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

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on December 7, 1998, at 3:00 p.m. in 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the November 9, 1998, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

Provost's Report

D. Question Period

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees

1. PSU Foundation & Office of University Relations - Director Jan Kurtz & Vice President Gary Withers

*2. Graduate Council Annual Report - Terdal

*3. Library Committee Annual Report - Barton

*4. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report - Barham

5. University Planning Council Quarterly Report - Wells


F. Unfinished Business

G. New Business

*1. Proposed Constitutional Amendment - Art. IV, Sec. 4. j) Graduate Council - Terdal

*2. Program Proposal for Ph.D. in Computer Science & M.S. in Financial Analysis - Terdal

*3. ARC Recommendation for B.S. Notation - Wetzel

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the November 2, 1998, Senate Meeting
E2 Graduate Council Annual Report
E3 Library Committee Annual Report
E4 Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report
G1 Proposed Constitutional Amendment - Art. IV, Sec. 4. j) Graduate Council
G2 Program Proposals for Ph.D. in Computer Science & M.S. in Financial Analysis
G3 ARC Recommendation for B.S. Footnote

Secretary to the Faculty
341 Cramer Hall • 725-4416/Fax:725-4499 • andrewscolliers@pdx.edu
Minutes: 
Presiding Officer: Ronald C. Cease 
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier 


A. ROLL 

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES 

The meeting was called to order at 3:08 p.m. The Minutes of the October 5, 1998 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved with the following correction: 

Wetzel was in attendance on October 5, 1998. 

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR 

The Secretary has recorded the following changes in Senate and committee appointments since 5 October: 

Susan Karant-Nunn resigned from the Advisory Council on 28 October. She will be replaced by Barry Anderson.
Oren Ogle has been appointed the Senate Steering Committee representative to the Campus Alcohol & Other Drug Policy Committee.

Rudy Barton has resigned from the Library Committee effective 15 December.

**CHANGES IN TODAY’S AGENDA:**

George Pernsteiner will report for the Administration. President Bernstine and Provost Reardon are out of town.

ADD under NEW BUSINESS, item G.3. PEBB Benefits and OUS Faculty.

CEASE announced that three items have been distributed on the floor in conjunction with today’s Agenda: for item G.2, the IFS proposal for selection of an OUS faculty member to the State Board, and for item G.3, a copy of the OSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee letter to PEBB, and blank copies of the PEBB survey from in the benefits packet.

**Vice President’s Report**

PERNSTEINER stated enrollment is up 2.37% to date, and exceeds our projected goal of 2.33%, therefore we have met our revenue and student enrollment targets. FTE is now 15,230, which is the highest since 1988. The growth of Freshman and Sophomore numbers should contribute to continued increases in the coming years.

The Governor has recommended an $81. million budget for higher education, however this could change based on November and December revenue estimates. This figure represents 60% of the OUS request. The system is considering a $5. million request from the "E" Board for unanticipated enrollment increases at OIT and OSU. This is important for PSU, as the system has most recently had to adjust budgets to compensate for low enrollment at OIT.

BULMAN asked if we were to assume that 60% of our proposal is good news. PERNSTEINER stated that funding the new model at some level is better for PSU than any past funding.

KARANT-NUNN asked if our percentage of state funding equals that of U. of Oregon, which was cited as 15% in the Saturday Oregonian. PERNSTEINER stated our state funding is more than 25% of our budget. There is a higher percentage of research and out-of-state tuition funds in U. of Oregon’s budget.
D. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Vice President for University Relations Gary Withers and Jan Woodruff, Director of Marketing

Question #1, part 1. WITHERS stated, the Office of Marketing and Communications is a resource, similar to OIRP. It is there primarily to provide information and data to decision makers. It does not set academic policy. This information relates to a host of things, including: ways in which it can better promote, identify, create and enhance the image of the institution; how and where we can best serve our students and the community; and, what our decision makers, such as George Pernsteiner, need to know about issues related to pricing. PSU is now in a tuition-driven budget model where those issues will come up. Marketing and Communications represents one of three primary areas of interest with respect to decision making, with the other areas are the academy and the public interest. So you have what the market tells us, what we tell ourselves and what the public tells us they want.

Part 2. WITHERS stated the components of this new marketing strategy are not completely developed yet. With broad input, University Relations will continue to gather information to draft a promotional strategy for the university. There are a number of ways to reach people including print, electronics, one on one, promotional activities, targeted events, etc. We need to look at this mix to determine the best vehicles to reach constituencies which include current and prospective students, funders, public officials, and others with an interest in the university.

Part 3. WITHERS stated an Advisory Board has been formed which is composed of approximately 2/3 university and 1/3 community members. There are 8 faculty on the Board, including Steve Harmon, SBA, Dick Pratt, ES, Alan Resnik, SBA, James Ward, SSW, Don Dickinson SBA, David Johnson, HST, Dean Janine Allen and Dean Marvin Kaiser.

