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The full text of the Proposed Revisions to the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases to add new ranks is available at:

http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

The motion to approve will be voted on at the January 2014 meeting.

In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Senate Agendas are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have public notice of curricular proposals, and adequate time to review and research all action items. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full proposals are available at the PSU Curricular Tracking System: http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com. If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate. Items may be pulled from the Curricular Consent Agenda for discussion in Senate up through the end of roll call.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of his/her Senate Alternate. An Alternate is another faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator. A faculty member may serve as Alternate for more than one senator, but an alternate may represent only one Senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than 3 meetings consecutively, will be dropped from the Senate roll.

www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate
TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty  

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 6, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the December 2, 2013, Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   EPC proposal on Academic Program Review
   Discussion item: Academic Program Array Review

D. Unfinished Business
   *1. Proposed revisions to the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases to add new ranks
      *a Revised language for Proposed Revisions to Article V. ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND PROCEDURES: NTTF A.1c Peer Review (p. 34)
      b. P&T Revisions (full text): http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

E. New Business
   *1.b-c. Joint GC & UCC and UCC Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Proposed Graduate Program Changes
   *3. Proposal for the Implementation of New Faculty Ranks
   *4. EPC Report on Revising the process for the creation, elimination, and alteration of Centers and Institutes, and proposed new Work Flow Charts
   5. Proposed resolution to request to line-item access the All-Funds budget
      *The text of the resolution will be posted to the Senate web site and list serve as an addendum prior to the January meeting

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 (16:00)
   Provost’s Report
   Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
   B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2013 and attachments (B1-3)
   E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda (1b & 1c)
   E-2 Proposed Graduate Program Changes
   E-3 Proposal for the Implementation of New Ranks
   E-4 EPC Report and Proposal for adoption of New Work Flow Charts (4a-c)
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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, December 2, 2013

Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey


Alternates Present: Schrock for Carder, MacCormack for Lindsay, Beitelspacher for Pullman, Cal for Recktenwald, DeLaVega for Smith, Spolek for Tretheway, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: Clucas, Cotrell, Hunt, Talbott


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The November 4, 2013 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIDE asked senators who did not receive the November 25 email Preview of the December agenda to inform the Secretary. She noted that it might help avoid confusion if senators who forward the information in these emails to their districts would add a brief explanation that identifies the recipients as members of a Senate district. She announced that the discussion item and a question from Steering would be handled by the Provost in her Report with plenty of opportunity for asking questions (under item G). She added that, as the Bylaws allow, a group of Senators would propose January agenda item that would be previewed after the two scheduled announcements.
1. IFS Report

HINES reported that discussion at the November 22-23 IFS meeting had focused on the future of the regional and technical universities and the three options before them: a choice between individual boards, a central coordinating board, or becoming satellite campuses of U of O and OSU. IFS also continues to query its role under the new governance model for higher ed. Wiewel, Andrews, King (AAUP) and McBride presented to IFS. [Note: IFS Minutes will be posted once approved at: http://oregonstate.edu/senate/ifs/ifs.html]

DAASCH asked if all campuses get individual boards, what does IFS anticipate its role to be at the state level? HINES said that it is looking like the arrows are pointing more toward a relationship with HECC than with the OEIB. The advantage for IFS is consultation with a body at state level, and HECC can say that it consults with faculty. HINES noted that the faculty representative appointed to HECC is non-voting. BURNS recommended continued communication with faculty on other campuses as a beneficial activity, whatever model adopted. SANTEL MANN suggested that if the regional campuses became satellites, such a model could further erode funding for PSU. HINES said that she would add this question to a document that IFS is preparing. GREENSTADT asked if this model were a way for PSU to become a flagship institution itself, at the same level with U of Oregon, and about the issue of program duplication. HINES noted the official view that is that there is no hierarchy among the campuses. She said that it appears that the Provosts’ Council and HECC are going to be looking at the duplication question, but the process for doing so is still not clear; she added that HECC’s immediate concern is making sure that campuses are coordinating their courses in terms of transferability. HINES encouraged anyone with observations or questions to email her at mhines@pdx.edu.

2. PSU Graduation

GELMON, GPC chair, introduced Nicholas Running, PSU Commencement Coordinator. She encouraged senators to open a conversation with their districts about ways to make graduation a better experience going forward and to increase faculty involvement. She reviewed the membership, charge and responsibilities of the Graduation Program Board (GPC), and described the benefits of dividing commencement into two ceremonies. (See minutes attachment B-1). She noted the opportunity to suggest student speakers, to add to the program for the luncheon between ceremonies, and to use other spaces in the Moda Center for post-graduation events (see slides 6 and 7). Suggestions can be directed to commencement@pdx.edu.

LIEBMAN suggested that the graduation luncheon honor the service of faculty who chair Senate committees. MERCER advocated for finding ways to convey the excitement of graduation as an event to those who haven’t experienced it. KARAVANIC wondered if the large-screen monitors could feature a student-assembled images as individual names are called. GELMON and RUNNING noted that the unpredictable order in which students appear made this match technically difficult and could slow the process down, but that Q/R coding could
possibly match information like major. MACCORMACK suggested paying some attention to how dynamic proposed graduation speakers are. DOLIDON asked about hat decoration. RUNNING said that PSU would be working with a new gown supplier and sponsoring a hat decoration contest. SANTELLMANN suggested that Q/R coding might also allow linking the students’ rendering of the pronunciation of their names. GELMON said that the Board plans to invite faculty to self-nominate as readers and to audition them, and, perhaps, readers could be matched with the fluency needs of degree-areas. MACCORMACK and GELMON reminded faculty of PSU-AAUP coverage of gown rental costs for members.

3. Resolution sponsored by a Group of Supporting Senators for discussion and vote in the January 2014 Senate meeting

GEORGE, one of the supporting senators, stated that the bottom line was the need for more eyes on and more creativity in budget decision-making. Therefore they would be requesting access to line item All-Funds budget information.

MCBRIDE noted that the Steering Committee would be discussing the resolution with its sponsors at its December 9 meeting.

Discussion item – Program Prioritization (see item G)

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to revise the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases to add new ranks

LIEBMAN reviewed the motions and process leading to the proposed resolution on non-tenured faculty positions. (See slides, attachment B-2.) He said that the heart of the task was to amend the PSU P&T Policies and Procedures in order to add nine new ranks and to create language adding job descriptions, promotion criteria and paths, and an evaluation process for these ranks. He noted that U of Oregon and OSU both have institutionalized ways for giving fixed-term (NTTF) faculty longer-term horizons for employment and promotion. He concluded with the request for questions of clarification, correction, and substantive comment on the document to be voted on in January, noting that what was proposed were fixes and not a rethink of the whole guidelines that were the legacy of a major and widely respected revision in 1996.

