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The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on December 6, 1993, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA
A. Roll
B. Approval of the Minutes of the November 1 and 8, 1993, Meetings
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. President's Report
   2. Provost's Report
D. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   1. Quarterly Report, University Planning Council—Weikel
   2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee—Levinson
   3. Annual Report, Graduate Council—Spolek
   4. Annual Report, Scholastic Standards Committee—Zareh
   5. Committee on Undergraduate Student Retention—Kinnick
F. Unfinished Business
   1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course Proposals—Levinson and Spolek
G. New Business
   1. Should the Faculty Senate move to CH 53 beginning Winter 1994—Oshika
H. Adjournment

The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the November 1 and 8, 1993, Senate Meetings
   President's Report, November 1, 1993
   Memo from Marvin Beeson/Franz Rad, November 8, 1993
   Questions and statistics related to General Education Program, OAA
   Memo from Duncan Carter to General Education Working Group
E2. Annual Report, Curriculum Committee
E3. Annual Report, Graduate Council
E4. Annual Report, Scholastic Standards Committee
F1. Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Course Proposals

NOTE: The report of the Committee on Undergraduate Student Retention has been mailed to Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate under separate cover.

National average: 2% increase in state support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>93-94 approp. in thousands</th>
<th>2-year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland State Univ.</td>
<td>44,076</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>13,394</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>12,591</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (1)</td>
<td>13,859</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU (2)</td>
<td>101,730</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>58,937</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO (1)</td>
<td>54,322</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community colleges</td>
<td>90,305</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student aid</td>
<td>12,404</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>17,111</td>
<td>+27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>428,099</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) offset by increased non-resident tuition revenue

(2) offset by shift of veterinary and some other state-wide services to lottery funding
To: PSU Faculty Senate

From: Marvin Beeson, Chair
Geology Department

Date: November 8, 1993

Subject: Proposed Sequence of Courses

Background information and our departmental views are summarized below:

1. These courses have been planned and initiated jointly by CE and Geology.

2. These courses have been offered as co-listed courses by these two departments for the past three years.

3. The course sequence content is nearly equally divided in the academic domains of CE and Geology.

4. The instructor has a joint appointment in CE and Geology and was hired for the purpose of teaching this sequence of courses.

5. The question of allocation of student credit hours is not an issue.

6. This is a case of cooperation and not duplication.

7. This is a case of a joint venture effort, as opposed to one department piggy-backing on the other.

The usefulness of co-listing is in several ways, among which are:

1. CE and Geology can each disseminate course information in their respective media, such as catalogs, program brochures, and announcements in their respective professional organizations newsletters.

2. Departmentally identified courses add significantly to the visibility of the department in the professional community, which is extremely important for recruitment.

3. Departmental autonomy is preserved, in that it is possible to include discipline-oriented topics/requirements for the two segments of students from the two departments.

We believe that courses whose contents are distributed nearly equally between two departments should be allowed to be co-listed if this distribution is pre-planned, and includes equal participation and coordination by the two departments. Also, we firmly believe that in these times of budget decline, the University should be encouraging more of these types of inter-departmental cooperative offerings, and not discourage and refuse them.

FNR:clc
PROPOSED SEQUENCE OF COURSES
IN GEOLOGY AND CIVIL ENGINEERING

G 475/575 INTRODUCTION TO SEISMOLOGY (3)
Earthquakes and exploration seismology, the origin and occurrence of earthquakes, nature and propagation of seismic waves in the earth, earthquakes as a hazard of life and property. Uses of reflection and refraction exploration seismology, borehole velocity measurements, seismic remote sensing and direct measurement techniques for earthquake hazard assessment and other science and engineering applications. This course is the same as CE 443/543; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: Senior or graduate standing.

G 476/576 SEISMIC EVALUATION (3)
The process of evaluating earthquake hazards in a region of specific location; methods of evaluating the seismic potential, and various hazards associated with seismic activity. Hazards include liquefaction, ground failure, and site amplification. Techniques for evaluating the susceptibility, potential, and severity of the hazards. Techniques of expressing and quantifying hazards for use by planners and designers. This course is the same as CE 445/545; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: G 475/575 or CE 443/543.

G 477/577 EARTHQUAKE ACCOMMODATION IN DESIGN (3)
Consideration of the effects of earthquake shaking and induced ground failure in the design of buildings, pipelines, bridges and dams. Incorporating the earthquake hazard assessment for a project in the design process. The goal of this course is to allow geologists, geotechnical engineers, structural engineers, and architects to see how their particular tasks are impacted by the earthquake effects. Types of analysis used to evaluate earthquake design requirements in several disciplines including geology, geotechnical engineering, structural engineering, and architecture. This course is the same as CE 448/548; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: G 476/576 or CE 445/545.

CE 443/543 INTRODUCTION TO SEISMOLOGY (3)
Earthquakes and exploration seismology, the origin and occurrence of earthquakes, nature and propagation of seismic waves in the earth, earthquakes as a hazard of life and property. Uses of reflection and refraction exploration seismology, borehole velocity measurements, seismic remote sensing and direct measurement techniques for earthquake hazard assessment and other science and engineering applications. This course is the same as G 475/575; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: Senior or graduate standing.

CE 445/545 SEISMIC EVALUATION (3)
The process of evaluating earthquake hazards in a region of specific location; methods of evaluating the seismic potential, and various hazards associated with seismic activity. Hazards include liquefaction, ground failure, and site amplification. Techniques for evaluating the susceptibility, potential, and severity of the hazards. Techniques of expressing and quantifying hazards for use by planners and designers. This course is the same as G 476/576; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: CE 443/543 or G 475/575.

CE 448/548 EARTHQUAKE ACCOMMODATION IN DESIGN (3)
Consideration of the effects of earthquake shaking and induced ground failure in the design of buildings, pipelines, bridges and dams. Incorporating the earthquake hazard assessment for a project in the design process. The goal of this course is to allow geologists, geotechnical engineers, structural engineers, and architects to see how their particular tasks are impacted by the earthquake effects. Types of analysis used to evaluate earthquake design requirements in several disciplines including geology, geotechnical engineering, structural engineering, and architecture. This course is the same as G 477/577; course may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: CE 445/545 or G 476/576.
Questions Related to the Proposed General Education Program
prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs, 1993

1. Is this an attempt to: a) do away with departments b) reduce graduate programs c) turn Portland State into an undergraduate institution?

No.

As the Committee's report states, the issue of General Education is a serious concern throughout Higher Education. The annual report from the American Association of Higher Education that surveys major issues on campuses throughout the United States indicates that 92% of the institutions are involved in revising general education. This is an issue of major concern not only because of the current criticism but also because the issue of assessment has become very central in accreditation processes. The proposed program reflects the direction many Universities are taking on general education. This proposal has been reviewed by Professor Jerry Gaff of the Association of American Colleges who is one of the major scholars on this topic and the author of Life for the College Curriculum (1991), by Dr. James Ratcliff and his associates at the Center for the Study of Higher Education and Penn State, and by Professor Arthur Levine who was the major author of the Carnegie Commission Report on general education. All of them have been extremely favorable in their evaluations and comments. Professor Gaff has indicated his interest in working with Portland State in the further development of the program, Dr. Ratcliff has requested that the proposal be published in the Journal of General Education as a model of a research-based approach to the development of a general education program.

General Education has not been the focus of attention in recent years and what we and most other institutions are now addressing are the effects of that neglect. It is an important issue in and of itself and deserves the attention of the entire faculty as a central part of our academic mission. As indicated above the efforts of the faculty committee and the various faculty discussions have resulted in a proposal that seriously addresses general education at Portland State. This endeavor is in no way intended to diminish the importance of our undergraduate disciplinary majors, our undergraduate professional majors, or our graduate programs. It is the case however that general education is the part of our curriculum that all students are involved in and is the one part of the curriculum that is a university wide concern.

The increased emphasis on the importance of general education is evident in both the national discussions about this issue and is evident in the new accreditation standards that our curriculum is expected to meet, particularly the new standards on assessment.

2. What are the budgetary implications of the Program?

Based on the information provided by the Deans on the budgetary implications of the proposed program, the full implementation of the program would require approximately $800,000 to support instructional costs of the four levels of course work proposed. In addition there would be the need to reallocate some current administrative activity to the program, and to provide support services and faculty development funds. Attached is a budgetary impact analysis prepared by the Dean's Office of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In instructional costs it approximates the impact assessment that has been done by the Deans of the Schools and by the Office of Academic Affairs. The costs other than direct instruction are more debatable. For example the 120 Capstone Liaisons, the Research Assistant for Assessment. There is also some difference of opinion on the instructional cost based on differing interpretations of the cost of the 200 and 300 level courses. The CLAS plan does not consider the possibility that a large number of 200 and 300 level courses that we now offer could be used under the new general education proposal if they were to include the objectives and goals identified in the proposal. It is important to remember that we now require 18 hours of upper division course work to meet the distribution requirements; in fact the course numbering system we now use originally reflected the distribution approach to general education and 300 level courses were not to carry pre-requisites. We have drifted away from that original structure and have turned to directing almost all of our 200 and 300 level course offerings to disciplinary purposes and away from general education purposes. The proposed plan would require that we be more conscious of the fact that if we require upper division work
as part of general education then we have an obligation to provide courses at that level that are truly
general education courses.

