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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 **February 3, 2014**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the January 6, 2014, Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor:
   *Project Team (#92) Credit for Prior Learning Status Report – Associate Dean Chabon
   Senate Budget Committee update – Bowman
   IFS – Hines
   Discussion: Setting academic priorities: Looking beyond the budget.

D. Unfinished Business

E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. EPC recommendation on the proposed Academic Program Review Policy
   *3. Proposal to create a new title of “post-doctoral fellow”

F. Question Period
   *1. Questions for Administrators: Question to Dean Beatty
   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
   *Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee
   *Semi-annual Report of the Interinstitutional Athletics Board

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:*
   B   Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of January 6, 2014 and attachments (B1-3)
   C-1 Project Team (#92) CPL Status Report
   E-1 Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda (1b & 1c)
   E-2 EPC recommendation on proposed Academic Program Review Policy
   E-3 Proposal to create a new title of “post-doctoral fellow”
   F-1 Question for Dean Beatty
   G-1 Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee
   C-2 Semi-annual Report of the IAB
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Date: Dec. 17, 2013; New Senators in italics
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 6, 2014

Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey


Alternates Present: Schrock for Carder (after 4 pm), Elzanowski for Lafferriere (after 4 pm), B. Hansen for Magaldi, Hatfield for O’Banion, Ryder for Skaruppa, DeLaVega for Smith

Members Absent: Eppley, Faaleava

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews, Beatty, Bowman, Everett, Fink, Gould, Hansen, Hickey, Koroloff, Labissiere, MacCormack, Mack, Maier, Reynolds, Rueter, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The December 2, 2013 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIEDE announced that Steven Bleiler (Math) has assumed the LAS-Sciences Senate seat of Scott Burns, now retired.

MCBRIEDE distributed a handout for the January 6 Discussion item on academic program array review (see minutes attachment B-1) and introduced the chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), Robert Gould.

GOULD highlighted the need to distinguish academic program review, where the unit is the department and where review is conducted by external accreditors, and program prioritization or program array review of academic degree programs. He announced
that the EPC would be bringing a proposal to approve a new University policy that mandates regular review of academic units or departments to February Senate. The new policy can be accessed through the Curriculum Tracker Wiki under the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals (EPC Section): https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/70816697/Educational%20Policy%20Committee

Discussion item: Academic Program Array Review

Introducing the discussion item, MCBRIDE noted the negative feelings and concerns that had surfaced about the approach of the Dickinson book, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*. She stressed that the Provost had taken the approach that program prioritization, or program array review, was a shared governance function. She said that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee had already had several conversations with the Provost and on its own about undertaking such a process, and now wanted to engage Senate in consideration of what actions to take. Senate could decide whether it wants to embrace the opportunity or not. Steering Committee had voted to recommend engaging in a program array review process, to ensure that it is accountable to faculty governance; but she noted that PSU lacked a culture of program review apart from review for accreditation in the professional schools, making it difficult for Steering to capture what the majority sentiments are. Steering Committee had gathered a list of working principles, caveats and questions for such a review (see slides 2-3, B1), that it was offering as a place to start to elicit Senate feedback.

MCBRIDE moved the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 3:20 to 3:55 pm.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposal to amend the Portland State University Policy on Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases to incorporate new faculty ranks

LIEBMAN reviewed suggested revisions (see D.1.a of the January packet) for Article 5 of the December 2013 amended version of the PSU P&T Policy document, based on advisory input from the EPC and agreement from the AAUP. He noted that a second motion would follow the vote to amend the Policy. It would bear on the work of departments and make recommendations for the implementation of the new ranks (see E3). LIEBMAN said that there had been very few substantive objections to the proposed amendment. Revisions to Article 5 were intended to clarify procedures for evaluation and to come up with ways for Non Tenure-track Faculty (NTTF) to establish an evidentiary record for review. The new guidelines make known the possible ways for departmental committees to take appropriate input for review, relevant to teaching, community engagement, or contributions to the discipline. The Revision Committee wished to attend to the fact that people in the academy have a variety of measures of performance and ways of progressing through an academic career. The revisions also respond to EPC’s request that the system be transparent. It had been agreed that there would be a series of forums with the P&T Guidelines Revision Committee on implementing the new ranks. The Committee tried to look across the more than 40 academic and research units of the University to develop and all-purpose
formula guiding review of NTTFs, building in flexibility for departments to have department-specific ways of understanding the guidelines.

HOLIDAY/LAYZELL MOVED Faculty Senate RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases, (published in D-1, on December 3, 2013) with the revisions to Article 5 (published in D-1.a, January 2014) in order to incorporate the following new faculty ranks: Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor, Senior Instructor I & II, Senior Research Assistant I & II, Senior Research Associate I & II.

The MOTION to APPROVE PASSED: 51 in favor, 3 to reject, and 4 abstentions, tabulated by “clicker” (in Turning Point).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in “E.1.b” and “E.1.c” were ADOPTED as published.

MCBRIDE introduced David Maier, chair of the Graduate Council.

2. Graduate Council Proposals

MAIER noted that the recommendations that the Graduate Council was bringing forward under E-2 could probably have remained on the Curricular Consent Agenda, given that they were relatively minor changes.

a. Faculty Senate recommends adoption of Changes to Existing Programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

________/RUETER MOVED Senate APPROVE the proposals listed in E-2.

LUCKETT asked whether the MST in Mathematics, which had served several departments, would be eliminated. MAIER replied the change was only for the Maseeh Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

The MOTION to APPROVE PASSED: 54 in favor, 1 reject, 1 abstention. (recorded by “clicker”).

b. Faculty Senate recommends adoption of Changes to Existing Graduate Programs in the College of the Arts:

BEASLEY/REUTER MOVED Senate APPROVE the proposals listed in E-2.

MAIER noted that students without an undergraduate degree in architecture wishing enter the existing two-year Masters program were required to
complete undergraduate coursework prior to enrollment. The change would allow these students to be admitted directly into a three-year Masters program.

WENDEL said three-year programs are very common in schools of architecture. LUTHER asked if it were a 1+2 program, with the first year of coursework at the undergraduate level. MAIER affirmed that the three-years were entirely graduate-level; participants would just have an undergraduate degree from a different discipline.

The MOTION to APPROVE PASSED: 5 in favor, 0 reject, 2 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).

3. Proposal on the Implementation of New Faculty Ranks

LIEBMAN said that the purposes of the motion were to respect the principle of grandfathering current faculty adopted in the April & May 2013 Senate Motions on New Ranks, to maximize the number of promotional steps for NTTF, and to facilitate the introduction of the Professor of Practice rank. Senate wishes to encourage departments to undertake the steps needed to decide if the new ranks apply and rewrite their guidelines. Forums would help departments to answer any questions about implementation. (See slides, minutes attachment B2.)

*[Secretary’s note: the proposal below, replaces the version published in E-3.]*

MERCER/__________ MOVED Senate APPROVE the proposed resolution:

_The Faculty Senate calls on the Provost and the Office of Academic 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. This will require speedy publication and dissemination of job descriptions and promotion criteria for the new ranks in university documents; revision, review and approval of departmental P&T guidelines; and negotiation of contractual minimums for the new ranks._

_Senate asks all departments with non-tenure track faculty on fixed-term appointments (NTTF) to incorporate appropriate new ranks and guidelines into departmental promotion and tenure guidelines by April 15, 2014. Additionally, Senate asks for review by the appropriate Dean and Provost to take place by June 1, 2014. Hiring into these ranks should begin no later than July 1, 2014._

_To allow for promotion, the Senate has called for placement of all current NTTF appointed as Senior Instructors at the new rank of Senior Instructor I. However, in departments where new criteria for Senior Instructor II may overlap to a great degree with old criteria for Senior Instructor, the department has the discretion to affirm appointment of faculty hired prior to September 16, 2014 at the Senior Instructor II level, pending approval of new guidelines by the Dean/Provost._
MERCER asked about the crossed-out text and the phrase “not using” Librarian on the first slide (see slide 2, B2). LIEBMAN explained that the slide was a record of 2013 Senate motions and the crossed out item 5 did not pass; in addition the rank of Librarian is tenure-line at PSU and this status will not be changed to fixed-term.

