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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 1, 1998, 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 8, 1998.

AGENDA

A. Roll
*B. Approval of the Minutes of the May 4, 1998, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   President’s Report

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE FOR 1998-99

D. Question Period

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER PRO TEM FOR 1998-99

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   1. Advisory Council Annual Report - Wamser
   2. Committee on Committees Annual Report - Kenreich
   3. Univ. Planning Council Quarterly/Annual Report - Bodegom
   4. Faculty Development Committee Annual Report - Herinckyx
   5. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report - Tosi
   6. Report of the President’s Task Force on Campus Climate - Miller-Jones

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE FOR 1998-99

F. Unfinished Business
   1. Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, Sec. 4, 4, m) University Planning Council
   2. Report of the University Studies Review Task Force - Farr
   3. Discussion of the Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirement - Rosengrant

G. New Business
   1. M. of Software Engineering and Other Graduate Course/Program Proposals - Terdal

DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES TO ELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPS FOR
   1998-2000: CLAS (2), SSW (1), AO (1), CUPA (1), SBA (1), GSE (1)

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:
   B Minutes of the May 4, 1998, Senate Meeting
   E1 Advisory Council Annual Report
   E2 Committee on Committees Annual Report
   E3 Univ. Planning Council Quarterly/Annual Report
   E4 Faculty Development Committee Annual Report
   E5 This report will be delivered under separate cover no later than May 28, 1998
   F1 Constitutional Amendment, Article IV, Sec. 4, 4, m) University Planning Council
   F2 This report will be delivered under separate cover no later than May 28, 1998
   F3 Discussion of the Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirement
   G1 M. of Software Engineering and Other Graduate Course/program Proposals

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

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 4, 1998
Presiding Officer: Ulrich H. Hardt
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. The Minutes of the April 6, 1998 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved with the following correction:

O’Toole was incorrectly listed as absent.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Bernstine has approved the actions of the April Faculty Senate Meeting:

Approval of the M.S./M.A. in Writing, including new courses.

Course and program proposals in English, Physics, Science Education and Sociology.
University Studies course proposals for Freshman and Sophomore inquiry courses.

Extension of the Drop/Withdraw/Grading-option-change Deadline to the 5th week of term.


Correction to the printed text of the Proposed Constitutional Amendment ("G2") has been distributed on the floor.

Vice President’s Report

The new funding model for OUS is still not finalized. In the meantime, a policy document was distributed for discussion this week.

Enrollment continues to be good for Freshmen and total Undergraduate numbers. Graduate applications continue to be stagnant.

The campuses and the Chancellor’s Office are still in negotiations for the Fall 1998 budget.

President’s Report

This week the PSU Urban Center Project received additional funding of $1.5 million from the Meyer Memorial Trust, and $2.5 million from the City of Portland. Groundbreaking is scheduled for June. This announcement was followed by applause from the floor. Finally, as the Senate is already aware, this year’s graduation speaker is President of the United States William F. Clinton.

FISHER asked if the issue of Graduation ticketing has been settled. BERNSTINE stated that all attending will be required to hold tickets, and only Graduates will receive Guest tickets. ALLEN stated a letter describing procedure will be sent to faculty at the end of the week. The Graduation "hotline" telephone number is 725-4910 and information is available on the PSU Web page.

LALL noted that his research currently includes a Paragon Cable line at PSU, and he has been contacted by Robert Walker, Television Service, to use the line for overflow audience viewing from Harrison Hall.

Following the President’s Report, HARDT introduced Diane Vines, new Vice Chancellor for Corporate and Public Affairs and Secretary to the Board. Vice
Chancellor Vines encouraged Faculty to contact her regarding issues in her domain, and noted that she has an office at Mill Street as well as Eugene. In the next few months, she will be developing a public information campaign about the budget needs of the campuses. The campus leadership and the Board will be requested to participate by "going on the road" to sell their message. We need to present a consistent message to the public regarding reinstatement of base funding for higher education. She is also developing a plan for statewide Distance Learning coordination and enhancement.

HARDT asked Senators to report on departments who are discussing or implementing certificate programs, as Vice Provost Feyerherm urged faculty to do at the last Senate Meeting. DAASCH stated that Engineering is working on several, in conjunction with SB 504 mandates, which actually predate last month’s conversation. MORGAN stated that PSU would do well to look at the Certificate programs which Public Administration administered at Salem and Bend when the program was at Lewis & Clark. He noted they were also excellent recruiting devices towards later full degree completion.

BULMAN stated Geography is discussing a GIS (Geographic Information Systems) certificate. ENNEKING stated Math is talking with several other departments regarding Applied Statistics Certificates, as well as developing internal ideas for a Math Ed certification. BENSON stated Education has had two certificate programs in teacher licensure since 1994. Since last month’s Senate discussion several other ideas are being investigated.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions for Administrators or the Chair.

E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Annual Report of the Budget Committee

FARR briefly reviewed the report ("E1"). He noted this was a productive year as regards faculty inclusion in the budgeting procedures, and that he hopes the loose ends of the process will be tied up by next year. It is important to prepare budgets in a timely manner, especially when the state doesn’t come through.

ENNEKING asked if the committee was hindered by the delay in setting the new OSU funding model. FARR stated that the committee was kept informed at PSU, but that PSU hasn’t gotten a budget from the state. Hopefully, next year the process will be implemented in its entirety.
HARDT accepted the report for Senate and thanked the committee for their work this year.


FORBES presented the report, noting that this year has been very quiet compared to last.

He added that review of Title IX has implications for the introduction of four new women's sports, crew, water polo, lacrosse and field hockey.

HARDT accepted the report and thanked the committee for their work this year.

3. Annual Report of the Teacher Education Committee

JIMERSON introduced the report. STEINBERGER requested it be noted, in relation to item #6, that the cohort in administration at Southern Oregon had 24 students and prospects are good for another cohort next year. Additionally, a cohort may be initiated in Newport for 1998-99.

4. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting

CEASE introduced the report for Wollner, who was unable to attend, noting two items of great importance, performance based standards and budgets/faculty salaries.

CEASE reminded Senators that Higher Education Lobby Day is 27 May, 10-12 a.m. in Rm. 50 at the Capitol. He noted that an important issue we have not answered well is the question of what happens if salaries are not increased.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Preliminary Report of the University Studies Task Force

Grant Farr, Chair of the ad hoc committee appointed by the Steering Comm. introduced their report, thanking his colleagues for their participation to date. FARR noted there are three issues being examined: 1) curricular needs of General Education; 2) Assessment, and 3) Cost and placement in the instructional structure of the university. FARR also noted the open and honest response of the administration and University Studies colleagues. He stated the committee's intent is to have a report for the June Faculty Senate meeting.
G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Master of Engineering Program Proposals

TERDAL/DAASCH MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the seven proposed Master of Engineering degrees.

TERDAL introduced the proposals for seven new M.E. Degree Programs in Engineering, and yielded to Trevor Smith to answer questions regarding the proposals. Smith noted that the proposals were developed in response to SB 504, which mandated internships in the Portland area. The degrees require 45 credits with up to 13 credits fulfilling the internship component, and have been designed to respond to industry needs.

ENNEKING asked for a clarification regarding the Math requirement in the M.E. core requirements. Smith stated the requirement is for 4 credits from Math and an additional 4 credits of any Numerical Methods course.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution, Art.IV, Sec. 4., 4, m., University Planning Committee

BODEGOM introduced the proposal, noting that it is basically a "housekeeping" item, to revise outdated terms and conditions.

Hearing no discussion, HARDT referred the Proposal to Advisory Council to review the language, and return it to next month’s Senate.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OASD</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collie, Samuel F</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Sandra</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>GEOG 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broido, Ellen</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>ENG 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham, Mary Ann</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>CLAS 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketcheson, Kathi</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>OIRP</td>
<td>ENG 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Dee</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>CARC</td>
<td>HST 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Mary Beth</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>PSY 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movahed, Arezu</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>OGSR</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres, Vasti</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle, John</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning, William</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Ray</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watne, Donald</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller, Beverly</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenner, Steven</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goslin, Lewis</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, Nancy</td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack, Carol L.</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Dilafruz</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordhoff, Karen</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Rolla</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driscoll, Michael</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lall, Kent</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casperson, Lee</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch, Roy</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turcic, David</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmsted, Carillon</td>
<td>XS-HS</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry, Samuel</td>
<td>XS-PDC</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyck-Kokich, Judith</td>
<td>XS-ESP</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrington, Margaret</td>
<td>XS-SS</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattenberg, Richard</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agre-Kippenhan, Susan</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Lawrence</td>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erskine, Ellen</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cease, Ronald</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozawa, Connie</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelmon, Sherril</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Douglas</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Walter</td>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal, Margaret</td>
<td>IOA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenreich, Mary Ellen</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell, Faye</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley, Sarah</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Richard</td>
<td>RRI</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corcoran, Kevin</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holladay, Mindy</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Paul</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Interim appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORY COUNCIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Karant-Nunn(97-99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cooper(98-00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Wollner(97-99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Biolisi(98-00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Wamsner(97-99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Bulman(98-00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERINSTUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cooper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Cease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Wollner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 13, 1998
Advisory Council Annual Report, 1997-98


Meetings of 1-2 hour duration have been held nearly every week, with President Bernstine attending as his schedule permits (about once a month). One meeting was held with Acting President Michael Reardon in July. Meetings have included a variety of other campus members as well.

