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SENATORS ARE REMINDED
TO FORWARD THE NAME OF HIS/HER ALTERNATE TO THE
SECRETARY TO THE FACULTY, AS SPECIFIED BY THE
PSU FACULTY CONSTITUTION, ART. V., SEC. 1., 3).
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 November 5, 2001, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

NOTE: The following Order of Business, effective for six meetings, is instituted by the Steering Committee pursuant to the charge of the Senate at the March 5, 2001 meeting.

A. Roll Call
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 2001, Meeting
*C. Discussion Item - Intellectual Property (Moderator: Robert Daasch)

D. Brief Announcements by the Presiding Officer
E. Unfinished Business
F. New Business
G. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   President’s Report
   Provost's Report
   Vice President’s (FADM) Report

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

I. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   *1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, Meeting of 5-6 October 2001 - Wollner
   2. Report of the Advisory Committee on Academic Computing - Driscoll & Rhodes
   *3. President’s Diversity Initiative Update - Lieberman
   5. ASPSU Report - Cunningham

J. Selection of Discussion Item for the December 2001 Meeting

K. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the October 2, 2001, Senate Meeting
   C Discussion Item - Intellectual Property
   D Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 5-6 October 2001
   E President’s Diversity Initiative Update
   F Report on the Housing Review Task Force

 Secretary to the Faculty
(503)725-4416/facs5-4499 • 341CH • andrewscolliers@pdx.edu
C. REPORTS AND PROPOSALS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY SENATE

Persons wishing to bring matters before the Senate should contact the Presiding Officer or Secretary so that the items can be placed on the agenda. The agenda for meetings is finalized seven calendar days after the prior meeting, or, after summer break, on the Monday preceding the meeting by two weeks.

Reports and proposals are to be submitted in written form so that they can be included in the Senate mailing for the appropriate meeting. Final versions of all materials to be included in the Senate mailing must be in the office of the Secretary to the Faculty (341 CH, ext. 5-4416), in camera-ready and electronic copies by the second Thursday after the prior Senate meeting. If the material is not received, the report or proposal will be eliminated from the agenda of the meeting.

D. Senate Meetings and Committee Reports Schedule for 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE REPORTS</th>
<th>SENATE MEETING</th>
<th>STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**</th>
<th>WRITTEN ITEMS DUE FOR SENATE MAILING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None Scheduled</td>
<td>October 1, 2001</td>
<td>September 17, 2001</td>
<td>September 18, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on</td>
<td>November 5, 2001</td>
<td>October 8, 2001</td>
<td>October 11, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Information Technology</td>
<td>December 3, 2001</td>
<td>November 13, 2001</td>
<td>November 15, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Reports from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Report:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Planning Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Annual Report:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Committee</td>
<td>January 7, 2002</td>
<td>December 10, 2001</td>
<td>December 13, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Scheduled</td>
<td>February 4, 2002</td>
<td>January 14, 2002</td>
<td>January 19, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Report:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Planning Council</td>
<td>March 4, 2002</td>
<td>February 11, 2002</td>
<td>February 14, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Reports from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Requirements</td>
<td>April 1, 2002</td>
<td>March 11, 2002</td>
<td>March 14, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Reports from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Committee</td>
<td>May 6, 2002</td>
<td>April 8, 2002</td>
<td>April 11, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Reports from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>June 3, 2002</td>
<td>May 13, 2002</td>
<td>May 16, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarterly Report:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Planning Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Senate Meetings are in 33CH (3-5 p.m.)

**Steering Committee meetings are at 3:00 p.m. Mondays in the OAA Conference Room (394 CH), unless otherwise noted.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 1, 2001
Presiding Officer: Scott Burns
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Conrad for Dieterich, S. Elteto for Kern, Wells for Lall, Kauffman for Palmer.


NOTE: The following Order of Business, effective for six meetings, was instituted by the Steering Committee pursuant to the charge of the Senate at the March 5, 2001 meeting.

A. ROLL CALL
B. Approval of the Minutes of the June 4, 2001, Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

The minutes of the June 4, 2001, meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate were approved with the following corrections:
- Livneh was present.
- The Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee was accepted by the Presiding Officer at the May 4, 2001 Senate meeting.

C. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Added to today’s Agenda:
I.3. Faculty Grievance Procedure Update

Items to be entered into the minutes of the day’s meeting:

- Changes in Senate membership since June 4, 2001:
  Claudine Fisher has resigned from the Senate due to sabbatical leave and is replaced by Marjorie Enneking. Robert Liebman has resigned from the Senate due to sabbatical leave and is replaced by Stephen Reder. Shelly Reece has resigned from the Senate to complete his last full-time year in the English Department, and is replaced by Janice Haaken. Melissa Gilbert has resigned from the University and is replaced by Barbara Brower.

- Changes in committee membership since September 1, 2001:
  M. Herrington has resigned from the Budget Committee, and the university effective 9/28/01.
  The following committees have vacancies to date: Committee on Committees - GSE representative; Faculty Development Committee - GSSW Representative; Budget Committee - GSSW representative, SES representative; Deadline Appeals - one at-large member.

- Senate/Committee appointments since September 17, 2001:
  Committee on Committees: Yves Labissière will represent the new Other Instructional Faculty; Mara Tableman will fill the CLAS position vacated by Shelly Reece.

D. DISCUSSION ITEM - The Future of Student Housing at PSU

HEYING introduced the participants, Gary Meddaugh, President of College Housing Northwest, and Brian Chase, Director of PSU Facilities. He reviewed the issues outlined in “D” and reviewed procedures for the discussion item: each speaker allotted 8 minutes with 2 minutes of questions to follow for each, followed by 10 minutes for general discussion from the floor.