It is also important to recognize that the proposed program would be phased in over three to four years
and that the initial instructional costs to mount the first year of the program would be around $400,000.
Costs would increase to the $800,000 level incrementally over the period of implementation,
approximately $133,000 more each year.

OAA Budgetary impact assessments are:

1st year  $350,000-400,000 direct instructional costs
          Administrative costs $70,000 including OPE for program direction
          *classified support--$26,985
          *Assessment
          Faculty Development $120,000

(*these activities would become part of an Instructional Service Center that will have other support
functions and include faculty research on assessment.)

2nd year  $100,000 additional direct instructional costs

3rd year  $100,000 additional direct instructional costs
          Capstone Coordinator, $45,000 including OPE

4th year  $100,000 additional direct instructional costs

Total of fully implemented program:  $1,061,000 per year

Student mentor costs could be covered by using existing tuition remission program

3. ARE RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROGRAM?

In the 1993-94 budget we have $2,800,000 that are being used to cover the costs of the tenure
relinquishment program, curricular costs not in the base budget of departments, and special projects,
most of them matches for curriculum development grant funded projects.

Over the next two years $265,000 related to special projects will be available for reallocation, more
than enough to cover the administrative costs identified in the CLAS estimates.

$500,000 ($400,000 in 94-95, an additional $100,000 in 95-96) will cover direct instructional costs

$2,045,000 remains for direct program support over and above what is in 1993-94 department and/or
School budgets.

We have been averaging around 15 retirements a year for the last five years. It is very likely this
average will hold. In order to achieve the additional $300,000 of direct instructional costs for general
education, with even an average of five retirements over the next four years, we would release
$1,200,000. The reallocation of $300,000 to general education costs would still leave $900,000 for direct
department or School support.

The $120,000 for faculty development can be drawn from the revenue realized by the success of our
Summer School over recent years and is an appropriate way to use these revenues to support all
University projects.

There are two points that need to be emphasized in considering the allocation of available financial
resources. 1) the instructional resources attached to the proposed general education program would be
resources available to departments and schools. To consider them as separate funds that are diverted from academic programs implies that general education is not an important priority or that it is somehow separate from the responsibility of faculty and their disciplinary. We must consider that we have responsibilities in both areas of the curriculum and that general education is not simply a necessary intrusion into the disciplinary or professional major. Well planned general education supports all programs of study. The instructional resources for general education might well be used to allow departments that participate to acquire more graduate assistants or hire visiting faculty. 2) the State Board, the Chancellor, our own budget reduction plan all indicate that funds returned to us over the original budget reduction should be allocated to support new initiatives and educational reform. The proposed general education program would respond to those directives and still leave funds available to build disciplinary and graduate programs.

4. WHAT WOULD BE THE IMPACT OF ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY REDUCTIONS?

Additional reductions resulting from a decrease in state general funds in 1995-97 is a possibility. However we should be aware that doing nothing in the way of educational reform is not a secure strategy with which to confront the possibility of additional cuts. Our recent experience indicates that we will be in a stronger position to compete for resources if we have responded to the issues that are being raised nationally and locally about the need to emphasize a student oriented educational program. In the discussions on budget reductions for this biennium, there were recommendations that Portland State stop offering lower division courses and become an upper division and graduate institution. Many of us are opposed to this idea. Our ability to avoid such a change depends on how effectively we can demonstrate the unique value both to students and to our own educational program of continuing to offer lower division courses. A coherent, well designed program of general education that responds to the goals and outcomes being advocated for general education will make that position much stronger.

5. WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT ON PROGRAMS THAT LOSE STUDENT CREDIT HOURS AS A RESULT OF A DIFFERENT GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM?

The President and the Provost have both stated that support for programs at the departmental level should not be driven by student credit hour production. In fact an analysis of the correlation between student credit hours and reduction of faculty fte over the last ten years indicates that, at most, only one department in the entire University has an apparent correlation that could indicate that a decline in student credit hours resulted in a loss of faculty fte.

The President has frequently stated her view both within the institution, in the state, and nationally that we wish to develop a new budgetary allocation process that will not be based on sch production but on defined outcomes both at the departmental and university level.

It is clear that some departments with a small number of faculty cannot easily divert faculty resources from disciplinary requirements. The instructional resources for general education are necessary to allow the faculty in these departments to participate without damaging the departmental program.

6. WILL FACULTY RECEIVE APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION FOR PARTICIPATION IN A GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM?

The Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increase Guidelines can be revised to include specific reference to faculty contributions to general education. The President's Advisory Council which is charged in the Faculty Governance Procedures to oversee matters of faculty welfare can direct that such a revision be done; The Provost can direct that such a revision be undertaken. Revisions to the criteria in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines must be done in consultation with the AAUP.
General Education Curriculum
30 freshman core @ 15 credits - 30 students per course - 900 students
30 sophomore courses @ 12 credits - 40 students per course - 1200 students
40 junior/senior courses @ 12 credits - 50 students per course - 2000 students
120 capstones @ 6 credits - 15 students per course - 1800 students

5 instructors per freshman core course, each instructor teaches 5 sections
1 instructor and 1 community liaison per capstone course

Assumptions
1. General education faculty replaced with tenure track faculty
2. 80% of general education core faculty come from CLAS
   60% of capstone faculty come from CLAS
3. Average teaching load is 9 courses per year
4. 2/3 release time for participation in freshman core courses
   half of sophomore and junior/senior faculty released 3 credits for teaching 4 credits
   half of sophomore and junior/senior faculty released 6 credits for teaching 4 credits
   3 credit release for 6 credit capstone course
5. Leadership requires addition of asst/assoc dean
6. Effective capstone courses require a coordinator and community liaisons
7. Assessment procedures to be developed by existing faculty. Research assistant needed to collect and enter data.
8. Student mentors will receive tuition waiver
   1 mentor per freshman course
   1 mentor per 2 sophomore courses
9. General education advising will be done by faculty participating in the core in coordination with new asst/assoc dean
10. New faculty will teach 6 undergraduate and 3 graduate courses per year
11. Departments will review degree programs' requirements

Best guess of course substitutions and reductions for CLAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% reduc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Credit Hour Impact at 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>SCH Now</th>
<th>SCH Gen Ed</th>
<th>SCH Needed</th>
<th># of courses needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>26,568</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,068 @ 50</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>47,764</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>33,364 @ 60</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>60,870</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>36,870 @ 60</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>34,921</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>24,121 @ 23</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total courses needed to cover major & elective SCH = 827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Released by GE faculty</th>
<th>Courses Remaining</th>
<th>Courses Needed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty needed to cover 113 courses = 19 across PSU
Faculty needed in CLAS at 70% = 13
Faculty needed in CLAS at 80% =15

---

**CLAS faculty resources at 80% freshman, sophomore & junior, 60% capstone**

- 24 faculty @ 6 courses in freshman core
- 12 faculty @ 3 courses in sophomore courses
- 12 faculty @ 6 courses in sophomore courses
- 16 faculty @ 3 courses in junior/senior courses
- 16 faculty @ 6 courses in junior/senior courses
- 72 faculty @ 1 course in capstone

78 undergraduate fte (6 undergraduate courses per year) to general education
78/245 =32% of undergraduate fte devoted to general education

**CLAS faculty resources at 70% freshman, sophomore & junior, 60% capstone**

- 21 faculty @ 6 courses in freshman core
- 10 faculty @ 3 courses in sophomore courses
- 11 faculty @ 6 courses in sophomore courses
- 14 faculty @ 3 courses in junior/senior courses
- 14 faculty @ 6 courses in junior/senior courses
- 72 faculty @ 1 course in capstone

63 undergraduate fte (6 undergraduate courses per year) to general education
63/243 =26% of undergraduate fte devoted to general education
## Total Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>80% CLAS</th>
<th>70% CLAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 faculty @ 33,000 + 28.5% OPE</td>
<td>805,695</td>
<td>636,075</td>
<td>551,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst/Assoc Dean of General Education @ 55,000 + OPE</td>
<td>70,675</td>
<td>70,675</td>
<td>70,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary @ 21,000 + OPE</td>
<td>26,985</td>
<td>26,985</td>
<td>26,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant for Assessment @ 28,000 + OPE</td>
<td>35,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Coordinator @ 35,000 + OPE</td>
<td>44,975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Capstone Liaisons @ 1,345 + OPE</td>
<td>207,399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 student mentors @ 2,175 tuition reimbursement</td>
<td>97,875</td>
<td>97,875</td>
<td>97,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty Development</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

|                | 1,409,584 | 831,610  | 746,800  |

*Faculty Development

- Summer stipends for freshman core faculty 30 @ $3,000
- Faculty workshops $30,000
  - writing, assessment, cooperative learning environment, technology in the classroom, service learning
TO: Chuck White and the General Education Working Group

FROM: Duncan Carter, English
Coordinator, Writing-Intensive Course Pilot Program
Director of Writing, 1987-93

RE: Revisions/Clarifications of "Writing--Communication"

I have long been an advocate of the kind of coherent, integrated general education experience you propose. When writing requirements are isolated from the rest of the curriculum, students come to those courses with a large chip on their shoulders. Integrating writing into freshman inquiry courses and throughout this program should reinforce our belief that writing is always undertaken for some purpose, a purpose shaped in large part by the rhetorical context in which one finds oneself. And the idea that all faculty should share responsibility for student literacy is perfectly consonant with the goals of Writing Across the Curriculum.