General functions of the Advisory Council are specified in the Faculty Constitution, including:

- Service as an advisory body to the President on matters of policy. In general, discussion of policy issues between the President and the Advisory Council is confidential. Topics of discussion most often covered budget updates and statewide issues, as well as the specific issues listed below.
- Advising on ad hoc University-wide committees. This procedure was not always followed.
- Review of constitutional amendments for proper form and numbering (two this year).
- Conduct studies and make recommendations on matters of faculty welfare to be presented to the President and/or the Senate. Our concern for this role led the Advisory Council to be involved in a variety of issues; of those issues, the following have had specific actions taken.

Specific issues:

- Naming policy – passed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President
- Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Task Force – a task force has been named
- Presidential Search Procedures – a statement of suggested revisions was forwarded to the State Board, but no substantive changes were implemented
- Administration of research grants – a variety of changes are currently being implemented
- Library services – advised on procedures for addressing ongoing problems
- Distinguished professorships – under discussion
- Identification of centers of excellence / assessment of programs – under discussion

Respectfully submitted: Carl C. Wamser, Chair for 1997-98

May 6, 1998
Committee on Committees
Annual Report
May 7, 1998

Membership:
Marvin Beeson, CLAS (GEOL)
Tom Biolsi, CLAS (BIO)
Eugene Enneking, CLAS (MTH)
Marjorie Terdal, CLAS (LING)
Randy Zelick, CLAS (BIO)
Dan Fortmiller, AO (IASC)
Kent Lall, EAS (CE)
Carol Mack, ED
Mary Ellen Kenreich, Chair (LIB)
John Settle, SBA
Mary Constans, SFPA (ART)
Richard Hunter, SSW
Howard Wineberg, UPA (CENS)
Steffen Saifer, XS

The Committee on Committees appoints members and chairs of all constitutional committees, ensuring divisional and required representation. The Committee also makes recommendations to the President concerning membership and chairs of all administrative committees, ensuring divisional representation as appropriate. The Faculty Senate Committee Preference Survey is the primary resource for the Committee in making new recommendations and appointments. Committee members also confer with continuing and outgoing chairs for opinions regarding their committee's membership. Service on committees is usually for three years.

Fall term, the Committee made recommendations and appointments for 16 positions on the four calendar year committees. We also filled one vacancy on an academic year committee. We met once in person and completed follow-up business via email and phone.

Winter term, the Committee filled a couple of positions that had become vacant. Also during Winter term, Graduate Council asked us to consider a suggestion in a draft report of the Graduate Task Committee to further define the Council membership in the Constitution. Discussing via email, we recommended that the following sentences be added: "It is desirable that the faculty appointees be selected from among faculty members with an interest or involvement in graduate education. These individuals can be identified with the assistance of the Office of Graduate Studies." The Graduate Council will propose this change to the Senate.

Spring term, the Committee will meet in May to make recommendations and appointments to 15 academic year committees.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Ellen Kenreich, Chair
University Planning Council

Annual report to the Faculty Senate meeting of June 1, 1998.

Members of University Planning Council:

Activities:
1. Intellectual property subcommittee is starting to look at the various issues. Meeting has been scheduled with the OUS Director of Legal Services.
2. Revision proposed for Article IV, section 4m of the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty: elimination of Management Services position, replacement of Budget Director by Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration.
3. Meeting with Finance and Administration to keep informed of the changes in OUS allocation model.
4. Recommended for the name change of Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering.
5. Recommended for the name change of School of Education to the Graduate School of Education.
6. A subgroup is serving on the Universities Studies Taskforce.

Pending:
1. Develop guidelines for the naming of academic units and programs.

Submitted by: Erik Bodegom, UPC Chair, 5/14/98
Faculty Development Committee Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Date: Thursday, May 7, 1998

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier
From: Heidi Herinckx, Chair

Re: Faculty Development Committee Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Deadline for submission of proposals for Faculty Development Grants was March 30th, 1998. Forty-four (44) proposals were submitted totaling $412,098. The committee's budget for this year ($100,000) remains the same as in previous years.

Due to the delays in our committee's award, the entire review process for this year was pushed back by four months. The faculty development committee has committed to working diligently over the next month to complete the remaining scope of work before the end of the academic year. Proposals are currently under review by committee members. Deadline for review is May 11th, 1998. As soon as the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects can enter reviewers scores into their database, the committee will begin meeting as a group to make recommendations for funding. The committee's goal is to complete all funding decisions by the end of May, so that the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects can notify funded applicants, assign account numbers and set up other files by the end of this academic year.

I will be able to provide a more complete report to the Faculty Senate at the June meeting.

Heidi Herinckx, Chair

Committee Members
Kofi Agorsah (BST)
Amy Driscoll (CAE)
David Morgan (IOA)
Beverly Fuller (SBA)
Dannelle Stevens (ED)
Brad Hansen (XS-IS)
Jeff Holland (LIB)
Peter Leung (PHY)
Walt Fosque (SFP A)
Michelle Gamburd (ANTH)
Wendelin Mueller (CE)
Sharon Elteto (LIB)
Martha Works (GEOG)
Marcia Silver (ENG)
Proposed Amendment
CONSTITUTION OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY
Text to be deleted struck out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty.
Section 4, Faculty Committees
m) University Planning Council. The University Planning Council shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Council shall be composed of the chairperson of the Budget Committee, plus five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one faculty member each from each of the professional schools, Business Administration, Education, Engineering & Applied Science, Fine & Performing Arts, Social Work, and Urban & Public Affairs, one faculty member from the Library, one faculty member from the School of Extended Studies, one faculty member representing All Other faculty, one Management Services person, one classified person, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate). The chairperson shall be selected from the membership by the Committee on Committees. The Provost, the Budget Director, Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning shall serve as consultants at the request of the Council. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee.
The Council shall: ....

************
DISCUSSION ITEM:
Proposal To Amend The
Bachelor Of Arts Degree Requirement

For the Bachelor of Arts Degree: Students must complete 28 credits to include:

- a minimum of 12 credits in the Arts and Letters academic distribution area,
- a minimum of 12 credits in the Science and/or Social Science distribution areas, and
- 4 credits in a foreign language numbered 200 or higher.

A minimum of 4 of the 12 credits in the Arts and Letters academic distribution area must be in the area of Fine and Performing arts.

Sandra Rosengrant, Chair
Academic Requirements Committee
May 7, 1998
DATE: May 18, 1998  
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Marge Terdal, Chair Graduate Council  
RE: Recommendation of program changes, new programs, new courses

The following graduate program changes were reviewed by the Graduate Council and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

**Masters degree in Theater Arts**
1. Add the option of Masters of Science in Theater Arts for those who wish to focus more intensively on performance and production areas.
2. Reduce required number of credits of courses in theater arts from 36 to 33, and increase the number of credits that may be taken outside of theater arts from 9 to 12. The total credits needed for the degree remain 45 (this includes 6 credits for thesis or other final project).

A copy of the proposed catalog copy and rationale for the changes is included here.

**Ph.D. in Urban Studies**
1. Change core requirements from five substantive core courses and three core methods courses to: a year-long research seminar (9 credits) and a course in Research Design (4 credits). The Graduate Council has asked for proposals for these courses within the next academic year.
2. Change number and names of field areas from: Development and Planning, Location Theory and Analysis, Transportation, and Geographic Information Systems to the following: Planning, Community Development, Policy Analysis, Gerontology, Social Demography.
Continue to require 21 credits in one field area and 18 credits in a second field area, plus 20 credits in courses supporting first and second fields.
3. Total number of course credits required for the Ph.D. is reduced from 88 to 72 (plus 27 for dissertation).

A copy of the proposed catalog copy and rationale for the changes is included here.