Part 4. WITHERS stated there have been ongoing discussions with academic leaders including the Provost regarding hiring, developing the marketing strategy, etc. WITHERS introduced Marketing Director Jan Woodruff to respond to Question #2.
Question #2. Jan Woodruff stated the plan is to do the same as before, but more. The office will continue to do what has worked well in the past, as well as adding a host of activities which will help gain visibility and support for the university. The office will distribute newsworthy information and track its placement in the media. It will engage in a strategic and proactive approach to communicating so it can more effectively capitalize on all that is out there. For publicity several new approaches will be used, including: 1) Research, to better understand the media and the interest groups; and, 2) Put in place more processes and systems so the office can respond more quickly to communication opportunities. For example, they are working on an experts list, a P.R. opportunity calendar, and they have daily strategy sessions on communications. The office is employing an interdisciplinary team approach which means that they all come to the task with different tools and talents and bring a lot of resources to bear. Press releases are used to amplify and support dozens of different promotional techniques.

A. JOHNSON asked who faculty can send information to since both Pat Scott and Brian White are dismissed. WITHERS stated it should be forwarded to him, until the new structure is in place. COLLIE asked how will Marketing and Communications interact with Admissions and recruiting. Jan Woodruff stated that Marketing works in support of these offices. DRISCOLL asked who is paying for the "more" in Woodruff's statement. Jan Woodruff stated that the office will provide more service for the same cost.

WOLLNER noted that it is his understanding that the office is contracting services, and asked how it was working out. WITHERS stated he has employed a temporary employees with a four week contract during the transition. WOLLNER stated he has heard that there have been some problems with this temporary arrangement, and requested comment. Jan Woodruff stated that she has no indication of any problems. WOLLNER stated he would have to disagree. Jan Woodruff stated that if there are problems, people should talk to her about them.

BURNS noted he applauds the university for undertaking a marketing strategy, however, regarding the two employees who were fired, why couldn’t their skills have been upgraded and/or retooled? Jan Woodruff stated that two new positions are required. They are for generalists in marketing with three years experience, one an integrated marketer and one an integrated program manager. These positions require much broader skills and experience in advertising, because this is a more integrated holistic approach.
ELLIS asked if the assembly could conclude, based upon these remarks, that Communications is secondary to Marketing. Jan Woodruff stated that it is an issue of semantics. All these marketing activities have to do with communications.

KARANT-NUNN stated that it must be reiterated that this body, regardless of anyone’s personal connections with Scott and White, does not want to see colleagues summarily dismissed, and this must be communicated to the Administration. These individuals may represent other categories of employees who are not protected by tenure as we are, but they are part of our community. The special privileges that faculty enjoy are partly responsible for defining the overall climate of the university, and that extends to our employment practices.

RUETER noted that, following up on the question by ELLIS, marketing and communication seem to be lumped together in this new plan, and the result would appear that blurbs replace content. How will the office protect against that? Jan Withers stated that the shape and placement of the information depends on the target audience.

LIEBERMAN asked what is Marketing’s role in the recruiting of students and how will Marketing connect with Admissions regarding recruiting ideas. Jan Woodruff stated her office would work with the ideas presented to it on an individual basis, and make an effort to maximize effectiveness.

TORRES noted that research has been mentioned as a component of Marketing, and asked for elaboration on what that might include. Jan Woodruff stated the office conducts interviews, focus groups, etc., with students, the business community, and opinion leaders. It also use a wide variety of secondary research collected nationally from other universities.

FULLER recommended the office interview exiting students.

ELLIS asked, with limited resources, how the office will develop an in-depth understanding of the faculty so it will have the expertise to communicate the faculty to the outside world. The concern of the faculty, aside from the layoffs, is that we be adequately represented. Jan Woodruff stated that the office intends to be more proactive about communication with the faculty, as faculty to public relations is one of its best tools for promoting the university.
E. REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Steering Committee Report on Recommendations for University Studies

CEASE noted that the Task Force of last year is disbanded, for those who may not be aware. The Steering Committee is monitoring the progress of the Task Force recommendations, and will designate follow-up to appropriate Senate and administrative bodies, where it has become evident that recommendations have not been addressed.

2. Facilities Report

Staff Architect Richard Piekenbrock reported for Facilities Director Brian Chase, who was out of town. Piekenbrock referred the assembly to the Campus Plan Map attached to the Agenda, and he reviewed the current campus plan. He noted that the grade school project (including relocation of Marston House) is on hold for at least a year, the trolley route has been modified due to the siting of the new practice field, designs are underway for the Native American Center, and there are two options under consideration for the orientation of Benson House to the Park Blocks. The relocation of the latter is dependent on final funds being raised.