MEDDAUGH gave a brief history of College Housing Northwest to date, noting that it was started in 1969 as a non-profit corporation to provide housing for PSU students as the college was prohibited by state law from doing so. The board of directors includes four students and three members of the business community. “CHNW” has a residence council, and a professional staff composed of residence managers at approximately one per fifty units, approximately one per thirty freshmen, and additional night managers. Facilities managed by CHNW currently include 928 units, 450 of which pre-date 1932, and 481 of which are owned by CHNW. Facilities are primarily apartments and board objectives include rental at 80-85% of comparable market rate, and a “green” policy with regard to management. Chris Moeller of ASPSU has handout for those who are interested.

CHASE, using two large maps of PSU and the downtown core, reviewed housing issues which confront PSU in the next few years. They include: changes in the university, the ability to hold rents at 80% of market value in the future, age of the...
housing units, questions of who manages housing and how it is operated, the rent increase required of all tenants when West Hall was financed, and the new contract to be negotiated in July 2003. Traditionally, housing demands have exceeded supply. The university’s perspective is changing, for example, should all student housing should stay at 80% market value. He noted the school/housing project which was shelved, the “Birmingham replacement” scheduled for summer 2002, the use of the Ondine for Freshman students, the need for conference accommodations, and other factors.

DAASCH asked what will be the net gain/loss in housing with the Birmingham replacement. CHASE stated 135 units will be gained and 230 will be lost. DAASACH asked what the units will be like and how that is determined. MEDDAUGH noted the project will be composed of 280 square foot studio apartments with full kitchens, which were designed on the basis of surveys, etc.

KETCHESON noted that a housing review task force was convened last year, and that committee shared their findings and recommendations with CHN and Facilities. Their deliberations included questions of what should be the student’s experience as regards the linkages with academics, etc.

CUMMINGS asked for a clarification of our land usage policy. CHASE noted that there are very few pieces of land available for anything at PSU, and they include the Stratford, possibly Helen Gordon land, tennis courts, PCAT building, etc. The university needs to go up not out; they need more than a half million more square feet for academics and 400-500 new housing units in the future. In the last five years, the university has added one-half million square feet of space. The question is what should be the mix for all these proposals, for example, student housing involves issues of affordability and access.

R.MERCER asked about financing of building projects such as the Birmingham replacement. CHASE noted that most construction has been wood frame, which costs a great deal less than steel and high rise. MEDDAUGH noted that every housing unit constructed in the downtown core in the last 30 years has had government subsidy.

HOFFMAN noted that housing is the largest recruiting problem for Admissions. Furthermore, the literature on housing references the direct relationship of housing satisfaction to retention. She noted, additionally, that Brian Chase is the only university member on the CHN board and serves only in an ex officio capacity.

RUETER noted that PSU still has no clear long range enrollment plan to apply to these factors. TETREAULT noted she will be addressing that issue in the upcoming year.

THAT ENDED THE DISCUSSION ITEM.
BURNS followed the Discussion item with a short Power Point presentation on faculty governance structures. BURNS concluded, noting that the overall mission for this year’s Faculty Senate will be to build community at PSU.

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV., 4., 4), h) Teacher Education Committee

Senators were requested to add the word “Graduate” in front of “School of Education” where it had been accidentally deleted at the end of the first paragraph.

The Advisory Council had no comment on the proposed amendment. There was no discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals Changes

EDER presented the proposals for the committee, suggesting the items be divided into three motions.

RUETER asked for a clarification as regards the Senate’s responsibility for approving Graduate courses and programs, with respect to budgetary issues. EDER noted that the issue of resources is outside the domain of the Graduate Council, and that the assumption is that the dean in question has previously addressed budgetary issues before forwarding the proposal.

CUMMINGS asked if these proposals in “F-I” parts A., B., C. are all funded out of the base budget or grant monies. EDMUNDSON noted that many of these are certification courses and may be offered a variety of ways depending on resources and faculty.

TABLEMAN asked for a clarification of the difference between M.S. and M.A. degrees. LIVNEH noted that M.A. degrees generally have a requirement for reading proficiency in one foreign language.

ENNEKING asked if the program crossover with other schools with regard to Substance Abuse curriculum had been addressed. It was noted that it had.
CUMMINGS/SHUSTERMAN MOVED the Senate approve “F-1, A. EPFA New Course Proposals, B. Special and Counselor Education New Course Proposals and Changes in MA/MS in Education: Counseling, and C. Certificate in Substance Abuse Counseling.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

GELMON asked if undergraduate proposals related to items “F-1”, D., E., F. have been approved by the Curriculum Committee. EDER stated that there was no coordination with the Curriculum Committee, particularly on courses that are primarily for the graduate population.

CUMMINGS noted that certain courses did not have prerequisites. EDER noted that many do not, however graduate standing is required.

WOLLNER/MERCER MOVED the Senate approve “F-1, D. CUPA New Course Proposals, E. Graduate Certificate (CUPA/SBA) in Real Estate Development, and F., CLAS New Course Proposals.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

RUETER asked for a point of clarification regarding the origin of the $50.00 per course fee for validation of graduate credit. EDER stated he didn’t know. RUETER requested the committee review the fees for the purpose of having them reflect the actual faculty time involved.

DAASCH asked if the 10-year limit was hard and fast. EDER noted that petition was still an option.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President’s & Vice President’s (University Relations) Report

BERNSTINE greeted the Senate and guests. He noted that we have experienced large enrollment increases again this year and the administration is monitoring the impact of this growth carefully. He then yielded to Gary Withers for an update on the PSU Capital Campaign. WITHERS reviewed the campaign to date (see attached handouts and copy of overheads). He concluded by noting that overall fundraising has increasing approximately 15% in the past year, through early September of this year.

