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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 June 2, 1997, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH. Please reserve two hours for this meeting and provide for your alternate to attend if you must leave early. If the agenda is not concluded, the Senate meeting will be continued to Monday, June 11, 1997.

AGENDA
A. Roll

* B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 5, 1997, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

President's Report

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE FOR 1997-98

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

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM FOR 1997-98

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
*1. Advisory Council Annual Report - Brenner
*2. Committee on Committees Annual Report - Works

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE FOR 1997-98

F. Unfinished Business
*1. B.A./B.S. in Women’s Studies - Pratt and Brenner
*2. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4, 4, d - R. Liebman
*3. Amendment to the Constitution, Article IV, 4, 4, j - R. Liebman

G. New Business
*1. Report of the Strategic Budget Planning Committee - Pfingsten & Kenton
*2. Report on the University District & Elementary School Plans - B. Chase

DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES TO ELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
REPRESENTATIVES (1997-99) FROM EAS (1), LIB (1), CLAS (3), FPA (1) AND XS (1)

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
B Minutes of the May 5, 1997, Senate Meeting
D1 Question for Provost Reardon regarding University Studies
E1 Advisory Council Annual Report
E2 Committee on Committees Annual Report
E3 University Planning Council Annual Report
F1 B.A./B.S. in Women's Studies
F2 Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, d
F3 Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, 4, j
G1 Summary Report of the Strategic Budget Planning Committee
G2 University District and Elementary School Plans

Secretary to the Faculty
341 Cramer Hall • 725-4416/FAX:725-4499 • andrews@po.pdx.edu
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 5, 1997
Presiding Officer: Ulrich H. Hardt
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Herrington for Feeney, Dobson for Weikel.


A. ROLL CALL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Ulrich Hardt at 3:05 p.m. The Faculty Senate Minutes of April 7, 1997, were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Presiding Officer Hardt gave recognition to those faculty members who have passed away during this year and asked the Senate to remember them with gratitude for their service to the University and in most cases also to the Faculty Senate.

"I begin with Dawn Dressler who died on October 17 at the age of 69. Dawn taught in the Physics Department from 1962-1988 and is especially remembered for her role of advising pre-med students. She served on the President's Advisory Council, was elected to the Faculty Senate several times, and she played a pivotal role in the previous big discussion of general education and the Smeltzer Committee.

John Elliott Allen was the beloved professor emeritus in the Geology Department, a
department he founded in 1956 after serving 20 years as a field geologist throughout the U.S. He taught here until 1974 but came in daily to his office on campus and remained active in his scholarship until about a month before he died on December 17 at age 88.

Pokey Allen coached football at PSU for 7 years and was our winningest coach, amassing a 63-26-2 record before leaving for Boise State in 1993. Pokey taught all of us how to win—not just his teams whom he took to playoffs and NCAA Division II national championship games. He was a tremendous promoter of the University and a promoter of a strong and optimistic human will, until he died at 53 on December 30.

Al Sugerman’s memorial service was held on February 5 this year, and he will be remembered for his long and successful teaching career in the Speech Communication Department where he began teaching in 1963. Al was also active in faculty governance, was elected to the Faculty Senate, and he served as Secretary to the Faculty for a couple of years.

Milan Svoboda passed away on March 10 at the age of 53, and all of us will remember him as a member of last year’s Senate and a faithful attendee this year as chair of the Department of Public Health Education. He joined PSU in 1970 as assistant professor and advanced through the ranks, and served as assistant dean and graduate coordinator for the School of Health and Human Performance.

Joyce Petrie died of a massive heart attack on March 15 at the age of 62. She had just recently retired as professor of Library Media and was in fact just finishing up a couple of classes she was teaching for us. Joyce is credited with keeping a strong PSU program alive—the only library science program in Oregon, and she served several terms on the PSU Library Committee.

Let us remember these in gratitude in a moment of silence. Thank you.”

CUMPSTON reminded those present, after the Provost’s Report, that the Capstone Fair is May 20 in the Ballroom, and urged those present to stop by for a look.

1. Provost’s Report

REARDON reported on the progress of our program proposals, as a result of Board votes at the meeting last week. Four preliminary proposals are now accepted: Mathematics Education Ph.D., Conflict Resolution Master’s, Women’s Studies Baccalaurate, and Counselor & Special Education option in the Education Ph.D. There was discussion only on the Women’s Studies proposal. There is a similar proposal from University of Oregon. We are ready to
proceed with approval of full proposals, in some cases. The M. Music received formal approval.

REARDON reviewed progress on the OSSHE biennial budget. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor have visited the campuses for discussions. They will take proposals for institutional budgets to the President’s Council on May 15. Based on enrollment projections at the individual institutions, the budget will be tentatively divided.

SCHAUMANN asked for comment with respect to the issue of the enrollment corridor. REARDON stated our corridor request has been agreed to, and our figures and the Chancellor’s differ by only about five FTE.

LENDARIS asked Reardon to explain what happens with the upper limit ceiling. REARDON stated we are funded at the mid-point of the corridor. In our case, that means there is 350 FTE on either side. Below that, we will lose funding, and above that we get no additional funding. There is no absolute upper limit on enrollment, but we would only get additional biennial funds at a discounted figure of $2900/FTE, if there was an overall revenue increase across the system.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

E. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Budget Committee Annual Report

SCHAUMANN presented the report (D1) and noted that the committee had nothing to do this past year except disseminate information. They were included in the Strategic Budget Design Task Force activities by representation of only two of its membership. With respect to the new budget plan, the Budget Committee recommends the Budget Committee and UPC should be regular reviewers at all stages of budget design.

HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report

GORDON-BRANNAN presented the report (D2) and took questions.
JOHNSON asked if grant monies awarded have leveraged additional funding, a charge indicated in the criteria for funding in the past several years. GORDON-BRANNAN stated there are no figures to address this question.

HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report

VAN-DYCK KOKICH and STERN presented the report (D3) and took questions.