LUCKETT emphasized the importance of the issue of whether Senior Instructors were eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor and that his understanding was that the possibility had been closed off. LIEBMAN replied that only current NTTF faculty would continue to be eligible for this promotion under the grandfathering rules. LUCKETT worried that the changes would lock all new NTTF faculty hired in the future into a permanently lower set of salaries. LIEBMAN noted that this was a question for collective bargaining, a process that only establishes salary minimums, not market rates. DAASCH asked if the text
regarding grandfathering would stay permanently in the P&T document. LIEBMAN said yes, the language would stay, as a reference to the terms under which people had been hired. SANTELLEMMAN emphasized that motions approving the new ranks and grandfathering had already passed Senate and that the motion under discussion was to approve additions to the P&T guidelines to implement them. LIEBMAN agreed that this was the “unfinished business.” BOWMAN noted that in the past departmental criteria had made promotion to Assistant Professor rank difficult to achieve, and that he did not see new language that addressed whether promotional criteria for NTTF would now be measured by job-specific performance. LIEBMAN said that was left up to departments. The new guidelines were aimed at encouraging clear criteria that define good work for NTTF, evaluation by a right body, and the promise of promotion. He added that he personally, would advocate for multi-year contracts as a way to promote professional development for valued contributors to the University. DAASH noted important edits in the scholarship section for NTTF.

HANSEN stated that the new criteria for Senior Instructor II (SrI-II) looked like the old criteria for Senior Instructor to some faculty in his unit. If that were the case, why couldn’t these faculty be grandfathered in at SrI-II? He observed that even if NTTF faculty were to forgo the presumed promotional bump to SrI-II, it could be to their advantage in the long run to be in a salary compression-equity pool negotiated by the PSU-AAUP contract for the SrI-II level in the future. LIEBMAN noted the quandary for the P&T Guidelines Revision Committee. It had been required to place everyone at SrI-I and had to come up with general rules, knowing that some inequalities might result from one-size fits all. However departments still have to translate the general guidelines into a working document with departmental promotional guidelines and criteria. LIEBMAN also noted that AAUP and EPC were vetting the proposal. HANSEN said that faculty were asking why, if they had already demonstrated that they met the criteria for SrI-II, does the burden falls on them to prove themselves again?

BURNS/DAASCH MOVED the PROPOSAL to AMEND the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases.

MCBRIDE observed that, given the complexity of the issues, it was not possible for the guidelines to anticipate all the ripples of implementation. She noted that the Steering Committee would report on responses from the Educational Policy Committee and PSU-AAUP in January. She reminded senators that the vote on the document in January would be up or down. If senators were unhappy with the result, they could vote no and send the document back for further consideration.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in “E-1c” were ADOPTED as published.
F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

The Senate Steering Committee posed the following question to Provost Andrews in response to her report on Program Prioritization at the last Senate meeting:

What is your position on the status and future of tenure at PSU?

[The question was taken up by the Provost under item G.]

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

[The President’s Report was presented after the Provost’s report]

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS said she would address the question about tenure with prepared comments for the record. (See minutes attachment B-3.) Before speculating as to why the question had arisen, she stated: “We cannot be a research university without tenured faculty members. And, I have never said, not wanted to imply, we should eliminate or phase out tenure.” She concluded with an invitation to senators to join her in a conversation with Steering Committee members around academic program prioritization.

MCBRIDE said that Steering Committee had been wrestling with the question of how to launch such a process and had reached no conclusions. It hoped that the opportunity for a question and answer session with the Provost would provide some clarity.

MACCORMACK: Are we going into this with a presumption that some percentage of programs will be candidates for elimination?

ANDREWS: It will really depend on the criteria that are developed. We are not saying let’s prioritize all the programs and then the lowest 25% will get lopped off. I hope that you, through faculty governance, will determine what kinds things we should be looking at to determine the viability of our program array.

DAASCH: Maybe remind folks that there is a difference between doing prioritization and implementation; eliminating a program can take some time, longer than the six months laid out for the review.

ANDREWS: Yes, as a result of the review, there would be recommendations that would have to come to the Senate. Those things have to happen in sequence and you can’t presume that all that would be done in six months. Having said that, program prioritization is not something you drag out for years. I would like to see a pace such
that come next year this body can be looking at results and say what are some of the actions we can take.

STEVENS: Program prioritization sounds like an endpoint that triggers additional activities. External reviewing bodies have certain criteria for program assessment. Where are the descriptors for this review being elaborated?

ANDREWS: Some institutions call the process “program array review.” Prioritization doesn’t mean a ranking, it means putting programs into particular kinds of categories—from a range of those in need of investment to those that need to be phased out. I am not wedded to any particular terminology. The end result does have to be us looking at whether or not we have programs that are no longer viable or some that we should be developing.

GELMON: There are already 10 to 15 specialized accreditors that this University interacts with. Is there a way we can build on all the preparation and work that is done for those external peer reviews?

ANDREWS: It depends on the criteria you all come and those criteria might be different than for a specialized accreditation review.

RUETER: Where will this information come from?

ANDREWS: Again, it depends on the criteria set. Hopefully, most of the information is already available centrally. For example, we know how many students are served.

LUCKETT: There’s confusion about what the unit of analysis is. “Program” can mean a department or department-like unit, or it can mean a degree program.

ANDREWS: This process is not about departments, but academic programs and degree programs that are being offered by the institution.

PADIN: On the issue of the direction of tenure, rhetoric aside, the last few years this institution has become committed to shorter and shorter-term relationships. A lot of faculty would like to see that promiscuity become a long-term relationship. Those differences should be aired out. On the budget, it seems to district-level colleagues that when it comes to non-academic programs, that is where shared governance ends. There is a lot more to this university than academic programs and the decision not to have everything open for consideration is very much an academic question. The least defensible academic program might be more defensible than the other things that we are not talking about.

ANDREWS: I’m not saying that other things aren’t important, but in my opinion as Provost, academic program array is the one of the most important things that you all have entrusted to you, and it is important for us to act on that.

GEORGE: You mentioned degree programs, how would University Studies be evaluated?
ANDREWS: What the definition of a program is needs to be decided. I don’t have the answer. You may think you have prioritized programs in your own units, but the University hasn’t done that. The way this works has the Provost working in concert with the Faculty Senate to develop a process that we all think is viable for looking at programs and deciding if these are programs we should or shouldn’t have at PSU. I hope you can provide input to the Steering Committee as they think about creating a process. This is important and it is related to the budget. Choice costs money, and it isn’t always merely about eliminating positions, it is also about re-deploying money and faculty time.

