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AAUP/PSU FACULTY SENATE
SHARED GOVERNANCE CONFERENCE

Friday, November 15, 9:30 a.m.- 12:00 p.m.
UPA Gallery (UPA 2nd Floor)

Featuring:
Keynote address by Jane Buck,
President of the National AAUP

Introductory comments by Jennifer Ruth, ENG.
Round-table discussion on the state of shared governance at PSU (Moderated by Gerry Sussman, USP. Participants include Charles Heying, USP; Provost Mary Kay Tetreault, OAA; Sherril Gelmon, PA & Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate; and others)

The future of tenure• The growth of the fixed-term ranks and the effect on governance• Distance education and higher-education standards• The ownership of intellectual property• Privatization trends in the university• Corporate management styles as the new modus operandi• Decision-making at the department level• Corporate branding and academic freedom• The relationship between faculty senates and collective bargaining• Academic Professionals and shared governance

For more information, contact the PSU-AAUP office at 5-4414 or aaup@psuaaup.net
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 4, 2002**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll  

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 7, 2002, Meeting*

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  
   Shared Governance Forum Announcement  
   President’s Report  

D. Unfinished Business  
   None  

E. New Business  
   *1. Vision, Values and Priorities – Tetreault*  
   *2. Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., m) - Gelman*  
   3. Access, Costs and Enrollment – Gelmon  

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   Provost’s Report  
   Vice President’s (Community Relations) Report on the Capital Campaign  
   1. *Report of President’s Initiative on Advising – Lieberman*  

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:*

B Minutes of the October 7, 2002 Meeting  
E1 Vision, Values and Priorities: Working Statements  
E2 Proposed Amendment to the Constitution, Art. IV., m)  
G1 Report of President’s Initiative on Advising
2002-03 Alpha Roster: FACULTY SENATE

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agorsah, E. Kofi</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agre-Kippenhan, Susan</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Janine</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames, Kenneth</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres, Hayward</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arante, Jacqueline</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham, Mary Ann</td>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolsi, Tom</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleiler, Steven</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodowicz, Gary</td>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brower, Barbara *(for Gilbert)</td>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Cynthia</td>
<td>CMPS</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Darrell</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, Scott</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Virginia</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabelly, Alan</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Carolyn</td>
<td>EPFA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caskey, Micki</td>
<td>ED/CI</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casperson, Lee</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenoweth, Thomas</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collie, Samuel</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Mary Beth</td>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornman, Patricia</td>
<td>XS</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cress, Christine</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daasch, W Robert</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon, Grace *(for Balshem)</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco, Ruth</td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr, Grant</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer, William *(for Holloway)</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosque, Walton</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Sandra</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelles, Erna</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelmon, Sherril</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glanville, Kimberly</td>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory, Mark</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haaken, Janice *(for Reese)</td>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagge, Tim</td>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Douglas</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmon, Steven *(for Feeney)</td>
<td>XS-SS</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks, Arthur *(for Hixson)</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey, Martha</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillman, Stan *(for Adajian)</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Richard</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Greg *(for Millner)</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivanjee, Pauline *(for Friesen)</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, David</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolin, Annette</td>
<td>JUST</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketcheson, Kathi</td>
<td>OIRP</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Dee</td>
<td>CARC</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Mary</td>
<td>ECON</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights, Clive</td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretovich, Duncan</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristof, Jane</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lall, Kent</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman, Constance</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebman, Robert</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckett, Tom *(for Bjork)</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandaville, Jon *(for Brown)</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Lorraine</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller-Jones, Dalton</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, James</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, James</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissen, Laura</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connor, Sorca</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Halloran, Joyce</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Jeanette</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peigahi, Hamid</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeiffer, William</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philbrick Donna</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince, Tracy *(for Michael)</td>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffo, David *(for Bizjak)</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reder, Stephen *(for Liebman)</td>
<td>LING</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhee, Ma-Ji *(for Perrin)</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Rebecca</td>
<td>XS-IS</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosengrant, Sandra</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueter, John</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seltzer, Ethan</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinn, Craig</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shusterman, Gwen</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spolek, Craig</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John, Primus</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbott, Maria</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple, Jacqueline</td>
<td>ED/CI</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, Linda</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Jian</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanjala, John</td>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattenberg, Richard</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weasel, Lisa *(for Greco)</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetzel, Patricia</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler, Lawrence</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollner, Craig</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (for Labissière)</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interim appointments indicated by asterisk.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 2002
Presiding Officer: Sherrl Gelmon
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Voetterl for Carr, McNames for Daasch, Bickford for Falco.


Ex-officio Members Present:


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of June 3, 2002, were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

The CLAS and the Other Instructional Caucuses are requested to select new membership for the Committee on Committees, to replace Tableman and Labissiere, respectively.

At the next meeting the Steering Committee plans to share a modified version of Robert's Rules of Orders, revised. This year's Senate Parliamentarian is Terry Rhodes.
The Steering Committee is co-sponsoring the November 15 Governance Forum with AAUP, as described in item “C” attached to today’s agenda.

Changes in Senate memberships since June 6, 2002:
- Grace Dillon has replaced Martha Balshem, OI, effective 28 August
- Tracy Prince has replaced Yvonne Michael, UPA, effective 30 August
- Pauline Jivanjee has replaced Barbara Friesen, SSW effective 10 Sept.
- David Raffo has replace John Bizjak, SBA effective 30 Sept.
- Tom Luckett has replace Gavin Bjork, CLAS effective 30 Sept.

Changes in Interinstitutional Faculty Senate membership:
- Craig Wollner has replaced Elizabeth Furse effective 1 October.

Additions/corrections to today’s Agenda:
- Attachments to “D.I. Markers for the Baccalaureate” are available at the doors.

President’s Report

BERNSTINE welcomed all to the new academic year, and noted that his Convocation address is available on-line at President’s Corner. BERNSTINE yielded to Debbie Murdock, Special Assistant for Government Relations, to discuss public affairs.

MURDOCK thanked the Senate for the formal invitation to address them. She stated she would be happy to answer questions regarding the 5th Special Session of the Legislature later, but would like to focus her remarks on looking to the future.