LENDARIS asked if all recommendations in the report have been endorsed. STERN stated most have but there are some unfinished items, such as gender equity issues. STERN was asked what the outcome was of last year’s issue of prayer on the playing field. He stated the policy developed by the committee has undergone a final review at the Attorney General’s level and survived largely intact. LENDARIS requested the policy be included in the minutes to follow through on the Senate’s involvement last Spring. STERN agreed to forward it (attached).

STERN stated an additional issue has come up late in the year, which is taking the committee to the legislature. They have become involved in giving testimony regarding lottery monies for athletics, as a result of the activities of our supporters there.

JOHNSON asked for comment on the previously established long-term objective to go to zero spending from general fund. STERN stated improved box office will move us in that direction. VAN DYCK-KOKICH added that revenues also may be used to address gender equity issues, etc. REARDON stated that when the State Board approved use of general institutional funds, they put a cap on that allowance, so that it must end somewhere around 1999.

HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

4. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report

YOUNG presented the report (D4), prior to item E.1. She stated that she has enjoyed her ten year tenure on the committee, thanks in large measure to the helpfulness of Dean Everhart and Assoc. Dean Hardt.

MACK requested the Administrative Licensure Cohort be added to the report. During Fall and Summer 1995-96 this cohort had a total of 140 students.
HARDT accepted the report for the Senate.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, d

2. Amendment to the Constitution - Article IV, 4, j

HARDT recognized Robert Liebman, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curricular Reform, to present the two amendments (G1 and G2) the committee were charged to develop last month. LIEBMAN summarized that the effect of “G1” is small changes would be approved at the UCC committee level only and then communicated immediately to the campus community, via Web page. The chief effect of “G2” is to focus the activity of Graduate Council around substantive issues of graduate education. UCC has approved the amendments.

TERDAL distributed the response of the Graduate Council to “G2” with their proposal to amend Art.IV, 4, j), 3) and 4), as follows:

"The Graduate Council suggests the following amendment to the motion submitted to the Faculty Senate for changes to the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty.

j) Graduate Council

3) Make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning approval of all new graduate programs and their courses and of all changes in existing graduate programs and their courses. The chair of the Graduate Council will be notified by the Curriculum Coordinator of all curriculum issues that relate to graduate programs and courses in order to determine if they represent substantive change or a minor change.

(Examples of a minor change might be a change in course number, course title, prerequisites. Such changes in 400/500 level courses would be handled directly by the Curriculum Committee.) (The rationale for submitting the changes to the Senate is that making recommendations first to the Curriculum
Committee would slow down the process rather than streamlining it.)

4) **Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing graduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.**

(The rationale for this is that it could involve the Graduate Council in the periodic program review process, which the Task Committee on Graduate Education and Research report recommends.)

GOSLIN/JOHNSON MOVED the wording proposed by the Graduate Council be substituted for Art. IV., 4, j), 3) in “G2.”

LENDARIS asked if “Curriculum Coordinator” could be described so it is clear what that means. REARDON stated that it would be preferable to reference the Office of Academic Affairs instead of the particular position. LIEBMAN stated the position was cited to differentiate between the support activities provided by OAA and OGSR. TERDAL stated all materials Graduate Council receive come from OAA.

CABELLY stated he opposes the amendments because they have not gone far enough to speed up processes. They appear to add steps, not delete them. CABELLY asked if the committee considered eliminating the Graduate Council. LIEBMAN stated yes, but the decision was to retain Graduate Council to keep a stake holder in graduate education.

SHIREMAN asked for a clarification of “G2” Art IV., j), 3). LIEBMAN deferred to PRATT who stated the proposed substitution is no change; that’s what they do now. TERDAL stated the Graduate Council doesn’t want the change that “G2” proposes. ROSENGRANT stated she agrees that another level of review does not streamline the process. LENDARIS stated the phrase “concerning approval” is ambiguous. LIEBMAN stated the intent is not to add another layer. ROSENGRANT proposed a different substitution, clarifying language stating that the Graduate Council refer its decisions to the UCC.

GOSLIN stated the Senate can’t change the amendment when it isn’t approved and people are getting more confused rather than less. FISHER agreed.
THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE AMENDMENT FAILED by sixteen (16) yeas to seventeen (17) nays.

TERDAL/LENDARIS MOVED the wording proposed by the Graduate Council be substituted for Art. IV., 4, j), 4) in “G2.”

LIEBMAN stated the original language was changed to make the two committee descriptions congruent, and to clarify the role of the Graduate Council.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE AMENDMENT PASSED by unanimous voice vote, excepting one (1) nay.

MOOR stated he supports the intent to streamline processes, but the issues related to two committees approving certain courses is still not resolved in the language of these amendments. CABELLY stated he interprets “G1” and “G2” differently than any new language apparently intended. LENDARIS agreed. ROSENGRANT noted that this on-going debate indicates that the language is not communicating what was intended. WINEBERG stated he also does not understand the intended approvals process. PRATT suggested the language be amended to clarify intent. TERDAL stated again that Graduate Council does not intend to abrogate their approval of courses, just minor changes.

GOSLIN/CABELLY MOVED to table the amendments until the next meeting and charge the three committees to resolve these differences and clarify language.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.


WAMSER presented, prior to item G.1., the proposed policy (G3) which came about in response to the issue of gifts having strings attached. It was drafted by Advisory Council in Fall 1996 at the request of the President. Senate Steering Committee forwarded it to UPC, UCC and GC in January 1997 and requested Wamser, as Chair of UPC, coordinate approvals by the three committees. Additions and deletions in the draft text (G3) represent the joint recommendations of these committees.
WAMSER/CABELLY MOVED the Policy Statement on External Gifts and Grants be approved by the Faculty Senate.

LENDARIS noted that the revised statement deletes the sentence having to do with “strings attached,” which begins with the words, “Programs which depend exclusively on external funds for their very existence may be more subject to informal sources of influence...” (section II, last paragraph, last sentence). He asked where else in the policy this idea is covered. WAMSER stated the committees thought it was well covered in the paragraph which is two above the sentence, and that the sentence in question was redundant.

