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THE LAST REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE PSU FACULTY SENATE IS JUNE 4, 2001, AT 3:00 P.M. SHARP. PLEASE RESERVE THE FULL TWO HOURS ON YOUR CALENDAR FOR THIS MEETING, AND PROVIDE FOR YOUR ALTERNATE TO ATTEND IF YOU WILL BE ABSENT DURING ANY PORTION OF THE MEETING. IF THE AGENDA IS NOT CONCLUDED, THE MEETING MUST BE CONTINUED ON MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2001, AT 3:00 P.M., IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THE BUSINESS OF THE 2001-02 ACADEMIC YEAR.

Senators are reminded to notify the Secretary to the Faculty of any additional summer addresses and/or the name of your Alternate, in the event a need arises for a special meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate (Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Art. V, Sec. 3, 3), and Faculty Governance Guide p.11, "Functions and Procedures of the Faculty Senate")
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May 19, 2001
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 June 4, 2001 at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

NOTE: The following Order of Business, is effective for six meetings, by Senate charge on March 5, 2001.

* A. Roll
* B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Meeting

C Brief Announcements

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER

D. Faculty Senate Discussion Item - The Legitimate Uses of Fixed Term Faculty - Heying

E. Unfinished Business
   *1. Report of the Ad Hoc committee on the Faculty Grievance Procedure - Kenny
   *2. Student Advising Implementation Team Update Report - Smith

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM

F. New Business
   *1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV, 4., 4), h Teacher Education Committee
   *2. Graduate Council Proposals for Ph.D. in Mathematics and Courses - Eder

ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE

G. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

Provost's Report

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

I. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   *1. Advisory Council Annual Report - Sestak
   *2. Budget Committee Annual Report - Rufolo
   *3. UPC Annual Report - Ritchie
   *4. Committee on Committees Annual Report - Beasley
   *5. General Student Affairs Annual Report - Jacobs
   6. Supplement to Faculty Development Committee Annual Report - Ketcheson
   *7. Update on Presidential Assessment Initiative - Lieberman

J. Selection of Discussion Item for October 2001 Meeting

REPS TO COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES - CAUCUS ELECTIONS:
   CLAS (3), CECS (1), SES (1), SFPA (1), LIB (1), OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL (1)

K. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   A Roster of PSU Faculty Senate, IFS and Advisory Council 2001-02
   B Minutes of the May 7, 2001 Faculty Senate Meeting
   E1 Report of the Ad Hoc committee on the Faculty Grievance Procedure
   F1 Proposed Constitutional Amendment, ART. IV, 4., 4), h
   F2 Graduate Council Proposals for Ph.D. in Mathematics and Course Proposals
   I1 Advisory Council Annual Report
   I2 Budget Committee Annual Report
   I3 UPC Annual Report
   I4 Committee on Committees Annual Report
   I5 General Student Affairs Annual Report
   I7 Update on Presidential Assessment Initiative

Secretary to the Faculty
341CH • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4499 . andrews@pdx.edu
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2001
Presiding Officer: Judith Patton
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Members Absent: Balshem, Barton, Bjork, Brown, Cabelly, Carpenter, Chaille, Eder, Erskine, Falco, Feeney, Fisher, Herrington, Holloway, Hunter, L. Johnson, Kenny, Kiam, Latiolais, L. Mercer, Peterson, Philbrick, Rogers, Sherman, Skinner,


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

A. ROLL CALL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The minutes of the April 2, 2001, meeting were approved as published.

C. BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

2001 Faculty Elections are underway, and ballots are due May 16, 2001. The newly constituted division, Other Instructional, is repeating Senate Nominations on that ballot, as eligible members were omitted in the first round.
D. DISCUSSION ITEM: Athletics at PSU, Budgetary and Other Considerations

PATTON introduced the discussion moderator, David Johnson, and indicated that the minutes for this portion of the meeting may be less inclusive, depending on the ability of the Secretary to the Faculty to capture discussion and the time involved.

D.JOHNSON introduced the speakers and reviewed the format. He noted that this new feature of the Faculty Senate has prompted extensive discussion, especially around the question of what might or might not be accomplished, and what will be the mark of success. D.JOHNSPON suggested that a good outcome for this activity will be that our understanding of the subject will be deepened. The discussion should complicate our understanding and bring to bear some skepticism about our own preconceptions and our own generalities. Like a good class, we should leave knowing more about the subject, having had our curiosity peaked, and finding our understanding complicated in ways we hadn’t imagined before. Grant Farr and Stan Hillman each have been apportioned 10-12 minutes, with Farr speaking first, and this will be followed by 10 minutes of questions and discussion from the floor.

FARR indicated he is pro-Athletics, and noted that Tom Burman, Sherry Frey, Tim Walsh, Terri Mariani and Kim Glanville are present. FARR noted he is here to discuss Athletics as a member of the Senate and a Professor, and intends to discuss what he thinks is important about Athletics. FARR distributed two papers on Athletics (attached), and highlighted several issues. We are the largest university in the state and Athletics is a major component of any great university. This is especially relevant to incoming high school graduates. Athletics has brought us national notice this year, and it is important to development efforts. Athletes and their coaches are active in community service. Athletes are active in student government, their grades are comparable to their peers, and they have a higher graduation rate than non-athletes. The Budget for Athletics has increased, and we must have fiscal accountability. Tom Burman is working towards that end by streamlining the program, including releasing six coaches and bringing the remainder into the budget process. He has also reorganized ticket sales and the Viking athletic fund. We now have the beginning of a team in place to eliminate the budget deficit. Other changes to work on are integrating the coaches into the university community, and improving faculty involvement in Athletics. The Faculty Senate has a mechanism for Athletics oversight, the IAB, and that committee must be more active.

HILLMAN noted his inherent leanings are basically pro-Athletics, but the purpose of this presentation is to educate us to differing perspectives. There are three functions of a university, to provide students access to a quality education, provide a variety of scholarly expertise to the community, and to enrich the experiences of the region with cultural and performance events. There are three fiscal sources that support these functions, state funds via the RAM model,
student tuitions and incidental fee support, and external support. In the third area, the President has brought a breath of fresh air to the campus, so the third leg of the stool doesn’t collapse one more time as a result of changes in state general fund appropriations. The first question is, does Athletics contribute to our responsibility as a university? Scholarships contribute to access for a diverse group of students. The off-campus interactions of coaches and students, and the expertise they contribute, provide a community service. Athletics events are part of the fabric of a segment of the regional population, which includes alumni. That answered, the question is how do you characterize the interaction of campus units relative to PSU as a whole? The Biological model, for example, illustrates the mutualistic relationship, the commensal relationship (the interaction is favorable to the smaller unit but neutral as far as the whole), and the relationship that is favorable only to the smaller unit, the department for example, but is inhibiting to the growth of the larger organism, in this case the university. The tale of two units, Biology and Athletics, is that Biology provided a net benefit to the university of $3. million, whereas Athletics incurred a net loss. We know there are about only fifteen athletic programs in the nation that are net revenue, so probably the best we can expect for Athletics is a commensal relationship. However, the interaction for Athletics has become parasitic, as evidenced by the unanticipated bill that appears every year. There are two major outcomes, the problem of chronic deficits, which points to mismanagement of resources, and the morale problem caused by these deficits in the rest of the university. In closing, how will further deficit spending by Athletics be prevented? It has been a failure of the Senate IAB committee not to force the Athletic director to deal responsibly with the budget. Additionally, the President must do this as well. Lastly, it needs to be determined what is the appropriate rate of growth for the Athletic fund.

A.JOHNSON noted it would be good to hear from the Intercollegiate Athletic Board regarding today's discussions. A.JOHNSON yielded to PSU student Shane Jordan. Mr. Jordan noted that an important component of his college experience is activities outside the classroom, and that Student fees cover expenses for such, to a degree.

HEYING noted there has never been a discussion of how important a part of the university this is. For example, what is the number of students and faculty who attend athletic events or are interested in athletics? PSU Athletics are not covered in the local press, etc. so it is difficult to evaluate local interest. FARR noted that lack-of-press is a good point, and that we should make the effort to get the community involved solving it.

LALL stated we are the largest university in Oregon and we have a mission to be the university of choice. Therefore, we need to recognize that high school students choose a university according to the prestige of its athletic programs. As regards budgetary concerns, Athletic tuitions are at out-of-state rates on the income side of the balance sheet. Also, on the model of the organism, Athletics could be
viewed as our fitness program. We must come to an agreement that Athletics should be fully supported.

D.JOHNSON noted that the Steering Committee has proposed that discussion not result in immediate action or motions, but that they could be considered at a future date through regular Senate procedures.

HILLMAN noted that relative to revenue averages of Big Sky schools, PSU Athletics is not doing as well as it could. We contribute average support, but we have a history of under-average performance.

BURMAN noted that Athletics had $2.1 million prior to the start of year, and at the end of the year there is a deficit of over $1 million. This is of great concern and the intent of both the President and the Athletics Director is to fix it. As a clarification, it should be noted that Athletics give back almost $1 million in tuition, fees, etc. Also, next year’s proposed budget is more realistic and therefore larger. In the past, the administration focused on the new field and renovations, as opposed to operating expenses, therefore we have experienced under-realized income from gates and stipends. The focus has been shifted to generating income. For example, revenue is doubling monthly, since staff reorganizations. The Senate could make an important contribution to this effort with a very active Intercollegiate Athletics Board.

PALMETER noted that criticisms raised so far are only about budget and deficits. Is there no intent to discuss the academic performance of student athletes? HILLMAN noted he trusts the data that is indicated in the handouts regarding grades, graduation rates, etc. HILLMAN reiterated his view that the consistent problem is with deficits and the impact they have had on academic programs each year.

SCHUSTERMANN noted that graduation rates of student athletes are poor, according to this data. Comparing them to the general population is problematic. The Chemistry Department recommends that athletes should not take any classes in their department while competing, as they consistently under-perform, even in the introductory class. The department doesn’t want athletes in their classes, especially male athletes, as they are a routine problem. Athletes are a problem in academics on this campus.