Hopefully, January will mark the beginning of the next Legislative session to determine a better 2003-05 biennial budget, however, in the upcoming session, we will probably see what happened in 2001-03 happen again, only magnified tenfold. The new biennium can best be characterized as having limited resources, restricted new state programs, and a challenge from the Legislature to even hold their own on their priorities. The way for PSU to approach the session is to take a leaf from the President’s Convocation speech and really demonstrate to legislators that we are committed to the mission of this campus, that we are going to go forward with the work we are doing, and that we will be successful in spite of the challenges. We are very enthusiastic about where PSU is, and about the future of this institution. We can be mindful of the challenges but still put forward the face that PSU has done in the past, which is that we offer new solutions and new strategies.

The OUS system as a whole will be going in with four priorities from the Chancellor’s office. The first and highest priority will be trying to get the RAM Model budget funded at the highest possible level and to hold fast to the original assumptions, the latter of which is of particular importance to PSU. Second, the system is refining proposals regarding administrative reform provisions, administrative flexibility, etc. Third, and of particular interest to PSU, is a constitutional amendment allowing the
sale of bonds for remodeling and repair of buildings. This measure would be placed on the May ballot in 2004. Fourth, is increased funding for student Financial Aid which is an opportunity for us to talk about PSU’s access mission. The overall objective continues to be to access the maximum possible funding from the legislature and to achieve this through positive relationships with them.

In the next few months, you will be seeing candidates and legislators on campus with staff members. By all means, stop and say hello. For PSU to be successful, we need to reach out and connect with our legislators and candidates through both campus contacts and activities in your own districts and neighborhoods. That is the most important thing for us to do between now and the end of the year.

In preparation for the session, we are strengthening our connections with the business community. The president has hired Don McClave, former head of Portland Chamber of Commerce, to reach out to business leaders to bring them on board to talk about PSU. Our hope is that we will have a cadre of folks who will be able to go to Salem next year, to talk about PSU on our behalf so that its not just us carrying the message.

Finally, with respect to Congress there is basically nothing happening. We went in this year with three priorities for earmarked funding, including the engineering building, a livability institute, and library resources for Middle Eastern and Judaic Studies. It looks like Congress could adjourn without doing an appropriations bill, leaving these priorities unfunded. As soon as we know the outcome, we will start work on the next session to keep these priorities in play.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Academic Requirements Committee Report on Markers for the Baccalaureate

WETZEL presented the report (attached) and noted the summary of polls will be included with it in the minutes of today’s meeting. The alumni response was low. The short list of recommendations includes encouraging student participation in the discussion and determining where this will go next.

MILLER-JONES stated that presumably after the Assessment Initiative is reported on, the Senate would take action with respect to these activities combined.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate and thanked the committee for their work on this project.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals
KOCH briefly presented the proposals for the committee, recommending the division of motions.

HILLMAN/SHUSTERMAN MOVED the Senate approve the program changes in the MA/MS in Chemistry in “C1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

BLEILER/REDER MOVED the Senate approve new courses and changes to existing courses in Curriculum and Instruction, GSE in “C1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

MORRIS/SPOLEK MOVED the Senate approve new courses and changes to existing courses in Systems Engineering and Electrical and Computer Engineering, CECS including correction to the college title in the document in “C1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

WATTENBERG/KRISTOF MOVED the Senate approve the new course in Art, FPA in “C1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

HUNTER/JIVANJEE MOVED the Senate approve new courses in Social Work, SSW in “C1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Potential Topics for Senate Discussion Items

GELMON introduced the item, which is designed to identify topics of important interest to the membership the 2002-03 Senate. She requested members take no more than a total of ten minutes to submit ideas and that they be succinctly described. CABELLY offered “the privatization of the university”; ARANTE offered “the state of academic freedom at PSU”; BURNS offered an IFS request, “ideas to educate the public about how to get them to see the full value of faculty”; FOSQUE offered “how to get faculty to participate in commencement”; MILLER-JONES offered “who makes decisions about the structural/architectural design of the campus”; ARANTE offered “the state of shared governance at PSU”; GELLES offered the impending problems for students who are currently members of the armed forces; McNAMES offered “intellectual property policy at the university” and with local contractors; RUETER offered “the role of fixed term and tenure track faculty in scholarship”; SHUSTERMAN offered “the role of faculty in accommodating students with disabilities.”
NOTE – There is no recorded transcript from this point.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Question for Vice President Kenton

KENTON, after introducing Assoc. Vice President Cathy Dyck, proceeded to respond. PSU spends $1.4 Million on custodial services, or $.60 per foot. OSU spends $1.00 per foot, Reed College spends $1.50 per foot, etc. Our spending is obviously low. We are contracted with PHC, which did not require bidding. PHC has two new large accounts, Portland Airport and Portland Public Schools, which have put pressure on PSU, as many of PHC’s good employees have been transferred to help with the startup of these new accounts. The current contract expires October 31, 2002. The new contract includes certain improvements, for example, strengthened background checks. We have negotiated a six-month extension during which we will examine the following options, a new contract with PHC, opening up the contract to the competitive bid process, and moving services back in-house, the latter option being very unlikely. In 1988, the language or our original agreement with PHC states that it is recognized by both parties that the budget is small, etc.

There are several ways faculty could help make things run more smoothly, including to report all complaints to Facilities (5-3738 or by email). If there are security issues, call Campus Safety & Security (5-4404).

ARANTE asked who is responsible for rodent control? KENTON noted this is a health and safety issue and a janitorial issue, and rodents need to be reported. REDER asked for a clarification of the security problem, which is who should be called for a locked room. KENTON stated that for entry into a building from the outside, call CSSO, and for internal entry call PHC, or both.

GELLES suggested that faculty find the site in their area being emptied for food waste and use that for their garbage. She also noted she has had conversations with her CUPA janitor who is just as frustrated about security. KENTON urged that faculty get to know the staff. COLLINS asked how we get reimbursed for the recent thefts. DYCK indicated faculty need to call Angela Rodriguez. GEL MON asked who handles recycling. KENTON noted it is the same provider. KENTON concluded, we are engaged in a major sustainability initiative which recycling is included in, for example we are developing major recycling centers, converting to motion sensor lights, undertaking water saving improvements etc. There is a recycling survey on the web, and faculty are encouraged to fill it out.

2. Questions From The Floor For The Chair.

None.

