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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 April 7, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the Mach 3, 2014 Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor: IFS - Hines  
   Discussion item: All Funds line-item budget

D. Unfinished Business  
   1. Revisions to the Portland State Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases* to add new faculty ranks:  
      *A NEW Appendix IV & the entire P&T document with suggested edits will be posted on the Faculty Senate website as D1a & D1b:  
      http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

E. New Business  
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda  
   *2. Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Entrepreneurship (SBA)  
   *3. Proposal for Credit for Prior Learning  
   *4. Proposal to rename the PSU Urban Honors Program to an Honors College  
   *5. Senate Resolution

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   President’s Report (16:00)  
   Provost’s Report  
   Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships  
   Report of the Program Prioritization Ad hoc Committee  
   Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council  
   Annual Report of the Institutional Assessment Council

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:  
   B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 3, 2014 and attachments  
   E-1 (a, b, c) Curricular Consent Agenda  
   E-2 Undergraduate Certificate in Entrepreneurship  
   E-3 CPL Policy recommendation  
   E-4 Proposal to Rename the Honors Program to an Honors College-  
   E-5 Resolution  
   G-1 Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council  

Secretary to the Faculty
hickeym@pdx.edu  • 650MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4624
## FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

### 2013-14 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer… Leslie McBride  
Presiding Officer Elect… Bob Liebman; Past Presiding Officer… Rob Daasch  
Secretary…..Martha W. Hickey  
David Hansen *ex officio*, Chair, Committee on Committees, Maude Hines, *ex officio*, IFS Representative

****2013-14 FACULTY SENATE (63)****

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Others (9)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Banion, Liane</td>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Faaleava, Toeutu (for Hart)</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Karen</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Marcy</td>
<td>SHAC</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Luther, Christina</td>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccar, Cindy</td>
<td>EMSA</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll, Becki</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popp, Karen</td>
<td>OGS</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skaruppa, Cindy</td>
<td>EMSA</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Administration (4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pullman, Madeleine</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Hansen, David</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layzell, David</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loney, Jennifer</td>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†McElhone, Dorothy</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigelman, Nicole</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Dannelle</td>
<td>ED-CI</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Michael</td>
<td>ED-POL</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†McElhone, Dorothy</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eng. &amp; Comp. Science (6)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>†Recktenwald, Gerald</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tretheway, Derek</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurk, Lisa</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertini, Robert</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karavanici, Karen</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine &amp; Performing Arts (4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magaldi, Karin</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendl, Nora</td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Boas, Pat</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin, Corey</td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAS – Arts and Letters (9)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friedberg, Nila</td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Greenstadt, Amy</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaen-Portillo, Isabel</td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolidon, Annabelle</td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Robert</td>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese, Susan</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAS – Sciences (8)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lafferriere, Gerardo</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parra, Jeremy (for Works)</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Bleiler, Steven (for Burns)</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eppley, Sarah</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez, Erik</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daescu, Dacian</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, Linda</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Ruetter, John</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAS – Social Sciences (7)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liebman, Robert</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Bluffstone, Randall</td>
<td>ECON</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brower, Barbara</td>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAnda, Roberto</td>
<td>CHLT</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu, ChiaYin</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckett, Thomas</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padin, Jose</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library (1)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>†Beasley, Sarah</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Instructional (1)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>†*Carpenter, Rowanna (for Jhaj)</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work (4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talbott, Maria</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†*Taylor, Michael (Pewewardy)</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holliday, Mindy</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrell, Victoria</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Public Affairs (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Labissiere, Yves (for Newsom)</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelmon, Sherril</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Clucas, Richard</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodowicz, Gary</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carder, Paula</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farquhar, Stephanie</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Date: April 7, 2014; New Senators in italics  
* Interim appointments  
† Member of Committee on Committees
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, March 3, 2014

Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Baccar, Bleiler, Bluffstone, Boas, Brodowicz, Brower, Carder, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, De Anda, Dolidon, Epbley, Farquhar, Friedberg, Gelmon, George, Greenstadt, Griffin, Hansen, Hsu, Hunt, Ingersoll, Jaen-Portillo, Kennedy, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, Mercer, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Pullman, Recktenwald, Reese, Rigelman, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Stevens, Talbott, Tretheway, Wendel, Works, Zurk

Alternates Present: Bowman for Beasley, McNames for Bertini, Schrock for Carder (after 4 pm), Blekic for Carpenter, Goodluck for Holliday, Raffo for Layzell, Elzanowski for Lafferriere (after 4 pm), Kelley for McElhone, De La Vega for Smith

Members Absent: Chrzanowska-Jeske, Faaleava, Karavanic, O’Banion, Skaruppa, Taylor

Ex-officio Members Present: Andrews, Aylmer, Bowman, Cunliffe, Everett, Fallon, Fink, Gould, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, Labissiere, Maier, McElhone, Maier, Rueter, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The February 3, 2014 minutes were approved as published. [Secretary’s correction: Chrzanowska-Jeske was present.]

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIDE noted that Senate does not have to end at 5:00 pm; it may continue until it loses its quorum. If loss of quorum happens when a matter is being voted on, Senate Bylaws require that the meeting resume on the following Monday. She also announced that reports from the three Officers of the Administration would begin as scheduled at 4:00 pm, but with the President’s Report offered last.

MCBRIDE reported that administrators and faculty were working together to make sure that the proposed revisions to the P&T Guidelines to add new Non-Tenure-Track Faculty ranks met the needs of all faculty. Talks were progressing well and with much good will. The Senate will have the opportunity to run through any changes.
Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

CHABON noted on-going efforts to conduct a fair, acceptable, documented, and verifiable CPL process that honors student prior learning and upholds the integrity of the PCU curriculum and degree. She reminded senators that PSU already awards three of five types of CPL (see slide 1, minutes attachment B1), and invited faculty to contribute to the discussion and to stay informed about the process through their dedicated web site: https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/home

CHABON introduced Cindy Baccar, head of the CPL Policy Working Group, to preview a Statement of nine specific policies for guiding the award of CPL credit at PSU (see slides 3-14, minutes attachment B1).

BACCAR noted that the Working Group included the chairs of EPC, ARC, SSC, and UCC, and that one of the key presumptions behind the CPL policy proposals was that each academic unit will control what CPL credit is appropriate for its discipline and courses. This policy is intended to address concerns voiced in focus groups about the quality of what is transcripted and workload.

MCBRIDE stated that the Policy Statement would be voted on at the April meeting. She encouraged senators to talk to members of their districts about the proposal.

GOULD announced that the EPC would bring a proposal to rename the Honors Program as an Honors College to the Senate for a vote at the April meeting: https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/66405835/13%2014%20Academic%20Units%20Centers%20Institutes

BOWMAN, chair of the Budget Committee, reminded senators that they can send questions about the All Funds Budget and are welcome to serve on the sub-committee that will review it. GREENSTADT asked what kind of questions had been or could be asked. BOWMAN said all questions were welcome.

Discussion item: Setting Academic Priorities—Looking Beyond the Budget (part 2).

MCBRIDE introduced Steering Committee member Karin Magaldi, to provide some context for further discussion of the academic priorities question introduced at the February meeting. She reminded senators that one reason for the discussion item was so that the Steering Committee could be more pro active in its work.

MAGALDI recalled Lynn Santelmann’s earlier presentation on Academic Priorities (see February 2014 Minutes, B3). She revisited PSU’s “Vision Statement” and priorities and goals from PSU’s current Strategic Plan and encouraged senators to think more specifically about how these themes align with our academic goals and priorities. She noted the tension that seems to have arisen between two of the goals of the Strategic Plan, one aiming for student success and the other for budgetary and curricular efficiencies. (See slides, minutes attachment B2.) She asked senators to
consider what actions Senate could recommend to define and support academic priorities.

MCBRIDE moved the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 3:38 to 3:51 pm.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in “E.1.a-c” were ADOPTED as published. [Secretary’s note: Courses listed as E.1.b.1-3 were approved with E.2; and E.1.c.9 and 10 should read 5 to 4 credits, not 4 to 3.]