FARR indicated that only 25% of the forms Kim Glanville sent out to faculty were returned, and that faculty do not participate in advising athletes. It is part of the faculty’s role to turn around certain cultural attitudes that athletes bring with them into the university about academics.

D.JOHNSON concluded the discussion, noting that the two outstanding issues around Athletics are budget deficits and students’ academic success.
E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4, 4) l, Budget Committee

SESTAK reported for Advisory Council that the language was approved.

THE MOTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. General Student Affairs Committee Proposal for Missed Class Policy

JACOB presented the draft proposal for the committee, noting that the draft has been discussed with the Intercollegiate Athletic Board and Kim Glanville, academic advisor to Athletics. Additionally, it was distributed to Faculty Senators by e-mail on March 21, 2001, for comment. Responses from Heying, Sherman, and Eder were considered by the committee, and the decision was to make no changes to the proposal.

FARR/MERCER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the Missed Classes Policy.

CRAWSHAW asked for a clarification regarding the policy application to the Final Examination. JACOB indicated it is not intended to apply. WOSLEY-GEORGE asked who is to define "unreasonable burden." JACOB noted it is up to the individual faculty member to decide. BRENNER noted the policy is somewhat incomplete, as it indicates a second "step," contacting the Chair, etc., but it does not indicate what procedure is at the step. JACOB agreed the committee has no answer.

RUETER asked why we need a policy instead of the individual discretion presently exercised by faculty. ALLEN indicated that an established policy serves to, 1) encourage the student to initiate dialogue with the faculty member, and 2) provides a process to determine appropriate accommodation. This proposal is modeled on policy at Arizona State.

HEYING noted, as he stated in his e-mail response, the policy privileges certain students at the expense of others, for example, students might experience day care emergencies, workplace demands, etc. As regards external conflicts, it is important that the student take the responsibility for deciding when and to take the course. Individual faculty members must decide on the resolution.

SHERMAN noted he supported Heying's e-mail, for example, when a student identifies a death in the family, it is up to the faculty member to
make the ruling. The language, "unreasonable burden" is of concern as it suggests a hierarchy of ____________. Of greater concern is that the policy has pedagogical implications. There are many class activities other than tests, etc., which pedagogically can't be made up. If there must be a policy, the pedagogical implications have to be acknowledged in it.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MISSED CLASS POLICY WAS DEFEATED by 29 Against, 15 In favor, and 4 Abstentions.

BRENNER asked what is the outcome of this vote. JACOB indicated the committee could take up the issue again although it would have to wait until next fall.

G. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President's Report

BERNSTINE thanked David Johnson, Stan Hillman and Grant Farr for participating in the Athletics discussion, and noted he hoped it was informative.

BERNSTINE noted there is certain optimism developing as regards the state budget forecast, which comes out on 15 May.

BERNSTINE announced the 2001 recipients of faculty awards. The Branford Price Millar Award, for scholarship, instruction, university service, and public service, goes to Kenneth Dueker. The George C. Hoffman Award, for distinguished contributions to the university in the areas of instruction, service and scholarship done in the spirit of humanism, civility and collegiality, goes to Roy Koch. Applause.

Provost's Report

TETREAULT reviewed activities in Academic Affairs. The Great City-Great University Series continues. The K-12 Roundtable and Forum took place in the last month. They illustrated the thousands of students who are impacted by PSU faculty and students, and indicated faculty agreement that Pre-K through 12 education is part of faculty responsibility across the disciplines. The next pair of activities is around the Creative Industries, with a roundtable scheduled for 1 June and a forum scheduled for the fall. There was a follow-up activity regarding the earlier topic of our 3-university collaboration in April. A proposal is underway to support planning efforts. PSU Opera performances are in progress. There was a recent activity in the "faculty vitality" project, including a campus visit from Al Guskin. Promotion and tenure decisions will be distributed on 15 May, with the President's decisions to be distributed the first week of June. On May 10 there

Minutes, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 7, 2001
will be a activities and an awards ceremony as part of the Kellogg project for civic engagement.

H. QUESTION PERIOD

None

I. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of April 6-7, 2001

BURNS, reporting for Wollner, noted the report was included in the mailing. There were no questions.

2. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

KETCHESON presented the report for the committee, noting their hope is to be able to announce the awards at the June senate meeting. The committee’s new responsibility this year, awarding travel funds, has required developing procedures as well as making the awards themselves. The committee strongly urges that more funds be appropriated in the area of travel funds.

BRENNAN stated the committee should redefine the top award amount so faculty have a more realistic notion of amounts they might receive, and the committee should move the process forward so faculty can plan. KETCHESON noted both points are well taken, and both items have already been addressed. The latter problem was partially as a result of the delayed contract settlement last year.

HEYING asked what was the match of funds that resulted. KETCHESON noted the match was a minimum of 20%.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

FRANK presented the report for the committee, and took questions.

HEYING asked for a clarification regarding the mission statement. FRANK noted the committee has contributed to several drafts and the activity is still in progress. HEYING asked if it is the committee’s role to explore with the Athletic Department alternative visions for Athletics at PSU. FRANK stated yes. HEYING requested the committee explore this more seriously, as we are a commuter campus and student interest would
indicate we might go to an alternative model, for example, the intramural vs. the professional sports model we are currently engaged in developing.

A.JOHNSON made the suggestion that more frequent committee reports would be desirable. FRANK indicated that next year, particularly, quarterly reports would be appropriate as we are engaged in our NCAA review.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

REULER presented the report for the committee, and took questions.

To facilitate the Teacher Education Committee recommendations for changes in their constitutional committee description, the Presiding Officer displayed an overhead (attached) an amendment proposal prepared by the Secretary to the Faculty. The Presiding Officer then requested ten Senators submit names for endorsement and the following Senators complied: Sandra Rosengrant, Steve Brenner, Diane Yatchmenoff, Carolyn Carr, Walt Ellis, Barbara Sestak, Margaret Neal, Larry Crawshaw, Ansel Johnson, TH.

CUMMINGS/ELLIS MOVED the Senate approve the proposed Constitutional Amendment, Art. IV, 4. 4), h. Teacher Education Committee.

REUTER called for a quorum.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The quorum was lost. The meeting was ended at 4:48 p.m.
> Academic Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-3.99</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-2.99</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Honor Roll
Fall 2000 – 128 with a 3.0 or above
Winter 2001 – 120 with a 3.0 or above

> Student-Athlete Profile

> PSU students of color:

- **Student-Athletes of color** 28%
  Of 295 student-athletes, 84 are from ethnic origin *
- **PSU Students of color** 18%
  Of 12598 students, 2293 are from ethnic origin**

*Incl. Black, Am In/AN, Asian/PL Hispanic, Other  
**1999 Data – NCAA Eligibility List  
1999 Data - www.orip.pdx.edu

> Like general PSU population,  
student-athletes also work, support families and graduate in four years.

> More than meets the eye...

> PSU student-athletes are required to:  
  • Maintain a minimum 2.0 GPA  
  • Be registered for a minimum of 12 hours at all times  
  • Maintain satisfactory progress towards a degree with periodic checks  
  • Practice 20 hours/week (in season), 8 hours/week out of season.  
  • Participate in Community Outreach activities  
  • Attend enhancement seminars throughout the year
Community Outreach

Student-Athletes, Coaches & Staff have volunteered thousands of hours over the past three years.

In addition to teamwork on the field, PSU student-athletes team up with the community off the field including: Food bank, Aids House, Officiating, Habitat for Humanity, Children's Hospital Volunteer, Camps, "Just Say NO" campaigning, Race for the Roses, and Mighty Viks.

PSU student-athletes are involved on the campus including: Student Ambassadors, Summer Orientation Leaders, Greek Organizations, Campus Escort Service, Student Government, and Fellowship of Christian Athletes, to name a few.

Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athletes*</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCAA Official 2000 Graduation-Rates Report

*Only counts student-athletes on Aid

National Media Coverage

ESPN, Sports Illustrated, Fox Sports, USA
Today all covered PSU Athletics in 2000.

Academic Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Fine &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Urban &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Majors</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(due to NCAA Rules student-athletes cannot declare their major until their Junior Year)
Public Relations and Development
• Athletics is one of the ways universities are known to the public. This is especially important for younger students who may be considering entering PSU as Freshmen.
• ESPN, Fox Sports, USA Today have covered Portland State University athletics in 2000.
• Athletics provides a vehicle for university development that benefits the entire university. Athletics has assisted the University Development Office in raising over $16,241,374
• Athletics donors are active on the University Campaign Cabinet and the Foundation Board.

Community Service
• In the past three years student-athletes, coaches, and staff have volunteered thousands of hours in their communities, impacting the lives of local youth and their neighbors through nearly 100 different organizations or events.
• Student-athletes are active in campus organizations and participate as Student Ambassadors, in student government, and escort services.

Academics
• Student-Athletes enter PSU with higher GPA’s than students in general.
• Student-Athletes graduate at a higher rate than PSU students in general.
• African American and Hispanic student-athletes on student aid, enter PSU with higher SAT scores than their counterparts in the general student body.
• In the last three years the core GPA for football athletes has been above 2.9, and for all athletes the core GPA has been at or above 3.0. Both of these are better than students at large.
• PSU’s academic standards for athletes are higher than the other Big Sky schools and higher than the NCAA.

Budget Issues and Recent Changes
• The Athletic Department has grown from just over 3 million in 1992-1993 to over 6 million this year and the University’s contribution to athletics has increased from $367,500 in 1992-1993 to over 2 million this year. In addition, athletics has often incurred a deficit that the university has had to cover. This year the projected deficit may be over 1 million.
• Portland State University hired a new Athletics Director in September of this academic year. He has implemented the following changes to increase accountability and sound budget management:
  • Replaced at least four head coaches and two administrators
  • Restructured the Athletic Department to focus on resources in marketing and development.
  • Created a budget process that includes coaches and administrators, so that they have budget input and budget accountability.
  • Reorganized development operations and the Viking Athletic Fund (Viking Athletic Funds are up over the last few months).

