TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Robert Liebman, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on April 1, 1996, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

* B. Approval of the Minutes of the March 4, 1996, Meeting

C. Announcements and Reports
   1. Announcements
   2. President’s Report
   3. Provost’s Report
   4. Vice President’s Report (FADM)
   5. Vice-Provost’s Report (OGS)

D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Presiding Officer

E. Reports from other Administrative Officers and Committees
   1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate - B. Oshika
   2. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council - A. Cabelly
   3. General Student Affairs Committee - F. Li
* 4. Faculty Development Committee - G. Lafferriere
* 5. Academic Requirements Committee - R. Mercer

F. Unfinished Business
   1. Constitutional amendments (3/4/96)

G. New Business
   * 1. Writing Intensive Courses - D Carter
   * 2. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals - D. Pratt/ W. Ellis (PhD in Math Education)

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
B. Minutes of the March 4, 1996 Senate Meeting
E3. General Student Affairs Committee
E4. Faculty Development Committee
E5. Academic Requirements Committee
G1. Writing Intensive Courses
G2. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals
THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 4, 1996
Presiding Officer: George Lendaris
Secretary: Robert Liebman


Ex-officio Members

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:07. The Faculty Senate Minutes of February 5, 1996 were accepted as circulated.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

On behalf of Debbie Murdoch, Government Relations, LENDARIS communicated a request for PSU faculty participants in OSSHE-sponsored box-lunch briefings for top administrative officers on issues of importance to the State. Murdoch noted that faculty have taken part in information teams briefing interim legislative committees. In February, David Swanson and Howard Wineberg spoke to the interim committee on growth management. Administration of Justice faculty will testify in March before the interim judiciary committee.

2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
2. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

3. PROVOST'S REPORT

5. VICE-PROVOST'S REPORT (OGS)

LENDARIS reported that RAMALEY was in a meeting and could not attend. REARDON did not offer a report. KOCH will report at the April meeting.

4. VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT (FADM)

PERNSTEINER reported that implementation of the four strategies for budget reduction have kept the University on target. These are: additional funds from the Chancellor, increased enrollment, savings in the current budget, and year-ahead reductions in the base. Winter Term 96 enrollment is above the target. FADM has identified its one-time and permanent cuts and the Provost is soon to meet with the Deans to suggest academic budget cuts that will be brought before the Budget Committee.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

LENDARIS clarified the review process for University Studies. UCC discussed procedures to review FRINQ and SINQ courses with Professors Toth and Biolsi. The authorizing motion does not call for a decision on the program’s continuance, but obliges ongoing assessment and regular reports to the Senate.

E. REPORTS FROM OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

E1. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

OSHIKA added to ENNEKING’s report on the Feb 2-3 IFS meeting (Minutes, 2/5/96, page 27)

a) Les Swanson, OSSHE Board president, noted growing interest and potential support for higher education and suggested that any increased funding would be targeted, for example, to engineering/high tech in the Portland metro area, distance education, and/or satellite programs as in Bend.

b) Articulation was another key theme. Swanson discussed a possible 7-year high school/bachelor’s degree track and the need for industry, community colleges, and OSSHE schools to collaborate in support of the CAM.
c) Programs supporting important gubernatorial initiatives such as at-risk youth, corrections, and vulnerable populations may be targeted for more funding.

d) IFS is attending to the location, composition, and agenda of the focus groups convened for the four OSSHE task forces by the Davis and Hibbetts research firm.

e) At the April Senate meeting, OSHIKA will summarize the working drafts of the four task forces.

E2. Committee on Committees

WATNE made three points

1. Toward the goal of wider participation on committees, CoC will implement new strategies to increase faculty involvement in the 1996 committee preference survey.

2. In cooperation with Retired-Emeriti Professors of PSU, CoC will circulate the committee preference survey to emeritus faculty, many of whom have expressed interest in continuing their service to the University. It is planned that they will be consulting or ex officio (non-voting) members.

3. Toward the goal of a successful renewal of academic-year committees, CoC will improve communication with members of standing committees regarding their recommendations for chairs and for the continuation of members.

E3. Ad hoc committee on Procedures for Curricular Change

LIEBMAN reported that he expected to have a final list of members by the April meeting.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

F1. Motions, 2/5/96

LENDARIS reported that the Steering Committee decided to refer the three curricular motions discussed at the February meeting to the Ad hoc committee on Procedures for Curricular Change. LENDARIS offered two clarifications/modifications: 1) The initiation of a new course involves first, a judgement about usefulness and quality through peer review, and second, after successful peer review, further administrative decisions regarding scheduling and cost. Motion #1 refers solely to judgements exercised through peer review -- not administrative decisions. Motion 2 should be reworded to consider only x01 and x07 courses. Motion by HARDT/WATNE to refer
to the Ad hoc committee was approved unanimously by voice vote.

