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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 2009
Presiding Officer: Robert Mercer
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2009, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:06 p.m. The minutes were tabled pending review of the recording with respect to item “E.5.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

“D-1” TABLED until the June senate meeting.

Report of the Academic Advising Council, tabled in April, will be presented today.

Nominations for Presiding Officer of the 2009-10 PSU Faculty Senate

Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 2009
GEORGE/REESE nominated Maude Hines (nominations remain open through the start of the June Senate meeting).

President’s Report

DESROCHER presented the report for the president, who was not in attendance. She reviewed the process for budgetary decisions regarding reductions as well as the normal budget process. To date, colleges and schools have proposed budget reduction scenarios and certain differential tuitions, tuition increases have been proposed, and a proposal for salary reduction is under development. Additionally, the ad hoc long-range investment team chaired by Dean Kaiser (LTIH) has recommended an FTE or salary reduction. These activities will be merged into a comprehensive proposal to be forwarded this month to the Deans, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, and the President. There will be public hearings May 20 and 22.

_________ requested a clarification regarding salary reduction proposals. DESROCHERS noted that the Governor has already proposed a “work furlough” in other words, days taken without pay, to SEIU. If he mandates this across the agencies, campus discussions would commence with AAUP and AFT.

DESROCHERS briefly reviewed the plan to respond to the H1N1 (swine) flu. She noted in particular, that we are an urban campus and respond in that context. She concluded, there are no suspected cases at PSU. ________ asked if there is a plan for class delivery if the university were to be closed. DESROCHERS stated that the team is monitoring such issues.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

BROWN and BEYLER presented the items for the committees.

CARTER/FLOWER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE “E-1” Curricular Consent Agenda.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, IV., 4), 4, h) Teacher Education Committee

MERCER reviewed the course of this proposal. He noted that after a proposal was moved several months ago, it was tabled indefinitely as subsequent to that motion, there were a number of changes proposed.
JACOB/DEVLETIAN MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the proposal asa described in “E-2.”

BLEILER/_____________ MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, IV., 4), 4. m) Educational Policy Committee (tabled 4/6/09)

TABLED, as this follows on item D-1, also tabled.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

KOCH noted that the High Achieving Student Ad Hoc Committee had their first meeting last week; therefore we will be requesting an extension of the reporting date. The Draft Policy for Low Enrollment Classes has been developed and it will be circulated to departments and shared with AAUP. The Ph.D. in Applied Physics has received OUS Provost Council approval, but is now on hold due to the OUS Board freeze on new programs.

1. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report

HICKEY presented the report for the committee, noting a few corrections. She reminded that there are two changes of particular note, the deletion of Transfer Transition, and the addition of WR 121 for transfer students.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Advisory Council Annual Report

WALTON presented the report for the committee (attached).

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a report and spokesperson.

4. Intercollegiate Athletics Board Annual Report
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JACOB presented the report for the committee and took questions.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Library Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a spokesperson.

6. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a spokesperson.

7. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

The report was tabled for lack of a report text.

8. Writing Committee Report

JACOB presented the report, tabled from April, for the committee. The full report will be posted on the Senate web page.

9. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

FORTMILLER reported, after G.7. He reminded that mandatory advising will go into effect in Fall 2010, and discussed some of the parameters of this change. He discussed principles and advising tenets (attached).

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:40 p.m.
Presidents Advisory Committee
Annual Report
April 24, 2009

Members, 2008-2009
Duncan Carter, CLAS
Robert Mercer, CLAS
Connie Ozawa, USP
John Rueter, ESM (chair)
Linda Walton, HIST
Carl Wamser, CHEM

Our committee met with President Wiewel five times so far this year. We have one more
meeting scheduled for May. Topics were suggested both by the committee and the
president. Topics included merit pay issues, honors degrees, summer meetings of faculty
and the composition of various ad hoc committees.

During the year the committee also acted as one of the steps in checking constitutional
amendments for wording and possible unintended consequences.
PSU's Model of Undergraduate Academic Advising

A minimum of three advising “touch points” within the first two years

1) All undergraduate students who are new to PSU are required to attend New Student Orientation.

2) Freshmen are advised in year one in partnership with the academic units and professional advisers.*

3) All undecided/undeclared sophomores must declare major by year’s end. Students advised and assisted in decision-making by the UASC and Career Center. Majors and pre-professional students advised by schools/colleges and departments.

Roll-out is for the freshman class of 2010, sophomores 2011.

*People w/dedicated FTE to advising in the schools/colleges, departments and UASC based on their advising process.
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Advising Tenets include:

- Advising is proactive before it is reactive
- Advising should create an affinity with the academic discipline as soon as possible
- Advising is teaching, multiple approaches are necessary for conveying information
- A foundation of advising is providing students access to accurate information
- Good advising ultimately leads to confident students with clear pathways
- Advising is a shared responsibility among students, faculty and professional advisers
Memorandum

Date: 13 May 2009

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

From: Michael Bowman, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Re: Motion to Revise Procedures for Approval of Academic Units.

The Educational Policy Committee is proposing that the Faculty Senate:

1) Abolish the current informal process for the Establishment of a School, College, Department, Division, Center, Institute or Similar Agency Serving Instructional, Research, and Public Service Functions.

2) Stop using the current Process for Approval of Centers for the approval of new centers and institutes. However, continue to use this document as the process for the review of centers and institutes.

3) Adopt the new Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units attached.
Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination, or Alteration of Academic Units

Answer the appropriate questions below.

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

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

* Signatures are required of administrators at each level above that of the immediate supervisor that approve the project prior to submission to CADS+.
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Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units

Start → Proposal
1. Proposal
2. Review & recommendation by faculty in affected unit(s)
3. Review & recommendation by immediate supervisor
4. Revise
5. Educational Policy Committee
6. Budgetary analysis by Budget Committee

Approved

Review & recommendation by Provost

Reviewed by Provost, Dean, University Librarian or Vice-Provost?
Yes → Yes
No → Revise

Reviewed by next higher level

Is unit a significant academic entity?
Yes → Yes
No → Only a minor alteration of unit?
Yes → Review by Council of Academic Deans
No → Review by Faculty Senate

Revise

Review by Educational Policy Committee

5/12/2009
Notes

1. Proposals are prepared using the appropriate Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination or Alteration of Academic Units form.

2. Appropriate faculty groups should be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, when a center is created within a department it is the departmental faculty who would vote to approve, while for a merger of two departments it would be the faculty of both departments, and for the creation of a new school containing existing departments it would be the faculty of those departments.