Minutes, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2002
G. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost's Report

TETREAULT noted that enrollment today, October 7, 2002, is 20,826, which is 10.8% above that of last year at this time. We have a number of new classrooms in the PCAT building, and classes continue to be bulging even with revenue sharing classes. The result has been a real team effort.

TETREAULT discussed her response to the faculty focus groups. A detailed letter is forthcoming tomorrow which discusses this (attached).

Vice President's Report

KENTON noted that the Oregon state economy is declining about $60 Million per month. The 5th special session required a $2 Million cut in the OUS system, taken in ETIC and grad cell funding, translating to $450,000. for PSU. Additional cuts to OUS will total $27 Million if the election on January 28, 2003, does not pass the income tax surcharge. For PSU, that equals $5.6 million more cuts in this biennium. PSU has been asked for scenarios for the $5.6 million cut and we have proposed the following: a surcharge equal to $120. per student maximum, starting Winter ‘03 or $240. starting Spring ‘03. That will realize $2.6 Million in supplemental income. The balance will be realized from non-recurring cuts and drawing down reserves. Despite reductions in the budget, PSU continues to look forward to the future, including growing enrollment to 35,000, expanding the campus district and facilities to include added housing, especially for non-resident students, doubling research, increasing faculty, and developing new programs.

Note – Recorded transcript resumes here.

BURNS asked for comment on the future of the PCAT block. KENTON stated $250,000 has made significant improvements and faculty will be pleasantly surprised. As for that block of land in the future, it is so critical to PSU that we should not move until we are ready and sure of our direction.

A question was asked regarding PSU’s relationship to the Macadam area. KENTON noted we are looking at a piece of property that we would buy as a foothold in that district. It abuts the property owned by OHSU and we could possibly develop it in cooperation with OHSU.

RUETER asked if PSU is considering having a satellite campus. KENTON stated we continue to develop partnerships with community colleges and TETREAULT noted we are looking at language for BA partnerships. KENTON noted that managing
Conversation on the Baccalaureate Markers

At the November 2001 Senate meeting, ARC was assigned the task of “starting a conversation” on the baccalaureate markers. Pat Wetzel convened a subcommittee of ARC members plus additional faculty from a cross-section of departments to determine what form the conversation should take.

Those who took part in discussions and planning include:
Cynthia Brown (CMPS, UNST), Duncan Carter (ENGL, CLAS), Beverly Fuller (SBA), Kris Kern (LIB, ex officio ARC Chair), Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP), Yves Labissiere (UNST), Kathleen Merrow (HON, ARC), Dalton Miller-Jones (PSYCH), Terry Rhodes (ex officio OAA), Sandra Rosengrant (FLL), Gwen Shusterman (CHEM), Juliette Stoering (OIRP), Pat Wetzel (FLL, ARC), Craig Wollner (UNST, IMS)

The working group decided to poll the faculty and the alumni on their reactions to the Markers.

Access to alumni was problematic. An open invitation via letter drew only one response. We believe that with more lead time and a better plan on our part, alumni would be an excellent source of feedback on the Markers.

The faculty poll took the form of a discussion board on the web:
http://portfolio.pdx.edu/Discussion_Boards/SquishDot/Markers/view

All departments were invited to participate: the chair, head of curriculum committee, and one at-large. A summary of their responses is attached (Appendix 1). The responses themselves are also attached (Appendix 2).

The committee recommends that students be included in any further discussions. The committee also asks where the conversation on the markers goes next? Are they to be integrated into the assessment initiatives? And who will take the lead in further development?

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Wetzel, ARC
Summary of Markers Conversation: Question 1

Please give us your thoughts about the proposed Markers of the Baccalaureate at PSU. Do you support the effort to define markers? Why or why not? What concerns do you have about defining markers?

Major Themes:

1. Markers that we should consider adding:
   a) ability to evaluate and communicate using graphics and math
   b) Information Literacy—rationale: “if we want our students to become independent learners. They need to understand how information is organized, how to find and evaluate it and how to use it effectively”.

2. Revisions and Modifications to Proposed Markers
   a) Elaboration and or syntactic revision on the "Creative Synthesis" and "Engage with Important Areas of Investigation" marker.
   b) Develop clear levels for each markers, with clear expectations and or standards of evidence.
   c) Each level should have clear operational definitions that are testable or quantifiable.
   d) Markers 8 and 11 seem very hard to measure and it might be difficult to reach consensus on them.
   e) Marker 12 may not be applicable to all students
   f) Marker 13 might flow from the critical thinking goal. Further, we should reach consensus on what we mean by “sustainability.”
   g) Markers should contain more specificity; specific requirements should be enhanced beyond minimal competency.

Other General Themes

4. There is the sense that the markers conversation ought to arise naturally from or be informed by the discussion on assessment of student learning.

5. There are strong opinions on the “civic engagement” and “environmental sustainability” section of the markers. Many faculty express that while they are supportive of the values embedded in these ideas, they don’t feel that they should be translated into specific markers. The hope is that these would emerge naturally from an “unbiased education”.

6. There are concerns raised regarding standards and assessment of markers across disciplines and majors. Will they (expectations) be different in different parts of the University?” How do we define what is expected so that it is more than is now required in high schools under the state curriculum standards and benchmarks? As an example, should a student in art be expected to move beyond the high school standards in math? Should science students be expected to move beyond this level in history?”
something on the scale of the Southeast PCC campus would require a major administrative presence, which would not be cost effective.

LUCKETT asked for a clarification regarding the tuition surcharge. KENTON stated that both graduate and undergraduate students would be assessed per credit with the increment differing, but the total the same.

G. REPORTS

1. ASPSU

WALLACE reported for the students. They are working on three major projects this year, the major in Black Studies, lobbying in Salem, and a voter registration and education campaign.

A question was asked regarding issues of diversity at PSU and the impact of “9/11.” WALLACE noted that the student focus was on fear and safety issues. She thanked the professorate at PSU for opening their doors to these issues and creating a positive climate.

2. Report of ACAIT

Rhodes presented the report for the administrative committee (overheads attached).

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for Senate.