I am especially pleased to see that under your proposal our students will not only do significantly more writing than at present, but that writing is broadly conceived. Students must learn to write, but they must also write to learn (that is, there is a good deal more to writing than grammar and mechanics). Proposed faculty development activities should assure that those teaching in this program come to share your broad conception of writing.

The English Department's Writing Committee and I are pleased to see that your revisions address our chief concerns: the needs of certain categories of at-risk students, and means of assuring that our graduates have met some minimal standard of writing proficiency.

We remain concerned about the status of writing teachers. Historically, responsibility for writing instruction at PSU (as at many institutions nationally) has slipped from tenure-track faculty to instructors and TAs who, in turn, have come to rest on soft money. It seems paradoxical to us that, as writing becomes more central to undergraduate education, writing faculty risk becoming more peripheral. We need to continue to work together to assure that implementation of this program will not continue this trend. Your suggestion that consultants from Alverno College and elsewhere might help us think through the specific roles of the Writing Lab, writing faculty, student mentors, and "writing consultants" is a good one.

Ultimately, however, I am persuaded that you are attuned to this problem and committed to working out some reasonable solution. No major change comes without risk. The many benefits of your proposal make those risks worth taking.

Therefore, I urge adoption.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 1 and 8, 1993
Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika
Secretary Pro Tern: Carl Wamser


Alternates Present: Becker for Burke, Casperson for Kocaoglu, Toth for Liebman, Adams for Talbott, Grubb for Visse.

Members Absent: Brenner, Briggs, Etesami, Gillpatrick, Kenny, Manning, Schaumann.


November 8

Presiding Officer: Beatrice Oshika
Secretary: Alan Cabelly


Members Absent: Briggs, Etesami, Gillpatrick, Jackson, Kenny, Manning, McGuire, Miller.

Ex-officio Members: Ahlbandt, Bowlden, Cabelly, Davidson, Diman, Erzurumlu, Everhart, Harris, Koch, Kosokoff, Ramaley, Reardon, Spolek, Toscan, Toulan, Vieira, Ward, Weikel, Wineberg.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM, noting that Carl Wamser had agreed to serve as Secretary pro tem in the absence of Alan Cabelly, who will be attending the memorial for Anna Bavetta.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Minutes of the October 4, 1993, were approved unanimously as submitted.

OSHIKA then made the following announcements:
There will be a memorial service for Anna Bavetta, Business Administration faculty member who died in a fall on Mt. Rainier on October 24. The service will be today at 4:00 P.M., at the Old Church. OSHIKA then asked for a moment of silence for the following faculty members who have recently passed away: Anna Bavetta, John Redman, Frank Roberts and Art Terry.

1. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

RAMALEY announced that those wishing to contribute to the Frank Roberts Scholarship Fund could do so through the Foundation. Those who wish to contribute to the Anna Bavetta Memorial Fund may do so at any branch of First Interstate Bank.

RAMALEY then distributed a report from the Chronicle of Higher Education, included in the minutes. The material was developed from Illinois State University. PSU is close to the national average in terms of its state support, while most other state institutions have done worse. Part of the reason for our success is the use of lottery funds for non-core programs, so we still have some difficulties. We now have a few years in which to demonstrate the effectiveness of our institution, in an attempt to continue receiving these monies. However, we are not out of the woods. But we should be proud of the fact that we are becoming a national model, identifying the nature of the campus and its faculty, and the relationship of PSU to the community and other educational institutions. This was the goal when Ramaley came to this campus a number of years ago. We also have developed a number of national audiences to address ways of receiving feedback and communicating our successes beyond our doors and state. We have a great deal of influence on what education means in this state, and how this definition it is developing nationwide. She expressed regret that she would have to leave for Anna Bavetta's service later in the day, because the discussion of curricular changes is at the heart of our university, and may be some of the most important changes on our campus in the next ten years.
2. **PROVOST'S REPORT**

REARDON noted that he would ask the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate to work with the Committee on Committees and help him form new *ad hoc* committees. One is needed for assessment based on accreditation needs and support of instructional changes, as directed by the State System. We must define assessment and outcomes that apply directly to us. This will also be done on a System-wide basis.

A next committee will work with administration to assess and develop models for support structures for instruction and for community activity. We have seen what other institutions have done; now is the time for faculty to develop this.

He is developing a question and answer sheet for general education reallocation, and hopes to have these estimates available by mid-week so they can be used for the final part of the general education discussion.

Finally, Diman has noted that Armageddon, Apocalypse, and Accreditation all begin with the letter A, and that preparation for accreditation is underway. Diman, Cooper and others have attended orientation seminars given by the Northwest Accrediting Association, and are preparing for that process. The ten-year accreditation visit is tentatively scheduled for April 12-14, 1995. Prof. Cooper is chairing the committee, and preparing for our self study. The draft report will be delivered to the accrediting team by winter 1995. There are new accreditation standards, which will respond to much of the national debate on higher education. This is likely to lead to more rigorous standards with new guidelines.

COOPER agreed that this will be more rigorous. He said we should expect to be required to provide data and evidence. Our faculty committee structure will be called upon to assist in the process.

3. **Jan KURTZ,** President of the PSU Alumni Association, thanked faculty for the opportunity to speak about the Association, and noted that she had received significant opportunities as a student. Scott Kaden is also present today. She asked for assistance from faculty in a number of outreach opportunities. First, the Student Affairs Committee has sponsored internships in the past, and is now offering its first scholarship to children of alumni. They are also designing significant internships, perhaps to be tied to the capstone experience of the new general education proposal.

The next opportunity is the PSU Advocates Committee, which has been quite active in the political arena in the past year. It has told the PSU story to the legislature, and has recently held a sales tax forum. It will now work more directly with a number of specific legislators. The Outreach Committee’s goal is to reconnect more alums with the university, letting them see how PSU still can be important in their lives. Finally, PSU Weekend, November 12-14, showcases the value of PSU in the community.
KURTZ concluded by making three requests of faculty. Volunteers for activities and board members are needed; let the Association know which alumni will be good for this. Secondly, information about alumni accomplishments should be communicated to the Association. Finally, we need to invite alums to campus activities that our departments hold. The Alumni Office will help faculty with mailing lists. We all need to continue working together, as this will help our mutual goals. OSHIKA also noted the importance of the relationship.

D. **Questions for Administrators**

There were no questions.

E. **REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES**

TUFTS gave the fall registration report. Headcount is 14,486, down 3.5% from last year. Total credit hours are down 3.3%.

F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

G. **NEW BUSINESS**

1. OSHIKA noted that SPOLEK, Graduate Council Chair, was at class, and would be late. LEVINSON reported for the Curriculum Committee. He noted one correction: for Ch 332, concurrent enrollment in Ch 338 is strongly recommended. JOHNSON/BOWLDEN moved to accept the Curriculum Committee changes listed in G1. JOHNSON then moved to amend G1, adding the colisting of 3 courses in GEOL and CE, courses on earthquakes and seismology (a Nov. 1, 1993 memo notes the rationale for this; a slightly amended memo of Nov. 8, 1993, written by Marvin Beeson, Geology Department Chair, and Franz Rad, Civil Engineering Department Chair, is provided with these minutes):

   \[ G 475 = CE 443 \]
   \[ G 476 = CE 445 \]
   \[ G 477 = CE 448 \]

JOHNSON then summarized many of the points of the memo.

LEVINSON indicated that CE courses were initially approved by the Curriculum Committee, and that the dual listing came out of Graduate Council discussions. He noted that a memo from the University of Oregon from the State Board indicated that dual listing was not allowed. A discussion then ensued in an
attempt to determine the difference between co-listing, dual listing, and cross listing. SMITH supported the need of both departments to offer these courses. It is vital that the community see these courses. Others indicated that many courses are cross listed throughout the university. Some are courses that the two departments share.

OSHIKA noted that she would welcome a motion to table the proposal in the absence of a representative from the Graduate Council.