3. The “immediate supervisor” is the administrator to whom the unit in question directly reports.

4. The individual or group at this approval stage meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back for further consideration.

5. Significant academic entities include, but are not limited to: departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, and institutes.

6. CADS meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back to CADS for further consideration. If the revision is accepted by CADS the revised proposal is sent to the Senate Steering Committee to determine if this is a significant enough change to warrant re-consideration by the Senate (or would elevate what had been a minor alteration to a major alteration and thus require Senate approval).
Proposed 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

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

The Committee shall:

1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.
2) Take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, with appropriate consultation with other interested faculty committees, and with timely report or recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
3) Receive and consider make recommendations to the Senate concerning the approval of proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, or other significant academic entities. All proposals must use the Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Academic Units.
4) In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University.
5) Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.
6) Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.
7) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term.

Rationale

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

1) The first change copies the initial language of one of the charges of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This is to make the new approval role of EPC clearer (like UCC’s approval role in undergraduate curriculum matters).
2) The second change makes clear that divisions, centers, and institutes are significant academic entities. Currently that can be inferred from the title of the processes for the approval of academic units, but the new process has a generic title. There is thus nothing explicit that indicates the status of divisions, centers, or institutes.
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PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY
4) STANDING COMMITTEES

b) 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, but many other units provide undergraduate programs that provide the subject
matter content and other prerequisites required of applicants to the GSE teacher
preparation program. In addition, other units provide a graduate course of study that
includes licensure specific to their professional area.

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

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

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

Membership. The Committee shall consist of sixteen seventeen members of the
University Faculty, representative of each of the following departments or programs:
Business Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education and Counseling,
Special Education, Counselor Education, Educational Leadership and Policy,
Foundations of Administrative Studies, Educational Leadership and Policy, Community
Health, Art, Speech and Hearing Sciences, English, Foreign Languages and Literatures,
the combined social science departments and divisions (Anthropology, Economics,
May 11, 2009

Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology, the combined science departments (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Environmental Science and Management, and Physics), Engineering and Computer Science, Mathematics, Mathematics and Statistics, Theater Arts, Music, and Child and Family Studies, and The committee will include two students. recommended by the ASPSU Senate.

The GSE Dean and Assistant GSE Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Education Librarian, and the Assistant Dean for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences shall be ex-officio non-voting members, with the Assistant GSE Associate Dean serving as committee secretary. One of the sixteen voting 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.

Rationale

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

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

Faculty Senate Member Signatures:
May 13, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate – Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.a.1
CH 693 Enzyme Structure and Function (3), change 3 credits to 4 credits

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.a.2

- EMT, Master of Science in Engineering and Technology Management, change course names, change required courses.
April 29, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown
Interim-Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Richard Beyler
Chair, Graduate Council

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

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses

E.1.b.1
- RUS 421/521, Topics in Contemporary Russian Culture (4)
  Study of current issues in post-Soviet society such as political processes, educational reform, migration, and others. Recommended prerequisite RUS 342. May be repeated for credit when topics differ.

Maseeh College Engineering and Computer Sciences

New Courses

E.1.b.2
- ECE 435/535 Radar and Sonar Processing (4)
  Introduction to radar and sonar processing including detection and estimation theory, array processing, and signal propagation models. Course will concentrate on physics-based processing techniques applied to real systems with application to remote sensing, underwater sonar and medical imaging. Pulsed systems and spectroscopy may also be covered in the context of terahertz sensing. Coursework will involve readings from current scientific journals and MATLAB data processing. Prerequisites: ECE 331, 332.

E.1.b.3
- ECE 430/530 Applications in Electromagnetics, Optic, and Acoustics (4)
  Introduction applications of electromagnetics (EM), optics, and acoustics in engineering fields. Specific topics will change, but may include (EM): antenna design, electromagnetic interference, microwave and terahertz sensing, waveguide design, and wireless communications; (optics) lasers and LEDs, holography,
diffraction and scattering; (acoustics) commercial audio, underwater acoustics, medical ultrasound, and active noise control. Course content will consist of project-based laboratory activities and reading assignments from current publications. Prerequisites: ECE 331, 332.
June 1, 2009

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown, Interim Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Science

Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.1. BS in Computer Engineering –
- Reduction of credit hour requirements to 180 credits
- Introduction of two specialization tracks
  - Computer Hardware
  - Embedded Systems
- Removal and addition of specific required courses
- Curriculum redesigned to cover topics centering on computer systems and higher-level design as opposed to detailed transistor-level circuit approach.

E.1.c.2 BS in Electrical Engineering –
- Reduction of credit hour requirements to 182 credits
- Introduction of six specialization tracks
  - Energy Systems
  - Analog/RF Circuits
  - Electromagnetics
  - Microelectronics
  - Signal Processing
  - VLSI Design
- Removal and addition of specific required courses
- New courses introduced in Freshman year curriculum

E.1.c.3 Minor in Electrical Engineering –
- Changes in the minor reflect the proposed changes in the BS in Electrical Engineering (see above)
- ECE 101, 102 and 103 are used in place of EAS 101 and 102
- Number of required credits remains the same.
New Courses

E.1.c.4
- ECE 101 Exploring Electrical Engineering (4)
  Freshman introductory course for students interested in electrical engineering. Students learn the design process, teamwork and presentation skills through completion of a hands-on project. Lab activities familiarize students with basic equipment and components. Speakers present an overview of different fields and career opportunities in electrical engineering.

E.1.c.5
- ECE 102 Engineering Computation (4)

E.1.c.6
- ECE 103 Engineering Programming (4)
  Software design, algorithms, data structures, and computation using the C programming language. Interfacing to sensors, actuators and other hardware. Writing documentation and presenting technical content. Recommended prerequisites: ECE 102, Mth 112.

E.1.c.7
- ECE 312 Fourier Analysis (4)
  Software design, algorithms, data structures, and computation using the C programming language. Interfacing to sensors, actuators and other hardware. Writing documentation and presenting technical content. Recommended prerequisites: ECE 102, Mth 112.

E.1.c.8
- ECE 325 Distribution and Sustainable Energy Systems (4)
  Software design, algorithms, data structures, and computation using the C programming language. Interfacing to sensors, actuators and other hardware. Writing documentation and presenting technical content. Recommended prerequisites: ECE 102, Mth 112.