G. NEW BUSINESS

G1. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution

LENDARIS introduced three amendments regarding the enlarged definition of the faculty voted 11/94. Secretary’s note: Full text of the amendments and sections of the Faculty Constitution to be changed were circulated with the agenda. The first amendment would create the labels: designated and certified. The second amendment would create distinct representation for designated and certified faculty in the All Other category. The third amendment would specify representation on eight standing committees. LENDARIS reviewed procedures for amendments and opened discussion. SVOBODA called attention to the impact of adding additional members on four committees. LIEBMAN interpreted the motions regarding committee representation as making easier the selection of faculty qualified to serve among a roster that includes many whose work is not primarily instructional (eg campus safety, public relations, athletics). RICKS corrected Liebman’s misreading of management service employees who are not unclassified and therefore do not fall within the enlarged definition. LENDARIS suggested that the Provost provide with discussion of how unclassified employees are certified for participation in the Senate. RICKS noted that OIRP provides OAA with a list of unclassified employees holding faculty appointments, including many research assistant or research associate appointments which are not designated. CABELLY noted that, in 1994, one argument for expanding the faculty was the difficulty faced by Committee on Committees to find representatives from AO category (then 15-20) and suggested that an unintended consequence of new amendment would be leave committees unfilled. HARDT raised the concern of whether separate seating would set a precedent for other units such as SBA or UPA to seek separate representation for their designated and certified faculty. Referring to the legislative history, OSHIKA noted that a) there were unranked faculty who contributed to instruction (eg XS), but were unrepresented in Senate, and b) designated faculty do not form a natural class in All Other.

In his job as academic adviser, MERCER has broad exposure to instruction across campus and thought it unwise to disqualify people like him from serving on instructional committees. HOLLOWAY suggested there was wisdom in having athletic staff learn about curriculum and said the implication of the amendments was to create a 2 tiered faculty. S BRENNER asked whether this body was a university senate or a faculty senate and if we take ourselves to be a university senate will find it useful to have wide representation. J BRENNER asked for clarification on why an amendment was preferable to relying on the good judgement of the Committee on Committees to choose appropriate members of instructional committees.
LENDARIS replied that the amendment would offer guidance.

In response to ROBERTSON's question as to why voting only applies to All Other, LENDARIS suggested that the 5 senators added after enlargement have a different perspective. SVOBODA, J BRENNER, HOLLOWAY sought a rationale for determining eligibility for committees as proposed. RICKS suggested that restricting eligibility is unwise if people who do academic advising or deal with the Grad Council are unrepresented. In response to KOCAGOLU's question about the meaning of designated and certified, HARDT interpreted designated in terms of hiring prior to the 1994 amendment. WINEBERG asked whether certification was permanent.

OSHIKA suggested that in lieu of amendments, what has been happening de facto could be formalized by adopting a set of guidelines to assure the qualifications of those who serve on faculty committees.

LENDARIS reminded that separate Senate representation of All Other was an additional consideration. Recognizing that AO was a heterogeneous group, J BRENNER had heard no special claims or grievances by a subgroup and therefore could see no rationale for splitting the category. OSHIKA described the process of certification and assignment that occurred during the first year after enlargement. HARDT said a look at Senate history shows AO was always heterogeneous (as it included all who did not report to a Dean) and that enlarging the category will not narrow representation any more than happens in SBA and CLAS where senators come from both big and small departments. Opposed to a split, RICKS argued altering representation in this way would dictate a structure that no other unit has. LENDARIS pointed to the new category for extended studies as a case for separate representation. LENDARIS suggested compromises including removing the amendment regarding representation on instructional committees. HOLLOWAY suggested the steering committee should review the discussion and revise the amendments before the next mailing.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Gerardo Lafferriere–MTH, Chair, Faculty Development Committee  
RE: Annual report of the Faculty Development Committee  

Committee Members: George Cabello (PLL), Malgorzata Chrzanowska-Jeske (EE), Amy Driscoll (OAA), Kit Dusky (LIB), Mary Gordon-Brannan (SP), Heidi Herinckx (RRI), Valerie Kata-giri (CEED), Joanne Klebba (SBA), Elizabeth Mead (ART), David Morgan (IOA), Thomas Potiowski (ECON), Herman Taylor (BIO).

Consultants: Michael Reardon (OAA), Roy W. Koch (ORSP).