**Oregon Master of Software Engineering**
This is a proposal for a new state-wide professional Master of Software Engineering Program to be offered jointly by the computer science departments of PSU, OGI, OSU, and UO. A description is included with this packet of materials. A complete description is available in the Graduate Office. New course proposals will be submitted by early Fall term, 1998.

The Graduate Council approved this program with one statement to be added to the proposal: "A fair policy of credit reporting and graduate degree allocation shall be developed by the program and communicated back to each institution during the next academic year for review."
Option Proposal for MBA Program
Add an option in the Management of Innovation and Technology (MIT) for the MBA program.
1. Requires that students desiring the MIT option choose among a specified set of courses to fulfill the 17 hours of electives in the MBA program. It does not affect the core (required courses) in the MBA program.
2. A number of existing courses will periodically be offered with a focus on the context of innovation and technology and designated with a “T” (for technology) after the course number.
3. Three courses will be required for the option; one is currently in the Bulletin. Others have been offered as 507 courses and will be submitted as new course proposals in the next academic year.

A description of the program option is included here.

New Course Proposals
CS 546 Data Models and Languages (3)
Semantic data models, object-oriented databases, the object-relational data model, deductive query languages, multidatabase systems, advanced relational database theory. Readings and lectures, exams, and a substantial project that will involve surveying the literature in a major area of database research. Prerequisites: CS 444/544 and either graduate standing or CS 251.

MUS 512 Graduate Theory Review (3)
A course designed for graduate students who need to review their knowledge of basic theoretical concepts. Can be taken for credit but will not be applied toward completion of degree requirements.

Changes in Existing Courses
MUS 540 Music History: The 20th Century (2)
Drop course. It has been superseded by two other 20th century music history courses.

ARCH 580, 581, 582 (6,6,6)
Change course title from Architectural Design Studio to Graduate Architectural Design Studio I, II, III and add “Must be taken in sequence.”

Guidelines for Graduate Certificates
The Graduate Council approved the proposed guidelines for graduate certificate programs, a copy of which is included with this packet of materials from the Graduate Council.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE IN EXISTING PROGRAM

Request for the following change(s) in Masters Degree in Theater Arts
(degree program) (academic area)

Reproduce proposed catalog statement in full noting changes (with underline, brackets, italics):

GRADUATE PROGRAM

The Theater Arts Department offers the degrees of Master of Arts and Master of Science. The program of each graduate student is planned in consultation with the departmental adviser.

A prospective student shall be admitted to graduate study after the department has reviewed the student's qualifications and recommended acceptance into the specific degree program.

The prospective M.A./M.S. graduate student who, after initial admission to the graduate program, does not enroll for classes within one calendar year shall have admission to the degree program canceled.

Degree Requirements. University master's degree requirements are listed on page 98. Specific departmental requirements are listed below.

MASTER OF ARTS OR MASTER OF SCIENCE

Prospective graduate students who plan to earn an M.A. or M.S. degree should present a minimum of 24 credits in theater arts, including 8 credits in acting, 4 credits in directing, 8 credits in technical theater, and 4 credits in costuming, or equivalent competencies as determined by the department. Individual students may be required to complete additional graduate and undergraduate courses to make up for deficiencies.

The Master of Arts degree is recommended for students who want to focus their graduate study on research and scholarship in the history, literature, and criticism of the theater and who may also plan to continue their graduate work in a doctoral program in theater. The Master of Science degree is suggested for students who wish to focus more intensively on performance and production areas in preparation for a career in the professional theater and/or further degree work in a Master of Fine Arts theater program.

All Masters degree students must successfully complete a minimum of 45 graduate credits with at least 11 credits of approved courses in theater arts. Twelve credits may be taken in approved areas outside the Department of Theater Arts. In addition, the student must successfully complete one of the following projects, for which no fewer than 6 graduate credits in theater arts will be given: (1) a research thesis on an approved topic from the fields of theater history, theory, practice, or dramatic literature and criticism; (2) two papers of appropriate length on subjects chosen from the fields of theater history, theory, practice, or dramatic literature and criticism; (3) a project in directing, scene design, lighting design, acting, or costume design; or (4) the composition of two one-act plays or one full-length play. An oral examination is required.

The Master of Arts student must demonstrate competence in the use of a foreign language and will typically complete the program with a thesis, playwriting, or two paper project. The Master of Science student must demonstrate expertise in skills pertaining to either advanced theater performance or design and will typically complete the degree program with a project in directing, acting, scene design, costume design or lighting design, a project in playwriting, or a two paper project.

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 intent of the change to include the Master of Science degree is to accommodate the majority of our graduate students who bring a practical theater orientation to their study. While the Master of Arts degree with its required language proficiency is certainly appropriate for students who are interested in
traditional research, a Master of Science degree which puts an emphasis on practical theater arts skills will more fully satisfy the needs of many of our graduate students. For these students, who may aspire careers in the professional theater or wish to continue their theater study in professional training, theater programs, rather than demonstrating minimal proficiency in a foreign language, the development of advanced computer, drafting, drawing, or communication skills is much more relevant and germane to their course of study. Moreover, these skills are already required of students seeking to complete their projects in the design, production, and performance areas. Indeed, the completion of the necessary qualifier in each of these areas—a requirement to be satisfied before the student can proceed to the project—necessitates that the student demonstrate proficiency in the skill(s) most appropriate to his area.

The intent of the change in required credit hours is to bring graduate requirements in Theater Arts into alignment with the new four-credit class model. The present requirement that limits the Theater Arts Masters student to 9 credits taken in an approved area outside the Department was formulated on the basis that graduate courses were generally 3 credits. The student was thus allowed to take three courses outside the department. Given the fact that most graduate courses are now 4 credits, a shift to 12 credits (or three 4-credit courses) seems an appropriate change. The change from "approved area" to "approved areas" is merely a matter of adjusting the catalog to standard departmental practice.

Graduate students in consultation with the Theater Arts faculty may determine that the completion of courses in two or three different areas may be important or necessary for their course of study.

The change with regard to the minimum credits for prospective graduate students is intended to reflect current practice. When we dropped the 2 credit makeup requirement for our majors (1996) we felt that consistency required that we no longer require such a course for prospective graduate studs.
Proposed catalogue copy

**Ph.D. IN URBAN STUDIES**

Dynamic metropolitan regions are increasingly seen as central to economic, social, and political development throughout the world. Composed of one or more central cities, suburbs, and adjacent agricultural and natural areas, they are the essential building blocks of the global economy and the sources of social and political innovation. Understanding metropolitan regions and their problems, and analyzing policies to shape their evolution are major concerns of the Urban Studies Ph.D. The doctoral program explores these issues from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary points of view. Through participation in classes and seminars, and supervised research and teaching activities, Ph.D. students prepare for careers in institutions of higher education and in research organizations.

The School of Urban Studies and Planning offers doctoral specializations in the following areas of advanced interdisciplinary study: Planning, Community Development, Policy Analysis, Gerontology, and Social Demography.

**The first paragraph above is taken from the College of Urban and Public Affairs 1997-99 Catalogue**

**Degree Requirements: Ph.D. in Urban Studies**

**Core Requirements**

Beginning in the fall quarter, all entering doctoral students participate in a year-long research seminar (9 credits) and take an accompanying course in Research Design (4 credits). In addition to grounding students in the research process, this team-taught seminar surveys the field of urban studies and the diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches to research taken by School faculty. A paper is required at the end of the seminar.

**Field Area Requirements**

Doctoral specializations are available in the following areas of advanced interdisciplinary study: Planning, Community Development, Policy Analysis, Gerontology, and Social Demography.

A student prepares two fields of specialization, at least one of which should be chosen from among those listed above. A student-nominated field, developed in conjunction with School faculty, may be offered as a second specialization. Faculty groups specify field-specific course requirements, including methodology courses and courses essential to a multidisciplinary approach. These groups work closely with students to develop coherent specializations that prepare each individual to do Ph.D.-level research in that field.

A minimum of 21 credits is required in the first field, and 18 in the second.

**Program Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies Research Seminar</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Field</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second field</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other coursework in support of first and second fields</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning** focuses on the development and implementation of mechanisms for organizing social, economic, political and environmental change at the local, state and regional levels.

**Community Development** deals with the dynamics of neighborhood and community formation and change and with public policies that address the needs of groups and places within contemporary society.

**Policy Analysis** provides an opportunity for students to identify urban problems, contemporary and historical policy issues, and stakeholders in the policy process. It also allows for an analysis of the effects of policies and of the historical and political contexts in which they emerge.

**Gerontology** addresses the social issues, problems, policies, and programs that affect the quality of life for our rapidly aging population. Students have the opportunity to work directly with faculty on publicly- and privately-funded research at the College's highly regarded Institute on Aging.