2. Proposal for Undergraduate and Graduate Certificates in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in the School of Business Administration

MAIER noted that the recommended Certificates would be granted by a fully online program; there were three separate certificates: undergraduate, graduate and non-credit. The proposal includes three new 400/500 level courses.

RUETER/BLEILER MOVED to APPROVE the Certificates proposed in “E2.”

BLUFFSTONE asked what mix of tenure and non-tenure track faculty would teach the courses. CUNLIFFE asked one of the sponsors of the proposal Cindy Cooper, Director of Impact Entrepreneurs (SBA), to address questions from Senators. COOPER said the mix would meet accreditation standards and involve tenure-line faculty in developing content. LUCKETT asked how many were expected to complete the certificate. COOPER said 25 to 35 per year, once the program was fully launched. RUETER asked for confirmation that the vote was on both the Proposal and the courses listed in E.1.c. MAIER confirmed. _______ asked if only participants could take the courses offered. MAIER said enrollment was open. MACCORMACK noted that undergraduate certificates can only be awarded to students upon graduation from PSU; he asked if the program wanted to include non-PSU undergraduates? COOPER hoped there was a way that obstacle could be overcome, given the level of outside interest.

LAFERIERE asked if tenure lines would be added to support the program in the future. MAIER said courses would be run by current faculty. RUETER thought that the certificate would generate new student credit hours. EVERETT noted that students with Bachelors degrees could receive the Graduate-level certificate since it would be a stand-alone program. REESE asked what the common credit count was for a certificate. EVERETT replied 16 to 24 credits. GREENSTADT asked for confirmation that the program required no additional faculty. COOPER confirmed.
THE MOTION to APPROVE the Certificates in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in the School of Business Administration PASSED, 45 in favor, 5 opposed, 3 abstentions. [Recorded by “clicker.”]

[Secretary’s note: items E.3 & E4 were discussed after Reports from Administrators.]

3. EPC recommendation on the proposed Academic Program Review Policy

MCBRIDE noted that after the Policy had failed to pass in February, EPC had taken input and was now prepared to reintroduce a revised proposal.

BLEILER requested that the chair confirm that there was still a quorum present. The quorum was confirmed.

GOULD reminded Senators that a review policy and a report on its status was mandated by NWCCU, the University’s accreditor: The proposed Policy on Academic Program Review is distinct from program array review. He added that the EPC was making a commitment to come back to the Senate during Spring or Fall term with a report on the Review Guidelines referenced in the Policy that are currently being beta tested. Today’s vote would be limited to the Policy itself.

GOULD then highlighted elements of the Policy that had be rewritten to address the concerns raised during the February discussion: 1) The definition of academic unit has been clarified in section IV to make it clear that units like University Studies were included; 2) Guidelines referenced in III. 2 are now “linked,” rather than incorporated; 3) VI.5 states that colleges are expected to cover the cost of review, and 4) the wording of VIII. 2-6 was amended to ensure more flexible criteria for external reviewers.

/LUCKETT MOVED to A the revised Academic Review Policy

WENDEL asked whether departments will be able to use their professional accreditation review documents and plans. HARMON said that the process was designed so that some of the information from accreditation reviews could be incorporated in the PSU Academic Program Review. GOULD clarified that Steve Harmon was the Policy’s editor. RUETER requested the floor for Cathy de Rivera (ESM), who spoke in support of the review policy as a practice that can provide an extremely valuable road map for academic programs. DELAVEGA (for SMITH) noted that the GSE already has two external bodies reviewing its programs; she asked if it would now be required to complete a third external review? HARMON said yes, PSU’s goals would differ from the accreditation review, but the intent was not to make the process onerous.

The Motion to ADOPT the proposed Academic Review Policy, as published in “E3.” PASSED: 37 in favor, 5 opposed, 3 abstentions [recorded by “clicker.”]
4. Proposal to Ratify the Bylaws of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS)

HINES announced that the Bylaws had recently been changed, and IFS was asking that the Faculty Senate of each member campus ratify the changes.

REESE/RUETER MOVED to RATIFY the Bylaws of IFS in “E.4.”

The MOTION to RATIFY the IFS Bylaws PASSED: 31 in favor, 1 opposed, 6 abstentions. [Recorded by “clicker.”]

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report [delivered after Vice President Fink’s Report]

WIEWEL announced that the PSU Board of Trustees will meet March 12 to take up the 2015-17 budget. The Board has formed three sub-committees--Academic Affairs, Finance Administration and Audit. The campus Public Safety Task Force has issued its report and plans a public forum April 30; the Senate will be asked to comment. The PSU Office of Advancement will merge with the Portland State Foundation and be headed by Vice President Francoise Aylmer. WIEWEL noted that the Portland City Council is discussing a proposal from Mayor Hales to abolish the Education Urban Renewal District, while providing PSU with other resources.

WIEWEL expressed his concern about the state of labor negotiations and PSU-AAUP’s declaration of impasse, reading a prepared statement (see minutes attachment B3).

PADIN objected to the third-person reference to the Union, as though it were not constituted from the faculty itself. WIEWEL said he did not understand PADIN’s comment.

Provost’s Report


ANDREWS provided an overview of progress on the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines revisions. She has been working together with faculty to provide the right
distinctions between titles and ranks, and clear definitions and career ladders. On January 22 she let the Senate Steering Committee know she had some additional recommendation. At their suggestion she next met with the co-chairs of the Revision Committee (Freels and Liebman). At that meeting on February 12, with McBride, Hickey, Mack, and Reese also attending, there was consensus on what to change and what not to change. Steering Committee was briefed on February 17 regarding what had been accomplished and was told that Liebman, Hickey, and Andrews would reconvene to go complete the process. That was accomplished on February 27, with the exception of an addendum that Hickey [and Liebman] are preparing to outline options for grandfathered NTTF.

ANDREWS objected to characterization of her recommendations as a massive redlining of the document: Ninety percent of the “red lines” consisted in striking the repetitive verbatim the text of the OARs and substituting a reference to them in the document, she stated. Other changes were primarily for the sake of clarity. ANDREWS said that she understood it was important to keep the references to the OARs in the document. She stressed that the Provost cannot unilaterally create Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; this is a shared governance process. There will be consultation with the Senate on issues when she does not concur. It is an iterative process. The goal is to bring the Guidelines back to the Senate for review in April.

STEVEN: Have you put back the OAR references or left them out?

ANDREWS: We put them back in. We will just add a sentence that states the PSU Board of Trustees will be the successor of those rules.

STEVEN: It would be nice to have a table of contents for the document.

GREENSTADT: Questions have arisen about the status of Senate actions. Senate is supposed to be making decisions based on best practices rather than immediate economic concerns. How can the Senate’s roll be protected, if it is only making recommendations?

ANDREWS: I would not classify it as “only” making recommendations. The Senate generates policies, but shared governance means there needs to be a dialogue--where the Administration can say we have some questions about this, or we propose this change. I hope that the P&T revision process and the Program Array Review are providing examples of how this process can move towards mutual consent.

LUCKETT: My biggest problem with the proposed ranks is that we still have no idea what salaries might be attached. I am hoping for some kind of guidance relatively soon.

ANDREWS: It is really important for us to be able to identify these ranks, but the P&T Guidelines, as a document, has nothing to do with salary levels.

ANDREWS concluded her report with a preview of SARA, a State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement, that she would seek Senate comment on in April. SARA will make it easier for students in Oregon and other states to take online courses. This authorization will allow PSU to avoid the necessity of obtaining permission from each individual state to offer students of that state access to PSU online courses. Its
requirement that PSU meet the standards of the Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education is one that PSU already meets, under the requirements of our accreditors (NWCCU). ANDREWS noted her role in developing the national policy and her membership on the WICHE Steering Committee that will review applications for SARA membership. (See slides, minutes attachment B4.)

Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships [1:30]

FINK drew attention to the Report on International Research at PSU that had been disseminated as an attachment to the February minutes and the Quarterly Report on the ORSP web site. He announced that ORSP was initiating three research excellence awards to honor faculty, one for junior faculty, one for senior, and one for research faculty. He reported that research universities in Oregon are collaborating to upgrade technology infrastructure and have released an RFP for design of a ten-year “road map” for technology in Oregon. FINK also provided data showing the decline of post-doctoral employment at PSU, illustrating the relative disadvantage for faculty at PSU because of the extra cost of PERS (see slide 1, minutes attachment B5). He reported that the new category of Post-doctoral Fellow approved at the February Senate meeting, a critical step for those who want to go on to academic careers, had been questioned by AAUP and was now on hold. He recommended that those interested in the issue talk to their Union representative to try to get some clarity on it.

LIEBMAN stated that AAUP did no more than request a legal finding as to whether the new position is in compliance with PERS law, or requires a special exemption from the Legislature. FINK asked if it was AAUP’s practice to look at every law to find problems. LIEBMAN said that AAUP was concerned with safeguards for workers and asked what the practice for post docs was in other PERS states. FINK asked what benefit was provided to current post docs. LEIBMAN suggested if the law could be changed to allow for earlier vesting, or portability, all would benefit. He requested a written legal opinion stating that the position was appropriate. FINK wondered if the question was being raised because of AAUP’s loss of 9 post-doc members. LIEBMAN pointed out that the loss represented 9 positions out of 1250, and that the question diminished the important advocacy role that AAUP played. He declared that if Fink could provide a legal finding that the position could be created under Oregon law, then the Senate should be convinced. FINK said okay.

ZURK thought all were in agreement that post docs do not benefit from the current arrangement and asked if the administration could propose a satisfactory way forward. FINK said that it was an HR issue. LIEBMAN agreed that it was a question of how to go forward legally. EPPLEY said she sponsored the proposal because it concerns a lot of scientists at PSU; they did not want to override rights, but want to fix the problems of the current system. ANDREWS stated that she had transmitted to the Senate that the Administration concurs with the recommendation and was looking into how to implement it.

PADIN ask if we knew what the range of probable causes was for the decline in post docs at PSU, noting that one factor might be offers that were not competitive. FINK replied that this was a good question, noting that funding has also gone done in the last few years. EPPLEY stated that funding in Biology has remained constant, but
faculty have decided that given the extra cost of post docs, there are better ways to spend the money.

**Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee**

MCBRIDE accepted the report in “G-1” and thanked the Committee.

GOULD requested that senators share ideas or models for how to coordinate with student governance, and he noted that the Honors College Proposal could be found in the PSU Curriculum Tracker.

**Report of the Academic Prioritization Ad hoc Committee** [addition to the agenda]

JONES, member of the Academic Prioritization Ad hoc Committee appointed by the Advisory Council, announced the committee's membership: Shelly Chabon (Assoc. Dean, CLAS), Jonathan Fink (VP, RSP), Kris Henning (CUPA), Mark Jones (MCECS), DeLys Ostlund (CLAS), and Barbara Sestak (COTA). Steve Harmon (OAA) will provide support.

JONES reported that the Committee had met three times. He gave an overview of their charge and plan for laying the groundwork for a program prioritization review, and discussed what was and was not within the scope of their work. (See slides, minutes attachment B6.) Their focus would be on a process specific to PSU and on academic programs, in particular. The Committee envisions a three-step process that begins with “assessment”—taking a look at the mission and goals of the University in order to develop an understanding of the organization and what it has to offer. The second step would launch an “analysis” based on the understanding gained. This would enable the third step—planning that might result in changes and involve the “oversight” of faculty governance. (See slides, minutes attachment B6.) The Committee sees the purpose of such a review as “taking stock” of who we are so that decision-making does not occur in a vacuum, and so that we will have the ability to respond strategically to proposed re-allocations of resources. JONES said Committee members would welcome faculty input and feedback. They have a short time line. A report is due to Senate in April.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.
Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

The Five Types of CPL—awarded at PSU
1. Challenge Exams (administered by individual departments)
2. Credit-by-exam (AP, IB and CLEP exam scores)
3. Credit for Military service/training (ACE)
4. Portfolio based assessment (approved by Faculty Senate in 2005)
5. Industry Certifications (credit for completion of recognized industry training & certification programs)

Policies Work Group

Visit our Project Site: sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3

Cindy Baccar, RO
Rachel Cunliffe, Chair UCC
Robert Gould, Chair EPC
Becki Ingersoll, ACS & ARC
Alan MacCormack, Chair ARC
Deanna Smith, Financial Aid
Liane O’Banion, Chair SSC

Purpose of Motion

• Adopt CPL Academic Policy Statement
  – Includes set of 9 specific academic policies to guide award of CPL
  – Addresses how CPL will be
    • officially recorded on transcripts
    • treated with respect to various degree requirements
    • limited or restricted

Process Used to Arrive at these Recommendations

• Policy Committee — included chairs of EPC, UCC, ARC, SSC — vetted with their committee members.
• Reviewed with Honors Council.
• Reviewed EAB and HECC best practices research
• Reviewed emerging HECC standards
• Informed by Faculty Focus Groups
**Key Presumptions**

- Each academic unit, as designated by course prefix, will determine whether any of the CPL types are appropriate for courses within it’s discipline.
- Presumes necessary administrative support and resources will be available to guide the students and the departments through the process.

**Policy Recommendation #1:**

Which courses are eligible for CPL?

CPL can be awarded for any discrete numbered course in any subject area that PSU offers, including course numbers 100-level through 400-level, at departmental discretion. CPL cannot be awarded in subject areas/academic disciplines that PSU does not offer.

**Policy Recommendation #2:**

How will CPL be recorded on PSU official transcript?

- AP, IB, CLEP and MIL credit, like transfer credit, will not be included on the official PSU transcript.
- PSU Exam and Portfolio credit, like institutional credit, will be included on the official PSU transcript.

**Policy Recommendation #3:**

How will CPL be graded?

- CPL is limited to Pass only grading.
- If the CPL review process results in a non-award of credit, no record will be entered on the transcript.
- PLA portfolio and PSU Exam credit will be counted in the current 45 credit P/NP limit.
- AP, CLEP, IB and MIL credits will continue to be exempt from the 45 credit P/NP limit.
Policy Recommendation #4: Can CPL be used to repeat a D or F grade?

CPL cannot be used to repeat (i.e., replace the GPA effect) of a D or F grade.

Policy Recommendation #5: Does CPL count in meeting the PSU residence credit requirement?

CPL will not count toward the necessary residence credits, nor will it interrupt the calculation of the requirement that "45 of the last 60 credits must be at PSU".

Policy Recommendation #6: Are there limitations on degree applicability within the major or UNST?

CPL can be used in all areas of the baccalaureate degree requirements, unless it is restricted in a major by a particular academic unit.

Policy Recommendation #7: Are there any admission & enrollment status requirements?

• AP/IB/CLEP/MIL credit will be evaluated and awarded as transfer credit at the time of admission, prior to matriculation/enrollment.
• PSU Exam credit requires the student to be admitted and matriculated/enrolled.
• PLA, portfolio based CPL requires the students to be admitted, matriculated/enrolled, and in good academic standing.
Policy Recommendation #8: Does CPL credit count in establishing UNST placement?

- PSU Exam and Portfolio type PLA credit will not be used to establish UNST placement.
- AP/IB/CLEP/MIL type CPL credit will continue to be used to establish UNST placement.

Policy Recommendation #9: Is there a limit on the amount of CPL that can be awarded to a student?