The MOTION to APPROVE PASSED: 49 in favor, 1 reject, 4 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).

MCBRIE thanked the Committee members for all their hard work on developing the text and guidelines for the new ranks. [Applause.]

4. **EPC Report on Revising the Process for the Creation, Elimination and Alteration of Centers and Institutes, and proposed new Work Flow Charts.**

GOULD introduced Tim Anderson, who had participated in the EPC subcommittee and joint OAA Task Force to review the process for Centers and Institutes at PSU.

ANDERSON noted that the existing process had not always been followed, and there was a desire to streamline review for units, to create one that does not require all the steps of academic program review. He reviewed the existing flow chart for Academic Units, which has been revised to reflect organizational titles in use [including “office”], and the two new Workflow charts that had been created for (1) Public Service Centers/General Support Service and (2) Centers and Research/Membership Centers (see E-4). The EPC is charged with reviewing the status of the units to determine whether or not the unit is an academic entity. If EPC determines that it is not an academic unit, the center or institute will not need to go through Faculty Senate review process. ANDERSON noted that the work flow charts include footnotes that elaborate on the process. Research Centers will have multiple ways of jumping through the process.

HANSEN/ZURK MOVED the Senate APPROVE the two new Flowcharts for the Creation, Alteration, and Termination of Centers and Institutes, listed in E4.

LIEBMAN emphasized that this recommendation connects with the earlier discussion of program array review. One of the main ways that the Senate exercises its partnership in governance is through the creation, elimination and alteration of academic programs. The proposal gives some authority, or wind in the sails, for the EPC.

The MOTION to APPROVE PASSED: 48 in favor, 3 to reject, 5 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).
5. Proposed Resolution to Request line-item access to the All-Funds Budget

GEORGE and PADIN provided background on the evolution of the resolution. (See slides, minutes attachment B3.)

GEORGE noted that the 15* sponsoring Senators had received feedback and clarifications from other senators, the Senate Budget Committee, and the Provost, and had decided on a simpler, more direct request. The gist of the resolution remains the same: To ask for budget details and transparency, based on the principle that shared governance needs shared information. She noted that at PSU virtually every decision involves budgetary considerations. It is also a great time to institutionalize budget transparency as we move into a new governance relationship with the state, and a new university governance model. Transparency may also reduce mistrust and misinformation.

PADIN stated that the Senate takes its role very seriously, and senators felt that they did not have everything that they needed to discharge their responsibilities—a feeling that seemed to be widespread across campus. Citing the PSU Constitution, he noted that the faculty has the mandate (Arts. 1 and 2), and Senate has the primary responsibility (Art. 5, Sect. 4), for issues of faculty welfare, educational policy and establishing budgetary priorities, working with the administration. The lack of information became fairly clear at the November Budget Forum that Senate co-sponsored with the AAUP. He argued that we need an open source [of information] for the budgeting process.

*from Senators Randy Bluffstone, Gary Brodowicz, Barbara Brower, Sarah Eppley, Linda George, David Hansen, Karen Kennedy, Robert Liebman, Thomas Luckett, Robert Mercer, Jose Padin, Karen Popp, Isabel Jaen Portillo, Erik Sanchez, Michael Taylor

SANTELMAN/ BRODOWICZ MOVED the RESOLUTION:

*Whereas the Faculty are responsible for the intellectual and fiscal integrity of academic programs in shared governance, and

*Whereas The Faculty can only knowledgeably participate in setting budget priorities and processes, congruent with the Constitution, if fully informed,

Be it resolved that the members of the Portland State University Faculty Senate: Request ongoing access to the All Funds line-item budgets[1] and to the final budgets for FY 2012-2014.

[1] A detailed, line item, all-funds budget, recurring and non-recurring, of all operating ledger accounts, with each account identified by type and code levels for fund, organization, program, and account. A chart of accounts defining fund, organization, program, and account hierarchies by type and code levels, with corresponding titles and descriptions.

BRODOWICZ observed that Committee chair Hillman stated in June 2012 that the Budget Committee lacked strong confidence regarding the administration’s
communication of budgetary issues; and last year’s 2013 Budget Committee Report, (HANSEN chaired), recommended that University provide the All Funds budget to improve the Senate's understanding of the University’s budget and priorities. The specificity offered by the resolution will help the Budget Committee better do its job.

MERCER observed that individuals participate as senators because they share a vision of the University's mission and care about achieving that vision. Noting that he voted as an individual, rather than from a position, he stated his support for the resolution. He noted that in times of stress, as during contract negotiations, we can generate more heat than light. He wanted to think about the future and ways for Senate to play an educated role in the process that would lead to more light.

ZURK wondered if the information requested was what was actually needed by the Budget Committee.

HANSEN replied that the Budget Committee was in discussion with the Vice-President of Finance's Office about what the data requested would look like and what was feasible. It was expected that it would come in a spreadsheet, with data tables that could be aggregated or disaggregated. BOWMAN agreed.

LIEBMAN underscored that fact that the Budget Committee is genuinely representative of all parts of the University. Its members are liaisons with budget officers and staff at the university and college level. Decisions connected to a likely program array review will have to do with what we fund and how we fund it efficiently. To do its work the Budget Committee needs access to data that is not yet provided on the [FADM] website.

The MOTION to APPROVE the RESOLUTION PASSED: 48 in favor, 0 to reject, 4 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”). [Applause.]

MCBRIDE noted that OAA’s cooperation with the crafters of the resolution to fact-check was a good illustration of their commitment to shared governance. In addition, the Office of the Budget has already promised to get data to the Budget Committee in a usable and informative way by the end of the month.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

The Senate Steering Committee posed the following question to President Wiewel on behalf of the English Department:

How is PSU responding to the University of Oregon pursuing the establishment of competing programs at their White Stag building in Portland? Are you concerned?
WIEWEL wished everyone a happy and productive new year and thanked them for their constructive participation in drafting the budget resolution. He observed that the University of Oregon has wrestled for decades with the question of what they want to do in Portland. Its most recent study is a 245-page report that inventories U of Oregon activities in the White Stag Building in Portland. Former Provost James Bean has been charged with figuring out a Portland strategy. WIEWEL said that he has communicated PSU’s concern about the outcome to President Gottfredson of the U of Oregon.

WIEWEL added that current rules that require inter-institutional consultation on academic activities only relate to programs. However, he invited faculty to keep his office informed of any new overlapping courses. A three-year pilot summer program called “Urban Ducks” [http://urbanducks.uoregon.edu/] has caught PSU’s attention, but PSU is more concerned about the Oregon Institute of Technology Wilsonville campus. He asserted that PSU will challenge encroachment; but it should also have programs that serve the needs of the region, or somebody else will.

GREENSTADT noted that it had been the experience of the English Department (with an MFA in Writing) that promises of non-duplication made by the U of Oregon Journalism Program at the White Stag Building had been broken. In particular, she asked how it was possible for Journalism students to be advised to take PSU classes, but to register for them through the U of Oregon. ANDREWS said that in November PSU had notified U of Oregon that it wants to withdraw from the reciprocal agreement that allows graduate students to take courses from other Oregon institutions without paying tuition to the offering institution.