MIDSON, however, stated that he would prefer to put these courses in place now, and alter it later if necessary. If there were a problem, we would have to change many university courses. TOULAN agreed that many courses would be in violation of the alleged memo. DIMAN suggested that we ask each department for their input: BEESON said that his students would prefer Geology courses, while SMITH and LALL noted that both students and employers preferred a CE listing. BEESON noted that this was an attempt to move into the cooperative mode that we are examining for the entire university. It was then suggested that the issue be sorted out by Curriculum Committee. FORBES said that the amendment was simple, made sense, seemed like the thing to do, and called for question. OSHIKA reminded everyone that the first vote was on whether to add the amendment of the three cross-listed courses to the Curriculum Committee motion. The amendment PASSED unanimously by voice vote. In response to a question, OSHIKA noted that the Faculty Senate would be voting simply on the undergraduate portion of the proposal.

In response to a question from SVOBODA about overlap of MTH 465 and 466 with research/methods courses in other departments, OSHIKA noted that MTH 464 was formerly MTH 460. Regarding overlap, LEVINSON noted that a Math department statement indicated there was not overlap with other courses in the Math department. BJORK then stated that, at the undergraduate level, there is no other course like this. It is taught by a professional statistician. He suggested that the Graduate Council examine overlap of graduate courses. OSHIKA reiterated that the graduate portion would come up at the next meeting.

The amended motion, for undergraduate courses, PASSED with one negative vote.

2. DAVID JOHNSON, noting that he rarely speaks at the Faculty Senate, moved in the strongest possible terms, to accept the report written by the General Education Working Group, along with the motion in G2. WOLLNER seconded.

MOOR/FORBES offered the following substitute motion: “That the Senate approve in principle the adoption of a pilot program wherein the general education program proposed by the General Education Working Group would be
made available to entering first term freshmen as an optional alternative to the present requirements, and that the proposal be referred to the appropriate faculty committees for their review and recommendations."

OSHIKA, without objection, offered to turn the meeting into an informal consideration of the question as if we were a committee of the whole. This eases some of the parliamentary rules. In response to a question by A. JOHNSON, OSHIKA noted that one possibility is that the vote on the proposal would occur on November 8.

FRANKS noted that Senators would be receiving data from OAA in mid-week, and would like to ensure that no vote be taken before we have the information. With that stipulation, she had no objection to moving into informal discussion. OSHIKA stated that we were now in that informal mode.

WHITE described modifications (the October 27, 1993 report) to the Senate. He also discussed the handout from Duncan Carter, describing how the program fits into the Writing Intensive Course Pilot Program. White showed what the new General Education Program looks like. He also noted that the following people have been added to the Working Group: Devorah Lieberman, Speech Communication, and Carol Mack, Chair of Curriculum and Instruction in the School of Education. He also thanked the committee members for their dedication and their work, and described the excitement that members still have after eleven months of work.

Changes in the October 27, 1993, report include the following:

1. Freshmen courses are not traditional core, and are now referred to as "Freshman Inquiry," which more accurately reflects the mission.
2. Duncan Carter helped improve the writing aspect throughout the four years of the program.
3. Suggestions by Darrell Millner and Johanna Brenner significantly improved diversity across the curriculum.
4. Interdisciplinary aspects of the program continue to be improved, especially at the sophomore through senior levels.
5. Course clusters continue to be improved.
6. The committee name has been changed, to delete the word "advisory."

WHITE then discussed the merits of program. The key focus is on ENHANCEMENT of student education. FEASIBILITY is generally not addressed by committee’s charge, and will receive responses from the Provost. The question of whether to have a PILOT PROGRAM is important. Phased implementation is required by the current proposal. The program will be phased in over a four year time period. The committee argues that pilot concept is
vague, complex, confusing, costly, and uncertain. It would also be unclear about when to end the pilot.

A. JOHNSON asked what the status of the General Education Committee was, whether it was constitutional or otherwise. REARDON noted that implementation would be considered by appropriate Faculty Senate bodies.

BOWLDEN wanted to know why a pilot was desirable. MOOR thought that there were significant concerns that full-scale implementation would presumably direct resources from underfunded departments. He wondered whether the benefits would be worth the cost. He also wondered what the academic benefits of the new program were. A pilot would enable us to determine whether the approach actually works. This would also allow us to determine what the outcomes are.

In response to OSHIKA’s questions, REARDON thought that the new program might help resource allocations, and might give the university better assessment methods. He also thought that many other benefits might accrue to the university. These might go beyond what otherwise might be expected. BEESON thought control groups would help us evaluate the program. He stated that there are many models across the country, some as pilots, some as phased-in, and some as voluntary.

MIDSON thought the pilot would really need four years or more, because the normal expectation is a four year phase-in.

REECE wondered what committees would be involved in implementation. OSHIKA thought these would be those normally involved in curriculum, such as the Curriculum Committee, ARC, and the like. MOOR, REECE, and OSHIKA all thought that we would need to specify future committee work.

DAVIDSON thought that freshmen orientation was not comparable to general education, and would not make a good comparison to the General Education Freshman Inquiry.

DeCARRICO wondered if an optional program would make the reallocation of resources even more difficult than the current proposal. WHITE thought that if the program were optional, he would expect most students to take the new program. He noted that incoming freshman can graduate under their catalog or any newer one, so the old plan would be required for 7 years also.

TOULAN reminded the assembly that we need curricular reform. The current proposal is as good as any; a pilot program would lead to confusion, and educational objectives would not be achieved. We as faculty are here to make
crucial educational decisions for the students. A pilot would not be an appropriate control group, but would be biased toward student selection based on advisor or student perception. DAVID JOHNSON agreed, noting that the pilot would not meet either educational or cost objectives. We should be reminded that course content is based on faculty control; this proposal would restore faculty positions on the basis of majors.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4:45 p.m. OSHIKA returned the Senate to formal session. A. JOHNSON moved to adjourn; the motion was approved, and OSHIKA noted that the Senate would continue on November 8.

THE SENATE RECONVENE ON NOVEMBER 8 AT 3:00 P.M.

OSHIKA called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM and made the following announcements:

1. There has been trouble with the mailings. Anyone who does not receive a mailing by November 29 should call Alan Cabelly at 5-3789.

2. The next Steering Committee meeting will be November 15, at 3:00 PM, in SBA 690.

3. There is consideration of moving the Senate to CH 53, the newly remodeled room with the Starship Enterprise technology. Senators are asked to consider whether they would like to move.

4. There are minor editorial changes to be made to G2, p. 1:
   Freshman "Year" should be changed to Freshman "Inquiry."
   The word "core" should be deleted.
   #2: Delete the words, "Each course must be"
   Bottom line: delete the word "core"

5. All senators should have received two handouts from the Provost's office: "Questions Related..." and "General Education Curriculum."

Continuation of G1

A. JOHNSON/DeCARRICO moved the acceptance of the Graduate Council recommendations, with the addition of the Beeson/Rad memo of November 8.

SPOLEK noted that the Graduate Council had been asked to do this, but felt that the dual listing was inappropriate because they felt that the content was not dual. The departments and the Senate Steering Committee asked them to reconsider, which they did, without coming to a new decision. There was concern about precedent, and about misleading students. The Council felt that two courses should be listed as Geology, and one as Civil Engineering. RAD knew that the
memo had been given to the Graduate Council, and that this is not duplication, but is anti-
duplication. The courses are half civil engineering and half geology. This is a joint venture, and
should be encouraged. Part of the goal is to upgrade the level of earthquake awareness in both
the general public and the technical professional community. These courses will help this occur.

DIMAN read from the December 3, 1990 report of the University Curriculum Committee,
where it discussed cross-listing: "'Cross-listing' occurs when two or more departments share
responsibility and perhaps SCH for one course but list that course in the Bulletin and Time
Schedule with separate department prefixes." The report later says that "The Committee has
adopted for Bulletin purposes the following policy, based on OSU's practice, for cross-listed
courses: (1) Such courses must contain the same numbers, titles, credits, and prerequisites,
with prefixes indicating the departments offering the course; (2) Descriptions for such courses
must reflect identical content; (3) A distinctive indicator (such as "slash-listing") must indicate
clearly (a) that each course is cross-listed and (b) which department is primarily responsible for
it; and (4) the Bulletin must state that a cross-listed course may only be taken once." DIMAN
thought that this policy has not been changed.

SVOBODA asked why the Graduate Council differed from this policy. SPOLEK said that the
Graduate Council had not been aware of the policy, and had asked for this type of information.
Another institution had been told that it could not do this. Finally, the Council still felt that the
courses were distinct in their content: two geology, and one civil engineering. In response to
a question form DAVID JOHNSON, SPOLEK noted that he has not found the specific
requirement given to the other institution. RAD thought that if a policy prohibiting cross listing
existed, then it has been violated many times on this campus. SMITH noted that the instructor
has roots in both disciplines, and that the content has developed in both simultaneously.
PARSHALL believed that the proposal met the university guidelines; TOTH thought that if the
proposal had been accepted at the undergraduate level, it should also be accepted at the graduate
level.