MOOR asked why the word “humanitarian” had been scratched. WAMSER stated they felt confident in defining “educational values” but were hard put to specify where humanitarian values were defined by the university. The intent is that educational values include humanitarian values, unless we find a place to define our humanitarian values. MOOR noted that research on animals or humans may involve educational values while being inhumane. WAMSER stated that problem was recognized but that developing a policy which listed the values in question was another issue. Section III specifies a procedure which allows for those developed to be explored when needed. REARDON stated the OARs and our own internal rules exist to address that issue. MOOR asked what if you accept the gift and then the committee says you can’t, or what about secret funds. WAMSER stated that both concerns were covered in section II, paragraph 2. ENNEKING stated that speaking as one member of Advisory Council, Wamser’s comment regarding the definition of “humanitarian” is well taken. BREENNER stated that, on the contrary, “humanitarian” was included by the Advisory Council because they had struggled with this same issue, and that using the term signals a concern for broader moral and ethical dimensions. WAMSER stated this document defines a process for raising concerns and examining them. CABELLY stated UPC compared the compatibility of the policy with our mission which by definition includes “humanitarian” values. SHIREMAN stated the original language applies to grants as well as gifts, and would require a thorough review of issues. What about Dept. of Defense monies, for example, which are not humanitarian, even if they are potentially educational?

DANIELSON/GOSLIN MOVED the text of the Policy Statement on External Gifts and Grants be amended to retain the lined out words “and humanitarian” in section I, paragraph one, sentence one.

ROSENGRANT stated she is sympathetic with the original language. FISCHER asked where are humanitarian values going to be articulated -
religious background alone could affect an individual's differing view of them. MOOR stated it is unlikely there is a clear definition anywhere, and we must think about a question like this when it arrives. DANIELSON stated that keeping the language emphasizes its importance. SETTLE stated he supports UPC's position and opposes the amendment. DAASCH stated the policy is not an arbiter, it just moves the process forward, and he is therefore against the amendment. BRENNER stated there's always a process of interpretation going on. This operates on two levels, the activities of the researcher and/or the program, as well as the source of the funding for those activities. This is in part an expression of where we stand as a community and what our values are. WAMSER stated that both educational and humanitarian values are equally vague, variable and diverse, but educational values are loftier and inclusive. ENNEKING stated section I, items 1-4, provide the only concrete definitions to measure with.

THE AMENDMENT FAILED, twenty-one (21) in favor to twenty-two (22) opposed.

JOHNSON asked if the four parts of section I are all inclusive. WAMSER stated no, it is just a way to check for compatibility.

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote, excepting one (1) nay.

4. Guidelines for Evaluation of Program Proposals

WAMSER presented the guidelines (G4) developed by the UPC for their own use, and took questions.

SETTLE asked why the term "best practice" is in quotations. WAMSER stated this was done to designate that the term is somewhat dependent on the discipline as well as the proposal. They could easily come off. SETTLE stated that this has the effect of a leading remark. GOSLIN stated he supported having the phrase in quotations because "best practice" is constantly evolving.

DAASCH asked how the guidelines will be disseminated. WAMSER stated it would be given to next year's UPC and to proposers, for starters. GOSLIN urged that it be spread to a wider audience. HARDT suggested OAA could disseminate it.
5. B.A./B.S. in Women’s Studies

PRATT introduced the summary of the proposal (G5), stating UCC has approved it.

JOHNSON/FISHER MOVED the program be approved.

REARDON stated the Board voted approval of the preliminary proposal but had questions which revolved around two issues: 1) is Women’s Studies a discipline justifying an undergraduate degree, and 2) do such degree programs provide for gainful employment.

LENDARIS asked how we answer #1). BRENNER stated that the full proposal describes the development of the discipline as evidenced in scholarly journals, associations meetings, the activities of scholarship, and the degree to which area studies have developed to support an entire curriculum. Focus in the major has been provided so that the degree isn’t watered down. LENDARIS asked if we approve Women’s Studies, do we next have to confront men’s studies. BRENNER stated no, that is the university right now.

CABELLY asked how many credits are in the current certificate program, how many certificate students are graduated per year, and how many majors per year are anticipated? BRENNER stated the certificate requires 32 credits, and 12-15 students per year graduate with a certificate. They took a survey and thirty people want to pursue a Women’s Studies major. The majority of what were previously certificate students would pursue majors.

WINEBERG asked how many new courses are there, and what does a graduate do for a living. BRENNER stated WS 301, WS 341 and WS 342 are new courses. The major serves the same purposes as any other liberal arts major, i.e. continuing with a professional education or preparing for lifelong learning.

MOOR/GOSLIN moved to table the item until the next meeting.

THE MOTION FAILED by a voice vote.

MOOR stated this is an unusual major. In general one can identify what the subject matter is, but in this case, the required courses constitute the core of that subject. This program is designed with a general attitude rather than the study of a subject. The Senate must approved or not approve the major recognizing this difference. PRATT stated that the non-congruence with
expectations in this major is no greater than for any other major. It is always a complicated affair to explore new curriculum.

HARDT stated there is no longer a quorum and the item is therefore continued to the next meeting, but discussion may continue.

CABELLY stated he is comfortable with curriculum as presented. WAMSER stated Moor’s point is, as he understands it, that the field is currently understood to be the sociology of gender. BRENNER stated there are some WS majors which have emphases on topics such as biology, reproductive functions and/or health issues, for example. BRENNER stated that the word “feminism” used in a scholarly context refers to a body of scholarship in which people see themselves as offering an alternative to traditional scholarship in that field. Feminism indicates a questioning of the cannon from a gender perspective, not a point of view. FISHER stated we already have slants in Child and Family Studies, Chicano, Black Studies. SAIFFER stated he agreed, that a subject such as Child and Family Studies is a sub-set in the liberal arts. MOOR stated CFS is not analogous to Chicano Studies, BS, or WS. When these latter topics were proposed, the Senate was assured that they were responses to certain historic omissions, and would disappear eventually because the need would disappear.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.
Rationale

The guidelines which follow are intended to provide assistance and direction concerning the proper relationship between religion and intercollegiate athletics for those involved in intercollegiate athletics and their administration.

The guidelines are designed to ensure that student athlete's religious rights are respected without either actual or implied religious coercion by PSU, its employees or agents. When acting within the scope of their employment coaches and athletic administrators are prohibited from soliciting or encouraging religious activity by student athletes.