Report: The Faculty Development Committee has carried out the following activities since the last report to the Faculty Senate:

- The 1996-1997 proposal review cycle started in mid-November. A total of 54 proposals were received by the deadline. This amounts to an increase of 50% in the number of proposals. The funds requested totalled $356,187.80.
- A second committee meeting was held in December to clarify some guidelines in preparation for the review process.
- The proposals were filed, information entered in the computer database and reviewers assigned by the end of the year. There were 29 proposals from CLAS faculty, 6 from EAS, 6 from FPA, 6 from UPA, 3 from SSW, 2 from SBA and 2 from ED.
- During January, each member of the committee reviewed about 16 proposals, filled out a review form, and assigned a score. Each proposal received 4 reviews from committee members (chosen at random). One additional reviewer, expert in the field, was chosen for each proposal. Most of these reviewers were from outside this committee and some from outside the university. The guidelines stated in the call for proposals were followed closely.
- By mid February, (almost) all the reviews were compiled. The committee started a series of meetings to make the final recommendations. During these 4 two-hour meetings each proposal was discussed by the whole committee and final recommendations were made.
- The Committee recommended partial or total funding for 30 proposals.
- The Committee is currently reviewing proposals for the Institutional Career Support-Peer Review program. It expects to be done by the April Senate meeting.
The Committee wishes to take this opportunity to thank Arezu Movahed and the staff of the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects for their valuable assistance with the administration of the Faculty Development Program.

The committee would like to suggest for future consideration by the Senate the possibility of changing the reporting dates. The current arrangements require the Committee to file reports when the review process is not quite done. A first report in January could cover in some detail the submission process, including a breakdown of proposals submitted for that year. A final report in May could give a more detailed description of the completed Peer Review and Faculty Development processes.

Finally, the committee would like to suggest for future consideration by the Senate the possibility of dropping items 7 and 8 in the current list of charges of the committee. Those tasks are now better addressed in other committees.
Academic Requirements Committee

Annual Report to the Faculty

April 1996

Committee Members: Daphne Allen, Rod Diman (ex-officio), Dan Fortmiller (ex-officio), Angela Garbarino (ex-officio), Lyza Gardner (student), Martha Hickey, Stephen Martin, Robert Mercer (chair), Shirley Morrell, Bob Tufts (ex-officio), Mary T. Withers, Helen Youngelson-Neal

1. During the period 9/15/95 to 3/15/96 ARC processed 107 petitions. Of them, 94 were granted, and 13 were denied. Four petitions concerned the new general education requirements (2 were granted, 2 were denied).

2. ARC is dealing with issues that arise from the new general education requirements as charged by the constitution. We have had a number of meetings with representatives from University Studies, CLAS, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Registrar’s office to discuss both current issues and to attempt to anticipate potential issues before they arise. It is the hope of the committee to make some procedural recommendations to the Senate regarding freshman general education requirements, transfer student issues, and writing competencies.

3. After discussions with the Department of English and a proposal by the Director of Writing, ARC approved the Department’s authority over petitions for waivers of Wr 121 and 323.
Proposal for Continuation of The Writing-Intensive Course (WIC) Program

The Proposal:

1. That the Writing-Intensive Course (WIC) Program* be changed in status from pilot program to ongoing program.

2. That WIC courses continue to be held, ideally, to 20 students per section; that there no longer be a limit to the number of sections offered annually. [See "Guidelines," attached.]

3. That students continue to be permitted to substitute a WIC course for Writing 323 (provided they earn a grade of C- or better) so long as Writing 323 remains a requirement.

*The Writing-Intensive Course program as originally approved by the Faculty Senate in March, 1993:

"This program [shall] consist of up to 20 sections per year of regularly offered courses in the disciplines, taught at the 300- or 400-level by specially trained faculty, which would be designated Writing-Intensive Courses (WIC)."

Background/History:

Portland State University has been interested in some form of Writing Across the Curriculum program at least since the work of the Smeltzer Committee (1985). For whatever reasons, that group's initiatives failed to stimulate much in the way of activity at the grass roots level, and consequently fizzled out.

The University Writing Advisory Committee, representing a range of schools and departments, was formed in 1992 to look at this issue again. Their work culminated in the 1993 proposal for a two-year pilot program in Writing Across the Curriculum (quoted above), to run from 1993 to 1995. The Faculty Senate amended the proposal by adding that the program be evaluated, and passed it in March, 1993.

In 1995 Duncan Carter (ENG), Chair of the University Writing Advisory Committee and coordinator of the WIC Program, asked the Faculty Senate for a one-year extension (that is, until June of 1996) in order to allow time for evaluation studies to be completed. That extension is about to expire.
Discussion:

During the three-year life of the pilot project, more than 50 faculty have received special training in how to incorporate writing into their instruction (receiving stipends for doing so) and have gone on to teach some 58 sections of Writing-Intensive Courses in disciplines ranging from physics to dance. Every school that teaches undergraduates has offered a WIC course except for engineering and UPA.

Faculty report that teaching WIC courses changes the way they teach their other courses; when they see the quality of student engagement that comes with writing about a subject, they find it difficult to do otherwise with their other students. In general they have learned how to use informal writing to promote learning, as well as what it means to view writing as a process rather than strictly as a finished product. Many report that their most important learning came from frequent contact with the trained Graduate Assistant assigned to assist them. A number of WIC faculty have moved on to Freshman Inquiry or Sophomore Cluster courses, taking what they learned in WIC with them.

