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 May 3, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the April 5, 2010, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   1. Discussion Item: Library Funding

   Nominations for Presiding Officer, 2010-11 PSU Faculty Senate

D. Unfinished Business
   None

E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda – UCC (Brown)
   *2. Writing Requirement Proposal – ARC (Hickey)
   *3. Credit Hour Limit Proposal – SSC (Miller)
   *4. Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research Proposal – Bowman
   *5. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, Art. II., IV., and V., Faculty – Liebman
   *6. Proposed Changes to “Functions and Procedures of the Faculty Senate” - Liebman

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report
   Provost’s Report
   1. Office of Sponsored Research Report on Millar Library Funding - Feyerherm
   *2. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report - Hickey
   *3. Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report - Farr
   *4. Library Committee Annual Report - Merrow
   *5. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report - Miller
   *6. Teacher Education Committee Annual Report - Reuler

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included:

B. Minutes of the Meeting of March 1, 2010 and attachments
   E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
   (more)

Secretary to the Faculty

www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate • 850MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax 5-5262
E-2 Writing Requirement Proposal
E-4 Credit Hour Limit Proposal
E-5 Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research Proposal
E-6 Proposed Amendments to the Constitution, Art., II, IV., and V.
E-7 Proposed Changes to “Functions and Procedures of the Faculty Senate”
G-2 Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report
G-3 Intercollegiate Athletic Board Annual Report
G-4 Library Committee Annual Report
G-5 Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report
G-6 Teacher Education Committee Annual Report
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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 5, 2010
Presiding Officer: Maude Hines
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Raffensperger for Bielavitz, Dinno for Carder, Reese for L. Mercer, Morris for Pejcinovic, Meekisho for Sailor, Newlands for Trimble, Gough for Webb, Duncan for Zurk.

Members Absent: Accetta, Anderson-Nathe, Baccar, Bleiler, Buddress, Cabelly, Caskey, Collier, Curry, Danielson, Chaille, Fuller, Hoffman, Jacob, Johnson, Khalil, Koroloff, Lall, Leite, Murphy, Nash, Oschwald, Pierce, Rogers, Strathman, Taylor, Wallace, Wendler, Wetzel,

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Balzer, Beyler, Davis, Hickey, Knight, Koch, Mack, Sanford, Smallman, Spalding, Su,

A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 1, 2010, MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 15:04 p.m. The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

THE MEETING OF MAY 3, 2010 WILL CONTINUE UNTIL 5:30. PLEASE BE PREPARED TO STAY THE ENTIRE 2.5 HOURS, IN ORDER TO CONCLUDE THE MAY AGENDA.

HINES noted that the Steering Committee has charged a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee to be developed to provide faculty response to the
proposal to restructure OUS. She noted that Michael Bowman will be a member, and the committee’s report will be presented at the May meeting of the Senate. To volunteer, Senators may contact her or the Faculty Senate “Contact” at www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate. RUETER volunteered. (attachment)

1. Discussion Items

Faculty Committee on OUS/PSU Structure

BOWMAN presented background on the issue, including a description of the committees working on it. He described briefly the downward trend in public funding for higher ed, the general proposition to restructure in order to increase fiscal flexibility, and some examples of what this might include.

ARANTE queried if we are paying enough attention to the activities of OUS around this issue, for example, see Jay Kenton’s proposals of last month. BOWMAN noted that we are pursuing this activity because the financial impacts are the only ones that OUS and others are considering. SANFORD noted the students are working on this item. RUETER noted there is a tension between the system and this campus. We now hold some cards, for example the potential for local taxes, so we need to decide where we stand.

HOOK queried if the president is genuine, and requested more information. DAVIS noted that the six principles are the President’s position.

JHAJ noted that funding is the reason for these proposals, and performance oversight will continue to increase regardless. SCHECHTER noted that these proposals do not address tuition increases, and graduation rates decrease as tuition rises. She queried if we can address not where the governance will reside, but the problem of costs.

PSU-OHSU Strategic Partnerships Task Force

GELMON presented background on the issue and described the people and committees involved, and DAVIS noted this activity is a result of the latest Greenlick effort.

BURNS noted that there are some obvious collaborations, but we are too different in other areas. ARANTE asked if there is literature regarding OHSU tenure and salaries. GELMON noted that anecdotal evidence indicates some obvious differences in cultures around tenure and salaries. R. MERCER asked if there have been discussions about trading students. KOCH noted that OHSU doesn’t have the capacity to absorb additional students without funding. HICKEY commented on collaborations (inaudible). LIVNEH noted that there are several OHSU-GSED collaborations, but they are mostly “person dependent” e.g. if the person leaves, the collaboration ends. HOOK noted that there are collaborations in engineering that should be inventoried, and also cautioned that official or top down collaborations are not successful.
SHUSTERMAN noted there are collaborations in Chemistry, and queried if we are anticipating a merger. DAVIS noted that the charge of the House committee includes up-to investigating a merger, however that option is not popular with the participants. RUETER queried how this contributes to capacity. GELMON noted that the pie is finite, for example, what would this do to the two libraries. DICKENSON noted that he is involved with several entrepreneurial folks at OSHU who want to work with PSU.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

HOOKS/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular proposals consent agenda, as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Graduate Council Proposal for Certificate in Service-Learning and Community-Based Learning in Post Secondary Education

BEYLER presented the proposal.

AMES/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the item, as listed in “E-2”.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported after “G-3.” He noted that the search for the new Vice President for Research and Strategic Partnerships continues and the position profile is available on the HR page. As noted in the February announcement, faculty representatives on the search committee are Daasch (representing Faculty Senate), Powers, Jiao, and Dill, and the committee has commenced screening applicants. The intent is to have campus interviews scheduled in early June, or if there is delay, they will be conducted in the fall.
KOCH noted that after final consultations he has established the Minimum Enrollment Policy (3/31/10) available at http://www.pdx.edu/oaa/reference-documents). He reminded that Faculty Senators in December floor discussions were in the majority in favor of the draft proposal, or with modification that would add a minimum undergraduate seminar size of ten and a minimum graduate seminar of five, plus some refinements about how the dean and department chairs will respond and communicate regarding these situations. He concluded that he has also altered the past policy that a class may be cancelled at any time, to include cancellation only for financial implications. He concluded that data on enrollments with respect to class size for the past three years has been correlated by OIRP and this data will be forwarded to the deans, to use for schedule planning.

1. Academic Advising Council Annual Report

FORTMILLER presented the report. He also reminded that the new Advising Model requires advising and orientation and starts this summer. SHUSTERMAN asked how documentation for required advising would be documented. FORTMILLER noted that Banner would be used. She also noted that there is a problem with September advising, as it is very late for departments to be adding sections. She urged that Advisors need information from students for successful advising at orientation in summer. There were other questions about the change, and Fortmiller recommended faculty review the literature documenting the proposal.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

2. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report

GOUGH presented the report for the council.

The Presiding Officer accepted the report for the Senate.

3. Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Propose Changes to the Constitution

LIEBMAN and JONES reported for the committee with slides (attachment), noting that these proposal are all intended to respond to our growth and reinvigorate faculty governance in one way or another. He reviewed that the committee proposes amendments reiterating the criteria for membership in the faculty, reducing the size of the senate by one-half, establishing the position of President Elect, dividing CLAS into three governance divisions, and other miscellaneous related changes. The committee also will be proposing in their final report changes to the by-laws to establish agenda setting, improve communication, increase senator’s participation on committees, and improve committee support. He concluded, the committee feels strongly that it is important to restore university service to its former status on the tenure and promotion portfolio.
BROWER and JHAJ spoke against decreasing the size of the Senate. ANDREWS-COLLIER noted that research indicates that institutions of our size have Senates based on a ratio of half of our size. BUTLER noted that the large size has not fostered engagement. WALTON spoke in favor of decreasing the size of the Senate, noting her participation on a prior governance committee, and citing the recommendations of 2009 by the consultant on faculty governance. CARTER noted he thinks that to reenergize the senate, these changes are worth pursing, and reminded that if they are not successful they can be rescinded. CUMMINGS queried if the membership is the same, senior players. HOOK disagreed, noting he became a senator upon his arrival and has learned a great deal. NEAL urged that we support the committee's contention that faculty be given the credit due for participation in governance. SHUSTERMAN spoke in favor of sub-dividing CLAS. BROWER queried if shrinking the Senate will cause exclusivity. RUETER queried if the decrease in All Others will have a negative impact on committee service.

4. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 5/6 March

RUETER reported after “B” and noted that minutes of the meetings are available at http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html. He emphasized in particular the value of the discussion by Tony Van Vliet about the history of the OUS system, the information provided by Provost Koch on semester conversion issues, and the discussion with Chancellor Pernsteiner regarding the negative impact of converting the system campuses to autonomous corporations. RUETER continued, Dalton Miller-Jones is working on a summary of all the proposed structural changes to the OUS, which will be posted when finished. Lastly, he noted that a proposal is also in progress to establish an Applied Bachelors degree at the community college level.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:53.
To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty Senate
From: Senate Steering Committee
Re: Charge for sub-committee of Educational Policy Committee

The Steering Committee is charging an EPC sub-committee to study issues related to OUS restructuring as described below.

