NOTICE TO SENATORS AND EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE:
Copies of page 2 of E.1. University Curriculum Committee Annual Report that were missing from the December Senate Mailing are attached after the last page of this mailing. Please file with December materials.
TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty  

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 8, 2001, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.  

AGENDA  

A. Roll  

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 4, 2000, Meeting  

B. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  

President’s Report  
Provost’s Report  

D. Question Period  

1. Questions for Administrators  
2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair  

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees  

1. Report on the President’s Student Advising Action Council  
*3. Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee - Ketcheson  
*4. Quarterly Report of the University Planning Council - Ritchie  

F. Unfinished Business  

*1. Report on the University Studies Program continued from December 4, 2000  

G. New Business  

1. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV., Organization of the Faculty  
2. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Article V., Faculty Senate  

H. Adjournment  

*The following documents are included with this mailing:  
B Minutes of the December 4, 2000, Senate Meeting  
E2 Library Committee Annual Report  
E3 Faculty Development Committee Annual Report  
E4 University Planning Council Quarterly Report  
F1 Supplemental information will be provided for the meeting. Report on the University Studies Report included in the December Senate mailing.  
G1 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV., Organization of the Faculty  
G2 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Article V., Faculty Senate  

Secretary to the Faculty  
andrewscolliers@pdx.edu • 341 CH • 725-4416/Fax:725-4499
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 4, 2000
Presiding Officer: Judy Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Bjork, Cabelly, Carpenter, Chaille, Falco, Farr, Feeney, Fortmiller, George, Glanville, Hunter, L.Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Peterson, Rogers, Shireman, Sherman, Skinner, Turcic, Wang, Wosley-George.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

The minutes of the 6 November 2000 meeting were approved with the following correction: p. 10, Douglas Sherman, ED, was present at the October & November Senate meetings.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies has distributed the notice, "Appropriate Use of I and X Grades" (attached), to instructional faculty, as requested by the 1999-2000 Faculty Senate.

Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since 6 November 2000:
Marc Feldesman, ANTH, has been appointed to fill the vacant CLAS position left by Mark Trowbridge (2001) in the Faculty Senate.

The SBA caucus of the Faculty Senate elected Rodney Rogers, SBA, to serve on the Committee on Committee. He replaces Alan Cabelly, who is on sabbatical.

Committee on Committee appointments to committee vacancies: Wendy Stewart, LIB, has been appointed Chair, Deadline Appeals Committee; Richard Hunter, SSW, has been appointed to the Academically Controlled Auxiliary Activities Committee; Ric Vrana, GEOG, has been appointed a CLAS representative to University Planning Council; Barbara Guthrie has been appointed the SES representative to the University Planning Council; Joseph Poracsky has been appointed to the Student Conduct Committee; Marjorie Enneking has been appointed the Mathematics representative to the Teacher Education Committee; Rebecca Robinson has been appointed the SES representative to the Curriculum Committee.

Committee on Committee appointments to calendar year committees, effective 1 January 2001: Curriculum Committee: Stephen Walton, FLL, replaces Everett for CLAS; Jan Semenza, SCH, replaces Gelmon for UPA; Emily de la Cruz replaces Narode for ED. Beverly Fuller is re-appointed Chairperson.

Graduate Council: Robert Eder is re-appointed Chairperson; Sandra Wilde replaces Lewis for ED.

Library Committee: Tim Anderson is appointed Chairperson; David Holloway, ENG, replaces Gorji.

The President is not in attendance as he was called out of town.

**Provost’s Report**

TETREAULT noted that the President sends his regards and both he and she thank all of you for the work you have done this quarter, particularly for the increased number of students taught, research completed, community partnerships nurtured and forged, and also for the growth in fundraising and the capital campaign.

The Governor’s budget was released on December 1st, and it is available on the Web and copies will be placed in the Library. George Pernsteiner, Jay Kenton and Dick Pratt worked through the weekend, to review and respond to it. This morning, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., Vice Pres. Pernsteiner and the Provost attended the "Presidents Plus One" Meeting, to discuss the system-wide response. The discussion was impressively collegial; there seemed to be broad consensus that one of the things to be emphasized was "quality with full funding of the Budget Model." Of course this budget is tentative because the process is just beginning.
We need to use this budget cycle to sharpen our priorities and our vision, and our budget and enrollment planning. Budgets always challenge you to do that. We need to go forward with our year-long series of thinking about what it means to be a great university in this great city, and use the roundtables, the public forums and the Urban Portfolio Project to articulate what that means for us. It is more incumbent on us than ever to put ideas behind the idea of a great university. The first PSU roundtable will be held December 6, to discuss current future collaborations between PSU, OGI, and OHSU, and will include faculty and deans from CLAS, CUPA, GSSW and CECS. On February 7 there will be a public forum to include, as well, representatives from OGI and OHSU. We also expect to go forward with the next idea on the year-long series, creative industries.

As has already been discussed with the Budget Committee, we also need to develop long-term budget and enrollment strategies. The Budget Committee has received a proposal for long term and short-term projects; and with the release of the Governor’s budget, it would appear the long term is now. The Budget Committee has agreed that we jointly address enrollment-related questions identified by the Enrollment Management Policy Committee. These include issues related to optimizing enrollment to contribute to institutional revenues, student learning, research, and the quality of faculty and staff work life. We will also work together to clarify how PSU will invest institutional resources with our academic mission in mind to intentionally shape enrollment in relation to the number and mix of students and programs. This includes the question of how we tie enrollment growth and planning to resource allocation. Lastly, we also need to work with Vice President Pernsteiner and others, the AAUP, to develop a position paper that addresses the issue of faculty and staff salaries and how to make consistent progress in achieving parity with peer institutions.

There has been an initiative for faculty and departments to write proposals addressing the issues of enhancing faculty vitality while increasing student learning. The purpose is for faculty and departments to think in new ways about how we do our basic work of teaching and how to do that in ways that don’t increase costs but do enhance faculty vitality and student learning. Fifteen proposals have been received so far, and hopefully, new models will result from the proposals that are funded.

We need to organize around the idea of maintaining quality by advocating current funding of the budget model. We are compelled to support the Governor’s budget, and we will address its impact on PSU, however, both the Governor and the Legislature in the last session made funding the model the highest priority. We need to work with them to maintain quality by staying the course on the budget model.

The Administration will work with the Budget Committee and CADS to address all of the issues above in relation to the budget reality, as it becomes clear in the coming weeks and months.
PERNSTEINER stated the framework for the budget discussions is the fact that the State General Fund budget does not have enough revenue to fund the Current Service Level in the next biennium. In other words, to do exactly what we are doing now but with the increased costs of salary roll-ups, there are not enough funds. There are three major reasons: 1) the economy is not growing as rapidly as recently, thus reducing the growth in income tax revenues; 2) as in every biennium, year two costs are larger than year one; and, 3) the state has incurred debts of approximately several hundred million dollars as a result of several lawsuits, and these must be paid from the general fund. The net effect of these factors is about a $700 - 800 million shortfall in the current service level. Within that framework, the Governor also had proposed several initiatives, some of which are not intended to be funded by the General Fund, such as the rural initiatives, but some of which are, such as the Early Childhood Initiatives. The result is that most agencies, including OUS, saw a reduction in their budgets from what it takes to continue at the Current Service Level. Additionally, the Governor has asked higher education to take on some new initiatives within the monies he has allocated. They include the Bend program, some engineering investments, and a stabilization fund for the rural campuses. Thus, with reduced dollars, we will be required to do additional things we were not doing in '99-01.

The focus of today’s meetings was the potential impact of the Governor’s budget on the Oregon University System. It is safe to say that we will be doing some very careful looking at our budgets. We must maintain our quality, while continuing to serve students, increasing funded research, and keeping college affordable to students. We must save some monies during the remainder of this year in order to help us plan our way over the following biennium. We have to do it in a way so as not to hurt the enrollment of the students currently being served, and does not hurt our trajectory of funded research. We are on the right path; we are doing the things we are supposed to be doing and we are doing the things we want to be doing. Lastly, we will also have to focus our attention on what our high priorities are during the next two years, in order that we can get through the biennium. We may have some budget reductions in those years. We don’t yet have numbers.