E.1.c.9
- ECE 373 Embedded Operating Systems & Device Drivers (5)
  Extends the microprocessor interfacing skills gained in ECE 372 to the design of hardware and device drivers for a microprocessor system with an embedded operating system. After a brief introduction to the basic structure and operations of the Linux OS, students will gain extensive practice developing Linux device drivers for a wide variety of hardware devices. Course will also include discussions of security and power management techniques commonly used in embedded microprocessors systems. Prerequisites: ECE 372 or co-requisite CS 333.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.10
- ECE 221 Electric Circuits (4) – change course title to Electric Circuit Analysis I; change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.11
- ECE 222 Signals and Systems I (4) – change course title to Electric Circuit Analysis II; change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.12
- ECE 223 Signals and Systems II (4) – change course title to Electric Circuit Analysis III; change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.
E.1.c.13.
- ECE 271 Digital Systems (5) – change credit hours from 5 to 4; change prerequisites.

E.1.c.14.
- ECE 311 Feedback and Control (5) – change credit hours from 5 to 4; change description; change prerequisites and lab hours.

E.1.c.15.
- ECE 321 Electronics I (4) – change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.16.
- ECE 322 Electronics II (4) – change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.17.
- ECE 323 Electronics III (4) – change credit hours from 4 to 3; change description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.18.
- ECE 331 Engineering Electromagnetics I (4) – change course description.

E.1.c.19.
- ECE 332 Engineering Electromagnetics II (5) – change credit hours from 5 to 4; change description.

E.1.c.20.
- ECE 411 Industry Design Processes (2) – change credit hours from 2 to 4; change course description; change lecture hours.

School of Social Work

Change in Existing Courses
E.1.c.21.

School of Fine & Performing Arts

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.c.22.
- BA in Art History –
  o Change total required credits from 92-96 credits to 68 credits – makes the total credit hours for the studio focus ARH major comparable to that of the liberal arts focus program.
  o Adds Art 117 and Art 119 to studio art foundation course options.
  o Changes Second Year requirements.
  o Changes Third- and Fourth-Year Upper-division requirements.

E.1.c.23.
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Darrell Brown
Interim Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The following proposal has been approved by the UCC, and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbwiki.com and looking in the 2008-09 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**

**New Instructional Program Leading to an Undergraduate Certificate in Revitalizing Endangered Indigenous Languages**

**Brief Overview**

This undergraduate certificate will provide fundamental training for language revitalization by providing interested students an understanding of the main causes for language loss and the factors involved in language maintenance. The course-work will prepare students to work with and in indigenous communities on language revitalization. As part of that preparation, students will learn principles for developing language materials and language assessment tools, both of which are commonly and crucially needed in tribal language programs.

The certificate program provides unique theoretical and practice-based training. The undergraduate certificate will give theoretical and practical training at a beginning level, emphasizing field experience with actual native communities. This will be the first certificate on Language Revitalization in the Pacific Northwest (and the first undergraduate certificate in the United States), and it is vital that this program be developed as soon as possible. Nearly all Native American languages are endangered, that is, they are no longer spoken by children or people of child-bearing age and therefore are destined to become extinct without immediate intervention. This certificate program contributes not only to this urgent field of academics but also to Portland State University’s mission. Through this certificate, our students will serve the city and neighboring communities, which include the Native tribes and the Urban Native communities. Though this certificate focuses on the indigenous languages of North America, the training afforded through the certificate will be applicable to those of outside of North America.

The courses included in the certificate are currently taught regularly. Therefore, the certificate will be operational as soon as the certificate program is approved.

**SCOPE OF STUDY**

This certificate will provide fundamental training for language revitalization, so that interested students will understand some main causes for language loss and factors involved in language maintenance; prepare these students to work with Native communities and organizations on language revitalization; and teach the critically important skill of the development of language materials and language assessment tools.

[ADMISSION REQUIREMENT]
1. Admission to Portland State University.
2. A minimum GPA of 2.5.

**COURSE OF STUDY**

The certificate requires eight courses from below.
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COURSE REQUIREMENT: All courses must be approved by an advisor.

[CORE COURSES]

1. NAS 201 Introduction to Native American Studies (4)
2. LING/NAS 301 Introduction to Native American Languages (4)
3. LING 390 Introduction to Linguistics (4)
4. LING 417/517 & NAS 417 Maintenance and Revitalization of Endangered Languages (4)

[ELECTIVES]

5. NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY/BACKGROUND
ONE of the following:
  HIST 330 Native Americans of Eastern North America (4)
  HIST 331 Native Americans of Western North America (4)
  HIST 464/564 Indians of the Pacific Northwest (4)
  NAS 303/PS432 Great Tribal Leaders (4)
  ANTH 313 Indian-White Relations (4)
  ANTH 314 Native Americans (4)
  ANTH 415/515 Applied Anthropology (4)
  ANTH 417/517 Advanced Topics in Native American Studies (4)

6. LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND BILINGUALISM
ONE of the following:
  LING432/532 Sociolinguistics (4)
  LING437/537 First Language Acquisition (4)
  LING438/538 Second Language Acquisition (4)
  LING480/580 Bilingualism (4)

7. LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY
ONE of the following:
  FL 498/598 Foreign Language Methods (4)
  LING 477/577 TESOL Methods I (4)
  LING 439/539 Language Assessment (4)
  LING 475/575 Curriculum Design and Materials (4)
  LING 476/576 Corpus Linguistics (4)
  FL 493/593 Language Proficiency Testing and Teaching (4)

[Required Field Experience]

8. ONE of the following:

   NAS 404: Cooperative Education/Internship (4)
   LING 409: Practicum (4)

[CERTIFICATE COMPLETION REQUIREMENT]

PORTFOLIO
Students in the program will develop a portfolio, which includes field notes, journals, feedback from the community and final reflection papers (15-20 pages for the undergraduate students). Certificate Director will be responsible for assessing the completion of a students' certificate.

TOTAL 32 credit hours
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PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PSU FACULTY

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY.

Section 4. Faculty Committees

g) Faculty Development Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other divisions, two from the Library, and, as consultants, the following, or their representatives, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research or their representatives. It is desirable that the Appointees should be selected from among faculty members who are active and interested in research, teaching, or other scholarly or creative activity. The Committee shall:

1) Establish subcommittees and working groups as needed to carry out the committee functions.

2) Establish policies, in consultation with administrative officers, as to the allotment of funds whatever institutional sums have been granted or appropriated for faculty research, multi or interdisciplinary ventures, Faculty development, including conference travel, research support, and the enhancement and Faculty improvement or evaluation of teaching, and Peer Review or creative endeavors.