Background:
David Fronhmayer's Report to the Chancellor's office "The Coming Crisis in College Completion: Oregon's Challenge and a Proposal for First Steps" proposes restructuring OUS and changing the relationship of Oregon's public universities to the State, and the Governor's Reset Committee on higher education is scheduled to make recommendations on restructuring in June. President Wiewel's draft white paper "Restructuring PSU's Relationship with the State: The Case for Change" outlines guiding principles for PSU if financial restructuring were to take place.

Committee Charge:
To aid in gathering faculty input and assessing faculty positions on these documents, an "OUS Restructuring" sub-committee of Educational Policy Committee is charged with assessing the potential impact of restructuring on Portland State's academic values, including curriculum, scholarship, tenure and our role as the largest institution of public higher education in the state. The committee's report will be due at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.
Proposed Constitutional Changes

Our proposals are intended to make the PSU senate:

- more pro-active
- more participative
- more effective as an advocate for PSU's future

We ask that they be considered as a package.
Strengthening Senate Leadership

Presiding Officer

- We propose replacing the current one-year Presiding Officer term with a succession:
  - Presiding-Officer elect
  - Presiding Officer
  - Past Presiding Officer
  each with a one year term

Aims:
- To make easier recruitment/on the job training
- To have institutional memory
- To provide extra hands when needed

Steering Committee

- We propose staggered two-year terms for Steering Committee members

- Current one-year term sacrifices experience and continuity

- Members of senate committees normally serve for two or three committees

[Administrative Detail]

- These changes will likely result in officers who must serve beyond their elected Senate term

- We will add language to extend the terms, if needed, for Officers and Steering Committee members

Eligibility
Eligibility

- We propose that, for unranked faculty, eligibility be defined by one's academic function and not by academic qualifications.
- Language clarifies but does not change longstanding definition of faculty.
- Motion presented at the March 1 senate meeting.

Reorganization

We propose:

- Reorganizing representation of CLAS into three academic divisions.
- Including representation of XS within All Others.

Changes in representation only:

- CLAS and XS retain their current identities and administrative structures.
Rationale for division of CLAS

- Splitting CLAS into three academic divisions will more closely represent the teaching and research interests of its faculty in the Senate and on University committees.

- Having smaller divisions will reduce the number of nominees and increase their familiarity to electors.

- Separate divisions will make feedback from Senators to departments more likely as Senators will come from more departments.

Rationale for including XS in AO

- Goal is to have units with more than one or two senators, divisions that are more evenly matched by size

- This proposal will allow for continued and more flexible representation of Extended Studies within the Senate

- After research and discussion, we believe that XS fits more naturally with AO (and not with Ol as we originally proposed)
Moving to 1:20 Representation

- Senate has grown from 55 in 1994 to 117 in 2010 and will continue to expand with increases in enrollment and research.
- The Senate's large size has resulted in less engagement by individual members and a diffusion of responsibility.
- We believe that a smaller senate will be more engaged and more effective.

Additional Suggestions

We suggest that:
- Language calling for retired faculty representation be removed (an organization of emeriti faculty no longer exists).
- Members of the advisory council be added as ex officio members (if they are not already serving as elected members).
- Senators who regularly miss meetings should resign and be replaced to assure representation of their division.

Recommendation 1: Setting the Senate Agenda

- Goal: Focus annual Senate agenda on the year's most important matters.
- The aim is for the Senate to operate in a strategic fashion to address institution-wide issues as a working partner with the administration in shared governance.
- Senate leadership and key committee chairs would hold a daylong 'retreat' in the summer to establish priorities for the coming year. This should be followed by a coordinating meeting with administration.
- The Senate should use a large portion of the first fall Senate meeting to define and discuss its strategic agenda for the year.
- At the final Senate meeting, the outgoing Presiding Officer should report progress on the year's agenda.
- We recommend funding for the daylong retreat and for a course release for the Presiding Officer.
Recommendation 2: Communication

- Goal: To raise the profile of Senate and its activities:
  - Senate President address new faculty at Convocation
  - ALL Faculty receive Senate Handbook
  - Sitting senators contact new faculty
  - Regular updates to faculty via email, etc., ...

- Senate president: send letter in Sept. w/ goals for year
- Orientation for new senators @ last meeting in Spring Qtr
- Improvement in the website
- Funding to support senator activities
May 3, 2010

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Darrell Brown, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the UCC, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2009-10 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.c.1.
- BA/BS in Psychology – Adds 4 credits of Psych 200 level or above as required courses; increases total required credits from 56 to 60.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.2.
- Intl 101 Introduction to International Studies (4) – change course number to Intl 201.

School of Social Work

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.3.
- SW 400 Practicum and Seminar I – III (4 crs per term) – change course description and prerequisites to “SW 439, SW 440, SW 491 and SW 492.”

E.1.c.4.
- SW 430, 431, 432 Generalist Social Work Practice I, II, III (3,3,3) – change prerequisites to “Prerequisites: SW 430-431, SW 439, SW 440, SW 491, SW 492.”

E.1.c.5.

E.1.c.6.
- SW 440 Human Behavior in the Social Environment (4) – change title to Human Behavior in the Social Environment: Macro.

E.1.c.7.
- SW 450 Research Methods for Social Work Practice I (3) – change prerequisites to “Admission to major, SW 439.”

E.1.c.8.
- SW 451 Research Methods for Social Work Practice II (3) – change prerequisites to “Admission to major, SW 450.”
Undergraduate Studies

New Clusters

E.1.c.9.

- **Global Perspectives**
  The aim of this cluster is to introduce students to the richness of cultures in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East, drawing on perspectives from the humanities and social science. Through exploring the interplay between political, economic, environmental, and cultural systems, past and present, students will develop skills and attitudes to function as “global citizens.”

E.1.c.10.

- **Interpreting the Past**
  This cluster offers students the chance to explore our complex and interwoven histories using the tools of the humanities and sciences. Concentrating on the pre-20th century world (excluding North America, which is studied in the American Studies Cluster), we investigate the diversity of our shared human past, giving students a necessary context for understanding the present.
April 14, 2010
To: PSU Faculty Senate

Enhancing Writing Instruction at Portland State

The ARC has held several discussions subsequent to receiving the 2009 Report of the University Writing Committee (UWC) with a recommendation that the Faculty Senate endorse an explicit university-wide writing requirement for the Baccalaureate degree of 8 credits of lower-division writing (and 4 credits of upper division writing). We have interviewed the chair of UWC, staff of the Writing Center and University Studies, and discussed the current challenges and opportunities for supporting a lower-division writing requirement. We articulated some of our concerns regarding implementation at the November 2009 Senate meeting, and we have asked the Senate Budget Committee to advise the Senate on some of the fiscal implications of a new requirement.

We are agreed that there is a need for supporting students’ development as writers and that it appears that this could be successfully integrated in the first two years of course work already required for general education (as envisioned at the outset of the UNST program). A report by the Office of Institutional Research at PSU shows a correlation between the number of writing classes and higher GPAs and graduation rates (see page 1 of the UWC report to ARC).

We also believe that there will be a need for greater infrastructure to support the requirement and respectfully request that the Senate be given assurances by the Provost that it will be provided.

ARC proposes the following motion to Faculty Senate for its consideration:

In order to promote the quality of writing instruction and enhance student learning, Portland State University will institute a university-wide graduation requirement for the Baccalaureate degree to include a minimum of 8 credits of writing composition (WR 121, 222, 211 and 227) at the lower division level, with the understanding that completion of Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry requirements will satisfy this writing requirement. Completion of the first and second year of the Honors program will also satisfy this requirement.

Students who transfer with 90 or more credits and only 4 credits of writing may take WR 300, 323, 327, 333 or 420, or a WIC course in place of a second lower division course.*

The writing requirement will be effective beginning with the 2011-2012 catalog year; therefore, those students who transfer to PSU may fulfill their writing requirement according to the catalog that corresponds with the year they started college.

UWC will report to the Senate by June 2011 and in June 2012 on whether the assurances below have been met.
ARC Memo & Motion

*WR 121 is now required of all transfer students. Transfer students with less than 90 credits can expect to fulfill the writing requirement by completion of the required number of SINQs, whether one, two or three, according to their placement (or FRINQ and 3 SINQs, if placed as a Freshman). It should be noted that ARC does NOT intend that liberal studies majors or transfer students with more than 90 credits should use SINQ courses as a way of satisfying this new requirement.