HOLLOWAY recalled that he had been chair of the Curriculum Committee when the policy read
by DIMAN had been written. He said that this kind of decision had been just fine. HALE
thought that the proposal should be approved with the stipulation that the numbers be brought
into alignment; RAD noted that this had been tried, and that because of different numbering
systems, this was impossible. This will not cause confusion to the students, because they will
not be switching between departments.

SVOBODA asked that the overlap between MTH 565/566, Experimental Design and Methods,
and other applied statistics and research design courses be clarified. SPOLEK stated that the
math department had responded by saying that these were theoretical courses, were not discipline
specific, so approved the courses. SVOBODA thought that there was much research design
overlap on campus, and asked what the general view towards this was. SPOLEK thought that
no permanent policy decisions would be made now, but that the current Graduate Council was
willing to allow each discipline to develop their own courses, after consultation with the Math
department.
In response to TOTH’s question, RAD noted that a student would not be permitted to take any course more than one time, except by normal university rules allowing a student to repeat a course. A student could get credit for the course content only one time.

KRUG called for the question, G1 as amended by the November 8 Beeson/Rad memo. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Continuation of G2

OSHIKA noted that there were two motions on the floor, the main motion as proposed by the General Education Working Group (with minor editorial changes as noted earlier), and the motion by MOOR (listed with the November 1 minutes) to substitute a pilot program.

Without objection, OSHIKA asked that the Senate return to informal session, as it had on November 1. No objection occurred, and the informal session began.

In response to FARR’s question, WHITE noted that it was not required that every course be interdisciplinary. BEESON then assumed that all courses be reproposed in the Curriculum Committee, because they are not in the catalog as 4-credit courses. WHITE noted that the fourth credit is writing/communication, and that it would of course go before the Curriculum Committee. OSHIKA then stated that all curriculum revisions would go through the normal processes.

MOOR asked PERRIN if the analysis done by the Provost’s office considers this. She said that her analysis was based on student credit hours, and that it was looked at on a course-by-course basis to see how it would affect the numbers. Release time might be the only area impacted by the extra credit.

In response to TOTH’s question, WHITE noted that all new courses would have to pass through some screening process. TOTH was also concerned that scheduling would become random or cafeteria style, simply with a set of mixed components. WHITE stated that the General Education Committee would ensure that clusters fit together. SVOBODA then asked if the workshop group would ensure that each cluster touched on all goals. WHITE noted that each 4-credit course and track does not touch on all the goals. However, students taking various courses will touch on most goals.

REARDON thought that the real key is to provide a mechanism to allow faculty to respond to General Education needs. We cannot anticipate what every course would look like before it moved into place. The important process is to keep General Education from drifting once it began. A mechanism to foster this is needed.

BEESON then asked if there were mechanics to force students to take math and science. LATIOLAI, noting that he is the committee member from the Math Department, said that the courses are being developed to have numeracy, elementary statistics, and algebra. The basic
foundation will exist. GRECO then asked about the requirement to have, e.g., a literature student be required to take a science track. Will we require students to take courses from outside of their major track, in interdisciplinary tracks. WHITE said that the University of Washington has sequences/clusters so the experience range occurs; however, advising is important. WHITE does not envision a student graduating without science.

BJORK, noting that he is a former freshman advisor, wondered what would happen if a freshman responded only to professional goals, ignoring the general education requirement. WHITE said that the student must take freshman inquiry before the sophomore requirements.

FARR, referring to p. 1 of the OAA report, thought that the new plan directs most 200 and 300 courses to disciplinary courses and not to general education. That moves us away from the philosophy of exposing people have coursework outside of their discipline, and into developing skills. BALSHEM thought that this would happen only if we allowed it to occur. Our thinking/teaching allow us to reach out in scholarship/teaching. As a personal exercise, she listed all the courses she taught, and asked herself what she was trying to achieve in these courses. In particular, what is the specific body of knowledge, and then what was the meta level of analysis? For many courses she really needs the assistance of some other faculty member to teach what she truly desires. The interdisciplinary approach facilitates this. At the heart of this proposal is the agenda of what we desire to do at this university.

WINEBERG, Chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, read the following prepared text:

I am troubled by the fact that the Faculty Senate is being asked to vote on the General Education Working Group Proposal, that if approved, would completely overhaul the undergraduate curriculum; yet, there is nothing in the proposal about how to implement the curricular changes.

I find it incomprehensible that the proposal eliminates the diversity requirement. The Academic Requirements Committee spent two years evaluating the merits of a diversity requirement including how to implement such a requirement. The diversity requirements has been in effect for only one year and already there is a move to eliminate this requirement with the rationale being that too many courses can be used to meet the diversity requirement; yet, this is exactly what the Faculty Senate wanted. In the winter of the 1991-92 academic year, the Academic Requirements committee drafted a proposal outlining the criteria to be used in evaluating what constitutes a diversity course. The Faculty Senate would not approve the ARC’s proposal stating that the criteria were too narrow. The ARC was instructed to revise the criteria making it more inclusive, the result being that about 110 courses can be used to meet the diversity requirement.

It seems ludicrrous to eliminate the diversity requirement with the hope that diversity will somehow be introduced into the curriculum. Why not amend the current proposal to include the diversity requirement? If after several years it is show that diversity issues
have been incorporated into the undergraduate curriculum, then it would make sense to eliminate the diversity requirement.

The proposal has substantial gaps when it comes to transfer students. According to the proposal, a transfer student who comes in as a sophomore (i.e., has 45 credits) does not have to take the freshman inquiry courses. A transfer student who comes in with 43 or 44 credits would be required to take 15 hours of freshman inquiry. This will cause much ill will and animosity among these transfer students not to mention the possible financial implications for the students. Secondly, what happens to someone who takes the first freshman inquiry course and then does not attend school winter term? Will this person have to wait until next winter to continue the sequence? What if the core faculty have changed and the student has completed only two of the three required freshman courses? Does he have to start all over again?

It would be prudent to address some of these issues before voting on the proposal. Why not allow the appropriate senate committees an opportunity to discuss some of these issues and then report back to the Faculty Senate in the January meeting with their comments before voting on the proposal.

REECE noted that the October 27 document, on p. 6 and 7, addresses diversity. He read the following from the report: "First, faculty teaching in the general education program will be required to complete faculty development which focuses upon how to include diversity issues within the courses they are developing or adapting for the program." "The second element of our approach will be to insure that persons with expertise in developing and delivering courses related to diversity, particularly those faculty who teach in the Women's Studies and Black Studies Programs, are members of the general education committee." REECE thought that this would increase, not decrease knowledge of diversity among students. Committee members feel that there will be a great deal more, not less teaching of diversity within the new program.

TOULON compared the new curriculum to architecture. When you start building, you do not start with the furniture. You start with the foundation. The question we should look at is on the quality of the concept. Many problematical issues of implementation will be resolved later. This document is as good as any we could develop. We could be here until next Monday if we want to list and examine all the details. OSHIKA thought that this statement was true, and suggested that now might be a plausible time to go back to regular session to resolve this. BEESON agreed, but thought that the substitute motion deals with this. He thought that the details were important, and that the pilot responded to that. TOULON clarified his point, stating that the committee could have responded to all the details if it had developed a 300 or 400 page document. This probably was not feasible.

AHLBRANDT, agreeing with Toulon, thought that there could be problems with any new proposal. He stated that his perspective at PSU was a new one, so he wanted to look at what attributes employers tell us they need from workers. These include the ability to communicate, the ability to work within teams, to be flexible, to made decisions with limited data. These are
all key elements in this proposal. In todays world of work, we are going from a very hierarchical to a decentralized work environment with flexibility and interdisciplinary teamwork, with cycle time reduction and rapid decision making. These are the kinds of strategies that are making companies competitive; those who cannot adapt to this will not achieve success in the years ahead. Our new curriculum helps companies in our region and our students grapple with these issues. He expressed the fact that he will be proud to be associated with this new curriculum. We should move ahead now without a pilot because this is fundamentally good here; it is not right to make students wait to work out all the nuts and bolts.

DAVID JOHNSON wanted to reiterate what Deans Toulon and Ahlbrandt said. He had many remarkable discussions with people on both sides of the question. Most faculty are seeking answers, are working together to improve general education. MOOR thought that the motive is that there is uncertainty about the quality of the proposal. Thus, we do not want to expand on something that might limit our ability to teach. We are unsure about the benefits; with this uncertainty, it is unwise to take the risks. He believed that the benefits of pilot are the same as full scale implementation, without the risks. If the proposal fails, a wholesale move would cost much. The risk is not worth taking. REARDON reminded the Senate that the only students for whom this is required would be new PSU students, entering in the fall of 1994, with no prior college. If this is a pilot, with student options, we can not test it because it would not involve random selection. REARDON also wanted to know how we would assess the pilot because we have no goals of current program. MOOR reserved the right to answer these questions later.