F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to Postpone B.A. Degree Requirement Action

CEASE introduced the motion noting it is proposed by the Steering Committee.

A. JOHNSON/BURNS MOVED ("F") "the B.A. Requirement Proposal be returned to the Academic Requirements Committee to resolve issues of consensus with interested and appropriate parties regarding: 1) the definition of the baccalaureate degree, 2) the foreign language requirement, and 3) inclusion of a 4 cr. science/ mathematics requirement. The ARC will return this item to the Faculty Senate on January 4, 1999, for final consideration."

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.
G. NEW BUSINESS

1. ARC Proposal for Proration of University Studies Transfer Credits

WETZEL introduced the proposal noting that it reflects current precedent and this year it applies to 850-900 transfer students not classified as Freshmen or Sophomores. It was also noted that an asterisk be added on "45-59 hours" on the copy in the Agenda packet.

WETZEL/A.JOHNSON MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE ("G1") the Proposal for Proration of University Studies Transfer Credits.

RUETER asked why students couldn’t substitute other courses. WOLLNER answered, that SINQ are unique "gateway" courses for the Clusters, and can’t have substitutions. MOOR noted that this is simply a refinement of a principle. WAMSER noted that transfers dislike the identification with lower division status, and asked if re-naming has been considered.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Proposal from IFS to Approve Process for Faculty Nomination to the State Board

CEASE introduced the proposal, reviewing the history behind its inception in IFS, and referencing the Report of the October IFS meeting which is in the Senate Agenda mailing.

COOPER/WOLLNER MOVED THE SENATE ADOPT the process as outlined in the IFS letter of 19 October from President Kemble Yates, which was distributed (attached).

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

3. PEBB Benefits Plan

CEASE reviewed the concerns about the new benefits packages being developed by the Public Employees Benefit Board, which appears to be an attempt to reduce the cost of benefits to the system. He referenced the 1 November e-mail copy of the letter from the OSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee to PEBB and the PEBB Survey, which were both distributed (attached).
KARANT-NUNN/ENNEKING MOVED "the Senate express support for this letter and direct the Steering Committee to compose a similar letter reflecting the position of the PSU Faculty Senate."

WOLLNER noted that this issue is covered in his report of the October Meeting of IFS which is included in the current Senate packet mailing. COOPER noted that at the IFS meeting, there was strong consensus that the move to HMO's doesn't satisfy the needs of many faculty, as well as for other professionals employed by the State.

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:19 p.m.
October 19, 1998

Dear Faculty Senate President:

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) would like to ask your help in fulfilling a longterm goal for faculty: to get an OUS faculty member named to the State Board of Higher Education. With the crucial help of other faculty leadership groups (Association of Oregon Faculties, American Association of University Professors, and others), we persuaded the 1997 Oregon Legislature to pass legislation which permits a faculty member to serve on the Board. We believe, with the right person nominated and enough encouragement, the Governor can be persuaded to name a faculty member to the Board in June of 1999. The Board is currently composed of private individuals, many very dedicated, but few with current direct knowledge of the conditions in which our faculty operate on the campuses as they engage in teaching, research, and service. The Board currently depends on occasional campus visitations, the University Presidents and Provosts, a brief report by the IFS President at the beginning of its meetings, and the Chancellor's Office staff for its information. We believe with a faculty voice at the table, an invaluable perspective for the Board can be provided. In order to make this plan a reality, we are asking for your Senate's help in nominating qualified and interested faculty from your institution for this position. AOF and IFS have agreed on the following process:

1. Engage institution Faculty Senates in identifying qualified and willing candidates for the position. Have each institution forward its nominations to a Nominating Committee through their IFS Senator by January 15, 1998.

2. A Nominating Committee, consisting of faculty from the IFS Senate, AOF Board, and other faculty leadership groups, will select no more than 3 names to submit to the Governor.

3. These names will be shared with each Senate and other group for endorsement prior to submission to the Governor.

4. The finalists' applications will be sent to the Governor.
So we're asking you to do the following: 1) Vote on a motion to endorse this process for nominating a faculty member to the board, and 2) initiate a call for nominations on your campus for faculty qualified and willing to serve on the Board. Generally, a "qualified nominee" would be a faculty member with proven leadership, and ideally would be able to represent faculty from the whole System -- not just those of his/her own institution. I have enclosed some materials giving details for applying the position. Please talk to your IFS Senator or AOF Representative for more details.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,

Kemble Yates
IFFS President
Dear Board Members,

The purpose of this communication is to respond to the information provided at the meeting on September 28, 1998 on the OSU campus. Campus leaders were encouraged to provide input to the Board concerning the health care benefits for the year 2000 and beyond. The OSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee has reviewed and analyzed faculty and staff concerns about the current health care benefits package and wishes to present them to PEBB for serious consideration in the development of future benefits packages.