3) Encourage Faculty scholarship and teaching by eliciting proposals for projects. Evaluate proposals for travel grants, research, teaching, and creative projects, and make recommendations for funding.

4) Recommend to appropriate administrative officers the distribution of institutional research funds. Review funding requests submitted through the Peer Review process and make recommendations for awards.

5) Keep work with the Office of Graduate Studies and Research to maintain records of research faculty development fund distributions and endeavor to record their subsequent history.

6) Report to the Senate at least twice each year.
Committee Charge: The charge of the faculty senate budget committee is outlined in Article IV of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty.

The Budget Committee focused on four major initiatives this year:

1) Provided input and feedback to the PSU Budget Team (R. Koch, C. Mack, L. Desrochers, and M. Fung) and received information to share with colleagues
2) Conducted an environmental scan of how other universities are dealing with reduced state funding and budget cuts
3) Wrote a report which included information and recommendations pertaining to self support programs at PSU
4) Identified the role of the budget committee in the context of the new strategic and budget planning process, which resulted in amending the Constitution

Provided Input and Received Information
The Budget Committee was consulted and provided input on the following issues:

1) For CADS Fall retreat discussion on University initiatives/priorities, growth, budget model, and sustainability,
2) Budget principles and priorities for 2009-10,  
3) Tuition for 2009-10, including differential tuition,  
4) Open Forum Budget Sessions for all PSU staff,  
5) Charge and make up of Long Term Institutional Financial Strategies Committee,

The Budget Committee hosted three non-OAA units (HR, facilities, and IT) to discuss:
1) How productivity was measured  
2) The process for determining 12.5% cut scenarios

Environmental Scan  
1) A subcommittee reviewed at what 7 universities across the country were doing to address budget cuts and developed a summary and full report for the Provost.  
2) The report was shared with LTIFS.

Self Support Information and Recommendations
1) Formed a subcommittee to look at the issues and concerns about 2008-09 budget cuts self support programs.  
2) Wrote a comprehensive report on the positive impact and role of self support at PSU and the central service costs incurred.  
3) Provided the report and input to the Deans/Vice Provost’s subcommittee looking at self support.

Role of the Budget Committee
1) Developed a clear sense of the role of the budget committee in the new environment, where the budget is following strategic planning.  
2) Wrote an amendment to the Constitution, which included Budget Committee analysis of all new/revised programs and changes to educational units. It was approved.  
3) Reviewed and provided an analysis of budgetary implications for several new programs.  
4) Agreed to take on the role of communicating budget information to all faculty and staff through a variety of methods.

Budget Work in Process
1) Finalizing the process for review of new/revised programs and for changes to educational units.  
2) Provide input on 2009-10 budget scenarios.

Issues for the 2008-09 Committee
1) Finalize the PSU process for Budget Committee review and analysis of new/revised programs and changes to educational units.  
2) Provide input on the budget scenarios for 2009-10 as needed.  
3) Determine a way to ensure greater dissemination of information from the Budget Committee to faculty university-wide and greater input from faculty into the issues the Budget Committee is discussing.
February 11, 2009

TO: Budget Committee
FROM: Cheryl Livneh for Subcommittee
RE: Subcommittee Report

A subcommittee of the Budget Committee (M. Bowman, S. Jhaj, C. Livneh, D. Lyons, R. Miller, and K. Toth) formed to look at what some other universities across the country were doing to deal with their budget cuts.

The subcommittee met to identify the universities it would look at and the information we would gather. We decided on comparable universities, Urban 13: Arizona State Clemson San Diego State University UMass-Boston University of Memphis Wayne State

We gathered information about:
Campus size Operating budget Local economic impact (if available) Enrollment Workforce size Tuition Colleges and Schools Degrees Pertinent budget information Current strategies

When we could find it, we looked at the equivalent of their budget committee, guiding budget principles, etc.

I am attaching a chart that shows each university’s strategies for its budget cuts. Unfortunately, there was nothing that really stood out as a panacea. We did find that many universities are in much worse shape that we are (even though that may be hard to believe). I have all of the background information if anyone is interested.

Thanks to the committee members, who were terrific about getting this done in so short a time frame!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Arizona State</th>
<th>Clemson</th>
<th>IUPUI</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>Un Memphis</th>
<th>UMass-Boston</th>
<th>Wayne State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Across the Board Cuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary-positions will not be filled for 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed program initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stopped</td>
<td>Will continue, because funds in hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds from auxiliaries</td>
<td>Redirected construction $ from housing, athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furloughs</td>
<td>10-15 days/yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Freeze</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Waiting for President's decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational consolidations</td>
<td>Several colleges and schools reorganized into 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Elimination</td>
<td>Non-essential temporary employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Enrollment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S &amp; S</td>
<td>Overtime, energy, S &amp; S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Time</td>
<td>Voluntary permanent reduction up to 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Incentives</td>
<td>Voluntary for Public Service Activities employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000 salaries moved from state funding to trust funds permanently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Reductions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in use temporary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session profits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will go to Central Un.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Restrictions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Admin will not be filled. Faculty not filled unless special talents needed. Later said goal is no reduction in faculty or staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Committees
Portland State University
Report to Faculty Senate, June 1, 2009

Chair: Gary Brodowicz (SCH); Chair-Elect: Gerardo Lafferriere (LAS-MTH)
Members: Mary Ann Barham (AO-UASC), Barbara Brower (LAS-GEOG), Darrell Brown (SBA), Jack Devletian (ECS), Ramin Farahmandpur (ED), Robert Fountain (LAS-MTH), Vincent Fritzsche (XS), Sukhwant Jhaj (OI-UNST), Jana Meinhold (SSW), Judy Patton (FPA-TA), Robin Paynter (LIB), John Rueter (LAS-ESR), Randy Zelick (LAS-BIO)

After meeting once in the Fall Term, the Committee on Committees conducted most of its routine business (staffing various committees, etc.) via e-mail. An attempt made to set up and use a Wiki to conduct business and keep records met with limited success. Approximately 25 committee replacements were made throughout the year, and most required a simple e-mail vote.

The committee met twice in April to review the Faculty Senate Committee Preference survey and fill various committee vacancies and to elect a chair for the 2009-10 academic year (Lafferriere). We also nominated faculty to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Process and Criteria for Review (and Elimination of?) Programs.

In 2009-10 the committee plans to upgrade its web communications (i.e., senate website), and recommends that the Faculty Senate website be used as the main repository for all supportive information needed by committees such as the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, Educational Policies Committee, etc. Access to all necessary information in this manner should streamline committee review of material, enhance transparency, and improve the process of filling committee vacancies.