Similarly, those who have conducted workshops for WIC faculty have been able to apply what they have learned in staging workshops for faculty new to University Studies. So one of the goals of the WIC program—"to promote a campus-wide dialogue about how writing is best learned and taught"—has begun to be realized. Write Now, the newsletter funded by this program, also works to promote this dialogue.

When this program was initially proposed, proponents claimed that "the right reasons" for it were "improvement of the quality of undergraduate instruction, and as an important faculty development activity." It seems to have succeeded on both counts.

Evaluation of the Program:

When the Faculty Senate asked that the WIC pilot be evaluated, Hugo Maynard (PSY) and Nona Glazer (SOC) volunteered to head the evaluation effort. Glazer having since retired, the burden fell to Maynard and a team he assembled in the Community Psychology Group, led by Ron Yoder and Howard Nicholls. They assembled information of three types: (1) interviews of WIC faculty, (2) interviews of students in WIC courses, and (3) comparisons of actual writing samples from WIC courses and Writing 323. Faculty interviews were generally positive, as were student interviews. Students were especially pleased to have an option to Writing 323. Comparisons of 176 essays from some 30 different courses (323 and WIC courses alike) showed no significant difference in the amount of improvement made by students in WIC courses and those in Writing 323. [See "Summary," attached.]

Given University Studies, Do We Need This?

Yes. We don't need to worry about assigning too much writing. In any case, WIC courses are the best place to address discipline-specific writing issues. Each discipline may be seen as
constituting its own "discourse community," and each such community generates its own conventions for a host of issues ranging from what kinds of questions may be addressed, to what kinds of evidence may be used to answer them, strategies for analysis or interpretation of evidence, genres/patterns of organization, format, specialized vocabulary, style of documentation, and the like. If you want to be a member of the club, you have to learn to speak the lingo. Such issues are difficult to address in WR 323 in a discipline-specific way, and they are unlikely to receive more than a passing glance in University Studies courses.

Duncan Carter, Chair
Univ. Writing Advisory Committee
GUIDELINES FOR WRITING-INTENSIVE COURSES
AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

How Writing-Intensive Courses (WIC) Fit Into the Curriculum:

To graduate from PSU, a student must complete Writing 121 and Writing 323. During the two-year pilot program in Writing Across the Curriculum (1993-95), students may substitute a WIC course for Writing 323 (if and only if the grade is C- or better). WIC courses will consist of regularly offered courses in the disciplines, taught at the 300- or 400-level by specially trained faculty whose course proposals have been approved by the University Writing Advisory Committee.

What WIC Faculty Can Expect of the University:

The University Writing Advisory Committee will conduct regular workshops and follow-up sessions for WIC faculty, addressing such issues as writing-to-learn activities, designing writing assignments, and responding to/evaluating student writing. Throughout the pilot period, writing specialists will be available to respond to specific questions or problems. Although our budget—like everyone else's—remains uncertain, we also hope to be able to offer student access to the Writing Lab, a newsletter and other publications, and possibly even a limited number of teaching assistants and/or student tutors.

What the University Will Expect of WIC Faculty:

Faculty teaching WIC courses will be expected to attend a three-day workshop prior to teaching the course, to attend occasional follow-up sessions, to participate in evaluation studies, and to fulfill the criteria for WIC courses spelled out below.

Criteria for Writing-Intensive Courses:

1. **WIC courses shall emphasize student writing as a mode of learning.**

   To meet this criterion, WIC courses should:
   
   - include frequent opportunities for students to write (both graded and ungraded writing)
   
   - require at least 5,000 words (including drafts, in-class writing, informal papers, and polished papers);
     polished final drafts of papers which students have rewritten after receiving revision-oriented feedback should account for 2,000 words of this total.
   
   - limit enrollment (ideally, to 20 or fewer students).

Since writing is an important way of thinking about concepts and data, instructors should plan to use writing as an integral part of the way students assimilate and come to understand course content. One good way to do this: have students write informally, in or out of class, and then use their writing in class. Students can write about a lecture (Do they understand it? Do they have questions? Can they apply what has been said to a specific instance?); a discussion (writing down their own ideas before discussing, or summarizing what they've derived from a discussion); a passage in the text (ask them to paraphrase, abstract, exemplify, apply, extend, or argue with something the text says), and so on. Most or all of this “writing to learn” need not be graded.

Graded writing could include academic essays, position papers, microthemes, lab reports, responses to cases, and other kinds of writing appropriate to the discipline. Students should expect to revise graded writing based on feedback and criticism.

2. **WIC courses shall feature grading policies which give significant weight to the quality of student writing.**

   At least 30% of the overall grade should be based on graded writing.
3. WIC courses shall focus on content related to the discipline and be taught by faculty knowledgeable about the discipline.