**Social Demography** provides training in the tools of demographic analysis, with particular attention to the methods of data collection, techniques of demographic analysis, and the interpretation of research findings. Social demography involves the use of the principles and methods of demography in decision making and planning problems in both public and private settings.

**Ph.D. in Urban Studies: Regional Science**

Regional science brings a variety of social science perspectives to bear in analyzing the growth and development of metropolitan areas, states and regions.

**Please note that the catalogue descriptions of the existing fields do not specify required courses. The existing catalogue, in the section labeled Field Area Requirements, contains language that is essentially the same as that in the proposed section with regard to the courses that will compose a student's field area**
Rationale for proposed changes, Ph.D. in Urban Studies

The proposed revisions in the Urban Studies PhD program are intended to increase the quality and quantity of applicants to the program, and to enhance the competitiveness of our graduates in the academic job market. The areas of specialization within the doctoral degree and the core requirements have not been revisited in many years, during which time there have been some changes in the nature of the field, our faculty resources, and the kinds of jobs available to those who complete the PhD here. In addition, the proposed revisions embody lessons we’ve learned over the years regarding the sometimes tenuous relationship between existing requirements and success in achieving learning objectives. The proposed revisions primarily give new names, descriptions, and coherence to things we already do, and emphasize certain skills and experiences earlier in the students’ careers than is now the case.

The proposed new field areas and descriptions are more specific and coherent than are the ones they are intended to replace. They reflect concentrations of current and future faculty research and teaching interests, and provide a more effective vehicle for organizing faculty groups that will monitor and evaluate student progress through the doctoral program. In addition, the new field names reflect areas of growing interest in the larger domain of urban studies, and correspond more closely to the specializations sought by academic employers of our doctoral graduates. For example, the proposed fields in planning and community development are intended to better position our graduates to compete for jobs in university departments of urban and regional planning, which are a major source of employment possibilities. The proposed field in gerontology, which builds on faculty resources in the College of Urban and Public Affairs’ Institute on Aging, is intended both to attract more students to this increasingly important area of study and practice, and to help graduates find work in gerontology-related teaching programs and research centers.

The proposed change in the core requirement reflects our desire to introduce students to the process of doing research, and to introduce students to the research interests of the faculty, at the outset of the program. Rather than wait to take a field-specific research seminar at the end of the student’s coursework, which is the existing arrangement, the proposed first-year seminar will enable the student to establish connections with faculty in the student’s area of interest, and permit us to gauge early on the student’s research-related strengths, weaknesses, and likelihood of success. In addition, our experience has been that passing a required exam that is based on a set of substantive urban studies courses taken by entering students - the current practice - is not a good indicator of success in passing field area exams, presenting a viable dissertation topic, and completing the research project. The trouble some students have in formulating dissertation proposals also reflects an under emphasis on research experience, which the proposal aims to remedy. Having all our entering doctoral students begin the first-year research seminar in the fall is intended to promote a sense of identity and colleagueship.

The proposal to reduce the minimum number of course credits required from 88 to 72 follows from the effort to create more coherent field areas. The higher requirement has sometimes produced diffuse specializations, which create difficulties when it comes time to construct field area examinations. Faculty groups acting in their advisory capacity may recommend coursework beyond the required minimum when it is deemed appropriate. The change to require students who have earned 27 dissertation credits to register for at least three credits per quarter - rather than one - to maintain continuous enrollment is intended to reflect continuing faculty and university resource commitments to these students.
This summary describes a new state-wide professional Oregon Master of Software Engineering Program (OMSE) to be offered jointly by the computer science departments of the Oregon Graduate Institute (OGI), Oregon State University (OSU), Portland State University (PSU), and the University of Oregon (U of O). During the start-up period, the Program will be offered in the Portland area. The Program will then be extended to other locations in Oregon including Corvallis and Eugene.

The OMSE Program is a professional degree intended to impart technical skills and knowledge to professional software engineers and to provide a firm conceptual foundation that will be an asset for them throughout their careers. The following are the principles that form the basis of the program:

- the Program will be offered jointly by the four institutions;
- industry is a partner in determining overall content and packaging;
- the Program will teach best practices;
- the Program will be accessible to working professionals.

To pursue the degree each student will need to be admitted to one of the four participating institutions as well as to the program itself. The institution that admits a particular student will be the institution that grants the degree to that student.

The Program is a direct response to persistent detailed requests from the software industry to strengthen Oregon’s software engineering presence in higher education, to offer advanced degrees in software engineering, and to provide a comprehensive program of professional education in software engineering.

The Program features a three-tier core course structure plus electives. The third tier includes extensive project work. No thesis or comprehensive examination is required to obtain the degree.

The OMSE degree requires 48 credits -- 16 three-credit courses:

1) Software Engineering Foundations, 21 credits
2) Software Development in Context, 12 credits
3) Program Integration and Strategic Development Skills, 9 credits including 6-unit Practicum
4) Electives and Specializations, 6 units
**OMSE Course Structure**

![Course Structure Diagram]

**OMSE Prerequisite Structure**

![Prerequisite Structure Diagram]

* OMSE 500 Principles of Software Engineering (first course)
OMSE 511 Managing Software Development
OMSE 512 Software as a Business
OMSE 513 Professional Communication Skills for Software Engineers
OMSE 521 Using Metrics and Models to Support Quantitative Decision Making
OMSE 522 Modeling and Analysis of Software Systems
OMSE 525 Software Quality Analysis
OMSE 531 Software Requirements Engineering
OMSE 532 Software Architecture and Domain Analysis
OMSE 533 Software Design Techniques
OMSE 535 Software Implementation and Testing
OMSE 551 Strategic Software Engineering
OMSE 555 Software Development Practicum I
OMSE 556 Software Development Practicum II

All courses shown must taken to complete degree.

- Recommended Sequence
- Prerequisite
- Subset of course is prerequisite
- Can be taken in any order

Note: Electives may have their own prerequisites.

**Part 1:** Software Engineering Foundations, 21 credits

These courses convey the foundation skills of the OMSE program in technical capabilities, personal competencies, and the business context for software development. OMSE 500 is the first course of the foundation courses. The other foundation courses require only OMSE 500 as a prerequisite.

**Part 2:** Software Development in Context, 12 credits

The courses on software development in context provide instruction in the basic areas of software development: requirements, architecture, design, implementation, and testing. The course material in each of these areas provides instruction in underlying principles,
development methods and tools, and analytic methods and tools with a focus on applying principles, techniques and tools to realistic examples. Each of these courses also ties in with the curriculum themes by addressing development, maintenance, and product evolution phases and their work products.

Part 3: Program Integration and Strategic Development Skills, 9 credits

Courses in this area focus on integrating the skills taught in the OMSE program and on the ability to think abstractly about the processes and products of software engineering. Students must have completed Part 1 and Part 2 of the OMSE program before beginning Part 3. (Exception: A student may begin taking courses in Part 3 in the same term as taking any remaining courses in the first two parts.) In Strategic Software Engineering, students learn the skills necessary to develop and adapt their software engineering processes to meet emerging needs. In the Software Development Practicum, students participate in the end-to-end development of a significant software product and apply the personal competencies and development skills learned throughout the program in a development context that includes the essential characteristics of real commercial software development.

The Electives provide the student the opportunity to add depth to the curriculum in one or more areas or to gain specialized technical skills relevant to a particular employer or career. These courses are or could be offered as part of the normal graduate programs in CS, business, or engineering at the participating institutions.
Budget

A summary budget for the Master of Software Engineering program for the current biennium follows. Assuming 100 FTE students, the total recurring costs for the program will be $2.0M per year. During the 97-99 Biennium the total expenses will be $2.25M including $0.42M in capital expenses.

MSE Program Budget Summary
4/27/98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Benefits</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruiting Costs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrative Costs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of Capital Assets</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense for Elective Credits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Expenses</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenses</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational and Capital Expenses</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Investment</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget above uses the following assumptions:

Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty relocation per FTE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty start-up per FTE</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design of courses per course</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course pilot delivery fee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course session delivery fee</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core course tuition per unit</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSAL

Management of Innovation & Technology Option in the MBA Program
School of Business Administration
Portland State University

Introduction

The Management of Innovation and Technology (MIT) Option for the Portland State University MBA Program will focus on the problems and issues associated with the development and use of technology by businesses and other organizations. The target market is MBA students, many working for local technology companies, who desire to pursue advanced education in technology management beyond the core requirements of the MBA program.