HANSEN asked what the guidelines would govern the process or protect against duplication in the future. WIEWEL reiterated that past protections did not apply to courses. How those customs would be carried on by the HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Council), which is charged with avoiding unnecessary program duplication among Oregon’s universities, is work in process.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WEIWEL reported that experiences shared at the Board’s orientation in December (11-12) had confirmed his belief that the University will be well-served by the new PSU Board of Trustees. On December 15, the Presidents of the 7 campuses had reported to the Legislature their collective agreement to create a Shared Services organization. With the exception of bargaining with SIEU, participation in shared services will be voluntary. He reminded senators that the 7.5 million dollars in cuts at
the institutional level that had been identified in December still left PSU an anticipated 3 to 3.5% cut. Individual academic units will still be required to identify 8% in possible cuts, out of which, collectively, a 3 to 3.5% cut would be realized. He concluded that the proposed program array review would have little to do with these cuts, given its current pace, but it would be very useful for the 2019 budget. [Laughter.] More seriously, he added, that we do always need to be thinking about where we allocate resources. He announced there had been another 2.5 million dollar gift in support of the Viking Pavilion and the good news that the Scholarship Campaign was halfway to meeting its 50 million dollar goal.

**Provost’s Report**

The Provost’s report was postponed to the February meeting.

**Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships**

The Vice-President’s report was postponed to the February meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.
January Discussion Item: 
Academic Program Array Review

TransformUS differs from previous work, such as systematic program review, in that its mandate is not to review but to prioritize; it is not in series but simultaneous; and it is entirely about resource allocation — we are very much aware that the outcome of program prioritization must be that the university stops doing some things and both saves and shifts significant resources. Like workforce planning, prioritization will result in changes to units, but these will be in future years as decisions are implemented.

Tentative List of Principles and Caveats
1. The process should take the long view, both in terms of creating a reasonable timeline for the review and in terms of aligning it with PSU’s mission, vision and strategic planning.
2. The process must be faculty designed and driven, and must be founded on a clear agreement between faculty governance bodies and administration as to how governance decisions will be executed.
3. For review purposes, agreement is needed on a definition of “program.”
4. Senate should set benchmarks and receive reports from the committee charged with overseeing the process at critical stages of the process.
5. Resources and faculty support (e.g., release time, staff support) will be needed to conduct the work.
6. Tenure-line faculty in programs slated for elimination will have reassignment rights.

Questions That Have Surfaced:
1. Should a horizon for data gathered be stipulated – no less than (5, 7, 10 year?) look back?
2. How to articulate the charge to the committee/committees—what its priorities are—to define and carry out steps of the process?
3. Due diligence requires research on how other campuses have successfully engaged in this kind of review. Should there be “faculty research appointments” involving a 1-term course release for committee service and charged with defining process and criteria?
4. What kind of committee can most effectively think about process and criteria—one with representation by expertise, by school/college, or from existing Senate committees? How are major stakeholders, including students and alumni, ensured an appropriate voice?
5. How will the outcomes be shared? Will there be a process for interrogating and/or appealing priority recommendations?
6. What happens after PAR?
Questions That Have Surfaced:

g. Should a small Ad Hoc Committee be formed and charged with laying initial groundwork for the larger process?

Responsibilities could include such things as: identifying and investigating approaches used at other campuses (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators) and, based on that research, recommending a framework for PSU; determining timeline; determining representation on committee(s); defining “program” and recommending extent of review—academic programs, institutes and centers, non-academic programs.

This Ad Hoc Committee would make recommendations to Senate at its April meeting allowing time for Steering to develop a formal charge for the new working committee(s) and for review and approval of the charge by Faculty Senate. The new committee(s) would begin planning process spring term.

Question for President Wiewel

On behalf of the PSU Department of English, the Steering Committee has posed the following question to President Wiewel.

“How is PSU responding to the University of Oregon pursuing the establishment of competing programs at their White Stag building in Portland? Are you concerned?”
Motion for Implementation of amended P&T Guidelines 1/6

In response to questions & concerns about using the amended P&T Guidelines, Steering crafted a motion for implementation

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.

Implementation

OAA must
- Publish new ranks in coordination with HR
- invite AAUP to reopen contract to set salary minimums
- Inform schools and departments of procedures and timetables for reclassification
- Review and approve revised P&T Guidelines from departments

Implementation

Departments must
- determine if new ranks apply to their faculty
- establish procedures for reclassification, if needed
- choose to use Prof of Practice or Clinical Instructor
- redraft their P&T Guidelines to fit the new PSU Guidelines
- send new department P&T Guidelines to Dean & Provost for review
Implementation

Processes for promotion for faculty can begin after July 1, 2014 for AY 2014-15

Ad hoc P&T committee will hold at least one open forum for questions from all faculty (candidates for promotion, P&T/Personnel committee members, department chairs)
To schedule 2nd half of Winter 2014 term.

Committee

Members (Tenure-Track and NTTF)

- Mike Bartlett (BIO)
- Rachel Curtiffe (CR)
- *Sandra Freels (WLL)
- **Christina Gildersleeve-Neumann (SPHR)
- Julie Haun (BLP)
- *Bob Liebman (SOC)
- Michael Taylor (SSW)
- Gayle Thieman (GSED)
- Diane Yatchmenoff (RRI)

* co-chairs
** joint member of New Academic Ranks Task Force & our committee

Ex officio:
Margaret Everett (OGS)
Carol Mack (DAA)
Ren Su (MCECS)
Faculty Senate Resolution on Budget Transparency  
January 6, 2014

Faculty Senate Resolution  
Whereas the Faculty are responsible for the intellectual and fiscal integrity of academic programs in shared governance, and  
Whereas the Faculty can only knowledgeably participate in setting budget priorities and processes, congruent with the Constitution, if fully informed,  

Be it resolved that the members of the Portland State University Faculty Senate:  
Request ongoing access to the All Funds line-item budgets1 and to the final budgets for FY 2012-2014

1 A detailed, line-item, all-funds budget, recurring and non-recurring, of all operating ledger accounts, with each account identified by type and code levels for fund, organization, program, and account. A chart of accounts defining fund, organization, program, and account hierarchies by type and code levels, with corresponding titles and descriptions.

Constitutional Rationale  
• Essential Faculty functions  
  • Article 3: Faculty Powers (Sections 1 and 2)  
  • Article 4, Section 4 (Senate Budget committee)  

• Authority and responsibility for:  
  • Faculty welfare  
  • Educational policy and quality  
  • Recommend budget priorities  
  • Review and approve significant changes to educational programs

Current Need  
• Faculty has been presented with calls for significant budget cuts and possible restructuring  
• Faculty does not feel it has the information it needs to evaluate, recommend, or discharge its responsibility in setting priorities
Working Group Status Report:

Administration: Formed project working groups. Coordinated with OAA to develop and finalize project management plan and steering committee charter. Submitted report and feedback re HECC CPL standards to Provost’s Office. Worked with OAA to finalize detailed project work plan and timeline. Communicate project milestones and gather responses from Faculty Senate at each stage of the work. Ensure that information from focus groups and senate is used to inform all areas of the project. Continue project oversight, including identifying and recruiting new faculty and student team members. Completed revisions of IRB documents for HRSC approval. When approval is secured, will send interview invitations to CPL administrators of 16 successful CPL programs. Craft statement of CPL program mission, vision, and values. Identify consultant with expertise in development and assessment of learning outcomes.

Evaluation: Completed fall term Focus groups with faculty and department chairs in November 2013 and shared the results with the PC#92 team in January and with Faculty Senate in February. Administered on-line survey to students who have received CPL at PSU. Conduct second set of focus groups during spring term. Provide formative assessment of the project.

Policies: Developed a set of policy recommendations to submit to the entire PC#92 team in January and Faculty Senate in March. Plan to present to FS for approval of policy recommendations at the April meeting.