BURNS reported on the meeting, held at the new OUS campus in Bend. The Bend campus, a branch campus of OSU, currently has 14 FTE faculty, and 400 students (320 FTE) students. Along with other public and private institutions, PSU has developed a presence there, in Social Work and Public Administration. Jim Lussier, Board President, discussed several issues, including sustainability, a strategic plan for the board, public relations with respect to what faculty do, a plan to double resources, and campus autonomy. IFS has set their own goals, to work with the Chancellor, working with the community colleges, and working on faculty visibility. OSU has put together a PERS initiative so that they can be part of the solution (attached). Lastly, U of O has an annual faculty leadership caucus, which would work well at PSU.

4. Assessment Initiative Report

LIEBERMAN directed Senators to the items in the Agenda mailing, and briefly gave a history and an update on Assessment. Currently, Assessment is focusing on accreditation which occurs in 2004, more information on which is
available at the website under "President's Corner" and "Institutional Portfolio." LIEBERMAN acknowledged the work of Bill Becker in directing this team effort.

RUTER noted that earlier in the meeting we deferred the baccalaureate markers for the report on assessment.

MILLER-JONES suggested that the Senate Steering Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to discuss the markers and assessment together.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.
October 8, 2002

Academic Campus Community
Portland State University

Dear Colleague:

It was a pleasure to see so many of you last week at Convocation. President Bernstine's presentation reminded us of the many "firsts" we have achieved in the last year. The records broken spanned student enrollment, expansion of our campus, receipt of private donations, externally funded research, and the number of positive media articles and reports, including national rankings in *U.S. News and World Report*’s new category of "Programs That Really Work." (See attachment for rankings.) While the President's remarks set a realistic tone for the fiscal challenges we face, it is clear that the President is confident of our continued success as an institution. We are proceeding with our plans to build upon our burgeoning enrollment, growing research and external funding, promising new faculty and staff hires, and collaborative engagements in the community.

Last year we began a planning process that included a number of campus-wide discussions of draft vision and values statements. The facilitators of these discussions continued a Portland State tradition of scholarly engagement by conducting twelve focus groups with faculty. Their work followed a research design that resulted in a report that provides us with a thoughtful analysis of the faculty input and a set of recommendations.1 Campus views also were solicited in two open forums held on campus. The input received has been instrumental in the development of a vision statement and a set of institutional priorities that will be presented and discussed at Faculty Senate in November. The vision of an institution "known for student learning and community engagement" directly reflects the values that were expressed most consistently by our campus community and reported by the facilitators: connection to community and quality teaching.

The report heightens our critical understanding of the core values we hold, but also provides us with information regarding some areas of faculty concern. I propose to pay special attention to three key sets of issues that fall under the report’s theme of “identity crisis” (p. 7). This summary theme reports tensions that faculty feel between our access mission and quality, issues of research productivity and lack of infrastructure, and the balance between undergraduate and graduate programs. Because of the importance of these concerns, we have begun to review and address them through the work of the deans’ planning priorities sub-committee and the Senior Executive Enrollment Management Team (SEEMT). Discussions will continue in the Council of Academic Deans, and future ones will be held in the Faculty Senate.

When I met with the focus group leaders to discuss their findings, they reported that group participants emphasized how critical it would be for me to let the campus know what I will do to

---

1 “The Faculty Responses to Values and Vision Statements of PSU: Final Report” may be accessed at [http://portfolio.pdx.edu/Portfolio/PSU_Vision/](http://portfolio.pdx.edu/Portfolio/PSU_Vision/). I extend my appreciation and thanks to Martha Balshem, Peter Collier, Leslie McBride and Kerth O’Brien for their work on this project.
act upon their findings. In the following, I outline the concerns expressed by the faculty and the actions I propose to take up with various groups throughout the campus.

**Access and Quality**

The perception that PSU is an institution with an identity crisis was most commonly expressed as “a dynamic tension between two values – access and quality.” Most faculty members appreciate both values and labor to blend and balance them. Many describe the effort to straddle this dichotomy as “wearing.” This finding, and the recent discussions regarding the increase in the GPA required for admission as a first-time, full-time freshman, suggests that we need to explore the issues surrounding this dichotomy. The SEEMT is writing a position paper, “A Plan for Educating Oregon’s Population Center,” that addresses these dual values, and the Enrollment Management Implementation Team is recommending processes regarding recruitment and retention, particularly at the undergraduate level.

In our discussions of values in SEEMT, we have agreed that we believe that universities in the 21st century can deal with the complexity of balancing access and quality. Questions we are considering include: Can we move beyond the dichotomy by emphasizing the ideas of access and opportunity, or access and completion? Why do we assume that this is a tension that has to exist between the two goals? We agree with Alexander Astin, Professor of Higher Education at UCLA, who has said we need to pay more attention to institutions that develop talent rather than those that demonstrate talent through standardized measures, such as GPAs and test scores. How does this idea inform what we do? Some believe that our access mission obscures our strengths. How do we remain true to our access mission and convey the strength of our programs, faculty and students to our various external communities?

*Proposed Actions:* The position paper states a number of specific recommendations that include a review of our admissions practices and goals for the size and composition of the student body. The SEEMT team will complete its position paper by November 1st and circulate it to the Council of Academic Deans, who in turn will hold discussions with their department chairs. Similar discussions will be held with the Student Affairs directors and groups identified by the President’s Advisory Council. Input from these groups will be taken back to SEEMT and incorporated into the position paper, which will guide our work to balance access and quality as we educate Oregon’s population center. The Enrollment Management Implementation Group, along with other appropriate departments or programs, will develop and implement plans to address the paper’s final recommendations.

**Infrastructure Support for Research**

The Focus Group Report summarizes faculty concerns in this area as a frustration over the “dichotomy between institutional demands for research productivity and lack of supportive infrastructure.” It was noted that this theme emerged more frequently among untenured than tenured faculty.

William Feyerherm, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, has observed that the University has gone through a successful transition in the past decade from a culture that did not emphasize research or external funding to one that does. Our success is evidenced by our current external funding of $29 million, an increase of 270 percent over the last decade. We are poised for another transition of greater increases. The Planning Committee is proposing a goal of $50 million by 2007.
In initial discussions with Vice Provost Feyerherm and the Council of Academic Deans, we have concluded that we need a multifaceted approach to understanding the complexity of this set of issues as they relate to faculty culture, our dual values of teaching and scholarly/creative activity, and our tight budget climate.