The Market in Oregon

The technology industry is now Oregon’s largest employer. In terms of job generation, it is the smaller emerging growth companies, especially in the high-technology industries, which are responsible for much of the growth in the Oregon economy. The Northwest is one of the key regions for technology development in the United States. The region enjoys a high number of startup companies as well as a strong complement of emerging growth companies. Oregon has over 1,000 high technology companies, most of them small and somewhere between the startup stage and the rapid growth stage. Approximately one third of these companies are either emerging growth companies, or soon could be, providing they can access the intellectual capital necessary to generate and manage rapid growth. The industries represented include test and measurement instruments, computers and peripherals, software, communications, biotechnology, environmental engineering, medical electronics, and aerospace, among others.

The Role of Portland State University

For the past decade Portland State University has been developing courses and programs designed to meet the needs of the technology-oriented companies. The School of Business Administration (SBA) has developed several technology-based courses, primarily in the ISQA and Marketing areas. However, it is the Engineering Management Program that is the most focused and developed of PSU’s efforts. The strength of this program is its focus on the needs of engineers and scientists whose objective is to advance to technical management positions. It is designed for engineers to manage engineers. A broader, more business-oriented program, which builds on the skills of the MBA program, is needed in order to train the technology-based leadership for the next century. It is these managers who will help shape the role of technology in industry and government. The proposed MBA MIT Option will complement the Engineering Management Program since the focus is on the strategic management of the entire enterprise.
Why Create A New Option for the MBA Program?

The MIT Option provides PSU’s MBA with a point of difference from other local MBA programs. There is a strong demand for a program of this type in the Portland area. The American Electronics Association of Oregon has long called for enhanced higher education resources in engineering and technology management in Oregon. The Oregon Graduate Institute of Science and Technology has responded with the development of an MS in the Management of Science and Technology and a certificate program for senior managers entitled “Building the General Manager.”

As technology-based industry continues to develop in Oregon, the SBA faces a strategic decision concerning its role in that development. If the SBA continues on its current path and does not address technology management, it risks being viewed as increasingly irrelevant to the fastest growing sector of the economy. The existence of OGI is a ringing testament to PSU’s and OSSHE’s inability to strategically address the engineering education needs of Oregon’s high-tech industries. Washington State University is rumored to be launching a Masters in the Management of Technology in the near future. PSU is a leader in business education in the Northwest. A technology management curriculum can readily be leveraged off the MBA program and perhaps the Engineering Management Program.

PSU Strength

The SBA has a small cadre of faculty with the requisite skill set to begin the implementation of the MIT option. Several of these faculty members have both industry and academic experience in technology management. In addition, there is significant interest by key technology managers to become associated with the program as advisors and adjunct faculty.

PSU Weakness

The principal weakness of the SBA is its small size and existing full deployment of faculty. To create and implement the MIT Option, the SBA will have to reallocate faculty and other resources to this program. This can probably be done, in the short run, by limiting electives and focusing resources on MIT courses. However, there may not be a favorable match between faculty skills and course requirements if an MIT faculty member presently teaches only required courses.

Advisory Board

A business advisory board has been recruited to guide the MIT Option’s strategic direction. Members are senior management of local technology and other companies.
MIT Option Description

The primary goal of the MIT Option is to produce students who are knowledgeable about strategies for managing the development, acquisition, implementation and commercialization of leading-edge technologies. Students will have a sound understanding of how to formulate and implement these strategies, from external market factors to internal resources and capabilities. Strategy is studied in the classroom, and especially through the perspectives and experiences of leading executives in seminars and on-site visitations. Faculty research, internships, and consultation will augment classroom instruction.

Courses

The MIT Option requires that students take the 17 credit hours of electives in the MBA program from a specified list of courses, and that the business project be completed with a MIT focus. Students who complete the technology course requirements, in addition to the MBA core requirements, will receive an MBA degree with special designation of the Management of Innovation & Technology Option. The table below compares the regular MBA with the MBA-MIT Option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular MBA</th>
<th>Hrs.</th>
<th>MBA-MIT Option</th>
<th>Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MIT Business Project</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required MIT Courses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Graduate Electives</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MIT Graduate Electives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Graduate Certificates

1. **Definition.** A graduate certificate program is a linked series of graduate level courses which constitute a coherent body of study with a specific defined focus within a discipline. It is designed for a post-baccalaureate participant and reflects the educational mission of the University.

2. **Curriculum and Scope.** A certificate curriculum is a structured progression or collection of courses approved and offered for graduate degree credit. It consists of a minimum of 15 quarter term credits. The curriculum may include a final project or portfolio to provide for integration of the sequence of course materials.

3. **Admissions.** Students must be admitted to the certificate program by the University and must meet standards for admission to allied graduate degree programs (e.g. Masters or Doctoral level programs). Minimally this requires an accredited baccalaureate degree and an acceptable grade point average. Programs may specify additional requirements. Students may be admitted as graduate degree students (e.g. concurrently admitted to a Masters or Doctoral program), or admitted to the University as graduate certificate students.

4. **Transcripting.** Courses and certificates completed will be transcripted by the University Registrar as a part of the student’s permanent University record. Students must apply for award of the certificate, which may be awarded at any time the requirements are met.

5. **Integration with degree programs.** Degree credits earned in fulfillment of a certificate program may be applied to a degree program (e.g. MA, MS, PhD, EDD). Courses completed for a degree program may be applied to completion of the certificate program. Courses completed up to seven years prior the certificate award date may be used to satisfy certificate requirements. All courses taken for completion of a graduate certificate program may be used for degree credit, so long as they meet the appropriate standards for use in the degree (acceptable grade, completion within seven years of degree award date for the Masters Degree).

6. **Approval.** Before offering certificate programs, the program must be proposed by a department, program, or by combinations of departments and programs, and must receive approval from the Graduate Council (acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate) and the Office of Academic Affairs.
Membership:

Marvin Beeson, CLAS (GEOL)
Tom Biolsi, CLAS (BIO)
Eugene Enneking, CLAS (MTH)
Marjorie Terdal, CLAS (LING)
Randy Zelick, CLAS (BIO)
Dan Fortmiller, AO (IASC)
Kent Lall, EAS (CE)
Carol Mack, ED
Steffen Saifer, XS
Mary Ellen Kenreich, Chair (LIB)
John Settle, SBA
Mary Constans, SFPA (ART)
Richard Hunter, SSW
Howard Wineberg, UP (CENS)

The Committee on Committees appoints members and chairs of all constitutional committees, ensuring divisional and required representation. The Committee also makes recommendations to the President concerning membership and chairs of all administrative committees, ensuring divisional representation as appropriate. The Faculty Senate Committee Preference Survey is the primary resource for the Committee in making new recommendations and appointments. Committee members also confer with continuing and outgoing chairs for opinions regarding their committee's membership. Service on committees is usually for three years.

Fall term, the Committee made recommendations and appointments for 16 positions on the four calendar year committees. We also filled one vacancy on an academic year committee. We met once in person and completed follow-up business via email and phone.

Winter term, the Committee filled a couple of positions that had become vacant. The Graduate Council asked us to consider a recommendation in a draft report of the Graduate Task Committee to further define the Council membership in the Constitution. The Committee on Committees discussed this via email during Winter term and also at our Spring meeting. We considered a suggestion to add the following sentences to the membership description: "It is desirable that the faculty appointees be selected from among faculty members with an interest or involvement in graduate education. These individuals can be identified with the assistance of the Office of Graduate Studies." The Committee came to the conclusion that this addition is unnecessary. An argument was made that similar statements could be added under all committees. It should be understood that a faculty member's interest and involvement in a particular committee is considered when making committee appointments and recommendations.

Spring term, the Committee is making appointments and recommendations to 15 academic year committees. Kent Lall has agreed to chair the Committee next year.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ellen Kenreich, Chair
Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
to the Faculty Senate
Portland State University
May 18, 1998

Members of the Committee:

Chair: Karen Tosi - CLAS, x5255
Faculty: Maria Wilson-Figueroa - SOC, x5820
        Greg Jacob - ENG, x3567
        Russell Miars - SPED, x4611
Students: No students have been appointed to this committee as of this date
Consultants: Janine Allen - OAA, x5249
             Susan Hopp - OSA, x5651
             Bob Vieira - AFM, x4471
             John Wanjala - OMB, x5902

The General Student Affairs Committee serves as an advisory board to administrative offices,
most frequently to the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean for Enrollment and Student Services,
on issues related to student services, concerns, educational activities policies and procedures
affecting student employment, or other matters of concern to students and the university
community.