WIC courses should be firmly grounded in each department's discipline. WIC courses are not English courses or grammar and punctuation courses; they are discipline courses which use writing tasks to help students learn.

4. At the same time, WIC faculty should consider themselves facilitators of student writing improvement, not just evaluators of finished products.

Particularly since WIC courses may be substituted for Writing 323, they should incorporate specific methods of helping students improve their writing. Various methods are possible. Faculty might:

- Assign rough drafts prior to the final, graded version, allowing time for revision-oriented feedback by peers or instructor;
- Incorporate in-class writing exercises to help students focus topics, generate ideas, research a subject, plan organization, write more effective sentences, etc.;
- Arrange for library visits or other means of helping students research more effectively;
- Use published writing in your field as models for student writing;
- Hold individual conferences with students to discuss drafts in progress.

5. WIC courses shall discuss writing issues pertinent to that discipline.

In planning the course content for a WIC course, instructors should also allow for some discussion for how writing is used by professionals in that particular discipline. A WIC course in business might, for example, discuss the writing done by working managers and what makes that writing effective or convincing. In some fields, this discussion might apply to the kinds of writing done in graduate school.

To raise such issues, instructors should consider assigning at least one paper representative of the kinds of writing done in the discipline, whether that be a case study, lab report, research article, review of the literature, project or grant proposal, or the like.

• The University Writing Advisory Committee, April 1993 (Based largely on WIC guidelines in effect at Oregon State University, Towson State University, and the University of Wisconsin--Stevens point).
Summary of Writing-Intensive Course Evaluation

Introduction

Writing across the curriculum (WAC), which includes writing-intensive courses (WIC), is an integrative approach to writing (the course content is further explored by students as they write), employed to broaden the pedagogy of disciplines. The PSU Faculty Senate mandated (spring 1993) that the WIC pilot project be evaluated. This evaluation has been carried out by members of the Community Psychology class, under the guidance of Hugo Maynard, PhD, beginning fall quarter 1993 and continuing through spring quarter 1996. The WIC project investigated three areas: quantitative comparisons between the WR 323 and WIC classes, faculty interviews, and student interviews.

The quantitative part of the study evaluated the improvement of students' writing over one term as determined by neutral graders, in a comparison of WR 323 and WIC papers. The qualitative part of the study sought feedback in the form of structured interviews from people on both sides of the desk, interviews focused on the WIC classes in order to determine the effectiveness of the innovative (WIC) as compared to the standard (WR 323) method of teaching writing. Not surprisingly, many faculty members had already been utilizing WIC approaches in their teaching for years, but without labeling them as such. Unfortunately, time and money constraints precluded a more thorough study of the qualitative elements, allowing only the WIC classes to be assessed. In any case the subjective nature of the interviews would have been difficult to compare and contrast in a manner similar to that which gauged the improvement in students' writing over one term of classes. The interviews have been subjected to a content analysis and set forth in a response tally (see appendices, complete report).

Method

Subjects:

The population consisted of students and teachers in both WR 323 and WIC classes. The students and teachers were asked for their voluntary participation in
the study. The period of time the data was collected from classes began in January, 1994, and continued through December, 1995.

Data Collection:

Three separate measurements of teacher and student performance and attitudes were collected. These included:

1) Teacher questionnaires-- These questions were designed to ascertain teachers' attitudes towards the WIC classes.

2) Student questionnaires-- These questions were designed to ascertain students' reactions to the WIC classes.

3) Analysis of students' improvement in class-- Two papers were collected for each student in each of the participating WR 323 and WIC classes. The teachers were instructed to allow a WIC team member to copy one of the student's first written assignments and one of the last written assignments.

Data Analysis:

1) Teacher and Student Questionnaires-- A content analysis was completed on all questions. Frequencies were reported.

2) Student academic improvement-- Of the collected writing samples, a random selection was made for the analysis. The selected papers were retyped and identifying class, subject, and names were removed. Writing samples were delivered in batches to the independent grading team. This team established in each batch a sample that served as a standard for grading all papers. The graders used a six-point scale. Each paper received two grades, from two separate graders. If the paper had grades that were two or more scores apart, then another grader reviewed the paper and replaced the score determined to be the farthest from the other two.

The graded papers were then returned to the research team. Wilcoxon analysis was performed on the differences between first and last papers for each class type, WIC and WR 323.

Results

1) Teacher and Student Questionnaires-- Generally positive comments. See Appendix in complete report for Teacher questionnaire results and attached Appendix for Student results.
2) Student academic improvement-- One hundred and seventy six papers were used for this analysis. Due to the type of data analyzed, statistical methods were used that only require ordinal scoring methods. The particular test used was the rank test for two independent samples (Wilcoxon Rank Score test).