Proposed Actions: I am committed to action that will improve research infrastructure as our research productivity continues to increase. I will consult with the President, the President’s Advisory Council, the Council of Academic Deans, Vice Provost Feyerherm, and Vice President Kenton to determine how best to implement the following actions and report to the Faculty Senate meeting in December on what we will do and how those actions relate to our vision and institutional priorities.

1) Review and document infrastructure support available for pre and post-grant activities through the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, the schools and colleges, and the Office of Finance and Administration. We will review various forms of support including: faculty "set ups," proposal and budgetary preparation assistance, assistance once the grant is awarded, appropriate access to labs and computers, teaching assignments, seed monies, and other support activities offered through the Provost’s Office, including the Center for Academic Excellence.

2) Review the effects of increasing indirect cost return to the schools and colleges from 15% in 1998 to the current 45%.

3) Determine what facilitates faculty research productivity in departmental contexts;

4) Learn more about how and if perspectives vary across faculty ranks.

5) Decide what is needed to enhance infrastructure support (consulting with the deans, the President, the President’s Advisory Council, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research).

Graduate and Undergraduate Education

As reported by the Focus Group facilitators, “Faculty expressed concern over the questions of institutional direction with regard to the priority given to graduate and undergraduate education. Many faculty come clearly on one side or the other of this dichotomy and desire clarity on the matter.” (p. 8)

In my observation, the decade of the 90s was a time in which the campus focused primarily on the enhancement of undergraduate education. That focus has paid off well with increased enrollments in first-time, full-time freshmen, increased enrollment throughout all of our undergraduate programs, improved retention rates from freshman to sophomore year, and increased national recognition. In the latter part of the decade, we began to add Ph.D. programs in engineering and computer science and are moving forward on adding one in mathematics.

As we continue to gain approval for more graduate programs, especially doctoral ones, we should be similarly deliberate about enhancing this area of our curriculum. We have good work to draw upon in the Graduate Council’s 2001 document entitled “Determining Areas of Distinction in Graduate and Professional Programs.” The Council intended that their criteria result in bold new investments or incremental investments of institutional resources and disinvestments in existing programs that are no longer viewed as areas of distinction. The three broad criteria identified as critical are:
- Quality: The ability of a program to achieve prominence.
- Fit/Synergy: The ability of the program to address an important need within the University’s graduate offerings.
- Feasibility: The University’s capability to launch and sustain a program of distinction in this area.

SEEMT also will provide advice in this area, since their work includes strategies for guiding graduate and undergraduate enrollment. We are taking up issues that include the most effective program mix among our undergraduate and graduate offerings in relation to our vision. These issues will be addressed in the position paper mentioned earlier.

**Proposed action:** In consultation with those individuals and groups named in the previous section, I propose to appoint an ad hoc committee composed of some members of the Graduate Council and other faculty, staff and appropriate administrators. Drawing upon the graduate study report written in 1997, the committee will gather data reflecting our current status and make recommendations to the Council of Academic Deans regarding graduate education, paying special attention to the emerging vision and priorities of the campus. For example, part of our working vision statement is to be an internationally recognized urban university known for innovative research. Since graduate programs will be central to that vision, one of the proposed priorities that has emerged from the planning process is to develop graduate and research capacity consistent with PSU’s central role in knowledge creation and dissemination. The development of new Ph.D. programs and the support of existing ones are action steps related to this priority.

We have a very busy year ahead of us. In addition to the work I have just described, we are continuing to implement steps outlined by the Presidential Initiatives Action Councils and to act on input from a number of forums and faculty roundtables on topics discussed in the Great City-Great University series (including creative industries, sustainability, K-12 education, and OHSU/PSU collaborations). Academic Affairs will be working hard to ensure that we meet the needs of our students, faculty, and community in light of fiscal constraints. It is an ambitious agenda, but it has great potential to match our efforts to the vision that we are developing for Portland State University. I look forward to achieving our continued successes together.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Tetreault
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

c: Dan Bernstine
Members of the Executive Committee

Attachment: Excerpt from *U.S. News and World Report*
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Initiative #1: Adequate technology infrastructure

Regularly develop rational, funded plans for keeping our technological infrastructure (hardware, software, and personnel) up-to-date. Both central and departmental technology staff should be involved in these planning efforts. Technology plans should continually examine support models and determine which services could be improved by being centralized and which could be improved by being decentralized.

Initiative #2: Distance and distributed education

PSU should support the use of technology-mediated instruction in strategic areas to reach new groups of students, to help current students learn in new ways, and to increase its competitive advantage. The use of distance and distributed education can be very expensive and careful choices must be made. A reasonable level of central support must be provided. It may be productive to examine partnerships. Examples: specific minors or programs may be chosen to be placed on-line to serve on-campus students and off-campus students at several sites; high demand classes may be provided on-line to facilitate access by more students limited by classroom availability.
Initiative #3: Technology in scholarship and student learning

PSU should support faculty members who develop broader faculty expertise on the effective use of technology in instruction, and who research the value and impact of technology-mediated instruction methods. Much work remains to be done through scholarly examination of the effects of technology on learning. PSU should find new ways for evaluating and improving technology-enhanced learning, better support faculty scholarship, and ensure that our graduates have the understanding of technology they need to be good employees and good citizens. The university can do this by leveraging existing strengths, e.g., its integration with the community, undergraduate student involvement in research, innovative capstone courses, and the breadth of technology experience in our student body.

Initiative #4: Research Computing

Technology is changing the way “traditional” university research is being performed. Faculty members are sometimes unprepared to support the technology they must now use in their research and may need new types of support to ensure the best use of their expertise. The support of faculty research is essential to fostering creative scholarship and enhancing the reputation of the university. Our focus must be on the importance of principal investments in support staff and training required for research computation and programming tasks. Primary support of research has and will continue to reside within schools, departments, and research groups. The institution should look for mechanisms to exploit synergy. PSU needs to provide some level of centralized research technology expertise to provide aid in programming, software and hardware support to the technical support staff, programmers and researchers within the departments.