There is no limit on the number of CPL credits a student can be awarded, although there are limitations on the number of credits that will be applied to the degree based on previous policy limitations, including P-grading limits in #3 and PSU Residency requirements in #7 above. PLA portfolio and PSU Exam credit is limited to 45 credits combined.
Academic Priorities: Looking Beyond the Budget Part II
Faculty Senate Discussion
March 3, 2014

PSU Vision
Portland State’s vision is to become:
- an internationally recognized urban university known for excellence in student learning,
- innovative research,
- and community engagement that contributes to the economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and quality of life in the Portland region and beyond

Strategic Plan Priority/Theme 2
- Priority/Theme 2: Improve Student Success: Ensure a student experience that results in higher graduation rates, retention, satisfaction and engagement.
  - Goal 2.4: Expand and improve assessment activities in line with best practices to improve student learning and meet accreditation expectations.
  - Goal 2.6: Produce graduates who can succeed and be leaders in a global community.

Strategic Plan Priority/Theme 5
- Priority/Theme 5: Expand resources in each of the funding streams (state, private, business partnerships, research, and tuition), manage resources effectively, engage employees, and match investments to strategic priorities.
  - Goal 5.1: Refine and begin to implement a new strategic budget model for the university.
  - Goal 5.2: Foster curricular and administrative efficiency and effectiveness.
Discussion questions

What does this mean in terms of academic priorities. Or in other words: What are our academic goals? Do they align with the strategic plan or do they diverge?

Discussion Aim

What action steps can Senate recommend as a result of our discussions this Feb. and March? (Action step ideas will then be discussed in Steering for consideration and refinement.) We’re looking for concrete suggestions that can guide future Senate initiatives.
Now for an update on negotiations with AAUP. As I'm sure all of you know, the union declared an impasse last week. I have to admit I was quite disappointed as it appeared substantial progress was being made in one-on-one meetings between Mary King and Carol Mack.

We value the excellent and hard work of our faculty and are committed to a fair and equitable contract that recognizes faculty's critical contributions while being cognizant of the university's financial realities. The University bargaining team made a new offer on Friday that is posted on the OAA website for anyone who would like to see the details. I encourage all of you to review the proposal yourselves, rather than to rely on second- and third-hand information. Both teams will be presenting thei
d final offers this afternoon, which will initiate the 30-day-cooling off period during which negotiations will continue. Once the 30-day period is up, and in the unlikely event we do not come to agreement, the union can call a strike and the University can implement its final offer.

I want to focus for a moment on an area of concern I know you share, and that is the impact on our students. Rumors have been spread suggesting that spring term and graduation will be cancelled in the event of a strike. This rumor has had a negative effect on students, some of whom have sought services at SHAC and talked to others to deal with the resulting anxiety. I want to assure everyone that our priority – just as yours - will be to ensure our students remain on track with their courses. Registration for spring term continues per usual and classes will open as scheduled on March 31. As an additional means to provide certainty and stability for our students, the University last week offered to extend the expiring contract through April 30. Unfortunately, the union declined.

I want to thank everyone in advance for your patience as we go through this process. I have instructed the University bargaining team to continue to make itself available to spend as much time as necessary to negotiate an acceptable resolution, and to request that both bargaining teams sit down promptly to do so. I am confident we will arrive at a settlement. In the meantime, we will continue to move forward with the business of serving our students and our community.

Thank you.
SARA: State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement

Actions:
I will look to getting Senate input at your April meeting

Bottom line for PSU
• SARA is a positive direction for us to take
• SARA will make it easier for PSU and for students living in other states to take online courses offered by PSU

What is it?
• An agreement between states that will allow their residents reciprocity to take online course in each other’s state

Problems it addresses
• PSU now separately needs approvals (state authorization) in each state and territory (54) where we wish to enroll students in our online classes
• States and territories have varying requirements for regulating out-of-state institutions
• PSU at present prohibits students from Arkansas and Minnesota from enrolling in any PSU on line course
• The process is inefficient

How it works
• Administered by the four regional higher education compacts
• Once states are approved, they can begin to enroll eligible institutions who apply.
• SARA is voluntary for states and institutions.
What does PSU need to do to join?

- Oregon needs to join WICHE SARA (SB 1525).
- Only states can be members of SARA.
- Once Oregon joins SARA, PSU can decide to apply to be recognized under Oregon’s SARA.

for PSU to be recognized by SARA:

- Must be a U.S. degree-granting institution that is accredited by an accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education.
- Agree to the Oregon SARA that we will abide by the Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education as set forth in SARA policy 5(2) 1-9. (Already a part of accreditation guidelines for regionally accredited institutions.) Handout provided.

The decision we have to make as a university

- Status Quo—continue to apply as a single institution to 54 states and territories for authorization.
- Join SARA (http://nc-sara.org/)

Proposed next steps

- Information session on SARA on Thursday March 20, 11-12 at the Office of Academic Innovation (SMSU 209M).
- In this session participants will learn more about the SARA approach, process and implications. There will be plenty of opportunity for Q&A.
- Faculty can register via http://www.pdx.edu/oai/calendar
- April Senate Meeting: respond to any questions and get your input.
Research and Strategic Partnerships

1) Publication data Powerpoint
2) Second RSP Quarterly Update on RSP website
3) Three Research Excellence Awards
4) Information Technology Roadmap RFP released
5) Rapid decline in number of post-docs at PSU

Research Excellence Awards

- Up to three Research Excellence Awards may be given each year.
- Junior Faculty Research Excellence Award for assistant or associate tenure track professor
- Senior Faculty Research Excellence Award for full professor
- Research Faculty Research Excellence Award for non-tenure track faculty member
- Each award is for $1500 taxable cash prize
Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee

Presentation to Faculty Senate
March 3, 2014

Committee Charge

Develop the initial groundwork for how PSU will conduct its academic program prioritization process

Committee Charge

Develop the initial groundwork for how PSU will conduct its academic program prioritization process

Committee Charge

Develop the initial groundwork for how PSU will conduct its academic program prioritization process

“Program Array Review”

not to be confused with “Academic Program Review”
Program Array Review

Why do we need a process like this?

This is about taking stock, developing a university-wide understanding of who we are and what we do.

Without it, we risk:
- Decision making in a vacuum
- Stagnation, inability to respond & reallocate resources
Plan of Work

Specifics of Charge
1. Identify and investigate approaches used at other universities (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators)
2. Recommend a framework for PSU
3. Determine a timeline and representation on subsequent committee(s)
4. Provide a definition for what constitutes a program and the scope of the review

Also in Scope
Discussion of values:
Shared governance, Transparency, Trust, …
Distinguishing/unique characteristics of PSU

Beyond our Scope
Selection of assessment criteria
Identifying specific data that will be required
(and establishing mechanisms to obtain it)

Timeline
Feb 18: Committee formed
Mar 3: Initial presentation to Senate
Apr 7: Final recommendations to Senate
May 5: Steering/Provost present formal charge for working committee(s) to begin the assessment process

We want your input!
Shelly Chabon
Professor & Associate Dean, CLAS
chabonr@pdx.edu
Jon Fink
Vice President, Research and Strategic Partnerships
jon.fink@pdx.edu
Kris Henning
Professor, Criminology and Criminal Justice, CUPA
khenning@pdx.edu
Mark Jones
Professor, Computer Science, MCECS
mpj@pdx.edu
DeLys Ostlund
Professor of Spanish, World Lang. & Lit, CLAS
delys@pdx.edu
Barbara Sestak
Professor, Architecture, COTA
sestakb@pdx.edu
Steve Harmon
Curriculum Coordinator, Academic Affairs
harmons@pdx.edu
March 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.1
• MS in Systems Science – change to existing program; add coursework-only option
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

College of Urban and Public Affairs

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.2
• MPH in Health Management and Policy – change in existing program, change core course and total credit hours
  FSBC comments: No negative budget impact
E.1.a.3
• PhD in Urban Studies – change in existing program; add new specialization area
  FSBC comments: The proposal "is adding text to the description of the PhD program allowing an Environmental specialization. The proposal states that they already have faculty with research activity in this area. While I am not sure of the exact overlap, it appears from the description that there are faculty in CLAS and Engineering working on related topics as well (natural resource management, environmental protection and quality). So I tend to believe the assessment of minimal additional resource requirements. It appears to me that this is a catalog change that reflects a capability already created by a pattern of recruiting over the past several years."
March 6, 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

New courses
E.1.b.1
• CE 485/585  Environmental Cleanup and Restoration, 4 credits
  Survey of procedures for evaluating risks posed by hazardous waste sites and the cleanup steps that lead to an acceptable restoration of such sites. Topics include U.S. environmental law and regulation, site investigations, risk assessment, and a focus on actual case studies, many in Portland and the Pacific Northwest. Prerequisites: junior standing, CE 371 or equivalent.