Practices: Develop recommendations for: course-level outcomes; faculty education and training; narrative construction and evaluation; and CPL orientation course. Present findings to PC#92 team in late March and to Faculty Senate in May.

Assessment: Develop a process for mapping course level learning goals to assessments within departments and establish CPL assessment practices that are valid and fair. Will provide scenarios for different assessment models and coordinate with practices group to design procedures for faculty development related to assessment of CPL. Will report recommendations to the PC#92 team in April and present to Faculty Senate in May.

Implementation: Consider approaches for implementing and sustaining a CPL program at PSU, including administration, financial management, faculty workload
and development, student recruitment, course fees and SCH attribution. Will identify implementation methodologies to present to the PC#92 team in April and present to Faculty Senate in June.

Field Testing: ISS: Determine learning outcomes and map existing courses to outcomes. Develop undergraduate certificate in sustainability. WLL/Comm: Identified faculty and students for field testing of CPL procedures.

WINTER 2014
• Develop CPL policies for PSU and seek input and approval from Faculty Senate (February)
• Prepare recommendations for an outcomes-based practice framework for CPL for review by PC#92 team
• Design assessment model for review by PC#92 team
• Identify implementation methodologies for review by PC#92 team
• Create goals and guidelines for spring term field testing

SPRING 2014
• Develop assessment procedures for use in field tests
• Begin field testing of practices and assessment models in ISS and WLL
• Conduct focus groups – Round 2
• Present CPL policy recommendations for Faculty Senate vote (April)
• Present updates on practice and assessment models to Faculty Senate (May)
• Present updates on recommended Implementation methodologies to Faculty Senate (June)

SUMMER 2014
• Analyze field test data and results from survey and focus groups
• Refine and further develop assessment, practice and implementation strategies.

FALL 2014
• Present results of field test findings to Faculty Senate (October)
• Continue field tests with partnering departments
• Submit Final Report to Faculty Senate and OAA (December)

PROJECT CLOSEOUT: December 31, 2014
PROVOST CHALLENGE #92: GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

The ultimate goal of this project is to build on past efforts and create a rigorous, reliable, and flexible framework for recognizing, measuring, and awarding credit for prior learning experiences (CPL) while upholding the quality and value of a PSU degree.

HECC Oregon Credit for Prior Learning Standards Review and Report by PC#92 Team

Our Process

In November, Provost Sona Andrews invited the Project Team to provide feedback on the HECC CPL Standards. The Provost Challenge #92 team is a diverse group of administrators, faculty and staff at PSU including the chairs of UCC, EPC, ACS, ARC and SCC as well as faculty from departments across campus, and faculty and staff from the library, the ISS, Financial Aid, Registration and Records, University Studies, CAI, and current and former unit representatives from AAUP. Our team implemented the following process in making the Standards available for review by the campus community:

• HECC Standards document posted for review by the entire campus community on PC#92 Google Site on November 27, 2013.

• Senators on the team were asked to invite district members and other senators and departmental and administrative colleagues to read the standards and post questions and comments by December 9, 2013.

• Team members provided their comments about the standards on December 10, 2013.

• Project Lead and Project Manager synthesized information and submitted the team response to the Provost’s office on December 16, 2014.

• Provost reviewed comments and forwarded to HECC leadership on December 17, 2013.

• HECC will review institutional feedback in January 2014 and issue Final CPL Standards in February 2014.

Our Comments

The document is thorough and reflects national CPL practices. Greater clarity was requested on the following points:

• Differentiating between learning outcomes and competencies as they relate to CPL.

• Affirming the role of faculty expertise in program administration, implementation, and CPL assessment standards and practices.

• Emphasizing sustainable tuition policies to ensure CPL is an affordable and accessible option for students.

• Increasing clarity and simplicity in transcripting and defining different types of CPL credits.

• Ensuring the sustainability of the program over the long term in the areas of administration, faculty education, and financial support.

The HECC Credit for Prior Learning Standards are available for review by the campus community at https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/hecc-standards-review/
## Provost Challenge #92: GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