The results from this analysis showed that there was no significant difference between the changes in scores from first papers to second papers in the WIC as compared to the WR 323 classes. It does not make any difference which class the student takes, the improvement or lack thereof, is not statistically different between the two types of classes. Although preliminary results indicate that there is no significant difference between the two groups, there may be significant differences between some smaller subgroups, with main and/or interaction effects.

Conclusion

While it has been determined that there is no significant difference in improvement in writing of students in WIC or WR323, there has been positive endorsement of the WIC program in personal testimony of faculty and student alike. The writing process engages students and knowledge of course content is revealed; having to articulate what they know affords students an opportunity to explicate, refine, and reflect on material covered and by so doing, gain a deeper understanding of it. The overall response to WIC was positive. One salient comment from both instructor and student was that WIC students were more engaged with the material. Those professors who already required writing assignments as part of their curriculum may have been somewhat less impressed with results, but in this case the expectation for improved performance was there; the reason writing was utilized as a learning tool is that it works.

One drawback to any course which is writing intensive is the time it takes to read, critique, and grade student papers; this endeavor becomes problematic, to the point of being prohibitive, as class size increases. This is why WIC classes are limited to 20 students, and most WIC instructors are assigned teaching assistants. Additional help made it possible to spend more time in discussion about writing. Students sometimes feel intimidated by professors, so reviewing writing with a peer group or an assistant may be sufficiently comfortable that more students will spend time polishing their writing skills. There was a subpopulation of students who took both WR 323 and WIC; when asked to compare the two classes the overwhelming response to WIC was positive but the response to WR 323 was mixed, some
realizing the value of the structure provided, the emphasis on writing as a process, the fact that writing was seen as an end in itself instead of a means to an end. Others regarded WR 323 (a required course) as an obstacle to be overcome, a few lamenting that they had not had the chance to waive the WR 323 requirement by participating in WIC. Perhaps, in a society that values individualism and freedom of choice, resentment towards requirements is only natural.

There are questions that remain to be asked. Can WIC and WR 323 peacefully coexist? Yes. These two approaches to writing and learning work well together, each serving to reinforce critical thinking necessary for effective learning in all classes, not just writing classes. Is it worth the time to write? Yes. Communication is vital to maintain society and writing, while not the only form of communication, is unique in that it is a lasting permanent record for future generations. What is the mission of the university in the community and how can this be accomplished? To provide quality education, to be sure, and to adequately prepare students for careers in the private or public sector. Without excellent writing skills it is debatable whether these people will be able to compete and function optimally in all facets of their work in a chosen field.

Finally, one may ask whether the writing required in the University Studies experiment will suffice in replacing WR 323. Another research study might be to compare these two approaches (at the junior level, to normalize for student ability and competency).

Howard Nichols
Ron Yoder
Community Psychology
Appendix: Student Interview Analysis

* Some response totals are greater than 23 (actual number interviewed) because those interviewed made more than one comment.

QUESTION:
Why did you choose to enroll in the course?
RESPONSES:
requirement (for major, to graduate, need seminar) 13
content of course 6
like professor 4
preference for WIC course over writing 323 2
write about subject interest in 2
sophomore standing not allowed to register for 323 2
take WIC course to replace writing 323 1
elective 1
only class that fit schedule 1
like to write 1

QUESTION:
What did you expect from a writing intensive course?
RESPONSES:
writing (lots of writing or specified amount of writing) 18
no expectation 3
more on course content than on writing 2
to improve writing in discipline 1
WIC to be more difficult than 323 1
learn research skills, using the library 1

QUESTION:
Was the instructor clear regarding the WIC course?
RESPONSES:
instructor was very clear 23
fairly clear (some misunderstanding) 2
confusing 2

QUESTION:
How accessible is the writing instructor or TA?
RESPONSES:
accessible (office hour mentioned) 11
accessible, but have not needed their help 6
TA is very accessible and helpful 4
Professor accessible, TA not as accessible 3
fairly accessible (difference in schedules) 2
not accessible 1
QUESTION:
What has been your experience so far?
RESPONSES:
writing (a lot of writing, mention specific assignments) 8
good (getting a lot out of it) 7
helping me writing on subject content 4
stressful, hard work, frustrating 3
very good, preference over 323 2
improving writing on other courses' projects 2
OK 1

QUESTION:
Assuming PSU will implement WIC courses what can be done to improve the process?
RESPONSES:
instructor very important (show great interest in course, great knowledge of writing) 7
classes should meet more than once a week 5
Syllabus is very important 5
don't know 3
better communication (in general, and when English Standard structure to assignments is not one's first language) 2
requirement 2
323 or WIC 2
TA is a very important part of class 1
want a lot of feedback about writing 1
use computers and turn in disks 1
take 2 or more WIC course to replace writing 323 2
encourage use of writing lab 1
make sure people know about the option of taking 2 or more WIC course to replace writing 323 2
don't have TA and professor both teach course 1