As the Legislative Session unfolds, as we get further revenue forecasts, as we get more certainty about the costs of lawsuits, as we get a little more clarity about the priorities of the Governor and the legislative leadership, our goal will be to fund the model as fully as is possible to fund it. We want to maintain our quality and we want to maintain the trajectory we are on, with respect to both enrollment and funded research. In the coming weeks we will be working with the Budget Committee and the Council of Academic Deans, to begin to ferret out the plans we will need to work through the next several months. To reiterate, if we don’t have a higher appropriation level than the Governor’s proposal once the Legislative Session is completed, the ‘00-01 savings will be used to ameliorate cuts in ‘01-02 and will not be returned to units.
BURNS requested a clarification of budget figures listed in the 2 December Oregonian which suggested an increase in OUS funding. PERNSTEINER stated that although it appears on page 32 of the "Budget in Brief," nobody can figure out what that $691.4 million means. Our appropriation in the '99-01 biennium, was more than $750 million, and the appropriation for the '01-03 biennium is roughly $760 million (including OHSU in both cases).

KOCH asked if the Vice President could estimate the size of the problem. PERNSTEINER stated it is hard to say at this date. If you make some assumptions about enrollment growth and access funding, about tuition increases allowed by the Governor, and about some of the other things looked at this year, you begin to narrow the number down to the point that, working with the Deans and the Budget Committee, we can have some realistic plans that will allow us to stay on our current trajectory. However, it won't be easy.

A. JOHNSON asked what percentage of our total budget comes from the state. PERNSTEINER stated it depends on what you count; if you count everything you get, it's about 22%, but if you don't count the auxiliaries, the funded research, etc., it is about 50%.

NEAL asked, if by saying "save some monies" now the Vice President means cuts. PERNSTEINER stated what he is hoping to do is to bank some money this year. For example, if you have a vacancy and are not going to fill it, if you would give him back that money he will put it in an account with your name on it. If it isn't needed, he will let you roll it forward, and you will not loose the position. It's a way of "cashflowing" us through. Otherwise, if you go right up to the date and spend everything you had you have to cut extra to get through the next year. In the second year of the biennium, given the way the state funding works, we would have more money than in the first year. Rather than ratcheting up and down, we would try to smooth it out a little bit.

SBAIT asked if the proposed budget includes a 4% tuition increase per year. PERNSTEINER stated, yes, and that the board had already requested an increase in tuition. SBAIT noted we are one of the highest states, nationwide, with regard to charging students. How will a tuition increase help students, especially low-income students? PERNSTEINER stated that affordability is of great concern. In relation to the Western states, we have a relatively high tuition, and in relation to national tuition rates, we are sort of average. In terms of affordability, because our income in Oregon is slightly below the national norm, it makes it less affordable than for students in some other states.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Faculty Senator Michael Cummings submitted the following questions for Vice Provost Allen on 4 December:

   1. What is the status of the reciprocity agreement that allows students from southwestern Washington to attend PSU at in-state tuition rates? I understand, the program has run out of money and is no
longer available. Has the program been permanently discontinued? Or will be refunded by the next legislature? If it is discontinued, what is the potential impact on enrollment at PSU?

2. Now that we have joint agreements with area community colleges (each one being slightly different), what is the policy on financial aid? If a student takes 8 credits at PSU and 4 credits at PCC does this count as 12 credits for financial aid purposes? Is the total number of credits taken at both institutions what is counted or is it only the credit load at PSU that counts?

ALLEN responded to question #1. She noted that the reciprocity agreement with Washington State, which had been in effect for many years, was not funded in the last legislative session. Chancellor Cox signed an agreement with the Higher Education Coordinating Council of Washington to "grandfather" students currently in the reciprocity program to their degree completion. Therefore, no funding has been withdrawn, but the program is ending. PSU has developed an alternative by replacing it with a merit scholarship program for students in the five bordering counties. Anyone with a 3.0 or above is eligible to apply for the limited number of scholarships, currently set at 300, which will range from $4,500 - $6,000 per year in fee remissions. We hope this will soften the impact of losing the reciprocity program. ALLEN noted we also participate in "WUE", the Western Undergraduate Exchange program, which allows students from western states to attend PSU at 150% of in-state tuition, however, only twenty-one baccalaureate majors qualify. HOFFMAN added that while the new program does not provide comparable funding, 70 scholarships are reserved for incoming Freshman and the rest are available for students with 30 transferable hours, as opposed to the required 90 transfer hours in the former program. The announcement is already on the Web.

BRENNAN asked if these scholarships would be available for graduate students, as the reciprocity agreement was. ALLEN stated no, noting also that the reciprocity agreement included only 30 graduate placements.

A. JOHNSON commented that WSU-Vancouver is advertising on Tri Met busses that they charge instate tuition. ALLEN noted that the ads are somewhat misleading. Beginning this year, they have the same tuition policy we have, e.g., students enrolled part-time (less than 8 hours) may use the in-state tuition rate.

SBAIT asked what was the number of students served under the old program and what is the impact. PERNSTEINER stated there were 228. ALLEN stated the objective of the new program is to soften the fiscal blow of losing those students. SBAIT asked if they could move to Oregon. ALLEN stated they have to meet the same residency requirements as anyone else, and full-time enrollment actually makes getting residency harder.

D. JOHNSON asked if students taking less than 8 hours are assessed in-state fees. ALLEN stated yes. KENTON added that all students, not just Washingtonians, are assessed in-state fees for less than 8 hours.
MERCER noted that as the proportion of state support diminishes, the notion of in state versus out-of-state tuition becomes more obsolete. MERCER also asked for a clarification of residency policy at Eastern Oregon. ALLEN stated that the new policy is based on the notion that the Portland metropolitan area is on both sides of the river, regardless of state. PERNSTEINER stated Eastern Oregon has had only in-state tuition since the 1950's, however, the small schools are all getting one or another break and we are not really comparable. PSU has argued unsuccessfully for years that our Vancouver students should pay in-state tuition, in the same way that if they work on this side of the river they pay Oregon income tax.

ALLEN responded to question #2. She noted that we have joint financial aide agreements with PCC, MHCC, and Clackamas CC for co-admitted students, which allows us to count enrollment at both institutions towards the 12-hour full-time requirement. This does not apply to other community colleges.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Curriculum Committee

GELMON presented the report, after G.1., and thanked the committee and consultants for this year's work.

MILLER-JONES asked for comment on the issues of pre-requisites for upper division courses, as opposed to prohibition of pre-requisites for upper division UNST cluster courses. A. JOHNSON noted that the Academic Requirements Committee is looking at the issue of prerequisites. The new "DARS" records program makes it possible to automatically block enrollments and several programs have requested it. PALMITER noted that Math is already taking this information off "Banner."

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Annual Report of the Graduate Council

EDER presented the report after E.7. noting one error: page 2, last paragraph, 3rd sentence, should read: "Overall 92% of the petitions were approved, which is a greater increase..."

A. JOHNSON commended the language of sentence 2, Preamble, "Graduate and Professional Programs Mission Statement," page 2.

RUETER asked, regarding the Masters of ESE, how were you able to specify one particular pedagogical approach (e.g. on-line), and was that approved at the outset or when the proposal was approved? EDER stated the history of the proposal was that it was externally mandated as a collaborative project to be largely web-based. It
received the usual scrutiny, including examination of the on-line issues, and was approved before Eder joined the Graduate Council.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.


4. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee

DIETERICH presented the report, immediately after D. Question Period.

A. JOHNSON noted that the Academic Requirements Committee first reviewed the request for A+ grading and passed it on to Scholastic Standards.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

5. Quarterly Report of the University Planning Council

The Chairperson was not in attendance; therefore the Presiding Officer postponed the report to January 2001.