1. Failure to include faculty input in the decision-making process. The means by which PEBB decided to eliminate Blue Cross/Blue Shield Plan 3 -- the most subscribed plan at OSU -- is unacceptable to faculty. The fact that the decision was made without asking for faculty input raises serious concerns about PEBB's decision making processes. Faculty on the plan were notified in a letter just prior to the Open Enrollment period while faculty considering a switch to plan 3 received no early notice. A great confusion currently exists on the OSU campus as to the merits of alternative options, and this confusion fosters fear that the PEBB process is marching toward a single HMO plan.

The entire process demonstrated little respect for OSU employees, the recipients of the benefits. Employee input is critical for PEBB to develop credibility with OSU faculty. Adequate and timely information is critical in helping the employees respond in a rational manner. Consultation is required before decisions are made, not after the fact.

2. Failure to offer a plan that meets the needs of a workforce stationed across the state and throughout the world. Higher education comprises about 25% of the entire pool of PEBB constituents. We urge caution in lumping all constituents into an "average" in order to determine the most appropriate package. Significant and important differences and expectations exist within the sub-groups of constituents. The Board must respond to the needs and expectations of those sub-groups. With reference to this concern, faculty in higher education have responsibilities covering the globe and their benefits packages must be robust enough to respond to off-site emergencies. We are an international enterprise with teaching, research, extended education, internship supervision, and economic development work all over the world. Although an HMO system might work well for place bound state employees, it is entirely inappropriate for oceanographers working in the South Pacific, professors in a European study abroad program, or an internship supervisor in South Africa. For this reason, indemnity plans are the only viable alternative, and the level of benefits within those indemnity plans is also important.

3. Failure to match plans to the health care provider circumstances in the community. In the consideration of the package, serious concerns must be given to (a) the various types of plans, (b) the use of preferred and participating providers, and (c) cash back and opt out features. It is not enough to say, "Yes there will be an indemnity plan and there will be cash back and opt out." The level of benefits in a particular plan is the critical element.

The fact that faculty have been heavy users of Plan 3 should provide the Board with an indication of the type of plan that is desired. Even though that package was the most expensive, the faculty used that plan for specific reasons. Many chose that plan over a cash back. The level of benefits was the attraction. The Board must solicit information about the type of plan that is desired in a timely and proactive manner.
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appears to be a limited number of local doctors in the preferred category who are accepting new patients. There is considerable uncertainty at this point over whether Co-Pay and Plan 3 are even close to equal. Whatever plans are identified, the Board must consider the impact in the local areas. Offering something that is not accessible is not a benefit, in fact, it is disingenuous.

4. Erosion of benefits and weakening of recruitment/retention incentives. Recruitment and retention of quality faculty is important to the entire OUS, including OSU. Faculty currently believe that the benefits repackaging is a reduction in pay. Since faculty salaries in Oregon currently rank 39th in the nation, Oregon is clearly not competitive across the nation. Up to this time, we have been able to highlight the benefits package in attracting faculty in spite of the low salaries. A reduction in benefits will erode the ability of OSU, across the board, to attract and retain our strongest faculty upon whom the State of Oregon depends to maintain and improve a quality system of higher education.

We feel it is entirely appropriate to ask the Legislature for additional financing if the alternative is a reduction in benefits. As they consider faculty salaries for the next biennium, so they should consider the cost of appropriate benefits packages.

We hope the Board members are able to use this information as they begin the difficult task of consolidating the BUBB and SEBB benefits programs. We look forward to the opportunity to be involved in the development.

Sincerely,

OSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Maggie Niess, President
Kenneth Williamson, President Elect
Anthony Wilcox, Immediate Past President
Bruce Coblentz
Irma Delson
James Foster
Larry Griggs
Phyllis Lee
Gordon Matzke

c: President Paul Risser
Provost Roy Arnold
Kemble Yates, President of IFS
Chancellor Cox
State Board of Higher Education Members
John Yunker
Lois Courtney
Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee
Steve Davis, Chair
Cliff Trow
Barbara Ross

Maggie Niess Email: niessm@ucs.orst.edu
Professor and Chair
Science and Mathematics Education Phone: (541) 737-1818
Oregon State University FAX: (541) 737-1817
Corvallis, OR 97331
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TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Marjorie Terdal, Chair of Graduate Council

RE: 1998 Graduate Council Annual Report

Appreciation is extended to the members of the 1998 Graduate Council:

- Michael Bowman, Eileen Brennan, Steven Brenner, Scott Burns, Robert Eder, Mary Ellen Kenreich, Rolla Lewis, Herman Migliore, Joyce O'Halloran, Patricia Rumer, Friedrich Schuler, Michael Shaughnessy, Trevor Smith, William Tate, Paulette Watanabe, and Howard Wineberg, and Deborah Payne Towner, our student member.