Note: there is no recorded transcript from this point through “I.1”
Provost's Report

TETREAUT noted that a letter from her is on its way to faculty boxes. It highlights the following items: first, the PSU community response to events of 11 September, including the President's letter, the letter of the President, the Senate Presiding Officer, and the ASPSU President; second, the CAE response to those events; and, third, the activities of our faculty as public intellectuals responding to these events. Secondly, the Provost reviewed the Great City - Great University Series, noting in addition the RFP related to $300,000 for dedicated research. The series this year will include the following potential themes: park blocks neighbors, sustainability, higher education partners, children and family.

TETREAUT discussed enrollment and enrollment management issues. This year to date, headcount is up 7%, FTE is up 4%, and SCH is up 7.4%. There are currently pilots in self-supporting courses. Last year's Enrollment Management Committee subcommittee report will be placed in the Library, and this year the committee has been reorganized and is composed of senior administrators.

Vice President's (Finance & Administration) Report

PERNSTEINER thanked the assembled faculty for "what you have done to make this university so attractive" to our students, and for "staying the course...."

PERNSTEINER continued, the university was successful in securing the budget from the legislature that was presented to the Budget Committee in June, and all are pleased that we did not have effect any major cuts.

The PSU energy bill has risen from $430. per hour before 1 October to $645. per hour after 1 October due to a 49.6% rate increase. We had set aside $1. million for increases, however since May, Facilities has saved from 14 to 18%. This savings can be improved upon by doing two additional things, remember to turn off lights in classrooms and offices, and contacting Facilities whenever room temperatures are too warm or too cold.

SHUSTERMAN noted that more information regarding conservation would help, for example, reminders that doors remain closed at Hoffman Hall so that the system can self-correct temperature problems. CRAWSHAW agreed, noting that people may not be sure of how often to turn off fluorescent lighting. HAAKEN asked if a conservation campaign is planned. PERNSTEINER noted there will be continued attention in this area.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

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

1. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Interim Report

FRANK reported for the committee, noting that quarterly reports are planned this year, and that the draft NCAA report is completed and on the web at http://www.president.pdx.edu/reports/ncaa/.

2. President’s Assessment Initiative Update

LIEBERMAN directed attentions to “I-2” in the Agenda mailing and reviewed Assessment activities planned for this year.

3. Information Item Concerning Faculty Grievance(non-contractual) Procedures

PRATT, reporting after “G”, presented the information, noting that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Grievance Procedures has additional work to complete this fall as a result of recent changes in Oregon Administrative Rules made by the State Board which have effected the PSU rule(OAR 577-042-). The university has declared temporary changes to the rule to be in effect for 120 days, and copies are available in Academic Affairs.

J. SELECTION OF DISCUSSION ITEM FOR NOVEMBER 2001 MEETING

DAASCH/MERCER MOVED the Senate address the issue of Intellectual Property, and Robert Daasch will be responsible for preparing for the discussion.

DAASCH indicated that he did not have details in place as yet, but was willing to serve as moderator and organize the issues and presenters.

BRENNAN requested that televised lectures be included in the discussion, as they are being re-used. noted there is a recent article in Academe relevant to this item. RUETER noted that the Senate might also consider the option of no discussion item in November.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.
On our way to our goal!

$29.1 MILLION RAISED

- $3.2 M toward professorships & chairs
- $9.6 M toward capital projects
- $5.5 M to add new scholarships
- $8.4 M for new programs
- $660,755 raised in annual support

PROFESSORSHIPS

$11 M

$3.2 M

29.26% of Goal!

Capital Projects

$42.8 M

$9.6 M

22.35% of Goal!

Scholarships

$12.3 M

$5.4 M

44.21% of Goal!

Programs

$24.1 M

$6.3 M

26.49% of Goal!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Campaign Goals</th>
<th>Donations Committed</th>
<th>Donations Committed as a % of Goal</th>
<th>Donations Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading by Design</td>
<td>$52,640,000.00</td>
<td>$11,680,739.98</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>$7,005,863.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching the Region</td>
<td>21,395,000.00</td>
<td>4,515,174.13</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>3,714,477.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Student Success</td>
<td>16,200,000.00</td>
<td>9,088,633.05</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>8,466,933.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Gifts</td>
<td>3,855,957.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,855,957.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Total</td>
<td>$90,235,000.00</td>
<td>$29,140,504.16</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>$23,043,231.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Official start date of the capital campaign is July 1, 1999.

Donations Committed: gifts, pledges, and projected matches.

Donations Collected: gifts, pledge payments, and collected matches.
## Campaign Goals (in millions of dollars)

**Total Campaign Goal** $90.235

**Leading by Design**

### Capital Projects
- New Engineering Building (private support) $20.00
- Equipment for Engineering 10.00
- Improvements in Technology 5.00
- Renovate Fine and Performing Arts Labs 1.00
- Vertebrate Natural History Museum 1.00
- **Total for Capital Projects** $37.00

### Professorships
- Chair in Professional and Industrial Mathematics $1.50
- Professorship in Accounting 0.50
- Professorship in Food Marketing and Logistics 0.50
- Professorship in Biology 0.50
- Professorship in Chemistry 0.50
- Professorship in Environmental Sciences 0.50
- Professorship in Engineering and Computer Science 0.50
- Professorship in Management of Innovation and Technology 0.50
- **Total for Professorships** $5.00

### Programs
- Center for Nanoscience $2.50
- Center for Life in Extreme Environments 2.50
- Program in Environmental Sciences and Resources 1.00
- Partnership for the Advancement of Science Education 1.00
- Program in Management of Innovation and Technology 1.00
- **Total for Programs** $8.00

### Scholarships
- Mathematics and Science $1.14
- Accounting 0.50
- Management of Innovation and Technology 0.50
- College of Engineering and Computer Science 0.50
- **Total for Scholarships** $2.64