The committee spent considerable time this past year trying to come to consensus about the process for selecting faculty for committee chairmanships and filling vacancies. If time allows, we request no more than 10 minutes of the time allotted for our report to discuss faculty feedback about this process.

Finally, the Committee on Committees thanks the PSU faculty who willingly stepped forward to serve in a variety of roles and take seriously the role of faculty in shared governance.
May 11, 2009

To: Faculty Senate
From: Darrell Brown, Interim Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Re: 2008-2009 Annual Report to Faculty Senate

Chair: Joan Jagodnik, UASC
Interim Chair: Darrell Brown, SBA
Chair Elect: Martin Lafrenz, CLAS

Members: Ellen Bassett, CUPA
Joe Ediger, CLAS
JR Estes, UNST
Ramin Farahmandpur, (beginning SP 09), GSE
Charlotte Goodluck, SSW
Tom Hastings,
Anne McClanan, FPA
Branimir Pejcinovic, CECS
Tom Raffensberger, (for Adriene Lim) LIB
Sean Rains, Student
Bee Jai Repp, SES
John Reuter, CLAS
Robert Sanders, CLAS
Elizabeth Wosley-George, (F 08 and W 09), GSE

Consultants: Cindy Baccar, ARR
Shawn Smallman, Vice Provost for Instruction, OAA
Steve Harmon, OAA

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 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee concerning the approval of all new undergraduate programs and undergraduate 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.

**Curricular Proposal Review:**
In 2008-09 the Committee convened 13 times to review course proposals, new programs and program changes, and to discuss additional issues related to the charge of the Committee. The Committee recommended approval of:

- 57 new courses (63 in 07-08)
- 55 existing courses changed (25 in 07-08)
- 2 dropped courses (2 in 07-08)
- 0 new majors (3 in 07-08)
- 15 existing majors changed (8 in 07-08)
- 3 new minors (2 in 07-08)
- 4 existing minors changed (0 in 07-08)
- 2 new certificates (1 in 07-08)
- 0 existing certificates changed (0 in 07-08)
- 26 courses added to UNST clusters (10 in 07-08)
- 77 courses dropped from UNST clusters (10 in 07-08)

The details of the specific courses and programs can be found on the wiki referenced below.

**Staff Support:**
Steve Harmon, Curriculum Coordinator (OAA) and Cindy Baccar, Director of Registration and Records (ARR) provided support throughout the year.

Steve Harmon developed a wiki providing on-line access to all the documents required for the work of the committee (http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/). Committee members, and the University community in general, can now electronically access all program and course proposals submitted for consideration. In addition, interested parties can track the progress of proposals through the Committee and the subsequent PSU processes. The UCC membership roster, meeting minutes, the PSU Faculty Governance Guide, the UCC Handbook, and some curricular policies are also accessible through the wiki.

The UCC made a commitment with the Grad Council to collaboratively revise the course proposal sheets to require that the proposer not only indicate who was spoken to regarding potential overlap, but also the response to the proposer.
Memorandum

Date: 13 May 2009

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

From: Michael Bowman, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Re: Educational Policy Committee Spring Quarter report

This report covers the activities of the Educational Policy Committee for Spring 2009. Minutes from are available at the Committee’s website at: http://homepage.mac.com/flowermj/epc/.

Committee membership: Tim Anderson (ETM), Ben Anderson-Nathe (CFS), Mirela Blekic (UNST), Michael Bowman (LIB, chair), Barbara Brower (GEOG), Alan Cabelly (SBA), Duncan Carter (LAS), Liz Charman (ART), John Erdman (MTH), Michael Flower (HON), Amy Greenstadt (ENG), Collin LaVallee (ASPSU), Cheryl Livneh (CEED), Alan MacCormack (UNST), Theo Malone (ASPSU), and Sarah Tinkler (ECON).

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

Process for the Approval of Academic Unit Changes: The Committee has submitted this process to the Senate for approval. It was discussed at length at the April meeting and was tabled. The Committee has revised the motion and is resubmitting it this meeting.

Proposal for Center for Women, Politics, and Public Policy: The Committee has reviewed this proposal and its motion recommending Senate approval of this proposal is also in this packet.

P&T Addendum for Research Assistants/Associates: The Committee has reviewed this addendum and it’s conclusions are available with the addendum.

Committee Representation: Three ad hoc committees have members serving as representatives of EPC. Michael Flower is serving on the Ad Hoc Committee on High Achieving Students. Alan Cabelly is serving on the Committee on Long Term Institutional Fiscal Strategies. Michael Bowman is serving on the Ad Hoc Committee on Program Audit. In addition, Michael Bowman attended the Presidential Retreat on 18 May as the EPC representative.
Faculty Development Committee Annual Report, 2008-09

Linda Walton LAS/HST, Chair; Linda Absher LIB, Robert Bertini ECS, Steve Bleiler LAS/MTH, Scott Cunningham UPA/AJ, Roberto De Anda LAS/CLS, Marie Lewandowski XS, Karin Magaldi FPA/TA, Laura Nissen SSW, Berni Pilip AO, Neil Ramiller SBA, Luis Ruedas LAS/BIO, Alex Ruzicka LAS/GEOL, Wayne Wakeland OI, Kerry Wu LIB, Helen Young ED

Activities

We met as a full committee once in the fall and once in the winter to discuss the procedures for review of Professional Travel Grants and Faculty Enhancement Grants. We approved a request from Martha Balshem, Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, to state as policy on the website that the Committee will automatically consider Special Needs requests for Travel Grants as part of the package (i.e., support for an accompanying person). We also discussed and revised the ranking form used to evaluate Faculty Enhancement Grants. Subcommittees met to award Travel Grants in fall, winter, and spring. Another subcommittee met in winter to award funds for Peer Review. The full Committee met three times in April-May to review Faculty Enhancement Grant proposals. Results of all these review processes follow:

Institutional Career Support-Peer Review 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Proposals Funded</th>
<th>Total Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Funds Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$90,845</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Enhancement Grants 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Proposals Funded</th>
<th>Total Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Funds Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>proposals still under review</td>
<td>$782,215</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel Grant Awards FY 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Amount of Awards</th>
<th>Total Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2009</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$240,000 total

222,165 192,346
**Issues**

Due to the collision in timing of the deadlines for Faculty Enhancement Grants and Peer Reviews, we propose that the deadline for Faculty Enhancement Grant proposals be moved earlier in the year so that the Committee’s most intense work can be spread over a longer span of time and focused on only one set of reviews at a time (in addition to subcommittee reviews of Travel Grant proposals).