6. Report on the University Studies Program

The Presiding Officer vacated the Chair for the period of this report, and Presiding Officer Pro tem Robert Mercer took the Chair.

GELMON presented the UCC cover report as well as the UNST report, after E.1.

WOLLNER/PATTON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the report.

PALMITER noted she has read the report completely, and asked what was being asked of them beside general information. GELMON stated the request was for a report on what they were learning about what they were doing. This was the first comprehensive, integrated study of the program. The Curriculum Committee did not dictate or direct the study in any way. RHODES stated, although he came into the process after it had started, the attempt was to pull together all information collected up to that point, and to fold this assessment into the overall university assessment pilot project. GELMON noted the report indicates where the University Curriculum Committee sees a need for further and/or improved assessment in the future. RHODES agreed.

SHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification of the graphs on pages 12 - 14. RHODES stated that Martha Balshem prepared the graphs but couldn’t attend this meeting. He continued that these charts show overall that the student performance was average.
SHUSTERMAN asked for a clarification of the chart on page 18, and noted it is difficult to evaluate this assessment. RHODES stated that this chart indicates an overall positive response by the students to the program in this term. GELMON stated that the Curriculum Committee encountered similar difficulties in following this information, and noted that the executive summary provides a good synthesis of the findings, however, the committee felt it was their role to encourage assessment, not micro manage the procedures.

BRENNER asked if the Curriculum Committee has requested any particulars for the next round, and requested inclusion of the following questions: 1) Are there any specific learning objectives established for PSU's University Studies Program? 2) If yes, what are they (especially for science and mathematics)? If no, how and when will they be established? GELMON stated the committee felt its parameters did not include assessment of particular programs. BRENNER stated that this program replaced a large body of curriculum, and issues of boundaries, etc., are not the same as those for major programs, for example. GELMON stated if the Senate directs the Curriculum Committee to ask certain specific questions, the committee could direct these questions to the Assessment Council.

EDER asked Vice Provost Rhodes if this "in-house" self-study with no external review will be characteristic of the other assessments which will take place. RHODES stated, yes, that each unit is responsible for articulating the student learning outcomes in that unit. In the case of University Studies, they are attempting to articulate the goals approved by the Senate in a more operational manner, so they can be tested better. Most of the work done to this point has been about curriculum development, and student responses have been positive. We are inviting outside units to assist in the development of the Rubrics as well as how to measure them. EDER asked if, in summary, this means that assessments in future will be more rigorous. RHODES stated yes.

HOLLOWAY noted the difference between this and all other academic units is that the results of their decisions affect the graduation of every student, so its whole nature is different. [TRANSCRIPT STOPPED HERE AT 4:45 p.m.] CRAWSHAW agreed this is very different from other programs; University Studies is not just a major, it is supporting all the programs. Therefore, all faculty need to be involved in review.

... MERCER called for order.

PATTON stated that faculty members outside the program have participated in portions of the review, and many teach in the program. What is needed is help with the Rubrics and development.

__________ commented on lack of coordination of or at the level of Clusters.
RUETER referenced the Curriculum Committee Report of the UNST Assessment Plan, Faculty Senate Meeting of 5 June 2000, "Overview", last paragraph, indicating "improvement," and noted that "that part is missing in the report." RUETER ....."cut some slack..." GELMON responded ...

RUETER stated that the report is self-referential; and suggested an "all curriculum" pilot be put on the table to compare with/get out of this bind.

D. JOHNSON/A.JOHNSON MOVED TO TABLE the item.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MERCER noted that a request will be forwarded to Martha Balshem be in attendance at the January Senate meeting to answer questions that came up today.

7. **Report of the IFS Meeting of 2-3 December at OHSU**

WOLLNER reported, after E.5. He noted that as the meeting had just occurred, the written report was not ready, but will be included in the January Senate mailing (attached). Three items were of particular interest 1) The new OSU board chairperson, Don Van Luvanee, Chairman and CEO of Electro Scientific Industries spoke about his particular interest in technical education. He also said that the board should "guide but not lead the institutions" and under his stewardship it should be moving out of the business of micro-managing the state system. 2) PEBB rates will be again held down in 2001, but we should expect dramatic increases in 2002 barring any unforeseen developments. 3) Senators are requested to take an informal vote for or against conversion to semester. (The result was the PSU Faculty Senate favored conversion by a majority voice vote).

BRENNAN noted the palatability of a semester conversion is dependent on the sincerity of the intent. CRAWSHAW stated that it is a better overall instructional mode, but questioned the benefit for PSU's students, and he noted that in addition to the issue of sincerity there is the issue of cost. BRENNER noted that unless there is a definitive study, which includes all the parties at the outset, we should not take this seriously. WOLLNER stated we are not alone in the system in our reservations about this issue.

WOLLNER concluded by noting that he has been elected 2001 President of the IFS, Elaine Deutschman, OIT was elected President-elect; Jeff Johnson, EOU was elected Secretary, and Gary Tiedeman, OSU was elected representative to the Academic Council.
F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course Proposals and Program Changes

EDER presented the proposals, after E.2.

A. JOHNSON/FOSQUE MOVED THE PROPOSALS ("E2") BE APPROVED by the Faculty Senate.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals

GELMON presented the proposals, including summarizing page 2, which is missing from the December packet (attached).

A. JOHNSON/FISHER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.2., Part 1., Proposals from CLAS and CECS."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/CUMMINGS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G.2., Part 2, Proposals from SBA."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

A. JOHNSON/BODEGOM MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE "G., 2., Part 3, Proposals from SFPA."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


REUTER asked a question about and item, which GELMON answered.

THE MOTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

MERCER concluded the day's proceedings with a thank you speech to outgoing Curriculum Committee chairperson, Sherril Gelmon, for the outstanding work she has done over the past
two years in developing and coordinating procedures and the approvals process for University Studies courses and program, in addition to the committee's regular on-going workload. The assembly acknowledged Prof. Gelmon with standing Applause.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
At the December 6, 1999 Faculty Senate meeting, a unanimous voice vote endorsed a regular notification to faculty regarding the appropriate use of the "I" and "X" grades. When you assign grades at the end of the quarter, please keep in mind the following:

A grade of "I" may be assigned ONLY when all of the following exist:

- Overall quality of work to date is "C-" or above.
- Essential work remains to be completed, i.e. assigning a course grade including a "grade" for the missing work would drop the student's grade a letter grade below student's current grade.
- Reasons for the incomplete work are acceptable to the faculty member, and
- Consultation has occurred and a formal agreement for completion of the work has been reached.

Grades of "I" remain on the transcript indefinitely and do not automatically become an "F." Students have one year (or less if faculty member stipulates in the agreement) to complete the work.

A grade of "X" may be assigned when a faculty member has no basis for assigning a grade, e.g. non-attendance.

In other situations, a standard grade is to be assigned.

If you have any questions, please contact Fran Fahey x53402 in the Admissions and Records Office.
Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting Report

The IFS meeting of 1 and 2 December, 2000 was held at OHSU. On Friday, the senators were greeted by Provost Leslie Hallick who reviewed the recent history of the institution.

Lynn Snodgrass, outgoing Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Oregon Legislature spoke to the group about the role of IFS at the Legislature. Calling Professors “a special interest” like any other interest group that lobbies for its agenda at the Legislature, she urged the organization to stay active on behalf of faculty. She also said that higher education should work to repeal term limits (although she herself was an initial supporter of the concept) as a means of assuring that higher ed concerns would get a fair and knowledgeable hearing, rather than haphazard consideration by new legislators with little background in its importance.

Next, Professor Katherine O’Meara of the OHSU School of Nursing spoke about the pros and cons of distance education at OHSU.

IFS then conducted a question and answer session with Don Van Luvanee, Chairman and CEO of Electro Scientific Industries and President of the Board of the Oregon University System. A Ph.D. electro physicist by education, he emphasized his interest in education generally, but especially technical education. Van Luvanee emphasized several keys that he expected would mark his tenure as board leader. He said that the board would guide but not lead the OUS institutions. The board, he said, is “moving out of the business of micro managing the system.” He said the board under his leadership would be more interested in “refereeing not blueprinting.” At the same time, he emphasized that “where there are opportunities to do more, I will carry” the initiatives.