After consultation with the UWC, University Studies, the Writing Center and the English Department, ARC believes that assurance of institutional support for implementation of the lower-division writing requirement includes the following:

- University Studies is assigned at least .5 new FTE of a qualified individual’s position and adequate faculty development funds to train FRINQ and SINQ faculty, mentors, and graduate mentors in the teaching of writing and composition pedagogy;

- University Studies Council directs that FRINQs and SINQs have writing assignments that include opportunities for revision, ungraded and graded writing, peer review sessions (see page 3 of the UWC report to ARC);

- The University makes a commitment to increase funding for the Writing Center to handle increased demand for writing consultations;

- If demand for additional writing courses is sufficient, the University will support the creation of a tenure line and appropriate GTA support in consultation with the unit charged with delivery of the courses, i.e. the English Department.

- The UWC works together with academic advisers to communicate to students and faculty how the requirement can be met, and reports to the Senate by June 2011 and 2012 on whether the above assurances have been met.

Present:

Mary Ann Barham (consultant)
Angela Garbarino (consultant)
Linda George
Martha Hickey, Chair
Agnes Hoffman (consultant)
Becki Ingersoll
Sukhwant Jhaj
Jane Mercer
Robert Mercer
Louise Paradis
Greg Jacob (consultant, University Writing Council)
Memo

To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee
From: Randy Miller, Chair, Scholastic Standards Committee
CC: Sarah Andrews-Collier
Date: April 13, 2010
Re: Credit Hour Restriction for Students on Academic Warning and Probation

The Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) in collaboration with the Undergraduate Advising & Support Center (UASC) has reviewed the subject of credit restrictions for students who are placed on Academic Warning or Academic Probation. We are making the following motion:

Students on Academic Warning or Academic Probation are restricted to registering for 13 credits or fewer per term until the respective status is removed from their record. This restriction can be overridden with the approval of an academic adviser.

The proposed process would place a credit hour hold on the students ban-web account and could be adjusted or overridden by an advisor in UASC or staff in the Office of Registration and Records when appropriate.

Rationale: Through a multi-year review of student reinstatement petitions the SSC has determined that additional mechanisms must be put in place prior to students being dismissed. Currently there is a registration hold placed on students when they first go on Academic Warning; this hold is removed when they attend a workshop sponsored by the UASC. Review of data indicates that there has been little change in the academic performance of these students since this intervention was initiated in 2000. The SSC believes that limiting the number of credits for which students may register may increase the chances of academic success for this population. We are seeking to limit the number of credit hours for which students can register to 13 or fewer hours per term because this meets the minimum threshold for qualifying for financial aid and still be able to register for the 5 credit hours associated with Freshman Inquiry.

Currently, students on Academic Warning and Probation are provided with information about the College Success courses taught each term by the UASC. The UASC is also investigating other interventions for this student population.

This proposal has been forwarded to OAA, RO-ADM, UASC, and Financial Aid for input and comments. Provost Koch requested that this be reviewed in context as "a part of the larger student success/retention initiative". Mary Ann Barham has taken this proposal to the Undergraduate Advising Council and received their support.

E-3, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 20101
Memorandum

Date: 8 April 2010

To: Sarah Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

From: Michael Bowman, Chair, Educational Policy Committee
       Sukhwant Jhaj, Chair, Budget Committee

Re: EPC & Budget Committee Review on the proposal for the Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research

The Educational Policy Committee has approved the proposal for the new Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research (CIMR). The Budget Committee has analyzed the financial implications of the Center’s creation and finds that it does not negatively impact the University’s budget. CIMR would be established within the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

CIMR’s purpose is to support research collaboration among the faculty on campus who are engaged in mentoring research and raise the visibility of research in this area. Its core faculty include members from a variety of units: School of Business Administration, Child and Family Studies, Computer Science, Psychology, Regional Research Institute, School of Social Work, and Sociology.

This center would be the first center in the country focused on research on mentoring, as opposed to working with specific mentoring programs.

CIMR’s primary activities include fostering communication among researchers on campus; outreach to the community; referrals for organizations seeking research partners with Portland State faculty; aid in preparing and submitting grant proposals; and sponsoring meetings, workshops, lectures, and reading and writing groups for faculty working on proposals.

CIMR will be started with a two calendar year, $100,000/year grant from ORSP. The core faculty involved have demonstrated an ability to obtain significant money in grants and in private donations. The expectation is that ORSP will support the center with approximately $50,000 per year (as they do with other interdisciplinary centers), with additional money raised by the core faculty. ORSP’s support will provide partial support for administrative activities that cannot be built into individual grant budgets. The Budget Committee is satisfied with this information.

Thus, the Educational Policy Committee moves that the Faculty Senate approve the proposal for the creation of the Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research.
Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination, or Alteration of Academic Units

Answer the appropriate questions below for new units or units that are growing:

NOTE: For a complete description addressing all aspects of the proposed center in more detail, please refer to attached proposal for the PSU Enhancing our Research through Programmatic Investment initiative.

1a) What is the name of the unit?
We propose the creation of the Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research (CIMR).

1b) Provide a brief history or justification for it.
1. Several faculty from units around campus engage in research on mentoring. CIMR will provide a formal structure to support research collaboration across multiple academic disciplines and across the three traditional domains within the field of mentoring—youth development, higher education, and workplace mentoring.

2) How does the unit help Portland State University to achieve its themes/goals?
CIMR will have multiple aims:
2. To provide a catalyst for communication and collaboration among faculty
3. To support the development of projects and proposals that result in funding for research
4. To offer support and mentoring to newer faculty members and doctoral students
5. To improve the visibility of scholarly work on mentoring conducted at PSU among academic colleagues, current and prospective students, and the community at large
6. To build partnerships between PSU and organizations in the community that provide or promote mentoring
7. To forge connections with those who need and use high quality research in the field of mentoring to foster dissemination of knowledge

3) What are the objectives and planned outcomes for the unit?
The objectives and outcomes include the following:
- Academic scholarship on mentoring—indicated by publications authored by CIMR members
- Application for external funding—indicated by proposals submitted for research and sponsored projects
- Engagement with community partners—indicated by building and sustaining collaborative relationships with organizations and businesses
- Visibility for mentoring research at PSU—indicated by media coverage, attendance at sponsored events, and website visitors
- Inter-disciplinary collaboration—indicated by the foregoing accomplishments involving joint contributions by CIMR members from different units

4) What significant activities will take place within the unit?
Communications and resources. The CIMR will have a virtual presence with a website featuring faculty members and student affiliates and advisory council members along with the spectrum of scholarly activities and events at PSU related to mentoring. The website will serve both internal and external communications. The CIMR also will have an internal listserv for sharing announcements regarding new funding opportunities, partnership opportunities, relevant publications, and other resources that the CIMR Coordinator will actively seek out and share. In addition, the CIMR will facilitate the process of making referrals to interested colleagues when businesses and community organizations seek research partnerships with PSU faculty.
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Conceptualization and collaboration. The CIMR will convene meetings, lectures, and institutes to foster the identification and elaboration of themes that reflect the overlapping research interests and priorities of CIMR members. For example, the annual Summer Institute on Youth Mentoring, which brings prominent national researchers to PSU for intensive seminars and discussions, offers the potential to arrange "laboratories" to explore emerging ideas. Another mechanism for intellectual exchange will be a series of "Fresh Ideas" workshops featuring CIMR affiliates and experts from other institutions. Each half-day workshop will include a lecture addressing a topic relevant to mentoring followed by group discussion about implications and research directions. Finally, reading and writing groups will be formed for smaller groups of affiliates working on specific proposals. In addition to these formal efforts, the CIMR is expected to enhance research and education through numerous informal processes.

Proposal preparation. The CIMR will promote the development of proposals for external funding with skillful administrative assistance on grant preparation (e.g., formatting, tables, bibliography), budget planning (e.g., GRA rates, OPE), and university approval and submission processes (e.g., PIAF, electronic submission). The CIMR Coordinator will provide high level support on these tasks, working in conjunction with the staff and resources available through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects. The CIMR also will provide support for contacting and contracting with national or international expert consultants needed to address substantive issues in developing proposals (e.g., statistical consultation) or to review and provide feedback on drafts of proposals prior to submission.

5) Indicate the expected percentage of time and resources that will be allocated to each activity. Please include, if appropriate: courses to be offered, course development, research performed, community partnerships built, other (specify).

CIMR will grow and evolve as plans are pursued and opportunities present themselves. Time and resources will be devoted to each activity as necessary for its successful completion.

6) Why is a change needed to achieve these outcomes and to host these activities?
   a. What other units are already undertaking similar activities? Meet with these units and include documentation on the outcomes of these meetings.

   There is no other organization with a similar mission within any university in the United States.
   b. Why is a separate or changed identity and/or structure key to success in meeting the objectives and planned outcomes?

   The purpose of the Center is to promote inter-disciplinary collaborations and to raise the visibility of mentoring research at PSU.
   c. How will these outcomes be measured and assessed? What benchmarks will be used to determine the success of the unit?