**Total** $52.64
### Enriching the Region

#### Capital Projects
- Native American Student and Community Center: $0.70
- Steinway Pianos for School of Fine and Performing Arts: $1.00
- Total: $1.70

#### Professorships
- Professorships in Fine and Performing Arts: $1.00
- Professorship in History: $0.50
- Professorships in Social Work: $1.00
- Professorship in Education: $0.50
- Total: $3.00

#### Programs
- Center for Excellence in Writing: $2.50
- Portland Metropolitan Program in Jewish Studies: $2.00
- Institute for Portland Metropolitan Studies: $2.50
- Hatfield School of Government: $2.00
- Center for Japanese Studies: $1.00
- Total: $10.00

#### Scholarships
- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (departmental): $0.82
- School of Fine and Performing Arts: $0.50
- College of Urban and Public Affairs: $2.00
- Graduate School of Social Work (includes Fellowship): $2.00
- Graduate School of Education (includes Fellowship): $1.375
- Total: $6.695
- Total: $21.395

### Promoting Student Success

#### Capital Projects
- Renovate Stott Center: $2.50
- Renovate and Equip Millar Library: $0.60
- Equip and Furnish Gathering Space in Residence Facility: $1.00
- Total: $4.10

#### Professorships
- University-wide: $1.00
- Total: $1.00

#### Programs
- Fund for PSU: $5.00
- Support for University Outreach Initiatives: $2.50
- University-wide: Teaching Excellence Awards: $0.60
- Total: $8.10

#### Scholarships
- University-wide: Merit- and Need-based Scholarships: $2.50
- Athletics Scholarships: $0.50
- Total: $3.00
- Total: $16.20
Dear Friends and Colleagues,

I’m pleased to send you the first issue of “From the Inside Out”, a confidential monthly progress report to volunteer leadership, faculty and staff engaged in Portland State University’s first capital campaign, Building Our Future.

I’ll risk preaching to the converted to summarize just what this important work we’ve embarked on together is all about. No moment could be more auspicious for taking on our ambitious task. Portland State enters this campaign on a footing of advancement, achievement and a burgeoning national reputation. A couple of interesting facts which augur well for our success:

- Enrollment continues to climb rapidly--this fall the freshman class alone is up 25%.
- Research funding is up sharply--increasing 67% over the past 5 years.
- Private philanthropic support has jumped 500 percent since 1994-1995.

Our goal is to raise $90 million over the span of the campaign. These investments will elevate the University’s position of leadership in our region’s growth and economy while benefiting nearly every aspect of the university:

- Engineering, technology and science - new engineering building, improved science and technology facilities throughout campus, premier science and business programs, scholarships, professorships ($52.64 million)
- Programs, scholarships and faculty support in the arts, humanities, cultural studies, urban planning and professions - crucial to sustaining our region’s high quality of life. ($21.395 million)
- University-wide facilities, scholarships and faculty support to promote the success of our students. ($16.20 million)

You’ll find more detail about campaign projects in the campaign brochure, which you should have received recently.

We’re fortunate to have three prominent members of our community serve as campaign co-chairs:
- Ken Thrasher, former CEO of Fred Meyer, Inc.
- Don Frisbee, former chairman of PacifiCorp
- Craig Berkman, president of DB Capital.

Ken, Don and Craig will play pivotal roles in the campaign, working alongside other volunteers and our academic and executive leadership.

As the academic year opens, we continue the “quiet phase” of the campaign. This means the period in which we contact the major investors who will provide the campaign’s cornerstone support--and we do this without much public fanfare. In most successful campaigns this crucial quiet phase yields approximately 60% of the overall goal. As of September 1 we’re at 32%, right on course.
Find information about the College of Engineering & Computer Science at www.cecs.pdx.edu

Business and Education Programs Attract Cross-Disciplinary Investment

Major commitments from Gary and Barbara Ames, and Ken and Marta Thrasher’s demonstrate the symbiotic tie between a strong education system and a thriving economy and community.

- The Ames Professorship in Management of Innovation & Technology, and the Ames Scholarships at the School of Business Administration and the Graduate School of Education will help to prepare business leaders, and those who will educate business leaders and employees of the future. Gary, an alumnus, is former President and CEO of Qwest (then US West). Barbara earned her degree in education at Portland State and taught public school for three years before raising a family.

- The Thrashers have designated their support for the Fred G. Meyer Chair in the Food Industry Leadership Center and to provide economic opportunity scholarships for students in the Graduate School of Education. Ken is the retired Executive Vice President of the Kroger Company. Marta has a degree in history from Portland State.

Find information about the School of Business Administration and Graduate School of Education at www.sba.pdx.edu and www.ed.pdx.edu.

Monthly Snapshot: Co-Chair Ken Thrasher

- Building Our Future campaign co-chair.
- Leadership role in the Food Industry Leadership Center and the effort to establish Fred Meyer Chair.
- School of Business Administration advisory council member.
- Community interests: Oregon Halfway House; Albertina Kerr Center; Coalition for School Funding Now!; Governor’s Educational Quality Task Force, 1996
- Professional interests; Advisory Board Member, Oregon Business Council; Director, Portland Chamber of Commerce.
- Quote: “PSU offers a breadth of curriculum that ties together the elements that enhance Portland’s reputation as a model city.”

Do You Want to Find Out More?
For information about anything in this issue, contact Katrina Ratzlaff at ratzlak@mail.pdx.edu or (503) 725-5038.
Senate Discussion on Intellectual Property  
5 November 2001  
Organizer: R. Daasch, ECE

The purpose of this discussion is to consider the question

“What are the current positions of the university and the system on intellectual property?”

The key intellectual property (IP) issues on the research mission include

• research contracts with private or for profit sponsors and,
• commercialization of research output (sponsored and unsponsored).