Finally, on Friday, Denise Yunker, Benefits Manager at OUS and Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel, updated the group about the trend in health benefits provided by PEBB. They pointed out that costs in the health care market are going up by about 30 percent and predicted that by 2002 OUS will have to hike rates to match the soaring costs. As one strategy to keep costs low, OUS floated a plan devised by its PEBB task force to keep costs down more or less permanently. This involved an independent plan of some sort, but the bid for independence was rejected by PEBB itself and the Legislature. PEBB has nevertheless been persuaded to fund the real increase of 2000 in 2001, keeping premiums at about the same level.

Although a purchasing coalition has been proposed to PEBB which would allow OUS to buy insurance for OUS employees, this option also looks doubtful as far as a PEBB endorsement is concerned. In order to make the insurance offered in 2002 affordable by OUS and by employees, they predicted that PEBB would have to redesign its program in order to survive. This might include dropping cash-back option. In any case, they were confident that rates would go up substantially in 2002.

On Saturday, 2 December, IFS held elections for the coming term (January 2001–January 2002). The new officers are Craig Wollner, PSU, president; Elaine Deutschman, OIT, president-elect; Jeff Johnson, EOU, secretary; and Gary Tiedeman, OSU, representative to the Academic Council.

In other business, senators were asked to poll their campuses to determine if there would be support for a semester conversion plan. (This was accomplished at the PSU Faculty Senate meeting of Monday, 3 December with a majority favoring conversion).

Following a campus-by-campus review of distance education initiatives, in which it became clear that PSU had by far the biggest program, the meeting was adjourned.

Submitted by Craig Wollner

Craig Wollner
Professor, Social Science
Fellow, Inst. of Portland Metro. Studies

PSU Faculty Senate Meeting
December 4, 2000
Last year a subcommittee (Zelick, Anderson) was formed to conduct a pair of evaluations of the library from two very different perspectives. The first evaluation examined the faculty’s perception of the performance of the library through the use of a detailed survey. The second evaluation benchmarked the PSU Library against PSU’s official peer institutions.

Survey of PSU Faculty

A survey form was sent to all faculty, as determined from a bargaining unit member list supplied by AAUP. The PSU administration is contractually obligated to supply a current list to AAUP, so this was assumed to be reasonably accurate. The library committee prepared, addressed, and mailed 900 surveys. A copy of the survey is attached. The purpose of the survey was to find out how the faculty feel about the service they obtain from their library. The different categories of questions were determined after much discussion with the full library committee. Furthermore, there was a preliminary survey mailed in the Spring of 1999, which helped us improve our questions.

Notably absent from the survey were questions pertaining to electronic services. The committee understands that these are in flux, because of rapidly changing technology, but hopes to do another survey in the future specifically addressing the faculty’s needs in this area.

Survey Analysis Results:

There were 199 full responses to the survey. The responses were analyzed with the help of Mr. Chuck Harper, at the time a graduate student taking courses in Engineering Management. A full copy of the report prepared by Mr. Harper is available on request. A detailed summary of the findings is attached.

As can be seen from the survey, satisfaction levels for various library services were ranked on a scale ranging from “strongly agree” with being satisfied, to “strongly disagree” with being satisfied. The four categories were given a numerical score (4=strongly agree that you are satisfied, 3=mostly agree, 2=mostly disagree, and 1=strongly disagree that you are satisfied). There were 27 separate categories of service for which a mean satisfaction score was obtained.

The library scored high marks for most general services, and obtained a mean rank of approximately 3.0 for the question of being satisfied with the level of service provided by the library (our most general question). Eighteen categories of service were ranked with a score of 2.5 or better, the score at which the average
response is midway between “strongly agree that service is satisfactory” and “strongly disagree that service is satisfactory”.

There were a number of areas where the library did not receive such high marks. The lowest five of these are:

- Sufficient journals in research area: 2.37
- Informed of deleted subscriptions or materials: 1.78
- Informed of serials – new or need to be replaced: 1.72
- Informed of books – new or need to be replaced: 1.69
- Informed of special collection items, new or need to be replaced: 1.61

A score of 2.37 means that average response was closest to “mostly disagree” with the level of service in that category. A number of 1.61 means that the average response was between “mostly disagree” and “strongly disagree” that the level of service was satisfactory.

The analysis was then refined to include information on how important each service is to the faculty respondent. We obtained the mean difference between the satisfaction level (1 = least satisfied, 4 = most satisfied) and the importance level (1 = least important, 3 = most important) for each question. These scores distributed themselves from +3 to −2 and are interpreted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH SERVICE</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>large positive</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small positive</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small negative</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large negative</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed the following problem areas:

- Informed on books: -.64
- Informed on deletions: -.61
- Journals in research area: -.54
- Informed on serials: -.54
- Books in research area: -.39
- Informed on special collections: -.29
- Journals in teaching area: -.15

In addition to survey questions that were suitable for numerical analysis, there were opportunities for comments. These responses have not been fully analyzed but will be included in a further report.
Management Dynamics Inc. provides a library and university benchmarking service software tool: Scholarstat. They solicit information from nearly all academic institutions in the United States and then provide the compiled database with an analysis software package. Scholarstat analysis was performed on the PSU library and compared with the libraries the PSU administration considers our comparator institutes. These are:

- George Mason University
- Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis
- San Diego State University
- University of Illinois at Chicago
- University of Memphis
- University of Texas at Arlington
- University of Toledo
- University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
- Western Michigan University

Tim Anderson and his students performed a benchmarking analysis comparing the PSU library with its peer institutes.

Based upon previous studies of libraries, library service was decomposed into three components:

- Human Resource Efficiency
- Material Utilization
- Budgetary Efficiency

Each of these three components was analyzed separately and PSU’s Library was compared against the standard list of university peers. The comparisons were conducted using a method known as Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). DEA is a powerful technique for relative efficiency analysis. It does not require explicit weights to be assigned to aggregate measures together and does not rely upon an implicit fixed set of tradeoffs between inputs and outputs. Instead it attempts to give each decision making unit, DMU, (or in this case, library) the benefit of the doubt in terms of selecting a weighting scheme which puts it in the most favorable possible light relative to its peers.

It should be noted that this is not an experimental or poorly validated technique. DEA has been used in over 1500 studies of comparing banks, schools, hospital, and other institutions since it’s in inception in 1978. For more information, see http://www.emp.pdx.edu/dea/homedea.html or EMGT 537: Productivity Analysis. DEA has been used in several published benchmarking studies of libraries. These previous studies were used in both the development of the three models and the selection of specific inputs and outputs. Samples of related references include:


The analysis for each of the three components shows the inputs and outputs of the computational model, and a bar chart indicating the status of each comparator library. A result of 1.0 (bar to right edge of the plot) indicates that the library is performing no worse than its peers. As you will see, the PSU library is fine in two categories, but falls short in one.
Human Resource Efficiency

The Human Resources model compares libraries in how well they utilize their staff in providing services. The staff input is broken out into three categories: professional staff, support staff, and student staff. To make the model more realistic, weight restrictions were used based on the minimum and maximum ratios of salaries. Data from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) were used for finding these ratios.

\[
0.97 \leq \frac{\text{Weight on Professional Staff}}{\text{Weight on Support Staff}} \leq 3.60 \quad 1.60 \leq \frac{\text{Weight on Professional Staff}}{\text{Weight on Student Staff}} \leq 11.51 \quad 0.83 \leq \frac{\text{Weight on Support Staff}}{\text{Weight on Student Staff}} \leq 3.97
\]

The impact of the first weight restriction is that while libraries are still given the flexibility to choose the weights (or prices) that make them appear as efficient as possible relative to their peers, they can’t claim that professional staff costs deserve more than 3.6 times the weight (or price) of the support staff on a per-FTE basis. This limitation is drawn from the ARL database: using this nationwide listing of research libraries, the library with the most costly professional staff (per FTE) was 3.6 times the per-FTE cost of the library with the least costly support staff.