School of Business Administration

New Courses
E.1.b.2
• MKTG 437/537  Athletic & Outdoor Product Planning, 4 credits
  Provides insight into the product planning process for apparel, footwear, and hard goods in the athletic and outdoor industry. Provides an overview and hands on group project experience of ideating, creating, producing, merchandising, marketing and delivering a product to market. Prerequisites: BA 311.
March 6, 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](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com) and looking in the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**School of Business Administration**

*COURSE E.1.c.1 IS REMOVED FROM THE CURRICULAR CONSENT AGENDA:*
It will be voted on as part of item **E.2 SBA Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Entrepreneurship**

**New Courses**

E.1.c.1.
- Fin 310 Entrepreneurial Finance and Accounting (4)
  Introduction to the fundamental concepts of entrepreneurial finance and accounting. Covers the financial aspects of developing, financing, planning, managing, valuing and assessing new business ventures. Equips students with the quantitative, financial and accounting skills required to successfully develop, finance and manage a new venture.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**Changes to Existing Courses**

E.1.c.2.

E.1.c.3.
- Mktg 466 Principles of International Marketing – change prerequisites.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Changes to Existing Programs**

E.1.c.4.
- BA in World Languages and Literatures: Spanish – changes list of sequential courses allowed for language, literature, and culture credits. **FSBC comments:** Adding Span 344 and Span 345 to the 300-level options. New course proposed, Span 345. No new FTE requested. Courses will be covered by reallocating existing resources.
New Courses

E.1.c.5.
- ChLa 325 Mexican American/Chicano History I, 1492-1900 (4)
  Mexican American/Chicano/a history from the conquest of the Americas to 1900 with an emphasis on empire, civil rights, identity, culture, sexuality, and war. This is the same course as Hst 325 and may be taken only once for credit.

E.1.c.6.
- ChLa 326 Mexican American/Chicano History II, 1900-Present (4)
  Mexican American/Chicano/a history from 1900 to the present with an emphasis on migration, ethnicity, labor, civil rights, identity, and culture. This is the same course as Hst 326 and may be taken only once for credit.

E.1.c.7.
- Eng 325 Postcolonial Literature (4)
  Introduction to key texts, themes, issues, and approaches in postcolonial literature and theory.

E.1.c.8.
- ESM 150 Orientation to Environmental Sciences and Management (1)
  Self-paced online orientation that covers: virtual tour of PSU and ESM facilities, surveys of the two degrees, pre-requisite courses, UNST or Honors, Career Center, graduate programs, internships, creating a portfolio, student interviews, and steps to getting started.

E.1.c.9.
- Hst 325 Mexican American/Chicano History I, 1492-1900 (4)
  Mexican American/Chicano/a history from the Conquest of the Americas to 1900 with an emphasis on empire, civil rights, identity, culture, sexuality, and war. This is the same course as ChLa 325 and may be taken only once for credit.

E.1.c.10.
- Hst 326 Mexican American/Chicano History II, 1900-Present (4)
  Mexican American/Chicano/a history from 1900 to the present with an emphasis on migration, ethnicity, labor, civil rights, identity, and culture. This is the same course as ChLa 326 and may be taken only once for credit.

E.1.c.11.
- Span 345 Present-Day Cultural and Literary Expression (4)
  Study of contemporary Spanish and/or Hispanic American literary practices, works, and new media and works in global and digital contexts. Prerequisites: Span 303, Span 340.

E.1.c.12.
- SySc 332 Introduction to Agent-Based Modeling (4)
  At the crossroads of biology, ecology, economics, philosophy, and artificial intelligence, this course introduces Agent-Based Modeling: a new computer-based approach that’s grounded in the perspective that the complex macro-level patterns we observe in social systems are emergent from decentralized and self-organizing micro-level interaction among agents following simple and localized rules.

E.1.c.13.
- SySc 334 Modeling Social-Ecological Systems (4)
  Understanding social and ecological cycles and the interaction between social and ecological systems is essential for making human actions more sustainable. This course uses ideas from UNEP’s Green Economy Initiative and an easy-to-learn computer modeling approach called System Dynamics to explore the interaction between and dynamics within social-ecological systems.

Changes in Existing Courses

E.1.c.14.
- Bi 343 Genes and Society (4) – change course number to Bi 346.

E.1.c.15.
E.1c.16.
• Span 340 Fundamentals of Spanish Literary Studies (4) – drop.

School of Social Work

Change to Existing Program
E.1c.17.
• BA/BS in Social Work – Add additional course SW 460 Senior Integrated Portfolio (3) to program requirements.

College of Urban and Public Affairs

New Courses
E.1c.18.
• PA 430 Recruitment of Volunteers (2)
  This course takes a marketing approach to volunteerism. Interactive activities and discussion build on applying basic principles of volunteerism; examining different styles of volunteering; building a recruiting plan; examining marketing for volunteers; and managing recruitment. Assignments are interactive and designed to build applicable skills. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

E.1c.19.
• PA 431 Training of Volunteers (2)
  This course engages students in organizing training and continuing education sessions for volunteers. Topics include: how adults learn, learning styles, building content, measureable learning objectives, selecting the best teaching techniques, and evaluation of learning. Assignments are interactive designed to build skills directly applicable to a manager of volunteers program. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

E.1c.20.
• PA 432 Leadership and Management of Volunteer Programs (2)
  The healthy organization aligns support for staff who work with volunteers, makes volunteers an integral part of all work, provides staff development, and rewards staff accomplishments related to work with volunteers. In this course students will gain an understanding of the impact of communication style and leadership on volunteer programs. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

E.1c.21.
• PA 433 Evaluation and Recognition of Volunteer Programs (2)
  Students are exposed to evaluation methods, types, and styles for programs and for individual volunteers. Motivational theories are connected to the effectiveness of different type of recognition. Assignments are interactive and designed to build skills directly applicable to a manager of volunteers program. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

College of the Arts

New Courses
E.1c.22.
• Mus 363 The Music of the Beatles (4)
  Study of the development of the Beatles’ music from the late 1950’s through the early 1970’s. Students will gain a deeper understanding of the music through elementary musical analysis of form, harmony, and recording studio techniques. The cultural context from which their music emerged and their significant influence on popular culture will be examined.
March 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rachel Cunliffe  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of UCC for Faculty Senate

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is 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.

School of Business Administration

New Program
• Undergraduate Certificate in Entrepreneurship (Summary attached)

FSBC comments: The cost of teaching the new class is an additional cost. SBA will pay for this from the revenue generated by the class. However, the enrollment in this class will come from other junior cluster courses, so this will redistribute SCH from other cluster courses in other colleges/schools.

INCLUDES NEW COURSE PROPOSAL:  
E.1.c.1. Fin 310 Entrepreneurial Finance and Accounting (4)

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Overview:
While entrepreneurship curriculum, concentrations and majors exist at the majority of business schools around the country, PSU is uniquely positioned to draw on the Portland ethos of a do-it-yourself, craftsmanship-oriented, and sustainably-minded approach to business. Historically, the University of Oregon has emphasized technology-based entrepreneurship in its programs, and Oregon State University has emphasized family business. PSU’s differentiated approach to entrepreneurship has focused on inclusiveness. While high-tech and family-run businesses are included, so is the area of Social Entrepreneurship. PSU has been the only Oregon university designated as an Ashoka U Changemaker Campus in recognition of its leadership in Social Entrepreneurship. Fewer than 25 leading universities around the country have received this designation (http://ashokau.org/programs/changemaker-campus/). The structure of the Entrepreneurship Certificate will afford students a grounding in the fundamentals of
entrepreneurship while allowing them to choose an area of emphasis given the type of entrepreneurship they are drawn to.