### WORKING GROUPS & STEERING COMMITTEE 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION GROUP</th>
<th>Provides project administration and coordination with working groups and OAA, collects/analyzes data from existing CPL programs and administrators, oversees general project development, works with Faculty Senate on approval of policies related to CPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Chabon</td>
<td>Project Lead / Assoc. Dean of Humanities CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:chabonr@pdx.edu">chabonr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Coleman</td>
<td>Project Manager / English CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:coleman0c@pdx.edu">coleman0c@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICIES GROUP</th>
<th>Collects information on existing state and institutional policies for CPL and recommends academic and administrative policies for assessing and applying CPL at PSU in accordance with previously approved policies, state guidelines and HECC standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Baccar</td>
<td>Group Lead / Director of Registration &amp; Records EMSA SCOMM <a href="mailto:baccarc@pdx.edu">baccarc@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Cunliff</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution / Chair, UCC CLAS <a href="mailto:cunliff8r@pdx.edu">cunliff8r@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Gould</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution / Chair, EPC CLAS <a href="mailto:gouldr@pdx.edu">gouldr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Harmon</td>
<td>Curriculum Coordinator OAA <a href="mailto:harmons@pdx.edu">harmons@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becki Ingersoll</td>
<td>Advising &amp; Career Services / ACS &amp; ARC EMSA <a href="mailto:ingersollr@pdx.edu">ingersollr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Jagodnik</td>
<td>Health Sciences Advisor CLAS <a href="mailto:jagj@pdx.edu">jagj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan MacCormack</td>
<td>University Studies / Chair, ARC UNST <a href="mailto:alamr@pdx.edu">alamr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liane O’Banion</td>
<td>Learning Center / Chair, SCC EMSA <a href="mailto:obaniol@pdx.edu">obaniol@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Smith</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Student Financial Aid &amp; Scholarships EMSA <a href="mailto:smithde@pdx.edu">smithde@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICES GROUP</th>
<th>Collects and analyzes information about different CPL methods and recommends a practice model for CPL at PSU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annabelle Dolidon</td>
<td>Group Lead / WLL CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:dolidon@pdx.edu">dolidon@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maude Hines</td>
<td>Co-Lead / English CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:mhin0s@pdx.edu">mhin0s@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowanna Carpenter</td>
<td>University Studies UNST <a href="mailto:carpenter@pdx.edu">carpenter@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Jagodnik</td>
<td>Health Sciences Advisor CLAS <a href="mailto:jagj@pdx.edu">jagj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Knepler</td>
<td>University Studies UNST <a href="mailto:knepler@pdx.edu">knepler@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Labissiere</td>
<td>University Studies UNST <a href="mailto:labissy@pdx.edu">labissy@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student: E.S.</td>
<td>Political Science CUPA ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION GROUP</th>
<th>Collects formative and summative data about the project. Conducts focus groups and student surveys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pete Collier</td>
<td>Group Lead / Sociology CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:cfpc@pdx.edu">cfpc@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Ketchison</td>
<td>Institutional Research &amp; Planning OAA <a href="mailto:bukk@pdx.edu">bukk@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Lloyd-Pool</td>
<td>Institute for Sustainable Solutions ISS <a href="mailto:minor@pdx.edu">minor@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION GROUP</th>
<th>Considers approaches and designs and develops practices for administration, financial sustainability, student recruitment and retention, and faculty workload and development for implementing CPL at PSU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Dujon</td>
<td>Group Co-Lead / Dean of Curriculum Development &amp; Enrollment Management CLAS SCOMM <a href="mailto:dujonv@pdx.edu">dujonv@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ASSESSMENT GROUP
Gathers information on learning outcomes in place at PSU and works with disciplinary experts to refine and operationalize course and program learning outcomes. Recommends assessment methods for use in evaluating learning outcomes, and evidence of student work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Co-Lead / Philosophy / AAUP REP</th>
<th>CLAS</th>
<th>SCOMM</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleksandar Jokic</td>
<td>Group Co-Lead / Philosophy / AAUP REP</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d8aj@pdx.edu">d8aj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Jones</td>
<td>School of Business Administration</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wmj@pdx.edu">wmj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Duggar</td>
<td>Director, Disabilities Resource Center</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jen.duggar@pdx.edu">jen.duggar@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mercer</td>
<td>Assistant Dean for Student Success</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mercer@pdx.edu">mercer@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student: D.W.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Co-Lead / SBA Student Learning &amp; Success Manager</th>
<th>SBA</th>
<th>SCOMM</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Matta</td>
<td>Group Co-Lead / SBA Student Learning &amp; Success Manager</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmatta@pdx.edu">tmatta@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike Arnold</td>
<td>Group Co-Lead / Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:narnold@pdx.edu">narnold@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candyce Reynolds</td>
<td>Educational Policy, Foundations, &amp; Admin Study</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:reynoldsc@pdx.edu">reynoldsc@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowanna Carpenter</td>
<td>University Studies</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:carpenter@pdx.edu">carpenter@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Ketchison</td>
<td>Institutional Research &amp; Planning</td>
<td>OAA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bukk@pdx.edu">bukk@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Davidson</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>LIBR</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeanne.davidson@pdx.edu">jeanne.davidson@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Voegele</td>
<td>Interim Director, Teaching Learning &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>OAI</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:voegelej@pdx.edu">voegelej@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake Mitchell</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Natural Sciences</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:drakem@pdx.edu">drakem@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student: P.L.</td>
<td>Leadership for Sustainability Education</td>
<td>GSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIELD TESTING – INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS (Spring 2014)
Field tests implementation of the CPL approaches. Creates a program to allow students to earn an undergraduate certificate in Sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Lead, ISS</th>
<th>ISS</th>
<th>SCOMM</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Lloyd-Pool</td>
<td>Group Lead, ISS</td>
<td>ISS</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:minor@pdx.edu">minor@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Allen</td>
<td>Director, Institute for Sustainable Solutions and Associate Prof., Public Administration</td>
<td>ISS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhallen@pdx.edu">jhallen@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thad Miller</td>
<td>Urban Studies &amp; Planning</td>
<td>UPA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:trm2@pdx.edu">trm2@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Hamilton</td>
<td>Institute for Sustainable Solutions</td>
<td>ISS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahamilt@pdx.edu">ahamilt@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Sherman</td>
<td>Sustainability / University Studies</td>
<td>ISS / UNST</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:davidbar@pdx.edu">davidbar@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Matta</td>
<td>School of Business Administration</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmatta@pdx.edu">tmatta@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Jones</td>
<td>School of Business Administration</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wmj@pdx.edu">wmj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Brown</td>
<td>School of Business Administration</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:djdb@pdx.edu">djdb@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Koch</td>
<td>Civil Engineering &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kochr@pdx.edu">kochr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Messer</td>
<td>Urban Studies &amp; Planning</td>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:messerb@pdx.edu">messerb@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Maser</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Management</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:maserj@pdx.edu">maserj@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Lincoln</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarah.lincoln@pdx.edu">sarah.lincoln@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell Fletcher</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>COTA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:harrell@pdx.edu">harrell@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avram Hiller</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ahiller@pdx.edu">ahiller@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIELD TESTING – WORLD LANGUAGES & LITERATURES & COMMUNICATION (Spring 2014)
Field tests implementation of the CPL approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Group Lead / WLL</th>
<th>CLAS</th>
<th>SCOMM</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annabelle Dolidon</td>
<td>Group Lead / WLL</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dolidon@pdx.edu">dolidon@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Robinson</td>
<td>Group Lead / Communication</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>SCOMM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffreyr@pdx.edu">jeffreyr@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Thorne</td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sthorne@pdx.edu">sthorne@pdx.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 9, 2014

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
• ANTH 454/554 Archaeological Field School, 6 credits – change course description
January 9, 2014

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 Programs
E.1.c.1.
   • BA in Art History – adds the BS option to the major; changes “liberal arts” focus to “critical analysis” focus.

E.1.c.2.
   • BFA in Art Practices – drops Art 485 and adds two extra credits to Art 498 BFA Thesis Exhibition course.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.c.3.
   • ArH 437 Nature Into Art – changes course number to ArH 337; changes prerequisites.

E.1.c.4.
   • ArH 439, 440 History of Architecture – changes course numbers to ArH 339, 340; changes prerequisites.

E.1.c.5.
   • ArH 451, 452, 453 Ancient Art – changes course numbers to ArH 351, 352, 353; deletes 551, 552, 553; changes description; change prerequisites.

E.1.c.6.
   • ArH 456 Early Medieval Art – changes course number to ArH 356; changes prerequisites.

School of Business Administration

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.c.7.
   • Minor in Business – changes course requirements.

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Changes to Existing Programs

E.1.c.8.
• BA/BS in Biology – redefinition and reorganization of the required curriculum.

E.1.c.9.
• Minor in Biology – redefinition and reorganization of the required curriculum.

E.1.c.10.
• BA/BS in Chemistry – changes course requirements; changes total number of credits from other fields from 42 to 46.

E.1.c.11.
• BA/BS in History – changes 400-level course requirements.

E.1.c.12.
• Minor in International Economics – changes to course requirements.

E.1.c.13.
• Minor in Economics – removes redundant information.

E.1.c.14.
• Minor in Medieval Studies – adds to allowable course list.

E.1.c.15.
• BA/BS in Philosophy – revises course requirements.

E.1.c.16.
• Minor in Writing – now lists excluded WR courses from allowed foundation courses and electives; includes provision for the limited use (8 crs) of Pass/No Pass.

New Courses

E.1.c.17.
• Bi 320 Introduction to Organismal Physiology (4)
  An overview of fundamental principles of physiology. Course covers the physical and chemical mechanisms responsible for how plants and animals function. Prerequisites: Bi 251, Bi 252.
Motion: The Educational Policy Committee moves that Faculty Senate approve the adoption of the proposed Portland State University Academic Program Review Policy, available in PSU's Curriculum Tracker on the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals for EPC motions.

See below or click on the Educational Policy Committee link, or use the link, here.

Background: It is the policy of the Office of Academic Affairs that all PSU academic programs, as required by Northwest Commission on Colleges and University (NWCCU) standard 2c Educational Resources, and any associated centers or institutes go through a periodic academic program review in order to improve the effectiveness and quality of the academic programs offered by PSU.

The academic program review process at PSU is designed to provide continuous improvement of academic quality within academic units through self-study, external review, and internal action plans. For the purposes of this document, “program review” refers to a department or division’s holistic appraisal over five years of its curricular offerings (certificates, majors, minors, and graduate programs), and where applicable, its centers/institutes.

The Educational Policy Committee reviewed the Academic Program Review Policy, and at EPC’s November 13, 2013 meeting unanimously voted to approve this policy document to be submitted to the Faculty Senate.

Academic Program Review Policy

I. Policy Statement
It is the policy of the Office of Academic Affairs that all PSU academic programs, as required by Northwest Commission on Colleges and University (NWCCU) standard 2c Educational Resources, and any associated centers or institutes go through a periodic Academic program review in order to improve the effectiveness and quality of the academic programs offered by PSU.