DeCARRICO thought that a pilot project would not lead to full commitment of the faculty, so the results would be different. If this were done on a full scale basis, we would all be committed, giving a better chance of success. DAVIDSON commented on the cost/benefit process, from the benefit standpoint. She had previously been involved in a similar program, where the benefits to the faculty were strong with little cost. The faculty became engaged with people they had never worked with, enlivening themselves, and revitalizing their careers.

WINEBERG saw no comments about evaluation or implementation in the proposal. He wondered whether this or another group would implement it.

BUNCH was impressed with the proposal, noting that the President said that this might be the most important action taken on this campus in ten years. He was also impressed with the fact that the deans were as positive as they were about it. However, the US Senate is dealing with problems, and finds it important to deal with the details. Items such as NAFTA, welfare, and health care begin with pilot programs: Wisconsin pilots welfare reform, and Oregon health care reform. This might be a great principle, but we might be moving too fast. The devil is in the details. At some point, the whole faculty should be brought in on the decision making if we want their commitment.

EVERHART identified problems with the pilot. By 1996 all high school students graduating will have had a curriculum that matches up with this one. By 1996 the high schools might be more advanced than we are if we only implement a pilot. GRECO thought that full
implementation would let us respond to the tough questions that are being raised. WOLLNER endorsed what has recently been stated by Deans Everhardt and Ahlbrandt. There are many external pressures and variables favoring a full scale move into the program.

OSHIKA, without objection, moved the Senate back to a regular session.

MOOR wanted to answer the question of assessment. He thought that it would be difficult to assess success of a pilot in the absolute. We would simply use outcome measures before and after for both programs. Determining this is like finding a cure for cancer. If I pray and you use medicine, we can see the results and then make comparisons. He agrees with much of what is in the proposal; there are many good concepts here, including the opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary work. PERRIN stated that we can assess old vs. new by comparing new "no prior academic credit" freshman with new "few prior credit" freshman who will take the old program. This is a built in pilot. SCHAUMANN thought that the pilot would give us a built in control. If we go to the new program, we cannot evaluate the new program.

The Question was called. The motion to substitute the pilot program FAILED, by a secret ballot of 32 to 15.

COOPER then asked about the impact of general education on reaccreditation. The questions to be asked include whether you have a clear general education goals, and whether you have evaluated your success towards achieving these goals. WHITE said that, if approved, skillful people on campus could immediately begin the assessment phase.

In response to a question from A. JOHNSON, OSHIKA stated that the proposed implementation date was fall 1994, with freshman inquiry classes beginning at that time.

LALL was concerned about the flexibility in the system. In particular, he wanted to know what would happen with people who come in and out of university. WHITE noted that these are year-long courses. LALL would like to see stand alone courses. WHITE said that there has been much discussion about this issue: e.g., if a student takes off winter, could the student return in the spring. They could, and pick up what they missed in the summer. In response to A. JOHNSON's question, WHITE preferred keeping students together for pedagogical reasons, but realized that this could not be required. Students will be advised to do so, but will have much flexibility.

FOSQUE asked about student retention, wondering what would happen if much transferring between groups occurred. WHITE thought that it probably will not happen this way, and OSHIKA thought that many contingencies were possible. WHITE then agreed with SCHAUMANN's assumption that students picking up many credits in the summer would not be effective because of summer jobs. He preferred that most of the course work be within the three academic terms.

ERZURUMLU was interested in the broader picture, noting that this is a major step towards a
new way of advancing general education, and that the committee has given us a method of resolving what is a national issue. Fine tuning will of course be necessary, but PSU becoming a leader in this is great.

RAMALEY repeated the analogy of building construction, noting that it always has changes after the blueprint has been approved. Here we want to define the "Form Given Goals," then work through the furniture, color of upholstery, etc. It is terribly important to trust our judgment and our faculty; we will be able to solve many of these problems later. e.g., Mary Ricks can provide much of the data needed to see if our freshmen will get out of synch. We have fifteen years of data, and can agree on a broad base of national experience. We then are taking the national experience and relating it to our campus. We have escrowed the resources needed to do this. We don't have to argue about the dollars needed to make this work. The Provost's answers say the dollars are in the bank. This is the lowest risk approach that we can take to solve this problem, and I commend all those who have spent their time and thoughtful attention on this.

WINEBERG wanted to know who will review and implement the program. OSHIKA stated that these discussions have begun, and that the course changes will go through standard university governance processes.

The Question was called. The main motion in G2, to implement the General Education proposal PASSED, by a secret ballot of 37 to 9.

OSHIKA announced that there was sherry available at K-House. She congratulated and thanked everyone involved for their hard work.

ADJOURNMENT

OSHIKA adjourned the meeting at 4:45 PM
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE
December 6, 1993

Members: Teresa Bulman (CLAS), David Cox (ED), Faryar Etesami (EAS), Dawn Graff-Haight (UPA), Paul Latiolais (CLAS), Al Levinson (Chair, CLAS), Bill Manning (SBA), Anne McMahon (LIB), Gary Petersen (ASPSU), Marjorie Terdal (CLAS), Linda Walton (CLAS), Emily Young (SFPA)

Consultants: Linda Devereaux (OAA), Mary Ricks (OIRP), Nancy Tang, Rod Diman (Vice Provost)

Procedure: The committee operated as it had in the previous year (see Report to the Faculty Senate December 7, 1992).

Policy: In response to the Steering Committee request last year that we examine the possibility of streamlining the curricular process to a one-year process (see Report to the Senate Dec. 7, 1992), we do not see a way to streamline the present process. The review process now in place might be streamlined but only at the expense of loss of review at some level.

Regarding courses listed in the PSU BULLETIN that have not been offered regularly, we believe that an honest statement of what courses are available requires that courses not offered for a six year period either be offered or be expunged automatically by OAA. If a course that has not been offered for six years is to be offered then a new course outline should be prepared and filed with the committee. The committee recommends that OAA require a justification from departments for keeping courses in the BULLETIN as exemptions to this policy.

Regarding the use of the 410 designation the committee notes that there does not appear to be uniformity across campus of the review of 410 courses. Also, there is a question about how many times a given 410 may be offered before it must be reviewed as a new course offering with appropriate prerequisites. Three times may be some peoples' understanding and the committee believes that to be reasonable. The committee recommends that departmental curriculum committees review all 410 courses taught and proposed to be taught in their departments and that such courses must have appropriate prerequisites and that they may only be offered three times at which point they are either submitted for review as new courses or dropped. OAA presumably could police this.

We discussed revisions in the format of the forms used for proposing changes in programs or courses to make better use of modern word processing and obtain a more useful document. As part of this proposed revision we adopted 50 minutes of class time as equal to one hour for the purpose of stating hours/week for lecture course outlines. The revision of the forms themselves will be a project for the future.

Regarding dual listing of courses, we agreed that a general policy should be formulated
but that more information than we had available was needed. We have a number of such courses now. The committee noted that the members had not been supplied with information on existing System or institutional guidelines, regulations or traditions on curricular matters. Also, it is not at all clear that a policy statement by a committee binds all future committees, especially if there is no mechanism for making a committee aware of previous policy statements. Except for carryover in the membership from previous years, there was no knowledge of policy decisions from past years. This is an unsatisfactory situation. The collection of available information should be a high priority for future committees. One method that was discussed to perpetuate such information would be to include all policy decisions in the annual report to the Senate and to distribute a collection of these reports each year to each incoming committee member. It has become apparent recently that a vehicle independent of the administration, such as the Senate Steering Committee or the Committee on Committees, would be desirable. As an alternative, consideration might be given to having all curricular proposals come directly to the Senate.

Curricular Actions: The committee took the following curricular actions during the 1993 calendar year.

Child and Family Studies Undergraduate Major: The committee approved the proposed undergraduate degree program.

Program Changes: The committee approved the following program changes:
- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: Chemistry: Increase hours by one; Geology: Split into two degree options, Geology and Applied Geology;
- Sociology: Change in major requirements:
- School of Engineering and Applied Science: Change in Computer Science minor;
- Electrical Engineering: Changes in BS program and major; Mechanical Engineering: Change in BS requirement.
- School of Business Administration: Information Services and Quantitative Analysis: Change in program description.
- School of Urban and Public Affairs: Administration of Justice: Change in major requirement.

