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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on March 2, 1998, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the February 2, 1998, Meeting

Provost’s Report

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

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. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting - Wollner
*2. University Planning Council Quarterly Report - Bodegom

F. Unfinished Business

*1. Appointment of University Studies Task Force
2. Discussion of University Studies Report

G. New Business

*1. Proposed Changes in SySc Ph.D. Program - Terdal
*2. Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals - Molander
*3. Proposed Naming Guidelines - Wamsen

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the February 2, 1998, Senate Meeting
E1 Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report
E2 UPC Quarterly Report
F1 Appointment of University Studies Task Force
G1 Proposed Changes in SySc Ph.D. Program
G2 UCC Course and Program Proposals
G3 Proposed Naming Guidelines

Secretary to the Faculty
5-4416/Fax. 5-4499 • 341U CH • andrews@po.pdx.edu
A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the January 5, 1998, meeting were approved as submitted.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

• CHANGES/ADDITIONS IN TODAY'S SENATE AGENDA:

G2, Curriculum Committee Proposals, is added to today’s agenda. This is a two page document, comprised of "G2" postponed from the January Senate Meeting, and a second page of courses approved by UCC in the interim.
There will be no President's Report, no Provost's report, and no IFS Report at today's meeting.

- ARC has proposed slight changes in the wording of "G1" (Proposal to amend the B.S. Requirement) from the published version, for the sake of clarity. The change will be read into the minutes when the item is taken up today.

- The Secretary has recorded the following changes in Senate and committee appointments since the January meeting:

  Ellen Skinner will fill the position vacated by CLAS Senator Marjorie Enneking (1998)

D. QUESTION PERIOD

None

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

None

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. PROPOSAL TO MODIFY B.S. DEGREE REQUIREMENT

ROSENGRANT/BURNS MOVED the Senate amend the B.S. Degree Requirement, to state:

For the Bachelor of Science Degree: Students must complete a minimum of 12 credits in the science academic distribution area, a minimum of 12 credits in the arts and letters and/or social science distribution areas, and 4 credits in mathematical sciences/statistics. A minimum of 8 of the 12 credits in the science distribution area must be in coursework with integrated or associated laboratory or field work.

ROSENGRANT noted the current motion reflects concerns that were raised in discussions held subsequent to the proposal introduced at the December Senate meeting. She also noted, in response to a question last month, that the new requirements would not allow 4 credits from Freshman Inquiry to be applied towards the 36 hours, as is the case with the present requirements.
DRISCOLL asked if this change applies to the exclusion of Omnibus-numbered courses. ROSENGRANT noted that the exclusion of Omnibus numbered courses is not part of the B.S./B.A. requirements, rather, it was part of the old General Education distribution requirement.

DRISCOLL stated he supports the proposal as now worded, as its responds to EAS concerns.

BEESON stated he supports the motion as a step in the right direction. ENNEKING stated he supports the motion as the negative impact on Math will be minimal, and Math is in a position to create a course to address students' "distribution" needs.

KARANT-NUNN asked for a response to her question posed in January - why is this essential for a Psychology major, for example, but not a Foreign Languages major, and why are we acting on this without reviewing the B.S. requirement? ROSENGRANT stated this action does not preclude changing the B.A. requirement, rather, it is simply a proposal to change the B.S. requirement in time to be implemented in the 1998-99 Bulletin. KARANT-NUNN asked for responses to the rest of her question. WAMSER stated he would stress Rosengrant’s rationale, that the B.S. needs modification now, and the B.A. can follow later. PERRIN stated the Social Science majors need to have the Science breadth in order to reflect the degree, which is not a "B.S.S.," but a B.S. MERCER stated the B.S. requirement contains the most glaring problems, and shouldn’t be held up for discussion of the B.A. requirement.

THE QUESTION was called.

THE MOTION TO MODIFY THE B.S. DEGREE REQUIREMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote, except for two against. No abstentions.

2. UNIVERSITY STUDIES ASSESSMENT REPORT

HARDT noted that this is the second of three parts, and the final report will be discussed at the May Senate meeting. Today’s presentation is in part a response to questions posed by the Steering Committee after this report was mailed. He noted that each presenter will be restricted to five minutes, and Senators are requested to save questions for the question period to follow.

HARDT recognized Assoc. Dean Chuck White to present this report to the Senate. WHITE referred Senators to University Studies 1994-97, A Progress Report, January 1998, and stressed several major points: the program is
faculty driven, it is supportive of students and faculty in the pursuit of inquiry, it strives to integrate academic foundations with increasingly rigorous content, the program is learning-centered, and it is intended to provide flexibility in a fixed curriculum for faculty and students. WHITE introduced ten other individuals to discuss various aspects of the report/program. Craig Wollner reviewed governance of the program. He noted the UnSt Committee, starting in 1996-97, shifted from program development to policy review. It has several subcommittees, including FRINQ Council, Capstones Comm. and Cluster Coordinating Council. Michael Flower reviewed the Cluster Coordinating Council. It’s responsibility is the middle portion of the UnSt experience, particularly in the convergence of the goals of individual courses, clusters and university studies in general. It is noted there is a shortage of SINQ courses and a shortage of courses in the natural sciences. Leslie Rennie-Hill discussed the Mentor Program, describing two actual pairings of faculty/mentor and mentor/student. Susan Agre-Kippenhan discussed the Capstone Committee, giving an overview of their activity, the process of capstone development, and challenges. Judy Patton described the high school FRINQ programs, noting that 10-20% of the participants continue study at PSU. Joe Uris discussed community college co-admission and the transfer transition courses. Michael Toth reviewed assessment/program support activities. The process itself has undergone reassessment due to two significant issues, there are no previous data for comparisons, and the program is still in the process of implementation, Assessment is formative rather than summative. Toth yielded to Kathi Ketcheson, Acting Director of OIRP, who presented the statistical portrait developed to date. Michael Toth discussed the assessment of the first faculty cohort, which will be presented at a national meeting in March. Preliminary results indicate faculty undergo a consistent shift in their definitions of student-centered learning, teaching, teaching satisfaction, community, and comfort level. Cheryl Ramette described the five-year classroom assessment study in progress, and Robbie Jessen described some anecdotal responses from the study.