Individuals who participate in the conduct of PSU’s athletic programs should think about the propriety of their actions in this area by considering the principles and guidelines provided within this document. The goal is to allow appropriate religious expression while avoiding coercion and/or any suggestion that the University has an official position for or against religion or a particular religion.

Principles

The development of specific guidelines has been based on four principles:

1) the Constitutional prohibition of governmental establishment of religion;

2) the Constitutional protection of the free expression of religion;

3) adherence to applicable State and Federal legislation and relevant court interpretations thereof;

4) proper exercise of authority by athletic staff members and coaches.

Guidelines

The Guidelines which are described below represent an attempt to provide athletic coaches and administrators with policies and suggested actions with respect to religion in PSU’s intercollegiate athletics. Copies of these guidelines will be provided to each coach and be available for student athletes, the University community and the general public.
A. Recruiting

*Coaches shall not use a prospective athlete's religion or religious fervor as a criterion for or against recruitment or scholarship decisions, nor shall the coach's or team member's religious interests be used as a recruitment tool.*

Examples of precluded behavior:

- suggesting directly or indirectly that playing time is based on a prospective athlete's religious beliefs or behavior.
- awarding of scholarship dollars based on a prospective athlete's religious beliefs or involvement in religious activity.

Examples of acceptable behavior:

- answering questions posed by a prospective athlete or the athlete's family about the availability of places to worship in the community or the ability to attend religious services on the road.
- talking about the values which the coach expects from the student athlete

B. Prayer

*Portland State University recognizes the right of its coaches and athletes to choose to or not to: pray, observe moments of silence, meditate and otherwise exercise or express their personal religious choices in a manner which does not indicate or imply such behavior is sanctioned by the University.*

*Prayer, of PSU athletes, may not be led by or participated in by coaches, athletic administrators or other people acting under color of State authority. Coaches should avoid the appearance of promoting prayer by removing themselves from any such activity that, due to its time, manner or location, could be viewed as encouraging or mandating student athlete attendance at a religious activity. Prayer involving more than one student athlete shall be conducted in a manner which does not appear to be an official activity of the team.*

Examples of precluded behavior:

- coach calling players to a prayer meeting.
- coach transporting team members to a place of worship (except as noted below).
- official team meeting immediately before or after a game for a prayer.
Examples of acceptable behavior:

- coaches may engage in prayer in private settings such as their own office outside the presence of student athletes.
- a student athlete may kneel and observe a brief moment of thanksgiving after scoring.
- coaches may, only when on the road with their teams, transport student athletes (who voluntarily request such transportation) to a religious service and may stay and attend such a service with those students.

C. Favoritism

*Coaches shall not display favoritism toward, or prejudice against, any continuing student athlete due to their particular religious behaviors or beliefs.*

Examples of precluded behavior:

- denial of scholarship renewal to a player who refuses to participate in team prayer meetings.
- coach selecting team captain based on the athlete’s acceptable religious beliefs or behavior.
- differences in playing time based on an athlete’s religious beliefs or behavior.
- differentially treating athletes for missing team activities due to practice of their religious beliefs.

D. Public Statements and Behavior

*Coaches and athletic administrators must scrupulously avoid making statements, displaying behaviors or taking actions which could be perceived as encouraging, supporting or promoting a particular religious viewpoint, because the public could interpret those individuals as representatives of Portland State University.*

Examples of precluded behavior:

- speaking in public or being interviewed and advocating for a particular religion or religious belief unless the individual explicitly notes that he/she is speaking personally, not as a representative of the University.
- while giving a talk to a community group suggesting that religious players are better team players.
- using team buses to transport athletes to a place of worship.

Examples of acceptable behavior:

- attending and being active in the religious institution of his/her choice.
- expressing a religious view so long as it is clearly labeled as their personal view separate from their role as an athletic professional.
E. Coercion

No coach or athlete shall be required by any University employee or student to exercise or express any religious belief or behavior.

Examples of precluded behavior:

- requirements that coaches and/or athletes attend a religious service.
- a team leader suggesting that attendance at a “team” prayer meeting is expected.
- an athlete repeatedly pressuring teammates to attend a religious service.

Examples of acceptable behavior:

- an athlete inviting others to attend a service at his/her religious institution.
- an athlete encouraging others to participate in a religious study group.

F. Accommodation for Religious Beliefs

Coaches and athletic administrators should be aware of their duty to make reasonable efforts to accommodate students’ religious beliefs. If a request for accommodation is made, the coach or athletic administrator should seek guidance from the Athletic Director in responding to such a request.

G. Violations

Violations of these guidelines will be treated in the same manner as a violation of the Internal Management Directive Code of Ethics for Intercollegiate Athletics, subjecting the violator to discipline as provided in the State Board of Higher Education rules.

F. Grey Areas

When a coach or athletic administrator is confronted with any situation covered by these guidelines and is unsure about the proper behavior in that situation, the proper course of action is to seek guidance from the Athletic Director. Should the AD be unsure about the situation he/she shall bring the matter to the Intercollegiate Athletics Board or the University’s President for resolution.
QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Question From Steering Committee for Provost Michael Reardon

In the Faculty Senate of November 1996, the following questions were asked with respect to University Studies:

UNIVERSITY STUDIES. University Studies is now in its third year. Please provide Faculty Senate members with an update on the evaluation component of the program. As part of this update, answers to the following questions would be very helpful:

1. What evaluation procedures does University Studies have in place?
2. What forms of program data are being collected?
3. How is the program responding to evaluation findings?
4. How is University Studies determining whether it is meeting its original four goals related to inquiry and critical thinking, communication, human experience, and ethical issues and social responsibility? What criteria are being used to evaluate these goals?
5. "What are the retention rates in comparison to pre-University Studies rates?"
6. Has a cost-benefit analysis been conducted and, if so, what are the results of the analysis?
7. How will the results and findings be shared with the University community to help departments connect their goals and curriculum with University Studies?