MCBRIDE: Would you like us to take a straw poll to ask senators what they think about doing program review right now?

ANDREWS: It would be better if Steering could come up with a proposal to bring back to Senate on how you as faculty might engage in this process. I don’t think it’s a question of do we do it or not; I think it’s a question of how we do it. We would be shirking our responsibility by not doing it. You don’t want me to do this on my own. I don’t.

MCBRIDE thanked the Provost and senators for their thoughtful observations. She then introduced the President for his report.

President’s Report

WIEWEL acknowledged the anxiety around the concerns discussed with the Provost and said discussion was good, but added that the whole issue of communication among the faculty, between the faculty and Senate, and faculty and administration continues to be something that we are all struggling with. He questioned whether the new district constituent system was working well. He termed the amount of disinformation "huge," noting that the Provost had felt it necessary to read a statement verbatim for the record. He hoped that Senators feel a responsibility to share information. He said that it struck him as somewhat absurd for the Provost to have to answer the question "Do you believe in tenure." He was happy she had used the question to delve into possible worries or fears that arise around this question, adding that we have real challenges and shared work to address them.

WIEWEL announced that the Oregon Senate had confirmed appointments to PSU’s governing board. Their first two-day orientation is planned for the next week. He noted the launch of PSU’s four-year graduation guarantee and the benefit of having degree maps that chart paths to completion. PSU has signed articulation agreements and renewed dual admission arrangements with PCC and Clackamus Community College. He reminded senators of upcoming registration and financial aid deadlines.

Turning to the budget rebalancing process, WIEWEL stated that the 8% exercise is about revenue increases or reduction of expenses, and will be used to identify priorities. It was undertaken to avoid an across-the-board 8% cut. He explained that the Executive Committee is trying to make strategic cuts that will reduce cuts to the academic side, and they anticipate other measures beyond the administrative salary freeze and the increased revenue from enrollment already announced. A task force is
considering whether savings could be realized by merging Foundation activities and University Advancement will report at the end of January. He said that they would continue to let people know about progress in whittling down the 15 million dollar gap, even though he was aware that some would see this as evidence that there never was a 15 million dollar gap. He maintained that the gap was real and they had chosen not to wait until June 30 to figure out how to cut it. He concluded that senators have to be co-responsible in these communications, stating that we cannot have shared governance if there is not shared communication.

DAASCH: Would you like to comment on your editorial in the Sunday Oregonian (12/1/13)?

WIEWEL: Yes, it was a joint editorial with the presidents of OHSU, OSU, and U of Oregon about the effects of the federal sequester for research funding, economic growth and student learning opportunities. It was part of a coordinated approach with the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). WIEWEL added that he had been invited to a White House conference on student access and student retention, and Provost Andrews or Vice-President Balzer would attend.

LIEBMAN: At what level are decisions to be made when cross-subsidies knit one department’s service course together with a whole host of other programs. We are culturally inclined in this body to know how to set things up. Our forms attend to how things are put together. How much due diligence is there to making cuts that will leave us whole and enable the growth that is at the heart of this?

WIEWEL: This process takes time. We started last summer with a list of all possible cuts and have been looking at potential consequences. The University is a complicated entity. For a long time things have grown, because we know better how to add things, and everyone has wanted their own “X.” We tend to grow and replicate infrastructure, so we are looking at a lot of that, and we have to do it very carefully.

RUETER one of the most influential books I’ve read recently is The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth. It’s said that everyone one loves democracy when they are growing. We are very egalitarian in Portland, and as a democratic body might not be up to cutting. It will require more than set criteria, we might need a culture change.

WIEWEL: Well, it’s like what happened at OUS. Nominally, OUS was supposed to make decisions about program duplication, but I think there was a time when there was the implicit understanding that “I’ll let you do what you want and then I will get to do what I want,” rather than thinking about what makes the most sense for the state and who can deliver programs most efficiently. Somebody will have to make decisions and Senate will have to be involved. I think that you are right that we shy away from the tough decisions. It’s not easy for people to agree democratically that if you can’t afford everything, you are off the island.
Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships

FINK said that he and his staff have met with 13 departmental faculty groups across campus to hear their ideas about research opportunities and concerns. The Presidents’ Advisory Group Implementation Committee, with representatives from PSU, OHSU and OSU, has met to further program coordination between the universities around four program areas. The following are the “lead communicators”: 1) for Life Sciences, Don Dorsa and Jon Fink; 2) for Public Health, Sona Andrews and Jeanette Mladenovic; 3) for Global Partnerships, Jeanette Mladenovic and Jon Fink; and 4) for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Tim Stout and Erin Flynn. OHSU is hoping to capitalize on access to PSU undergraduates and graduate students, and PSU on OHSU’s connections with NIH funding and research.

Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

GOULD reminded senators that EPC oversees a process for Creation and Elimination of units. He reported that a key concern for EPC had been how far upstream faculty governance can engage in the decision-making process. For this reason EPC was seeking ways to piggy-back on the planned extension of the Budget Committee’s work with the colleges and Deans. GOULD also remarked that the process of completing approval for the redesign of the Work Flow Charts had been complicated by the question of how centers and institutes get placed into a particular work-flow chart. How can EPC be engaged at the beginning stage of the process?

MACBRIDE recognized Scott Burns. BURNS announced that he was retiring at the end of December after a 43.3-year career. Praising PSU’s culture of active shared-governance, he noted that for his 23 years at PSU, he had been a senator, presiding officer, and IFS representative. He thanked everyone with whom he had served and moved to adjourn. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.
Graduation Program Board
Senate Discussion December 2013

Graduation Program Board

- A policy and advisory committee
- Advises the President, Provost, and the Commencement Coordinator
- Addresses policy and planning for University graduation ceremonies
- Members serve a term of three calendar years

Graduation Board Members

- Sherril Gelmon, CUPA, Chair
- Craig Shinn, CUPA
- Gerald Recktenwald, MCECS
- Steven Harmon, OAA
- John Beer, English, CLAS
- Rebecca Ingersoll, EMSA
- Regina Arellano, EMSA
- Carley Westover, Student Representative
- Cindy Reyes, Student Representative
- Rayleen McMillan, ASPSU Student Representative
- Nicholas Running, Commencement Coordinator

What Does the Board Do?