Faculty Responsibilities
• The Intercollegiate Athletics Board represents faculty interests and should play an active role in overseeing and monitoring athletics.
• The Athletics Department, including the Athletics Director, coaches, and athletes must be better integrated into the life of the university. This is beginning to happen.
• The faculty, both individually and through the faculty senate and other bodies, should take a more active interest in athletics. Talk to the student-athletes in your classes. Get to know the coaches, invite them to faculty meetings, go watch practices, and attend games.
How would one characterize the type of interaction of any unit to PSU as a whole?

1. **Mutual** – Interaction favorable to both the unit and the growth of PSU

2. **Commensal** – Interaction favorable to the unit, but neutral to PSU

3. **Parasitic** – Interaction favorable to the unit, but inhibits the growth of PSU

Does Athletics contribute to our responsibilities as a University?

1. Scholarships contribute to access for a diverse group of student athletes that probably would not attend PSU.

2. There is interaction with regional high school coaches and students.

3. Athletic events are part of the fabric of a segment of the regional populace including alumni.
What are PSU's responsibilities to the citizenry?

1. Provide access to quality university educational experiences for students.
2. Provide a variety of scholarly expertise to the community.
3. Enrich the experiences of the region with cultural and performance events.

How are those responsibilities supported?

1. State General Funds via the RAM Model
2. Student Tuition and Fee Dollars
3. External Support – Grants, Sponsors and Alumni Giving
What are the fiscal issues that the Administration and Faculty Senate need to deal with relative to Athletics?

1. Chronic deficits reflect mismanagement of resources and poor administrative oversight. Deficits also lead to morale difficulties because the resources detract from the delivery of quality educational experiences to the students. How will further deficit spending by the Athletic Department be prevented?

2. Given the inaccuracy of the projection to the faculty that the move to Division 1 athletics was not going to entail investment of institutional resources, what is an appropriate growth rate for institutional investment in Athletics?
Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Non-contractual Grievance Procedures


Committee's charge. The committee was charged with the task of reviewing the non-contractual grievance procedures to determine if they provide a prompt and efficient method for handling work place disputes and further to make recommendations for change where deficiencies in dispute resolution procedures are noted.

Committee's investigation. To carry out its charge the committee took the following action:

1. Interviewed members of the PSU community thought to have knowledge relevant to the committee, including current and past AAUP-VPs for grievances, past chairs of grievance committees, Office of Affirmative Action, Ombud’s Office, Rod Diman, Sarah Andrews-Collier and several Deans.
2. Reviewed the literature on university conflict resolution programs
3. Reviewed the literature on the causes of faculty stress and the causes and effects of faculty satisfaction and dissatisfaction

Discussion

The Problem. At PSU, work place disputes comprise a broad array of issues and include relational conflicts and interpretations and applications of procedural rules. Only a small number of those disputes are grieved through the available formal processes. While there are established Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) processes in place for handling disputes such as discrimination and harassment, there are many other conflicts where ADR procedures are more appropriate.

Options for the Presentation of a Grievance. A faculty member with a grievance has two options under rules now in place. The first is under the appropriate union contract and may be used when the issue being grieved is a matter covered by the contract, hence it is referred to as a “contractual” grievance. Examples of contractual grievances are issues involving the denial of promotion or tenure, the non-renewal of a teaching contract or a matter of pay or workload. The second, non-contractual, option is pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-042-0005, et. seq.) that covers any complaint of “unfair and inequitable” treatment by the university.

Contractual Grievances. The contractual grievance procedures are found in the two collective bargaining agreements and each provides for a formal process. See Article 20 of the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement and Article 10 of the AFT agreement. The committee was not charged with the review of those procedures.
Non-contractual Grievances. Non-contractual grievances cover any complaint of "unfair or inequitable" treatment and may include any matter whether covered by a bargaining agreement or not.

Non-contractual Procedure. The non-contractual grievance procedure begins with a timely presentation of an oral grievance to the faculty member's department chair. Normally, the grievance must be presented within 30 days of the action that gave rise to it. The rules direct the department chair to arrange a meeting with those persons involved. It further directs that all make a sincere and significant attempt to resolve the grievance. The rules contemplate that most grievances will be resolved at this level. However, if the grievance is not resolved, it is presented, in writing, to the grievant's Dean for review. When the Dean receives the grievance, a formal file is opened and a meeting is scheduled. If the Dean is unable to resolve the grievance the grievant next requests a peer hearing with the chairperson of the University Faculty Grievance Panel. The chairperson is to convene a panel of peers that is to conduct a hearing and issue an advisory report to the Provost. Under the current rules, there is little guidance given to the peer committee to aid it in the conduct of the hearing. The Provost is to review the hearing committee's report and make her/his decision solely on the basis of the panel's report and the evidence presented at the peer hearing. The Provost's decision may then be appealed to the President. Under rules currently in place, but in the process of being changed, appeal of the President's decision may be taken to the Oregon University System board. Each step of the process is subject to formal rules of timeliness with deadlines set forth in a specified number of days. The entire process is to be completed within 180 days. Throughout the process both sides are entitled to representation by attorneys. The rules may be found in the Oregon Administrative Rules, 577-042-0005, et. seq.

Problems with the Non-contractual Procedure. The original intent of the non-contractual procedure was to provide faculty with a process for "...solving problems in a collegial manner with members of the University community confronting each other directly as peers seeking to resolve conflicts in a way that embodies mutual respect and fairness." Notwithstanding that statement, faculty with recent experience on peer panels indicate the process has become formal and legalistic with both sides often being represented by attorneys and with hearings conducted under strict rules of evidence. The committee was told the process is costly, legalistic, adversarial, and causes the positions of the parties to become entrenched, making compromise difficult. The committee believes the process, as currently configured, is useful only when significant issues of rights, principles or interests are involved, or where litigation is contemplated. It does not appear that the process is appropriate to resolve day-to-day relational conflicts or problems that do not rise to crisis proportions.

One explanation for the trend toward the legalistic is that courts now generally require a faculty member seeking to adjudicate a claim against the University to first "exhaust his or her administrative remedies." The effect of this rule is to make the contractual and non-contractual procedures part of a protracted litigation process.
Committee Finding. For most disputes a court challenge is a last resort to be used only when all other possibilities for redress are exhausted. However, at PSU, alternatives to the formal rules are available in only a few cases and are not widely practiced or well known. Consequently, most workplace disputes are not adequately addressed under the current rules and, therefore, do not meet the needs of most faculty. It is our belief that many grievance issues would be better subjected to an Alternative Dispute Resolution process that favors informal mediation.

When a grievance process does not provide a speedy or mutually satisfactory resolution, faculty morale suffers. One of the most alarming findings in the national literature is that up to one-third of mid-career faculty are disillusioned or disaffected and exhibit problematic behavior of one kind or another. Examples of behavior of disaffected faculty are:

1. Socially isolated or withdrawn from colleagues.
2. Sometimes unfriendly, uncooperative or oppositional in department meetings and functions or in dealings with colleagues.
3. Inactive in research and scholarly activity.
4. Frequent sources of student complaints.
5. Unwilling to share committee work or student advising.
6. Suspicious, obsessive, even paranoid.

The rate of disillusionment of junior faculty was lower but still surprisingly high. Interviewees indicate PSU is not immune from these problems.

The same literature indicates the causes of disaffection and mid-career problems often arise from unexpected personal conflicts with colleagues, students or supervisors or from decisions made by others perceived as being threatening to the faculty member’s career. These appear to be the types of problems and issues that are not being addressed under the current adversarial grievance procedures. The committee believes they are best addressed under procedures favoring mediation.

Committee’s Recommendations

The current non-contractual grievance process often does not resolve disputes in a manner that is speedy, local and limited. Because it is not speedy, problems fester and workplace morale suffers for the delay. Because disputes are not resolved at the lowest level, parties who know little about a specific workplace are called on to make decisions. When grievances move to peer hearing, many faculty who serve are unsure how to exercise their responsibilities. We should aim for dispute resolution processes that are swift, close to the work unit where the individual faculty member works, and respectful of all parties involved. The process should involve parties who are knowledgeable of dispute resolution and the grievance process.

1. The committee recommends that the University expand the options available to grievants to include other less formal tools for conflict management. Such other tools...
should include mediation, listening, coaching, mentoring, informal problem solving, and direct negotiation between affected parties. The new tools should be designed to be voluntary, collaborative, confidential, fair, impartial, equitable, and safeguard a grievant's right to seek resolution without fear of retaliation. The new ADR procedures should have the following characteristics:

- Provide options for all types of problems and all people, including employees, supervisors, faculty and staff.
- Create a conflict competent culture that welcomes dissent and resolves conflict at the lowest level through direct negotiation.
- Provide multiple access points. Employees can readily identify and access a knowledgeable person whom they trust, for advice about the conflict management system.
- Provide multiple options—both rights-based and interest-based—for addressing conflict.
- Provide structures that coordinate and support the multiple access points and multiple options and that integrate effective conflict management into the organization’s daily operations.

The committee expects that such an alternative dispute procedure would be less expensive, lead to rapid settlement, instill a sense of personal empowerment, and preserve the relationships that are critical to the effective workings of the University.

2. The new alternative dispute resolution system should utilize resources now in the University system such as the Office of Affirmative Action and the Campus Ombuds Office. Consideration should be given to the use of models available in SAFE SPACES and the sexual harassment network. Further, the University should create new resources to train mentors, mediators, department chairs, and others involved in both the non-contractual and alternative dispute resolution options.

3. The new alternative dispute option should allow for access from various places in the University community such as from departments, Deans, Office of Affirmative Action, Campus Ombud's Office, or other appropriate places.

4. The alternative dispute resolution option should be coordinated with the more formal non-contractual grievance procedure to comprise a comprehensive and integrated conflict management system. Such integration should provide for a mechanism to declare a “time-out” from the deadlines imposed by the non-contractual procedure to facilitate a faculty member’s use of an alternate option. Notwithstanding these recommendations, nothing currently recommended should be construed to eliminate, weaken, or otherwise undermine the current formal rules, including the rights to be free from retaliation and to due process.

5. The committee recommends the rules be changed to allow the parties to a grievance to jointly elect to forego a peer hearing.

Submitted by William Kenny
Article IV., 4., 4), h) Teacher Education Committee. This Committee shall operate on the general premise that teacher education is an all-University activity and responsibility. Specifically, teacher education programs are the responsibility of the Graduate School of Education. Final accountability for teacher education programs is accorded, therefore, to the Faculty of the School of Education.