WHITE concluded the presentation with a discussion of budget. It is estimated as 4% of the instructional budget and stable. There is clear need for additional support to the mentor program particularly as regards the high school program. The goodwill of people has contributed to low assessment costs thus far. Enrollment trends are an area of uncertainty, with projected increases of freshmen and transfers. More on-call faculty support is needed. There needs to be continued attention to coherence across clusters. There should be a review of the definition of the baccalaureate. There should be a dual assessment of the program and the majors concurrently. There will be an all-university conversation on the report on February 28, 1998.
BROWN noted the presentation was very helpful as a supplement to the published report, and asked two questions, what will be future activity as regards smaller departments which are unable to participate, and will there be discussion of issues other than science, such as foreign language. WHITE stated that these issues have been recognized.

BULMAN asked if the data exists to show the involvement of faculty and budgets, department by department, and unit by unit. WHITE stated it exists. BULMAN requested it be provided to the faculty.

BEESON yielded to Ansel Johnson, who noted the Sophomore clusters are not represented by their costs to departments. He asked also if $1.5 million, by his estimate, is the approximate cost to run the capstone program, as there are approximately 10+ students per faculty. WHITE stated the capacity of each capstone is increasing beyond the ten students per capstone which was anticipated, therefore we will need fewer. Additionally, summer session covers funding of ten capstones.

ENNEKING asked if assessment is addressing the question of subgroup-type demography, for example, younger versus older students. WHITE stated this has not been addressed. KETCHESON stated there are two questions on the entering student survey regarding younger versus older students. OIRP is now examining this breakdown.

BEESON asked when there would be a move from formative to summative assessment. WHITE stated there is an ongoing interplay of issues and forces which makes this question difficult to answer. For example, a research paper has been added at the FRINQ level, as opposed to the previous writing requirement, where the research paper is in WR 321. We must define what is appropriate for each level, and communicate that with departments. TOTH noted that this is the first year that the fourth year is in the program. Additionally, cluster/capstone faculty are still adjusting their courses to the program, as opposed to their initial objectives. WHITE queried at what point the is program fully implemented, so that the latter assessment can take place. Cluster instructors undergo growth after joining the program.

BEESON stated this is an important question, for example, the vote on the B.S. Degree Requirements was reflective of current conditions. We can’t wait too long for evaluation to be completed. There are also other educational goals at stake, such as diversity, writing, etc. within the program, and the impact on graduate study, etc. outside the program. We should consider a broader forum...
for evaluation. HARDT, agreed, stating that several other committees should participate.

WAMSER noted that there are broad differences in departmental participation, for example there are nine (9) Economics courses and eighty-nine (89) History courses. WHITE stated the differences are in part because, as this is a voluntary program, variables have to do with individual involvement. For example, several historian collaborated. Maybe we haven’t been directive enough.

PRATT, agreeing with Ansel Johnson, asked if there are estimates of hidden costs of faculty time, such as collaborations. WHITE stated that adjunct funds have sometimes been utilized, and SCH goes back to the department. TOTH stated there is no basis for the previous cost of General Education, rather, we should examine the impact on the institution. Perhaps, we should try to estimate the cost prior to this program.

PERRIN stated assessment is a special challenge, as we must also answer the question as to how well general education prepares students for the major. We might need a larger control group to do that.

DAVIDSON noted we must recognize the effects throughout the university. Over the past year at least seven specific departments have begun doing just that-and we need to find ways to extend what they learned through the process and what they are doing to others on campus. The Provost is looking at the possibility of a seminar in the spring that would raise the chance to talk about the effects of change generally in higher ed and the relevance of those changes to the specific changes on this campus - as well as dealing with assessment.

Discussion was concluded.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. GRADUATE COUNCIL COURSE AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

TERDAL introduced the proposed Graduate course and program changes, noting the Graduate Council’s endorsement, with the addition to the list of one more course:

Phy NEW COURSE: Phy 679 - Advanced Atmospheric Physics

TERDAL noted that this list does not include courses which also have undergraduate numbers. Some of these are still in the approval process in
University Curriculum Committee and will be forwarded at the next Senate meeting.

TERDAL/WAMSER MOVED the Senate approve this list of Graduate course and program proposals.

WAMSER asked if the Chemistry Department was consulted regarding the coordination of Phy 679 with Ch 620 Atmospheric Chemistry. TERDAL stated yes.

