveness; by reviewing case studies; and via a student’s personal research of specific urban problems.
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY
Text to be added underlined. Text to be deleted struck-out.

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY
4) STANDING COMMITTEES
h) Teacher Education Committee.
This Committee shall operate on the general premise that teacher education is an all-
University activity and responsibility. Specifically, teacher education programs are the
responsibility of the Graduate School of Education. Final accountability for teacher
education programs is accorded, therefore, to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
Education.

The Teacher Education Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to coordinate
the activities of the several schools, college, 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 it 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.

Membership. The Committee shall consist of fourteen 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 Counselor Education, Educational Policy, Foundations and Administrative Studies,
Community Health, Art, Speech and Hearing Sciences, English, Foreign Languages, the
combined social science departments (Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History,
Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology), the combined science departments
(Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics), Mathematics, Theater Arts, and Music,
and Child and Family Studies, and two students recommended by the Student Senate.
The Dean and Assistant Dean of the Graduate School of Education and the Education
Librarian shall be ex-officio non-voting members, with the Assistant Dean serving as
committee secretary. One of the fourteen faculty 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. [end]

Rationale:
At the final meeting of the Teacher Education Committee on May 2, 2007, the committee
voted to amend their annual report to recommend “add to the TEC membership a
representative from Child and Family Studies. We felt this was a necessary addition to a
committee addressing teacher education preparation at Portland State University.”

E-4, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, June 4, 2007
Focus the Nation
Letter of Endorsement

Global warming poses a serious threat to people and natural systems across the planet. Public and private policy decisions about global warming this decade will have impacts lasting for generations.

To focus the nation's attention on this crucial issue, Portland State University, in conjunction with colleges, universities, and high schools across the country, will organize a symposium about "Global Warming Solutions for America" on or around January 31, 2008.

On that day, faculty are strongly encouraged to travel with their classes to attend scheduled programs about climate change or to discuss it with their own students. The symposium program committee will work with interested faculty to develop appropriate material for their classes, and to insure that diverse disciplines are represented in symposium panels and workshops.

Organization:

Representative:

Date:

Endorsing organizations will be listed and linked on the “Endorsers” page of the Focus the Nation web site: www.focusthenation.org.
May 14, 2007

Education Policy Committee (EPC)
Spring 2007 Annual Report

Committee Members: Duncan Carter, Richard Beyler, Michael Flower, Marek Elzanowski, Marcia Fischer, Darlene Geiger, Alan Cabelly, Brad Hansen (Chair), Sharon Elteto, Bee Jai Repp, Joy Rhodes

According to the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. The Committee shall:
1) Serve as the advisory board to the President and to the Faculty Senate on issues of 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 recommendation to the Faculty Senate,
3) Receive and consider proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities,
4) In consultation with 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.

The EPC has met bi-monthly, and conducted the following business during 2006-07:

1. Reviewed and presented to the Faculty Senate for approval the proposal to transition Child and Family Studies to the Graduate School of Social Work

2. Recommended that the senate approve changing the name of the Graduate School of Social Work to the Portland State University School of Social Work.

3. Responded to the Faculty Senate on the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance (CFG) with recommendations. The chair of the faculty senate suggested that these recommendations be referred to the Steering Committee for evaluation and action. The actionable items among the recommendations are as follows:
   - The senate should obtain a list of active Centers at PSU from the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, who is responsible for coordinating reviews of each Center. The list should contain the following information about each Center:
     - Does the Center require approval by Faculty Senate? The criterion is whether it “involves establishment or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments.” Centers may be reclassified upon review by EPC.
When was the Center established and when is it scheduled for review?

- The Committee on Committees and the Steering Committee should reevaluate the roles of faculty on senate committees, and collect some data from faculty serving on committees that deal with such issues as student petitions and minor course changes. If it is determined that faculty are engaged in inappropriate tasks, the senate may decide to revise its charge to a committee.

- The Committee on Committees should evaluate membership on curriculum-related committees to determine whether a majority of instructional faculty are in place to inform decisions regarding academic issues.

4. The EPC has researched several questions at the request of faculty:

- What are the ramifications of abolishing the tuition plateau, and how does this change impact a liberal arts education at PSU?

  - The provost responded with statistics related to degree completion, enrollment numbers, and the budgetary impact. The questions of how this change impacts the breadth and richness of a liberal arts degree, and how this affects student decisions and impressions of the university remain unanswered.