We gratefully acknowledge the participation of our consultants and staff:

- Linda Devereaux, William Feyerherm, Maureen Orr Eldred, Robert Tufts

ROLE OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council is established by the Faculty Constitution and is charged with the duties outlined on pages 5-6 of the 1998-99 Faculty Governance Guide. These duties include the development and recommendation of University policies; establishment of procedures and regulations for graduate studies; adjudication of petitions regarding graduate regulations; recommendation of suitable policies and standards for graduate courses and programs; coordination of graduate activities with regard to requests for substantive changes in existing courses, requests for new courses and programs, and changes in existing graduate programs.

ACTIONS

Graduate Petitions

The Chair continued the procedure of appointing subcommittees to read student petitions submitted to the Graduate Council. During the 1997-98 academic year, the Graduate Council acted on 70 petitions, which is a decrease of 5 from the previous year's total of 75 petitions. Overall 80% of the petitions were approved, which is a decrease from the previous year's 91% approval rate. A total of 55, or slightly more than three fourths of all petitions, requested a waiver of the one-year deadline for removal of an incomplete, an extension of the seven year limit on course work for a master's degree, a waiver of the course transfer limit, or approval of retroactive registration. The results of the petition activity for the year are attached.
New Programs

The Graduate Council approved the following proposals for new degree programs:

- MA/MS in Writing, Department of English
- Master of Engineering in Project Management, in Technology Management, in Systems Engineering, in Electrical and Computer Engineering, in Mechanical Engineering, in Civil Engineering, all from the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
- Master of Software Engineering, joint program between four institutions (PSU, UO, OSU, OGI) through the Oregon Joint Schools of Engineering
- PhD in Computer Science, Department of Computer Science
- MS in Financial Analysis, School of Business Administration
- MS in Systems Engineering, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

The Graduate Council approved the following proposals for new Graduate Certificate programs:

- Digital Signal Processing
- Image Processing
- Communication Systems
- Design Automation
- Analog and Microwave Circuit Design
- Lasers and Optoelectronics
- Computer Architecture and Design
- Integrated Circuit Test, Verification, and Validation
- Digital Design, all from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Environmental Geology
- Hydrogeology
- Engineering Geology, all from the Department of Geology
- Hydrology, from Environmental Sciences program
- Children's and Young Adult Literature, from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction
- Mathematics for Middle School Mathematics Teachers, from the Department of Mathematical Sciences
Program Change Approvals

The following program changes were approved by the Graduate Council during the year.

Master of Public Administration and MPA: Health Administration
change in existing degree requirements

MA/MS Speech Communication
addition of non-thesis option

PhD in Public Administration and Policy
change in existing degree requirements

PhD in Social Work and Social Research
change in existing degree requirements

Master of Social Work
change in existing degree requirements

PhD in Systems Science
changes in existing degree requirements

PhD in Urban Studies
changes in existing degree requirements

Master of Business Administration
addition of an option in Management of Innovation and Technology (MBA:MIT)
### Graduate Council Petitions Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>INCOMPLETES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Waive one year deadline for incompletes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SEVEN YEAR LIMIT ON COURSEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on coursework</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Waive seven year limit on transfer courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CREDIT LEVELS/GRADING MODES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Change from P/NP to grade retroactively</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DISQUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Extend Probation, with qualifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Readmission after one year Disqualification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>TRANSFER CREDITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Accept more transfer hours than allowed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Accept miscellaneous transfer credit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Accept more Reserved credits than allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>REGISTRATION PROBLEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Retroactive registration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Retroactive withdrawal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Accept late grade change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIMITS ON COURSE TYPES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Waive 12 credit limit on 501/505 courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>Waive University limit on 800-level courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MISCEllANEOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>Waive reserve graduate credit policy within 45 hrs BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL for 1997-98

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of petitions in Previous Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Library Committee advises the Director of the Library in all policies affecting the Library and makes recommendations regarding purchases and acquisitions. The Committee met several times over the past calendar year and, in accordance with our directives, have the following activities to report.

1. Oversight and Implementation of the Library Vision Plan
In May 1996 the Faculty Senate discussed and approved the Library Vision Plan, which is presently being implemented. This plan developed strategies dealing with necessary technological changes to the Library. In addition to improving information delivery services to the university community, the plan addressed physical and capital needs. In this latter group, the expenditure of $500,000 in COPs funds resulted in technological improvements to facilities and networking capabilities. The planned $2.7 million remodeling of the second floor of the library is dependent upon legislative approval this year of $1.35 million in general obligation bonds; in addition, a fund raising campaign will be initiated to secure private matching funds of an equal amount. If these funds can be secured, remodeling of the second floor could commence in summer 2000.