   Answered above.

7. a. What is the proposed structure of the unit?

   CIMR will represent an affiliation of faculty committed to the mission of the center. Center for Inter-Disciplinary Mentoring Research will be composed of core faculty, research fellows, center affiliates, students, professional staff, and advisory councils. Core faculty members will be individuals with an academic appointment at PSU (including adjunct who conduct research on mentoring, teach courses on mentoring, provide primary leadership for a mentoring program, or have the appropriate background, interest and capacity to develop a program of research on mentoring. CIMR research fellows will be colleagues at other research institutions who are associated with projects under the auspices of the CIMR (e.g., co-investigators). CIMR affiliates will be individuals without academic or research appointments who may have a professional interest in the work of the center by virtue of their involvement with mentoring programs at PSU or in the community. PSU students at both the undergraduate and graduate level will be connected with the center through their paid or unpaid roles in faculty-sponsored research projects associated with the CIMR. Professional staff will provide administrative support for the activities of the CIMR as described below. In addition, the CIMR will have two advisory councils to provide guidance about prevailing needs, trends, and opportunities relevant for planning and implementing CIMR goals and objectives. One advisory council of regional
leaders in government, business, education, and human services will address local issues that could be the focus of community engagement for the CIMR to support schools, communities, and businesses in Oregon. The other advisory council will be composed of national experts who can provide recommendations about how the CIMR can have the greatest effect on research and education in the overall field of mentoring.

b. Where will it be housed?
CIMR staff will use office space located within the Regional Research Institute for Human Services.

c. Will it become a separate administrative unit?
CIMR will be administratively supported through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

d. Will it have its own support staff?
CIMR will have a center coordinator and a GRA position for a doctoral student.

e. How will faculty become affiliated with the unit?
CIMR will continue to grow and change with new membership over time. Although it is anticipated that the increased visibility associated with establishing a center will draw interest from additional colleagues in the university, there will be an active program of outreach to faculty conducting research in mentoring or closely related areas. The Deans of all schools and colleges will be asked to recommend contacts, and initial members of the CIMR will be asked to refer appropriate colleagues.

f. Will faculty FTE be assigned to the unit?
The Campbell Professor in Social Work will devote time to the CIMR through his existing appointment.

g. What is the likely faculty composition (% tenure-track, % fixed-term, % adjunct)?
Core faculty are likely to be tenure-track faculty and research faculty, but there is no pre-determined composition.

h. According to what rules will faculty be evaluated for P&T?
Not applicable.

8. Who will have administrative oversight for the unit?
CIMR will be administratively supported through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

9. When would the unit be established or the change be enacted? What is the period of time for the unit to operate (if it is not permanent)? Describe how the unit may evolve or expand.
CIMR will be officially established upon approval of this proposal. It is anticipated that CIMR will remain in existence for at least five years and likely well beyond. There is no planned timeline for ending the center. CIMR will experience turnover in personnel and projects, and it will continue to pursue opportunities aligned with its goals.

10. What additional resources are needed for the unit? From where will these resources come?
What revenue will the unit generate?
CIMR is being established with a multi-year commitment of funding from ORSP through the Enhancing our Research through Programmatic Investment initiative. CIMR will raise additional external funds from foundations and businesses for specific projects and general support. Some activities will generate revenue for registration or tuition (e.g., conferences and events).

a. Budget: Show all anticipated sources of revenue and expenditures.
Revenue will be from core university support, donations and sponsorships, and research grants. Expenditures will be for dedicated center staffing and center program activities.

b. Space: Describe in detail the new space needs and where the unit would be situated.
Space for the director, coordinator and GRA will be located within the RRI.

c. Staff: Describe all anticipated workers at all levels.
CIMR will have a part-time coordinator and a doctoral student GRA.

d. Support Services: Describe necessary increased support services, such as additional laboratory equipment, library resources, or computers.
CIMR faculty and staff will not need any services or infrastructure beyond what is already provided to them through their affiliations with the university.
11. List the individuals proposing the change and their affiliations.

Thomas Keller, Ph.D., Duncan & Cindy Campbell Professor, School of Social Work, and Director of PSU Summer Institute on Youth Mentoring (spokesperson)

Talya Bauer, Ph.D., Gerry and Marilyn Cameron Professor of Management, School of Business Administration

Peter Collier, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology

Mark Eddy, Ph.D., Research Scientist, Oregon Social Learning Center, and Adjunct Professor, School of Social Work

Sarah Geenen, Ph.D., Assistant Research Professor, Regional Research Institute on Human Services

Kris Gowen, Ph.D., Research Associate, Regional Research Institute on Human Services

Katie McDonald, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Psychology

Jana Meinhold, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Child and Family Studies

Jose Padin, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology

Laurie Powers, Ph.D., Associate Dean for Research, School of Social Work, and Director, Regional Research Institute on Human Services

Robert Roesser, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology

Jo-Ann Sowers, Ph.D., Research Professor, Regional Research Institute on Human Services

Donald Truxillo, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology

Bryant York, Ph.D., Professor of Computer Science
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ARTICLE II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY.
The Faculty shall consist of the Chancellor, the President of Portland State University, and all persons who hold State Board appointments with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, and whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University. Unranked members of Portland State University who are certified by the Provost to have academic qualifications sufficient to justify appointment at one of the above mentioned ranks, whose primary responsibility is for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the education process, and whose full-time equivalent is at least fifty percent teaching, research, or administration at Portland State University shall also be included in the faculty regardless of title. The University Faculty reserves the right to elect to membership any person who is employed full-time by the Oregon University System.

Rationale: to match the original intent of the Article.

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY.
Section 4. Faculty Committees.
1) Appointment. The Committee on Committees, hereinafter described, shall appoint the members and chairpersons of all constitutional committees and ensure adequate and required divisional representation. The Committee on Committees shall make recommendations to the President concerning the membership and chairpersons of all committees established by administrative action and ensure divisional representation as appropriate. Constitutional committees are those established under provisions of the Faculty Constitution. Administrative committees are those established by the President and charged by him or her with a specific assignment on a continuing basis for periods of one or more years. Ad hoc and special committees may be established at any time by the Faculty, the Senate, or the President, and shall carry out specific duties and report as directed. No special committees shall be established that duplicate the work of an existing Faculty, Senate or administrative committee. The Committee on Committees shall appoint membership of special committees established by the Faculty or Senate. The Advisory Council will make recommendations of membership for ad hoc and special committees established by the President.

For the purpose of committee representation, the word "division" shall mean shall mean any school or college, each of the three academic distribution areas of Arts and Sciences (Arts and Letters, Sciences, and Social Sciences), Business Administration, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Fine and Performing Arts, Library, Social Work, Urban and Public Affair, Other Instructional Faculty, and All Other faculty; the term "instructional division" shall mean any school or college, and Other Instructional Faculty. The members of the Committee on Committees will normally serve two years and must be members of the Senate during their tenure as members of the Committee. The following divisions shall elect members in even-numbered years:
• All Others (1 member)
• Business Administration (1 member)
• Education (1 member)
• Liberal Arts and Sciences (2-3 members)
• Social Work (1 member)
• Urban and Public Affairs (1 member)

The following divisions shall elect members in odd-numbered years:

• Engineering and Computer Science (1 member)
• Library (1 member)
• Liberal Arts and Sciences (2-3 members)
• Fine and Performing Arts (1 member)
• Extended Studies (1 member)
• Other Instructional Faculty (1 member)

Rationale: To divide Liberal Arts and Sciences into more effective groups.

ARTICLE IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY.
Section 4. Faculty Committees.
4) Standing Committees and Their Functions.
d) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This committee shall consist of five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one from All Other faculty, two students, and, as consultants, the following or his/her representative, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Curriculum & Undergraduate Studies, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research & Planning. Etc.
g) Faculty Development Committee. This committee shall consist of five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), two from the Library, one from each of the other divisions, and, as consultants, the following, or their representatives, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research. It is desirable that the appointees be selected from among faculty members who are active and interested in research, teaching, or other scholarly activity. Etc.
j) Graduate Council. This council shall consist of five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one from All Other faculty, two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the Dean of Graduate Studies, and, as consultants, the following or his/her representative, the Provost, and the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies & Research, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees only from among faculty members with an involvement in graduate education. Etc.
l) Budget Committee. This committee shall consist of five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other divisions, two students, the chairperson of the Education Policy Committee and,
as consultants, the following or his or her representative, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Education Policy Committee. *Etc.*

**m) Educational Policy Committee.** The Educational Policy Committee shall advise the Faculty Senate and the President on educational policies and planning for the University. Membership of the Committee shall be composed of the chairperson of the Budget Committee, plus five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other divisions, one classified member of PSU, and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate). The chairperson shall be selected from the membership by the Committee on Committees. The Provost, the 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 Committee. The chairperson (or a designated member) shall serve on the Budget Committee. *Etc.*

**n) University Studies Council.** This council shall consist of five six faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (two from each of its divisions), one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one from All Other faculty, one elected representative of the core University Studies faculty, two upper-division undergraduate students and, as consultants, the following or his/her representative: the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the immediate administrator of the program, and a representative of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. The Committee on Committees shall endeavor to select appointees from among faculty members with an involvement in general education. *Etc.*

**ARTICLE V. FACULTY SENATE.**

**Section 1. Membership.**

1) **Ex-officio Members**

a) The President, the Provost, all Vice Presidents; all Deans; the Director of the Library; all Vice Provosts; all Assistants to the President; the Secretary to the Faculty; a representative of the retired faculty association; and the Student Body President of the Associated Students of Portland State University shall serve as ex-officio members of the Senate. Ex-officio members shall have full rights of discussion and making of motions but shall not have the right to vote. These Ex-officio members are not eligible to become elected members.

b) The chairperson of constitutional committees, members of the Advisory Council, and representatives to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate shall serve as ex-officio members if they are not serving as elected members.