The key intellectual property (IP) issues on the teaching mission include

• Internet based course materials (WebCT, streaming video/audio, WWW pages...),
• distance learning materials (taped lectures) and,
• more traditional classroom output lectures, books, laboratories

The AAUP (<url: http://www.aaup.org/deipdocs.htm>) capture its views on the intellectual property issue with five questions:

• What is "intellectual property"?
• Who owns the intellectual property?
• Who may use the intellectual property?
• How are any funds to be distributed?
• How are emerging issues and disputes resolved?

Portland State objectives (<url: http://www.gsr.pdx.edu/rsp/policies/intelprop.html>) for its policy on intellectual property are

• Provide systematic means of bringing inventions, technological improvements and educational and professional materials into the public domain;
• Encourage the development of new knowledge while protecting traditional academic freedom of employees in the publication of materials, development of inventions and discovery of technological improvements;
• Establish principles and procedures for equitable sharing net royalty income with employees, and with sponsoring agencies when required by an agreement.

The Oregon University System Directives (<url: http://www.ous.edu/board/imdtoc.htm>) address issues of intellectual property in Section 6: Finance and Business Affairs under Licensing, Patent, Educational, & Professional Materials Development, & Copyright Policies & Procedures. The application of these policies is summarized below.

The policies for licensing, patents, educational and professional materials development, and registration of copyrights apply to all Department of Higher Education employees whose work-related assignments, regardless of location, might enable them to develop new knowledge which was conceived purposely or fortuitously. The policies also apply to other persons using institutional facilities, personnel, or other resources.
Friday, 6 October

The Friday meeting was an unusual one in that IFS chose to conduct a "seminar" on the Oregon political culture and its "resistance" to funding higher education at a high level. Gordon Dodds, Professor Emeritus of History at PSU and one of its most distinguished historians, set the tone of the discussion with a talk entitled "Overview of Oregon's Political Culture." Other invited participants included Reps. Kelly Wirth (D-Corvallis) and Phil Barnhart (D-Eugene); Vice Chancellor Diane Vines; Grattan Kerans, OUS lobbyist; and Jim Lussier, member of the OUS Board from Bend. The following excerpts from the discussion represent a transcript of the conversation provided by Marye Heft, IFS senator from OIT.

Dr. Dodds began by asking: How can we make a bigger impact of Oregon Citizens to value higher education? He provided the following historical perspective to answer his question.

Oregon history can be divided into three eras: 1) the Oregon Trail-from 1840-1869, 2) the progressive era-from the late 19th century to the early 20th century, and 3) the environmental legislation era- from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s.

The Oregon Trail era (1840-1869) is identified by the mass migration of people from the Midwest and other areas to Oregon. These people came to "escape an existing [bad] condition."

The progressive era (late 19th to 20th century) is identified by the belief that people are fundamentally good. It was a time of optimism, and "people were not deterred by social problems." In this era, Oregon was an agricultural state.

The first major industry/corporation in Oregon was the Southern Pacific Railroad. This industry came under fire by businessmen complaining of no service and by farmers complaining about their grain not being shipped on time. Also during this time, some people displayed a fear of the new emigrant. And another complaint was that the Oregon constitution was too restrictive.

As a result of these complaints, the people decided to change the political structure of the state. In 1902 the initiative and referendum were introduced. These devices have become known as the "Oregon System." After 1902, some public officials were recalled.

Between 1902 and 1912, progress was seen in some areas but not others. For example, the voters placed taxes on utilities and Oregon beaches became public. The voters refused to issue road bonds and the tax base is defeated for the University of Oregon and for Oregon State University.
In summary, during the progressive era the citizens want "cheap progressivism," which is progress that does not require much sacrifice.

The environmental legislation era (from the mid-1960s to mid-1970s) is marked by a nation-wide concern for the natural environment in Oregon and by a great population movement into the State. This was a time of great prosperity for the state.

During this time, Tom McCall worked with the citizens of Oregon to clean up the pollution in the Willamette River.

The push during this time was toward making government more efficient. The people believed in restructuring government.

Legislation that passed included the 1969 statewide zoning law (the first in the nation), the 1971 bottle bill, and the 1969 ban on field burning (which was later modified). Legislation that did not pass included the 1969 and 1985 sales tax initiatives and the 1971 income tax rise to benefit schools.

Finally, Oregon today—a snapshot

Annual spending in Oregon for higher education is $292.50 per person. Annual spending in Oregon for prisons is $510.30 per person.

- From 1980 to 2000, higher education spending increased 21%. During the same time, prison spending increased 282%.

- The Chronicle of Higher Education ranked the library research holdings of major Universities. The University of Oregon made the list at a ranking of 80th. The University of Oregon also made the list for endowments at 168th.

- In the year 2000, Oregon earned an affordability rating of D-. Oregon also earned the ranking as the 5th least affordable state for higher education.

- In Oregon, 75% of 18 to 24 year olds have a high school certificate. This is the lowest in the nation.

- Forty-four states among 50 spend more per capita than Oregon on higher education.

- In Oregon, from 1989 to 1999, the income gap widened faster than any other state but Rhode Island.

What can we learn from the past? The following are Dr. Dodds' insights:

- For most Oregonians, we have not made changes that require very many sacrifices. We believe in cheap progressivism. As a state, we are "skating by." We are happy to be in the middle
• We will not become another Silicon Valley unless the state has a dramatic change of heart.

• To directly quote Dr. Dodds, "I can't think of an argument or an appeal to get people to support higher education suddenly [in Oregon] when they have never done so."

Grattan Kerans, Assessment of Higher Education's 2001 Legislative Session

Mr. Kerans explained that we have been in a recovery mode since the measures of 1991 and 1993.

Joe Cox brought a change in attitude. He let the legislature know, "You will get these things for your investments."