The model to the right illustrates the inputs and outputs used in evaluating the Human Resources Model.

Human Resource Results:

![Human Resource Results Chart]

Thus PSU is on a par in utilizing their staff when compared with peer institutions.
Material Utilization

The material utilization model examined the performance of the library in converting holdings into use by patrons. While libraries do not have the ability to make people check out materials, providing access to scholarly material is perhaps the fundamental purpose of the library and wisely selected materials should be reflected in increased circulation.

The above figure indicates that the Portland State University Library is last among 10 peers in the conversion of holdings into circulation. Further investigation will be needed to investigate the reasons for this and how substantive a problem it represents.

Bear in mind that the data used for the benchmarking study were the most current available but still represent 1997-98 data. The PSU Library has recently completed significant changes in the Inter-Library Loan system and this may result in improved Material Utilization results.

The low Material Utilization results might indicate a mismatch between researcher's/student's needs and the concentrations of holdings, and/or weak communication regarding new acquisitions.
**Budgetary Efficiency**

The budgetary efficiency model compares the ten peer institutions with respect to how they convert dollars into three general categories requiring significant expenditures. The three general categories are weekly service hours, staff, and acquisitions. The staff output is broken out into three categories: professional staff, support staff, and student staff, all measured in full time equivalents (FTE). The same weight restrictions as the Human Resources Model on staff are also applied to this model. The acquisitions are measured in terms of the net amount of volumes added and the periodicals received.

![Diagram](image)

**Budgetary Efficiency Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Memphis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus PSU is on a par with its peer institutions in its use of fiscal resources.
Benchmarking Interpretation

Relative to peer libraries, an initial examination says that the PSU Library makes good use of Human Resources and its overall budgets. Material utilization is much lower than peers, however.

For example, given the relatively lower level of holdings at PSU, it is expected that we would have higher levels of circulation and inter-library loan.

We have not yet attempted to analyze why there is a difference between the expected and realized material utilization, but clearly this could occupy some of the committee's activity in the next year. Again it is important to note that the database used, while the most current available, contains data from the 1997-1998 academic year. The 1999-2000 database should be available shortly, and the committee plans to re-run the analysis.

It should be noted that the survey results and the benchmarking study produced very comparable results. The main issues for faculty relative to library satisfaction had to do with material (has book x been received, for example) and the benchmarking results suggest that the PSU library falls short in the area of material utilization.

DEA is a peer evaluation technique that is strengthened by the addition of data and it is not necessary to limit comparisons to just the standard set of peers, since DEA will intrinsically find similar libraries for evaluation. Therefore, the committee will consider expanding this work to include additional libraries from the Scholarstat database. A rule of thumb sometimes used in DEA is that there should be at least two times as many decision making units (in this case, libraries), as there are inputs plus outputs. Each of our models used six or seven inputs and outputs, indicating that more data would be beneficial. It is important to note, however, that adding more libraries to the dataset could not raise the scores for any of the ten libraries (including the PSU Library) studied. Rather adding more libraries would increase the resolving power of the analysis to uncover more subtle differences between libraries.

Recommendation to the Senate

The library committee would like to commend the library for its performance relative to personnel and budget efficiency. The survey results and benchmarking analysis have identified the service category of material utilization that the library should improve to satisfy faculty and maintain standing with PSU's peer institute libraries. To this end the committee recommends the following:

- That the library management prepare its own report to the Faculty Senate describing the actions taken to improve service in this area.

- That there be similar reviews of the library made at periodic intervals. The library committee believes that on-going assessment is an important function, and with this report have established a valuable methodology for performing future assessments.

- That one position of the library committee be reserved for a library faculty member, chosen by the Senate committee on committees in the same way other members are chosen. We feel as though this would improve communication between the library and the committee.
This survey is an attempt of the Faculty's Library Committee to get feedback from the university community. We would like to know which areas of library service are working well and which could be improved. Please evaluate each question on its satisfaction and importance level. Place an "X" under the option that best defines your evaluation of both criteria. If you don't have an opinion about the subject, just skip the question.

Also, please consider this - many of us have used world-class libraries at different times in our careers, but we don't expect the PSU library to be as comprehensive as the very best research libraries so please calibrate your responses towards a reasonable expectation.

Thanks for your cooperation,

PSU Faculty Library Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Importance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The library's services are important to your research/teaching area.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with the level of service that the library provides you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students in your department receive good service from the library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students in your department receive good service from the library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library is open a sufficient number of hours per week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interlibrary loan process works smoothly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSU Library provides sufficient help in finding materials at the PSU library?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSU Library provides sufficient help in finding materials at other libraries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSU Library provides good service to students in your courses. (Based on feedback from students in your classes).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
<td>Satisfaction Level</td>
<td>Importance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient journals in your research area.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient books in your research area.</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient special collection items (maps, folios, etc.) in your research area.</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient journals in your teaching area.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient books in your teaching area.</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sufficient special collection items (maps, folios, etc.) in your teaching area.</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interval between ordering serials and having them available on the shelves is reasonable.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interval between ordering books and having them available on the shelves is reasonable.</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interval between ordering special collection items and having them available on the shelves is reasonable.</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are informed of new serials that have arrived, or lost serials that need to be replaced.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library informs you of new books that have arrived, or lost books that need to be replaced.</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library informs you of new special collection items that have arrived, or lost special collection items that need to be replaced.</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library informs you about deleted subscriptions or materials.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a positive interaction with your subject librarian</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel as though the library management is sympathetic/helpful/accessible with respect to special needs.</td>
<td>Mostly Disagree</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
<td>Satisfaction Level</td>
<td>Importance Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mostly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with your involvement in the selection of journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with your involvement in the selection of books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with your involvement in the selection of special collection items (maps, folios, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the library received a large increase in budget, what services or items would you put in place?

First Choice: ________________________________

Second Choice: ________________________________

Third Choice: ________________________________

Additional Comments:

Please return to Zelick | BIO
General Questions

1. On average how many trips do you make to the library per year?

2. On average, how many times do you electronically access the library services?

3. Please describe areas of excellence or particular strong points of the PSU Library.

4. Are there any specific issues you have with the library?

5. To reiterate our admonition from the first page of this survey, many of us have used world-class libraries at different times in our careers but it is unreasonable to assume that the PSU Library can be as comprehensive as the very best research libraries. With this in mind:
   a) Are there services or other items you have used in other libraries that you found useful, but which are not available in the PSU Library?
   b) Is it your perception that the level of service provided by the PSU library, as outlined above, is consistent with the size and scope of our university?
## Ranked average of satisfaction

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive interaction with subject librarian</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library mgmt is responsive to special needs</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0633</td>
<td>.7288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad service</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0435</td>
<td>.5025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient help locating materials</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0355</td>
<td>.7740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with service provided</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.0184</td>
<td>.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied w/interslibrary loan</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.9513</td>
<td>.8513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad student service</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.9405</td>
<td>.6830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to students to support coursework</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.9317</td>
<td>.6842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient help locating materials from other libraries</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.7842</td>
<td>.8122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with interval from order to shelf-spec.collections</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.7245</td>
<td>.7149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied w/involvement in book selection</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6718</td>
<td>.8875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied w/ hours open</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>.8513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient journals in teaching area</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6175</td>
<td>.7666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient special collections in teaching area</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6111</td>
<td>.7032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient books in teaching area</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6108</td>
<td>.7652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with interval time from order to shelf - serials</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.6064</td>
<td>.7509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied w/involvement in journal selection</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.5373</td>
<td>.8728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of help with searches of other libraries</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>.5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient special collections in research area</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.4928</td>
<td>.7597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval time from order to shelf - books</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.4846</td>
<td>.7178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied w/involvement in spec. collection selection</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.4783</td>
<td>.9126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient books in research area</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.4071</td>
<td>.8032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient journals in research area</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.3777</td>
<td>.7927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed of deleted subscriptions or materials</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.7778</td>
<td>.8316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ranked average of satisfaction