- Selects student speakers
- Advises Provost on Commencement format
- Responds to Provost and President on Commencement organization
- Makes decisions on elements such as music, commemorative book, program copy, some elements of format of ceremony
Recent Changes in Commencement

- Two ceremonies in one day, each running approximately two hours
- More seating availability for family and friends of graduates
- Two student speakers at each ceremony
- Faculty and staff lunch between ceremonies with presentation of awards
- No summer commencement

The Board Hopes For:

- More faculty involvement – both tenure/tenure track and fixed term
- More student nominations for speakers
- Greater input into commencement speaker selection
- More student participation from those colleges/schools that have their own ceremonies
- Suggestions of feasible creative ideas

Seeking Senate Input

- What is the most memorable commencement experience you have had?
- What is a 2-5 minute highlight of a recent PSU commencement?
- What would you like to see in the student speakers -- focus, selection, etc.?
- If we were to create a word cloud about commencement, what would be one or two words you would use that represent commencement?

Make Commencement Memorable

- Encourage your best students to self-nominate for student speaker
- Nominations will open in Winter
- Encourage your senate district members to attend Commencement
- Attend the lunch and your ceremony
- Send us your ideas to: commencement@pdx.edu
Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of PSU P&T Guidelines Draft Motion 12/2/2013

May – June:
- Reviewed the June 2012 Final Report and Minority Report of the New Academic Ranks Task Force
- Gathered OIRP data on the distribution of NTTF in PSU schools & colleges
- Consulted with Vice-Provost Carol Mack
- Compared policies at peer universities such as
  - UO which has career NTTF
  - OSU which offers extended fixed-term contracts
  - U of Maryland NTTF report (March, 2013)

June – September: Circulated templates of our draft job descriptions and promotion criteria/procedures to:
- Associate Deans of all schools and colleges and the Library
- Directors of major research institutes and IELP
- Department chairs in many disciplines
- Principal Investigators in sciences and engineering

September – October: Revised P & T Sections for
III. Ranks — Added job descriptions and promotion criteria for 9 new ranks
IV. Academic Appointments — Revised language for consistency
V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure — Added language for non-tenure track instructional positions and incorporated language from the 2009 Appendix for research positions*

Appendix II — Added template for NTTF seeking letters of support
Now invite substantive comments from the floor on our recommended language.

This week: Comments and proposed text edits also welcome (Please use Track Changes to log corrections and additions)

Next week: Committee will review feedback and make revisions which we’ll deliver to Steering by 11/18

December 2, 2013: Motion for discussion and amendments

December, 2013: Review by EPC & AAUP (Article 14, Section 3)

January 6, 2014: Senate votes to approve one motion without further amendments

Senate Motions

F Senate passed 4 motions for implementation of OAR 580-0020-005 (March 4 & April 1, 2013)

For fixed-term faculty on contracts thru June 2014

1. Grandfather existing rank
2. Maintain paths of promotion
3. Reclassify to maximize number of promotion steps
4. Not use the title of Librarian
5. Continue “Visiting” and “Adjunct” for temporary and part-time
6. Add Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor

Grandfather

Motion 1: Grandfather Rank for NTTF employed thru June 2014

Maintain their current academic ranks and titles in future PSU employment contracts with the following guidelines:

- 0.5 FTE or above
- Currently hold the rank of Assistant, Associate, Full, or Distinguished Professor
- Continue to perform the same job duties

Maintain Promotion Paths

Motion 2: Maintain promotion paths for NTTF hired thru 6/14

For 0.5 FTE & eligible for promotion to the ranks of Assistant, Associate, Full Professor with the following guidelines:

- Promotion criteria are consistent with OUS and PSU Guidelines for Promotion
- Senior Instructor I faculty may choose promotion to either Senior Instructor II or Assistant Professor in accordance with departmental and university guidelines
- Faculty who attain the rank of Senior Instructor II are eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor
Reclassification

Motion 3: Reclassification for NTTF hired thru June 2014

Current PSU Rank be reclassified in accordance with the following guidelines:
– 0.5 FTE or above
– No faculty member receives a pay cut

Current PSU Rank to New PSU Rank
Senior Instructor > Senior Instructor I
Senior Research Assistant > Senior Research Assistant I
Senior Research Associate > Senior Research Associate I

Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor

Motion 6: NTTF hired thru June 2014 at .5 FTE or above, and whose current position meets the criteria be given the option of holding Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor
– Revised PSU and departmental Promotion & Tenure Guidelines must include these ranks.
– No faculty member shall receive a pay cut as a result of reclassification.

Our charge:

Craft job descriptions, promotion criteria, and evaluation procedures for the new ranks of
• Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor
• Senior Instructor I & II
• Senior Research Assistant I & II
• Senior Research Associate I & II
Add grandfathering, promotion paths, & reclassification language

Administrative Intent

Oregon Administrative Rule 580-0020-005
Regularize practices for NTTF at all OUS schools

UO – Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty for Clinical, Prof of Practice, Instructor & Lecturer, Research Assistant, Research Associate, Research Faculty

OSU - Extended Fixed-Term Contracts Policy and Procedures for Senior Instructor, Clinical Associate & Full Professor, Senior Faculty Research Assistant
Guiding Principles

From 1996 P & T Guidelines
  • a career orientation from hiring to promotion in keeping with a profession
  • broad guidelines, implementation delegated to departments
  • regular and fair procedures for the evaluation of all faculty

New/revised language

III. Ranks – Added job descriptions and promotion criteria for 9 new ranks (pp 16-20)
IV. Academic Appointments – Revised language for consistency (pp 20-23)
V. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure – Incorporated language for research positions from 2009 Appendix & added language for NTTF instructional positions (pp 32-40)
Appendix II – Added template for NTTF letters of support (p 49)

Proposed Motion

• D-1
PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT INCREASES.

December 2, 2013: Motion rises for discussion and amendments
No voting today

• The full document is published on the Faculty Senate web site, under Senate Schedules and Materials as D1b (full text): http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

January 6, 2014: Senate votes to approve as a single motion without further amendments
Response from Provost Andrews to the Question: What is your position on the status and the future of tenure?

At PSU, based on our P&T guidelines, “the granting of tenure reflects and recognizes a candidate’s potential long-range value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth... In addition, tenure insures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University.”

As the chief academic officer of PSU my job is to work with you—the senate-- and all of our faculty and staff at this university to make sure we have the highest quality programs, that we engage in research and scholarly activity, and that we have an impact on our community and State. Having tenured faculty members is critical to achieving those goals and delivering on our mission. So the short answer to the question that has been posed to me “What is my position on the status and future of tenure at PSU” is to say to all of you that PSU, our students and our community benefit greatly from having tenured faculty members, now and in the future. We cannot be a research university without tenured faculty members. And, I have never said, not wanted to imply, we should eliminate or phase out tenure.

I am guessing that for some of you my simple answer may not suffice, so allow me a bit more time to address some areas where I think this question might be coming from. In doing so, I speak on behalf of the entire administration.

Maybe the question is being asked because the rate of growth of fixed term and adjunct faculty at PSU is happening at a higher rate than tenure track/tenured faculty (although I hope you are all aware that the number of tenured faculty at PSU has also been increasing).