*Rationale:* there is no longer a retired faculty association.

**ARTICLE V. FACULTY SENATE.**

**Section 1. Membership.**

3) **Alternates.** Each elected member of the Senate is expected to attend its meetings regularly. However, before the first meeting of the fall term each senator shall designate
in writing to the Secretary to the Faculty an alternate who shall serve in the senator's absence with full rights and powers. A senator may change his or her alternate at any time by so informing the Secretary in writing. A senator who takes a leave of absence, or sabbatical leave for one academic year or more or is absent for more than three consecutive meetings must resign his or her Senate seat, which shall be filled in accordance with Section 2, Paragraph 5 of this Article.

Rationale: prolonged absences allowed by the current rule deprive units of appropriate representation.

ARTICLE V. FACULTY SENATE.
Section 2. Election of the Senate.
1) Determination of Divisional Representation. By the first Monday in March of each year, the chief administrative officer of each division (see Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2) shall report to the Secretary to the Faculty the name of each faculty member, and the number of full-time equivalent faculty assigned to each division. At the same time, names of regular faculty and the number of full-time equivalent faculty in programs not in any instructional division shall be reported by the chief academic administrative officer and the vice presidents, or their designees, to the Secretary to the Faculty. These Faculty shall be assigned by the Senate Steering Committee to divisions as prescribed in Article V, Section 1, Paragraph 2. The Secretary to the Faculty, under the supervision of the Senate Steering Committee, shall then determine the number of senators to be allocated to each division, apportioning one senator for each multiple of ten full-time equivalent faculty with an additional senator for any remainder of 10.0 or more full-time equivalent faculty. Any division with fewer than ten full-time equivalent faculty shall have one senator. A newly instituted division shall elect its senator(s) in the next regular senate election.

Rationale: Since 1994, the number of Senators doubled from 55 to 115, through the inclusion of All Others and faculty hiring. Changing the ratio will return the number of Senators to 55, resulting in a more engaged and cohesive, and effective Senate.

ARTICLE V. Section 3 ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE
1) Officers and Their Duties. Upon delegation of authority by the President, the Senate should choose its president and a presiding officer-elect in such manner as shall be prescribed in “Functions and Procedures of the Senate.” The President will serve a one-year term to be succeeded by the President-Elect. The outgoing President shall be considered as Past President during the year following her term.

Rationale: to ensure leadership succession and safeguard institutional memory
PROPOSAL TO AMEND FACULTY SENATE BY-LAWS

A. FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Article V of the Faculty Constitution describes Senate membership, election procedures, organization, authority and functions (pages 7-9). Within certain limitations, the Senate is empowered to make rules governing its own internal organization and procedures. The following revised statement of "The Functions and Procedures of the Faculty Senate" was approved at the meeting of May 5, 1973:

... Resignation

The Constitution requires that a Senator who will be absent for one academic year three consecutive meetings or more must resign his or her Senate seat; the vacancy will then be filled by the Secretary to the Faculty according to the constitutional provision.

Presiding Officer

Upon delegation of authority by the President under Article V, Section 3, of the Faculty Constitution, the Senate shall elect each year at the last regular scheduled Senate meeting of spring term, a Presiding Officer who will chair all meetings of the Senate and its Steering Committee. The Presiding Officer must be a member of the Senate at the time of service....

Presiding Officer Pro-Tem Elect

The Presiding Officer Pro-Tem Elect shall preside in the absence of the Presiding Officer at all meetings of the Senate and its Steering Committee and be elected according to the same procedures as the Presiding Officer.

... Steering Committee

After the election of a Presiding Officer and a Presiding Officer Pro-Tem Elect, the Senate shall elect four two of its members each year to serve two-year terms, with the Presiding Officer, Presiding Officer Pro-Tem Elect, Past Presiding Officer, and Secretary, as the Steering Committee of the Senate. Following nominations by voice, elections of the four two additional members of the Steering Committee shall be by secret ballot. If four two candidates do not receive a majority of the votes cast on the first ballot, successive run-off elections shall be held among the leading candidates whose combined votes total at least 50 percent of the votes cast, until four candidates receive a majority of the votes cast....
Question for administrators: In the context that some football games in the early fall against overmatched opponents are considered "money games" and that there are a disproportionate number of serious injuries during these games:

a. is it fair that our athletes are asked to take all the burden of the risk of injury without any compensation. Should we consider providing scholarship guarantees and full and meaningful health insurance coverage (such as lifetime insurance coverage for injuries)?

b. Does our current football program conform to the standards for sportsmanship established in the IMD for OUS? I am referring to http://www.ous.edu/about/polipro/files/IMD%201-08.pdf
Specifically:
8.036 (3) (a) The intercollegiate athletic program of the institution shall reflect high standards of scholarship, sportsmanship, fair play, integrity, and concern for the individual. 8.036 (3) (c) (iv.) Refrain from participation in an intercollegiate athletic program of the institution when existing injuries and/or physical impairments would jeopardize the student athlete's health and welfare; and 8.036 (3) (g) (xii.) pertaining to coaches
Permitting, requiring, or encouraging a student athlete who is injured, or otherwise physically or mentally impaired, to participate in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution without authorization from a physician or authorized athletic trainer; And, I thought I saw this in there someplace before but "fair play" and "sportsmanship" are defined in a way that prohibits trying to injure an opponent.

But in any case it is covered by OAR 577-031-0135 Conduct Proscribed by the State Board of Higher Education section (4) Detention or physical abuse of any person or conduct which is intended to threaten imminent bodily harm or endanger the health of any person on University–owned or –controlled property.

These points seem particularly salient in light of recent evidence on the risk of permanent harm from multiple concussions.
Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)

Annual Report
Date: April 12, 2010

Members, 2009-2010
Linda George, ESR
Martha W. Hickey, FLL/INTL – Chair
Becki Ingersoll, UASC
Sukhwant Jhaj, UNST
Jane Mercer, SCH
Robert Mercer, CLAS
Louise Paradis, CARC

Consultants
Mary Ann Barham, UASC
Angie Gabarino, ARR
Agnes Hoffman, ADM
Shawn Smallman, OAA

The ARC held its first formal meeting on October 12, 2009. From April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, ARC reviewed 441 petitions. Of those, 415 were granted, 26 were denied. For the four terms of the 2008-2009 academic year, ARC processed 390 petitions (up from 377 in 2007-08). The majority of petitions were for University Studies waivers, primarily at the cluster level, but there were also a fair number of requests to extend eligibility for the 2001-02 catalog.

ARC reviewed two policies regarding credit allocation and placement practices for non-native speakers of English. In December, after consultation with the PSU Applied Linguistics Intensive English Language Program, ARC moved, and the Senate approved, decreasing the number of transferrable English as a Second Language (ESL) credits from 36 to 24, specifying that these credits reflect course work completed at the “advanced” or “academic” college-level of study or above. This change will be effective fall 2010, and is in keeping with state-wide norms, including credit transferred with the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees.

In addition, in March 2010 ARC reviewed an IELP comparison study documenting how scores on two new exams have been reconciled with the paper TOEFL test to establish English language proficiency. ARC concurred that it is reasonable to adjust current PSU internet TOEFL and IELTS undergraduate and graduate minimum scores so that they more closely follow current practice at other institutions (i.e., increasing internet TOEFL undergraduate from 60 to 71, and graduate score from 68 to 80; and decreasing the IELTS undergraduate minimum score from 6.5 to 6.0, and graduate score from 7.0 to 6.5).

In December of 2009, after review of the 2009 Report of the University Writing Committee (UWC) and discussions with the chair of UWC, staff of the Writing Center and University Studies, and a preparatory discussion at the November Faculty Senate meeting, the ARC proposed that Faculty Senate endorse a university-wide writing requirement for the Baccalaureate degree of 8 credits of lower-division writing. The motion specified that completion of Freshman Inquiry and Sophomore Inquiry would fulfill the 8 credit requirement.