ACAIT will continue to address the following tasks:

- Updating the vision and values to guide academic computing;
- Advising on classroom technology issues (such as location and scheduling of technology-equipped rooms, types of classroom technology needs, etc.);
- Advising on changing student and faculty computing support needs;
- Reviewing and advising on computing equipment replacement plans/schedules;
- Reviewing campus networking plans and changes; and
- Advising on appropriate technology support and tools for research.
Tasks to be completed and reported to the 2002-03 ACAIT

- The Office of Information Technology, working with the Administrative Priority Committee, ACAIT and other campus information technology planning groups (NAGS, LCMG), will develop a clear policy statement on centralized and de-centralized infrastructure systems. The campus needs to resolve what mix of services should be provided from a central unit and what should be more localized. Resources do not allow us to be unclear about who provides services, acquisitions, etc. - a collaborative approach is needed.

Tasks to be completed and reported - continued

- The Research Advisory Committee in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs will develop an overall strategy for moving research computing forward. Without a well-articulated infrastructure and policies, our research progress will stall.
- Technology is one tool related to student learning. The Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable will articulate what PSU's expectations are for student learning with technology, and the needs of faculty who wish to use technology in their teaching.

Tasks to be completed and reported - continued

- Teaching distance or distributed courses is expensive and time consuming to develop (and sometimes to deliver). The ACAIT needs to recommend guidelines that guide the investment of institutional resources to support and encourage faculty to develop distance and distributed courses and programs to more effectively meet high or low student demand courses, provide access for under or un-served students, and to meet faculty and student expectations for technology-mediated teaching and learning.
AACAIT Web Location

http://www.acait.pdx.edu/

AACAIT Committee Members 2001-2002

- Terrel L. Rhodes, OAA (Chair)
- Judy Anderson, LIB
- David Butts, ED
- Tom Luba, SBA/MBA
- Daniel Pirofsky, FPA
- Janet Hamilton, SBA
- Barton Massey, CMPS
- Nancy Koroloff, SSW
- Bemi Pilip, OGIS

- Gerardo Lafreniere, MTH
- Gwen Wolfram, ESS
- John Rueler, BIO (ex-officio)
- Dick Pratt, OAA (ex-officio)
- Mark Gregory, OIT (ex-officio)
- Mark Kramer, OIT (ex-officio)
- Kathy Kercheson, ORIP (ex-officio)
Resolution to Restructure and Strengthen the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (PERS)

Presented as a Discussion Item to the Faculty Senate on October 3, 2002

Whereas, A financially sound, stable, and successful retirement system is critical to recruit and retain public employees who have sufficient knowledge and experience to provide high quality service to Oregonians; and

Whereas, Critical policy and operational adjustments are essential to maintain the long term financial sustainability and public support for the PERS; and

Whereas, An effective retirement system helps to assure that public employees will be financially able during retirement to be regular volunteers and contributors to their communities; and

Whereas, An important role of government is to serve as a model in all its actions and specifically in this case to provide an adequate, fair and secure retirement for its employees; and

Whereas, The current structure and principles of the PERS including;
- holding the Fund in trust for PERS members and protecting the Fund from diversion to other users;
- achieving and maintaining an actuarially sound funding policy for PERS benefits authorized by the Legislature;
- taking no actions that violate member's legal rights to benefits;
- administering the System in the best interest of all the members;
- advising the Legislature so that it may fulfill its fiduciary responsibility to System members;
- monitoring the work of the Oregon Investment Council in investment of the Public Employees Retirement Fund;
- considering the entire PERS membership when making decisions
remain fundamentally relevant and necessary to assure public employees' futures while doing so within a manageable cost; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State University Faculty Senate guarantee an adequate though not inappropriate level of retirement benefits paid from public resources both in terms of minimum [60-65] and maximum [80-85] percentages of the last year's salary or a minimum amount based on percentage of median income, whichever is greater.

2) That actuarial tables be adjusted regularly [every five years].

3) That the rate of return on retirees' accounts be indexed [20 time period] and regularly [quarterly] adjusted to adequately reflect the PERS rate of return in the long term.

4) That an adequate reserve fund [two years] be maintained to continue payments to retirees based on the long-term rate of return without using the General Fund to support any PERS expenditures when the economy lags and/or state revenues decline.

5) That the same quality of retirement benefits [Return Tier Two to Tier One] be provided to all public employees.

6) That retirees be offered the option to continue benefiting from PERS during retirement by choosing a variable payment option [increasing as a person ages].

7) That public employees are assured a certain projection of retirement benefits [at least five years out].

This resolution is necessarily general due to the complexity of the PERS. However, the OSU Faculty Senate remains committed to finding a fair and resilient solution. The solution must meet the State's contractual and ethical obligations to Oregon's dedicated public employees and recognize the market realities of compensation packages, which rely on retirement benefits, to approach some level of competitiveness for quality employees. Equally important, the solution must demonstrate respect and appreciation for and deserve the necessary support from Oregonians and their legislative representatives.

DRAFT

PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 2002
## President's Assessment Initiative Timeline

The following timeline highlights the assessment activities and goals by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2000-2001  | • Engage 10 departments  
             • Make assessment visible                                                                   | • Assessment process designed  
             • Establish ARN (Assessment Resource Network)  
             • 10 units developing assessment plans  
             • 1st Annual Assessment Symposium  
             • Hire Assessment Graduate Assistants (GAs)                                                 |
| 2001-2002  | • Engage 23 units (including original 10)  
             • Develop and implement Assessment GA class  
             • Continue to make assessment activities visible on campus and online                       | • New units developing plans  
             • Participating units display department reflections, and  
             • 2nd Annual Assessment Symposium                                                             |
| 2002-2003  | • Engage all units in Assessment Initiative and establish School/College Liaisons  
             • Enhance Assessment GA class and establish GA departmental/assessment tool support  
             • Enhance ARN  
             • Collect student learning data and feedback for departmental uses, where appropriate  
             • Post, where appropriate, assessment initiative, program review and accreditation information on the Institutional Portfolio website (www.portfolio.pdx.edu)  
             • Continue to make assessment activities visible on campus and online                       | • All units completed student learning assessment plans  
             • All units display completed assessment plans in the PSU Institutional Portfolio  
             • Assessment findings incorporated into program review process and curriculum improvement  
             • 3rd Annual Assessment Symposium                                                             |
| 2003-2004  | • All units collecting their assessment plan data for accreditation standards and departmental use  
             • Write PSU self-study for accreditation purposes  
             • Continue to make assessment activities visible on campus and online                       | • All units have their completed assessment plans, objectives and reflections online  
             • Results used to enhance programs  
             • 4th Annual Assessment Symposium                                                             |
| 2004-2005  | • Present report to Northwest Association of Schools & Colleges Accreditation Team  
             • Continue assessment cycle and use it for on-going departmental/program purposes           | • Completed accreditation report  
             • 5th Annual Assessment Symposium                                                             |
| 2005-2006  | • Review of PSU Assessment practices based on feedback from the Accreditation Site Team Report  
             • Assessment activities continue with intent on continuous feedback to the unit and improved curriculum | • Assessment activities continue with intent on continuous feedback to the unit and improved curriculum  
             • 6th Annual Assessment Symposium                                                             |
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Vision Statement

Our vision is to be an internationally recognized urban university known for excellence in student learning, innovative research, and community engagement that contributes to economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and the quality of life in the Portland region and beyond.