TERDAL responded to a question regarding the proposed non-thesis option in Speech Communication. She referred the Senate to the minutes of December 2, 1997, pp. 22-23, which stated that only 12-13 departments require a written thesis. CARTER stated that this distinction provides more flexibility for students. If they are Ph.D.-bound, they may want to pursue a praxis degree as they will have the research/dissertation requirement eventually.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE LIST OF GRADUATE COURSE AND PROGRAM PROPOSALS PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR UNIVERSITY STUDIES FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE INQUIRY COURSE APPROVALS

PRATT introduced the two lists of courses (attached), expressing a special thanks to Judy Patton for her assistance with Freshman courses, and to Michael Flower and Tom Biolsi for their assistance with Sophomore Inquiry courses. These individuals, together with the UCC, are commended for completing a difficult task.

PRATT/CEASE MOVED the Senate approve these lists of Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry Courses.

WAMSER asked what is the fate of thirteen other courses/titles which were proposed. PRATT stated the committee is still reviewing these. UCC views University Studies as a college curriculum committee. Articulation of the goals of University Studies in these courses is a sticking point. The presumption is that UCC will continue to press for refinements on those remaining.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE LISTS OF FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE INQUIRY COURSES PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 11, 1997
TO: Ulrich Hardt, Presiding Officer, Faculty Senate
FROM: J.R. Pratt, Chair
SUBJ.: Recommendation Of New And Modified Courses

The following course and curriculum proposals were reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

The committee reviewed and approved, after some discussion, Freshman Inquiry (UNST 101,2,3) proposals for the following themes to be active in 1997-98 and 1998-99.

- Embracing Einstein's Universe: Language, Culture, and Relativity
- Understanding our Pluralistic Society: Histories, Identities, Controversies
- Values in Conflict: Knowledge, Power, and Politics
- City Life
- Life’s Labors: The Purpose, Meaning, and Value of Work and Play
- The Columbia Basin: Watershed of the Great Northwest

The committee also reviewed and approved one theme to be offered as UNST 210 Transfer Transition:

- Frankenstein: Metamorphosis and Transition.

Summaries of the themes are available for review by senators in OAA and the University Studies office.

Senators should note that the proposal for UNST 210 also shows the course number UNST 310. The UNST 310 version of the course has not been approved pending confirmation of its recommended or required status by the Academic Requirements Committee.

The committee expects to complete its review of sophomore inquiry themes in time to report to the Senate in February.

cc: L. Devereaux, OAA
DATE: December 30, 1997

TO: Ulrich Hardt, Presiding Officer, Faculty Senate

FROM: JR Pratt, Chair

SUBJ.: Recommendation of new and modified courses

The following course and curriculum proposals were reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

**Approved Sophomore Inquiry courses (offered currently as UNST 299)**

- American Studies (the committee felt this proposal could serve as a model for other proposals)
- Archaeology
- Asian Studies
- Cities: impressions, perspectives, and fact (for Community Studies cluster)
- Community and identity in America (for Community Studies cluster)
- Portland communities (for Community Studies cluster)
- Environmental sustainability
- Youth and community development in the "good society" (Healthy People cluster)
- Health in our time (Healthy People cluster)
- Youth, service, and community (Healthy People cluster)
  [Note: The committee recommends retitling Youth and community ... and Youth, service ... to make the differences between these courses clearer.]
- Nineteenth Century studies
- Introduction to popular culture
- Framing the two cultures

The committee recommends that these courses be converted to discrete numbers by UNST.

cc: L. Devereaux, OAA
The Friday, 6 February meeting of IFS began with a presentation by Bill Anslow, Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance of OUS. His report was a summary of one he had previously given to the board budget committee. A predicate to his discussion of the budgetary issues facing the OUS was his comment that the system will be called on to serve some 11,000 more students than it currently is between the years 1994-2010 and perhaps 30,000 by 2020 or 2030. Other key realities he mentioned as having an impact on budget planning were that currently, the average age of OUS buildings is 40 years, and that while state funding has declined, total resources in the system have nevertheless increased. In addition, he said that in making allocation recommendations, he tries to think of OUS as one big university like Ohio State, although clearly the state decided long ago that Oregon could not have one massive university located in one place. The divergence of the missions of the institutions in the various locales across the state indicates why this has worked out in the way it has, but in the coming years, policy makers will have to deal with competition that will force the system to rethink how it allocates funds.

A major part of his presentation was a discussion of the necessity of rethinking elements of the budgetary formulae involved in the current method of allocation to the campuses. Chief among these issues was a detailed examination of the Budget Allocation System, the so-called BAS Model. He called attention to a key issue in the functioning of the BAS model: that campuses currently retain 63 percent of revenues generated in the system (raising the question in the new policy environment of increased competition within OUS of how much of pooled funds should campuses be allowed to keep). He noted that the BAS model was much more complex than the common criticism suggests in that it is more than simply enrollment-driven. Instead, he pointed out that it had some 200 “moving parts” and that perhaps its real difficulties stem from the fact that nobody completely understands it. Furthermore, he alleged that the biggest problem with the BAS model has been that it has never been fully funded. Currently, it is funded at about 70 percent. If it were fully funded, he asserted, everyone would say it worked well.

However, he did note weaknesses in the BAS model: it fails to recognize all students or clients served by campuses; it is too complex; it is a zero sum process; it lacks currency using 1970s teaching models; it responds slowly to growth opportunities; it is not an effective campus management tool; and the current version does not address technology strategies and how they are funded and implemented.