One might draw the conclusion that this is due to a lack of commitment to tenure, or not wanting tenure track/tenure faculty members. This is not the case. Rather, departments and schools and colleges have tried to balance the need to serve students, while at the same time have faculty engaged in research or scholarly activity--doing all of this in an environment of fiscal constraints. As a result, PSU has had to hire a mix of faculty to deliver on all aspects of our mission—teaching, service and research. There is no question that tenure track and tenured faculty need time for their research and scholarly activity, but we also need some faculty who devote their entire time to teaching. Inevitably there will be differences of opinion on where and how many tenure related faculty are needed. I hope, however, we can all agree that our first commitment has to be to provide high quality and affordable education to Oregonians.

Maybe the question is being asked because some think we are not going to hire any more tenure track or tenured faculty members. You should all know that even during this time of financial constraints and reducing budgets we have not put a freeze on the hiring of tenure track or tenure positions—as is often done at other universities. This was purposeful, because it is not a strategic way to approach delivering on our academic and research mission. It is true that some departments and schools/colleges are looking at all their positions and making
decisions as to whether to hire or delay, but the fact that we have not put a freeze on tenure track or tenured positions, and that we continue to hire tenure track/tenure faculty, should be one more indication of our support for tenure.

Maybe the question is being asked because some think that we have been denying tenure capriciously—as a way to whittle down the number of tenured faculty. In fact, the numbers of tenure faculty have grown. In the past 5 years, since 2009-10, only 2 persons were not renewed prior to tenure, 10 were terminated in their tenure year, and 101 were awarded tenure. In all of the non-renewal or termination cases, the university’s decisions were supported by evidence and the recommendations from departments and/or deans.

Maybe the question is being asked because last year I raised the issue of post-tenure review and some people think that was motivated by a negative view of tenure on my part. That was not the case. As some of you may recall, NWCCU cited us for not having in place good policies or practices regarding post tenure review. Last fall (a year ago) I charged the faculty senate to review our policies and propose how we can improve them to meet NWCCU standards. I do believe that formative post tenure review is of value to individual faculty members, their departments and PSU students.

It sounds like the main reason the question is being asked is because this Fall I proposed that we undertake a program prioritization process—a program array review-- and some might think this is being undertaken to eliminate tenure track or tenured faculty jobs. In fact, someone asked me if that was my hidden agenda. It is not. The suggestion to the faculty senate that we undertake program array review is based on a number of reasons not having to do with tenure: In a time of fiscal constraints we may not be able to afford all the programs we have. Review/prioritization will be based on a range of factors, not just enrollment but also mission centrality, local, regional, and state-wide needs, etc. PSU has had no systematic processes in place for the review of our academic programs (except those that undergo specialized accreditation). The NWCCU told us in Fall 2012 that we need “to implement an effective system for the review of academic programs” because we had none. Program prioritization is valuable for implementing performance based budgeting. You have all experienced either increases or decreases in specific majors and we should not assume that because a program was viable or well-resourced 10 years ago that it still is. And, you, the faculty, should be very interested in our program array and what our university offers. I have made it abundantly clear that program review/prioritization is a shared governance process. As you know, I have asked your faculty senate steering committee as to how we would go about this work. They, on 2 occasions, have expressed their support in working together on this and they have asked for us to devote some time at this meeting for further discussion.

I again thank you for allowing me to respond with some detail on this question related to tenure.
b. Faculty Curricula Vitae. All non-tenure track faculty members being reviewed should provide to the departmental committee an updated curriculum vitae. Curricula vitae should follow the format provided in Appendix I. A curriculum vitae should be updated at each stage of the review process.

c. Peer Review. Although non-tenure track faculty positions do not carry expectations for scholarly research, departments may require that candidates for promotion be evaluated by peers and other credible sources (e.g., authoritative representatives from a faculty member’s field, students, community participants, and subject matter experts) who are in a position to comment on the candidate’s activities that are required of their position when such evaluations are deemed by the faculty member and the promotion and tenure committee as relevant to the faculty member’s contribution as assigned by the University. Evaluations outside the department shall not be solicited or considered unless the use of external reviews is agreed upon by the faculty member and promotion and tenure committee as relevant to their contribution as assigned by the University. For non-tenure faculty to be reviewed for promotion, a list of potential evaluators outside the department which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and significance of the candidate’s professional activities, shall be compiled in the following manner:

i. **When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant**, the department chair will ask the faculty member for a list of at least four evaluators from outside the department. The faculty member may also provide a second list of possible evaluators perceived as negative or biased. Although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, if an evaluation is requested of someone on the second list the faculty member's exception will be included as a matter of record.

ii. **When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant**, additional evaluators from outside the department may be selected by the department chair or the chair of the departmental committee. The chair will send the list to the dean for review and the dean may add names to the list.

iii. **When the use of outside evaluators is deemed relevant**, the chair of the promotion and tenure committee will select evaluators from the combined list of evaluators from outside the department. A sample letter of solicitation for letters of support for non-tenure track faculty is provided in Appendix II. Please note, as suggested in the sample letter, the evaluator should be advised that the letter is not confidential and will be available for the faculty member's review. Requests for external evaluations shall include a link to University and departmental criteria for promotion. The faculty member being reviewed, in consultation with the departmental promotion and tenure committee, shall choose which, if any, samples of the faculty member's work shall be sent to external evaluators. Upon receipt of the evaluations, the chair of the department will send them to the departmental committee. Normally, a
December 5, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier
       Chair, Graduate Council

       Rachel Cunliffe
       Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, 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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.b.1

• EC 485/585 Cost-benefit Analysis, 4 credits - change course number to 427/527, change course description
December 5, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rachel Cunliffe
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

The following proposals have been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

Changes to Existing Courses

**E.1.c.1.**
- ArH 459 Gothic Art (4) – change course number to ArH 359.

**Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science**

Change to Existing Program

**E.1.c.2.**
- BS in Mechanical Engineering – minor changes to the minimum expected competencies (GPA).

New Courses

**E.1.c.3.**
- ECE 383 Nanotechnology: Simulation and Design (4)
  Introductory circuit simulation; properties of selected nanotechnology devices and systems; nanodevice simulation; development of nanodevice models. May be taken to satisfy the ECE technical writing requirement. This is the same course as SCI 383 and may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisites: junior standing or permission of the instructor.

Changes to Existing Courses

**E.1.c.4.**
- ECE 102 Engineering Computation (4) – change description and prerequisites.

**E.1.c.5.**
- ECE 103 Engineering Programming (4) – change description and prerequisites.

**E.1.c.6.**
- ECE 171 Digital Circuits (4) – change prerequisites.

**E.1.c.7.**
- ECE 331 Engineering Electromagnetics I (4) – change description.
E.1.c.8.
• ECE 332 Engineering Electromagnetics II (4) – change description.