Please provide in writing an elaboration on item #6. In particular, we would like to receive the following data:

1) Average enrollments (for the 1996-97 academic year) per scheduled non-zero credit class in UNST, and per scheduled non-zero credit, undergraduate class in each of the following schools or colleges: Engineering, Liberal Arts & Sciences, Urban and Public Affairs, Fine & Performing Arts, and Business Administration.

2) Average grades in those classes, again divided into these five divisions.

3) Average number of credits each class carries in each of these groups.
Members: Johanna Brenner(WS), Marjorie Burns(ENG), Marjorie Enneking(MTH), Mary Kinnick(ED), Robert Liebman(SOC), Rick Hardt(ED)

In addition to our ongoing consultation with the President, the Advisory Council undertook the following tasks:

1) Drafted a Policy on External Gifts and Grants. In response to concerns raised by faculty colleagues and by organizations from the local/national community, the President requested the Council to assess the appropriateness of a grant proposal requesting funds from the Turkish Government to establish a Turkish Studies Program at PSU. Since Portland State has no existing policy in this area, President Ramaley asked the Council to develop criteria through which the appropriateness of external gifts and grants might be evaluated.

The Advisory Council spent a good part of Fall term researching this issue. We found no other universities in the region or nationally (although our national search was hardly exhaustive) which had any explicit policy other than a statement that the university conformed to IRS regulations.

The Council drafted a policy which was reviewed by relevant administrative units and faculty bodies and eventually submitted to the Senate for consideration.

2) Consulted with administrators and faculty involved in external negotiations concerning the status of the PSU engineering and architecture programs.

3) Nominated faculty members to serve on search committees for the Dean of Fine and Performing Arts, the Dean of Education, and the President.

4) Made suggestions to the Chancellor about Presidential search procedures.
Report of the Committee on Committees
to the Faculty Senate
June 1997

Committee Members: Martha Works (CLAS--Chair), Marvin Beeson (CLAS), Tom Potiowsky (CLAS), Fred Nunn (CLAS), Carl Wamser (CLAS), Patrick Feeney (XS), Mary Constans (SFPA), Robert Daasch (EAS-EE), Mary Ellen Kenreich (LIB), John Settle (SBA), Carol Mack (ED), Richard Hunter (SSW), Dan Fortmiller (AO-IASC), Howard Wineberg (UPA-CENS)

The Committee on Committees appoints members and chairpersons of all constitutional committees and ensures required divisional representation. The Committee on Committees also makes recommendations to the President concerning membership and chairperson of administrative committees and ensures divisional representation as appropriate.

The Committee conducted the following business during the 1996-97 academic year:

Fall term: Met twice to fill vacancies and make recommendations and appointments for calendar year committees.

Discussed the possibility of having Retired-Emeriti professors serve as non-voting members of committees. Retired-Emeriti were surveyed last spring during the Committee Preference Survey. Of the roughly 50 responses (out of approximately 250), 9 people offered to serve. Because of the costs of surveying this group (surveys go out by 1st class mail) and the logistics of tabulating and determining their status, the Committee decided this matter would be best handled through direct contacts between the Retired-Emeriti association, interested individuals, and the Committee on Committees. Anyone interested in continuing committee work after retirement should contact the Retired-Emeriti group who will then pass their name on to the Committee.

Winter term: Filled a few vacancies through e-mail and phone connections.

Spring term: Met to make recommendations and appointments for academic year appointments. Of note: there was about a 39% response rate to the spring Committee Preference Survey. 294 surveys were returned out of 753.
Portland State University - University Planning Council
Annual Report, 1996 - 97

Membership:

Carl Wamser, Chair (CHEM), Carl Abbott (USP), Erik Bodegom (PHYS), Sharon Brabenac (SD), Alan Cabelly (SBA), William Greenfield (ED), Susan Hanset (FAC), Joan Hayse (SBA), Clive Knights (ARCH), Elaine Limbaugh (ENGL), Joy Rhodes (SSW), Rolf Schaumann (EE), Charles Smith (XS), Larry Steward (SP), Francis Wambalaba (BST), Scott Wells (CE), Robert Westover (LIB)

Consultants: Michael Reardon (OAA), Jay Kenton (BO), Mary Ricks (OIRP)

Specific Activities:

Recommended in favor of the proposed reorganization of the School of Urban and Public Affairs (Faculty Senate meetings, October 7 & 14)

Recommended in favor of the proposed establishment of a Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute (Faculty Senate meeting, December 2)

Coordinated faculty consultations regarding the proposed reorganization of engineering (various meetings through October, November, December)

Recommended in favor of the proposed policy on external gifts and grants (Faculty Senate meeting, May 5)

Developed general guidelines for evaluating proposals for changes in structure or function of academic units (Faculty Senate meeting, May 5)

Summary:

The University Planning Council dealt with the issues brought to it in the normal course of business, as described above. In addition, we kept in touch with major events related to university planning, hearing reports on the University District Plan, the Strategic Budgeting Initiative, and statistical trends in PSU enrollments and budgeting. In particular, the Council assumed an active role in the issue of the reorganization of engineering during the fall of 1996.

Besides addressing current issues, the Council wanted to help develop better procedures for making decisions regarding academic programs. Specific guidelines were developed which should be useful for future councils, as well as for other committees and for those who develop program proposals. We have collected the mission statements and related documents from the various schools and other university units in order to develop an overview of the visions and missions of the different university constituencies.

Further information is available on our web site:
http://www-adm.pdx.edu/user/chem/Wamser/UPC/

Submitted by Carl C. Wamser, Chair, May 14, 1997
PROPOSED MAJOR IN WOMEN'S STUDIES—SUMMARY/HIGHLIGHTS

Portland State University has offered an undergraduate and post-baccalaureate Certificate in Women's Studies since 1976 and a minor since 1987. We are proposing to offer a Bachelor's degree, rather than a Certificate at the undergraduate level. The Certificate would remain available as a post-baccalaureate degree.

CURRICULUM:

The Women's Studies Major combines an interdisciplinary core curriculum with individualized courses of study. The core curriculum will include: the introductory course, an interdisciplinary sequence of three courses focused on the development of critical thinking skills and an appreciation for the range of theoretical frameworks and methodologies present in contemporary feminist scholarship; a 3-term sequence in U.S. women's history; 8 credits in experiential learning, including a required seminar to be taken in conjunction with an internship or practicum.