**Evidence of Need:**
Oregon has been booming as an entrepreneurial hub as of late. In the University of Nebraska-Lincoln bureau of Business research (10/1/2012) Oregon has moved up four levels to be the sixth highest most favorably ranked state for Entrepreneurship. Portland has been experiencing a boom of incubators (our Portland State University Business Accelerator being one, with Nike+, Intel and Wieden+Kennedy supported PIE, and eight others). One of the incubators, TenX, (founded by Carolyn Duncan) was invited to speak at the White House (American economic Competitiveness Forum). Three Portland Start ups (Elemental Technologies, Act-On software, and Jama Software) were named on the Forbes 2013 list of the Most Promising Companies. Portland was ranked number five as a city of women entrepreneurs by NerdWallet, and number seven for young entrepreneurs (under30CEO).

However, in a 2011 report by the Portland Development Commission (Entrepreneurial scorecard: Portland, OR) they find fault with college attainment and state that, “Higher education is a vital asset in an innovation economy…. And Portland is playing catch-up with most of its peers…”.

There is considerable market demand, especially with Gen-Y. Per a 2013 study by PayScale and Millennial Branding, Entrepreneurship is the third most common major (following Neuroscience and Bioengineering). Arizona State University launched an entrepreneurship major in 2013 with the Director Sidnee Peck stating, “It was time to change the program because of changing economic conditions and the number of students interested and involved in the program,” adding, “A ripe and growing entrepreneurial community….has made it clear that students desire and will greatly benefit from the opportunity.”

Here at Portland State students have made it clear that they desire course work in entrepreneurship. We have a large and growing entrepreneurial community, as noted, we have a student E Club that has approximately 150 student members and over three hundred people signed up for the newsletter in the last year. Based on an informal sampling of the BA 101 and BA 301 courses (BA 101 & BA 301 student survey – Nobles, Eichelberger) when two hundred and eighty five students were asked the question “Why did you choose Business as a Major” (open ended question) the response tied for third was Entrepreneurship (following 1. Interest, 2. Career/job, and tied with “useful knowledge”).

**Program Objectives:**
The Entrepreneurship Certificate will be rooted in three disciplines: Management for the strategic conceptualization of value creation; Marketing for understanding the psychology and process behind engaging customers; and Finance for business model development and approaches to valuing startups and raising funds to support new venture launch. This interdisciplinary approach will achieve the following objectives:

- **To impart the fundamentals of entrepreneurship:** identifying market needs, conceptualizing approaches to fulfill those needs, researching potential avenues, assessing enduring business models, structuring the venture, raising funding for launch and sustained growth.
- **To support student-entrepreneurs in realizing their vision:** by offering a sequence of courses that will allow students to make appreciable progress on their own venture concept or that of a classmate, students will be able to experience the full process of venture creation. The students also will be plugged in with resources around campus that support entrepreneurship like the Lab2Market summer program.
- **To connect students with the entrepreneurial network at PSU and in Portland:** by expanding the students’ professional network, this will heighten their chances of success. One of the most valuable assets of an entrepreneur is her/his network. Because experienced entrepreneurs will serve as guest speakers and mentors for ventures coming out of this certificate, the students will broaden their networks. PSU’s Business Accelerator will serve as a resource for supporting the student
entrepreneurs and help them network with startups that are looking for interns with the toolset honed through the Certificate.

• **To contribute to the long-run success of our graduates:** whether running their own venture or spearheading “intrapreneurial” initiatives and innovations inside an established organization, our Certificate graduates will be empowered to chart their own career paths.

**Course of Study:**
Core Required Courses:
- MGMT 481- Entrepreneurship (4 credit hours)
- MKTG 338- Professional Selling (4 credit hours)
- FIN 310- Entrepreneurial Finance and Accounting (4 credit hours)

**Emphasis Areas:** (choose 2 additional courses from below; they do not have to be from the same emphasis area; all prerequisites must be met). Alternatively, students can select the 2 additional courses from external certificate programs in Athletic & Outdoor, Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship, the Business of Craft Brewing, or the Food Industry Management Certificate.

*Small/Family Business*
- MGMT 409 - Practicum: Small Business Consulting (Business Outreach Program) (4 credits)
- MGMT/MKTG/FIN 404 - Internship (including, but not limited to: Portland State Business Accelerator or with a BA 495 Capstone Client (4 credits).

*Innovation*
- MKTG 455- Technology Marketing (4 credits)
- MKTG 463- Service Innovation (4 credits)
- MGMT 410- Developing Creativity and Innovation in Business (4 credits)

Therefore, there will be a total of five courses completed for the certificate: three core and then two chosen by the student to tailor the experience to his/her interest.

**Cost:**
This Certificate comprises courses that are regularly offered in the School of Business, with the exception of one new course, Fin 310 Entrepreneurial Finance and Accounting. The Entrepreneurial Finance course will also be included in the new Design Thinking/ Innovation/ Entrepreneurship University Studies cluster, and therefore enrollment is expected to be robust.

We will work closely with PSU’s Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship to generate funds to support the services our student entrepreneurs will need, for example associated with website design, incorporation, and intellectual property management. These funds are expected to come through alumni donations and in-kind donations from service providers such as law firms and accounting firms in the region.

Competitions that are targeted at particular sectors, like PSU’s Clean Tech Challenge that ran earlier in 2012, and particular stages of the venture lifecycle, like pre-revenue elevator pitches, will also be high priorities for our fundraising activities. As noted previously, an SBA alumnus has pledged $10,000 annually to help get an early-stage PSU venture off the ground.
To: PSU Faculty Senate
From: Liane O’Banion, Chair of Scholastic Standards Committee
     Alan MacCormack, Chair of Academic Requirements Committee
     Robert Gould, Chair of Educational Policies Committee
     Rachel Cunliffe, Chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Re: Motion to Approve CPL Academic Policy Statement
Date: March 10, 2014

The motion being presented will clarify academic policies related to the official PSU transcript and use of CPL credit towards a PSU degree, in follow-up to the 2005 resolution approved by the Faculty Senate, whereby portfolio review type Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) was approved at PSU.

The SSC, ARC, EPC and UCC jointly present the following motion to the Faculty Senate:

MOTION: To approve the adoption of the CPL Academic Policy Statement, which includes the following nine academic policies:

### Policy Recommendation #1:
CPL can be awarded for any discrete numbered course in any subject area that PSU offers, including course numbers 100-level through 400-level, at departmental discretion. CPL cannot be awarded in subject areas/academic disciplines that PSU does not offer.

### Policy Recommendation #2:
Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and Military (MIL) credit, like transfer credit will not be included on the official PSU transcript. PSU Exam and Portfolio credit, like institutional credit will be included on the official PSU transcript.

### Policy Recommendation #3:
CPL is limited to Pass only grading. If the CPL review process results in a non-award of credit, no record will be entered on the transcript. Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) portfolio and PSU Exam credit will be counted in the current 45 credit P/NP limit. AP, CLEP, IB and MIL credits will continue to be exempt from the 45 credit P/NP limit.

### Policy Recommendation #4:
CPL for a course for which a student has previously earned a D or F does not remove the prior grade from the calculation of the GPA.
**Policy Recommendation #5:**
CPL will not count toward the necessary residence credits, nor will it interrupt the calculation of the requirement that “45 of the last 60 credits must be at PSU”.

**Policy Recommendation #6:**
CPL can be used in all areas of the baccalaureate degree requirements, unless it is restricted in a major by a particular academic unit.