The December motion was tabled following questions raised about implementation of the requirement. After further consultations with UWC and University Studies, ARC plans to bring a new motion to the May 2010 meeting of Faculty Senate. The motion requests that UWC report to the Senate by June 2011 and 2012 on the implementation process.
Institutional Athletic Board
Report to Faculty Senate
May 3, 2010

Board Member:
Grant Farr, CLAS, Chair
Walton Fosque, ART
Greg Jacobs, ENG
Melissa Trifilette, ADM
Chris Monsere, ECS
David Burgess, OIRP

Community Member:
Jim Mustard, Standard Insurance

Student Members:
Amirah Karim, Track
Carl Sommers, Football

Ex-officio Members
Torre Chisholm: Athletic Director
Robert Lockwood, PSU Student Faculty Representative

Athletics News:
- Portland State’s Anna Bertrand has been chosen as the Pacific Coast Softball Conference Mountain Division Pitcher of the Week for the second time this season as announced by the league office.
- Portland State freshman Britney Yada has been named first team All-Big Sky Conference for the 2009-10 season. Yada is one of two freshmen on the first team. The other, Stephanie Kim of Northern Arizona, is also the Player of the Year and Freshman of the Year.
- Women’s Basketball: The Vikings put together another historical season in 2009-10, earning their first Big Sky Championship and making their first appearance in the NCAA Division I Tournament.
- Men’s Basketball: The Portland State Vikings completed the 2009-10 basketball season at 13-19, reaching the Big Sky Conference Tournament semifinals before losing to regular season league champion Weber State. For PSU it ended a two-year run of Big Sky titles and trips to the NCAA Tournament.

APR Violations:
Over the last four years, the men's basketball program has received academic progress rate (APR) scores in the areas of eligibility and retention that are considerably below the threshold that the NCAA has established. During 2008-2009, the men's basketball program was sanctioned (a stage one penalty) for poor APR scores with a public warning letter. The men's basketball program was unable to improve its four-year historical APR score above 900 during the 2008-2009 year. As a result at the start of the 2009-2010 academic year, the men's basketball program received a stage two sanction
whereby it was limited to 11 (from the 13 possible) athletic scholarships and limited to 5 days and 16.0 hours of countable activity per week (practice time limitation).

Although the men's basketball program has made outstanding progress in raising its APR score (having lost only two APR points in the past three terms), it will not be able to raise its four-year historical average above 900 by the end of this spring term (even with a perfect APR score that term). Due to the fact that the men's basketball score is still below a 900 on the four-year historical average system, the men's basketball program is subject to stage three penalties for next academic year (2010-2011). The NCAA Academic Progress Rate Committee will make a decision on Portland State University's waiver petition by mid to late May. This committee has the authority to grant the waiver, grant the waiver with conditions or deny the waiver.

Regardless of the committee's decision, it will be important for the Intercollegiate Athletic Board to closely monitor the APR progress of the men's basketball program in order to avoid further sanctions on that particular sport and potentially other sports. In this task, the IAB will work closely with the athletic department and the APR Improvement Committee that has already been established. Although the recent APR scores from the past three terms for men's basketball offer hope that we have begun to 'turn the corner' on this problem, there are ominous sanctions that the NCAA can impose if this progress is only fleeting. If a particular team fails to raise its four-year historical APR score above 900, even after a post-season stage three sanction has been imposed, a stage four sanction could be levied on an institution that would restrict the overall membership status of the institution (loss of Division I status in our case for all sports).

Portland State University is petitioning for a waiver of stage three penalties. Stage three penalties result in the loss of post-season competition in a particular sport, in this case men's basketball program. In late April several members of the University administration and the Athletic Department, including the President, will travel to Indianapolis to appear before the NCAA Academic Progress Rate Committee. The IAB will report back to the Faculty Senate on the results.

**NCAA Reaccreditation:**

Portland State University is undergoing NCAA reaccreditation this year. This is done on a ten year cycle. With the guidance of the NCAA, PSU is preparing an internal audit on our athletic program. To accomplish this we have formed for a Steering Committee and five subcommittees. The subcommittees include:

- Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance
- Academic Integrity
- Gender Issues
- Diversity Issues
- Student-Athlete Well-Being

A draft of this internal audit will be finished by early April and the internal report will be available online for the PSU faculty. The steering committee will then schedule a series of public forums at which faculty, students, and other members of Portland State University will be invited to comment on the audit. The website containing the internal audit will be made public soon and the times and dates of the public forums will be announced.

**G-3, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 2010**
To: Faculty Senate  
Re: Library Committee Annual Report  
April 5, 2010  
Committee Chair: Kathleen Merrow. Committee Members: Donna Philbrick, Ed Zaron, Jack Corbett, Subash Kochar, Rudy Barton and Richard Beyler. Ex Officio and resource persons: Helen Spalding, Tom Raffensperger, Adriene Lim, Jocelyn Duffy and Anne Keea.

The issues discussed during committee meetings this past year were copyright laws and processes, Library initiatives undertaken and ongoing, and the challenges of the Library budget.

Copyright:
It was recognized that wading through the mire of copyright law is a continuing challenge for librarians and for faculty. The library has materials available online to provide guidelines: http://www.lib.pdx.edu/copyright/. We suggest that a Copyright Officer would be extremely useful to provide some of the infrastructure necessary to deal with copyright. We also learned that copyright and the budgetary challenges faced by modern university libraries are closely connected problems.

Initiatives:
The library committee went over and would like to report on the progress of the many initiatives undertaken by the University Library this past year.

Library Digital Library Initiative:
The Library is spearheading and managing several pilot projects in partnership with faculty and other units, such as OIT, Office of Graduate Studies, and CUPA. These projects include: the implementation and use of a new repository called The PSU Digital Repository; a new electronic submission system for PSU theses and dissertations; and a new Archival Information System. Internal technology grant funding will cover the hardware and software costs for the PSU Digital Repository. The rest of the costs for this initiative are obtained through existing personnel resources within the Library.

Library Knowledge Commons Initiative:
During Fall 2009 and Winter 2010, the Library created the “Knowledge Commons Sandbox Project“ to test various service models and technologies that could be used in a Knowledge Commons and learn how to best support the learning needs of PSU students. The space currently hosting the OIT Computer Lab and formerly housing the Assistive Technology Center has been identified for repurposing as a “Sandbox” The lessons learned through implementing the Sandbox project will be invaluable for establishing collaborative relationships and in choosing services and technologies for a new Knowledge Commons most needed by PSU students.

Library K-20 Community Engagement for Information Literacy Skills Initiative:
So far this year, over 200 high school students from three area schools and participants in High School FRINQ have received Library instruction at Portland State. The dissemination of and sharing of standards for information literacy is still in stages of initial discussion and planning.

Library Sustainability Initiative:
In support of the initiative, the Library has: Created an online subject guide to sustainability-related materials, created a webpage describing the Library’s sustainability related efforts, distributed Library Green information about how to recycle while using the Library and general recycling information, evaluated and reorganized all recycling in
the Library by PSU Recycles! Staff; including addition of informational posters, reduced library energy consumption, and performed "Library Environmental Sustainability Audit" including an evaluation of energy use, equipment and office supplies, cleaning and maintenance, transportation, and reduce/reuse/recycle efforts throughout all library facilities.

**Library Diversity Initiative:**
The Library presented “Focus on Faculty” presentations of female authors and their works, including Melanie Mitchell, Christine Rose, and Gina Greco. It hosted a display of rare materials in collaboration with Middle Eastern Studies to celebrate the program's 50th anniversary. The Library acquired 230 volumes ($6,300) of Spanish language materials at the 2009 Guadalajara International Book Fair to enhance Spanish-language holdings in a broad range of subject areas. The Library also held a display of historic Black Panther newspapers in celebration of Black History month. For the first time, the Library included Spanish-language skills and cultural competency with Latino populations in an advertised professional position.

**Library Distance Learning Initiative:**
Successful searches have been held for the Distance Learning Librarian and Library Instructional Technologist positions, and they will be filled in this fiscal year (FY10). The Library's 24/7 online chat reference service has increased significantly, from about 12 sessions per month to over 400 sessions per month. The Temporary Distance Learning Librarian has created and posted tutorials and learning objects in support of Learner Web, Extended Studies, and the School of Criminal Justice distance education programs.

Web site usage has increased and the proportion of off-campus users has increased. These are per-month visits to the Library website in 2009 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website visits per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>29,302</td>
<td>41,708</td>
<td>29.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of visits from off-campus</td>
<td>42.74%</td>
<td>48.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Library Network Services Initiative:**
In support of this initiative, the Library has:

- Implemented and released the new Portland State WorldCat system: [http://portlandstate.worldcat.org/](http://portlandstate.worldcat.org/), which required new Library Web site tutorials, components, and changes in staff policies and procedures.
- A PSU Library Faculty member has been appointed to the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Network Level Services Committee to help OCLC develop a new network-level platform and service related to Integrated Library System (ILS) components such as Circulation, Electronic Research Management, etc.