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

Membership. The Committee shall consist of fourteen members of the University Faculty, representative of each of the following departments or programs educating teacher candidates: Business Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education and Counselor Education, Educational Policy, Foundations and Administrative Studies, Health and Physical Education Community Health, Art, Speech and Hearing Sciences, English, Foreign Languages, the combined social science departments (Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology), the combined science departments (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics), Mathematics, Theater Arts, and Music, and two students recommended by the Student Senate. The Dean and Assistant Dean of the Graduate School of Education and the Education Librarian shall be ex-officio non-voting members, with the Assistant Dean serving as committee secretary. One of the fourteen faculty members shall serve as chairperson. Each department of the University which educates teacher candidates is encouraged to create its own teacher education committee to work with the University Teacher Education Committee and with the Graduate School of Education.

Rationale: See memorandum from Teacher Education Committee to Secretary to the Faculty attached to Teacher Education Committee. Annual Report, May 7, 2001 Faculty Senate Meeting
May 14, 2001

MEMORANDUM

To: Faculty Senate
From: Bob Eder, Chair, Graduate Council
RE: I. Recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:
   A. Psychology new course proposals (CLAS)
   B. Departments of Biology and ESR - Change in Department Prefix (CLAS)
   C. Cross-listing CE (CECS) and EC courses in ESR (CLAS)
   D. Department of Mathematics new course proposals (CLAS)
   E. Department of Speech Communication (CLAS)
   F. School of Business Administration proposals (SBA)
   G. Proposal for Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences (CLAS)

II. Informational item for Faculty Senate:
   "Determining Areas of Distinction in Graduate and Professional Programs"

A. Psychology new course proposals (CLAS)

Psy 444 / 544 Job Analysis (4)

Methods (e.g., interviews, surveys) used to collect information about jobs for use in human resource functions such as personnel recruitment and selection, training, performance appraisal, and compensation. Such information is also used to develop job descriptions and specifications. Course contains a community-based learning component. Students participate in a full job analysis including data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Prerequisite: Stat 243 and 244; Psy 321 and 360; or comparable Business Administration courses.

(To be added to Course Schedule and PSU Bulletin information)
Field Work Notation: In addition to class meetings, the course includes the completion of a minimum 40 hour field project that typically extends one week beyond the last scheduled class meeting.

Psy 546 / 646 Personnel Selection (4)

Technical and theoretical issues involved in selecting the appropriate worker to fit a job. Includes current research and theory in test development, test validation, selection methods, and criterion development. Heavy emphasis on psychological measurement (e.g., reliability and validity) and the legal issues involved in hiring and promoting employees. Prerequisite: Admission to the Psychology graduate program.

B. Departments of Biology and ESR - Change in Department Prefix (CLAS)

The following course prefix changes reflect a change in a faculty member’s department affiliation from Biology to Environmental Sciences and Resources:

Bi 445 / 545 Algal Physiology (4) to
ESR 473 / 573 Phytoplankton Physiological Ecology (4)
(update of title and course description) Prerequisites: Bi 251; ESR 321 or Bi 357)
Bi 475 / 575 to  
ESR 475 / 575 Limnology and Aquatic Ecology (4)

Bi 477 / 577 to  
ESR 477 / 577 Limnology Laboratory (2)  
Prerequisites: ESR 475 / 575

Bi 478 / 578 to  
ESR 478 / 578 Vascular Aquatic Plant (4)

C. Cross-listing CE (CECS) and EC courses in ESR (CLAS)

The following courses are cross-listed to reflect departmental affiliation of instructor:

CE 566 / 666 Environmental Data Analysis (4)  
Cross-listed as ESR 566 (Note: ESR does not have 600 level classes at this time)

EC 433 / 533 Natural Resource Economics (4)  
Cross-listed as ESR 433 / 533

EC 434 / 534 Business Environmental Management Economics (4)  
Cross-listed as ESR 434 / 534

EC 443 / 543 Global Environmental Economics (4)  
Cross-listed as ESR 443 / 543

D. Department of Mathematics new course proposals (CLAS)

The three, 3-credit course sequence in Topology I, II, and III is dropped and split into two three, 3-credit course sequences with algebraic and geometric foci, respectively, due to expanding knowledge in this field.

Drop: Mth 631. 632. 633 Topology I, II, III (3, 3, 3)

New Course Proposals:

Mth 634, 635, 636 Algebraic Topology I, II, III (3, 3, 3)  
Topics from: singular and simplicial homology and cohomology theories, fundamental group and covering spaces, CW complexes and elements of homotopy theory, algebraic theory of manifolds, introduction to differential topology and vector bundles, applications. Courses must be taken in sequence. Prerequisite: Mth 435 and Mth 444

Mth 637, 638, 639 Geometric Topology I, II, III (3, 3, 3)  
Topics from: geometric and piecewise linear topology, knots and 3-manifolds and gauge theories, geometric structures and geometrization of manifolds, applications to differential topology, vector bundles and to mathematical physics. Prerequisite: Mth 436.
Stat 470 / 570 Statistical Consulting (1)
Introduction to techniques and methods of statistical consulting. Faculty supervised consulting sessions with clients on appropriate projects brought to the Statistics Consulting Laboratory. Data and/or statistical problems, from within and outside the University, are provided by clients and interdisciplinary guest lecturers. Introduction to and proficiency with various statistical computing packages as data analytic tools. A community-based learning courses.

E. Department of Speech Communication new course proposals (CLAS)

SP 430 / 530 Advanced Communication Skills for Professionals (4)
Advanced work in the theory and practice of effective speaking and listening, employee and client relations, and competency assessment. Addresses characteristics that differentiate effective from ineffective communication. Develop and implement a model for communication skill building through behavior modification.

SP 432 / 532 Gender and Race in the Media (4)
This course will examine primarily the representations of gender and race, including age, class and sexual orientation in various media (mainstream and alternative), and will examine approaches which may be used to interpret these representations. In addition, we will also consider the potential impact that media institutions have on people's lives, political decisions and social relations. The overall aim will be for students to understand how their own cultural identities affect their media consumption and social positioning. This course is the same as WS 432; may only be taken once for credit.

SP 457 / 557 The Language of Violence (4)
Examination of violent language as a reflection of culture. Students will identify violent attitudes, themes, contradictions, metaphors, etc. implicit and explicit in our language. Verbal abuse and verbal aggression, violent words and metaphors in everyday speech, and the use of descriptive language to evaluative language when classifying acts of violence will provide insight into the notion of a "public violent mind." Students will also examine messages in violent entertainment, news reports, Internet and other media. This course is the same as WS 457; may only be taken once for credit.

SpHr 568 Medical Audiology III (2)
Continues examination of medical aspects of audiology from SpHr 577(4) and 578 (2). Specific topics to be addressed include central auditory processing and tinnitus. Evaluation and management of both pathological conditions will be included. Prerequisite: SpHr 578

Note: This creates a three course sequence in Medical Audiology; out-of-sequence course numbering is due to restricted availability of unused course numbers.

F. School of Business Administration proposals (SBA)

New Course Proposals

MKTG 435 / 535 Consumer Package Goods Marketing (4)
This course examines marketing distribution systems used by food and consumer package goods (CPG) companies. An emphasis is on describing CPG industry value chains and how business environmental factors impact the creation, delivery and capture of customer value by different industry participants. The course examines the marketing relationships between manufacturers, wholesalers, brokers, retailers and consumers. Topics include ECR, category
management, Efficient Replenishment, retail trends in buyer behavior, e-commerce, new product introductions, Efficient promotion, trade relations, industry alliances, competitive trends, channel roles & conflicts and globalization. Prerequisite: BA 311 or BA 339.

ISQA 440 / 540 CPG Purchasing & Supply Chain Management (4)
The food industry is one of the most dependent of all industries on supply & logistics. The industry is undergoing rapid transition. Consolidation and technology are dramatically changing the competitive environment and industry practices. Topics include supplier selection, purchasing, transportation, inventory, Efficient Replenishment, supplier partnerships, e-commerce issues, and food industry supply chain management. Prerequisite: BA 311 or BA 339

MKTG 436 / 536 Global Business Issues (3)
Globalization is having an increasing impact on the nature of competition. Managers need to better understand the impact of globalization on the firm and on what managerial skills are needed to be effective in an increasingly international environment. This class is designed to bring renowned business and government leaders into the classroom to discuss their experiences in international business. In each class students relate theory from course materials to the experiences of these leaders and discuss implications for practicing managers.

MKTG 461 / 561 E-Marketing (4)
Examines important marketing issues in a business world that is being transformed by widespread adoption of the internet and related technologies. Topics include customer relationship management, effects of internet on product-related issues (such as branding and new product development), pricing, distribution, and promotion, security and privacy concerns. Prerequisite: BA 311 or equivalent.

Course Change Proposals

MKTG 552T eServices Marketing (4) [current title: Relationship and Service Marketing (3)]
This course focuses on understanding the distinction between service versus product marketing with an emphasis on assessing, designing and managing on-line service offerings. eService relationships will be examined within a customer loyalty framework that considers customer value, switching costs and on-line relational bonds as key drivers of loyalty. Prerequisite: MKKTG 544

[Change in title, expansion of course description, and conversion from 3 to 4 credits]

Note: "T" at end of course number indicates the course is required for MBA in the Management of Innovation and Technology (MIT) option.