A primary task is an on-going review of the policies and procedures of the Office of Student
Development, which has responsibility for the educational activities and expenses associated
with all student organizations and Associated Students of Portland State University. The office
has spent this year reviewing all policies and had hoped to have the major changes ready to
present to the General Student Affairs Committee this spring. However, due to the need to
conduct additional research to ensure compliance with new interpretation of legal issues and state
policies, the policy manual will not be completely revised until the end of May. The Committee
will be asked to review changes affecting motor pool and transportation concerns, membership
and eligibility guidelines for student organizations, and student event security policies.

The Committee spent spring quarter working on two tasks. The first was to select the recipients
of the Outstanding Student Service Awards (*The President’s Award for Outstanding Service by a
Student & the Judith Ramaley Community Scholars Award*.) These awards are made at the
annual award and recognition night for students. Along with this task, the Committee worked
with the Center for Academic Excellence and the Office of Student Affairs on a project to
develop a database of students nominated by faculty for their service and leadership activities.
This will allow more students to be recognized for their work and will also streamline the
nomination processes associated with various awards and honors.
The second task, and an annual charge to this Committee, is the selection of the Student Commencement Speaker. There are typically only a few students who apply following nominations, but this year, due to President Clinton’s presence at the ceremony, eighteen students applied. The Committee developed criteria with which to evaluate the applicants and selected eight semi-finalists to formally present their speeches to the Committee. After considerable deliberation, and with special permission from the Graduation Board, the Committee chose two students for the honor.

A large focus for the General Student Affairs Committee in the coming academic year, will be the review and participation in a major revision of both the Student Conduct Code, an Oregon Administrative Rule, and the document entitled, “Policy Statement on Rights, Freedoms and Responsibilities of Students at Portland State University,” which was written some time ago and needs to be revised. Issues of academic dishonesty and institutional concerns about these areas will be natural companions to these revisions. All faculty will be invited to participate and to give input on these issues prior to review of the final documents by the Committee.

Submitted by
Karen Tosi, Chair &
Susan Hopp, Consultant
Final Report

University Studies Task Force

June 1, 1998

Task Force
George Battistel
Erik Bodegom
Barbara Brower
Mary Constans
Robert Daasch
Michael Driscoll
Grant Farr, Chair
Kathi Ketcheson
Robert Mercer
Earl Molander
Sandra Rosengrant
Carl Wamser
Richard Wattenberg
Summary of Findings

1. University Studies is a bold initiative designed to improve general undergraduate education at Portland State University. It was approved by the Faculty Senate and supported by the University. This undergraduate initiative was driven by the belief that undergraduate education had to change, in part because of the changing nature of American society. Portland State University was also concerned with retention rates and wanted to develop an undergraduate program that would encourage students to complete a four-year program of study. The Task Force recognizes that many faculty have invested a tremendous amount of effort and work designing, planning, implementing, and teaching in the new University Studies Program.

2. This program has brought considerable recognition to Portland State University. Visitors from around the country have come to Portland State University to see the how the program is structured. Other universities are adopting variations of this model, and Portland State has received national recognition for its innovations. In addition, the University Studies Program has received two prestigious grants.

3. The University Studies Program now faces a number of problems that threaten its sustainability.
   - After initial enthusiasm, participation of tenure-track faculty has declined in the Freshman Inquiry program.
   - Mechanisms to assure disciplinary balance have not been put into place.
   - Vital program assessments have stalled.
   - The budgeting and planning processes do not state real costs, nor do they offer a logical budget planning rationale.
   - There is insufficient coordination of University Studies with other units.
   - The organizational structure has not been clearly articulated.
   - The program has not been given the administrative guidance or direction needed for long term viability.

4. To ensure that University Studies ultimately thrives, the University needs to make a number of changes. The sustainability of University Studies is vital to the University and will depend on the clear support and commitment of the University administration and faculty.
Introduction

This Task Force was appointed by the Portland State University Faculty Senate Steering Committee on February 16, 1998, to examine the University Studies Program. The Task Force is composed of members from the University Senate Budget Committee, the University Curriculum Committee, the Academic Requirements Committee, the University Planning Council, and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The initial charge of the Task Force was to examine the University Studies Program in three areas: the breadth and adequacy of its curricular offerings; assessment regarding the achievement of its stated goals; and the budget and related staffing and planning issues. To examine these issues adequately, the Task Force decided to broaden the scope of the investigation to include the organizational structure of University Studies.

Task Force Procedures and Sources of Information

After its appointment on February 16, 1998, the Task Force began meeting weekly on Wednesdays at 7:00 am. The Task Force divided into three working groups, each of which dealt with one of the three major issues outlined in the original charge: curricular issues, assessment, and budget and planning. Each working group examined the original questions raised by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, redefined the questions as appropriate, and developed procedures to answer these questions. These working groups then reported back to the Task Force.

Members of the Task Force met, either individually, in working groups, or in the larger Task Force, with Provost Michael Reardon, Dean Marvin Kaiser, Associate Dean Charles White, Michael Toth, Craig Wollner, Michael Flowers, Judy Patton, Mary Kennick, Duncan Carter, Sheri Gradin, Seanna Kerrigan, Miles Turner, Jay Kenton and a number of individual cluster coordinators. The Task Force appreciates their cooperation, time, and input into the process. In addition, the Task Force used information from the "University Studies 1994-1997: A Progress Report," the 1997 "University Studies Advisor's Guide," a number of reports from the Office of Institutional Research including the "Portland State University Fall Term Fact Book, Faculty Work Load Data" from May 1998, and "Higher Education and the Oregon Economy," produced by the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy.

Background

University Studies was implemented in 1994 to replace the general education requirement that was then in place. University Studies sought to replace this “distribution” model of general education with a more coherent set of course requirements. The coordination of the general education program was placed under the control of the Office of University Studies. The change in the general education model was a response, in part, to well documented research on changes taking place at both the national and state levels about what a general college education should be and what skills and abilities college graduates should have. Specifically, the University Studies curriculum has four goals for student learning.

- To engage in inquiry and critical thinking.
- To use various forms of communication for learning.
- To gain awareness of the broader human experience.
- To appreciate the responsibilities of persons to themselves, to each other, and to community.
To accomplish these goals the University Studies Program organized its part of the undergraduate curriculum into four distinct levels: Freshman Inquiry, Sophomore Inquiry, the Upper Division Cluster, and the Senior Capstone.

**Task Force Findings**

**Curricular Issues**
The University Studies Task Force examined six curricular issues.

**Curricular Issue One**
What evidence is there that University Studies students receive broad exposure to science, math, and other commonly recognized elements of a liberal education?

**Discussion**
The inclusion of math and science content is not an explicit goal of the University Studies curriculum, although numeracy is listed as one of the objectives of the Freshman Inquiry sequence. The University Studies curriculum is based upon “interdisciplinary and thematically linked courses developed and delivered by faculty from all parts of the University.” Whether this concept of general education should include math or science is a matter for discussion. Clearly University Studies was developed as a “sharp departure from the distributive model” in which specific subjects were required.

At the Freshman Inquiry level, University Studies has made an effort to include science and math, as well as social science, writing, and the humanities, into the curriculum. In the first year of the program’s existence, four out of five of the faculty teams included a scientist or mathematician. However, in the following years the participation of science and math faculty members decreased. Now, even when there is a scientist or mathematician on the faculty team, there is no guarantee that science or mathematics is taught because individual faculty teach their own sections within the Freshman Inquiry concentrations.

In sum, attempts have been made in Freshman Inquiry to create faculty teams that include faculty from science departments, mathematics, English, and social science so that the students receive breadth of instruction. However, because of the limited participation of science and math faculty, the treatment of math and science is uneven and in some Freshman Inquiry classes probably nonexistent.

Problems of breadth of exposure are even greater in Sophomore Inquiry and the Upper Division Clusters. The clusters are created by interested faculty who volunteer to develop and teach the Sophomore Inquiry classes that lead into the cluster. Although the clusters are required to show that they accomplish the four goals within their course mix, most of the cluster courses are not in the areas of science or math.

**Conclusion**
The evidence is that University Studies students very likely do not always receive broad exposure to science and math. This is not consistent the University Studies goal of fostering inquiry and critical thinking. The fact that students may now graduate without taking any classes in science or math has led the University to alter the requirements for a Bachelor of Science degree to assure that Bachelor of Science majors do in fact receive training in science. Further, because there are no explicit requirements regarding other elements of a traditional liberal arts education within the University Studies program, there is some uncertainty about whether they are in fact a part of the University Studies experience.
Curricular Issue Two
What data are available that University Studies students are achieving competence in writing?

Discussion
Writing, which is central to the University Studies goal that students learn to communicate, is a key component of the University Studies curriculum at all levels. University Studies has attempted to include instruction in writing in the curriculum of Freshman Inquiry, which has replaced WR 121 as a requirement. At the Sophomore and Junior level, cluster courses are required to include some writing as part of the coursework. However, a number of points regarding writing can be made.