II. Reason for Policy/Purpose
The academic program review process at PSU is designed to provide continuous improvement of academic quality within academic units through self-study, external review, and internal action plans. For the purposes of this document, “program review” refers to a department or division’s holistic appraisal over five years of its curricular offerings (certificates, majors, minors, and graduate programs), and where applicable, its centers/institutes. Center and institute review should follow Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University. Program review provides academic units the opportunity for reflection and discussion of their programs on a regular cycle, and is explicitly designed to be collaborative in nature, and inclusive of
student, faculty, community, and administrative input as well as external evaluation, as determined by the dean. The overall goal of program review is to assist academic units in:

- articulating their goals and objectives in relation to the University's priorities, and initiatives,
- instituting a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities and impact,
- demonstrating progress toward achievement of department goals,
- using outcomes for program improvement and goal-setting,
- provide deans and the provost with more thorough and reflective evidence of program progress.

The academic program review process is accomplished through a recurring minimum 7 year cycle of goal setting, data gathering and analysis, and reporting. Through the college’s planning process, the academic department:

- establishes its goals and objectives related to teaching, scholarship and service for its respective programs;
- provides analysis of data received and/or collected to demonstrate progress toward the stated goals and objectives;
- reports on its progress toward meeting its goals and objectives within the unit’s and the University’s mission.

Academic units may consult the **Criteria for Program Review**, attached here, for program review questions.

### III. Applicability

This policy applies to all academic units, programs (undergraduate and graduate), schools and colleges under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs.

### IV. Definitions

**Academic Program.** Academic units offering at a minimum of a certificate or minor under the direct supervision of a Dean or Vice Provost.

**Action Plan.** A document outlining the Academic Program’s and dean’s strategies for addressing issues found during the Academic Program Review.

**Review Schedule.** An annual timeline for program review listing all academic programs designating the academic year in which the academic program will go through the Academic Program Review process. The Review Schedule is recommended by the deans of the schools and colleges in cooperation with department chairs and/or divisional directors and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs which will also maintain and publish the review schedule.

**Self-Study.** A systematic and thorough examination of all of an academic program’s components in light of its stated mission.

### V. Policy / Procedure

1. **Review Schedule**

   1.1. An annual timeline for program review and a master schedule of departmental rotation will be published on the OAA website.
1.2. Deans, with approval of OAA, are responsible for setting review schedules for their units on a 7 year cycle (unless otherwise influenced by the specialized accreditation agency).

2. Preparation
2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) sends a reminder to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) and to the deans listing the programs or departments he or she has indicated will be subject to review during the academic year.
2.2. Reviews will begin in Fall term and must be concluded by the end of Spring term.
2.3. The dean meets with the programs or departments to develop a process for the reviews and to finalize any decisions about information that will be required beyond what is typically provided by OIRP.
2.4. The program or department prepares review materials according to the Academic Program Review Guidelines (see link below), using the Criteria for Program Review in the Guidelines and any additional materials as required by the dean.
2.5. Core data elements will be available through Cognos reports at www.datamaster.pdx.edu, or directly from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (Those departments subject to specialized accreditation should also use these data, but may prepare other materials as required by their accrediting agencies.)

3. Review Process
3.1. The dean is responsible for initiating the process for a review of the program or department, including coordinating external reviews, and where relevant, community members input.
3.2. Department/program creates a self-study using the established standards/criteria listed below,
3.3. Self-study and list of potential external reviewers submitted to the dean for review and comment,
3.4. Self-study and program materials submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies, when applicable, for review and comment.
3.5. Self-study and dean’s response submitted to external reviewers, Depending on the program and at the discretion of the dean the review by external reviewers can either be through a site visit or done virtually,
3.6. External reviewers prepare a team report and submit it to the department chair or the review committee,
3.7. The dean and/or the department chair prepares a final report and action plan for the department/program based on the self-study and the external reviewers’ report,
3.8. The department/program prepares a response to the final report and action plan,
3.9. Departments/programs with institutes and centers will simultaneously initiate a review of those centers and institutes following the “Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University”,
3.10. The complete review packet (self-study, dean’s response, external review report, final report and action plan, and department/program response) submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

4. Implementation
4.1. Following the review of the self-study report, the dean’s response, the external review report, the final report and the action plan, the Office of Academic Affairs will meet with the college/school dean and the department chair or divisional director to discuss the recommendations made in the program’s Action Plan.

4.2. This Action Plan must be agreed upon by the Office of Academic Affairs, the college dean, and the departmental administrator. It becomes a part of the review record and should be used to guide any follow-up activities.

5. Follow-Up
5.1. The Office of Academic Affairs will call a meeting with OAA, the dean and department chair or director three years following the initial meeting to review the progress that has been made (or not made) with regard to the implementation of the Action Plan.

6. External Reviewers
6.1. Academic programs undergoing program review are expected to include 2-3 external reviewers in the process.

6.2. The selection of external reviewers shall be determined by the deans, in consultation with the program chairs/directors, from a list of candidates provided by the departments/programs.

6.3. Two to three external reviewers should receive and review the self-study written by the department, as well as the dean’s response to the report in advance of their visit to campus.

6.4. Deans may determine whether one or more reviewers make a site visit, or if a virtual visit is adequate for review purposes.

6.5. Deans or departments are expected to cover expenses related to these site visits.

7. Specialized Accreditation and Academic Review
7.1. To the extent possible, attempts will be made to coordinate the APR so that it occurs at a time most convenient to the accreditation cycle, as requested by the school/college undergoing specialized accreditation review.

7.2. Reviews of programs with specialized accreditation will be scheduled, whenever possible, to coincide with their accrediting agencies’ visit.

7.3. In addition, to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the value of all review processes, documentation prepared as part of the department/programs accreditation and/or external review processes may be submitted or included in the materials submitted for APR.

7.4. These reports will be reviewed for completeness and alignment with the university’s APR guidelines. Requests for additional information will be made if necessary.

8. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers
8.1. External Reviewers must be scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field.

8.2. External Reviewers should hold a terminal degree in the appropriate discipline.

8.3. External Reviewers should have experience with program administration and/or significant leadership role in higher education.

8.4. External Reviewers should have experience with student learning assessment, regional accreditation, and/or professional accreditation.

8.5. External Reviewers should have prior experience conducting reviews or are or have been officers in related professional organizations.
8.6. External Reviewers should be currently employed at a peer institution with a similar degree program.

8.7. External Reviewers must have no conflict of interest such as recent employment or consultation with Portland State University.

VI. Links To Related Forms
Link to APR “Action Plan” template.
Link to APR Guidelines.

VII. Links To Related Policies, Procedures and Information
Link to APR process webpage.
Link to “Centers and Institutes” Review policy and process.
Link to “Principles for Effective Assessment of Student Achievement”.

VIII. Contacts
Questions regarding this Policy should be directed to the Office of Academic Affairs at (503) 725-4596 or can be e-mailed to harmons@pdx.edu.

IX. Policy Adoption
Recommended: ____________________________ Date: _______

Faculty Senate Presiding Officer

Approved: ____________________________ Date: _______

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

X. History/Revision Dates
Adoption Date: To be added.
Next Review Date: To be added.
To: PSU Faculty Senate  
From: Sarah Eppley, Linda George, and Erik Sanchez, members of the Faculty Senate  
Re: Creating a new category of employee at PSU: “Post-doctoral Trainee”  
Date: January 13, 2014

Sarah Eppley, Linda George, and Erik Sanchez, members of the Faculty Senate, suggest that the Faculty Senate move as follows:

CURRENT PRACTICE: All post-doctoral researchers at PSU are currently hired as (Senior) Research Assistants or (Senior) Research Associates, job categories of represented members of the AAUP. As a consequence, PSU must contribute to PERS with the standard period delay until vesting. However, most such employees remain at PSU for a period of time ranging from 1–3 years and never achieve vesting. The PERS contributions must be paid by either the PSU faculty sponsor of the post-doctoral researcher or by a granting agency, with no benefit ever received by the post-doc.