A PSU Library Faculty member has been appointed to the Orbis Cascade Alliance’s Collaborative Technical Services Task Force to help the Alliance develop new models of shared, cooperative work related to acquisitions, cataloging, storage, and processing of materials.

**Library Initiative to Maximize student/faculty access to information resources**, despite large cuts in acquisitions funding;
In support of this initiative, the Library has:

- Worked closely with the libraries at University of Oregon and Oregon State University to collaborate on evaluation, ordering, and cancellation of Springer and Elsevier journal titles, using a custom method involving usage statistics, impact factors, and Eigenfactor data, with some data obtained gratis from Thomson Reuters, parent company of ISI.
• Continued to develop in-house PSU Library “Synergy” federated searching solution for simultaneous cross-searching of multiple licensed databases, and in-house GuideBuilder system for creation of research guides for students.

• Formed an internal Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Review task force to evaluate impact of acquisitions cuts on ILL operation and access costs, which are heavily subsidized by the Library’s operation budget. The ILL task force is working on a proposal for a pilot project to incorporate new pay-per-view features available on specific vendors’ sites.

• Evaluated approximately 900 journal titles from Ebsco and Harrassowitz received in print, or print + online, moving hundreds of titles to electronic format only to streamline workflow, increase access, and save processing costs.

• Continued membership in collaborative storage projects with other Oregon and Washington institutions.

• Evaluated collection and use statistics to cancel lower-use licenses and subscriptions in order to absorb a $550,000 acquisitions budget reduction in early FY2009/10.

• One-time funding of $500,000 was awarded in 2010. Efforts to use the new funding by June 30, 2010 are ongoing.

• In March 2010, the Library submitted a Proposal for $649,279 to permanently reinvest in the acquisitions budget in FY11. The proposal targets strategic academic priorities.

Budget:
The $550,000 cut in the Library Budget in FY10 has reduced the Library’s base funding for acquisitions to $2,770,616 annually. Although one-time funding was awarded later in the year for $500,000, the Library’s ongoing acquisitions funding of $2,770,616 is still woefully inadequate for a University of PSU’s size, setting, and status. This is reflected, for example, in the realization that the Library’s acquisitions budget was only 45% of the University of Oregon Libraries’ budget in 2009/2010, and that the Library’s resulting acquisitions budget of $2,770,616 was less than its $2,842,549 materials allocation in 1997-98 even without accounting for the difference due to inflation. Restoring the base 2009/2010 materials budget to $3,320,616 in 2010/2011 and beyond will enable us to better support student success; enhance the infrastructure; and support efforts to increase externally funded research. Surveys of faculty and students consistently state that the Library lacks sufficient resources to support the curriculum and research. In addition, student surveys consistently rank the Library as the top factor in their academic success.

FY10’s cut necessitated cancellation of $463K in journal and database subscriptions (528 individual journal or database titles) and a planned reduction of $85K in monographic purchasing. (The negative impact on monographic purchasing has been mitigated by the infusion of one-time funding in the fall of ’09 and with enrollment increase funding.) This level of reduction has damaged the Library’s ability to support all areas of the curriculum, but also has had an extremely negative effect on the sciences and the life sciences in particular. Because scholarly communication in the sciences occurs so predominantly through journal articles and because journals are paid annually, when the Library’s funding is cut, journal subscriptions (which consume 80% of the Library’s materials budget) are the only means by which most of the reductions can be made. The University is clearly aware that these cuts are harmful and has tried to mitigate their impacts by awarding the Library one-time funding when it appears there are surpluses. This funding mechanism has been quite helpful in restoring some monographic purchasing and acquiring access to databases for limited periods of time, but it is not a sustainable model for journals subscriptions. Faculty and students must rely on interlibrary loan services (which in 2010 have increased 6% over the same three-month period in 2009) or do without in their research and teaching. While PSU Library’s Interlibrary Loan services are excellent, they cannot replace the value of actual journal subscriptions, particularly those available online 24/7.
At the same time that these budget reductions have occurred, the University continues to add programs and research initiatives. Coupled with the University's staggering growth, the Library has lost substantial ground.

All one need do is extrapolate forwards the lines in the following graphs to see that unless significant changes are made the alignment of Library funding with the research and student expenditures will only get more and more out of line.

Sources of inflation rates: Bowker's Annual and Blackwell.
Assumption: inflation during the current year is reflected in the next fiscal year's prices. (Example: inflation from 2000 to 2001 affects prices paid during the fiscal year July 2001 - June 2002)

[Sources for graph data explained in appendix]

G-4, PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, May 3, 2010, 4 of 6
Resolution:

Whereas:
The history of resolutions coming out of the University Library Committee that reiterate the need for funding for library space and materials and acquisitions. In May of 2005 the Faculty Senate approved a motion to make the Library's critical need for additional space one of the top priorities for the University's next capital campaign. Last June, the Committee presented a resolution for Senate support of a request to the administration to give a small percentage of research money to the Library. This motion was tabled.

Whereas:
The Library Committee is very concerned that the funding of the Library is not part of the new discussions around shaping Portland State University as a great urban research university. The following resolution is aimed at addressing the lagging funds for library resources in support of all programs and disciplines. It is not enough to restore funding to previous levels, as those levels have already been shown to be below what is necessary, not to say what is desired, in funding for accessibility and acquisitions in both electronic and print collections, information resources and tools, available space for study and research, and the Library's ability to support University goals in retention, sustainability, student success, and civic leadership.

Whereas:
The Library is continuing to work with the limited and dwindling resources available to protect its acquisitions and to provide services to students, faculty, and the community with fewer resources and less staff than other comparator universities. The Library has continued to be innovative in responding to the new information environment even in the face of budgetary constraints.

Whereas:
The Library provides direct support to research at all levels at Portland State University. The strategic goals of the University aim to increase the amount of research and the amount of research funding this will attract. The strategic goals of this University also aim at increased enrollment and the increased funding this will generate. Neither of these can really take place without a well-funded and vital library that serves as the core of this envisioned or revisioned university. Vartan Gregorian, President of the Carnegie Corporation, has said "no university in the world has ever risen to greatness without having a great library, and no university is greater than its library."

Therefore the Faculty Senate resolves that:
The university administration make Library funding one of its highest priorities, and that it strive to identify and allocate the resources needed to reverse the downward spiral of funding and thus to restore and improve print, electronic, and other collections, and to restore and improve librarian-student ratios.
Appendix

Material Budget Growth Over Time:

Library Materials Base Budget
The “Library Materials Base Budget” numbers came from the Budget Office’s initial budget posting in Banner. These amounts also appear on Exhibit B for FY08 and FY09.

Funding per subject data
The funding per subject data comes from library records.

Other data
The “%growth” tab in the spreadsheet contains the data pictured in the graph, and cites the sources below for the FTE and research expenditures information.

FTE Faculty *
3 Term student FTE **
Research expenditures***
Library Materials Base Budget

* OIRP - Factbooks - Fall - 4th Week - Personnel - FTE Faculty Graduate Assistants by Department (Table 4.2.1); use Institutional Total for FTE Faculty = instructional faculty only, no grad assistants
** OIRP - Statistical Portrait - Students - Student Credit Hours/FTE - 3-Term FTE (Table 3.3.1)
*** History of Research Expenditures:
http://www.rsp.pdx.edu/res_data_CHART.htm

Materials Budget Adjusted for Publishing Inflation:
The sources of the inflation rates are listed on the graph, and copied below:

Sources of inflation rates: Bowker's Annual and Blackwell's* Cost & Coverage Report.
Library Assumption: inflation during the current year is reflected in the next fiscal year's prices. (Example: inflation from 2000 to 2001 affects prices paid during the fiscal year July 2001~-June 2002).

The “Academic Publishing Inflation rate during year” is blended inflation rate of monographs and serials. The Bowker’s Annual was used for the serials rates and the early year monograph rates, as the Blackwell web site did not include information prior to FY01. The Bowker’s tables cite Baker & Taylor*, Blackwell* and YBP* approval plan data as the source for the monograph rates.

*Baker & Taylor, Blackwell's, and YBP are Library services vendors/book distributors of academic materials.
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Committee Charge:

Scholastic Standards Committee
This committee develops and recommends academic standards with a view to maintaining the reputation of the undergraduate program of the University. It advises the Office of Admissions, Registration and Records in academic matters concerning transfer students or students seeking readmission after having had scholastic deficiencies. It assists undergraduate students who are having difficulty with scholastic regulations and adjudicates student petitions that request the waiving of regulations on suspensions (academic readmission).