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**

**Changes to Existing Courses**

E.1.c.9.
• Soc 460 Youth Subcultures (4) – change prerequisites.

**College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**New Courses**

E.1.c.10.
• PA 314 Students as Leaders (4)
  Introduces the concepts of leadership from theoretical and practical perspectives. Students will explore their own leadership competencies using the Social Change Model in relation to individuality, group dynamics and community building. Through in-class activities, interviews, and research, students will examine leadership as an individual/group process to create social change.

E.1.c.11.
• PA 315 Managing People for Change (4)
  This course examines today’s workforce and the new competencies required to manage people to meet the corresponding modern day challenges. It borrows from contemporary discussions about public sector (government and nonprofit) organizations as well as private sector organizations. Topics include human capital, workplace politics, intergenerational challenges, and job/wage disparities.

E.1.c.12.
• PHE 472 Marketing Public Health (4)
  From behavior change to policy change, how do we make the healthy choice the easy choice? This course will explore the attitudes we bring to our public health work, and tools and strategies we can use to develop our effectiveness in improving health outcomes for individuals and society. Prerequisites: junior standing.

E.1.c.13.
• PS 389 Environmental Political Theory (4)
  Examines the conceptual and normative issues surrounding the politics of the environment, including the understanding of environmental problems suggested by various theoretical frameworks, including democratic theory, economic rationalism, sustainability, and green radicalism. Issues discussed include the idea of nature in the history of political thought, climate change, and animal rights.

**Changes to Existing Courses**

E.1.c.14.
• USP 350 Concepts of Public Participation (4) – change course title to Inclusive Engagement.

E.1.c.15.
• USP 423 Real Estate Development and Finance (4) – change course number to USP 323, change prerequisites.
### Undergraduate Studies

#### Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.16.

#### 2013-14 Cluster Removals (201304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Remove from cluster:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 431U</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Latin American Anthropology (when content is appropriate)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH 399U</td>
<td>Towards Sustainable Architecture</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 410U</td>
<td>Psychological Development of African American Children</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Immigration Issues</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Ten Doc African Dias</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Topics in African/Caribbean History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Topics: Caribbean Architecture</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Topics: Rural and Urban Africa</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST 450U</td>
<td>Topics: Spanish Carribean</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 399U</td>
<td>The American Family on Film and Television</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 482U</td>
<td>Mental and Emotional Disorders: Impact on Children and Families</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 485U</td>
<td>Working with Diverse Families</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 490U</td>
<td>Sex and the Family</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS 493U</td>
<td>Community Resources and Family Support</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>American Cinema/American Culture</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Communicating about Violence and Children</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Health Communication</td>
<td>Healthy People/Healthy Places;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>International Film History</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Off Hollywood</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>The Fifties: Media and Culture</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Film Studies I</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Film Studies II: International Film History</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 399U</td>
<td>Film Studies III: Documentary and A.G. Film</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Alternative Media</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Information Cities</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Movies Look at TV</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Topics in Popular Media</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Gender and Difference in Popular Media</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 410U</td>
<td>Women in Contemporary Film</td>
<td>American Studies; Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 412U</td>
<td>Empirical Theories of Mass Communication</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 415U</td>
<td>Problems in Intercultural Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Slated for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 420U</td>
<td>Political Communication</td>
<td>Freedom, Privacy, and Technology; Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 422U</td>
<td>Critical Theories of Mass Communication</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 427U</td>
<td>Issues in International Communication</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 452U</td>
<td>Gender and Race in the Media</td>
<td>Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 457U</td>
<td>The Language of Violence</td>
<td>American Studies; Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 399U</td>
<td>Consensus Building: Theory and Practice</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 399U</td>
<td>Ecology of War and Peace</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 399U</td>
<td>Peace Studies</td>
<td>Community Studies; Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 399U</td>
<td>Participating in Democracy</td>
<td>Freedom, Privacy, and Technology; Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS 399U</td>
<td>Problems, Solutions, and Systems Thinking</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 332U</td>
<td>Environmental Economics</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 399U</td>
<td>Family Values and American Economic Decline</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 411U</td>
<td>Cultural Economics</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 417U</td>
<td>Women in the Economy</td>
<td>American Studies; Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 419U</td>
<td>Economics of Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 445U</td>
<td>Comparative Economic Systems</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 446U</td>
<td>Institutional Economics</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 447U</td>
<td>Economics of Transition</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Nonviolence and Ecological Sustainability</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Ghandi/Zapata NE W Agrinn</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Leadership and Careers in Sustainability</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Nonviolence and Ecological Sustainability: Critical Issues</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>School/Community Relations</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Spiritual Leadership</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Leadership and Careers in Sustainability</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 410U</td>
<td>Nonviolence and Ecological Sustainability: Critical Issues</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 418U</td>
<td>Educational Leadership in Schools</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 448U</td>
<td>Global Political Ecology</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 450U</td>
<td>Leadership for Sustainability</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 455U</td>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 456U</td>
<td>The Urban Schools and &quot;At Risk &quot;Status</td>
<td>Healthy People/Healthy Places; Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 457U</td>
<td>Cultural Pluralism and Urban Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP 457U</td>
<td>Cultural Pluralism and Urban Education</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 399U</td>
<td>Contemporary Women Writers</td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Literature of the Medieval Church</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>The European Historical Novel</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 399U</td>
<td>Topics in East African Culture: Proverbs, Riddles, and Oral Narratives</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 399U</td>
<td>Earth and Life History of Costa Rica</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 399U</td>
<td>Geology and the History of Hawaii</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 399U</td>
<td>Top: Climate Record in NW Geology</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 430U</td>
<td>Life of the Past</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 452U</td>
<td>Geology of the Oregon Country</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 457U</td>
<td>Volcanoes and Earthquakes</td>
<td>Global Environmental Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 345U</td>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 453U</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 399U</td>
<td>Festival Dance in the Africa Diaspora</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM 399U</td>
<td>African Diasporan Dance in the Americas</td>
<td>Global Perspectives; Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 399U</td>
<td>International Green Building &amp; Development</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 399U</td>
<td>International Sustainability, Urban Design and Human Health</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 399U</td>
<td>Literature and Cinema, Four Major Italian Novels and their Cinematic Adptions</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 399U</td>
<td>Modern Music Technology</td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 311U</td>
<td>Intro to Civic Leadership</td>
<td>(Remove from LSC due to number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 412U</td>
<td>Civic Engagement: The Role of Governing Institutions</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 413U</td>
<td>Civic Engagement: The Role of Individuals</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 414U</td>
<td>Civic Engagement: The Role of Social Institutions</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA 417U</td>
<td>Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH 308U</td>
<td>Elementary Ethics</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 307U</td>
<td>Philosophy of Social Science</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 309U</td>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL 320U</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Remove from Leading Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 407U</td>
<td>The Politics of North Africa</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 425U</td>
<td>Women and the Law</td>
<td>Freedom, Privacy, and Technology; Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 431U</td>
<td>State and Local Politics</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 466U</td>
<td>Politics of East Asia</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 468U</td>
<td>International Politics of East Asia</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 410U</td>
<td>Psychological Development of African American Children</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 410U</td>
<td>Women in Contemporary Film</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 459U</td>
<td>Infant Development</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 461U</td>
<td>Psychology of Adolescence</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 479U</td>
<td>Women and Organizational Psychology</td>
<td>Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399U</td>
<td>Marine Biology of the Oregon Coast</td>
<td>Sciences - Liberal Arts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399U</td>
<td>Rates of Change</td>
<td>Sciences - Liberal Arts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399U</td>
<td>Science and Politics of Columbia River Decisions (will be 354)</td>
<td>Sciences - Liberal Arts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI 399U</td>
<td>Sustainable Forestry Monitoring</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 410U</td>
<td>Sociology of Education: Socialization for Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 436U</td>
<td>Social Movements</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 483U</td>
<td>Sociology of the Middle East</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 427U</td>
<td>Major Topics: Latin American Prose (taught in Spanish)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 441U</td>
<td>Major Works in Translation (when content is appropriate)</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 441U</td>
<td>Spanish Literature in Translation</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 407U</td>
<td>Community Based Interventions</td>
<td>Healthy People/Healthy Places;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 407U</td>
<td>Issues in Child Welfare</td>
<td>Family Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 457U</td>
<td>The Language of Violence</td>
<td>Remove from American Studies and Popular Culture - remove U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 467U</td>
<td>Modern Theater I</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 468U</td>
<td>Modern Theater II</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 469U</td>
<td>Women Theater and Society</td>
<td>Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 471U</td>
<td>Theater History: 19th Century (European Theater)</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 471U</td>
<td>Theater History: Medieval/Renaissance Drama</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 471U</td>
<td>20th Century American Theater &amp; Drama</td>
<td>American Studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA 471U</td>
<td>Ancient Greek Drama</td>
<td>Interpreting the Past;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP 426U</td>
<td>Neighborhood Conservation and Change</td>
<td>Community Studies; Healthy People/Healthy Places;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP 445U</td>
<td>Cities &amp; Third World Development</td>
<td>Global Perspectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP 454U</td>
<td>The Urban Schools and &quot;At Risk&quot; Status</td>
<td>Healthy People/Healthy Places;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leading Social Change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP 457U</td>
<td>Information Cities</td>
<td>Freedom, Privacy, and Technology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular Culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 399U</td>
<td>Modern Travel Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 399U</td>
<td>Writing About 19th Century Texts</td>
<td>Freedom, Privacy, and Technology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 416U</td>
<td>Screenwriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 455U</td>
<td>Gender and Education</td>
<td>Gender and Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS 457U</td>
<td>The Language of Violence</td>
<td>American Studies; Gender and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexualities;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 5, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, 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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.a.1
- PhD in Biology – change to existing program; minor program revision