Anslow observed that the Board committee report on funding is due this spring and will consider several important questions, viz.: “should the Board move to revise the formula toward average cost per student and reduce the number of funding differentials by collapsing discipline categories; by combining instructional levels; or by other actions?” And “is the Board prepared to move away from these elements to a more streamlined and/or a single funding amount per
student?” Others, going to issues like financial incentives for targeted programs, are: “should the Board use its program approval processes and allocation techniques to modify current patterns?” And “should the Board seek incremental state support to begin to increase the numbers of degrees awarded in higher cost discipline categories where the need for more graduates is greater?” In the area of access to affordable education, such questions arise as “is the Board prepared to consider significant variations among institutions’ tuition rates?” And “is the Board willing to establish tuition rates based on the cost of programs in which an individual is enrolled?” An example of this is in the comparison of relatively low cost social science programs as against high cost engineering programs. Should engineering students pay a higher tuition? Another kind of question to be addressed in the report focuses on compensation patterns and their impact on funding models, e. g., “is the board prepared to review and, if necessary, modify present salary-setting policies?”

Vice Chancellor Anslow was followed by Senator Cliff Trow (D-Corvallis) who took up the issue of the Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy. He stated emphatically that if Oregon is to do higher education reform, the institutions should ask for more money. He also observed that the task force report is not the only way to address higher education reform. He faulted the report’s authors for appearing to assume that everyone agrees with them about the nature of the challenges facing higher education. He asserted that IFS needed to become focused, organize the campuses, lobby the Legislature assiduously, and proclaim that faculty are not interested in change if more money is not put into the system. He also said that faculty should not leave it to the Legislature to do what is necessary for higher education. Each institution should make use of its legislative friends, but that the lobbying should not become fratricidal. He also asked the rhetorical question: “is the OUS Board a good representative of faculty from the Legislature’s perspective?”

The next speaker was Representative Lane Shetterly (R-Dist. 34). He commented mostly about the Governor’s Plan for higher education stemming from the task force reports. He said his main priorities in viewing the situation of higher education would be that whatever reform occurred, keep all the institutions; whatever is going to be done about funding, don’t create new winners and losers; that the possible transfer of state funds to private institutions is of deep concern to him; and that there must be articulated reasons for and measurable results to any changes that are made.

Following Rep. Shetterly was Herb Ashkenasy, the President of the Board of OUS. He spent most of his time commenting on issues behind the Governor’s 19 December 1997 remarks to the Board concerning his desires for reform of the state system. He said that the Governor’s discussion with the Board highlighted the fact that everyone agrees that doing higher education better in Oregon is critical. Eighty percent of Oregonians go on to higher education, a much higher figure than the national average, a phenomenon occurring while the cost of education is increasing faster than the cost of living. On the subject of faculty, he said, presumably referring to feelings of discontent expressed by them, that nobody said they were not valuable; it is just that faculty are not invaluable. He said the cost/access issue would be a key to the future of higher
education. In that regard, he said that the Board is enthusiastic about the Governor’s mandate that money would follow students. This would mean that the best programming would be where the students are. The onus would thus be on the institutions to offer the “right” programs. He asserted that with more students lower program costs would ensue at specific institutions, which would then put more money in the schools’ accounts to do with what they chose. He said the Board agrees with the Governor that the BAS Model must be retired. But we will need something to replace it and currently the thinking is that it will be “performance indicators” which the Legislature has already passed into the higher ed enabling law and which mandate checks for access, cost, quality, and employability. These will be “massaged” into performance indicators for the campuses. Performance indicators, he said, should lead to a more rational system of subsidies to the campuses.

Ashkenasy also said that the system must attract more students and that as we do, productivity will be critical. We must “do it better, cheaper, faster.” He would, he said, support complete decentralization of the system if it would lead to the kind of competition that would create greater efficiency.

The final speaker of the Friday session was Betty Youngblood, President of Western Oregon University. She pointed out that, contrary to the view inside the state system, Oregon already has a highly decentralized system compared to others (Georgia, Wisconsin) in which she has worked. She believes we should actually centralize certain parts of the system and that change is needed within it--e.g., the BAS Model--but that too much centralization will lead to each institution trying to be all things to all people. She cautioned against looking at the alternatives as “either/or,” all or nothing. She pointed to the lack of total funding for BAS and said we would not be discussing reform if BAS were at 100 percent. What we really need is more access and more faculty. Money, she said, in closing would solve each of those problems.

The Saturday session of IFS included a round table discussion with various higher education lobbyists about what IFS could do to in the 1999 session of the Legislature. Among those present were Dave Barrows representing PSU-AAUP, Ed Dennis of the Oregon Student Association, Grattan Kerans of the Chancellor’s Office, and Mark Nelson of the Association of Oregon Faculties. The presence of the lobbyists was invited to facilitate the coalescence of a strong lobbying effort for the 1999 Legislature and to hear from experienced political professionals what IFS and faculty they represent can do to prepare Higher Ed to make the strongest possible case for its needs at the session. The consensus among the professionals was that faculty from each of the institutions will have to be involved if they want what will be the centerpiece of the campaign--improved salaries. In that regard, Ed Dennis repeated the pledge of OSA work to get a major raise for faculty into the Governor’s budget, but only if faculty will lend support beyond lip service to the campaign. They further noted that other key participants in the campaign must be the Chancellor and the Board as well as the business community. In addition, all agreed that Senator Neil Bryant of Bend, who appears to favor private education and the Senate president, Brady Adams, will be key players in the legislative process.
Paul Simonds, outgoing of IFS, gave his final report on the December 1997 Board meeting. He reported that Governor Kitzhaber, in discussing with the Board the state of higher education and the need to change, was blunt about his expectations of reform: “if the Board doesn’t change, I’ll change it.” The Governor’s remarks, it was noted are available on his web page.