In 1997, we began to turn around. In 1999, we saw a $150M increase in our budget.

For this biennium, we had $79M in the general fund above the total legislatively approved budget, which is a 10.6% increase in the general fund for this biennium. So, the legislature and governor made significant progress.

In this most recent budget, we had a loss. On the upside, we made up for some of this loss with the $44M for targeted programs, the $8.5M for new enrollment, and the $7.2M for the new campus.

On the downside, the general fund contribution to the cell values in the previous biennium was 87.9%, and this biennium it is 83.6, which is a 9% state reduction to the cell values. Stated another way, there was a $37M reduction in the general fund support for the continuing service level of the cell values for the current enrollment.

How was this shortfall made up? Students made up the bulk with a $25M tuition increase. Taking enrollment recovery and covering the current enrollment made up another $8.5M.

All of this recovery still left us $4 to 5M short in meeting the current service level of the current enrollment. So, we started this biennium with a small but measurable step back.

Yes, we got a D- in access from "Measuring Up 2000," but our recent tuition increase comes after 5 years of no increases.

The bottom line is that we have made significant progress recovering from Measure 5.

The immediate future involves a special session that the governor has called for January to look at cuts in Oregon to help balance the budget. This special session may not be our last one this year. The governor needs to cut about 2%, but he is against across the board cuts.
So, what do we need to look at? At this point, Grattan Kerans asked the following rhetorical questions: Is the OUS budget discretionary or basic? Is it a cost budget or an investment? Is this social, civic, or economic development that we generate? Do we want to be okay or excellent in higher education? Is our budget part of a block? Are we fundamental or are we scalable?

He answered these questions by stating the following. In terms of the 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2001 budgets, we are a cost. We represent a service. Adequate is good enough. We are not fundamental, and we are not part of the block.

On the positive side, we share our bad condition with all of other state appropriations expect prisons and the Oregon Health Plan.

Grattan Kerans had the following advice for the immediate term:

"Fund the enrollment. Keep our part of the model." Achieve the Oregon University system goal.

"Invest in capital renewal, so the education experience that students have is excellent." Right now we have a crises in capital because almost 20% of our current capital investment is in the deferred maintenance plan. This is a crisis the board will be looking at.

Representative Phil Barnhart (Democrat-Eugene)

Mr. Barnhart stated that the state is short funding $1 to 2.5 billion each biennium, and we don't have what we need to fund the state budget at any appropriate level.

He explained that the voters in Oregon don't understand the dire funding problems in Oregon. Higher education is simply a microcosm of what other programs in this state face.

Forty-five percent of Oregon citizens don't know we are in a deficit. The legislature has done us a disservice by pretending that manipulation of the budget will fix this deficit problem. Senior legislators are in denial about the budget situation.

The solutions? We need a frank conversation in Oregon about our revenue base and what we as Oregonians want.

We also need a fundamental shift that will require long-term work on the part of lots of citizens.

Representative Kelly Wirth (Democrat-Corvallis)

Ms. Wirth began by telling us that she wanted to speak about this legislative session and her impressions about what went wrong.
She explained that higher education wasted time by telling the legislature the benefits of higher education. The legislators know the benefits.

The fundamental failure is that people do not realize that we didn't fully fund the RAM because people don't understand the RAM. The RAM works in a booming economy. In other economies, the model needs flexible money.

What are the most important things we can do?

Give legislators an honest view of what a 2% cut will mean.

Also, explain the RAM.

In the special session, all the talk is about cutting budgets, and the talk should be about how to increase budgets. We need a conversation in this state about adequately funding this state.

Jim Lussier, Higher Education State Board Member

Mr. Lussier explained that right now we have way more need than money. We can't just ask for incremental increases. So, how do we get there?

In the short term, the special session will help.

In the long term, we need to determine what we are about and how to get there. We are at a survival level.

He explained that we make the mistake of planning with the money we have and not planning with what is needed to make us successful. This is not how business works (planning for success).

People in general understand the need for higher education, but they also have some negative perceptions. So, we have to make a much stronger case for higher education ion.

One potential revenue source for higher education is continuing education for companies. Right now business spends billions on this continuing education.

Also, we need to look at private/public partnerships.

Diane Vines (Vice Chancellor)

Ms. Vines stressed that the most important thing is the general public doesn't understand enough about us. There is a lack of knowledge about public universities.

She explained we need a strategic communications plan for higher education to talk about the benefits to society and the economy.
We are lucky if 10% of the population in Oregon can name four public higher education institutions.

Thirty-four percent of those surveyed in a recent phone interview think we are doing better than 5 years ago. Eighty-six percent want us to compete to be the very best (and we can capitalize on this).

She stressed that we are now in a knowledge economy. We have not shown well the role we play in this economic development. We need a well-educated citizenry.

We need to make the case to the people who can then tell their legislators. We need to get the message out about the importance of higher education in this state.

The board is also looking at new models for funding higher education. One model is public corporation status.

Kelly Wirth added that the community colleges did a great job in visiting legislators. They had a plan and they had one message. They knew their vital role in this state.

Some Key Points in the Resulting Group Discussion

Bruce Sorte OSU Senator) - Social services in the 1980s were hammered, and they learned to repackage their message to be successful. We need to sell ourselves and tell our stories.

Public education is becoming a private benefit. Tuition needs to go up to charge people who get this benefit.

Diane Vines-People lack knowledge about us. They want us to be the best, so we need a coordinated message.

They want their kids to stay in Oregon. The jobs are not here if you are not educated.

Grattan Kerans-The board is looking at the public corporation issue. We can either have what we have now with incremental change or we can come up with a new model.

Duncan Carter (PSU Senator) - Our fiscal relationship to the state won't improve. Our plan must respond to reality. We need to look at grants, gifts, and self-support courses.