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed of serials - new or need replaced</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.7226</td>
<td>.7834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed of books - new or need replaced</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.6871</td>
<td>.8342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed of spec. collection items, new or need repl.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.6118</td>
<td>.7882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to research/teaching</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.9790</td>
<td>.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of journals for research</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.8636</td>
<td>.3628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad svc importance</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.8145</td>
<td>.4484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of interlibrary loan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.7630</td>
<td>.4605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of books for research</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.7597</td>
<td>.4991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of responding to special needs</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.7411</td>
<td>.4792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of student coursework support</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6777</td>
<td>.5036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of positive interaction w/librarian</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6707</td>
<td>.5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of journals in teaching area</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>.5617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of having help</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6479</td>
<td>.5218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad svc importance</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6476</td>
<td>.5715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of hours open</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6345</td>
<td>.5377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of books in teaching area</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6316</td>
<td>.5835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of being involved in journal selection</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.6091</td>
<td>.5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of involvement in book selection</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.5701</td>
<td>.5682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of help with searches of other libraries</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.5238</td>
<td>.5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of time from order to shelf-serials</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.4124</td>
<td>.6885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of order to shelf-books</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.4083</td>
<td>.6416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of being informed of deletions</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.3151</td>
<td>.7097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of being informed about new/repl. books</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.2305</td>
<td>.7234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of being informed of new/repl. serials</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.1458</td>
<td>.7142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of special collections in research area</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.9205</td>
<td>.8055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of time from order to shelf for spec. collections</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.8923</td>
<td>.7930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ranked average of importance

#### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of special collections in teaching area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.8780</td>
<td>.7918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of involvement in spec. collection selection</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.8305</td>
<td>.7463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of being informed of new/repl spec. collections</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.7733</td>
<td>.7733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interaction with librarian</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9.3707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is responsive to special needs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.4857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad student service</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.3667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan process</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.2817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad service</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in finding materials</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to students in coursework</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.7936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in finding materials from other libraries</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in book selection</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.0918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in teaching area</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6.7688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in journal selection</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.8614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals in teaching area</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6.8437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate hours of operations</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.7270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals in research area</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in research area</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.5686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get serials</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.2078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get books</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6.0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get special collections</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.8421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections in teaching area</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections in research area</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.3898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in special collection selection</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on deletions</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.3048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on books</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.8684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on serials</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.8224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on special collections</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weighted variables (unranked)

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Process</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad student service</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.3667</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.762E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad service</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.2022</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.2697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate hours of operations</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.7270</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-7.45E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan process</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.2817</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in finding materials</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8.0036</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.3129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in finding materials from other libraries</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7.1562</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>.1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to students in coursework</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.7936</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>.1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals in research area</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6.6875</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-.5428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in research area</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.5686</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-.3922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections in research area</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.3898</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals in teaching area</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6.8437</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-.1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books in teaching area</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6.9688</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-8.59E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections in teaching area</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.4915</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.4407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get serials</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.2078</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.296E-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get books</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6.0280</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.869E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time to get special collections</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.8421</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.5658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on serials</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.8224</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-.5374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on books</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.8684</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-.6360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on special collections</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.2937</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed on deletions</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.3048</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-6.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interaction with librarian</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9.3707</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.7414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is responsive to special needs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.4857</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.3429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in journal selection</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.8614</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-8.91E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in book selection</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.0918</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.061E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in special collection selection</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1944</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Development Committee
Report to Faculty Senate
January 2001

Kathi A. Ketcheson, Chair

Martin Streck, CLAS (GEOL) (2000-)
Thomas Kindermann, CLAS (PSY)
Jun Jiao, CLAS (PHY)
Sharon Lee, CLAS (SOC)
Cynthia Sloan, CLAS (FLL)
Oren Ogle, LIB (1999-)
Gretta Siegel, LIB

Theresa Julnes-Rapida, UPA (PA) (1998-)
Thomas Gillpatrick, SBA (1999-)
Pauline Jivanjee, SSW (1999-)
Thomas Luba, SES (2000-)
Joan Strouse, ED (EPFA) (2000-)
Sue Taylor, SFPA (ART) (2000-)
Fu Li, CECS (ECE)

The Faculty Development Committee met on October 10 to review the request for proposals (RFP) used in past years for the Faculty Enhancement Program. Working with the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, the Committee revised the forms and released the RFP to the faculty on November 15. The deadline for completed proposals is January 15, 2001. Applications procedures and forms are available on the ORSP Web site at www.ogsr.pdx.edu/rsp/ under "Internal Funding." The Committee will meet again early in Winter Term to establish a schedule for proposal review and awards. We expect to have our work completed in time to report this year's awards during the May Senate meeting.

In accordance with the collective bargaining agreement between PSU and the AAUP, a separate fund for faculty professional travel has been established in Academic Affairs. The Faculty Development Committee has appointed a subcommittee to develop and implement a procedure for awarding these funds to eligible faculty. This subcommittee met on November 9 to develop an RFP and a preliminary set of procedures for awarding funds under this program. Again, working with ORSP and Academic Computing Services, the subcommittee developed a Web-based application form and released the RFP on December 4. The form is available on the Web site listed above. The subcommittee will meet once per term to review applications and will announce awards to individuals at that time. The application deadline for Winter Term is January 15.

Because we now have a separate fund for professional travel to meetings and conferences, such requests will no longer be funded through the Faculty Enhancement Program. Only travel that is necessary for completion of a research project will be considered for funding. Other requests for travel to present the products of scholarly work must be made through the professional travel grant program.

OIRP:kak
12/7/00
MEMO

TO: Full-time Faculty

FROM: William H. Feyerherm, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies

DATE: November 15, 2000

RE: Faculty Enhancement Grants

The 2000-2001 Request For Proposals for PSU Faculty Enhancement Grants is now on the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects website at http://www.qsr.pdx.edu/rsp/intfunding.html. Faculty holding an appointment of .50 FTE or more, and whose appointment continues through the 2001-2002 academic year, are eligible to apply. Applications are due by 5:00 PM on January 15, 2001 at the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, Room 111 Cramer Hall.

If you have any questions regarding the proposal or process, you may contact Kathi Ketcheson, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee at 5-3425, or by e-mail ketchek@mail.pdx.edu. A printed copy of the RFP may be requested by calling Jamie Walsh at 5-3423 or by sending an e-mail to walshj@pdx.edu.
The Faculty Development Committee is pleased to announce this year's internal grant program for Portland State University faculty. This Faculty Enhancement Program provides an opportunity to apply for the many forms of internal support. Faculty holding an appointment of .50 FTE or more, and whose appointment continues throughout the 2001-02 academic year, are eligible to apply for awards up to $10,000.

Statement of Purpose

In response to the current budget climate, the primary purpose of this year's program is to aid in building our capacity for research, instruction, and service through the enlargement of the university's resource base. Investigators are encouraged to contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 111 Cramer Hall, for help in identifying funding agencies and programs, both public and private.

The Committee will support a broad range of scholarly activities, from discovery to interpretation, including but not limited to activities that:

1. promote the discovery, integration, or application of knowledge,
2. develop community partnerships or have a significant professional or community service component,
3. promote effective teaching and/or innovative curricular development,
4. are of an interdisciplinary nature and/or have the involvement of multiple faculty,
5. are in keeping with the major general initiatives in the areas of health, the environment, international affairs, educational reform, information technology, and organizational effectiveness,
6. have a significant impact on the professional development of the faculty members involved, particularly junior faculty,
7. involve students in research, or
8. have as their major purpose the development of subsequent proposals for external funding.

The Committee emphasizes that the above list is not a ranking of priorities and is by no means exclusive.