• Not all of the Freshman Inquiry faculty teams include a writing expert, and not all of the University Studies teachers are competent or comfortable teaching writing. Faculty at every level of University Studies would profit from assistance in strengthening the writing component of their classes.
• Freshmen arrive at Portland State with varying writing skills. Assessment of the writing skills of newly arrived freshmen occurs during orientation, but it results only in a recommendation that inadequately prepared students take supplemental writing courses rather than in mandatory placement in such classes.
• There is no method to assess or evaluate the writing ability of transfer students or to deal with transfer students who cannot write well.
• There is no agreed upon writing standard to which the students are held, nor is there assessment, especially in the form of an exit exam, to ascertain whether students have learned to write at a particular level.

Conclusion
Writing has been an important aspect of the University Studies curriculum at all levels. Nonetheless, some problems remain in achieving and demonstrating competency in writing.

Curricular Issue Three
What data are available that University Studies students are achieving an awareness of diversity issues?

Discussion
Awareness of issues of diversity and multiculturalism is central to University Studies goal “To gain awareness of the broader human experience,” and specified as one of the objectives of the Freshman Inquiry sequence. As it has done with other areas, the University Studies model does not replicate the old general education model by requiring classes on other peoples or cultures, but rather has sought to incorporate multiculturalism and diversity into its core curriculum.

In addition, University Studies has sought to deal with diversity both by including minority faculty and peer mentors in its program and by training peer mentors and faculty to deal with students of diverse backgrounds. In 1995-1996 AY, 39% of the undergraduate peer mentors were racially and/or ethnically diverse, as were 24% of the graduate peer mentors. However, by the 1997-1998 AY the percentages had decreased to 20% and 12% respectively. Given the lack of diversity among the general PSU population, the diversity in the peer mentor program is commendable.

The inclusion of diversity in the classroom, however, seems to have been uneven. Some faculty expressed a lack of comfort at successfully incorporating diversity into the
various levels of University Studies. Some Freshman Inquiry faculty teams have successfully worked diversity into their curriculum at many levels, while other teams have not. At the Sophomore and Junior level, each cluster is required to include diversity and multiculturalism in its mix of courses, so that diversity issues, as generally defined, should be a part of the cluster sequence. Likewise, University Studies has included diversity as a central part of the Senior Capstone classes.

Conclusion

Diversity is difficult to define and include into the curriculum. University Studies has made a concerted effort to include diversity and multiculturalism into all stages of its program. The implementation of this may be uneven depending on the nature of the faculty teams, their interests, and their knowledge of multicultural issues. Mechanisms to ensure that diversity issues are uniformly addressed appear to be inadequate, however, and assessment data cannot be collected until clear, measurable objectives have been established.

Curricular Issue Four

Are the faculty and curriculum within University Studies representative of the breadth of disciplines across the University?

Discussion

University Studies uses faculty from all parts of the University, but given the voluntary nature of faculty and departmental participation and the nature of general education, some areas of the University are more represented than others. In the Freshman Inquiry classes, participation has been largely from the CLAS, with some contributions from FPA, Urban Studies, and Engineering.

At the Sophomore Inquiry and Upper Division Cluster level the balance of offerings remains problematic, although there is one cluster course in Business, two in Education, and eight in Public Health. There are also some cluster offerings in Engineering, and cluster offerings in science are being enlarged. Nonetheless, the cluster offerings are heavily weighted towards a few departments. According to the University Studies report, of the 370 cluster courses, 89, or almost one fourth are in History. In addition, just four departments, account for almost one half of all of the cluster courses. There is clearly an imbalance of offerings at the upper division cluster level.

At the senior capstone level, the capstones are primarily oriented towards social sciences in a public non-profit sector setting. In the 1997-98 AY the single largest department represented was again History with six capstones. However, there are also a number of capstones in Engineering.

Conclusion

The University Studies curriculum has largely been dominated by a few departments, mostly in CLAS. This is because participation in the program is largely voluntary on the part of faculty and departments and also because the courses offerings in CLAS and FPA lend themselves to general education purposes. Students would certainly benefit by the greater participation of other faculty from other parts of the University, but a variety of obstacles now exist that hinder broader participation.
Curricular Issue Five

What evidence is there that transfer students receive a coherent University Studies program?

Discussion

Transfer issues remain a problem. The University Studies program is aimed at taking incoming freshmen through a four-year program of general studies courses. Yet a large number of Portland State students transfer in from community colleges or other universities with varying amounts of transfer credit, and, in some cases, after a lapse of some period of time. As a result, fitting the transfer students into the University Studies program is a challenge. To accommodate the transfer student University Studies has developed two transfer courses, Transfer Transition 210 and 310, to integrate the transfer students into the program. These classes are not, however, required for students transferring in more than 44 hours. In addition, given the diverse nature of the transfer students and large variation in their academic preparation, it is very difficult to develop one or two classes that meet all of their academic needs.

Conclusion

The delivery of a coherent program for transfer students is a problem. It has been a challenge for University Studies to develop a transfer transition class to fit all needs. In addition, because transfer transition classes are not required of all students, many elect not take them. Finally, a large number of transfer students who are now required to take Sophomore Inquiry classes, petition the Academic Requirements Committee to waive or partially waive that requirement. Clear agreement on transfer coursework which serves a function comparable to that of Sophomore Inquiry should remain the topic of ongoing discussion between University Studies and the Academic Requirements Committee.

Curricular Issue Six

How does the involvement or lack of involvement in University Studies of tenure-track faculty increase or decrease the breadth of exposure offered to modes of inquiry and fields of knowledge?

Discussion

The use of non-tenure-track faculty in the University Studies program has increased. A high percentage of the faculty teaching in the Freshmen Inquiry and the Senior Capstone classes now fall into this category. Several points can be made. First, the use of non-tenure faculty is a University-wide trend, brought on largely by budget and staffing problems at the department and college level. Second, University Studies must depend on faculty and department cooperation for faculty participation. When departments send adjunct faculty to participate in the program, University Studies is generally obliged to use those faculty.

It is not clear that tenure-track faculty are better teachers than adjunct faculty. The use of non-tenure-track faculty does not necessarily imply a “decrease in the breadth of exposure” in the program. For instance, Physics is able to expand its participation in Freshman Inquiry largely because of its use of adjunct faculty.

Conclusion

The use of non-tenure track faculty is increasing in University Studies, and they now represent a large segment of the University Studies teachers. However, this trend is not unique to University Studies. The option of using adjunct and non-tenure faculty adds breadth to the University’s offerings. If the University wants its programs to be taught by
adjunct faculty, however, it must address resulting issues of quality, continuity, image, and coherence.

Assessment

There are a series of well-documented steps in a typical assessment plan for an academic program. They are repeated here to help focus the discussion.

1. Identifying goals
2. Identifying objectives
3. Developing performance criteria
4. Developing methods that lead to achieving the goals
5. Selecting assessment methods
6. Conducting assessment
7. Determining feedback channels
8. Evaluating whether performance criteria were met.

The University Studies Task Force examined three issues related to assessment.

Assessment Issue One

What is the overall assessment plan for University Studies and how is it being implemented?

Discussion

There has been considerable activity regarding assessment of the University Studies program. The report to the Faculty Senate made by University Studies in January, 1998, lists a number of assessment activities conducted by various groups. These include the formation of a PSU Committee on Undergraduate Retention, the development of a general education assessment model, a classroom assessment work plan, and other assessment efforts. Further, data have been gathered and presented on a number of assessment efforts. The Task Force makes the following observations:

• Assessment is vital for any program so that improvements can be made. This is especially important for new programs, such as University Studies, which is still being developed.

• University Studies has not clearly articulated the nature of each of the stages and has not developed an implementation plan. Much greater organization, clarity, and institution-wide commitment are required.

• University Studies does not yet have a comprehensive assessment plan. Program-wide objectives derived from the goals could not be found in the 1998 report to the Faculty Senate.
Conclusion

An overall assessment plan that is carefully and fully implemented is critical to the continued success of University Studies. Implementing an assessment program can be very time-consuming. The lack of an overall plan results in inefficiencies and makes it difficult to use assessment results to improve the program. The Task Force recommends that University Studies appoint a person responsible for the overall assessment plan who has the expertise, authority, and time to develop and implement it.

Assessment Issue Two

To what extent have University Studies goals and objectives been operationalized and measured?

Discussion

From the first University Studies proposal to the Faculty Senate to the program's Web pages today, the general goals for University Studies have been stated as

• Communication,
• Inquiry and Critical Thinking,
• Human Experience, and
• Ethical Issues and Social Responsibility.