**Policy Recommendation #7:**
- AP/IB/CLEP/MIL credit will be evaluated and awarded as transfer credit at the time of admission, prior to matriculation/enrollment.
- PSU Exam credit requires the student to be admitted and matriculated/enrolled.
- PLA, portfolio based CPL requires the students to be admitted, matriculated/enrolled, and in good academic standing.

**Policy Recommendation #8:**
PSU Exam and Portfolio type PLA credit will not be used to establish UNST placement.
AP/IB/CLEP/MIL type CPL credit will continue to be used to establish UNST placement.

**Policy Recommendation #9:**
There is no limit on the number of CPL credits a student can be awarded, although there are limitations on the number of credits that will be applied to the degree based on previous policy limitations, including P-grading limits in #3 and PSU Residency requirements in #5 above. PLA portfolio credit and PSU Exam credit are limited to 45 credits combined.

**Key Presumptions:**
These policy recommendations presume that each academic unit, as designated by course pre-fix, will determine whether any of the various types of CPL options are appropriate for credit within their discipline, and for which particular courses. It also presumess that necessary administrative support and resources will be available to guide the student and department through the process.
Joint Honors Council and EPC Recommendation on the Proposal to Rename and elevate the PSU Urban Honors Program to the PSU Honors College

Motion: The Faculty Senate approves the renaming of the Urban Honors Program to the Portland State University Honors College.

For the Proposal description, see the PSU Curriculum Tracker: https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/66405835/13%2014%20Academic%20Units%20Centers%20Institutes

Background:

The National Collegiate Honors Council has identified best practices that are common to successful and fully developed Honors Colleges (as distinguished from Honors Programs). The PSU Honors Program already satisfies many of the recommendations for Honors Colleges.

Educational Policy Committee unanimously voted to support the proposal. It would put PSU on equal footing with other universities in the OUS, and would increase PSU’s ability to recruit top students, as well as increase the image of PSU’s academic excellence.

Senate Budget Committee: There is no significant budgetary impact from the transformation of the Honors Program to an Honors College. There is a budgetary impact (which we have not been able to completely determine), but that is as a result of the growth (and planned future growth) of the program, not the organizational change. This proposal assumes that although Honors will be a college it will not be required to have all of the elements that the other colleges have (a Dean, a Fiscal Officer, etc.). If those requirements are imposed later then there will be an increased cost for this change. Additionally, for the growth of Honors to be sustainable Honors should capture all of it’s students differential tuition, and not just the 25% it currently receives. (12/18/13)
Faculty Senate Resolution 4/7/14  
(Introduced by Jose Padin, Linda George, Gary Brodowicz, Robert Liebman)

Whereas the PSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines on evaluation, promotion, tenure, and merit written by the PSU Faculty Senate have for 35 years been referenced and protected by the collective bargaining agreements developed by the administration of the University (hereafter University) and the PSU-AAUP (Article 14 Section 1);

Whereas the University’s right to alter, amend, modify, and make additions or deletions to the University guidelines on promotion, the award of tenure and merit increases requires consultation with AAUP on changes in criteria and mutual agreement with AAUP on changes in procedure. (Article 14 Section 3);

Whereas for 35 years the collective bargaining agreements between the University and the PSU-AAUP have language which provides contractual protections for past practice regarding the implementation of the P&T Guidelines in academic units (Article 8);

Be it resolved that the members of the Portland State University Faculty Senate:

Direct the administration to leave in place contractual protections for the consent and agreement by AAUP-PSU when changes are proposed in the P & T Guidelines

Direct the administration to leave in place language, which assures the substance of the contractual protections for past practice regarding the implementation of the P&T Guidelines in academic units.

Rationale

There is a long-standing relationship between the protection of the Faculty role in shared governance (including, and not limited to, Promotion and Tenure guidelines) and the guidelines and institutional practices historically developed by the American Association of University Professors. This relationship and affinity between shared governance, and standards and policies developed by the AAUP, continues: a large number of American public universities utilize the language from AAUP in their basic framework. The affinity and mutuality between both goes deeper. In many American public universities, including the University of Oregon, the Faculty role in shared governance enjoys contract protection.

At Portland State University the dual protection of the Faculty role in shared governance by Senate processes and contract language is also long-standing, beneficial, and not coincidental. With few exceptions (most of them temporary), the group represented by the Academic Senate, and the bargaining unit represented by the AAUP, are nearly identical. Both the Faculty Senate and the AAUP are in substance agencies of the Faculty, from whence they derive their authority. These two agencies of the Faculty can play complementary and overlapping roles. It is in the interest of the Faculty that they both act in concert to support its interest when that is possible.
Up to this point the rationale addresses the first part of the resolution directly (relating to Article 14), and the second part of the resolution (relating to Article 8) only indirectly. We must therefore elaborate on the rationale for the second part of the resolution:

Because the content and the specific practices of shared governance, as they take place, as it were, “on the ground,” day to day, cannot be spelled out or anticipated fully by any general guidelines, over time much of the substance of shared governance leaves an accumulated body of past practices. For instance, Departmental guidelines adapt the language of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and the implementation of the departmental guidelines provides a record of past practice. Shared governance protections should also, therefore, extend into the areas of shared governance in accumulated past practice. Here again, it is in the interest of the Faculty that contract language be preserved which assures the substance of the contractual protections for past practice regarding the implementation of the P&T Guidelines in academic units.
Council Membership:

Laura Marsh (CLAS), Becky Sanchez (SBA), Dan Fortmiller, Chair, (EMSA), Sarah Andrews-Collier (COTA), Sy Adler (CUPA), Jim Hook (MCECS), Marlon Marion (DMSS), Christina Luther (OIA), Erika Rodriguez Molina (student rep), Robert Mercer (CLAS), Janet Putnam (SSW),

Ex-Officio: Cindy Baccar (ARR), Mary Ann Barham (ACS), Marcella Flores (NSP), Casey Campbell (CUPA), Becki Ingersoll (ACS), Karen Popp (OGS)

Charge of the Academic Advising Council:

The Academic Advising Council promotes a positive and productive advising environment for advisers and students. Members will be responsible for reviewing the current status of advising and making recommendations on best practices regarding policies and processes related to academic advising campus-wide.

2013-14 Updates:

The Academic Advising Council has spent the year providing guidance to the campus advising community during the second full year of the implementation of the university’s intentional model of advising.

Academic advising changes in effect starting with Fall 2010 enrollees included:

- mandatory orientation for all new students
- required academic advising for first year freshmen with their intended major
- declaration of major no later than the end of the second year

Academic advising changes in effect starting with Fall 2012 enrollees included:

- required academic advising for all first year students (both freshmen & transfers)

The Council’s work this year has focused on the following:

1) 4-Year Degree Guarantee: Starting Fall 2014 full-time freshmen will have the opportunity to participate in PSU’s new initiative, the 4-Year Degree Guarantee (4YDG). A subset of the Council has been meeting to ensure that the registration and advising infrastructure is in place to serve students opting into the program. Communication plans are being developed to assure that students applying to the 4YDG program are fully aware of the expectations for participation; these expectations include math placement for majors requiring first-year math classes,
early orientation attendance, and registration date requirements for future terms. Each school or college is expected to have an advising plan for serving 4YDG students.

2) **EAB Student Success Collaborative:** The Council participated in the launch of the Educational Advisory Board’s Student Success Collaborative at PSU. The Collaborative offers a platform which combines technology, research, and predictive analytics and will enhance advisers’ ability to assist students who are at risk of not completing a degree. Advisers are piloting its use with four undergraduate student populations: Psychology majors, Business majors, Mechanical Engineering majors, and Exploratory/U Undecided students. The pilot will be undertaken this spring with the goal of including all undergraduate majors by Fall 2014.

3) **Input on Policies:** The Council provided input on policies related to SIS/Banner access for peer advisers, the online Major Change process, and the online Academic Requirements Committee process.

4) **Other Activities:** The Council continues to explore a unified advising file system to be used for campus-wide sharing of advising information. The Council also paid for 26 advisers to attend the local Student Success & Retention Conference and supported the academic advising study conducted in February/March by Janine Allen (GSE) and Cathleen Smith (CLAS).