2. The Serials Project
Expenses for serials are putting significant pressures on the Library's budget. Serials represent approximately 71% percent of the library's 1998/99 materials acquisition budget. Since serial costs are growing significantly faster than budgetary allocations, the present serial collection simply cannot be supported without additional funds. With that in mind, the Library initiated in late 1997 a pilot project to refocus the serials collection. Staff members are working with two departments - Chemistry and Physics - to see if 'on-demand' electronic access to certain journals would be satisfactory or preferable to paper copies. In an 'on-demand' scenario, serial articles would be delivered electronically to the faculty member's desk in 24 hours, and would thus alleviate pressures to subscribe and house physical copies, some of which may not be heavily used. These departments will be illustrative since serials for these two departments represent nearly 20% of the acquisition budget for monographs and serials for the entire Library. This study is scheduled to conclude in March 1999 and initial results indicate that significant savings can be made through delivery of materials via electronic means. A decision as to expand the study to all departments on campus will be made in spring 1999.

3. Library Operations
Just as there are budgetary impacts on materials, the segments of the Library's budget allocated to personnel are also being pressured. For example, the budget for student wages has not been increased for six years and is $100,000 under current actual expenses. The Committee has worked with the Director of the Library and other library faculty to provide the best possible delivery of services to faculty and other users in the face of continually increasing demands. Substantive improvements have been made in several existing areas such as the Interlibrary Loan Department, and to new services, such as Extended Services.

Membership:
Rudolph Barton, ARCH, Chair
Richard Forbes, BIO
Andrew Fraser, SYSC
Michael Gorji, EAS
Linda Parshall, FFL
Friedrich Schuler, HST
Alan Yeakley, ESR
Student Positions are vacant

Respectively submitted,
L. Rudolph Barton
Chair, Library Committee
Committee Responsibilities: The Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) is charged with recommending academic standards that maintain the reputation of the University, assisting undergraduates having difficulties with the scholastic regulations, adjudicating undergraduate petitions requesting a waiver on suspensions, and providing advice to the Registrar on matters concerning transfer students or students seeking readmission after having had scholastic deficiencies.

Committee Activities: In light of these responsibilities the SSC has met regularly to expedite the processing of petitions and to discuss policy concerns. The committee has also worked with Office of Admissions and Records personnel to improve the tracking of student petitions. Beginning in October all SSC petitions will be tracked using a Web-based database accessible to Admissions & Records personnel, SSC members, and in the future possibly advisors.

In March 1998 the committee brought the following motion, which was approved, to the Faculty Senate: The deadline for students to drop a class, to withdraw from school without the instructor's approval, or to make a change in their grading option has been changed from the end of the 4th week to the end of the 5th week of each term.

The committee also has established a deadline for the submission of petitions for reinstatement. Beginning Winter 1999, disqualified students wishing to be reinstated for the current term must submit their petition to the Office of Admissions & Records by the Friday of the third week of the term. The committee will then make decisions on their petitions by the end of the fifth week of the term. Petitions from students who miss this deadline will be considered for reinstatement for the following term. This change was made to facilitate the processing of petitions and to assure that students understand the severity of their academic situation and deal with it accordingly. Furthermore, in the past when petitions were accepted throughout the entire term, disqualified students often did not received a response to their petition for reinstatement until the end of the term.

Between January 1998 and October 29, 1998 the committee read 702 petitions and made the following decisions:

**Petitions for reinstatement:** 218
- Granted: 157
- Denied: 61

**Petitions for transcript changes:** 409
- Grade Change Options: 115
  - Granted: 64
  - Denied: 51
Add/Drop Requests: 140
- Granted: 113
- Denied: 27

Refund Requests: 154
- Granted: 121
- Denied: 33

Incomplete Extensions: 75
- Granted: 75
- Denied: 0

**Comments:** The committee is concerned about a number of issues:

a) the number of students who are disqualified more than once,
b) the number of students who frequently request changes in their academic records (e.g. grade change options, add/drop),
c) the need for a statute of limitations for the acceptance of petitions,
d) the lack of a satisfactory progress policy in regard to attempted versus earned credits, and
e) the excessive and/or inappropriate use of “X”s.

With regard to the first three items, the committee is discussing mechanisms for dealing these concerns. In regard to the last two items, the committee would like to move that these issues be studied by next year’s committee. Therefore:

**Motion:** The committee moves that the 1999 Scholastic Standards Committee, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research, investigate both the use of “X”s and possibility of establishing a satisfactory progress policy and subsequently make a policy recommendation to the Senate regarding this matter.