Kelly Wirth-Call us legislators on our tax credits. Hold us accountable.

Bruce Sorte-Could we compete as a corporation?

Grattan Kerans-We could offer a general obligation bond to the state.
This is no longer a public obligation. It is a private benefit. Remember our D- in access. During the last 20 years, we have shifted from the state picking up three to one of the cost of education to today where we are partners sharing equally in the cost.

Phil Barnhart-We need to be very careful with this public obligation/private benefit issue. What makes a society rich or poor? One reason we have a rich society is because of advanced education.

Jim Lussier-We have not come together as schools. We are seven separate schools. We need to transform the system.

Craig Wollner (PSU Senator) - We are at a transition point in higher education. What is a university? We need to figure this out in relationship to the population we serve. We need to create a new vision of the university.

Elaine Deutschman (OIT Senator) - Do we need to look a restructuring the board?

Diane Vines-The board priorities are 1) program review and program approval, 2) economy, and 3) linkages to K-12 and community colleges.

Kirsten Lampe (OHSU Senator) - The OSHU system is making an 8% cut. We are making difficult decisions about programs to keep and to lose.

Jim Lussier-We have a huge shortage nationwide of nurses, but OSHU is making cuts.

Bob Turner (WOU Senator) - It would be a huge mistake to eliminate regional universities. I am hearing an emphasis on training here and not education.

Group Discussion about Solutions

Kelly Wirth-Bring legislator to campus. Show successes, but more importantly, show the problems. Also, force republicans to look at measure 11 (mandatory sentencing) because this is a huge cost to the state. Make your case with personal contact.

Phil Barnhart- Work with your foundations. Find out which alumni are living in which districts and get these alumni to legislators

Diane Vines-You need to get the legislator when he/she is still a candidate.

Kelly Wirth-Higher education is important but we need more money. The problem is seniors, K-12, and higher education.

Phil Barnhart-The community college model works, which is training for a job.

Kelly Wirth-We need to emphasize that higher education is an essential service.
Kelly Wirth - It is very difficult getting real budget numbers from schools. We have no idea how things are really going in higher education and we don't understand the RAM.

Bruce Sorte (OSU Senator) - An action can be a publicity campaign. We have $20K. We need to know opportunities relate to risk.

Saturday, 6 October

The Saturday meeting began with a discussion of the previous day's session. It was agreed that the discussion format was one that could be usefully adopted for use at future meetings when an unusually compelling subject presented itself.

There was a discussion of the July OUS board meeting at which the students protested the tuition increases and the energy surcharge. There was general agreement that the board and staff of OUS had handled these increases badly both in their relations with students and legislators.

The chancellor's resignation was mentioned and IFS determined to try to play the most influential role possible by seeking an IFS-dedicated seat on the search committee in addition to one faculty at-large seat. Also, the IFS would like the search committee to support a faculty screening committee for the top 10 candidates, with at least one IFS representative on this screening committee.

Elaine Deutschman opened a discussion about the loss of cash back by PEBB. The major discussion focused on allowing people to have choices (because we no longer have the choice of different plans) and on thinking about different approaches to medical coverage.

Bruce Sorte presented a PERS Actuarial Update.

Craig Wollner
Professor, Social Science
Fellow, Inst. of Portland Metro. Studies
Portland State University
wollnercr@pdx.edu
Diversity Action Council

PSU recognizes that diversity in faculty, staff, and student populations enriches the educational experience, promotes personal growth, strengthens communities and the workplace, and enhances an individual's personal and professional opportunities. As a public university we have a special responsibility to work for equity and social justice and to make our programs truly accessible to our diverse constituents.

Charge

* Advise and report to the President and Provost about diversity.
* Develop and work to implement a Diversity Action Plan that includes specific action steps: Increase diversity of students, faculty and staff; Support curricular and pedagogical changes to incorporate diversity and equity; Foster research on issues related to diversity and equity; Create a welcoming and safe place for persons who represent diversity; Strengthen linkages with communities of diversity in the region.
* Promote significant structural changes at PSU to support service to diverse constituents.
* Recommend to the President and the Provost the allocation/redirection of resources to support diversity initiatives and commitments.
* Design and oversee an assessment process to monitor progress on implementing the Diversity Action Plan.
* Promote activities throughout the campus effectively addressing issues related to diversity.
* Recognize and honor exemplary actions that contribute to a supportive campus climate.

Diversity Action Council Members
Kofi Agorsah
Hayward Andres
Johanna Brenner
Kim Brown
Tom Burman
Elaine Cohn
Phyllis Edmundson
Karen Gibson
Darrell Grant
Samuel Henry
Agnes Hoffman
Andre Jackson, Co-chair
Priya Kapoor
Keith Kaufman, Co-chair
Devorah Lieberman
Yves Lebissiere
Deb Miller
Dalton Miller-Jones
Scott Minnix
Jim Nash
Sorca O' Connor
Mary Kay Tetreault
Karen Yelle
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The Diversity Action Council, in response to a charge from the President and Provost, and building on the work of the Campus Climate Commission, has developed a plan to increase the diversity of Portland State University. This plan focuses on four major areas:

Enhancing the institutional environment, curriculum, and scholarship

Increasing numbers of students from under-represented groups

Increasing numbers of persons from under-represented groups in faculty, classified staff, and administration

Strengthening connections with diverse communities in the region.

The council has identified a set of powerful actions in each of these four areas that will contribute to reaching the goal of creating an environment where diversity enriches the educational experience, promotes personal growth, strengthens communities and the workplace and enhances an individual's personal and professional opportunities. The actions in this plan meet the following criteria:

They have the potential to make a substantive difference at Portland State University within 3-5 years (powerful actions)
They involve all elements of the university (pervasive actions)
They contribute to systemic change (durable effects)
They will produce visible and lasting results (impactful actions)
They build on the work of the Campus Climate Commission and other campus initiatives (enduring commitments).