New Courses and Course Changes Approved:

College of Liberal Arts and Science:
- Chemistry (5 changes)
- Economics (3 changes)
- Geology (4 new courses, 8 changes, 2 drops)
- Mathematics (2 new courses, 4 changes)
- Philosophy (2 new courses)
- Political Science (1 new course, 1 change, 4 drops)
- Physics (2 new courses, 2 changes)
- Psychology (1 new course)
- Sociology (2 changes, 1 drop)
- Speech Communications (1 new course, 2 changes)
School of Engineering

Civil Engineering (3 new courses, 1 change)
Computer Science (4 changes)
Electrical Engineering (4 new courses, 2 changes, 1 drop)

School of Fine and Performing Arts
Music (1 new course)
Theater Arts (1 change)

School of Urban and Public Affairs
Administration of Justice (2 new courses, 2 changes, 1 drop)

School of Business Administration
Information Services and Quantitative Analysis (5 new courses, 4 of which replace existing courses, 2 changes)

Summary: 28 new courses, 39 changes and 13 drops.

Other Action: Considerations of four proposals, two from English and one each from Philosophy and Physics, were deferred at the request of the departments. Two course proposals from Civil Engineering, CE 443 and CE 445 and one from Geology, G 477, were not approved. A proposed program change in the Geology major was withdrawn.
DATE: November 8, 1993

TO: Alan Cabelly, Secretary
    Faculty Senate

FROM: Graig Spolek, Chair
    Graduate Council

RE: 1993 Graduate Council Annual Report

Appreciation is extended to the members of the 1993 Graduate Council:

Carl Abbott, Lois Breedlove, Eileen Brennan, Sharon Carstens, Gordon Dodds, Mary
Jane Dresser, Dean Frost, Lewis Goslin, Stan Hillman, Ken Peterson, Barbara
Sestak, Robert Shotola, Janet Wright

Consultants: Roy Koch, C. William Savery, Robert Tufts, Linda Devereaux, Berni
Pilip

ROLE OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council is established by the Faculty Constitution and is charged with the duties
outlined on page 11 of the 1993-94 Faculty Governance Guide. These duties include the
development and recommendation of University policies; establishment of procedures and
regulations for graduate studies; adjudication of petitions regarding graduate regulations;
recommendation of suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs;
coordination of graduate activities with regard to requests for changes in existing courses, requests
for new courses and programs, and changes in existing graduate programs.

ACTIONS

Graduate Petitions
The Chair continued the procedure of appointing a revolving subcommittee to read student petitions
submitted to the Graduate Council; however, there were two petitions upon which the entire
Council deliberated. During the 1992-93 academic year, the Graduate Council acted on 90
petitions which is a 28% increase over the previous year. Overall 83% of the petitions were
approved, slightly less than the 89% approval rate in 1991-92. Three of every five petitions (54)
requested a waiver of the one-year deadline for removal of incomplete, an extension of the seven
year limit on course work, or a waiver of the course transfer limits. The results of the petition
activity and analysis for the year are attached.

Joint Ph.D. Dissertations
The Graduate Council adopted in 1991 the policy that disallows joint authorship of Ph.D.
dissertations. This year, the Council was asked to grant an exception to that policy. The Council
overwhelmingly reaffirmed its original decision, denying the exception.

700-numbered Courses
The Graduate Council considered the request to modify the university policy regarding 700 level
courses to indicate that they cannot be used for an advanced degree. The council voted
unanimously to retain the current wording that they cannot be used for an academic degree.
POLICY DECISIONS

Retroactive Credit Level Change of 400/500 Courses
Since all 400/500 level courses are approved with a provision stating that the requirements for undergraduate and graduate students differ, and since it is assumed that the courses are taught as approved, the Graduate Council finds it inconsistent that undergraduate credit earned in a 400-level class can be retroactively changed to graduate credit in a 500-level class. As a result, it will be the policy of the Graduate Council that petitions to retroactively change from 400-level undergraduate credit to 500-level graduate credit will no longer be accepted.

Readmission of Disqualified Students
The Graduate Council approved a revised procedure for the readmission of a graduate student following academic disqualification. For students seeking readmission within two years of disqualification, completion of a re-enrollment form will be required. For students seeking readmission more than two years after disqualification, full admission procedures must be followed.

Conditionally Admitted Students
A student admitted to the University on a conditional basis due to low GPA will obtain regular status after completing 9 graded graduate hours with a 3.00 GPA. A student on conditional status due to low GPA who does not achieve a 3.00 GPA after completing 9 graded graduate hours will have his/her admission changed to "Deny, did not meet conditions" and will become a non-admitted student. This policy should be implemented by the end of fall term 1993.

NEW PROGRAMS

The Graduate Council approved the School of Education's Superintendent Endorsement. Education does not plan to offer the program until sufficient resources are available.

The Japanese Endorsement proposed by the School of Education and the Foreign Language department was approved.

PROGRAM CHANGE APPROVALS

The following program changes were approved by the Graduate Council during the year. The full program change proposal for the MBA is available in the Reserve Library.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
TESOL: Drop comprehensive exams, add core courses.

School of Business Administration
Masters in Business Administration: Entirely revise curriculum, numerous new courses.

School of Urban and Public Affairs
Administration of Justice: Replace AJ 507 Integrative Seminar with AJ 515 Theories of Crime and Justice.
Urban and Regional Planning: Remove USP 562 as part of the core and replace it with an elective.
1992-93 Graduate Council Petitions -- Summar

### CODE EXPLANATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>INCOMPLETES</th>
<th>Approved Petitions</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Waive one year deadline for incompletes</td>
<td>16 13 3</td>
<td>18% 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on coursework</td>
<td>15 13 2</td>
<td>17% 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on transfer courses</td>
<td>6 5 1</td>
<td>7% 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CREDIT LEVELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Change from UG to graduate credit</td>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>4% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Change from grad credit to UG retroactively</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>1% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Change from P/NP to grade retroactively</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>3% 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DISQUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Extend probation</td>
<td>4 4 0</td>
<td>4% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Readmission after one year disqualification</td>
<td>7 6 1</td>
<td>8% 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TRANSFER CREDITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Accept more transfer hours than allowed</td>
<td>13 13 0</td>
<td>14% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Accept non-graded transfer credit</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>2% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Allow &quot;C&quot; as transfer</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>REGISTRATION PROBLEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Retroactive Registration</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
<td>2% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Retroactive withdrawal</td>
<td>6 5 1</td>
<td>7% 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Accept late grade change</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>1% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Change grade option retroactively</td>
<td>4 4 0</td>
<td>4% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIMITS ON COURSE TYPES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Waive University limits on 501,503,505</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>1% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>Waive University limit on 800-level courses</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>1% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Rescind Administrative Withdrawal</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>1% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Remove course from PSU records</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>1% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL for 1992-93** | 907515 | 83%

**Number of petitions in Previous Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Petitions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a summary of the activities and deliberations of Scholastic Standards Committee during the 1992-1993 Calendar year:

The committee considered the revision to Plus/Minus Grading system to reflect the "two-decimal place" quality point as requested by Bob Tufts. The Scholastic Standard Committee agreed with the request to create uniformity between GPA and individual grade decimal place reporting. The two-decimal place reporting will use 0.33 and 0.67 instead of 0.3 and 0.7 to reflect the +/- designation.

The committee continued its tradition of reading petitions and voting upon issues discussed in the petitions. As of this writing, there are no statistical data available from the Registrar's office to present.

Members feel that the mission of the committee has been broadened to the extent of deviating from reviewing "scholastic standards" and the exceptional circumstances that warrant individual student's request. Instead, this committee has found itself increasingly involved with handing down decisions on a broad range of problems which it considers admission/registrar related issues (grade changes, drop and adds, tuition refund). Therefore, a reexamination of the mission of the committee has been suggested and a summary follows.

Members of the Scholastic Standards Committee feel that the mission of the committee should be defined more specifically. Page 7 of the faculty governance guide states (among other tasks):

"3) Assist undergraduate students in difficulty with scholastic regulations."
"4) Adjudicate undergraduate student petitions which request the waiving of regulations on suspensions."

The committee feels that the system of waiver request is being abused in many instances, and there have been too many "exceptional" situations to the extent that they can be considered "routine." Examples include: A) students considering a grade option change after having found out that such action is to their advantage. These petitions have no "scholastic" merit and should be handled by the instructor/academic unit. B) the committee has observed repeated petitions from the same students on the same issue, simply because there are no guidelines or mechanisms to limit the number of such petitions. This leads to an unnecessary waste of time for the members and, consequently, prevents members from devoting time to those petitions which deserve attention.
The following recommendations reflect the majority opinion of the committee.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1) The committee reaffirms its prior recommendation to the ad-hoc academic disqualification committee that the change of grade (P/NP to A-F and vice versa) and retroactive withdrawal requests should be handled by the academic units or instructors. There was a general agreement and understanding on the subject during the meetings with the members of academic disqualification committee.

2) The committee discussed the issue of "request for refund" petitions which have been added to the petitions under consideration. It is the overwhelming feeling of the committee that consideration of such petitions are beyond the mandate (and the abilities) of the committee, and this appropriately should go to Deadline Appeals Committee.

3) The committee will consider academic reinstatement/disqualification cases which require interpretation of "scholastic standards" and will no longer process "routine" petitions such as grade option changes or repeated petitions from the same individual (with no new information provided).