Values Statement

The pursuit of our vision rests on our success in transforming undergraduate education, our growing research programs, our strong collaboration with the community, and the core values we hold. These values describe not only what PSU is now, but what it will be in the future.

- Learning and Discovery

PSU values intellectual inquiry in its undergraduate and graduate programs, provides leadership in the development of knowledge, and creates opportunities for the application of knowledge to real-world problems.

We maintain a welcoming and stimulating environment that is conducive to success for students, faculty, and staff. We value tenure as an essential component of this environment.

- Access to Learning

PSU is committed to providing access and opportunity to learners from regional, national, and international communities in their pursuit of lifelong learning and diverse educational goals.

- A Climate of Mutual Respect

PSU values diversity and fosters a climate of mutual respect and reflection that supports different beliefs and points of view and the open exchange of ideas.

- Openness and Reflection
PSU endeavors to improve continuously as a university through reflection and open assessment of our activities.

- Community and Civic Engagement

PSU values its identity as an engaged university that promotes a reciprocal relationship between the community and the university in which knowledge serves the city and the city contributes to knowledge in the university.

We value our partnerships with other institutions, professional groups, the business community, and community organizations, and the talents and expertise these partnerships bring to the university.

We embrace our role as a responsible citizen of the city, the state, the region, and the global community and foster actions, programs, and scholarship that will lead to a sustainable future.

Institutional Priorities (for the next 3 to 5 years and not in priority order)

1. Attract and retain a faculty of distinction. The strength of the university is based on its faculty and high quality programs.

Specific action steps:

- Create faculty lines for leadership in economic, environmental, and social sustainability.
- Hire faculty of distinction consistent with priorities set by schools and colleges and the vision of the University, while supporting excellence wherever it exists.
- Invest in infrastructure support (including facilities) for programs of distinction (including research and creative activities) that attract and retain faculty.
- Develop policies and procedures to improve the reward system for faculty of distinction.
- Continue to address issues of faculty compensation and rewards.
- Ensure a balanced relationship between enrollment growth and tenure-track positions.

2. Attract and retain a student body that is excellent and diverse.

Specific actions steps:

- (SEEMT report is forthcoming)

3. Provide national leadership in student learning and talent development.
Specific action steps:

- Implement a plan to ensure the markers of our baccalaureate graduates.
- Sustain our national recognition as an innovator in undergraduate education and community-based learning.
- Continue to develop and support existing graduate programs that have national recognition.
- Continue the work of the President’s assessment, advising, diversity, and internationalization initiatives.
- Utilize assessment information, including departmental program reviews, to improve programs and instructional practices.
- Ensure a broad range of co-curricular activities (student government, community engagement, athletics, leadership training, student organizations and clubs, committee service, etc.) for student learning outside the classroom.

4. Increase financial security and resources. A quality institution needs financial predictability and stability.

Specific action steps:

- Explore and advance public revenue strategies that support partnerships with elected officials and policy makers to secure greater public funding for the University.
- Continue to build the University’s endowment and other funding sources.
- Increase revenue from research and sponsored projects to a total of $50 million by 2007.
- Establish benchmarks for research and endowment funding, with set proportions of funding to come from public and private revenue streams, and establish goals for next 10 years.
- Use enrollment management to promote and support stable funding streams.
- Continue to develop marketing strategies to tell PSU’s story, emphasizing that the university is indispensable and that a great city requires a great university.
- Manage costs to maintain financial stability.
- Continue to develop strategies that enhance student learning while promoting instructional efficiencies and faculty vitality.
- Investigate and implement new configurations for distance education and life-long learning that meet user needs and provide incentives for the schools and colleges to participate.

5. Develop our research and creative capacity consistent with PSU’s central role in knowledge creation and community engagement.

Specific action steps:

- Develop new Ph.D. programs and support existing ones consistent with this priority.
• Continue involving students in work on community issues.
• Continue to support the role of the arts and humanities in the university in the city.
• Grow externally funded research and sponsored projects, with emphasis on federal sources, to $50 million by 2007.
• Review infrastructure to support increased research capacity and make changes where appropriate.
• Align existing and future research centers and institutes to be consistent with this priority.
• Develop funding for research fellowships and support for undergraduate and graduate students.
• Develop targeted reciprocal relationships with users, educational institutions, public agencies, businesses, and corporations as a basis for setting and enabling research agendas.
• Outline the features and characteristics of a great university and implement a plan to reach this goal.
• Market our research and creative activities and capacity.

6. Provide leadership to create a nexus of educational institutions.

Specific action steps:

• Implement a comprehensive plan for integrating instruction and degree completion between community colleges and the university.
• Strengthen and expand the Metropolitan Collaborative Model to include private institutions and other partners.
• Identify and document activities underway that support and further this priority.
• Expand programs that link K-12 with the university.
• Utilize technology appropriately to achieve this priority.
• Continue to explore and strengthen our collaboration with Oregon Health and Sciences University.

7. Develop an administrative support structure that furthers all of these priorities.

• Hire a diverse staff and academic professionals with expertise needed to perform administrative and service functions efficiently and effectively.
• Continue to foster a spirit of entrepreneurship that encourages experimentation, organizational learning, and continuous improvement to deliver state-of-the-art administrative services.
• Develop partnerships with other service providers (as appropriate) to deliver value-added administrative and support services.
• Utilize technology to leverage service capabilities.