Kemble Yates, the incoming IFS president, reporting on the January Board meeting, said that the biggest news to come from that occasion was the report of Vice Chancellor Anslow (summarized above in the section on Anslow’s talk to IFS). He also said that it was announced that the retention monies mandated in the higher education budget was released to all campuses. President Yates was unable to answer the question this announcement engendered, “what were the strings on this money?”

John Cooper, delegated to attend the most recent meeting of the Academic Council, reported there was uniform skepticism on the part of the Provosts to the installation of the so-called performance indicators at the campuses. Creating a system of assessment based on the performance indicators (whatever they might turn out to be), they protested, would require them to drop some other program and asked Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, which that should be. In reply, she insisted that such a system would, indeed, have to be created on the campuses, no matter what the hardships.
University Planning Council

Quarterly report for the Faculty Senate meeting of March 2, 1998.

Members of University Planning Council:

Activities:
1. Intellectual property subcommittee is starting to look at the various issues. A local patent attorney will/has given a seminar on February 11, 1998.

Pending:
1. Revise Article IV, section 4m of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty to be in agreement with current practices (among others: under membership of the committee is listed: Management Services person, Budget Director).
2. Develop guidelines for the naming of academic units and programs.

Submitted by: Erik Bodegom, UPC Chair, 2/6/98
February 16, 1998

TO: Faculty Senate
FR: Senate Steering Committee
RE: University Studies Task Force

Preface

The University Studies faculty and staff have recently completed a formative assessment and presented a report to the Faculty Senate at its February 2, 1998, meeting. A number of questions has been raised about this self study and the General Education Program, prompting the Senate Steering Committee to hold a meeting with the chairs and other representatives of the following PSU committees: ARC, Budget Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the UPC.

Following lengthy discussions, the Steering Committee decided (with the concurrence of all others present) that it was time to move to the next step and assess the University Studies Program in the broader context, including its impact on the total university community. We are proposing appointing a task force made up of representatives of the five committees, with the expectation that they will prepare a preliminary report for the May 4, 1998, Faculty Senate meeting.

The following persons have agreed to serve on the Task Force:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Battistel</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bodegom</td>
<td>UPC/BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Brower</td>
<td>UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Constans</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Daasch</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Driscoll</td>
<td>UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Farr</td>
<td>BC, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Ketcheson</td>
<td>UPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mercer</td>
<td>ARC/SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Molander</td>
<td>UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Rosengrant</td>
<td>ARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Wamser</td>
<td>UPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Wattenberg</td>
<td>UCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Task Force is asked to consider the following initial questions in the three areas of Curriculum; Assessment; and Program Planning, Staffing, and Budgeting. As the group goes about preparing its report, it may add other questions and areas of concern.

I. CURRICULUM

What demonstrable evidence is available to document the progress that PSU University Studies students are making towards the curriculum goals and objectives of Freshman Inquiry and other levels of University Studies?

a. What evidence is there that UnSt students receive a breadth of exposure to science, math, and other elements of a liberal education?

b. What data are available that University Studies students are achieving competence in writing?

c. What data are available that University Studies students are achieving an awareness and respect of diversity issues?

d. Are the faculty and curriculum within University Studies representative of the breadth of disciplines across the University?
II. ASSESSMENT

How do we know that the program is working?

a. How well does the program meet its stated goals and objectives?

b. What evidence do we have that the new curriculum is an improvement over the distribution model?

c. What evidence is there related to student satisfaction and the quality of the student experience?

d. Are we able to distinguish the quality of the student experience of those entering at the freshman year from those transferring at the junior level? What do we learn from that?

e. How effectively is the General Education Program integrating with departmental majors programs?

f. How are assessment results used to help students meet the learning objectives and to make adjustments to the curriculum?

g. How has the University Studies agenda been changed by the shift from summative to formative assessment? At this point of the formative assessment, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the program?

III. PROGRAM PLANNING, STAFFING, AND BUDGETING

a. What plan or mechanism is there to maintain cooperation between University Studies and departments in planning and staffing courses?

b. What is the rationale for transfer of funds between University Studies and other academic departments, rather than direct payment of instructional costs? What is the financial relationship among the academic units and University Studies? What is the role of the CLAS dean’s office in oversight of University Studies funds?

c. What costs for offering all components of the University Studies program are not accounted for in the University Studies budget? What plan is there for maintaining necessary resources?

d. Based on three academic years of expenditures, what budget projections are available to show that future years of University Studies will remain at a fixed percentage of the University budget?

e. What were the assumptions made and the bases for estimating SCH generation in University Studies?

f. Given the enrollment-driven funding model, how are these budget projections affected by the increasing demand for Capstone? What evidence is there that there is an appropriate disciplinary balance among the offerings?

g. How does University Studies planning take into account the accreditation needs of other academic units?
DATE: February 9, 1998
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Marjorie Terdal, Chair Graduate Council
RE: Recommendation of program changes, new and modified courses

The following course and program proposals from Systems Science were reviewed by the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

Program changes address two issues: conversion from 3 to 4 credit courses and better integration of the systems science core with the departmental options.