MIM 516 Contemporary Pacific Rim and World Affairs (conversion from 3 to 4 credit hours)
[expanded readings and assignments, particularly related to China, Japan and Korea during this post-cold war period]

MIM 564 Global Human Resource Management (conversion from 3 to 4 credit hours)
[expanded readings and assignments, particularly related to motivating and leading employees in a multi-cultural context]
G. Proposal for Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences (CLAS)

(Please see the attached 3-page proposal summary)

II. Informational item for Faculty Senate:
"Determining Areas of Distinction in Graduate and Professional Programs"

Please see the attached one page document which is an essential companion piece to the recently approved PSU mission statement for graduate and professional programs. The document has evolved through multiple drafts with input from a variety of different constituencies over the past four months. These suggested characteristics or criteria are offered to assist the University in the strategic development and advancement of graduate and professional programs of distinction.
Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences – Proposal Summary

Overview. We propose to initiate a new disciplinary Ph.D. program in the Mathematical Sciences structured to provide the candidate with a greater breadth of preparation than traditionally found in existing programs. The new program differs significantly from traditional models of Ph.D. education in Mathematical Sciences and is designed specifically to provide the candidates with the skills needed to thrive in the changing environment currently characterizing industry, government, and higher education. In the sciences, engineering, and particularly in the mathematical sciences, the need for people who are well grounded in their field, yet conversant with several sub-fields is growing dramatically. The new program addresses these issues by dedicating approximately 25% of the credit hour requirements to professional development, cross-disciplinary experiences, and allied area coursework. A comprehensive examination administered by allied area faculty is also required. The program aims to develop students who have versatility, who are conversant in other fields, and who can communicate effectively with people in other professional cultures.

These qualities are essential to those seeking non-academic careers, a population which historically has been poorly served by traditional Ph.D. education in the Mathematical Sciences. Moreover, the current academic market clearly shows that for students whose career goals include the professorate the possession of these qualities is a requirement for successful participation in the academy of the 21st century. The program is meant to be flexible and learner driven. It provides the students a structured environment, professional guidance, and advising support. The students will experience other research cultures in a variety of ways. The proposed program will require an increased level of student responsibility and faculty involvement, and at an earlier phase than in traditional programs. These are core features of the proposed program and are meant to ensure that students do not complete the program in the manner of a traditional Ph.D.

Need. There is a nationally recognized need for basic reform in doctoral education. However, the various stakeholders use somewhat different language, even when talking about the same issues. Business and industrial leaders, for example, express the concern that freshly minted Ph.D.s cannot connect what they have been studying to the larger concepts or the larger operational issues with which a business or an industry deals. In local public forums business executives have clearly expressed that they aren’t interested in a watered down Ph.D. and have indicated that the core feature of the degree should continue to be technical competence and the independent investigation of a research topic. They want, however, Ph.D.’s who can work in teams, communicate their ideas, and think beyond narrow disciplines. Teaching institutions echo the same theme. But even research intensive universities are likewise saying that the ability to make innovative discoveries is crucial to the kinds of research questions being asked in the complex, 21st Century world, and that ability demands a multi-disciplinary approach. These themes resound with even greater urgency in the Mathematical Sciences. There is a continued increased demand from our stakeholders in industry, government and academia for highly skilled mathematicians. These themes echo throughout the discussions on Ph.D. reform of the PEW Roundtable and at various panel discussions within the discipline at such venues as the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley. The proposed program will have as a main focus the preparation of mathematicians who can interact well with other professionals.

Course of Study. The department of Mathematical Sciences currently offers over 70 graduate courses. Furthermore, at least 50 graduate courses in several allied areas have been identified with the assistance of allied area faculty. In addition to core course work in mathematics and at least one allied area, students complete a doctoral seminar/Internship component whose learning objectives include doing mathematics in the context of another discipline, interpreting mathematical issues inherent in the allied area, and communicating back mathematical findings.
Course Requirements:

A. Students whose highest degree in mathematics or related fields is a bachelor's degree; A minimum of 99 credit hours beyond a bachelor's degree distributed as follows:

Approved graduate level courses 63 credits
Out of these:
  a) Mathematics and Statistics courses of which at least 10 courses are at the 600 level 30 cr minimum
  b) Allied area (4 course minimum at the 500 and 600 level) 15 cr minimum
Doctoral seminar/Internship (Math 607) 9 credits
Dissertation (Math 603) 27 credits

B. Students entering with a master's degree in mathematics or related fields
A minimum of 72 credit hours beyond a master's degree distributed as follows:

Approved graduate level courses. 36 credits
Out of these:
  a) Mathematics and Statistics courses at the 600 level 18 cr minimum
  b) Allied area (4 course minimum at the 500 and 600 level) 15 cr minimum
Doctoral seminar/Internship (Math 607) 9 credits
Dissertation (Math 603) 27 credits

Faculty resources: The following faculty will be involved in the proposed program. They are listed together with their area of expertise.

AHUJA, Jagdish  Mathematical Statistics, Distribution Theory
BALOGH, Charles  Applied Mathematics, Learning Theory & Cybernetics
BEYL, Rudolf  Algebra, Homological & Cohomological Group Theory, Topology
BLEILER, Steve  Topology, Knot Theory, Differential Geometry, Group Theory, Combinatorics
CAUGHMAN, John  Algebra, Combinatorics, Coding Theory
CRAIN, Bradford  Probability, Statistics, Line Transect Sampling
ELZANOWSKI, Marek  Rational Mechanics, Differential Geometry, Hyperbolic Waves, Materials
ENNEKING, Eugene  Probability, Statistics, Combinatorics
ENNEKING, Marjorie  Mathematics Education, Secondary Teacher Training, Algebra
ERDMAN, John  Functional Analysis, Operator Theory
FOUNTAIN, Robert  Mathematical & Applied Statistics (Estimation Theory, Sampling Theory, Multivariate Analysis)
KIM, Jong Sung  Survival Analysis, Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models, Variance Estimation
LAFFERRIERE, Gerardo  Control Theory, Analysis, Robotics, Hybrid Systems
LATIOLAIS, Paul  Topology, Algebra
O'HALLORAN, Joyce  Algebra, Control Theory
PALMITER, Jeanette  Mathematics Education, Computer Algebra Systems
PRESTON, Serge  Differential Geometry, Hamiltonian Mechanics
SHAUGHNESSY, Mike  Mathematics Education, Geometry, Probability & Statistics
TABLEMAN, Mara  Probability & Statistics (Robustness, Rank Based Procedures, Survival Analysis, Biostatistics)
TAM, Kwok-Wai  Functional Analysis, Function Spaces
The following are potential allied area advisors/committee members in other departments who have agreed to participate in the new program. As the program develops we expect to enlarge and expand the list of allied area faculty.

BROWN, Cynthia
CASPERSON, Lee
DAWSON, Scott
EGERTON, Raymond
HALL, John
JIAO, Jun
KOCH, Roy
LAPIDUS, Jodi
LENDARIS, George
LEUNG, Peter
LI, Fu
MOCAS, Sarah
RECKTENWALD, Gerald
SEMURA, Jack

Computer Science
Physics and Electrical Engineering
School of Business
Physics
Economics
Physics
Civil Engineering and Environmental Sciences
OHSU
Electrical Engineering and Systems Science
Physics
Electrical Engineering
Computer Science
Mechanical Engineering
Physics

Resources Needed: The available courses are adequate to support the program. A budget request has been made for additional graduate support (approximately $50,000 per year for personnel support and graduate assistantships). A modest request is included for additional library materials. Funds are also requested to foster the necessary contacts leading to internships for the students who need them.

Outcomes: Students who complete this course of study will be qualified to perform original research in mathematics and to serve as members in interdisciplinary research teams. They may be employed in industrial and government research laboratories and they will have the credentials to teach in universities.

Graduate Council Recommendation. The Graduate Council at its May 9, 2001 meeting, voted 9-1 (with one abstention) to recommend Faculty Senate approval of the proposal for a Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences with the following comments:

1. The Council appreciates the modifications, enhancements and clarifications made by the Mathematics department to strengthen their proposal based on Council review and comment, and urges continuing efforts to bolster proposal rationale and elaborate on the unique features of this innovative Ph.D. program as it moves forward in the review process.

2. There are concerns among some Systems Science faculty that the proposed Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences duplicates the intended interdisciplinary purpose of the current Systems Science / Math Ph.D. and projects a commitment by the Mathematics faculty to engage in cross-disciplinary scholarship in dissertation research that has not been exhibited to date. The Council believes that the proposed Ph.D. in Mathematical Sciences is an excellent fit with the vision and values of an urban research university, reflects evolving trends in graduate mathematics education, and strengthens the University's doctoral offerings.
Determining Areas of Distinction in Graduate and Professional Programs

All graduate and professional programs at Portland State University are expected to be of high quality, efficiently managed, and achieving their stated program goals. Consistent with the recently approved mission statement in selected areas graduate and professional programs should strive to be nationally and internationally recognized. The following are offered as suggested characteristics or criteria that should be employed when determining areas of distinction in graduate and professional programs. These criteria are clustered around strategic perspectives of "quality", "fit / synergy", and "feasibility".

There is no a priori rank order to these criteria, nor would each criterion receive the same weight of importance when applied to a particular graduate or professional program. These criteria are intended to be equally applicable for graduate and professional program decisions that result in bold new investments or incremental investments of institutional resources, and for disinvestment decisions in existing programs that are no longer viewed as areas of distinction. The Graduate Council in consultation with the Provost offers this list of decision-making criteria as a first step in building a consensus within the University community for the strategic development of graduate and professional programs of distinction.

Quality: The ability of a program to achieve prominence.

Reputation Building. Is likely to produce a graduate or professional program of high caliber, garnering national or international reputation within its field. Typically, this directly reflects the ongoing collective scholarly accomplishments of the faculty directly involved in the program and the subsequent demand for and success of the program's graduates.

Creates Visibility for PSU as a Leader in Graduate Education. Is likely to create high visibility and recognition for the University as a leader in graduate education. Typically, this would be accomplished either by (1) launching new professional and graduate programs that are non-traditional, cross-disciplinary, or part of an emerging development in graduate education, or by (2) delivering traditional or mainstream professional or graduate programs that are widely regarded as leading programs.

Fit / Synergy: The ability of a program to address an important need within the University's graduate offerings.

Advances PSU Mission. Advances the University's unique urban mission, including the potential problem-solving application of the new knowledge created by the program, and the opportunity for the program to foster new and strengthen existing community partnerships.

Creates Program Synergy. Complements and / or enhances existing core disciplines and programs, creating synergy across programs, faculty interests and / or facilities.

Addresses Deficiencies. Addresses a deficiency in graduate offerings that is inconsistent with PSU's urban mission, as suggested by the "benchmarking" of current graduate offerings against comparator institutions.