Submitted by the Scholastic Standards Committee

Mary Ann Barham, chair
Tom Dieterich
Kit Dusky
Dan Fortmiller
Y.C. Jenq
Jennifer Loney
Shirley Morrell
Carroll Tama
Paulette Watanabe

November 12, 1998
Proposed Amendment

CONSTITUTION OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY
Text to be deleted struck-out. Text to be added underlined. Text shifted is italicized.

Article IV. Organization of the Faculty.
Section 4, Faculty committees
j) Graduate Council. The council shall consist of five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, one from each of the other instructional divisions, one from the Library, one representing All Other faculty, and two graduate students appointed upon recommendations by the vice provost for Graduate Studies and Research. It is desirable that the faculty appointees be selected from among faculty members with an involvement in graduate education. These individuals may be identified with the assistance of the Office of Graduate Studies.

The Council shall ....

Rationale: The Graduate Council is recommending this change in guidelines for selection of its membership so that those on the Council will be active participants in graduate education and be familiar with the current policies and practices of graduate education at PSU through their own participation. A reasonable group from which to choose could include departmental and program graduate coordinators, graduate program directors, thesis and project advisers, and those who have regularly served as graduate office representatives. These individuals may be identified with the assistance of the Office of Graduate Studies.
Date: November 9, 1998
To: Faculty Senate
From: Marjorie Terdal, Chair, Graduate Council
Re: Recommendations for new graduate programs

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

Ph.D. in Computer Science
Rationale: The Computer Science department believes this program is both timely and important. Timely because of the nationwide shortage of Ph.D. level computer scientists, which has been documented by its professional society, and because, with the addition of new faculty and the growth of the Master’s program, the department is well prepared to take on this added responsibility. Important because the program is needed to support the department’s research efforts, to help it attract and retain high-quality faculty, and to improve its ability to obtain external funding.

The department envisions a small, high-quality program which will allow faculty who are active in research to mentor one to two students each on an ongoing basis. Ph.D. students will be supported by the department for the first two years; after that, students will be expected to be picked up on a grant if they are to continue in the program. The faculty agree that the benefits of the program are great enough to warrant redeploying research time into teaching reading courses and mentoring students, in the expectation that the overall result will be a net increase in research productivity.

The program fills a pressing need for students and for industry and academia.

Course of Study: Students will be required to take a minimum of 90 credit hours beyond the Bachelor’s degree. Of these a minimum of 54 hours will consist of course work, including the following five required courses:

- CS581  Theory of Computation I
- CS570  Algorithm Design and Analysis
- CS533  Concepts of Operating Systems
- CS558  Programming Languages
- CS538  Computer Architecture

In addition each student will take 18 credit hours of focus courses, consisting of either 9 credit hours from each of two areas or 6 credit hours from each of three areas, as listed below:

1. Programming Languages
2. Systems/Networking
3. Software Engineering
4. Database
5. Theory

The additional 21 or more credit hours of course work will be made up from electives, which may include any of the courses in the five areas listed above, additional computer science courses, courses from Computer Science departments at cooperating universities, and courses from other departments within PSU, subject to the approval of the student’s advisory committee. Likely sources of external courses include OGI, with which we have a cooperative arrangement.
on the Master's level, and OSU and U of Oregon via distance learning arrangements.

The necessary courses, for the most part, already exist in the Master's degree curriculum. The exception is a selection of advanced seminars, which will be developed as the program begins to fill with students. Numbers of existing courses are given as they now stand. With approval of the Ph.D. program, they will be renumbered to add a 600-level alternative, where appropriate.

After completing the required core and the additional required courses, usually by the spring term of the second year, students will take a preliminary examination. After passing this, they will be assigned a provisional advisor based on mutual research interests. The rest of their course work will be planned in consultation with the advisor. The student will also write a Ph.D. dissertation.
Proposal Summary for Faculty Senate
Masters of Science in Financial Analysis

The Master of Science in Financial Analysis (MSFA) is a 49 credit hour program aimed at individuals who seek graduate specialization in financial analysis, but do not want the breadth provided by the longer 72 credit hour MBA offered at PSU. The degree responds to two developments from the business community. First, demand for financial analysts is growing rapidly as organizations fulfill the need to include these skills in the decision-making activities of functional areas such as manufacturing, supply and logistics, and marketing. Second, starting in 1999 students are required to have five years of education to sit for the Uniform CPA Exam. The MSFA provides PSU's accounting students an attractive avenue for fulfilling the five-year requirement. Of the 100 to 110 accounting majors graduating each year, approximately 75 - 90 sit for the CPA exam. Without the MSFA, PSU is in danger of losing accounting undergraduates to other schools who provide an equivalent alternative. The business schools at University of Oregon and Oregon State University are proposing complementary programs to fulfill this new need.