New courses:
- SYSC 514 System Dynamics, 4 cr

Changes in existing courses:
- SYSC 511 Systems Theory, 4 cr
- SYSC 512 Quantitative Methods of Systems Science, 4 cr
- SYSC 513 Systems Approach, 4 cr

Drop:
- SYSC 555 System Planning and Management, 3 cr

Rationale for the proposed program change (a statement of justification detailing the academic soundness of the proposal; projected development of supporting curricula, budgetary support and availability of faculty and other resources):

The program changes are an attempt to address two issues: conversion from 3 to 4 credit courses and better integration of the systems science core with the departmental options. For example, the SySc 513/514 option is designed for students who view systems with a more conceptual approach. This option may be a better match than our current requirement for departmental students in the Anthropology, Business, Psychology, and Sociology. While the more quantitative SySc 511/512 option might be better for core Systems Science departmental students in Economics, Engineering and Mathematics. Previously all students had to take SySc 511. The level of mathematics was low for some students and advanced for others. The SySc 511/513 option is included in the new program as it represents the current systems component requirement. Thus students can satisfy the core component in the same way they currently do, they can take a more conceptual route, or a more mathematical route.

Feedback from students, especially those in the social sciences suggests that the core and departmental pieces of the program are not well integrated. In order to address this issue, some of the 600-level courses will be taught with an integrative approach, in which the course is co-taught by departmental and systems science faculty. Students can take two of these courses which will explore systems science concepts in the context of the traditional disciplines. This approach would replace the cross-listed courses that do not address the issue of integration. We will offer the integrated courses as SySc 610 in their initial years and move them to discrete numbers in subsequent years.

We are finally converting from 3 to 4 credit courses. As can be seen several classes have been eliminated and the systems component has been changed from 18 to 16 credits.

We have developed a transition plan for students currently enrolled in the program to ensure that they can complete their degree in a timely manner. This plan specifies which courses taken before and after the beginning of the 1998-1999 academic year can be used to fulfill requirements under both the old and new programs.
Reproduce proposed catalog statement in full noting changes (with underline, brackets, italics):

Program Requirements

A discussion of general requirements for doctoral degrees is on page 94. Minimum requirements specific to the Ph.D. in Systems Science include:

Systems Component

Students in both the Core and Departmental Options are required to complete **18 [16]** credits of Systems Science coursework as the minimum systems component of the program. The first nine credits must be composed of three courses selected from the following: SySc 611, required for all students, and any one of the two course sequences SySc 612 and 613; SySc 625, 627, and 629 (choose any two); SySc 641 and 642, SySc 651 and 652, SySc 655 and 673; SySc 611 and 673; or SySc 655 and 613. All of these courses are taught by the core faculty. **(All students must satisfy the first 8 credits by taking two of the following courses:** SySc 511, SySc 512, SySc 513, SySc 514. Any combination of two of the courses except SySc 512 and 514 is acceptable. SySc 511 and 512 explore systems concepts in more quantitative terms than SySc 513 and 514. Consequently students taking SySc 511 and 512 should have stronger quantitative background.) Nine additional credits of Systems Science courses are also required, which may include courses offered by the participating departments and cross listed with Systems Science.

**(To fulfill the remaining 8 credits of the Systems Component, students must take two Systems Science courses numbered 515 through 599 or 610 and above. These elective courses are either advanced Systems Science courses or integrative courses. The integrative courses have emerged from the interdisciplinary nature of the program. They are taught jointly by faculty from Systems Science and participating departments and the topics covered illustrate specific applications of systems concepts.)**

Additional Coursework Requirements

Beyond the Systems Component described above, additional graduate courses in approved areas are required as shown below.

Requirements in addition to Systems Components (**18 [16] credits**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Entering Degree</th>
<th>Additional Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Option</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>9- [12] SySc + 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>72 for concurrent MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS</td>
<td>MS or equivalent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ling 415/515 LINGUISTIC PHONETICS (4)--Introduces the sounds of the world's languages with a concentration on English. Practical exercises designed to develop skills in production, discrimination, and phonetic transcription. Examines applications to speech technology (speech synthesis and speech recognition) and speech pathology. [NEW]

Biology

Bi 412/512 ANIMAL BEHAVIOR (4) [CHANGE CREDIT AND LECTURE HRS FROM (3) TO (4)]

Bi 417/517 MAMMALIAN PHYSIOLOGY (4)--Physiology of the mammalian cardiovascular, respiratory, renal and digestive systems with emphasis on homeostatic control and integration of these systems in normal and pathophysiological states. Prerequisite: upper division physiology course. [CHANGE CREDIT AND LECTURE HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITE]

Bi 418/518 COMPARATIVE ANIMAL PHYSIOLOGY (4)
Prerequisite: upper division physiology course. [CHANGE CREDIT AND LECTURE HRS FROM (3) TO (4), PREREQUISITE]

Bi 419/519 ANIMAL PHYSIOLOGY LABORATORY (4)--Laboratory experiments on the physiology of animals from the cell through organismic levels. Two 3.5-hour laboratory periods. Prerequisite: Bi 335, 417 or 418. May be concurrent. [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION]