Another issue of concern is the policy regarding summer activities of the committee. This matter was communicated in last year's report to the senate but no action was taken. Currently there is only one 12-month faculty member appointed to the committee and other members may not necessarily be on-campus during that time. Ironically, this is the period of time when many students apply for Fall term admission (or reinstatements) under special circumstances. The committee urges an appropriate response to this need such as appointing more 12-month faculty to the committee.

Respectfully submitted:

Members:

Pauline Beard, Eng
Mary Constans, Art
Kathleen Greey, Lib
Chi-Cheng Hsia, SBA
Bruce Keller, TA

Consultants:

Rod Diman, OAA
Bob Tufts, RO
Francine Fahey, RO

Fu Li, EE
Sorca O’Conner, ED
Marek Perkowski, EE
Dirgham Sbait, FLL
Hormoz Zareh (formerly Zarefar), ME, Chair
To the Faculty Senate: Courses approved by the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ISQA 360 BUSINESS COMPUTING FUNDAMENTALS (4)
Overview of topics to introduce students to the fundamental programming theories and concepts necessary to create workable solutions to the information system needs of managed organizations. Topics include computability, data structures, data abstraction, algorithms, recursion vs. iteration, principles of programming languages. Students will use the C language to apply course concepts. Prerequisite: C programming course or passing grade on C programming competency exam; ISQA 335. [NEW]

ISQA 420 STRUCTURED SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND DESIGN (4)
Examines the scope and organization of the systems development process and the role of the systems development professional. Topics include system requirements, system specification, systems design, implementation, and project management. Standard system analysis methods and techniques will be presented and applied using computer-aided software engineering (CASE) tools. Prerequisite: CS 207 and ISQA 360. [NEW]

ISQA 421 OBJECT-ORIENTED MODELING AND DESIGN (4)
Fundamental concepts of object-oriented modeling and design are introduced including encapsulation, classes, inheritance, use of entity-relationship diagrams to model objects and classes, and design techniques. Object-oriented programming CASE tools and languages will be presented and used. Prerequisite: ISQA 360. [NEW]

ISQA 422 KNOWLEDGE-BASED DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS (4)
Study of the theory and practice of decision support in the knowledge-based organization. Topics include decision theory, decision support, artificial intelligence, knowledge modeling, and implementation of knowledge-based decision support systems using expert system technologies. Prerequisite: ISQA 332 and ISQA 420, or graduate status. [NEW]

ISQA 423 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY: USES, PLANNING AND QUALITY ADVANCEMENTS (4)
Case-based course that studies the strategic applications and quality advancements realized from the use of information technologies. The topic of system architecture planning will be introduced. Students will need to survey the business community for Information Technology uses and applications, and prepare an Information System Plan. Current quality assurance/quality management issues facing information technologists will be analyzed. Prerequisite: ISQA 420. [NEW]

ISQA 424 DATA COMMUNICATIONS (4)
Prerequisite: ISQA 360. [ADD PREREQUISITE AND CHANGE CREDIT HOURS FROM (3) TO (4)]
ISQA 425 DATABASE MANAGEMENT (4)
Study of data environments, the evolution of database technology, database concepts and uses, data models, database design, and query processing. Emphasis will be placed on the relational model and database management systems that support that model. Students will participate in database design projects. Other topics address emerging database trends and opportunities. Prerequisite: ISQA 420. [CHANGE DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITE, AND CREDIT HOURS FROM (3) TO (4)]

ISQA 511 QUANTITATIVE METHODS FOR MANAGERS (4)
Covers quantitative methods useful in managerial analysis and decision making. Basic and advanced statistical models as well as forecasting and management science tools are studied. Prerequisite: admission to graduate program. [CHANGE PREFIX FROM MGMT, TITLE, DESCRIPTION, AND CREDIT HOURS FROM (3) TO (4)]

Actg 511 FINANCIAL ACCOUNTING (4)
An introduction to the reporting system used by businesses to convey financial information to parties external to the enterprise. Primary emphasis is placed on understanding the financial reports that are the end product of this system—what they do and do not tell the user about a business enterprise. The accounting principles, conventions, and concepts underlying financial reporting are examined with the objective of developing the ability to read, comprehend and perform a basic analysis of financial statements. Prerequisite: admission to graduate program. [CHANGE TITLE, DESCRIPTION AND CREDIT HOURS FROM (3) TO (4)]

FinL 514 ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE FIRM (4)
Examines the microeconomic foundations of the firm and provides a broad overview of the financial markets and institution's framework. Included is consideration of the components of the U.S. and international financial system in the global economy, the financial institutions that facilitate the flow of funds, interest rate determination, and how government policy affects funds flow and interest rates. Issues of demand and supply determination, market structure and resulting economic behavior are also considered. Prerequisite: admission to graduate program. [CHANGE TITLE, DESCRIPTION AND CREDIT HOURS FROM (3) TO (4)]

FinL 561 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (4)
Examines the financial concepts and problem solving skills required to evaluate whether managerial decisions add value to the firm. Students will develop an understanding of the financial implications of business decisions and a framework with which to evaluate their decisions. An integral part of this approach requires understanding how the different functional areas of a business interrelate and the supporting role that finance can provide. Topics considered include cash flow analysis, risk determination, valuation, working capital management and financing. Prerequisite: SBA 530, FinL 514, Actg 511. [NEW]

Mgmt 550 ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT (4)
Cover issues in organizational behavior and human resource management that are critical to organizational effectiveness. Organizations are studied from three perspectives: the individual, the work team, and the organization as a system. Topics include motivation, performance assessment, creative problem-solving, compensation, staffing, employee development, and organizational design. Focal emphasis on business leadership is examined from a multi-level perspective. Prerequisite: SBA 530. [NEW]
Mgmt 560 MANAGERIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PUBLIC POLICY (4)
Provides students with an understanding of how political, social, legal, regulatory and environmental issues impact business organizations within a global context. Topics covered include business ethics, corporate social responsibility, managerial integrity, legal considerations for managers, public policy process in relation to business, environmental analysis, environmental issues and management. Prerequisites: SBA 530, Mgmt 550. [NEW]

Mgmt 562 BUSINESS STRATEGY AND POLICY (4)
Provides an integrative, capstone study of strategy formulation and implementation in international and domestic business enterprises. Case analysis and other appropriate methodologies are used to develop the skills and judgment necessary to provide overall direction to the organization. Special emphasis will be placed on how to successfully match competitive strategy with effective implementation policies. Prerequisites: SBA 551 AND 552. [NEW]

Mktg 542 MARKETING (4)
Introduces basic concepts of the marketing process from the perspective of the marketing manager, and provides a framework for the analysis of problems in marketing management. A key focus is to examine the marketing planning and analysis necessary to develop sound marketing plans and strategy. Specific topics include the role of marketing strategy within the firm, analysis of marketing opportunities, selection of target markets and market segmentation, marketing strategies in a global marketplace and marketing mix decisions. Prerequisite: SBA 530. [NEW]

SBA 506 BUSINESS PROJECT (3-6)
An individual or team activity under the direction of a faculty member where students focus on knowledge transfer and the realities of applying MBA knowledge and skills to actual business problems or situations. Students are expected to sign-up for two consecutive terms for a minimum of three hours each term. Typically, business project credit is earned through the completion of a suitable project at work, through an individual internship, or through a team consulting project with a firm. Students meet periodically with their assigned faculty member to monitor progress on the agreed learning contract and to discuss a variety of implementation and organizational realism issues. [NEW]

SBA 530 COMPETING IN A GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT (8)
Inaugural MBA course provides students with an understanding of key themes related to successful global competition and with the interpersonal and intellectual skills required for individuals to contribute in a highly competitive and globalized business environment. Topics may include globalization of commerce, new organizational forms, information technologies, innovative human resource and product development practices, and the elements of quality. Individual and team competencies are developed in terms of interpersonal skills, problem solving, case analysis and knowledge acquisition. Prerequisite: admission to graduate program. [NEW]

SBA 531 EXECUTIVE BRIEFINGS (1)
A weekly series of presentations by local, regional, national, and international business leaders on current business topics. Fall term only. [NEW]
SBA 551 INTEGRATED PROCESS MANAGEMENT (4)
Covers the design and management of transformation processes within the firm and relationships with both suppliers and customers. There is a strong focus on customer satisfaction, quality, continuous improvement, and cost management as each relates to process design and control in both manufacturing and service organizations. Prerequisites: ISQA 511, Actg 511, Mktg 542, Mgmt 550 and concurrent enrollment in SBA 552. [NEW]

SBA 552 SYSTEMS FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT (4)
Provides the student with a systematic approach to the determination and measurement of the critical processes for achieving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Emphasis is given to the development of the necessary information systems to support process integration, critical process measurement, and related decision making. Prerequisite: ISQA 511, Actg 511, Mktg 542, Mgmt 550 and concurrent enrollment in SBA 551. [NEW]