- Are there disadvantages for students and faculty resulting from the Co-Admission program with community colleges, and how are programs impacted by a majority of students who transfer from other institutions?

  - The EPC has collected insufficient data to draw conclusions or make recommendations at this point.

- Is the quality of education suffering under the current budget model?

  - The EPC formulated specific questions related to the impact of internal funding models on the quality of education at PSU, focusing on the ramifications of mandated growth on our mission of academic excellence. The provost responded to these questions and shared his perspective on these issues. A report is attached.

The EPC has had a busy and productive year, and would like to thank the administration for their full cooperation in helping us gather the information required to advise the senate. The committee requests that in the future, it be given more opportunities to advise regarding the “establishment, abolition, or major alteration of programs” at PSU, since that is one of the primary duties of the committee. Numerous programs were established and altered this year without the benefit of consideration by the EPC.
The Educational Policy Committee has been studying the impact of internal funding models on the quality of education at PSU. Specifically, we are concerned with the effect of Student Credit Hour (SCH) quotas that have required an enrollment increase of 2% annually for departments to maintain stable funding levels.

BACKGROUND

With pressure on the institution to meet increasing costs in the face of diminishing funds from the State of Oregon, increasing SCH and therefore tuition revenue has been the means to meet financial obligations. From 2001 to 2005 departments were required to increase SCH by 2% each year to maintain the level of funding provided the prior year. For 2006-07 a different model has been instituted. The deans have been asked to project how many SCH their units can generate given the funds allocated the prior year. These projections become the new enrollment targets, rather than an increase of 2% across all academic units. The University Budget Committee (UBC) will determine how many SCH will be needed to meet financial obligations, and the provost may discuss with the deans whether it is possible to increase projections and the costs associated with that increase. This may be a less arbitrary way to establish growth targets, allowing department chairs to advocate for their curricular needs, but it remains a situation in which increasing SCH drives decision-making. It is an immutable fact that we must generate enough revenue to pay our bills.

CONTEXT FOR DISCUSSION

The EPC formulated some questions for the provost regarding the effects of mandated growth on the quality of education at PSU, and he met with the committee to share his perspectives. He expressed his concern about additional growth without programmatic planning, and stated that growth itself is not a goal. If PSU has the capacity to grow, then we could increase revenue up to that capacity. The university has accommodated enrollment growth by adding more adjuncts and fixed term faculty than tenure track faculty. The provost maintains that the deans are not instructed to require departments to generate increased SCH; however, as costs increase, additional revenue is required to balance the budget. If the deans’ projections cannot be increased to generate sufficient revenue, then costs must be cut.

The budget plan for 2007-08 is generally predicated on generating revenue, implementing some one-time cost savings, and a few permanent cost reductions. Methods cited in the budget plan to increase revenue include recruiting and retaining students up to the level of the 2005-06 academic year since enrollment has fallen this past year, and raising graduate tuition. The provost is committed to no change in the number of tenure track faculty in the budget plan. The Budget Committee’s report confirms that “the upcoming budget assumes no changes in the ratio of tenure track to fixed term faculty.” The provost’s response to some of the committee’s questions follows.

QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

What is being been done to ensure that the infrastructure at PSU has grown commensurately with SCH growth?
Response: We have not increased resources or tenure track lines to keep pace with enrollment growth, and ramifications of growth have put enormous strain on support services. We may have reached the limit of sustainable growth based only on tuition funding.

Is our governance structure based on a different proportion of tenure track to fixed term faculty, and are access funds used by departments to further alter that proportion? Governance refers to a wide range of services performed by tenure track faculty, including committee work (faculty senate, departmental P&T, searches, etc.), curriculum and program development, advising, recruiting, and community engagement.

Response: We would benefit from more full time faculty involved in university activities, but revenue restricts the option of hiring them. If we choose to serve more students based solely on the tuition revenue, the only way we can afford to do this is with adjunct faculty.

Given flat or decreased enrollment across the university, is there competition between departments for the existing pool of students?

Response: Since SCH generation is tied to each faculty member’s home department, this does not appear to be an issue. We may have some competition, dependant upon recruiting, capacity, or demand for popular majors. Academic priorities are being identified for reinvestment.

Does pressure to increase SCH lead to less interdisciplinary cooperation in general?