The council appreciates the opportunity to offer its suggestions toward achieving enhanced campus climate for faculty, staff, students and administrators. Many of these actions build on work that has been underway at the university for some time. We realize that these actions require new investments and reallocations throughout the university. The council recognizes the importance of a visible institutional commitment of resources to the success of this plan, and believes that commitment should be made visible throughout the university's budget development processes, as well as through allocations for special projects and university-wide activities.

The council recommends that the President and Provost assign accountability for the actions recommended over the next 3-5 years to the appropriate units and/or individuals. That accountability will include reporting annually on progress to the Diversity Action Council and the Executive Committee (DAC chair, Vice Provost for Campus Initiatives, President and Provost).
This plan identifies what actions are necessary to meet the university's goals, but the council deliberately decided not to prescribe how units or individuals should implement the actions. The council respects the creativity, capacity, and commitment that exist in the community and anticipates that the presence of a focused and explicit plan will guide all parts of the university in creating a truly diverse educational institution. The council also is prepared to provide consultation, referrals, and assistance to units who need support in taking the actions outlined for them.

The Diversity Action Council suggests that its role in the future have three major dimensions:

1. to annually review progress on achieving the Diversity Action Plan with the responsible groups, suggest mid-course corrections or alternative actions, and issue annual reports to the community on progress on the plan;

2. to administer funds (approximately $45,000/year) that support the campus-wide initiatives assigned to it: recruiting students (with Graduate School, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Admissions and Records), providing mini-grants for collaborative scholarship about diversity to be disseminated to the campus community and beyond (in consultation with Faculty Development Committee), and providing faculty, student, and staff development to promote infusion of diversity into the curricula, classroom management and communication skills, while advocating race relations, tolerance, and cultural competency (with CAE, Affirmative Action, and OAA), and providing support to form a resource team to help with minority faculty recruitment and retention;

3. to provide consultation, connections, and encouragement to groups across the campus who are working to advance this initiative.

Goal #1
Create an institutional environment, curricula and scholarship that enhance learning about diversity and respect for diversity and equality.

Goal #2
Increase the number of students from underrepresented groups who apply, are accepted, enroll and graduate such that, at a minimum, they are represented proportionally to regional (for in-state students) and national (for out-of-state students) populations.

Goal #3
Increase the number of persons from underrepresented groups in the faculty, staff, and administration so that they are represented in proportion to their current availability in relevant job pools and/or their representation in the region.

Goal #4
Increase the number of sustained and mutually beneficial connections with diverse communities.
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Portland State University
Diversity Action Council Activities
2001 - 2002

Connections
A monthly gathering for faculty of color on campus.

Faculty Mini-grants
Mini-grants of up to $1,000 to support research pertaining to diversity.

Student Mini-grants
Mini-grants of up to $1,000 to support student clubs and organizations with diversity related activities.

Focus on Diversity Series
Sessions that address research findings and recommendations relating to diversity, teaching and student learning.

Diversity Incentive Plan
The President's incentive plan to assist departments with the hiring and retention of underrepresented faculty in their area.

Diversity Hiring Resource Team
A network of faculty with expertise in the area of diverse faculty recruitment and retention available for departmental consultation.

Professional Development for PSU Staff
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- **1998 Campus Climate Report:**
  - Investigate ways to significantly improve the student learning experience at Portland State.
  - Conduct a careful, open review to determine if contracted housing is still the best option for Portland State University.
  - Currently, College Housing Northwest (CHNW) manages 10 facilities belonging to Portland State. The current contract expires 6/30/03.
• Bi-monthly meetings from January-November 2000.
• Members included:
  – Cathy Dyck, Chair;
  • Trevor Bryant, Student & CHNW resident;
  • Eric Cowan, Student & CHNW Board Director;
  • Megan Gaekow, Student;
  • Mark Gregory, OTT;
  • Susan Hansel, Facilities;
  • Josie Hardy, Graduate student & CHNW resident;
  • Agnes Hoffman, Admissions & Records;
  • Susan Hopp, Student Affairs;
  • Kathi Ketcham, Institutional Research & Planning;
  • Sarah Martin, Student & CHNW Board Director;
  • Candyce Reynolds, University Studies;
  • Katie Simback, OAA

• That the University carefully review and discuss the needs of students along with the needs of the University prior to either renewing or entering a new contract with CHNW. Engage in an RFP process.

• That more opportunities for enhanced educational experiences be provided for students living in CHNW. A committee should be formed comprising of staff from CHNW and PSU faculty/staff to explore the possibilities and the best methods for delivery.
• That an ex-officio representative be added to the board. (Currently, a Facilities administrator is the only non-student PSU representative.) The purpose of additional representation is to keep the academic side apprised of housing issues that may affect students.

• That a faculty advisor be appointed to the Residents' Council. This Council is made up of students from each building. It deals with both policy and operational issues.

• That a professional review of surrounding apartment market rates be conducted to support the claim that rents are at 80% of market.

• PSU attracts a diverse student population. The University and students would benefit from the formation of a multi-disciplinary and cross-functional committee to address future strategic housing needs of this changing population.
- That at least annually, a meeting should be held among CHNW, Academic Affairs and Business Affairs. This will ensure that upcoming concerns for each future fall term be addressed and issues resolved.

- That resident life programs be expanded to all student residents, similar to Freshman Experience.

- That human development and learning theory training be provided to residential life professional and paraprofessional staff. This should be a collaborative effort among Student Affairs, Counseling Services and CHNW.

- That the University support an active administrative role to make its existing residence halls into intentional living-learning communities.
That student satisfaction and housing awareness surveys be taken of current and former students. That the results be disseminated to FADM, OAA, CHNW, students and other interested parties.