Feasibility: The University's capability to launch and sustain a program of distinction in this area.

Financial Viability. Potential for external funding and/or financial self-sufficiency; takes into consideration the initial and continuing investment requirements to maintain a program of distinction.

Leverages Resources. Builds on and reinforces existing expertise, facilities, and faculty interests, particularly where a marginal increase in institutional resources would likely produce the necessary critical mass to generate higher proportional financial and programmatic returns.

Is Market Responsive. Possesses a coherent curriculum and delivery structure that responds to a specified market demand for graduate education and that meets or exceeds existing national standards. This is particularly important for professional programs of distinction.

---

1 Approved by Graduate Council 04/25/01 and endorsed by Provost Tetreault after consultation with the Council of Academic Deans.

2 Mission Statement. Graduate and professional programs at Portland State University will respond to evolving social, ecological and technological challenges and enhance the intellectual, civic, commercial and aesthetic context of urban life. In selected areas graduate and professional programs will be nationally and internationally recognized. In these fields, Portland State University will be considered a leader in graduate education. Approved by Graduate Council 11/16/00.
Members:
Scott Burns
David Johnson, Winter & Spring
Roy Koch
Robert Liebman, Fall Term (Sabbatical Winter & Spring)
Robert Mercer
Barbara Sestak, Chair
Craig Wollner

General functions:
• Serve as an advisory body to the President on matters of policy
• Serve the president as a committee on ad hoc University-wide committees
• Appoint membership on hearing committees and panels as required by the OUS and the faculty Conduct Code
• Review proposed amendments to the Constitution of The Portland State University Faculty for proper form and numbering
• Give advice to the President on the meaning and interpretation of the Constitution
• Conduct studies and make recommendations on matters of faculty welfare to be presented to the President and/or Senate

Meetings:
The Advisory Council met at least every other week throughout the year. Based on President Bernstine's schedule we were able to meet with him at least once a month except for Spring Term when we met with him twice. As a confidential body, we were able to have very frank discussions on a variety of topics raised both by the President and members of the Advisory Council. We also met with Provost Tetreault, Vice Provost Pratt, Vice Provost Rhodes and Associate Vice President Kenton at various times to discuss issues such as Great City-Great University forums, the off-campus in-load teaching policy, faculty work life policy, and thoughts on changes within Human Resources. The Advisory Council reviewed several proposed Constitutional amendments forwarded to the Council from the Faculty Senate. At the request of the President, the Council is currently working on a report regarding ways to move the discussion forward on general education.
The budget committee met every other week for the academic year. We received excellent support from our consultants. We commend the administration for providing information to the committee and for including the committee in the budget process. We believe that there is an open and constructive dialogue that allows for faculty input.

In response to last year’s Budget Committee report, the Senate charged the Budget Committee with looking at the cost/revenue variation across academic programs and developing criteria for evaluating whether funding variations were related to quality variation. The Senate also charged the committee to work with the Athletic Director to assess the reasons for budget problems and to identify student benefits that accrue from the athletic programs. In addition, the Provost suggested a number of items for the committee to consider over the year. These included an evaluation of methods to streamline the budget process and assessment of previous budget increments.
Budget Process

The budget process for this year has been hampered by substantial uncertainty regarding state revenue for the next fiscal year. Early concerns related to the possible impact on state funding if certain ballot measures were to be approved by the voters. This was later transformed into the possibility of substantial reductions based on the Governor’s proposed budget for higher education. One of the first tasks for the committee this year was to review and comment on procedures used for budget reductions in the past. Kathi Ketcheson, Director of OIR, provided information to the committee on the processes used in reductions for 1990-91 and 1992-93. The committee concluded that the 1992-93 process should be used again if substantial reductions were to be required. The committee also provided input into the budget request form sent out by the President and will have the opportunity to review and comment on budget requests. The committee continues to work with the administration to develop methods to evaluate budget increments with respect to University objectives.

Last year, for the first time, those requesting budget increments were asked to specify measurable objectives that the budget increment would accomplish. They were also informed that they would be required to report on the achievement of these objectives for five years after any increment was granted. It is too early to look for this information in the first year of the increments, but a subcommittee did look at previous increments. Further, assessment information has been requested as part of the budget process for the second year, and Dean's and administrators were informed that they would be expected to provide the requested assessment information to the Budget Committee starting next fall.

Assessment

The Assessment Subcommittee was charged with doing an assessment of Indirect Cost Rebates and Enrollment Incentives funds generated for the 1999-2000 Fiscal Year. The subcommittee interviewed the Deans in each of the units regarding their usage of funds as allocated. The subcommittee was also charged with assessing the increase in funding for University Relations. To accomplish this the subcommittee interviewed Gary Withers, Vice President for University Relations, regarding the allocation of the increase.

The subcommittee thanks Judy Ngai for generating the data and all the Deans and VP’s for their indulgence.

Assessing the use, efficiency, or effectiveness of Indirect Cost Rebate or Enrollment Incentive money is difficult. Funds are commingled and applied in a variety of ways. Indirect Cost dollars are generated ostensibly to offset costs associated with the operational or overhead costs of grants. Enrollment Incentive dollars were provided to stimulate and reward extra enrollment. In many cases both Indirect Cost and Enrollment
Incentive dollars were used to supplement Access funding or fill other funding shortfalls at the College or Unit level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Rebate</th>
<th>Enrollment Incentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$462,312</td>
<td>$473,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>18,315</td>
<td>92,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>49,804</td>
<td>108,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>286,574</td>
<td>38,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Urban and Public Affairs</td>
<td>126,245</td>
<td>118,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>95,986</td>
<td>4,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Extended Studies</td>
<td>184,104</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University</td>
<td>54,877</td>
<td>4,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,278,218</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increased allocation from approximately 15% to 45% of Indirect Cost dollars back to units is particularly encouraging. At this writing the Enrollment Incentive program is on hold due to budgetary limitations. If the program is to be used in the future, alternative forms of incentive should be considered and evaluated.

**Assessment of the increased funding for University Relations**

University Relations (UR) has increased in the Exhibit B Budgeted Amount over the last three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exhibit B Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Initial Unclassified FTE</th>
<th>Initial Classified FTE</th>
<th>Initial Grad Asst FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$ 3,245,440</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$ 2,789,346</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>$ 1,922,830</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE: The Development Officers for each School/College are separately budgeted within each respective School/College.
At issue is the increase from 98-99 to 99-00. UR is divided by function into the following (with the *E&G Appropriations* for the relevant two years):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Budget 98-99</th>
<th>Budget 99-00</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Office</td>
<td>901,065</td>
<td>1,342,635</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketing</td>
<td>83,712</td>
<td>98,712</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>256,843</td>
<td>301,261</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>42,425</td>
<td>40,312</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Magazine</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>126,978</td>
<td>128,726</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Records</td>
<td>174,354</td>
<td>202,802</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>387,896</td>
<td>626,805</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Office</td>
<td>31,741</td>
<td>63,088</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,005,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,815,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The changes in the various budget categories were discussed with Gary Withers and all seem to be quite reasonable and germane to the functions of the UR.

Assessing the fruitfulness of the extra investment in UR is not easy. There is no direct way to attribute increased funding for an item with increased revenue. One overall measure is the funds raised by the University. (See attached bar chart.) A substantial and commendable increase in the total gifts and pledges, more than 600% increase, is noted from 1994 to 2000. What amount of this can be attributed to the increased investment? Some of this can be attributed directly to UR, some of it should be attributed to the Departmental Development Officers for each school/college, and some of it can be attributed to the individual departments or units.

**Athletics**

The athletics budget has become a perennial issue for the Budget Committee because the required University support seems to increase every year and because athletics spends more and/or raises less revenue than is projected in the beginning budget each year, requiring the University to make up the difference. The amount of institutional support over budget may approach $1 million this year despite substantial increases in institutional support. Since the move to Division I, projections of required University support have always been too low, and the NCAA certification process may require that additional resources be committed to athletics.
Annual institutional support increased from $367,500 in 1992-93 to $2,411,540 in 1999-2000 and is projected to grow to $3,400,000 in the next five years. In addition the University forgave an accumulated deficit this year and is now required to make up any deficits of the athletics program. Student support increased from $1,292,161 in 92-93 to $1,652,229 for 99-00 and is projected to increase to $2,000,000 next year. $188,000 of the projected increase in student support is for gender equity, as is much of the projected increase in institutional support.

Athletics Director Tom Burman met with the Budget Committee to discuss Athletics funding and the budget problems. He has proposed changes to address budget accountability and to prevent the recurring shortages at the end of each fiscal year. The Budget Committee recognizes that the budget problems for Athletics are at least partly due to unrealistic projections and the inherent uncertainty of various revenue sources. We commend the Athletics Director for proposing changes to the budget process to address some of the problems.

The Budget Committee provided information on Athletics and its budget to the participants in the discussion of athletics in the Faculty Senate.

A subcommittee of the Budget Committee served on the Fiscal Integrity Committee for the NCAA certification process. Through this process it has become clear that the most likely outcome is that the University will be required to increase Institutional Support for athletics. A number of the committee members were very troubled by the likelihood of increasing athletics funding, especially when other budgets may have to be reduced.

**Long-Term Budget Process**

A subcommittee was formed to look at how the budget process could be used to promote long-term goals of the university. As part of the process, Janine Allen presented a report on the efforts of the Enrollment Management Policy Committee. The Budget Committee noted that much of enrollment management has been focused on recruiting and retention. However, issues such as the ability of the University to serve additional students, the capacity of the physical plant, and the quality of the educational experience must be given greater consideration. Dave Ritchie, the chair of the University Planning Council, chaired the subcommittee, and coordinated its efforts with the University Planning Council. The result is a joint report of the Budget Committee and the Planning Council on long-term issues. The report concludes that efforts being made to evaluate programs and set priorities must incorporate more specific goals and that the University must evaluate what works and what does not. This information should then be included in the budget process to guide the allocation of resources. Progress has been made in improving the assessment part of the budget process, but more needs to be done.
**Actions Requested From the Senate**

The Senate should request that the Athletics Director continue to work with the Budget Committee to assess the effectiveness of the changes in the budget process for Athletics and to develop criteria for assessing the benefits that athletics generate for the University.