QUESTION:
What is your impression of professors interest in teaching WIC course?
RESPONSES:
enjoys teaching Wic course, very interested 21
writing assistant is very good 2
focus more on content of course that writing 2
treats writing as normal part of course 1
uncertain 1

QUESTION:
How has your experience compared to 323?
RESPONSES:
WIC better (writing for a purpose) 6
less concentration on grammar in WIC 3
more concentration on course content 3
a challenge compared to 323 2
wrote more in writing 323 2
requirement more specific for WIC course 1
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

March 5, 1996

To: George Lendaris
    Presiding Officer
    PSU Faculty Senate

From: Walt Ellis, Chair
      PSU Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Mathematics Education

The above cited degree proposal submitted by the Mathematics Department was unanimously approved by the Graduate Council at its February 15, 1996 meeting. The proposal is now being transmitted by the Office of Academic Affairs, along with supporting documentation, for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

The Department of Mathematics is eager to have its proposal placed before the Faculty Senate as soon as is possible.

cc: Linda Devereaux
    Office of Academic Affairs
March 11, 1996

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Department of Mathematical Sciences
RE: Proposal for the initiation of a unique Ph.D. program in Mathematics Education

Objective
The proposed Ph.D. program in Mathematics Education in the Department of Mathematical Sciences will provide students with a solid grounding in both Mathematics and Mathematics Education. Graduates of this program will meet our nation’s current need for mathematics educators who can assist in the reform of mathematics at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. They will be prepared for the following professional careers:

1) Mathematics Educators within Mathematics Departments at universities, four-year colleges, and community colleges
2) Mathematics Educators within Schools of Education at universities and four-year colleges
3) Curriculum Specialists in Mathematics, Supervisors of Mathematics, and Mathematics Specialists in state or local Departments of Education
4) Private sector specialists in Mathematics Education

National need
Recent efforts by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, The Mathematical Association of America, the American Mathematical Society, and the American Association of Two-Year Colleges call attention to the importance of reforming the teaching of mathematics. As a result, there is an increasing need for specialists in Mathematics Education, and in particular for those qualified to work in collegiate Mathematics Departments. In each of the past five years there have been more new job openings in Mathematics Education at colleges and universities than there have been qualified applicants. Most of the applicants for these positions fall into two groups: (1) those with training in pure Mathematics but little or no training in Mathematics Education, or (2) those with training in Mathematics Education but little or no training in pure Mathematics. What is needed is a program that will provide prospective Mathematics Educators with a balance of training in Mathematics and Mathematics Education.

Uniqueness of Proposed Program
At the present time, there are only a handful of institutions in the nation that offer doctoral programs specifically geared to preparing candidates for a career in Mathematics Education. The majority of these programs are housed in Schools of Education and vary considerably in the amount of mathematics candidates are required to study. Some institutions require no course work in mathematics, while a very few require course work equivalent to a masters degree in mathematics. The few Mathematics Education doctoral programs housed in Departments of Mathematics require candidates to complete the same course work and pass the same comprehensive exams as candidates in pure or applied mathematics, delaying a candidate’s serious study of Mathematics Education for many years.

Our proposed Ph.D. program strikes a balance between Mathematics requirements and Mathematics Education requirements, making it one of the only programs of its type. Joan Ferrini-Mundy, a Professor of Mathematics at the University of New Hampshire -- and the
outside evaluator of this proposal -- identified this balanced approach as a major strength of our program and a feature which will attract candidates from across the country.

**Potential students**

In the last two years, 14 students have indicated an interest in pursuing a Ph.D. degree in Mathematics Education at PSU. Many of these students have been enrolled at PSU as masters students or are classroom teachers interested in pursuing a Ph.D. in Mathematics Education. Others are currently enrolled in other programs throughout the country and have indicated an interest in transferring to the proposed program at PSU. We expect the Ph.D. program to enroll 6 - 8 students in each of the first few years.

**Course of Study**

The course of study for the Ph.D. falls into two main categories: (a) breadth in Mathematics and (b) breadth and depth in Mathematics Education culminating in a dissertation in Mathematics Education. Admission requires a masters degree in Mathematics equivalent to the MS/MA or MST/MAT at Portland State University. Students must complete at least 54 graduate quarter hours beyond the MS/MA or MST/MAT degree together with 27 hours for the thesis: 18 quarter hours in 500/600-level Mathematics courses, 18 hours in graduate-level Mathematics Education seminars, and 18 hours in graduate-level electives chosen from courses currently offered in other Departments and the School of Education.

**Implications for funding**

The proposed program will not require additional money or resources from the Oregon State System of Higher Education. It will depend on both outside funding for research and curriculum development and on a small reallocation of resources within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (<1% of the total College budget).