E.1.a.2
- MAT/MST in Mathematics – change degree and major name to MS in Mathematics for Teachers

**College of the Arts**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.a.3
- MArch in Architecture – change to existing program; add three-year option

**New Courses**

E.1.a.4
- ARCH 563  Building Science Research Topics, 4 credits
  A workshop and seminar addressing the detailed application of passive strategies and building technology engaging key topics such as: building materials, envelope, environmental control, and structural systems. Utilizing contemporary building science research methods and practice. Course may be repeated for credit with different topics. Prerequisites Arch 569 or Arch 560.

E.1.a.5
- ARCH 568, 569  Architectural Technology I & II, 4 credits each
  A two-quarter sequence introducing technologies involved in the design and construction of buildings. Exploration of the physical properties of materials, building assemblies, and the methods of construction, leading to the integration of building envelope, mechanical, thermal and other environmental building systems. Courses must be taken in sequence.

E.1.a.6
- ARCH 570, 571, 572  Architectural Design Transition Studio I, II, & III, 6 credits each
  Transition studios developing architectural ideas, alongside media and technical skills necessary for advanced graduate study. Creative investigations of architectural design inspired by human activities, site, landscape, structure, tectonics, communal space and urbanism. Includes individual criticism, lectures and seminars. Courses must be taken in sequence.
Proposal for the implementation of New NTTF ranks

In conjunction with the motion made 12/2/13 in Senate to approve revisions to PSU promotion and tenure guidelines and pursuant to Faculty Senate approval of language to amend the Portland State University Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases to incorporate new NTTF ranks, the following resolution is proposed:

The Faculty Senate calls on the Provost & the Office of Administrative Affairs to ensure the timely, fair and appropriate implementation of nine new non-tenure-track faculty ranks approved by the Faculty Senate at its April and May 2013 meetings.

- Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor
- Senior Instructor I & II
- Senior Research Assistant I & II
- Senior Research Associate I & II

Hiring into these ranks should begin no later than July 1, 2014.

We anticipate that this will require speedy publication and dissemination of the job descriptions and promotion criteria for the new ranks in university documents, review and approval of revised departmental P&T guidelines, and negotiation of contractual minimums for the new ranks.

We ask all departments with non-tenure track faculty on fixed-term appointments (NTTF) to revise their departmental guidelines to incorporate appropriate new ranks and guidelines by April 15, 2014 in order for review by the appropriate Dean and Provost to take place by June 1, 2014.

Departments should carefully consider how to differentiate between the new ranks in their guidelines. The Senate has called for placement of all current NTTF appointed as Senior Instructors at the new rank of Senior Instructor I, to allow for promotion; however, this might not be appropriate in every department, where new criteria for Senior Instructor II may overlap to a great degree with old criteria for Senior Instructor. In these cases, the department should have the discretion to affirm the appointment of faculty hired prior to September 16, 2014 at the Senior Instructor II level, once new guidelines have been approved by the Dean/Provost.

Rationale: This motion is to assure that the implementation of New Ranks is in compliance with motions for grandfathering, re-classification, and maintenance of promotion paths approved by the Senate in at its April & May 2013 meetings.
Date: December 9, 2013

From: Educational Policy Committee

Subject: EPC Report on Revising the Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Centers and Institutes

In Spring 2012, there were multiple cases of centers, institutes, and other units undergoing significant change, with confusion over the appropriate role of faculty governance. This resulted in a suggestion to revisit the approval process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Centers and Institutes.