Direct the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council to continue work on developing criteria for resource allocation within the University and for using the budget process to address long-term priorities.

Request that the University Relations Director look at models for "productivity measurements" in our comparator institutions and/or models that are available from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the organization for constituent developers. Also, develop a process to attribute "credit" for the various gifts to the University. This process would reduce the propensity for several units to take credit for the same gift and allow for more reliable evaluation.

The Senate should request that the incoming chair of the Budget Committee meet with the outgoing chairs of the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council before the end of Spring Quarter to discuss continuing work on issues identified this year.

Submitted by Tony Rufolo
University Planning Council and Budget Committee
Subcommittee on Long-Range Issues
April 17, 2001

Overall Objective: Develop guidelines for future policy development and budget process that will support the university’s long-range planning by helping to assure:

- The overall breadth and quality of PSU’s educational and research activities;
- The University’s continued financial strength;
- The University’s achievement of its mission.

Discussion: Under current procedures, policies and budgetary targets seem to be based on historical activities at least as much as on any conception of what will best serve the long-range interests of the University. In particular, a focus on short-term enrollment issues often diverts attention from longer-term issues of building and maintaining capital stock and the quality of educational offerings. By identifying criteria for allocation of budget resources consistent with long-term goals, the budget process can become an integral part of strategic planning for the university. Similar considerations apply to other policy decisions such as hiring and curriculum development.

Assumptions, Principles and Considerations:

- PSU continues to be under-funded by comparison to the universities with which we compete, and can no longer afford to rely primarily on tuition plus state funding, which has in recent years proven both unreliable and insufficient for our needs. The university must build its capacity for obtaining funding from external, non-governmental sources including research and educational grants, gifts, partnerships, and investments. Hence, innovation, entrepreneurial activities, and risk-taking must be fostered at every level. This can be encouraged by making resources available for new ideas, by providing commensurate rewards for successful innovation, and by allowing innovative programs to retain a reasonable proportion of new revenues or cost savings.

- It will not be possible to invest in all promising proposals and programs at once. Priorities must be established, and investments targeted initially at the proposals with the greatest potential for return, consistent with achievement of the overall mission of the university. Future investments should then be targeted at other programs, with the objective of eventually strengthening the entire university.

- Maintaining and increasing the intellectual breadth and rigor of our curriculum, and the total intellectual development of our students, must remain a foremost consideration.

- Unit-level plans and initiatives and university-level priorities need to be reconciled through a process of formal and informal dialogue. This process will probably work most effectively if it is centered around existing administrative lines of communication, running from faculty and students (coordinated by chairs and other department leaders) through deans to the provost and president, with involvement of key administrative personnel at every level. The current dialogue
surrounding “enrollment management” provides one possible model for such dialogue.

- It is important to give full consideration to investments needed for long-term success of PSU, including maintenance of existing facilities and construction of new facilities as well as investment in promising new programs.
- The full cost and benefits of existing as well as new programs needs to be considered in the budgeting process. It is important that secondary costs and benefits, including those accruing to other units, be evaluated as fully as possible when evaluating proposals for new or expanded programs such as University Studies, Athletics, or Engineering.
- Programs that produce a significant net deficit of revenues compared to costs must be given especially close scrutiny to assure that they are operated as efficiently and at as low a cost as possible, while optimizing benefits to the university, its students, and the communities it serves. Similarly, programs that produce a significant net surplus of revenues compared to costs must be carefully evaluated to assure the maintenance of high standards of breadth and rigor.
- Current and proposed programs should be evaluated in terms of their contribution to the university’s overall mission as well as in terms of potential increases in student credit hours. In particular, proposals should account for contributions to other outcomes including scholarship and community service, and particularly for their potential contribution to the overall breadth and depth of the university’s curriculum and to fostering a climate of intellectual excitement and diversity.

Guidelines for the Budget Process

Discussion: The budget process is in the first place a process of allocating resources for the coming academic year. However, inasmuch as it implies striking a balance between the short and long term needs, and among various needs and opportunities, the budget process is also implicitly a process of planning implementation. Accordingly, we recommend the following guidelines for the budget process:

- Explicitly address long-term priorities early in the budget process.
- Invest in programs and proposals with high capacity for obtaining funding from external, non-governmental sources including research and educational grants, gifts, partnerships, and investments. Hold the recipients of targeted investments accountable for the accomplishment of stated goals. Reward success by allowing programs to keep a reasonable share of the resulting revenues, while diverting a share to new investments in other promising programs.
- Invest in programs and proposals with high capacity for improving the intellectual breadth and rigor of our curriculum and the total intellectual development of our students.
- Give full consideration to investments needed for long-term success of PSU, including construction of new facilities and maintenance of existing facilities as well as investment in promising new programs.
• Develop and implement meaningful criteria for assessing programs. These criteria should address potential effects on other units and on the overall breadth and rigor of PSU’s curriculum, and should address secondary as well as primary costs and benefits.

• When budget increments are granted, specific criteria for evaluation should be identified, and used to evaluate future budget requests. These criteria should address all areas of the university’s mission, including issues of intellectual breadth and quality, as well as financial issues.
Date: May 14, 2001
To: Senate Steering Committee
From: David Ritchie, Chair, UPC
Subject: Report of the University Planning Council

During the spring quarter the UPC accomplished two tasks. We continued the discussion of the role of the UPC and of potential ways to reconstitute the planning function to serve PSU better while also making more effective use of faculty time. We also worked with the Long-range Issues Subcommittee of the Budget Committee to devise a set of guidelines for incorporating long-range issues into the budget process. A copy of the joint report of the two committees will be presented in conjunction with the report of the Budget Committee.

During the past two years, the role of the UPC has seemed quite unclear; as a result it has been quite difficult even to gather a quorum. The Long-range Issues Subcommittee of the Budget Committee, with a total of five members, was much more effective, in part because of the simple effects of group size, and in part because its mission was more clear. I believe the UPC is much too large, and its stated mission much too diffuse and ambiguous, to be manageable. Moreover, much of what intuitively seems a logical mission for the UPC has been taken over by other groups, notably the Urban Universities Portfolio Project. I do not believe the UPC as presently constituted is an effective use of faculty time. Accordingly, I would like to make the following recommendations:

Recommendations:

1. Encourage other committees with a charge that impacts long-range planning to follow the example of the Senate Budget Committee, by appointing a subcommittee to consider long-range planning issues.

2. Either allow the UPC to exist in a state of suspension until it is clear that it is needed to fulfill some particular mission, or recommend that it meet once each year to consider and consolidate the actions of other committees during the year that have an impact on long-range planning.

3. It might also be useful for the Provost to assemble a smaller and less unwieldy advisory committee on planning issues.

4. The Senate should request that the incoming chair of the Budget Committee meet with the outgoing chairs of the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council before the end of Spring Quarter to discuss continuing work on issues identified this year.
University Planning Council and
Budget Committee Subcommittee on Long-Range Issues
April 17, 2001

Overall Objective: Develop guidelines for future policy development and budget process that will support the university’s long-range planning by helping to assure:

• The overall breadth and quality of PSU’s educational and research activities;
• The University’s continued financial strength;
• The University’s achievement of its mission.

Discussion: Under current procedures, policies and budgetary targets seem to be based on historical activities at least as much as on any conception of what will best serve the long-range interests of the University. In particular, a focus on short-term enrollment issues often diverts attention from longer-term issues of building and maintaining capital stock and the quality of educational offerings. By identifying criteria for allocation of budget resources consistent with long-term goals, the budget process can become an integral part of strategic planning for the university. Similar considerations apply to other policy decisions such as hiring and curriculum development.

Assumptions, Principles and Considerations:

• PSU continues to be under-funded by comparison to the universities with which we compete, and can no longer afford to rely primarily on tuition plus state funding, which has in recent years proven both unreliable and insufficient for our needs. The university must build its capacity for obtaining funding from external, non-governmental sources including research and educational grants, gifts, partnerships, and investments. Hence, innovation, entrepreneurial activities, and risk-taking must be fostered at every level. This can be encouraged by making resources available for new ideas, by providing commensurate rewards for successful innovation, and by allowing innovative programs to retain a reasonable proportion of new revenues or cost savings.
• It will not be possible to invest in all promising proposals and programs at once. Priorities must be established, and investments targeted initially at the proposals with the greatest potential for return, consistent with achievement of the overall mission of the university. Future investments should then be targeted at other programs, with the objective of eventually strengthening the entire university.
• Maintaining and increasing the intellectual breadth and rigor of our curriculum, and the total intellectual development of our students, must remain a foremost consideration.
• Unit-level plans and initiatives and university-level priorities need to be reconciled through a process of formal and informal dialogue. This process will probably work most effectively if it is centered around existing administrative lines of communication, running from faculty and students (coordinated by chairs and other department leaders) through deans to the provost and president, with involvement of key administrative personnel at every level. The current dialogue
surrounding "enrollment management" provides one possible model for such dialogue.

- It is important to give full consideration to investments needed for long-term success of PSU, including maintenance of existing facilities and construction of new facilities as well as investment in promising new programs.
- The full cost and benefits of existing as well as new programs needs to be considered in the budgeting process. It is important that secondary costs and benefits, including those accruing to other units, be evaluated as fully as possible when evaluating proposals for new or expanded programs such as University Studies, Athletics, or Engineering.
- Programs that produce a significant net deficit of revenues compared to costs must be given especially close scrutiny to assure that they are operated as efficiently and at as low a cost as possible, while optimizing benefits to the university, its students, and the communities it serves. Similarly, programs that produce a significant net surplus of revenues compared to costs must be carefully evaluated to assure the maintenance of high standards of breadth and rigor.
- Current and proposed programs should be evaluated in terms of their contribution to the university’s overall mission as well as in terms of potential increases in student credit hours. In particular, proposals should account for contributions to other outcomes including scholarship and community service, and particularly for their potential contribution to the overall breadth and depth of the university’s curriculum and to fostering a climate of intellectual excitement and diversity.