2009-2010 Report
The primary focus of the committee’s efforts this year has been to tighten up the appeals process for the SSC. This work is a carry forward of the efforts from the work of the committee from last year. It has become increasingly apparent that the process is in need of some serious review. We have discovered a number of very disturbing trends that exposed areas of potential threats to the integrity of the work of this committee. Our primary desire was to evaluate these potential threats and seek to resolve the issues behind them. One of the primary threats we discovered was an abuse that has gained the phrase “petition shopping” in which a student will submit a petition for a single class or subject and once they gain approval they submit a series of petitions all related to the
same issue. A second primary area of concern was the lack of information in the petition form as to the need for supporting documentation that the committee needs to give a full and equitable review of each individual case. A number of other similar concerns have arisen through time and all have led to the unanimous opinion that there was a serious revision of the petition forms used by this committee.

In response the committee has undertaken the complete revision of the SSC Petition forms for reinstatement and waiver of previous terms deadlines. Throughout this process we have worked closely with the staff of the office of Registration & Records to strive for a product that is clear, concise and easy to comprehend. We have reviewed petitions from a variety of committees or departments on campus, including Deadline Appeals, Office of Financial Aid and Academic Appeals Board, to seek input for our revisions. It our desire to have the revised copies available to students beginning no later than Fall 2010.

Additionally, the committee spent a considerable amount of time on the issue of reinstatement petitions from international students and reviewing the previous policy requiring a student to wait one term after dismissal before applying for reinstatement. We discovered that this policy placed some very serious obstacles before students seeking reinstatement, especially those international students. Many of these students faced the loss of their student visa status and possible deportation. After working with the Office of International Affairs we committed to establish a different review process for evaluating International students enrolled only in the IELP program. It was agreed that the ILEP staff was the best resource for evaluating the academic progress and potential success of these students who had not entered into the general PSU curriculum stream. Much of this concern was addressed when the Senate approved a motion from the Academic Requirements Committee related to this.

Our last primary effort for this year was to generate a motion to place a credit hour restriction on students who have been placed on Academic Warning or Academic Probation status. See attached document.

Annual Statistics: (from 9/1/2009 to 3/30/2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total petitions reviewed:</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds:</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option:</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Incomplete:</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop:</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatements:</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approved:</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds:</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option:</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Incomplete:</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop:</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatements:</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Denied</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds:</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Incomplete:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop:</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatements:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pending</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds:</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Option:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Incomplete:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop:</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatements:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 12, 2010

To: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

From: Emily de la Cruz, Chair

Teacher Education Committee

Re: Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

2009-10 Committee Membership

Committee Members:
Lisa Aasheim, COUN; James Bickford, SPED; Teresa Bulman, GEOG; Tom Chenoweth, ELP; Michael Cummings, GEOL; Debra Glaze, MUS; William Fischer, FLL; Greg Jacob, ENG; Karin Magaldi, TA; Jane Mercer, SCH; Carol Morgaine, CFS; Jeanette Palmiter, MTH; Ellen Reuler, SPHR; Amy Steele, ART; Lisa Weasel, BIO.

Student Member: Deb Miller (Ed.D. candidate and Director of Licensure).

Ex-Oficio Members: Sarah Beasley, Education Librarian; Randy Hitz, Dean, GSE; Steve Isaacson, Associate Dean for Academics, GSE; Cheryl Livneh, Associate Dean for Outreach/Director of Continuing Education, GSE.

Regular Invited Guests: Karen DeVoll, CLAS; Thomas Kindermann, PSY; Lynda Pullen, BTP/ITEP Advisor; Robert Mercer, Associate Dean, CLAS.

The University Teacher Education Committee (TEC) operates under the premise that teacher education is a university-wide responsibility, and TEC serves in an advisory capacity to coordinate activities of the schools, colleges, and departments of the University that are involved in teacher education. The TEC provides a direct communication link between the Graduate School of Education, the unit directly responsible for teacher education, and those departments across the university to the preparation and/or education of teacher candidates.

Teacher Education Committee Activities 2009-2010

Content Area Advisors Meeting

The Committee strives to facilitate communication between PSU’s undergraduate programs and the Graduate School of Education, particularly the academic advisors who work closely with GSE programs to advise future teacher candidates regarding their content area preparation. TEC planned the meeting agenda and activities for a Content Area Advisors Meeting; and co-sponsored the meeting with the GSE in January 2010. There was a good turnout, with 15+ Content Area Advisors from across PSU attending. At the request
of TEC, a number of GTEP faculty cohort leaders and advisors attended the meeting and met in small groups with Content Area Advisors to discuss Program updates and issues that Advisors face in their roles.

**Participation in NCATE/TSPC Accreditation Visit in the GSE**

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and Oregon Teachers Standards and Practices Commission conducted a joint accreditation visit to the Graduate School of Education in November 2009. TEC representatives met with members of the accreditation team to explain the Committee’s role in matters of teacher preparation. They provided useful information about the relationship between the undergraduate content area preparation and the Graduate Teacher Education Program. Members of the accreditation team were impressed with the concept of a cross-disciplinary, university-wide Committee that provides a forum for conversations about teacher preparation.

**Undergraduate Pathways**

*GTEP Early Admissions Process:* GTEP received eight (8) applications through the Early Admissions Process for Summer 2011 that TEC supported and GTEP put into place last year. Applicants from three (3) approved programs (Child and Family Studies, Elementary Education Minor, and Music Education) submitted applications by the April 1, 2010 deadline. They will go through the same review and admissions process as applicants who apply during the regular admissions cycle. Those who qualify will be admitted conditionally and all conditions must be fulfilled in order to be eligible to begin GTEP in Summer 2011. Those who do not qualify may continue working on providing evidence of their qualifications and request that their application be reconsidered during the regular admissions cycle in December 2010.

A fourth program, the Library/Media Endorsement Program, was also approved for the Early Admissions Process. However, the Coordinator and program faculty decided that the timeline wouldn’t work for most of their students and told GTEP not to expect Early Admissions applicants from their program.

*Education Minors:* This year, there are three approved education minors: Elementary Education; Secondary Education; and Special Education. CLAS advisors are seeing a steady increase in the number of undergraduate students who are declaring these minors as part of their program of study at PSU. The Summer 2010 GTEP admission cycle is the first applicant pool that will have students who have declared an Education Minor as part of their undergraduate preparation. Data is not yet available, however it is anticipated that these pathways will increase the numbers of PSU undergraduates applying to GTEP.

The University Teacher Education Committee continues to provide an important venue for dialogue and collaboration between the GSE and the rest of the Portland State University community as outlined in the Committee’s mission statement.
Report of the University Studies Council to the Faculty Senate 2010

Prepared by Mitch Cruzan, Chair


The University Studies Council has met biweekly for the 2009-1010 academic year. With fifteen members it has not been possible to identify one time period when it was possible for the entire committee to meet. To accommodate the entire committee we have alternated meeting times so every individual has the opportunity to attend at least once per month.

The primary focus of the council this academic year has been the refinement of procedures for cluster reorganization, which was initiated in our final report of the 2008-2009 academic year. The goal of this report is to update the Faculty Senate on progress made towards cluster realignment and to provide information on modifications to the cluster development process that have occurred since our annual report in June of 2009.

1. Modifications to the cluster realignment process.
   a. New clusters will be approved and implemented as they are developed by faculty groups.
   b. The timeline for cluster realignment has been adjusted to accommodate the development of new clusters by groups of faculty. The council will continue to encourage new cluster development and will reassess the progress of cluster realignment in the spring of 2011.

2. Progress on cluster realignment.
   a. Proposals for two new clusters (“Global Perspectives” and “Interpreting the Past”) have been reviewed and approved by the council.
   b. Coordinators for several existing clusters are reviewing the new cluster requirements to determine whether they need to make any modifications.
   c. One cluster (“Professions”) that did not have unique courses associated with it was removed.
   d. Lists of cluster courses have been generated to assist faculty working on the development of new clusters.
   e. Clarifications have been made by the council on several UNST policies that are relevant to clusters:
      i. Cluster coordinators and departments are encouraged to reexamine the content and student populations being served by courses listed at the 400 level. It is the consensus of the council that these courses should be reformulated and renumbered to the 300 level or removed from clusters. The council suggests that these changes take place within the next three years.
      ii. Courses listed as 400/500 will have their cluster designations removed in time for inclusion in the 2011 bulletin.
iii. In 2006 the council recommended that SINQ courses function as gateway courses for the disciplines. To facilitate the development of gateway SINQs in the new Global Perspectives cluster the council has approved cross-listed UNST/INTL courses to be taken under either prefix as a SINQ.

iv. All clusters will be reviewed on an on-going basis to ensure that cluster courses on the approved cluster list are offered at least every other year. Total course offerings in a cluster need to average at least 20 sections, or capacity for 700 students, per term. A minimum of 6 sections of SINQ, or capacity for 210 students, need to be offered per cluster each year. Clusters that do not meet these capacity requirements will be de-listed.

v. Cluster coordinators, chairs and other relevant curricular stakeholders will be notified of these policy changes.