OAA:mkt/kak
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Recommendation to Faculty Senate from the Steering Committee:

Further to the information to be presented by the Provost at the Faculty Senate meeting of November 4, 2002:

That an ad hoc committee of five Senators be charged to receive comments from the members of the Faculty Senate regarding the proposed statements of vision, values and priorities presented by the Provost, and report back to the December 2002 meeting of the Faculty Senate with a recommendation for Senate action.
Proposed Amendment to the Constitution
Of the PSU Faculty
(underlined text added, deleted text struck out, italics text moved)

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

The Council Committee shall:
1) Serve as the faculty advisory body to the President and to the Faculty Senate on matters of educational policy and planning for the University.
2) Take notice of developments leading to such changes on its own initiative, with appropriate consultation with other interested faculty committees, and with timely report or recommendation to the Faculty Senate.
3) Receive and consider proposals from appropriate administrative officers or faculty committees for the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities.
4) In consultation with the appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-range plans and priorities for the achievement of the mission of the University.
5) Undertake matters falling within its competence on either its own initiative or by referral from the President, faculty committees, or the Faculty Senate.
6) Form subcommittees as needed to carry out its work.
7) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each term. [END]

The Senate Steering Committee recommends that the name of the University Planning Council be changed to the Education Policies Committee.

(The UPC and former Educational Policies Committee were merged by Constitutional Amendment on June 1, 1991)

**Rationale**

This reflects the existing terms of reference for the committee, reorders the terms in priority order, and ensures that a standing committee of Faculty Senate is responsible for discussing matters of educational policy and bringing them to the attention of the Faculty on a regular basis.

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
October 14, 2002
# Student Advising Implementation Team Timeline

## Objectives of the Student Advising Implementation Team
1. Improve Central Advising
2. Assist in designing departmental student advising models
3. Assess the PSU Student Advising Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2001-2002 | - Piloted four departments (Psychology, SBA, Architecture, Biology)  
- Funds provided for Summer Advising  
- Enhancing Summer Orientation | - Departmental plans posted on website: (www.president.pdx.edu/Initiatives/advising/SAIT/home.html)  
- Collecting and assessing Dean’s reports on summer advising  
- Assess changes and impact in summer orientation |
| 2002-2003 | - Advisor handbook for students and faculty  
- Advising website being developed  
- Deans developing proposals for funds needed to meet student advising needs in schools/colleges  
- SAIT available to assist departments with advising plans  
- Electronically assessing student advising | - Advising handbook available for use Winter 2003 (paper)  
- Advising website live by Winter 2003  
- Deans’ student advising proposals reviewed by Winter 2003  
- Funds transferred into schools and colleges (see website for amounts)  
- Assessment tool available Winter term, when students register on-line |
| 2003-2004 | - Assess efficacy of departmental plans  
- Assess central advising  
- Assess the overall student advising model | - Departmental plans posted  
- Central advising assessed  
- Overall student advising model assessed and modified based on assessment data from students, IASC, departments, schools/colleges |
Summary of Markers Conversation: Question #2

After reviewing the list of proposed markers, can you think of other markers that have been left out? If yes, what are they? How would you define them?

General Discussion

Fifteen faculty members responded to the second question ion the markers discussion board. An addition that many of the respondents suggested or agreed with was to include a marker about “the ability to function constructively and responsibly within a selected field of expertise (major).” One faculty member explained the need for this addition by stating, “given the general educational concerns conveyed by the markers as they stand, some reference to the more specialized learning that takes place here is appropriate.” Another stated, “At the same time that we emphasize what is common in our student's education, I also think that it is important to value what students achieve in mastering one particular body of knowledge...education is not only process but also content. I think that including [a marker related to knowledge in a field of expertise] would help to ensure that in focusing on markers that often emphasize "process" goals, we not lose sight of what students gain through in depth study in one field.”

Other suggestions from the discussion:

1. expanding the human experience marker to include or adding another marker about the importance of gaining an international perspective;
2. adding the ability to learn and solve problem independently and the ability to evaluate alternative ways of knowing (in other words, acquiring information literacy);
3. emphasizing investigation and research in the markers;
4. emphasizing expression through applied and performing arts and encouraging familiarity with and appreciation of literature, arts, and music.
Summary of Markers Conversation: Question 3

Having reviewed the list of proposed markers, do you feel any are expendable? Should any be dropped? Which ones? Why are they unnecessary?

General Discussion

Twelve people responded to the third question ion the markers discussion board. The markers found problematic by the largest number of respondents (5) were Ethical Reasoning, Social and Civic Responsibility, and Importance of a Sustainable Environment. Most respondents agreed that college graduates should be equipped to act on the basis of values, but that it was inappropriate for the institution to say what those values/principles should be. One respondent felt these markers "bordered on political correctness"; others thought they would be difficult to evaluate.

Four respondents questioned the final marker, "Engage with Important Areas of Investigation." Three found it unclear, unfocused; the fourth thought it too closely related to specific subject matter to be seen as a transferable ability. Two thought this marker should include specific mention of research. By way of describing the vagueness of this item, one respondent wondered how someone investigates human imagination? What defines a "cross-cultural" community and who decides what to include? What is meant by "mutual support of theory and practice"?

Three commented on Oral and Written Communication. Two thought such basic skills were at too low a level to set even as a minimum. At least students should be able to do more than simply "articulate meaning." One respondent asked that the two be combined.

Two respondents asked that Analytical Thinking be combined either with Problem Solving (no hyphen) or Critical Inquiry.

Other suggestions from the discussion:

• Eliminate Collaboration and Working in Teams. This is a pedagogical tool and not a hallmark of the educated person. (On the same grounds, do not add a marker regarding community based learning.)

• "Technology" marker inappropriate. These are tools, not ends. It is passe, even insulting to suggest that computers are difficult, something to be learned in college.

• Creative Synthesis. What does this mean? How can I ask students to be able to do this when I'm not sure I can? How would we assess?

More general remarks included

(1) A plea that the markers not lead to the addition of courses to the curriculum. The Engineering programs are already extremely inflexible.

(2) A request that we use some other term than "marker"? "Indicator," for example.

(3) This is a good list if these markers are seen as representing some ideal college graduate, but not if they are supposed to be measurable attributes/skills.

(4) The markers are hard to evaluate. And what happens if the student doesn't accept or agree with all of the values stated in the markers?