The program was designed by defining specific industry needs from job skill profiles of financial analysts, conversations with professionals in the business community, desired outcomes for the CPA, and requirements necessary for Business School accreditation. The MSFA is distinctive by combining a heavy analytical and finance component with courses in business management and economics. It utilizes fourteen existing core and elective MBA courses, adds credit hours or renumbers another six existing courses, and proposes just three new courses. All courses are dedicated for graduates. The SBA will not grant a joint MBA/MSFA degree.

One full time cohort of 25 to 35 students will be enrolled in fall 1999 (capacity is 45 students), for which the SBA will require two additional faculty. With sufficient demand, a part-time night cohort will be launched in the future. The full time course schedule will allow students to complete the degree in four terms. The required faculty are more than fully funded by the funds generated from additional student FTE.

Applicants for admission to the MSFA program will be required to hold an undergraduate degree in business or a post-baccalaureate degree in accounting, and meet University requirements for admission to graduate programs. Applicants will be required to take the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT). Admission to the program will be competitive based on GMAT score, GPA, and years and significance of work experience. Averages for students admitted to the MBA program in fall of 1998 were 592 GMAT, 3.2 GPA, and 6.9 years of work experience. Because the MSFA shares many courses with the MBA, students admitted to the MSFA should have the same qualifications.
MSFA Curriculum Summary

Business and Economics Core (25 Credit Hours):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete All of the following (17 credit hours)</th>
<th>Select two of the following three courses (8 credit hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ec 551: Applied Econometrics for Financial Analysis  
(New Course) | Mgmt 550: Organizational Management |
| BA 531: Executive Briefings | Mgmt 560: Managerial Responsibility and Public |
| BA 551: Integrated Process Management | Policy |
| BA 552: Systems for Performance Measurement | Mktg 544: Marketing |
| Mgmt 562: Business Strategy and Policy | |

Financial Analysis Core (20 Credit Hours):
The following five accounting and finance courses are required of all MSFA students:

- Finl 551: Financial Management for Financial Analysts  
(New Course, similar to Finl 561 for MBA)
- Actg 551: Accounting Information Systems (Renumbered plus 2 credits)
- Finl 552: Investments (Renumbered) or Actg 552: Strategic Cost Management (Existing Course,  
Renumbered, 1 additional credit hour)
- Actg 553: Financial Statement Analysis (1 additional credit)
- Finl 553: Financial Analysis and Business Valuation

Financial Analysis Elective (4 Credit Hours):
Select one elective from the following courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finl 504: Internship</th>
<th>Actg 542: Tax Factors in Business Decisions (1 additional credit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finl 545: Hedging and Risk Management</td>
<td>Actg 552: Strategic Cost Management (1 additional credit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finl 552: Investments (renumbered)</td>
<td>Actg 576: International Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finl 556: International Finance</td>
<td>Marketing 544: Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finl 565: Cases in Corporate Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three New Courses in the MSFA

Ec 551: Applied Econometrics for Financial Analysis (4 Credit Hours): The theory and application of statistical regression, hypothesis testing, and simulation of econometric models. Emphasizes model construction and efficient use of economic data. Problems of multicolinearity, heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation, and distributed lags are discussed. Some familiarity with calculus and computer applications are assumed.

Finl 551: Financial Management for Financial Analysts (4 credit hours): Gateway course to the Master of Science in Financial Analysis. Examines the financial concepts and problem-solving skills required to evaluate whether managerial decisions add value to the firm. Students will develop an understanding of the financial implications of business decisions and a framework with which to evaluate their decisions. An integral part of this approach requires understanding how the different functional areas of a business interrelate and the supporting role that finance provides. Topics considered include cash flow analysis, risk determination, valuation, working capital management, and financing. Graduate credit cannot be earned for both Finl 561 and Finl 551. Prerequisite: Admission to the Masters of Science in Financial Analysis program.

Finl 562 Intermediate Financial Management (4 credit hours): Second level course in financial management to provide more depth in the study of asset pricing, capital budgeting, capital structure, dividend policy, working capital management, growth through mergers, and leasing. Emphasis on the further development of problem solving capabilities. Prerequisite: Finl 551 or Finl 561.

Changes in existing courses for this program:
- Actg 551: Accounting Information Systems (increase from 2 cr to 4 cr)
- Actg 542: Tax Factors in Business Decisions (change from 3 cr to 4 cr)
- Actg 552: Strategic Cost Management (renumbers Actg 512 and changes from 3 to 4 cr)
- Actg 553: Financial Statement Analysis (changes from 3 cr to 4 cr)
- Finl 552: Investments (renumbers Finl 543)
The Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) recommends that the following remark be appended to the description of the B.S. degree requirement in the PSU Bulletin:

Unless otherwise specified, only those courses in the following departments designated to have lab or field work will satisfy the B.S. degree requirement for lab/field work: BIOL, CHEM, ENV SCI, GEOL, PHY, and SCI.

PSU Faculty Senate
December 7, 1998