Bi 421/521 VIROLOGY (4)
Prerequisite: Bi 338. [CHANGE PREREQUISITE]

Foreign Languages and Literatures

Rus 330 RUSSIAN CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION (4)--A multimedia survey of major developments in Russian art, architecture, music, dance, theater, cinema and literature from 988 to the present day. The class focuses on ways major works relate to the artistic atmosphere of their times and on how subsequent generations have reinterpreted and reused them. Taught in English. [NEW]

Rus 416 READINGS IN RUSSIAN (2)--A variable-content course designed to give advanced students of Russian experience reading in a variety of content areas. Rus 421 is to be taken in conjunction with regularly scheduled corequisite courses. Students taking a corequisite course will do part of the required reading for that course in Russian. Prerequisite: Rus 342. [NEW]

*Rus 427/527 TOPICS IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE 19TH CENTURY (4)--Representative literature of the major Russian writers of the nineteenth century. Such topics as Golden Age, or the Nineteenth-Century Short Story. Prerequisite: Rus 303. [CHANGE TITLE, DESCRIPTION, DELETE 428/528]

Rus 433/533 TOPICS IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE 20TH CENTURY (4)--Representative literature of major Russian writers of the twentieth century. Such topics as Soviet Satire, The Thaw, Glasnost. Prerequisite: Rus 303. [CHANGE TITLE, DESCRIPTION, DELETE 434/534]
Geography

Geog 448/548 THE URBAN FOREST (4)
Prerequisites: One or more of Geog 313, 413, 432/532, Bi 334. [ADD 448, CHANGE PREREQUISITES]

History

Hst 327 THE U.S. IN THE 20TH CENTURY (4)--1890-1932, Populism and the Crisis of the 1890s; the Purity Crusade; Corporate and Anti-corporate Progressivism; Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson; the Open Door Policy and World War I; the League of Nations and the Red Scare; the New Era and Insurgents of the 1920s; the Cultural Conflicts of the 1920s; Herbert Hoover, the Great Depression, and the Election of 1932. [CHANGE NUMBER FROM 335, TITLE, DESCRIPTION]

Hst 328 THE U.S. IN THE 20TH CENTURY (4)--1932-1960, Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal Managerial State; Anti-New Dealers and the Noninterventionist Movement; World War II and the New Order; the Cold War and the National Security State under Truman and Eisenhower; the Anti-Communist Crusade of the 1950s and the Early Civil Rights Movement. [CHANGE NUMBER FROM 336, TITLE, DESCRIPTION]

Hst 446/546 TOPICS IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN PROFESSIONS (4)--Historical analysis of the roots and development of the intellectual, economic, social, and political power and authority of representative professions in America and the West. Topics include: Foundations of American Medicine; American Medicine in the Twentieth Century; American Lawyering; American Technology. Course may be repeated for credit with different topic. [NEW]

Mathematical Sciences

*Mth 614, 615, 616 MODERN ANALYSIS I, II, III (3, 3, 3)--Topics from nonlinear analysis, harmonic analysis, analytic functions, ordered vector spaces, analysis on Lie groups, and operator theory. Prerequisite: Mth 412/512. [CHANGE TITLE, DESCRIPTION]

Philosophy

Phil 201 INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY (4) [CHANGE NUMBER FROM 101]

Phil 203 CRITICAL THINKING (4) [CHANGE NUMBER FROM 103]

Phil 310 ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS (4)
Prerequisite: Phil 202 or the relevant Sophomore Inquiry. [CHANGE PREREQUISITE]

Phil 311 THE MORALITY OF PUNISHMENT (4)
Prerequisite: Phil 202 or the relevant Sophomore Inquiry. [CHANGE PREREQUISITE]
Physics

Ph 375 THE EARTH'S ENVIRONMENT: GLOBAL CHANGE AND HUMAN LIFE (4)--A non-mathematical introduction to the global environment and how human activities are causing climatic changes, ozone depletion, deforestation, and acid rain. Emphasizes the interrelationship between environmental processes. Deals with the qualitative aspects of how the earth's climate works, how it can be altered by burning of fossil fuels (emissions of carbon dioxide) and by the increasing concentrations of methane and other "greenhouse gases"; how the ozone layer can be depleted by man-made chemicals, and what is being done, or can be done to avert the undesirable consequences of these global changes. Are there processes in the environment that can counteract human influences? Are there feedbacks that can keep the earth's environment stable and livable? What can be done to balance population growth, increasing demands for a higher standard of living, particularly in developing countries, and the global pollution that these demands create? Students will take an active role in debating and discussing these issues and coming to grips with what global environmental change is likely to mean for all of us in the coming decades. [NEW]

Ph 471/571 ATMOSPHERIC PHYSICS (4)--Cycles of trace gases in the earth's atmosphere and their role in the environment. Emission, dispersal and removal of natural and man-made trace constituents in the atmosphere that determine the earth's climate and the stratospheric ozone layer. Mass Balance Models for quantitative analysis of atmospheric composition and trends. Climate change and perturbations of stratospheric ozone in modern times. Lays a foundation for the understanding of the complex issues of climatic change and its many linkages and feedbacks. Questions regarding environmental policy and action are examined in the light of current model results, their predictions and uncertainties. Prerequisites: one year each of calculus and calculus-based physics, introductory course in differential equations. [NEW]