Consultation with several former Committee chairs suggests that there are ongoing issues related to how the Committee can best evaluate research proposals across a wide range of different disciplines. It is imperative that the Committee be composed of individuals who are themselves engaged in scholarly and/or teaching activities or at least familiar with scholarship or teaching in a way that equips them to judge the merits of proposals. A delicate balance needs to be achieved between making use of disciplinary expertise on the Committee while avoiding conflicts of interest. Every year Committee members are among those submitting proposals for funding, and this cannot be avoided, since those best able to judge proposals are likely to be among those submitting them. We propose that in the future proposals by sitting Committee members undergo separate review by a subcommittee or that some other mechanism be employed to ensure equitable review of all proposals.

There seems to have been a lack of continuity from year to year as far as transmitting policies and experience, with the resultant loss of benefits that could be derived from knowing how previous Committees and chairs dealt with issues. We propose that outgoing chairs formally meet with their successors as well as with appropriate OGSR administrators. Lack of continuity among Committees has also led to a degree of inconsistency in the review of proposals. Even though over time there is need to review the procedures and goals of Faculty Development as the priorities of the University and its faculty shift, the principles used to evaluate proposals should not vary significantly depending on the composition of the Committee.

There is far more need for investment in research than can be accommodated, and this situation will only grow worse as institutional resources shrink. This is all the more reason to be as transparent as possible about the principles guiding the criteria for evaluation of proposals and to ensure that a wide range of disciplinary expertise is represented in the composition of the Committee.

**Committee Charge**

Last year a recommendation was made to amend the Committee’s charge in the Constitution, but apparently the process to enact this was never completed. Therefore, we are submitting a proposed amendment for consideration by the Faculty Senate. The Committee believes that this amendment accurately reflects what the Committee actually does. The evolution of the Committee’s role reflects changes in the University over the past two decades, particularly in the priority given to research.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 13, 2009
To: Faculty Senate
From: Richard Beyler, Chair, Graduate Council
Re: Annual report of the Graduate Council for the 2008-09 academic year

The Graduate Council has been composed of the following members during the past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>Years Served</th>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Beyler (chair, 08-09)</td>
<td>07-09</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Bodegom</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Borgmeier</td>
<td>06-09</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Elzanowski</td>
<td>07-09</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Everett</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toeutu Faaleava</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>AOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Fletcher</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>OIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gould</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Howard</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>LIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Jivanjee</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin LaVallee</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>student member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Maier</td>
<td>07-09</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Marshall</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>SBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Mildner</td>
<td>07-09</td>
<td>CUPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Robillard</td>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>FPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would also like to acknowledge the ongoing assistance provided by the Council’s consultants from the Office of Graduate Studies and Research and from the Office of Academic Affairs: William Feyerherm, DeLys Ostlund, Courtney Ann Hanson, Steve Harmon, and Karen Popp.

The Graduate Council has met approximately twice per month during the academic year to address graduate policy issues, and to review proposals for new graduate programs, program changes, new courses, and course changes. Teams of Council members have also read and recommended on the disposition of graduate petitions.

I. Graduate Policy and Procedures

Activity of the Graduate Council concerning graduate policy and procedures included the following:

- Prior to this year, Portland State University had no time limits for completion of doctoral degrees (in contrast to the seven-year limit for masters degrees). To bring PSU’s doctoral programs more into line with national standards, to create an analog to the existing policy for masters degrees, to provide a clearer framework for graduate advising, and to better ensure the timeliness and currency of students’ research, the Graduate Council considered a new policy regarding time of completion of doctoral degree programs. The Council recommended setting time limits for the various stages within doctoral programs: five years from admission to comprehensive exams (with an additional two years if an MA/MS degree is also needed); three
years from comprehensive exams to advancement to candidacy; and five years from candidacy to graduation. The Faculty Senate approved this new policy at its January meeting.

- The Office of Graduate Studies occasionally receives requests from students to move their application for graduation forward to a subsequent term for the sole purpose of maintaining eligibility for federal financial aid or international student (visa) status. The Graduate Council finds it inappropriate that a student who has met all requirements for the degree and has applied to graduate should be allowed to delay graduation only for such a reason. In addition to ethical issues, compliance with such a request could place Portland State University in a precarious position with various federal agencies. The Council determined that the Office of Graduate Studies should require all students requesting a delay of graduation to provide a rationale for the request and that the reason must be acceptable to OGS.

- Following a recommendation from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, the Graduate Council revised the procedure for implementing the second language requirement for MA and MAT degrees. Previously, undergraduate coursework used to fulfill this requirement could be no more than four years old at the time of admission to the graduate program. This time limitation has now been dropped. (As before, the requirement can also be met by examination.)

- Along with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council began using an on-line "wiki" system for tracking course and program proposals, which also makes it easier for interested persons (including Faculty Senate members) to see the content and progress of proposals. The URL for this website is: http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/.

- Some modifications to the proposal review process resulted from policy changes by the Provost’s Office, the Oregon University System, and the Faculty Senate; these changes, however, primarily affect earlier and later stages and not the work of the Graduate Council per se. Beginning in March, all new program proposals forwarded to the OUS for consideration use a new format which includes a “business plan” and discussion of faculty and other resources, targeted student population, and long-term recruitment and retention predictions for students and faculty. Also, following the March Faculty Senate resolution on the Budget Committee’s role, the Council’s chair met with the chairs of the Budget Committee, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Senate Steering Committee, as well as representatives from the Office of Academic Affairs, to develop a procedure for preliminary review of program proposals by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the Budget Committee.

- Congruent with an April resolution of Faculty Senate, the Graduate Council voted to hold itself in readiness to meet during the summer, if necessary, for consultation about possible actions needed in the face of state budget cuts.
II. New Programs and Program Changes

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the proposals for new programs and program changes recommended for approval by the Council and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate (except where noted). Many of these proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications during the review process. Proposals that are still under review are noted later in this report.