Budget Justification

The body of the proposal must contain a separate, clearly labeled section justifying the budget request. This justification must be presented in a manner appropriate for a well-informed reader to evaluate the proposed use of funds. The rationale for each budget item must be specified. In particular, principal investigators requesting equipment costing $500 or more must indicate the manufacturer and model number, and must clearly explain the need for the particular model. Similarly, the activities and role of research assistants must be detailed and clearly justified within this section.

Budget requests for graduate assistants must include tuition remission as a separate item. Departments are expected to provide support for graduate assistants as appropriate. The Faculty Development Committee may award a limited number of tuition remissions for graduate assistants.

The following items will only be funded in exceptional circumstances and must be clearly justified as crucial for the execution of the research project:

- Computer hardware
- Release time
- Summer salary

The normal replacement cost per credit hour of a lower division course is $571 plus OPE. If an investigator is requesting release time at a higher replacement rate, that rate must be explicitly justified within the proposal.

Funding for the following items cannot be approved. Proposals that include these items will be rejected by the Committee without review:

- release time that results in the complete release from teaching in a given quarter;
- activities to be performed in fulfillment of degree requirements of the principal investigator;
- travel, unless it is an integral part of the proposed project. (The Office of Academic Affairs administers a separate program for faculty travel.)
Proposal Preparation

Proposals must meet the page and vita format requirements listed below. In addition to the budget justification section, all proposals are to include an abstract of no more than 200 words suitable for media release. **Proposals not meeting these requirements will be rejected by the Committee without review.**

The forms listed below are on-line as Adobe Acrobat PDF files. To read and print these files, you must have a recent copy of Acrobat Reader (v. 3.0 or newer). Acrobat Reader can be downloaded for free from http://www.adobe.com/prodindex/acrobat/readstep.html

Proposal format:

- **Cover sheet:** 1 page, per the attached PDF file--can be completed online and printed out or can be printed blank and typed (this should be the first page).
- **Abstract:** 200 words
- **Proposal:** a maximum of 5 single-spaced typewritten pages, in at least 10-point type (12 spaces/inch)
- **Budget:** 1-2 pages in the attached PDF format.
- **Vita summaries:** a maximum of 2 pages per participant

Investigators are to submit **thirteen copies** of their proposal to the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 111 Cramer Hall, by **5:00 p.m. Monday, January 15, 2001.** Proposals concerning human subjects, live animals, recombinant DNA, or radioactive materials must have the approval of the appropriate persons/committees. The Committee reminds principal investigators that various academic units may have earlier deadlines for review and commentary. Principal investigators are to contact their deans, directors and/or department chairs regarding each unit's deadline.

Evaluation

The Committee receives more proposals than it can fund. The Committee will judge applications on the basis of the scholarly or creative merit of the project, and on the ability of the applicant(s) to successfully complete the proposed project. Budgets will be evaluated on the basis of their appropriateness to the project's objectives and anticipated results. The Committee will also consider the history, nature, and sufficiency of past and present funding received by the applicant(s). It is expected that information concerning the applicant's scholarly preparation will be provided. The easiest way to do this would be to join the research faculty registered with the Community of Science program. Staff in the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects will gladly assist you in
All proposals will be evaluated by reviewers reading within and across subject areas. Proposals will typically receive four to six reviews. The Committee reserves the right to solicit reviews from outside the Committee and/or the University. Investigators are reminded that many reviewers do not support proposals that are overly technical or rely on an excessive use of disciplinary jargon.

**Reporting**

Investigators funded under this program are expected to file a final report with the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects by September 30, 2002. The report should include, as appropriate, a copy of the extramural proposal, any intent to publish or exhibit results, and an abstract of no more than 200 words suitable for media release. The body of the report should be no more than three pages in length, with the extramural proposal included as an appendix.

Investigators failing to provide final reports will be ineligible to receive further funding from the Faculty Development Committee until a report acceptable to the Committee has been received. Proper acknowledgment of Faculty Enhancement Awards is to appear in articles and papers.
TO: Full-time Faculty
FROM: William H. Feyerherm, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies
DATE: November 30, 2000
RE: Professional Travel Grant Program

The application process for the Professional Travel Grant Program that started this Fall Term has now transitioned from the Provost's Office to the Faculty Development Committee. Faculty holding an appointment of .50 FTE or more are eligible to apply. Information on the program and the application form will be available on the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects website http://www.gsr.pdx.edu/rsp/intfunding/fdgtrav00.html by December 6, 2000. Applications for Winter Term are due by 5:00 PM on January 15, 2001 at the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, Room 111 Cramer Hall. The deadline for Spring term will be listed on the website.

If you have any questions regarding the proposal or process, you can contact Kathi Ketcheson, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee at 5-3425, or by e-mail ketchek@mail.pdx.edu. A printed copy of the RFP can be requested by calling Jamie Walsh at 5-3423 or by sending an e-mail to walshj@pdx.edu.
The Faculty Development Committee is pleased to announce a new internal funding program for Portland State University faculty. The Professional Travel Grant Program provides support for faculty holding appointments of .50 FTE or higher to attend professional meetings and conferences. In accordance with the PSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement, $20,000 is available for awards under this program during the current academic year.

Faculty may apply for awards of up to $1,000 and must include a 20% or greater matching amount from department, grant, contract or personal funds. The committee should receive applications at least 30 days prior to the proposed travel, and no later than the deadline stated below. Travel must include presentation of scholarly work, such as a paper, workshop, or seminar; preference will be given to applications for national or international travel and those that are most clearly related to a faculty member's scholarly agenda.

Please complete the application form on the Web at: www.gsr.pdx.edu/rsp/Travel/

Include the dates and destination of your proposed travel, a brief narrative describing the purpose of your travel and how it fits with your scholarly agenda (no more than 2-3 paragraphs), and a budget detailing your expected costs and the amount of matching funds that will be provided. In addition to the electronic submission of your application, you must provide the Committee with documentation (such as a copy of the conference program or a letter of acceptance) that you will be presenting your scholarly work at the conference or meeting you plan to attend, and your department head's signature on the summary form available on the Web application.

The Committee will meet once per term to make awards, excluding summer.
Your application may be submitted on the Web or printed and typed. If you use the Web form, you will still need to submit your department head's signature and supporting documents in person or through campus mail.

The deadline for Winter Term applications is January 15, 2001. Please submit your application and supporting documents to the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (ORSP), 111 Cramer Hall. If you have questions, please contact Kathi Ketcheson, Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, at 5-3425 or by email at ketchesonk@pdx.edu.
The UPC has met twice to discuss our role in PSU's planning process, and how we might usefully support other planning-related activities, notably the Urban Universities Portfolio Project (UUPP), the "Great City – Great University" series, and the assessment and quality of faculty work-life initiatives. We have determined that part of our role is to take the lead in helping define what constitutes both a "great city" and a "great university." We have also decided to meet with Vice Provost Rhodes to discuss the assessment and program review initiatives: That meeting is scheduled (pending Vice Provost Rhodes's schedule) for Nov. 20.
ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY.

Section 4. Faculty Committees.

1) Appointment. The Committee on Committees, hereinafter described, shall appoint the members and chairpersons of all constitutional committees and ensure adequate and required divisional representation. The Committee on Committees shall make recommendations to the President concerning the membership and chairpersons of all committees established by administrative action and ensure divisional representation as appropriate. Constitutional committees are those established under provisions of the Faculty Constitution. Administrative committees are those established by the President and charged by him or her with a specific assignment on a continuing basis for periods of one or more years. Ad hoc and special committees may be established at any time by the Faculty, the Senate, or the President, and shall carry out specific duties and report as directed. No special committees shall be established that duplicate the work of an existing Faculty, Senate or administrative committee. The Committee on Committees shall appoint membership of special committees established by the Faculty or Senate. The Advisory Council will make recommendations of membership for ad hoc and special committees established by the President.

For the purpose of committee representation, the word “division” shall mean any school or college, any school outside the colleges, the Library, Other Instructional Faculty, and All Other faculty jointly as a single entity; the term “instructional division” shall mean any school or college, any school outside the colleges, and Other Instructional Faculty.