MOTION: The PSU Faculty Senate urges that the University create a new title of “post-doctoral fellow,” designating individuals who conduct research under the auspices of a faculty member, hold a doctoral degree, and are appointed for a limited term of less than five years.

RATIONALE: The “postdoctoral fellow” category reflects the reality that many individuals holding doctoral degrees require a further period of training to develop professional skills prior to embarking on independent careers. This period of further study and research constitutes a traineeship and is therefore temporary in nature. However, all current PSU researchers holding doctoral degrees, regardless of the term of employment, are unclassified employees for whom contributions are made to PERS. This requirement inappropriately burdens the funding source in the case of the majority of such individuals, who depart PSU before vesting occurs and hence never receive PERS benefits. The high cost of the benefits contributed to the small number of postdoctoral researchers presently at PSU (see Appendix).

To distinguish post-doctoral trainees from more senior non-faculty researchers who remain at PSU for five years or longer, we suggest that the latter be considered professional research associates, for whom benefits appropriate to long-term employment, including PERS contributions and vesting, are appropriate. Therefore, establishing the new position of “post-doctoral fellow” will generate a two-tier system for non-faculty researchers holding doctorates at PSU.

The proposed two-tier system would move PSU in-line with practices currently in place at most other research universities. It is consistent with a commitment to furthering a culture of research on campus, as most tangibly manifested in the recently established Office of Research and Strategic Partnerships (RSP). Postdoctoral trainees provide mentorship and role models to graduate and undergraduate PSU students, and are able to assist faculty in grant preparation, publication, and other scholarly activities. For these reasons, and by virtue of their prior experience that enables a high degree of productivity, we confidently predict significant increases in the number of researchers holding doctorates and in campus-wide research expenditures from implementing this policy.
addition to substantively augmenting the intellectual capital at PSU, post-doctoral trainees will also promote innovation and outreach consistent with the PSU mission to “let knowledge serve the city.” Newly minted scholars with freshly obtained doctoral degrees will also have the experience of conducting research in the unique PSU setting, and can be expected to transmit values acquired here to the other research communities that they will later join.

Post-doctoral trainees at PSU would receive medical benefits paid by the funding source, but superfluous contributions to PERS on their behalf from the funding source would not be made. This is directly analogous to the PSU policy for graduate research assistants (GRAs), and is consistent with both the nature of the postdoctoral position as a traineeship and the guidelines for allowable expenditures from federal grants.

Establishing this two-tier system for PhD-holding researchers at PSU is consistent with the recent implementation of a similar plan at Oregon State University (OSU). This system recognizing the distinctive nature of post-doctoral trainees exists at most US research universities. OSU follows the recommendations of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF), who have agreed on the following definition of a postdoctoral scholar:

*An individual who has received a doctoral degree (or equivalent) and is engaged in a temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training to enhance the professional skills and research independence needed to pursue his or her chosen career path.*

The emphasis on the temporary aspect of the appointment and the importance of mentored training shows that in important ways the job function of the post-doctoral trainee is similar to that of a graduate student pursuing the Ph.D. degree. OSU has decided that these similarities justify adopting the same policy for each group with respect to PERS contributions. We urge that PSU follow suit.

### Appendix: Costs of presently required PERS contributions for post-doctoral trainees
(Example taken from a federal grant submitted in 2013, for which funding is pending).

Base 12-month salary for one postdoctoral trainee - $46791
Total fringe benefit percentage – 62.0%
Fraction of fringe benefit representing the PERS contribution – 25%
Amount of PERS contribution - $7253
Indirect costs - $7253 (0.48) = $3481

*Total contribution per postdoc-year = $10734*
Question for College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean Susan Beatty
Faculty Senate January 2014 meeting

CLAS fourth quarter (summer) department budgets have been cut by well over 50% in many departments compared with two years ago at the same time student enrollment expectations remain constant. These decisions have meant that most departments hire no tenure track faculty members in the summer, rely almost exclusively on lower cost adjunct faculty members and offer few or no advanced courses. Such staffing and curricular decisions are very different from the rest of the year and from past practice.

Why is the fourth quarter budget being cut so aggressively? Do you envision summer session in the future as being the time for courses taught largely by adjunct faculty members? What about students needing to take courses that should or must be taught by tenure track faculty members?
Date: Jan 16, 2014
To: Portland State University Faculty Senate Steering Committee
From: Christof Teuscher, Chair, Faculty Development Committee
Subject: Faculty Development Committee intermediate report to Faculty Senate Steering Committee

Executive Summary
The committee was in limbo until Oct 8, when the administration and AAUP signed an agreement to make funds available for the travel program. Given the very tight timeline and based on the outcomes of a Spring 2013 faculty survey, the committee decided to introduce a lottery-based travel award system. Specific criteria were established to bias the lottery probabilities. The application procedure was significantly simplified and is now based on the PSU travel authorization form. The committee received 109 proposals for the October deadline and 38 for the November deadline. The funding rates were 44% and 76% respectively. A total of $102,647 was awarded for travel so far. The lottery-based system has further decreased the proposal turnaround times to about two weeks.

The committee plans to announce the 2014 faculty enhancement program by the end of January. New tentative rules and guidelines were discussed. The key changes may include: (1) A waiting period of two years before award recipients can apply again. (2) Award duration extended from 1 to 2 years. (3) The applicant’s current funding will be considered in the award evaluation process.

Committee Roster
- Christof Teuscher, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Committee Chair
- Kathi A. Ketcheson, Institutional Research and Planning
- Helen Young, Education
- Barbara Heilmair, Music
- Annabelle Dolidon, French
- Cynthia Coleman, Communication
- David Peyton, Chemistry
- Peter Moeck, Physics
- Thomas Kindermann, Psychology
- Sarah Tinkler, Economics
- Tom Larsen, Library
- Kristen Kern, Library
- Berrin Erdogan, School of Business Administration
- Deborah Reed, Social work
- Ethan Seltzer, Urban and Public Affairs

Charles Burck (OAA) continues to be in charge of the administration and coordination of the FDC program. OAA will continue to support the FDC, however, due to limited staff resources they will be reviewing the level of support possible.
Established policies and procedures
In accordance with the committee's charges, we have established policies and procedures to carry out our functions. The procedure has been very challenging this year because of the ongoing bargaining.

Professional Travel Grant Program.
In accordance with the AAUP contract, the following guidelines were established for the Professional Travel Grant Program:

- Requests of up to $2000 per individual for travel funds may be made to the Faculty Development Committee.
- Per the current contract, the Faculty Development Committee shall not approve travel requests unless the request is matched by $150 in department, grant, contract, or personal funds. Further, for requests over $750, a match of 20% of the total travel cost is required. Each travel request must indicate all sources of funds to be used in the requested professional travel.
- New: The FDC will select awardees with a lottery-based system that considers the following factors:
  1. Previous travel award. The longer you have not received travel funding through this program, the more likely you will be to get funding during the current round.
  2. Your total available funding for travel. The more other travel funding (e.g., through grants, startup packages, foundation accounts, etc.) you currently have, the less likely you will receive travel money through this program. Note: we dropped this factor for the November round.
  3. Paper/poster presentation (or performance/exhibition for artists). You are more likely to receive funding through this program if you present a paper/poster (or performance/exhibition for artists) at the conference/meeting you are going to.
- Biases were established (by committee vote) for the above factors.
- Considering the total available funding led to confusion for the travel applicants in the November round. As a consequence, the committee decided to eliminate that selection criterion.
- New: The travel application is based on the PSU travel authorization form.
- New: Chairs do not need to approve matching funding anymore. The committee simply awards the requested sum on the travel authorization minus the matching part. It is up to the applicant to find appropriate matching funds, and if these funds are from their department/unit, to seek approval.
- New: We allow faculty to enter the lottery multiple times, as long as the travel deadlines are respected.
- New: The travel application system will stay open so that PIs can submit their requests anytime. Proposals submitted after a given deadline will simply be considered for the next round.
- The committee will only fund one professional travel request per person each fiscal year (July 1 - June 30).
- Late submissions will not be reviewed.
Facility Development Committee Faculty Senate Report

Faculty Enhancement Program.
The committee met on Jan 14, 2014, to discuss the 2014 faculty enhancement program under the previous AAUP article 19 guidelines. AAUP and the administration have agreed to fund the 2014 program at the 2013 level if no new bargaining agreement has been reached by the end of January 2014.