### Table 1. New Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Applied Physics</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA in Creative Writing</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Program Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS in Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Creates comprehensive examination option</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in Speech &amp; Hearing Sciences</td>
<td>Include SpHr 540 and SpHr 570</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW in Social Work</td>
<td>Delete prerequisite of human biology</td>
<td>SSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Education</td>
<td>Add third track (SDEP option)</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>Delete UG courses, include 511, 512, SPAN 514</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in Geography</td>
<td>Add GEOG 523 as requirement</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in TESOL</td>
<td>Add prerequisite of Ling 559</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA in Public Administration: Health</td>
<td>Change requirements to include more health</td>
<td>UPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>focused courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Course Proposals

Table 3 summarizes information on the new course and course change proposals submitted by the various units. A total of 44 new course proposals were reviewed and recommended to the Senate for approval, along with 31 proposals for changes to existing courses. Many course proposals were returned to the proposing unit for modifications as part of the review process, most of which in turn were received back and processed during the year.

### Table 3. Summary of Proposals related to courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>New Course Proposals</th>
<th>Course Chg. Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Credit</td>
<td>2 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Petitions

Teams of Graduate Council members reviewed 49 petitions and issued 51 decisions. The distribution of these petitions among the various categories is presented in Table 4. The approval rate during the past year was consistent with previous years. As in past years, the most common petition was the extension of the 1-year limit on incomplete grades; more than three-quarter of these requests were approved.

For the second year in a row, as demonstrated in Table 5, the total number of petitions is significantly lower than previous years. The Council encourages units to continue efforts towards improving graduate advising, and again encourages units to support and forward on only petitions which are necessitated by genuinely extenuating circumstances.

Table 4. Petitions acted on by the Graduate Council during the 2008-09 academic year (since the last Annual Report May 7, 2008)

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Waive one year deadline for Incompletes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on coursework</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2†</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CREDIT LEVEL/GRADE MODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Change grade mode retroactively (from P to letter-grade or vice versa)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DISQUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Extend probation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Readmission after disqualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Allow readmission while on academic probation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TRANSFER CREDITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Accept more Transfer or Pre-Admission credit than allowed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Accept miscellaneous transfer credits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Indicates more than one request category on a single petition; total reflects 51 decisions on 49 petitions
Table 5. Historic overview 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 Degrees Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Program Proposals in Progress (scheduled for review by Graduate Council in Fall 2009)

- Ph.D. in Pacific Northwest Studies
- Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics
- Graduate Certificate in Strategic Management of Technology
- Graduate Certificate in Technological Entrepreneurship
- Graduate Certificate in Technology Management

VI. Future Graduate Policy and Other Activity

- Possible improvements to the course proposal form/procedure, in particular to clarify the way in which proposing faculty and units address the question of possible overlap with other courses and other departments’ curricula.
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TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Teacher Education Committee
Barb Ruben, Chair

RE: Teacher Education Committee Annual Report 2008-2009

Committee Members:
William Tate, TA, Ellen Reuler, SPHR, Sarah Morgan ART, William Fischer, FLL, Jeanette Palmiter, MTH, Michael Cummings, GEOL, Jim Bickford SPED, Thomas Kindermann PSY, Jane Mercer SCH, Debbie Glaze, MUS, Greg Jacob ENG. Carol Morgaine, Child & Family Studies, Mike Shuster, BUS

Student Members: Deb Miller (Ed.D candidate and Director of Licensure)), Christina Overturf (CI)

Ex-Officio Members: Randy Hitz, Dean, GSE, Steven Isaacson, Associate Dean for Academics, Sarah Beasley Education Librarian. Emily Dela Cruz, GTEP Coordinator. Cheryl Livneh, Association Dean for Outreach/Director of Continuing Education

Regular Invited Guests: Karen DeVoll, CLAS, Lynda Pullen BTP/ITEP Advisor, Leah Hershey, CEED Programmer. Robert Mercer, Associate Dean CLAS, Christine Chaille, Chair CI

The University Teacher Education Committee (TEC) operates under the premise that teacher education is an all-university activity and responsibility, and TEC serves in an advisory capacity to coordinate activities of the schools, colleges, and departments of the University that are directly involved in teacher education. The TEC provides a direct communication link between the Graduate School of Education (GSE), the unit directly responsible for teacher education, and those departments across the university involved in the education of teacher candidates.

TEC Activities 2008-2009

The TEC focused on two primary areas. First, we continued our ongoing work to enhance the flow of students from PSU’s undergraduates programs to the GSE graduate programs. Second we worked to clean up the language in the job description and composition of our committee in the faculty governance guide.

Working closely with Emily de la Cruz, the GTEP coordinator, we worked on an early admissions process in which undergraduate programs may design procedures for their students to be considered for early admissions into our teacher licensure program during the spring of their junior year. These select students would enter GTEP directly after
completing their senior year. This will allow students the opportunity to map out a course of study as an undergraduate that will ensure appropriate preparation for teacher education at the graduate level. The early admissions process complements the work we did last year in establishing education minors. GTEP is looking forward to receiving proposals soon from undergraduate program interested in pursuing this option for their students.

The Teacher Education Committee updated the language in the faculty governance guide and anticipates approval by the Faculty Senate the end of this year. The purpose and members of the TEC are updated and clarified in the proposed changes.

We continue to strive to increase communication between Portland State’s undergraduate programs and the Graduate School of Education, particularly the academic department advisors who work closely with the GSE in advising future teacher candidates on their content area preparation. This has been particularly important this year as the GSE transitioned to an earlier December 1st admission deadline. We planned an information session in September 2009 for all academic department advisors. This meeting will set the tone for next year’s advising to be more informed and consistent for our potential teacher candidates.

TEC continues to provide an important venue for dialogue, communication, and sharing between the GSE and the rest of the Portland State University community as outlined in the committee’s mission statement.
General Student Affairs Committee
Annual Report
June 1, 2009

1. GSAC charge:
The committee consists of 5 faculty members and 5 members of the Associated Students of PSU. The chairperson is chosen from the faculty membership. Consultants include one representative from the Vice Provost office and the other one from the Dean of Students office.

The committee overall responsibilities are following (Art. IV., 4, k):
1. Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, budget, student discipline and educational activities.
2. Review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs and planning (counseling, health service, etc.)
3. Nominate the recipients of the Presidential Community Service Awards
4. Report to Senate at least once a year.”

The members of the 2008-2009 GSAC are:
Galina Kogan, FLL – Chair of GSAC
Randy BLazak, SOC
Chris Goodrich, UASC-OVA
Linda Absher, LIB-W
Ethan Johnson, BST

Students:
Monique Peterson
Amina Ali
Sean Rains
Kyle Cady

Consultants:
Jackie Balzer, Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Michele Toppe, Interim Dean of Students
Burton Christopherson, Director of Affirmative Action
John Wanjala, Campus Ombudsperson

2. Highlights of GSAC activities academic year 2008-2009
The committee met on April 6, 2009 to plan the spring agenda. The decision was made to continue two main activities.