Guidelines for the Budget Process

Discussion: The budget process is in the first place a process of allocating resources for the coming academic year. However, inasmuch as it implies striking a balance between the short and long term needs, and among various needs and opportunities, the budget process is also implicitly a process of planning implementation. Accordingly, we recommend the following guidelines for the budget process:

- Explicitly address long-term priorities early in the budget process.
- Invest in programs and proposals with high capacity for obtaining funding from external, non-governmental sources including research and educational grants, gifts, partnerships, and investments. Hold the recipients of targeted investments accountable for the accomplishment of stated goals. Reward success by allowing programs to keep a reasonable share of the resulting revenues, while diverting a share to new investments in other promising programs.
- Invest in programs and proposal with high capacity for improving the intellectual breadth and rigor of our curriculum and the total intellectual development of our students.
- Give full consideration to investments needed for long-term success of PSU, including construction of new facilities and maintenance of existing facilities as well as investment in promising new programs.
- Develop and implement meaningful criteria for assessing programs. These criteria should address potential effects on other units and on the overall breadth
and rigor of PSU's curriculum, and should address secondary as well as primary costs and benefits.

- When budget increments are granted, specific criteria for evaluation should be identified, and used to evaluate future budget requests. These criteria should address all areas of the university's mission, including issues of intellectual breadth and quality, as well as financial issues.
May 10, 2001

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Sarah Beasley, Chair  
       Committee on Committees

Re: Committee on Committees Annual Report (6/2001)

Members: Tim Anderson (EAS), Martha Balshem (UNST), Eleanor Erskine (SFPA), Margaret Herrington (XS), David Holloway (CLAS), Susan Hopp (AO), Risa Kiam (SSW), Paul Latiolais (CLAS), Robert Mercer (CLAS), Rodney Rogers (SBA), Sandra Rosengrant (CLAS), Douglas Sherman (ED), Craig Shinn (UPA)

The Committee held its first meeting in November to fill vacant positions and make appointments for calendar year committees. 18 new calendar year committee appointments and 7 new appointments fill vacancies on academic year committees were made. The Committee made confirmation calls to existing committee members to verify the continuation of their appointments. As has been noted in previous annual reports, voice mail and email remain essential tools for the Committee’s work.

During winter term a question about the status of student members on appeals committees which review confidential student information was referred to the university administration. Rod Diman responded via the Faculty Senate secretary that “it is fine” for students to serve on these committees.

The Committee has held three meetings in spring term to fill vacancies on 2001-2002 academic year committees as well as newly created positions (due to the advent of the Other Instructional division) on calendar year committees with divisionally prescribed membership. CoC members have contacted the chairs of all academic year committees to gather information, including recommendations for new chairs and any other issues related to necessary representation and the makeup of their committees. The Committee is working to confirm 55 appointments on 15 committees. The Committee will also reconfirm all continuing appointments.

The primary issue that the Committee on Committees encountered this year was the very low response rate on the Faculty Committee Preference Survey. The committee relies heavily on this survey to make sure that faculty members can perform university service in areas of most interest to them and that the makeup of committees is appropriate for their work. The Committee discussed possible reasons for low response including whether distribution of the survey is adequate (some Committee members reported that faculty in their departments did not receive the survey), and whether non-response is a
means of avoiding a committee appointments. Ideas to address this problem included making sure that department chairs are sent hard copy of the committee roster from the Faculty Governance Guide so as to make committee service more visible. The Committee also considered whether the survey form should include “Willing to serve” and “Not available this year” selections thus allowing faculty to reflect their current year’s workload demands without completely bowing out of the committee service component of faculty governance.
Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
To the Faculty Senate
Portland State University
May 8, 2001

Members of the Committee:

Chair: Greg Jacob, ENG, x3572

Faculty:
Randy Blazak, SOC, x8502
Beverly Fuller, SBA, x 3782
Dirgham Sbait, FLL, x5295
Candyce Reynolds, UNST, x4657

Students: Christine Moua
Michael Sean Kelley
Jocelyn Furbush

Consultants: Susan Hopp, OSA, x5651
John Wanjala, OMB, x5902
Janine Allen, OAA, x5249

Special Consultants:
Margaret Banyan, SD, x5653
Amy Spring, CAE, x5582

The General Student Affairs Committee serves in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets, and student discipline. The committee does have the specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs, and long-range planning. Each year the committee selects the recipients of the President's Community Service Awards, as well as the student Commencement speaker.

Fall Quarter the committee addressed the charges that the Student Organization Council brought up against the Office of Student Development. The charges were the following: 1) violation of the SOC Constitution by the Office of Student Development; 2) violation of Student Fee Committee Guidelines by the Office of Student Development; and 3) Violation of Oregon Administrative Rules by the Office of Student Development. The Student Affairs Committee set aside several meetings to listen to testimony from the SOC and the OSD. Following testimony,
the committee made several recommendations and sent a letter to the Vice Provost.

Winter Quarter the committee worked on drafting a "Missed Classes Due to University-Sanctioned Activities" policy. After several drafts the committee distributed the policy to faculty and the intercollegiate Athletic Board. On May 7 the policy was brought before the Faculty Senate for its approval. It was moved and seconded to approve. The motion failed.

Spring Quarter, as usual, was spent working on two annual tasks. First, the committee selected the recipients of the Outstanding Student Service Awards: the President's Award for Outstanding Service and the President's Community Scholars Award. These awards are presented at the annual Excellence in Education and Service Student Award Ceremony. The second task was the selection of the Student Commencement Speaker. The committee interviewed nine applicants and chose two.

Submitted by
Greg Jacob, Chair
Student Affairs Committee
May 17, 2001

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: Devorah Lieberman, Vice Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Campus Initiatives

RE: Update on the Assessment Initiative

PSU 2001-2002 Presidential Assessment Initiative

The PSU 2001-2002 Presidential Assessment Initiative will build off efforts and resources assembled from the previous year. The academic programs that began assessing their student learning in fall 2000 will continue their work and provide leadership and constructive reflection to 14 new academic programs. The program and support structure for the units in the PSU 2001-2002 assessment process is designed to enhance those activities that proved successful from the previous year and eliminate or restructure those activities that seemed to be less effective, with the goal of raising our capacity to serve a larger number of participating departments. The following will be the core of the undergraduate process; the graduate program assessment process is described separately.

2001-2001 PARTICIPATING UNITS

In order to achieve campus-wide assessment participation, units from several schools will be encouraged to take part. The units will be organized into “unit-groups” (8 total unit-groups) with a designated “Assessment Facilitator.” They will be organized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit-Groups</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS I (5 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS II (5 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS III (5 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES (1 unit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA (1 unit), SBA (2 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Capstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an effort to move this initiative forward, identifying the stakeholders and lead individuals is critical. These persons are described below:

Lead faculty liaison for each of the 24 units above (9 of whom will serve as Assessment Facilitators and as a group labeled “The Assessment Resource Network-ARN”)  
Academic Deans/Directors (6)  
Graduate Student Assessment Assistantships (8)  
Faculty-in-Residence for Assessment in the Center for Academic Excellence  
CAE Assessment Associate  
Vice Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Campus Initiatives  
Director of OIRP and OIRP  
Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies  
Vice Provost for Graduate Studies  
PSU Assessment Council  
Title III Assessment Project

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Each department/program that participates in the assessment process will designate a lead faculty member who serves as the academic program liaison to their assigned assessment group. Each assessment unit-group will function as a development team. Each unit-group will also designate a faculty Assessment Facilitator who will be assigned a graduate student assistant and will gain access to a modest assessment fund for her/his assessment unit-group. The unit-groups will be responsible for setting their assessment goals and objectives for the year, and for establishing a collegial support and production environment that advances individual department/program assessment toward the University’s overall goals. Unit-group meetings will focus on the development and implementation of program assessment plans that demonstrate student learning by documenting performance in the important goal areas of academic programs. In the initial weeks of the academic year, assessment unit-groups will prepare and submit to their Dean and to the Faculty-in-Residence a development and implementation plan that includes specific program assessment benchmarks. Assessment unit-groups will meet regularly with the Faculty in Residence for Assessment, and will meet at least once per term with their corresponding academic Dean and the “Assessment Resource Network.” The primary purpose of these meetings will be to mark progress towards the assessment objectives for the year.

The Vice Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Campus Initiatives will facilitate the campus-wide assessment initiative. She will work closely with the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and the Vice Provost for Curriculum and Undergraduate Studies and the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning on Program Review.
The ARN will facilitate the activities of the assessment unit-groups. The ARN will include the Faculty-in-Residence (FIR) for Assessment, the Faculty Assessment Facilitators, the CAE Assessment Associate.

The Faculty in Residence for Assessment will coordinate the departments participating in the Assessment Initiative. (S)he will be responsible for implementation, management, communication and support strategies, and will oversee the training and development of the graduate students participating in the initiative. (S)he will communicate regularly with Assessment Facilitators in order to provide support and encouragement as needed, ensure that issues are addressed and keep things moving along. S(he) will do these activities per the plan coordinated by the Vice Provost for Campus Initiatives.

The CAE Assessment Associate will be the primary day-to-day liaison and support person for the Faculty in Residence for Assessment and for the ARN, as well as an active member of the ARN. (S)he will collaborate with the Faculty in Residence on short and long range planning, implementation, management, communication and support strategies, and will provide support to the FIR with day-to-day management of the initiative, including support of the graduate students. The Assessment Associate will also facilitate staff support for the initiative within CAE.

The PSU Assessment Council will be a university-wide advisory group to the PSU 2001-2002 Assessment Initiative. Members of the Council will be the spokespersons for their respective units and will help in the recruitment process, development of learning outcomes areas and/or performance standards for the baccalaureate degree, dissemination of assessment information and assistance in troubleshooting issues that arise during the assessment process. The Faculty-in-Residence will assemble the Assessment Council once each term.

The Faculty in Residence for Assessment will coordinate offering a fall development workshop for faculty and graduate students. The PI and project staff for the Title III Grant Project will help facilitate the workshop and will provide selected follow-up activities to enable faculty and graduate students to work effectively within and outside of their disciplines.

One ARN member will have principal responsibility to facilitate department and programs in utilizing the assessment web site. (S)he will also be the primary liaison to the Urban University Portfolio Project (UUPP) and will be assigned a graduate student assistant.