For their individual program, students will design an emphasis which is based in a discipline or in a theme that crosses disciplines.

A discipline-based emphasis will consist of five courses (20 credits) in a department or program outside Women's Studies. Two of these courses are to be courses which familiarize students with that discipline's materials and approaches. The other three courses in the discipline are to be cross-listed with Women's Studies or approved by the Women's Studies advisor in the discipline.

A theme-based emphasis will consist of five courses which together form a coherent multi-disciplinary approach to a subject. All of the courses are to be cross-listed with Women's Studies or approved by their Women's Studies advisor.

Students will be required to develop a program in consultation with their Women's Studies advisor. In order to be considered for the BA or BS degree, this program of study will have to carry approval of both their Women's Studies advisor and the Women's Studies Coordinator. Changes in this program must be similarly approved. Non-approved programs will not be considered to meet major requirements. The point here is to ensure that students are well-advised and that their individually designed programs of study are intellectually coherent and appropriate to the goals of the Women's Studies major.

TOTAL CREDITS REQUIRED IN THE CORE: 32

Students will have a choice of taking either WS 340 or WS 341, although it is recommended that they take both.

TOTAL CREDITS IN INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM: 20

TOTAL CREDITS FOR THE MAJOR: 52

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) are not acceptable toward fulfilling major requirements with the following exceptions: one women's studies elective course, WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship, WS 409.
WS CORE CURRICULUM

WS 101 Introduction to Women's Studies [existing course] 4

WS 301 Gender & Critical Inquiry [new course]
Cross-discipline introduction to feminist frameworks including theoretical issues and varying
approaches to the study of women and gender. Attention to the relationship between gender and
other axes of inequality. Emphasis on the development of critical thinking skills. Pre-requisite WS
101

WS 340 Women and Gender in America, Colonial Era to 1865 (4 credits) OR
WS 341 Women and Gender in America, 1865-Present (4 credits) [existing courses] 4

WS 342 History of Feminism in the United States [changed course]
After a review of Western feminism’s Enlightenment roots and Victorian variations in the United
States, this course focuses on the shaping of modern feminism as a diverse body of questions, ideas,
and experiments in American life. Themes include political equality, the emergence of sexual
politics, issues of race and difference, women workers and class conflict, the civil rights movement
and gender struggles, radical feminism, conservative women and “backlash”, and feminist
internationalism. prerequisite: WS 340 or WS 341

WS 315 Feminist Analysis [changed course]
An exploration of the interpretive frameworks and research strategies utilized in contemporary
feminist scholarship. Drawing on examples from more than one discipline, students will be
introduced to a range of theoretical and methodological approaches, while learning to identify the
choices that scholars make in carrying out their work. Issues under debate within feminist
scholarship as well as the differences between feminist scholars and those working from other
frameworks will be examined. prerequisite: WS 301

WS 404/409 Internship/Practicum (3,3) [existing course] 6

WS 411 Experiential Learning Seminar (1,1) [new course]
To be taken simultaneously with WS 404 or WS 409. Students will present material based upon
their experiences in practica and internships. The seminar provides an opportunity for students to
reflect on the settings where they are working and analyze issues that emerge in applying feminist
theory to practice.

WS 415 Senior Seminar [changed course]
With a focus on analysis, critique, comparison and connection, students will work collaboratively as
well as independently in this theoretical, thematically-based course. The seminar is taught by faculty
from multiple disciplines. Students will be responsible for planning and leading discussion during some
sessions as well as presenting and responding to work-in-progress. pre-requisite: WS 315
RESOURCES:

Courses currently offered throughout the University are sufficient to support the electives for the proposed curriculum. In academic year 1996-1997, a total of 51 elective courses will be offered that could be used to fulfill individualized programs of study. As to the core curriculum, a 1.0 FTE in the History Department and a .66 FTE instructional appointment in Women’s Studies support seven courses in the core curriculum. Additional funds to support the participation of departmental faculty in teaching the remaining core courses will be allocated permanently to Women’s Studies by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

CHANGES TO THE CERTIFICATE AND MINOR

The Certificate in Women’s Studies will be offered as a post-baccalaureate degree only. The structure of the Certificate will remain unchanged. The total number of credits and the core course requirements will change in order to be consistent with the new core curriculum for the major.

The minor will change slightly. The addition of four new core courses (WS 301, 340, 341, 342) allows for increased requirements in the core relative to electives. The total number of credits (28) remains the same.

WOMEN’S STUDIES MINOR

A minor in Women's Studies will consist of 28 credits. Students will be required to take 12 credits in the core courses (not including WS 404/409, WS 411). The additional 16 credits may be fulfilled by either core courses (including WS 404/409, WS 411) or Women's Studies electives (courses cross-listed with other departments or approved by the Women's Studies Coordinator).

CERTIFICATE IN WOMEN’S STUDIES (Post-Baccalaureate Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Women's Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 301 Gender and Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 315 Feminist Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 415 Senior Seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship or WS 409 (Practicum)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved electives (minimum of 12 upper division)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 38

In meeting the 16 elective credits requirement, students may take a maximum of 12 credits in any one academic area (arts&letters, science, social science) and 4 credits in lower division courses.

Courses taken under the undifferentiated grading option (pass/no pass) are not acceptable toward fulfilling Certificate requirements with the following exceptions: one women's studies elective course, WS 404 Cooperative Education/Internship, WS 409.
Proposed Changes to Constitution of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty. Section 4 Faculty Committees

Text to be deleted struck-out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

4d) Curriculum Committee. This committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two students. The Committee shall:

1) Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new courses and undergraduate programs referred to it by divisional curriculum or other committees.
2) Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new graduate programs and their courses referred to it by the Graduate Council or other committees.
3) Refer Make recommendations to the Senate with recommendations all modifications and deletions of concerning substantive changes to existing programs and courses brought to it through committee channels referred to it by divisional the Graduate Council or other committees.
4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing undergraduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed undergraduate program and course modifications and deletions changes to the various divisions and departments.
5) Consider and prepare policy statements Develop and recommend policies concerning such curricular patterns curriculum at the University as the Committee deems necessary.
6) Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of appropriate committees.
7) Suggest and refer to the Senate, after consideration by the Academic Requirements Committee, modifications in the overall undergraduate degree requirements within the curricular structure.
8) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of undergraduate courses.
9) Report on its activities at least once each year to the Senate in summary form, including in such report a listing a list of programs and courses recommended and not recommended reviewed and approved.
10) Act in liaison with appropriate committees in the review of graduate-level courses.
Proposed Changes to Constitution of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty. Section 4 Faculty Committees

Text to be deleted struck-out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

4j) Graduate Council. This council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research Dean of Graduate Studies. The Council shall:

1) Develop and recommend University policies and establish procedures and regulations for graduate studies, and adjudicate petitions regarding graduate regulations.