GSAC Campus Forums taking place in Fall 2009 and Winter 2010. Fall topic will student-focused and winter topic will be faculty-focused.

Presidential Awards: The GSAC is responsible for awarding two presidential awards that are presented at commencement.
The President’s Award for Outstanding Community Engagement is an honor conferred annually to a maximum of 12 students who have engaged in an ongoing community service effort off campus.
The President’s Award for Outstanding University Service is an honor conferred annually to a maximum of 12 students who have engaged in an ongoing effort to enhance the student experience at PSU.
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Criteria in selection:
- GPA of 2.5 or higher;
- Junior, Senior, Post-baccalaureate or Graduate class standing;
- Letter of endorsement

The GSAC will notify President’s Award recipients beginning May 15th, 2009. Award recipients receive a $100 honorarium, are acknowledged at a luncheon scheduled for June 3, 2009, 12-1:30. Recipients are also profiled in a display case on the second floor of Smith Memorial Student Union for one year. Information on the application process is available at http://www.pdx.edu/dos/presidents_awards.html

Other Student Affairs updates from 2008-2009:
- Revision of Student Code of Conduct pending OAR rule revision process.
  Changes include:

  - Revision of **Student Code of Conduct** pending OAR rules revision process.
    Significant changes include:
    * Separate academic negligence from academic dishonesty. Academic Negligence is a new section for this code.
    * Separate sexual misconduct and sexual assault. Sexual Assault is a new section for this code.
    * Move appeal of conduct decisions from DOS to VPSA
    * Made violation of all University policies a violation of Code (instead of just listing alcohol, Computer policy, housing policy)
    * Alphabetized the definitions at the beginning
    * Created new emergency action section (replaced interim suspension)
    * Took out all PSU violations that were already listed as OUS violations

- Increase effort to include faculty in admissions and orientation events, student group advising, mentoring students, Native American Studies now housed in the NASCC

- **Healthy Campus Initiative**, spearheaded by Jackie Balzer, VPSA, meeting beginning spring 2009 to discuss a campus wide effort to initiate and uphold best practices and campus-wide efforts that highlight and promote healthy living and development;
- Continue to expand work of **Students of Concern Committee (SOCC) and Student Issues Team (SIT)** to effectively support students experiencing mental health issues and provide campus with tools and resources for responding to distressed students and disruptive behavior;
- Utilize data collected regarding student progress by to coordinate efforts ARR, UASC, CSHAC, Residence Life, SOCC and other units in order to **identify students at risk and develop targeted interventions** for them;
- Continue and enhance residential **Living Learning communities** through expanded and deepened partnerships between UNST and Residence Life Program (Current floors include Freshmen Year Experience (FYE), Global Village, Russian language immersion floor, and Sustainability floor).
- Continue to implement recommendations from First **Steps to Student Success and Retention Report**, including policies and programs that enhance college preparedness, new student orientation, academic advising, and use of student support services.

Galina Kogan, Chair
Scholastic Standards Committee
2008-2009 Report to the Faculty Senate

Chair: Jennifer Loney (SBA)

Members: Gerardo Lafferriere (MTH)
Shoshana Zeisman (UASC)
Don Frank (LIB)
Melissa Thompson (SOC)
Jennifer Dahlin (SHAC)
Aleksander Jokic (PHL)
Andrew Flight (MTH)
Randy Miller (CUPA)
Radu Popa (BIO)
Haley Holmes (SBA)

Consultants: Shawn Smallman (OAA)
Veda Kindle (ARR)
Liane Gough (UASC)

Committee Responsibilities: The Scholastic Standards Committee is charged with recommending academic standards that maintain the reputation of the undergraduate program of the University. It advises the Admissions, Registration & Records Office in academic matters concerning transfer students or students seeking reinstatement after having had academic deficiencies. It assists undergraduate students who are having difficulty with scholastic regulations and adjudicates student petitions that request retroactive addition or withdrawal of courses, tuitions refunds, retroactive changes in grading options, and completion of incompletes after one year.

Committee Activities: The SSC meets bi-monthly throughout the year (including summer term) to review student petitions and to discuss policy issues. The chair thanks all the committee members for their hard work in keeping up with the flow of student petitions, and for their diligence in maintaining the integrity of the students’ transcripts.

The Committee read 1,107 petitions from April 1, 2008 through April 1, 2009. This was an increase of 10% from last year. There was a decrease in reinstatement petitions filed with SSC this year (76 filed this year versus 106 filed last year). The number of Add/Drop petitions filed this year dropped 11.5%. This is due to the changes in registration deadlines implemented Fall 2008. The number of Grade Option Changes decreased slightly. All other numbers are relatively consistent with last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition Type</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Inc/Pending</th>
<th>% Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Extension</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option Changes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: If you add the total petitions column, you will see it does not add up to 1,107. This is because many of the refunds are also included in the add/drop row but are not counted twice.

The SSC thanks the faculty and staff for the time and thought they devote to the letters of support (or denial) that accompany student petitions; they are often the deciding factor in the committee’s decision.
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Faculty need to remember to complete a contract with each student awarded an “I” grade. This contract spells out the expectations and requirements for the student to receive a grade and also communicates the change, after one year, of the “I” to an “F” if the work is not completed. SSC continues to work with Admissions, Registration & Records to implement this change. The more consistent faculty are with their incomplete contracts, the fewer petitions will be filed and the easier it will be to make decisions.

SSC has been discussing and working with four topics this year.

- The first topic is the need to streamline the petition process by establishing set guidelines for students to follow when filing petitions. These guidelines should be completed and implemented for Fall term 2009. This will include a revision of the SSC petition itself.
- The second topic is to establish a consistent refund policy. This may entail incorporating the PSU Business Office (Cashiers) in part of the decision process. The goal is to align this process with other OUS institutions. This is an ongoing discussion.
- The third topic is the change in the Academic Support Program (ASP) offered by UASC and the effect it has on dismissed students. Starting in Summer term 2009, ASP will no longer work with dismissed students. This means the SSC must re-establish the process a student may follow to be readmitted to the University. This process should be in place by Summer term 2009.
- The fourth topic is creating a credit limit for students on Academic Warning and Probation. The new credit limit restriction will be designed to help students before they are academically dismissed from the University. The goal is to have the limit in place during the 2009/2010 school year.

Discussions of these four topics will continue through the summer. Completed items requiring Faculty Senate approval will be presented in Fall 2009.