It is safe to say that no program or individual at Portland State finds fault with these goals. Rather, the Task Force is troubled by the status of outcome assessment based on these goals.

Assessment step two calls for specifying clear objectives based upon program goals. Task Force interviews show that these are available for Freshman Inquiry and possibly the Capstone. Clear objectives must be developed for all program levels so that an accurate and useful assessment can take place. Systematic data collection has not occurred even though the program has been underway for four years. University Studies has gained favorable attention at state and national levels for its institutionalization of a general education program that is based in part on the latest general education research ideas and concepts. This attention, however, will shift from implementation to the demonstrable student learning achieved by the program. Indeed the shift in attention may be already happening.

The outcomes of University Studies goals will affect students long after their experiences at Portland State have ended. It is clearly difficult to define objectives and measure changes in student learning for some goals, such as social responsibility, during their time at Portland State. However, it is possible to define measurable outcomes to assess the processes by which University Studies provides exposure to ideas and concepts related to such goals. There is no substantial evidence that this approach to assessment has been tried.

Conclusion

Assessment activities for large parts of the University Studies program have stalled at the second step of the typical assessment process outlined above. Assessment is a key element to the vitality of the program, and the current status of assessment is a threat to the program. University Studies must move its assessment activities beyond this point to be fully integrated with other university programs and for Portland State to retain its prominence in general education reform.
Assessment Issue Three

How do University Studies assessment efforts relate to the assessment efforts of other academic programs?

Discussion

Assessment is an issue for all of Portland State University and other institutions in the state of Oregon. As an institution, Portland State University has not yet built structures and systems that encourage faculty from different programs to come together to discuss assessment. Comments from University Studies faculty and administration indicate that the program has been unable to bring together faculty from a broad range of other programs to develop, refine, and operationalize goals and objectives for general education.

University Studies has an opportunity to be a leader in defining key assessment issues and methodologies in general education reform. Portland State University has much to gain from helping University Studies succeed in this area. Given the universal nature of the stated goals, it is in the best interests of Portland State that other academic programs assist University Studies in developing measurable objectives and performance criteria.

Conclusion

The Task Force understands that assessment of student performance can be difficult, especially when dealing with general education goals. Nevertheless, we conclude that assessment must be undertaken in all parts of the University, not just University Studies, and that the university community needs to be committed to this. The Task Force recommends that a point person be appointed by the University to lead the assessment effort.

Budget

The University Studies Task Force focused on three budget issues.

Budget Issue One

What is the true cost of the University Studies and is this cost appropriate?

Discussion

It is clear to the University Studies Task Force that University Studies costs the university considerably more than its stated budget, approximately $1.8 million for 1997-1998 AY. There are three areas where costs are understated.

1. It is hard to estimate the cost of faculty time. For example, the majority of faculty teaching in University Studies come from CLAS. Over the past several years, there has been a significant reduction in CLAS class offerings as well as a decline in overall CLAS enrollment. The budgetary impact of University Studies on other units needs to be evaluated.

   A review of departments participating in University Studies shows that departmental compensation for faculty release time is irregular and understates faculty worth. In some cases, departments are compensated for participating faculty at near their true salary. In other cases, however, departments are given wage section money to cover faculty courses, and in some cases, departments are not compensated at all.

2. The University Studies budget also does not include the cost of some of its computer labs and computer equipment, for construction and maintenance of the University Studies offices and classrooms, and for staffing of the computer labs.
3. The University Studies budget does not include those staff members in the Center for Academic Excellence who perform essential functions for the University Studies program. This is true especially in the Senior Capstone program, which is staffed and operated largely out of CAE. CAE has at least 2 FTE dedicated to the capstone program. The amount that CAE contributes to University Studies is not included in the University Studies budget.

**Conclusion**

Because of the dispersion of University Studies costs outside the University Studies budget, it is difficult to conduct a reliable cost analysis for University Studies. Nevertheless, the true costs of University Studies appear to be considerably more than stated in its budget. Until these cost are known and itemized, claims that the University Studies budget remains at or below 4% of the University instructional budget are meaningless. The true faculty cost should be identified and itemized.

**Budget Issue Two**

Is University Studies more expensive than the old general education model?

**Discussion**

While it was impossible to arrive at comparable estimates of the cost of the old general education model and the new University Studies Program for cost comparisons, several observation can be made.

1. Although it appears that the University Studies Program is considerably more expensive than the older general studies requirements, the Task Force recognizes that University Studies is a far different program, offering a more enriched program for students. Therefore cost comparisons may not be relevant.

2. University Studies classes are intentionally smaller than the large-enrollment lecture classes that were often used to satisfy general education requirements in the past.

3. Since the old general education system was operated within the department structure, there was little or no cost to run the program. The University Studies Program has several administrators, an office staff, and a services and supply budget. These costs would not occur under the old general studies model.

4. Peer mentors and graduate mentors add considerable additional cost to the program.

5. Even though the University Studies Program was designed to replace many of the departmental offerings, in fact many of those classes continue to be taught, albeit with fewer sections and lower enrollments, because these classes serve other functions in the departmental curriculum. The result is the University Studies program has not completely replaced the general education courses, and therefore there are duplicate costs.

6. Finally, University Studies was designed in part to help in recruitment and retention, thus, in theory making money for the University. It does appear the enrollment and retention rates for freshmen have increased. Here again there is a need for clear assessment as a basis for cost benefit analysis.
Conclusion
While comparative data are not available, it does appear the University Studies is considerably more expensive than the old general education system. However, the Task Force is aware that University Studies is a different program so that direct cost comparisons may not be relevant.

Budget Issue Three
How does the budgeting of University Studies articulate with the rest of the University, and how could this be done better?

Discussion
Budget coordination between departments and colleges, especially CLAS, has been problematic. A major problem seems to be the lack of communication between University Studies and CLAS. In some cases, confusion is created when faculty have been hired simultaneously by both units. In many cases, CLAS is not a party to the discussions between departments and University Studies regarding faculty participation in the program and compensation. Other schools whose faculty participate in University Studies have also experienced similar problems.

Conclusion
University Studies has not done a good job of coordinating its budget planning, especially with CLAS, regarding faculty and department participation and compensation.

Organizational Issues

The Task Force undertook a preliminary examination of the organizational structure and operations of University Studies. While a complete management audit has not been completed, a number of points can be made.

- The organizational structure for various parts of the program has not been clearly defined in terms of responsibility and accountability, thereby impeding both internal decision making and control and external coordination and evaluation.
- There appear to be a number of overlapping and contradictory chains of command.
- A number of important functions are performed by other units, especially the development and supervision of the Senior Capstone program.

Discussion
Managing the implementation of any University Studies design would be a challenging task even with clearly defined structure, organizational processes, and budgets. In its present configuration, management is extremely difficult even for the most capable management team.

Conclusion
University Studies must establish a clear structure, regular processes, and a system of control and accountability, or its management problems are likely to persist indefinitely, which will affect performance and potentially threaten program sustainability.
Conclusions and Recommendations

University Studies is vital to the mission of Portland State University. It is essential that it be integrated as well as possible with the rest of the institution. To remain viable and sustainable, University Studies must receive clearer and more consistent support from the administration and the faculty. Without this support the sustainability of University Studies will be increasingly difficult. In order to win widespread university support, there are a number of issues that need to be clarified and resolved.

Curriculum and Assessment

1. Steps should be taken to assure that our students receive broad exposure to mathematics, science, writing, and other subjects important in a liberal education. Whether these issues of breadth can or should be addressed entirely within the University Studies program is a crucial issue for the University to decide.

2. Steps should be taken to assure that faculty from all schools and colleges of the University participate in the program at all levels.

3. The current clusters should be reevaluated with the goal of strengthening interdisciplinarity and fostering cohesion.

4. The University should develop a comprehensive assessment plan that will include all aspects of our academic programs, including University Studies, so that data on student outcomes can be systematically gathered. This will require identifying key individuals throughout the university whose primary responsibility is assessment. The individuals must be given the status and authority to make assessment a university priority.

Budget and Organizational Structure

5. The University needs to reevaluate the location of University Studies within the university structure in order to improve academic and administrative oversight of the program.

6. The organization of University Studies should be clarified so that the chain of command and the duties and responsibilities are known.

7. University Studies budgets should be planned in coordination with other units, especially, but not only, CLAS. Compensation to units for faculty participation should be funded according to an agreed upon and consistent formula.

8. The costs of University Studies should be delineated so that all expenses are known.

9. We recommend that the Faculty Senate develop and clarify procedures to facilitate the integration of University Studies into the existing system of university governance.