Going forward, the Council will continue to assess adviser workload issues given new advising mandates and to address the reality of an advising model which is funded to offer an adviser-student ratio which is twice the ratio recommended by the National Academic Advising Association. The Council will continue to explore ways in which technology may support and enhance advising. The Council will also be asked to review a policy recommendation to require declaration of major at a certain credit level and to identify whether this should be mandated and what the potential ramifications would be.

**Data and Accomplishments**

1) AY 2012-13 marked the third year of required advising for first-year freshmen and the first year for first-year transfer students. The Fall 2012 cohort, required to meet with an adviser during their first year, totaled 3,498 new students. Of this total, 2,993 or 85.6% met with an adviser and were eligible to register for their ensuing fall term. Adding first-year transfer students to the mandated advising requirement increased the number of students requiring advising by approximately 150%.

2) The most recent results of the Allen and Smith longitudinal advising study are very encouraging. Since the original survey in 2003, satisfaction with the accuracy of advising has improved from a mean of 3.87 to 4.45 on a Likert scale of 1-6. Overall satisfaction with advising also increased from 3.52 to 4.17. In 2010 eight advising learning outcomes were added to the study and scores on six of the eight outcomes improved. Significant
improvements were also noted in areas of “students’ feeling they made the right decision to attend PSU” and “overall satisfaction with their educational experience at PSU”.

3) The Freshman Retention Project (advisers, bursar and financial aid offices) provided outreach to 289 students. Outreach is provided to freshmen who identified in the University Studies “Prior Learning” and “End of Year” surveys a financial concern as a potential roadblock to continued enrollment and/or an uncertainty regarding their academic plan. Advisers also did outreach to students admitted with <3.00 entering HS GPA and to students who indicated a desire to return to PSU but had not registered for the ensuing term.

4) The Last Mile Project assisted students who had applied for graduation but had not completed their degree requirements. Since its inception, 437 students served by the Last Mile Project have graduated.

5) In addition to the funding of advisers to attend the Student Success & Retention Conference, 15 professional development workshops on a variety of advising topics were conducted throughout the year.

6) As in years prior, the Council has provided guidance to New Student Programs in the design and scheduling of summer orientation programming required for newly admitted students. The Council continues to discuss, and struggles with, the impact of PSU’s rolling admission policy on successfully orienting new students. In particular, transfer students who are admitted late in the admissions cycle pose difficulties as access to faculty advisers as well as classes is increasingly limited.

The Chair wishes to thank the Council for their efforts in bringing the advising model to fruition and furthering the success of students through the collaborative process that is advising. The Chair also wishes to thank academic advisers at PSU for their service to students.
IAC Annual Report

Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
March 7, 2014

In October 2013, the Institutional Assessment Council (IAC) reconvened after a one-year hiatus. Council member represent a variety of departments, offices and programs and have roles in those units related to assessment practices and policies.

IAC Members 2013-2014 Academic Year:

Rowanna Carpenter, Director of Assessment and Clusters, UNST
Micki Caskey, Associate Dean, GSE
Peter Collier, CLAS
Jeanne Davidson, Assistant University Librarian for Public Services
Jim Hook, Associate Dean, MCECS
Kathi Ketcheson, Director, OIRP
Leslie McBride, Interim Director, CUPA
Tyler Matta, Manager, Student Learning and Success, SBA
Suzanne Matthews, Assessment Coordinator, OAI
Jeremy Parra, Assistant Professor, CLAS
Janelle Voegele, Director, Teaching, Learning and Assessment, OAI (IAC Co-Chair)
Vicki Wise, Director of Assessment, EMSA (IAC Co-Chair), Replacement Lisa Hatfield, EMSA

Ex-Officio:
Sukhwant Jhaj, OAA
Margaret Everett, OGS

Staff:
Robert Halstead, OAA

Assessment Coordinator Suzanne Matthews joined the Office of Academic Innovation in February 2014. Suzanne comes to PSU from Mercyhurst University and brings many years of experience in postsecondary assessment, instructional systems design, and program assessment strategies for a range of learning environments (i.e., classroom, online, etc.).

IAC Charge:

The IAC will promote and oversee the continued implementation of assessment across the campus, working closely with three offices: Undergraduate Studies, Institutional Research and Planning, and the Office of Academic Innovation. It will create guidelines for assessment planning and implementation that reflect student learning at the program, department and institutional level.
In cooperation with the ex-officio members, the Council will design a strategy for addressing assessment long-term. It will oversee the implementation of key learning goals for institutional assessment. The IAC will serve as the review mechanism for assessment on campus and coordinate with the assistant and associate deans group the implementation of systemic annual reporting by school and colleagues. It will create an annual document on the status of assessment that will form the basis for institutional reports, such as those required by the PSU Faculty Senate and the regional accreditation body, NWCCU.

The IAC proposed the following goals to complete by June 2014:

(1) Develop documents and communication strategies to answer the question, “Why assessment?”
(2) Complete an inventory of current assessment work, including documentation of effective assessment practices;
(3) Create a plan for tying assessment processes into program review cycles;
(4) Create a timeline and work plan for continued implementation of assessment across campus; clarify the role of IAC and related offices.

Goal 1 progress:

The Council decided to build upon previous IAC communication and web presence efforts by creating an interactive online assessment resource. This online resource will include software for interaction and sharing models across programs, assessment resources and principles, and multimedia examples of innovative and effective work across units and colleagues. The site is currently under development with the goal of launching by September 2014.

Goal 2 progress:

Assessment Coordinator Suzanne Matthews, OAI, is creating a framework for organizing an inventory of program assessment work. The Office of Academic Innovation and the Office of Institutional Planning and Research are in discussion about a long-term technical solution for a campus-wide assessment database.

Goal 3 progress:

The Office of Academic Innovation has created a work plan for communicating with units scheduled for program review between 2014-2016, with the goal of supporting efficient and holistic methods for incorporating assessment efforts into program review processes.

Goal 4 progress:

The IAC’s strategic planning process is informed by a recent report on PSU’s assessment activities created by Dr. Bill Rickards, consultant in higher education research and evaluation. During summer and fall 2013, Dr. Rickards conducted telephone and office interviews with PSU faculty, staff and
administrators, examined institutional documents, and reviewed website materials related to institutional assessment. The report outlines Portland State’s assessment history, select practices and examples across colleges, principle considerations for future assessment activity, and recommendations for next steps. The following summarizes recommendations for immediate, mid-range, and long-term priorities:

**Recommended immediate priorities:**

- Prepare a map of assessment program and practices
- Invest faculty as co-investigators in questions stemming from real issues in programs (ex: retention, class size)
- Highlight assessment practices at program and department levels, including exploring assessment practices with specific curriculum content

**Recommended mid-range priorities:**

- IAC and OAI take up selected assessment initiatives, for example:
  - Data from Provost Challenges
  - Senior Capstones
  - Research agenda for teaching, learning and curriculum
- Collaborate across campus regarding increasing enrollment, persistence to graduation and number of graduates
- Expand relations between IAC, OAI and Senate
- Expand and refine use of recurring program review
- Develop and implement full studies of graduate follow-up
- Anticipate collaborations between OAI and other divisions to examine PSU education during time of increased enrollment, persistence to graduation, etc.

**Recommended long-range priorities**

Leverage relationships across the institution to examine larger questions of educational impact, including:

- Use of longitudinal studies of learning outcomes after college
- Examine trends in educational programming as they have develop
- Review continuing agenda in teaching learning and curriculum

Implement individualized research agenda at the department and program levels

- Consider a research agenda for teaching, learning and assessment
- Strengthen Faculty-in-Residence program to include select research initiatives

In addition to considering the above recommendations, the IAC will work with the Office of Academic Innovation to incorporate feedback from faculty, chairs, associate deans and deans on assessment strategic priorities and goals.