The members of the Committee on Committees will normally serve two years and must be members of the Senate during their tenure as members of the Committee. The following divisions shall elect members in even-numbered years:

- All Other (1 member)
- Business Administration (1 member)
- Education (1 member)
- Liberal Arts and Sciences (2 members)
- Social Work (1 member)
- Urban and Public Affairs (1 member)

The following divisions shall elect members in odd-numbered years:

- Engineering and Applied Computer Science (1 member)
- Library (1 member)
- Liberal Arts and Sciences (3 members)
- Fine and Performing Arts (1 member)
- Extended Studies (1 member)
- Other Instructional Faculty (1 member)
ARTICLE IV, Section 4. (continued)

4) Standing Committees and Their Functions....

d) Curriculum Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, two students, and, as consultants, one of the following or his/her representative, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Curriculum & Undergraduate Studies, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research & Planning. The committee shall: ...

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 instructional divisions, two from the Library, one representing All Other Faculty, and, as consultants, the Provost or his/her representative one of the following, or his/her representative, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research. It is desirable that the appointees be selected from among faculty members who are active and interested in research, teaching, or other scholarly activity. The committee shall: ...

j) Graduate Council. This council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Dean of Graduate Studies, and, as consultants, one of the following or his/her representative, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees only from among faculty members with an involvement in graduate education. The committee shall:....

I) Budget Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the professional schools, one from the Library, one from the School of Extended Studies, one representing All Other faculty, other divisions, two students, the chairperson of the University Planning Council and, as consultants, one of the following or his or her representative, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Provost, and the University Budget Director a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the University Planning Council. The committee shall:....

m) University Planning Council. The University Planning Council shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Council 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 each from Business Administration, Education, Engineering & Applied Science, Fine & Performing Arts, Social Work, and Urban & Public Affairs, one faculty member from the Library, one faculty member from the School of Extended Studies, one faculty member representing All Other faculty, from each of the other divisions, one classified person 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 Council. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee. The committee shall:....

[end]
Rationale (in order of sequence):
1) "School" is defined inside and outside of colleges, as a result of the reorganization of Urban Affairs and Engineering into colleges composed of schools and departments.
2) Engineering is renamed Engineering & Computer Science to reflect the revised name of the new college.
3) All Other faculty are divided into two divisions, Other Instructional Faculty and All Others, in order to group faculty more appropriately according to function. Other Instructional Faculty will include Systems Science, as well as University Studies and Honors, who were removed from Liberal Arts and Sciences Affairs effective spring 2000. Other non-assigned instructional faculty will join them in this new division which will elect approximately three Senators in April-May 2001.
4) To make committees with divisional representations more consistent with regard to consultants, language was added to include consultants on Curriculum Committee, Faculty Development Committee, and Graduate Council, in a similar manner as they consult on Budget Committee and University Planning Council.
5) The term "professional school" is deleted from the Budget Committee description, as it is undefined and ambiguous. Additionally, committee descriptions for Faculty Development, Budget and University Planning are made more consistent with each other and with existing descriptions for Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council by the substitution of "division" or "instructional division" for lists of specific divisions.
7) Classified "person" is replaced with classified "member of PSU" to reflect that designation elsewhere in the Constitution.
ARTICLE V. FACULTY SENATE.

Section 1. Membership.

2) Elected Members. Elected members of the Senate shall be chosen from the members of the Faculty. Representation shall be proportional by division. Elected members shall have full right of discussion, making of motions and voting. For the purpose of representation, the word “division” shall mean any school or college, the Library, Other Instructional Faculty, and All Other faculty jointly as a single entity; the term “instructional division” shall mean any school or college, and Other Instructional Faculty. Faculty who are involved in programs that are not within an instructional division shall be attached as groups to an appropriate school, college or instructional unit. (See Article V, Section 2, Paragraph 1.)

3) Alternates. Each elected member of the Senate is expected to attend its meetings regularly. However, before the first meeting of the fall term each senator shall designate in writing to the Secretary to the Faculty an alternate who shall serve in the senator's absence with full rights and powers. A senator may change his or her alternate at any time by so informing the Secretary in writing. A senator who takes a leave of absence or sabbatical leave for one academic year or more must resign his or her Senate seat, which shall be filled in accordance with Section 2, Paragraph 5 of this Article.

Section 2. Election of the Senate.

1) Determination of Divisional Representation. By the first Monday in March of each year, the chief administrative officer of each division (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2) shall report to the Secretary to the Faculty the name of each faculty member, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned to each division. At the same time, names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in programs not in any instructional division shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer and the vice presidents, or their designees, to the Secretary to the Faculty. These Faculty shall be assigned by the Senate Steering Committee to divisions as prescribed in Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2. The Secretary to the Faculty, under the supervision of the Senate Steering Committee, shall then determine the number of senators to be allocated to each division, apportioning one senator for each multiple of ten full-time equivalent faculty with an additional senator for any remainder of 5.0 or more full-time equivalent faculty. Any division with fewer than ten full-time equivalent faculty shall have one senator. A newly instituted division shall elect its senator(s) in the next regular senate election. [end]
Rationale:

All Other faculty are divided into two divisions, Other Instructional Faculty and All Others, in order to group faculty more appropriately according to function. Other Instructional Faculty will include Systems Science, as well as University Studies and Honors, who were relocated from Liberal Arts & Sciences Affairs to Academic Affairs effective spring 2000. Other non-assigned instructional faculty will join them in this new division which will elect approximately three Senators in April-May 2001.
3. Proposals from School of Fine and Performing Arts

a. ARCH 120: Basic Drawing, new gateway course
b. ARCH 204: Construction Codes and Compliance, new course as part of new concentration in architectural project management program
c. ARCH 205: Advanced Construction Projects, new course as part of new concentration in architectural project management program
d. ARCH 220: Design Drawing, change prerequisite to reflect new course of ARCH 120
e. ARCH 225: Digital Graphics, new course to reflect new skill requirements
f. ARCH 341: Developing as a Professional, new course and part of Professions in Society cluster
g. ARCH 466: Specifications Interpretation, new course as part of new concentration in architectural project management program
h. ART 260: Photographic Seeing, change to 4 credit hours, change course description, change prerequisites to reflect changes in departmental policies
i. ART 261: Photography, change to 4 credit hours, change course description, change prerequisites to reflect changes in departmental policies
j. ART 294: Water Media, change course title, change to 4 credit hours, change course description, change prerequisites to reflect changes in departmental policies
k. ART 296: Electronic Media for Studio Artists, new course to provide new technologies for majors
l. ART 297: Book Arts, new course to support other courses
m. ART 340: Intermediate Photography, change course title, change to 4 credit hours, change course description, change prerequisites to reflect changes in departmental policies
n. ART 436/536, 437/537: Painting: Topical Issues, change to 4 credit hours, change course title, drop third course in sequence (438/538) due to increase in hours, change prerequisites
o. ART 485: Studio Art Seminar, new course on professional development tools
p. Change in minor in jazz studies, changes to make catalog copy comparable to other music minors
q. Change in program in Theater Arts, changes in core (makeup, workshop) and add TA 330 Multi-cultural Theater to history/drama requirements
r. TA 469/569: Women, Theater and Society, new course to enhance curriculum
s. TA 315: Technical Theater Drawing, drop course to reflect other curricular changes
t. TA 314: Lighting Design I, change course description and prerequisites to update course description with course content
u. TA 313: Scene Design II, change prerequisites to reflect drop of TA 315
v. TA 317: Theater Technologies, change course description to update course description with course content
w. TA 435/535: Lighting Design II, change course description to update course description with course content

4. Proposals for Additions to UNST Clusters for 2000-2001

A new procedure was implemented in Spring 2000 for adding courses to UNST clusters once per year. This new policy “surprised” a number of faculty who wished to have courses included as “U” courses during 2000-2001 (in particular given enrollment pressures). Therefore, University