Ph 477/577 AIR POLLUTION (4)--Air pollution meteorology needed to understand air pollution, atmospheric dispersion models, K-theory, box models and receptor models. Use of simple computer models. This course is a foundation for the quantitative understanding of air pollution: At any point in the environment (receptor), how much pollution is caused by a known source? If there are many sources, how much pollution does each source contribute at a receptor? Prerequisites: Ph 213 or 223, one year of calculus, introductory course in differential equations. [NEW]

Ph 478/578 APPLICATIONS OF AIR POLLUTION MODELING (4)--Students work in teams to solve an air pollution problem using dispersion and receptor modeling techniques. It teaches the complementary nature of receptor and dispersion modeling. Teaches the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches to air pollution modeling when either approach is applicable. Students use established computer models and become proficient in their use. Prerequisite: Ph 477/577. [NEW]

Ph 679 ADVANCED ATMOSPHERIC PHYSICS (4)--Advanced course to provide a working knowledge of base models for studying global change including the greenhouse effect, global warming, stratospheric ozone depletion from man-made chemicals, tropospheric chemistry of HO and O3 and transport modeling. Prerequisite: Ph 578. [NEW]
COLLEGE OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Administration of Justice

AJ 100 INTRODUCTION TO ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE (1) [DROP]

AJ 200 INTRODUCTION TO ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS (4) -- An open system analysis of the decisions made in the adult criminal justice process. Contemporary problems and issues, shifting emphases, replacement of one ideology with another, and current operational practices will be analyzed focusing around these critical decisions. Alternatives and the dilemmas of changes in policing, prosecution, court administration, and correctional programs will be considered. [CHANGE TITLE, CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION]

AJ 210 INTRODUCTION TO JUVENILE JUSTICE PROCESS (4) -- A general overview of the various activities and decisions involved in the processing of young law violators. Examination of the justice system specially designed to handle children, consideration of the many stages in the system, and considerations of issues in juvenile justice policy formulation. [CHANGE TITLE, CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION]

AJ 220 CRIME LITERACY (4) [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4)]

AJ 330 CRIME CONTROL THEORY AND STRATEGY (4) -- An analysis of the methods used to control crime in American society. Emphasis on understanding the sometimes conflicting goals of the criminal justice system; attention is given to the general categories of general and specific deterrence, aggressive enforcement, situational and environmental defensive measures, and modification of the social order. Special attention will be given to how other countries control crime and the problems of comparison because of political and cultural differences. Prerequisites: AJ 220, Soc 200, or Psy 204. [CHANGE TITLE, CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION]

AJ 380 CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH (4) -- A critical examination of the usefulness and limitations of research related to criminal justice activities, procedures, and programs. Empirical criminal justice studies analyzed and discussed. Prerequisite: completion of all lower-division major requirements and AJ 330. [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4), DESCRIPTION]

AJ 409 SENIOR PRACTICUM (8)
Minimum 8 credits required . . . maximum of 16 credits . . . [CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM (6) TO (8), MINIMUM FROM 6 TO 8, MAXIMUM FROM 15 TO 16]

AJ 420 CRIMINAL LAW AND LEGAL REASONING (4)
AJ 440 CONSTITUTIONAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURES (4)
AJ 460 COURT PROCEDURES (4)
AJ 490 SENIOR COLLOQUIUM (4)
[CHANGE CREDIT HRS FROM (3) TO (4)]
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Naming Guidelines
January 5, 1997

Purpose

It can be fitting and appropriate to name campus buildings, spaces and programs for individuals or organizations who have made significant contributions to the growth of Portland State University. These contributions may include both gifts of service and financial support.

The following guidelines are intended to facilitate the involvement of the broader campus community in the naming process.

Guidelines

I. These guidelines cover all campus namings, whether for memorial/honorary purposes or for gift recognition.

II. The standing University Naming Committee reviews all naming proposals and recommends actions to the President.

A. Permanent committee membership includes: the President (at his/her option); Provost; Vice President for University Relations; Vice President of Finance & Administration; Chair of the (President’s Advisory Council) or (Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate); University Historian.

The University Naming Committee will be chaired by the President or his/her designee.

B. Additional representation as appropriate may be selected by the committee, including, but not limited to the following: Alumni; Emeriti Faculty; Students; Board and Advisory Board Members; Volunteers; Development/University Relations Staff.

III. All naming proposals will be submitted to the University Naming Committee via the Dean/Director, to assure that they are a priority of the college/school/unit concerned.

A. Proposals will be submitted to the President’s Office to initiate Committee action.

B. Proposals must include the following elements:

1. Namings for donor recognition. Proposals must be approved prior to discussions with the donor/s.

   a. Project fundraising plan, including cleared list of donor prospects.
   b. Description of proposed naming opportunity
   c. Plan for funding the cost of signage/recognition structures necessary for the naming project.
e. Preliminary approval of the Vice President for University Relations. The Vice President will bring the proposal to the Naming Committee following his/her review.

2. Namings for honorary/memorial purposes
   a. Description of proposed naming opportunity
   b. Plan for funding the cost of signage/recognition structures necessary for the naming project.
   c. Namings for memorial/honorary purposes must be consistent with OUS and state guidelines and clearance procedures. If necessary, the Naming Committee will contact Melinda Grier's office.

V. Record keeping, archival information, donor relations and other procedural business of the University Naming Committee will be maintained by the Office of University Development.