2) Recommend to the Faculty Senate or to its appropriate committees and to the Vice Provost of Graduate Studies and Research Dean of Graduate Studies suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs.

3) Coordinate all graduate activities of instructional units and programs with regard to requests for changes in courses, requests for new courses and programs, and changes in existing graduate courses and programs; and submit recommendations to the Senate Inform the Curriculum Committee concerning approval of all new graduate programs and of all substantive changes in existing graduate programs, including its review of new courses and substantive changes in supporting courses.

4) Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing graduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Consider the need for graduate course modifications and deletions; and review the credit value of graduate courses. Reports of such review and recommendations deriving therefrom shall be submitted to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies and Research, the Faculty Senate and appropriate faculty committees. Suggest needed graduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.

5) Advise the Senate concerning credit values of graduate courses.

6) Act in liaison with appropriate committees.

7) Report at least once a year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.
PRÉCIS OF REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC BUDGET DESIGN TEAM (5/9/97)

The Strategic Budget Design Team was appointed by President Judith Ramaley in October 1996 and given a three-fold charge: (1) Provide the criteria and a process to ensure appropriate investments in key University assets, (2) provide a framework to guide allocation decisions, and (3) extend the "culture of evidence" into the budget arena so as to measure the effect of allocation choices and to guide future decisions. The design team completed a draft report in April 1997 upon which this précis is based. The Design Team's final report will be submitted to the president shortly after its final meeting on May 12.

Strategic budgeting is defined as a community and constituency building process which is based on the generation and preservation of assets. It seeks to clarify how each unit adds to and consumes resources, and organizes the budget into five general categories: The base budget, the maintenance of University assets (such as people as well as physical assets), investments in new assets, funding for new initiatives (also referred to as venture capital), and a contingency fund.

An analysis of the current budget determined that the University is positioned to receive an increase of between $7 and $8 million next year as a result of increased enrollment. This fact vividly demonstrates the connection between enrollment and resources under the present Budget Allocation System (the BAS model). However, the University faces a number of expenditures, which could easily consume this additional funding in FY 1997/98.

Nevertheless, the Design Team has presented a set of general principles, criteria for allocating resources, and a proposed decision-making process. The general principles include an emphasis on faculty as the institution's most valuable asset, the need to make decisions in such a way so as to serve the best interests of the University as a whole, an open and rational budget process based on expected outcomes, establishment of a system which will provide data and other information needed for the budget process, and a process which results in a "collective mentality" which will foster institutional thinking and shared responsibility.

The criteria consider both the schools and colleges, as well as the support areas of the University. In the instructional units the criteria address teaching, mentoring and curricular activities, quantitative data such as degrees conferred, information on quality (employer evaluations of graduates, surveys of graduates, etc.), research and other creative activities as measured by such things as funded research, publications, etc., and community outreach. As a starting point for establishing criteria for the non-instructional units the Design Team recommends work done on this topic by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).

In its report the Design Team makes a number of suggestions on assessment. In some cases quantitative measurements can be used but, in others, the best approach is simply to ask people—either individually through interviews or questionnaires, or in focus groups.

Finally, the report contains a detailed description of the proposed budget process complete with a decision flow chart (see over). The annual budget development process begins with the president and an administrative committee who establish institutional needs and priorities. These priorities are reviewed by the Council of Academic Deans, the Budget Committee and the University Planning Council; Based on this input, budget instructions are prepared and budget requests are generated. The president, provost, vice presidents, and deans should involve department heads, directors, and managers in the formulation of budget requests, which should contain a description of how each request relates to an existing plan or priority, how it adds to or consumes discretionary resources, how it relates to the overall strategic plan of the University, and how it will be evaluated.

Responsibility for prioritizing budget requests will begin at the school, college or administrative unit level. A compendium of these prioritized requests will be prepared by the Budget Office and will then be submitted to key committees (such as the Budget Committee, and the Executive Committee). The president, in consultation with appropriate individuals and committees, will make affirmative decisions as to which requests to fund immediately, and which should be placed on a call list subject to funding becoming available during the year.
I. The President, working with the Provost and VPs, define the formats, priorities and parameters for budget process. 
   Due: Dec./Jan.

II. The Council of Academic Deans, Senate Budget Committee, and University Planning Council review proposed format, priorities, estimated funding and criteria and send their comments and concerns to the President, Provost and VPs. 
   Due: Jan./Feb.

III. Budget Office prepares budget request instructions, incorporating the Strategic Budget Committee's criteria, and the executive's format, priorities and estimated funding as revised by CADs' and the Budget Committee's input. 
   Due: March

IV. Departments, units and programs formulate requests based on instructions and submit to Deans or Vice Presidents/ Vice Provosts. 
   Due: April 1

V. VP's and Provost working with CADs prioritize requests and submit to Budget Office. 
   Due: April 30

VI. Preliminary requests are consolidated and are reviewed collectively by the President, Provost, VPs, and the Senate Budget Committee. 
   Due: May 15

VII. (a.) After receipt of the Senate Budget Committee's input this forms the basis of the Final Budget Request for consideration by the President, Provost and Vice Presidents. 
   Due: May 31

VII. (b.) A compilation of the requests is submitted to the Senate Budget Committee for review and comment. The Senate Budget Committee's comments are incorporated as appropriate and the revised requests are submitted to the President, Provost and VPs for consideration. 
   Due: May 31 (may take longer in periods of significant budget decrements to allow for additional input as required by the faculty and staff union contracts.)