An ad-hoc task force was appointed by the Provost in Fall 2012, consisting of Mark Sytsma (RSP), Steve Harmon (OAA & EPC), and Tim Anderson (EPC) to revisit this issue. The task force met with EPC, the Provost, and Jonathan Fink, to develop a partial inventory of centers and institutes, across campus, along with a revised set of flowcharts for different types of units that recognize the increasing diversity of units on campus, as PSU has grown and matured.

The ad-hoc task force gave its report to the EPC which then formed a subcommittee to refine this work. The EPC considered this work in the spring of 2013, and recommended it be sent to Faculty Senate for approval.

The core idea is that the Faculty Senate, through its delegation to EPC, has an active role in the approval process of all centers and institutes, as it has with other academic units. How a particular center or institute is classified has implications for the role of faculty governance, as explained below. These units can be considered to fall into the following three categories.

Public Service/General Support Service Center: These units are not considered to be principally academic in nature, and therefore do not require direct consideration by the Faculty Senate. In terms of process flow, relevant proposals are routed to EPC. EPC considers whether the unit is a Public Service/General Support Service Center, and if so, refers it to the budgetarily responsible Vice President.

Research/Membership Center: The principal change in routing in this case allows for research units that are based on peer-reviewed funding to be fast-tracked for approval, while all others go through the normal Academic Unit routing process.

Academic Centers and Institutes: Any center or institute that is determined to be primarily academic will be routed through the normal Academic Unit routing process. The accompanying Academic Unit workflow chart, appropriate for these centers and institutes, reflects PSU’s current administrative structure.

The inventory of current centers and institute developed the following estimate:

- Research/Membership Centers and Institutes: 49
- General Support/Public Service Centers: 24
- Academic Centers and Institutes: 7

Therefore, EPC unanimously recommends the adoption of the new flowcharts for the creation, alteration, and termination of centers and institutes.
Academic Centers and Institutes

An academic center or institute has training or instruction as its primary mission. An academic center or institute may also conduct research and public service activities. An academic center or institute may, but does not necessarily, include jurisdiction over academic curricula.

Examples: The Writing Center; The Center for Turkish Studies; CLAS, Computer Science Dept.; Office of Academic Innovation

General Support/Public Service Center

A general support or public service center provides service or support to PSU/OUS, including, but not limited to, faculty, staff, students, administration, and alumni. A general support service center does not generate revenue, except specifically for operational needs, and is established as a recognized support center. A public service center has public service, or technical assistance, as its primary mission. Research, instruction, and training activities may also be conducted as secondary components of the mission. A public service center or institute has no jurisdiction over academic curricula.

Example (General Support): The Women’s Resource Center; The Queer Resource Center
Example (Public Service): The Survey Research Center

Research/Membership Center/Institute

A research center has research as its primary mission. Although classified as a research center or institute, such a unit may also provide instruction, training, technical assistance, or public service programs. A research center has no jurisdiction over academic curricula. A membership center/institute receives a substantial portion of its funding from membership fees (paid by government, corporate, or other private entities) to pursue research, public service, or instructional activities of mutual benefit.

Examples: Center for Lakes and Reservoirs; NSF I/UCRCs
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1. Proposals are prepared using the appropriate Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination or Alteration of Academic Units form.

2. Appropriate faculty groups should be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, when a center is created within a department it is the departmental faculty who would review and make a recommendation, while for a merger of two departments it would be the faculty of both departments, and for the creation of a new school containing existing departments it would be the faculty of those departments.

3. The “immediate supervisor” is the administrator to whom the unit in question directly reports.

4. The proposal is reviewed by the supervisor of the “immediate supervisor”. If that person is the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean then review stops. Otherwise it moves up the line to that person’s supervisor. This continues until the proposal is reviewed by the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean. If the “immediate supervisor” has one of these titles skip this step and send the proposal directly to the Educational Policy Committee.

5. The individual or group at this approval stage meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back for further consideration.

6. Significant academic entities include, but are not limited to: departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, and offices.

7. The budgetarily responsible Vice President meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back to the Vice President for further consideration. If the revision is accepted by the budgetarily appropriate Vice President the revised proposal is sent to the Senate Steering Committee to determine if this is a significant enough change to warrant re-consideration by the Senate (or would elevate what had been a minor alteration to a major alteration and thus require Senate approval).
E-4b  Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Public Service Centers/ General Support Service Centers
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Notes

1. Proposals are prepared using the appropriate Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination or Alteration of Academic Units form.

2. Appropriate faculty groups should be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, when a center is created within a department it is the departmental faculty who would review and make a recommendation, while for a merger of two departments it would be the faculty of both departments, and for the creation of a new school containing existing departments it would be the faculty of those departments.

3. The “immediate supervisor” is the administrator to whom the unit in question directly reports.

4. The proposal is reviewed by the supervisor of the “immediate supervisor”. If that person is the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean then review stops. Otherwise it moves up the line to that person’s supervisor. This continues until the proposal is reviewed by the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean. If the “immediate supervisor” has one of these titles skip this step and send the proposal directly to the Educational Policy Committee.

5. The individual or group at this approval stage meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back for further consideration.
E-4c Process for Creation, Elimination & Alteration of Research/Membership Centers
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1. Proposals are prepared using the appropriate Proposal for the Establishment, Elimination or Alteration of Academic Units form.

2. Appropriate faculty groups should be determined on a case-by-case basis. For example, when a center is created within a department it is the departmental faculty who would review and make a recommendation, while for a merger of two departments it would be the faculty of both departments, and for the creation of a new school containing existing departments it would be the faculty of those departments.

3. The “immediate supervisor” is the administrator to whom the unit in question directly reports.

4. The proposal is reviewed by the supervisor of the “immediate supervisor”. If that person is the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean then review stops. Otherwise it moves up the line to that person’s supervisor. This continues until the proposal is reviewed by the Provost, another Vice President, an Associate Vice President, a Vice-Provost or a Dean. If the “immediate supervisor” has one of these titles skip this step and send the proposal directly to the Educational Policy Committee.

5. The individual or group at this approval stage meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back for further consideration.

6. Significant academic entities include, but are not limited to: departments, distinct programs, interdisciplinary programs, divisions, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, and offices.

7. The budgetarily responsible Vice President or ExCom meets with the proposer(s) and suggests revisions to the proposal. The proposer(s) revise the proposal to the degree they are willing and bring it back to the budgetarily responsible Vice President (or ExCom) for further consideration. If the revision is accepted by the Vice President (or ExCom) the revised proposal is sent to the Senate Steering Committee to determine if this is a significant enough change to warrant re-consideration by the Senate (or would elevate what had been a minor alteration to a major alteration and thus require Senate approval).