During the Jan 14 committee meeting, new tentative rules and guidelines were discussed. The key changes may include:

- **New**: Introduction of a waiting period of two years before award recipients can apply again. The intention of this measure is to distribute the available money more equally and to increase the probability of PIs to receive funding who never received funding in the past.
- **New**: We plan to extend the duration of the awards from 1 to 2 years. In reality, most PIs ask for an extension. A 2-year award period would allow for more flexibility in completing the proposed work.
- **New**: The applicant’s current funding will be considered in the award evaluation process. PIs with significant current funding will need provide extra justification why/how the FE award would further enhance their career.

The new rules and guidelines are pending committee approval. The committee expects the submission deadline to be at the end of March 2014.

Funding and submission statistics
Selected statistics for the two travel rounds so far are included below.

Professional Travel Grant Program.
October travel round:
- Total funded amount: $62,204
- Number of proposals: 109
- Number of funded proposals: 48
- Funding rate: 44%
- Grants funded with travel money: 16
- Grants funded without travel money: 30
- Grants with presentation: 32
- Grants without presentation: 8
- Funded with 2013 award: 1
- Funded with 2012 award: 7
- Funded with 2011 award: 6
- Funded with 2010 award: 4

November travel round:
- Total funded amount: $40,600
- Number of proposals: 38
- Number of funded proposals: 29
- Funding rate: 76%
• Grants with presentation: 14
• Grants without presentation: 10
• Funded with 2013 award: 2
• Funded with 2012 award: 7
• Funded with 2011 award: 8
• Funded with 2010 award: 2

Faculty Enhancement Program.
No statistics to report.

Faculty feedback on new lottery system
After the October travel round, faculty rated the new lottery-based system with an overall score of 3.54 out of 5. Faculty comments are included on the following two pages.
I believe the deadlines and processes for asking travel grant money for conferences should be independent of all the AUWU bargaining. I really appreciate all the efforts in this application process, especially the time and effort of people in the Senate. This seems very inappropriate. I have no funding for this conference that I need to go to, and that should be the number one priority.

The new system is much better. It is a breeze to get the last card of a travel award. Thanks for improving things.

I appreciate the streamlined process. In the past, there have been a lot of hitches involved and I have been denied an award based on an incorrect claim that my application was missing information (I think because so many documents were required that the committee had simply overlooked that the requested document was included). I think that, in many cases, the travel needs are legitimate and there is really no fair way to weigh them against one another, so a lottery is best. Thanks so much for your work on this.

What can I do to comment on the application? Seems odd.

The lottery system is much easier but it is far from perfect. Given the limited amount of funds, travel grants should only be awarded to tenure-related faculty since research is part of their job description. Moreover, travel grants should only be awarded if the faculty member is presenting a paper or chairing a panel (this would exclude posters and more attendance). If we had more funds (which we should absolutely fight for), these restrictions would not be necessary.

For easy of use, I'd say it’s fine. I wonder how this will impact my ability to receive funding since it’s a lottery. I will still prefer submitting a short narrative to explain why this is important to me to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I appreciate travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t think the PSU that could be horrendous to PSU. It’s too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.

This new system is much better. Thanks for your work on this.

This lottery system is a joke, and essentially penalizes anyone who is actually producing and bringing in grant money. What a great way to reward hard work — thanks PSU. It will also preferentially penalize anyone doing field research, because the application asks you to report all available travel money, there is no place to separate money for field work from that for conference travel, so if you are doing field research, you will always look like you are doing field work, which will lead you to receive funding (perhaps there could be a field added for submitting a short narrative).

I am applying for travel to a conference that PSU might host in 2016. I don’t get funding, there may be no representative from PSU. That could be detrimental to PSU. It is too bad that can’t be factored into the process.

We were asked about the last travel grant but not the history of requests. I recently got one but it had been more than 10 years since I received one. So, does that mean I won’t get one this year? I am not sure how you will rate the value of the award.

It seems like we need to advocate for more travel funds in contract negotiations. It seems like many worthy trips may be denied due to lack of resources.
Intercolligate Athletics Board (IAB)

Semi-Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Winter Term

January 15, 2014

IAB Members 2013-14 Academic Year

Chair: Toeetu Faaleava, UNST, OAA-McNair
Melissa Trifiletti, ADM
Randy Miller, PSC
Robin Beavers, ADM
Marlon Holmes, Student
Tyler Spencer, Student

Ex-officio Members
Professor Robert Lockwood, C&CJ and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative
Torre Chisholm, Athletics Director
Valerie Cleary, Associate Athletics Director, Senior Woman Administrator (SWA)
Monica Rimai, Vice President of Finance and Administration

The Board is charged by the Faculty Senate to:
1) Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University’s program in men’s and women’s intercollegiate athletics.
2) Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

Budget

The Intercollegiate Athletics budget for FY14 is $13,618,610. This includes $3,067,000 in fee remission support; $2,263,901 in education and general funding; and $3,702,409 in incidental student fee support. Primary expenses are scholarships for $4,230,000 and personnel for $5,101,110.

President Wim Wiewel notified Athletics and the PSU community in December 2013 that starting in FY15, PSU Football must operate as a self-support program. However, the program will
continue to receive university fee remissions. It is anticipated that direct and related football expenses for FY14 will exceed football related revenues by approximately $800,000. The President has directed Athletics to develop a plan to implement this policy. As a result, it is expected that education and general funding to Athletics will be reduced to approximately $1,500,000 for FY15. Athletics’ initial request to the SFC is for $3,677,096, which represents a modest decrease from FY14. It is anticipated that Athletics will account for the reduction in direct institutional support and student fees by playing an additional football guarantee game versus a PAC-12 opponent, and implementing further spending reductions in football.

**Athletic Performance**

Basketball season has begun and the Men’s team is 5-7, while the Women’s team is 4-10 as of 01/15/2014. Athletic teams had a mostly successful Fall sports season. Women’s Soccer and Women’s Volleyball both won Big Sky Conference Regular Season Championships. Football posted a 6-6 record, a 3 game improvement over the previous season. Men’s and Women’s Cross Country made improvements, including Sarah Dean recording PSU’s best ever conference meet performance. Women’s Golf completed the fall portion of their season, winning the New Mexico State tournament under new Head Coach Kailin Downs. Softball also debuted under a new Head Coach, Barb Sherwood, going 5-1 in the Fall, including a win over Oregon.

**Academic Performance**

Student-athletes posted outstanding academic performances over the past year. The most recent Federal Graduation Rates were published with PSU’s student-athletes scoring 69% for the most recent data measured, compared to 60% last year. Additionally, the NCAA has certified PSU’s Academic Performance Ratings (APR) for the 2012-13 season. The program average is 968 and no teams are subject to penalties.

**Compliance Manual**

Matt Billings and Dana Cappelucci of the Compliance Office have completed a draft of the Compliance Manual. They intend to present it to the IAB for approval at the IAB meeting on Dec. 17. This manual fulfills one of the commitments we made as part of the OUS Audit process last summer. The completion of this manual is an important step in our ever-expanding rules education process.