**Mathematics Education at PSU and the Portland Metro Area**

Portland State University has a long history of excellence and national recognition for its work in Mathematics Education, largely due to the high degree of collaboration among members of the Mathematical Sciences Department, the School of Education, the Curriculum Development Lab funded by The Math Learning Center, other universities, and the Portland area schools. The proposed Ph.D. program will build on these connections and help to provide a more coordinated and coherent level of service to the Portland metropolitan community. There are large numbers of mathematics teachers in the Portland area schools who are striving to improve their mathematics programs, teachers who look to Portland State University for direction and leadership in Mathematics Education. In addition, the ongoing development of innovative Mathematics curricula that are being used in local classrooms provides a natural laboratory for research in the teaching and learning of Mathematics. The Ph.D. seminars in Mathematics Education will also provide a service to the School of Education. These seminars will provide a series of courses for students who are currently enrolled in the Ed.D. program and seeking an emphasis in Mathematics Education.
Items for the April Faculty Senate mailing:

1. Statement of support for Writing Across the Curriculum.

2. New certificate program and courses in Chicano-Latino Studies.

3. Course credit change in Mathematical Sciences.
Statement on writing across the curriculum and writing intensive courses

The University Curriculum Committee strongly recommends that the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program and Writing-Intensive Courses (WIC) that are a part of this program be continued and expanded. The Committee finds the WIC program a very valuable part of the curriculum for the following reasons: it is a successful outcome of the WAC recommendation made by the Smeltzer committee in 1985; it gives students the opportunity to work on specific writing requirements in their discipline; it improves students' writing skills; it promotes active learning in the classroom; it enhances students' understanding of the content under study; it helps to promote campus-wide dialogue about how writing is best learned and taught; and it is a valuable, inexpensive way to encourage faculty development. The Committee recommends that all departments and programs offering undergraduate degrees include a writing intensive course as part of the curriculum.
Proposal for a New Program

CERTIFICATE IN CHICANO/LATINO STUDIES

The Chicano/Latino Studies Program will provide an interdisciplinary forum for the study of the historical, cultural, artistic, and social experience of Chicanos and Latinos in the United States of America. This is to be accomplished through a study of Spanish and appropriate, advisor approved courses chosen from disciplines such as: History, Sociology, Literature, Music, Art, Theatre, Dance, Economics, Education, Geography, Anthropology and Political Science.

Candidates for the Chicano/Latino Studies Certificate must successfully complete 40 credits in Chicano/Latino studies as well as meet the requirements for a degree in any major or field. As listed below, these credits consist of 24 hours in required core courses, 8 credits of third year Spanish, 4 credits ChLa 407 Seminar, and 4 credit hour of advisor approved electives. ChLa 201, 202, 203 serve as prerequisites for the upper division courses.

Program requirements are as follows (see page 2 for new course descriptions):

Sophomore core courses:
1. ChLa 201: Introduction to Chicano/Latino Studies I [new] 4 hrs
2. ChLa 202: Introduction to Chicano/Latino Studies II [new] 4 hrs
3. ChLa 203: Introduction to Chicano/Latino Studies III [new] 4 hrs

Junior level core courses:
1. ChLa 301: Sociology of Chicano/Latino Communities [new] 4 hrs
2. ChLa 302: Chicano/Latino Literature [new] 4 hrs
3. ChLa 303: Chicana/Latina Experience [new] 4 hrs

Other required courses—upper division:
1. Span 3: 3rd year Spanish-language courses * 8 hrs
2. ChLa 407: Seminar [repeatable under different titles] [new] 4 hrs
3. Elective(s): advisor-approved, ChLa-related course(s) ** 4 hrs
   40 hrs

*Note: students already possessing language skills equivalent to 3rd year Spanish may substitute advisor-approved ChLa-related electives. Note too the prerequisite for 3rd year Spanish is 2 years of lower division Spanish or the equivalent.

**A list of appropriate courses will be available each quarter from the Chicano/Latino Studies office and will usually be listed in each quarter’s time schedule as well.
Old Description

Mth 211, 212, 213 FOUNDATIONS OF ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS I, II, III (3,3,3) - Treatment of historical aspects of mathematics; sets; structure of the integers; rational numbers, and real numbers as infinite decimals; informal geometry of points, lines and planes; coordinate geometry; non-Euclidean geometries.

Courses must be taken in sequence. Prerequisite: grade of C-, P, or above in second year high school algebra or equivalent within the last five years, or satisfactory score on the placement exam.

New Description

Mth 211, 212, 213 FOUNDATIONS OF ELEMENTARY MATHEMATICS I, II, III (4, 4, 4) A constructivist approach to fundamental ideas of mathematics. Topics include: math models, problem-solving, numeration and structure of number systems, logic, geometry, and exploratory probability and statistics. Courses must be taken in sequence. Prerequisite: grade of C-, P, or above in second year high school algebra or equivalent within the last five years, or satisfactory score on the placement exam.