VIII. President, Provost and VPs review requests, make revisions as appropriate and, based on funding availability and other factors, make final decisions for funding. 
   Due: June

IX. Budget Office notifies affected units of their approved budgets. 
   Due: ASAP after adoption.

X. Budget Committee monitors results of operation and performs summative evaluation to inform subsequent processes.

XI. The Budget Office prepares an Annual Report each year detailing financial information, asset utilization information and accomplishments, outcomes and economic impacts resulting from operations. 
   Due: Sept./Oct. each year.
THE URBAN CENTER PROJECT

Portland State University’s Urban Center Project is the first phase of a six-block area that will be the new front door to PSU and the University District. It is comprised of a public plaza, transit facilities for both bus and light-rail, and a 134,000 SF building housing 26,000 SF of retail space, six distance-learning classrooms and new facilities for PSU’s College of Urban and Public Affairs. The project will cost approximately $29.2 million, from a combination of State, Federal, City and private funding sources. The project is scheduled to break ground in 1998 and be completed in mid-1999.

Design Process

The design process was a dynamic interaction between a multidisciplinary team and the client group representing the interests of the University, City and Tri-Met.

The design team included Thomas Hacker and Associates, Architects, Walker and Macy, Landscape Architects, and a support team including an artist, historian, and an urbanist, as well as civil, structural, mechanical and electrical engineers. Client committees included an Executive Committee which guided the overall process and consisted of the Dean of the School of Urban and Public Affairs, the Vice-President of Administration and Finance, a Vice-President and Chairman of the Real Estate Committee of the PSU Foundation and a representative each from City Planning and Tri-Met. The Advisory Group directed the master plan and included persons representing the University, Tri-Met, City Planning, Transportation and the downtown business community. A sub-group of the Advisory Committee was formed to prepare the Development Program for the six-block study area, and a related Building Programming Committee was formed to guide the development of the Urban Center Building.

The architects and landscape architects conducted a series of internal workshops to generate ideas. Independent design charrettes were conducted with an artist, historian and urbanist to explore basic concepts of space and form and the integration of public art. Semi-weekly Advisory Group meetings were held in an open public forum designed to encourage free exchange of opinions and ideas.

Urban Center Plaza

Design of the Plaza and Building has been integrated to create a vital open space for high volume pedestrian, vehicle, bus and train traffic. Inspired by the image of a crucible, the Plaza depicts the forces and motion of physical as well as cultural influences coming together between the University and the City. The crucible metaphor unifies the design of the Building and Plaza and is expressed in the major site elements as well as building masses. Diagonal intervention of the Light Rail tracks appears to spin the Plaza, which draws in and merges the Building with other energies of the City and University. At the same time it serves as a solid platform for festivals and events, as well as for daily use on a more intimate scale. It features brick and stone paving, fountains and softly landscaped groves of trees, with generous amounts of comfortable seating.

Urban Center Building

The concept for the Urban Center Building grows naturally out of the concept for the Urban Center Plaza. The image of the crucible at the center of the Plaza, with the connotation of motion, blending, mixing, invigorating is extended into the building geometry and the dynamic distribution of its masses.

The Urban Center Building will house the activities of the College of Urban and Public Affairs, which is made up of the School of Urban Studies and Planning, the School of Government and the School of Community Health. Each school contains both academic departments and research Institutes. The site of the Urban Center, between the heart of PSU and the governmental and commercial center of Portland, is ideal given the mission of the College. With the building literally straddling the Light Rail, the College securely links itself to the future of Portland and the region. Retail spaces front both the city streets and the plaza, enlivening the ground level with a variety of activities.

The building form is marked by monumental brick walls at the street edges eroded at the plaza side to a lighter concrete frame with elegantly detailed glass infill. The building is comprised of three wings, offset from each other but interlocked with vertical brick core towers that house the building’s utilities and circulation. The three wings step vertically from eight stories to three, with the lowest wing supporting a roof garden overlooking the plaza.
PROJECT SUMMARY

PSU UNIVERSITY STUDENT HOUSING & ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

BACKGROUND

PSU Housing and Elementary School is the outcome of Portland State University's participation in a community-based partnership with Portland Public Schools and College Housing Northwest. This project will be a national model for a "learning community" within an urban neighborhood. The Portland State University School of Education will actively participate with Portland Public Schools in the creation and implementation of programs offered to university and elementary school students at this new facility, which will expand educational opportunities for the youth of downtown Portland.

The proximity to the City's cultural district and resources of a major urban university makes the site a desirable one. Not only will this project address the need for affordable student housing, it will provide an integrated lifestyle choice for those who live, work, and go to school in downtown Portland.

Elementary School

Portland Public Schools intends that the proposed elementary school will serve the families living and working downtown, the children of students and staff of Portland State University, and families from surrounding neighborhoods attracted to the academic curriculum offered at this facility. The three-story school is a Kindergarten through Fifth Grade magnet school which will accommodate 350 students from all over the city, as well as the children of university students, faculty and staff. The primary spaces include a Media Center, small Gymnasium, outdoor Covered Play Area, Cafeteria, Prep Kitchen, Music Room, Administrative Offices, eleven Elementary School classrooms, and one classroom for the PSU School of Education.

Housing

It is College Housing Northwest's desire to offer exceptional housing to college students which provides them with the opportunity to enhance their college experience. The housing will consist of two five-story buildings, one on the west site and one on the east. Instead of a typical dormitory with shared bathrooms and kitchens, the housing units will be predominantly two-bedroom apartments with a living room, bathroom, and small kitchen. There are a total of 106 units on both sites, approximately 85% of them in a two-bedroom size. The balance of the units are either three-bedroom or studio units. A one-bedroom manager's apartment is included. Common spaces include a lobby for each of the two buildings, a shared lounge, an exercise room, and a laundry facility.

Parking

Parking will be provided below the housing on both sites. There will be a total of 95 spaces, of which 40 will be dedicated for the elementary school.

SCHEDULE

The project is still in the economic feasibility stage. The current schedule calls for construction to start in May 1998 and be completed for Fall term 1999.