Response: Since SCH follow individual faculty, there is no obvious reason that interdisciplinary instructional activities would be affected. If faculty are more focused on producing SCH for their individual departments, then interdisciplinary instruction might be impacted.

SOME HARD FACTS

We do not have the luxury of thinking about the university as immune to economic pressures. A partial solution lies in increased faculty productivity, and in reaching our full capacity. However, large classroom space is extremely scarce for popular courses at desirable times. According to Maslow’s hierarchy of human needs, the basic requirement for survival must be met before addressing higher-levels. Is there an analogy to the situation in which the university finds itself?

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Many factors contribute to educational quality. A highly qualified, experienced, and committed faculty is one factor. A relatively low student-to-teacher ratio is another. Excellent facilities, laboratories, and studios contribute. A community of well-prepared incoming students, with adequate foundation skills can reach academic excellence given these factors. How to balance such priorities while meeting financial exigencies is a difficult problem for the administration and the faculty at PSU.

In conclusion, our committee has determined that rather than having parallel, but separate discussions about generating revenue and about academic excellence, the PSU community needs to have an ongoing integrated discussion in which priorities for spending and student learning are considered in a balanced way.
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Committee Charge:
1) Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new courses and undergraduate programs referred to it by divisional curriculum or other committees.
2) Convey to the Senate recommendations from the Graduate Council concerning the approval of all new graduate programs and graduate courses.
3) Make recommendations to the Senate concerning substantive changes to existing programs and courses referred to it by other committees.
4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing undergraduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed undergraduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.
5) Develop and recommend policies concerning curriculum at the University.
6) Act in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairperson of appropriate committees.
7) Suggest and refer to the Senate, after consideration by the Academic Requirements Committee, modifications in the undergraduate degree requirements.
8) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of undergraduate courses.
9) Report on its activities at least once each year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.
UCC Activities:

Curricular Proposal Review:
This year the committee met 16 times to conduct the regular business of reviewing course proposals, new programs and program changes, and to discuss additional issues related to our charge. The committee recommended approval of the following (not including proposals currently under review):

- 59 new courses (68 in 05-06)
- 14 existing courses changed (38 in 05-06)
- 4 dropped courses (12 in 05-06)
- 6 new majors (0 in 05-06)
- 7 existing majors changed (4 in 05-06)
- 3 new minors (1 in 05-06)
- 0 existing minors changed (1 in 05-06)
- 1 new certificate (0 in 05-06)
- 3 existing certificate changed (1 in 05-06)
- 17 courses added to UNST clusters (28 in 04-05)
- 3 courses dropped from UNST clusters (9 in 04-05)

While there were somewhat fewer new course proposals to review this year (59 instead of 68), there was an increase in the number of new degree proposals (6 new majors and 3 new minors). New degree proposals generally call for more deliberation, and guests from various academic units were often called into the meetings to help clarify the program proposals. Of the new degrees which were proposed almost none of them sought council from the Educational Policy Committee. We would like to see an increase in this committee’s involvement in new program proposals, as it would help to ensure that major changes and additions to our academic offerings follow educational policies and pose no threat to current budget conditions.

New Course Proposal Form and Online Submissions:
Last year's UCC committee revised the PSU New Course proposal form, which has replaced the OUS-derived form that we were previously using at PSU. Most new proposals which we reviewed this year used the new form, and we expect that the switch to the new form will be complete sometime next year.

The new form was designed to better highlight the information needed by UCC and the Graduate Council and has proven to be very helpful to committee members. In addition, we have received positive feedback from faculty about the directions document which has helped to clarify the intention of various questions on the form.

This year most of our proposals were received and distributed electronically. For each proposal OAA received one electronic copy and one signed paper copy. We had hoped that this would help us cut down on paper waste in the review process, but currently only one member of the committee chooses to bring a laptop instead of printing out the proposals. So, while it is helpful to have electronic copies of the documents, it has not saved on printing and copying costs.

Staff Support
Before Terrell Rhodes left PSU, there were discussions which indicated that the administration would help UCC by providing staff support to make the committee’s work more manageable and efficient. While this did not occur this year, we would like to reiterate the need for a dedicated staff person to work a few hours each week to help implement the electronic distribution of proposals, set up and manage a database for tracking action on proposals, and help manage other ongoing clerical tasks.
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