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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 March 2, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the February 2 & February 9, 2015 Meetings

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor:
   *1. OAA response to Senate Actions

   Discussion item –

D. Unfinished Business
   *1. Procedures for Post Tenure Review at Portland State University, revised and amended

E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review

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
   *1. Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee
   *2. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 2 & 9 and attachments
C-1 OAA Response to February Senate Actions
D-1 Procedures for Post Tenure Review at Portland State University, revised and amended
E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda (a&c)
E-2 Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review
G-1 Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee
G-2 Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee
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A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The January 5, 2014 minutes were approved. The following correction is added: Mathwick was the alternate for Raffo.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN reviewed his set up for the meeting and drew attention to handouts available, including one explaining how the Psychology Department adapted the scholarly agenda which was discussed at the Forum on Post Tenure Review (PTR) on January 26, 2015 (see minutes attachment B1). LIEBMAN confirmed Consent Agenda items, and noted that the IFS report would be postponed.

Academic Program Prioritization (APP)

JONES announced that the APP Committee planned a forum in three weeks and previewed topics on the agenda, including scoring and timeline (see slides, minutes...
He emphasized the opportunity that APP would give faculty to discuss how to balance academic and fiscal priorities with the Administration.

**Academic Requirements Committee Memorandum**

MACCORMACK, ARC chair, reaffirmed the policy limiting students to 21 credits per term, unless they obtain permission from their advisor, or from the ARC (for over 25 credits). He noted that it has been difficult to track credit taken in the same term through other institutions that registered PSU students transfer after the term is over. However, the Registrar’s Office will begin more consistent monitoring for ‘after-the-fact’ overloads and will deny credit that exceeds the limit, in order to discourage the misuse of online courses.

LUTHER: How will this be communicated to students and when is it effective?

MACCORMACK: We’re sending memos to the Advising Council and others. It will be a transitional process, but going forward immediately.

CLUCAS: If some transfer credits are automatically denied, can students still use the traditional appeal process?

MACCORMACK: Yes. In the next year or so, students will need to consult with advisers who can facilitate a legitimate appeal. We are particularly concerned about screening out students registering for as much as 35 or 40 credits in a quarter.

KARAVANEC: Does the limit affect the credit for prior learning initiative?

MACCORMACK: No, CPL credit is not counted against the credit limit.

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

1. **Draft Proposal for Post Tenure Review - revised**

   BRODOWICZ/DONLAN MOVED the Proposal as published in D1 [Secretary’s note: a revision of the draft document previewed in December]

   LIEBMAN summarized the process of revision (see minutes attachment B3). He highlighted strong preferences expressed by faculty for review committees named independent of the chair and for chair oversight of the professional development plan (PDP) process. Faculty had also supported including chairs for PTR and immediate eligibility for a pay increase for individuals who completed their PDPs as an incentive.

   LEIBMAN described guiding principles for the Steering Committee’s revision—that the process not be cumbersome, that it balance past practice with individual scholarship, and that it be collegial, equitable and effective. He invited faculty who had contacted the Steering Committee in January to provide a rationale for
their suggestions. Proposed changes were circulated and displayed (see minutes attachment B4). [Secretary’s note: No individual changes were moved.]

BOWMAN noted that the Library, a unit without departments, wanted to follow its current practice for P&T and select a single committee for all its divisions to do post tenure reviews [amending III. E]. LIEBMAN acknowledged that some fix for units without departments was needed, noting the difficulty of accommodating all 50 to 60 units that the process needed to encompass.

GRECO said her proposals addressed concerns raised at the PTR Forum and worries about work-load creep. She thought that clarifying the difference between reviews for tenure and merit, which do require external or internal ranking, and PTR, which does not, could help streamline the process and its expectations. To respond to widespread anxiety about whether the pool would be funded after the first year, she suggested stipulating that Senate would reopen the guidelines if there were no financial incentive. She also advocated for specifying a step requiring departmental ratification of PTR guidelines if they were to be modified at the Dean’s or Provost’s level. DONLAN asked if only tenured faculty would vote to approve PTR guidelines, and what would happen if the vote were negative. GRECO said in her home department only tenure-line faculty would vote; and that guidelines that were not agreed upon would go back for more discussion.

LIEBMAN spoke to new language proposed for Article VI.c.7. The addition would stipulate that a required PDP that is attempted but incomplete should not be subject to sanctions under Article 27 in the PSU-AAUP contract.

RAFFO, chair of the Ad Hoc PTR Committee, said that there were explanatory marginal comments for his edits in the handout (see B4). He highlighted four proposed changes: (1) He thought that the definition of service [in IV.C.2.d] needed to be more broadly inclusive because service does not always take the form of being in a leadership position. (2) Review committees need to “provide evidence” for a negative decision; this would provide clarity about what activities a faculty member can do to improve performance. (3) Actions that are asked of a faculty member in the professional development plan (PDP) needed to be substantially within their control” and we should allow the faculty member to drive the drafting of the PDP. (4) Faculty in units without department chairs should have options for discussion before going to the Dean’s level for review.

LIEBMAN asked for comments on the suggested changes.

PADIN asked if the intent was to focus discussion on all the proposed changes as a whole. LIEBMAN said that the practice was to bring back the document with all amendments at once for an up or down vote to avoid trying to edit on the floor of the Senate.

PADIN proposed striking the second sentence in III.A requiring units to establish PTR procedures in their P&T guidelines. It could confuse the distinction that senators were trying to make between different reviews; PTR guidelines should
be separate. BLEILER said that units ought to be able to have all guidelines for separate procedures in a common document, and suggested that such a document could be entitled “Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Guidelines.” LIEBMAN agreed that the more precise language was a good alternative. RAFFO asked if any protections would be lost if the guidelines weren’t part of the P&T Guidelines. LIEBMAN thought not, since the reference was to departmental guidelines, which were themselves more directive procedures implemented under University guidelines.

PERLMUTTER reiterated a request that faculty only be required to draft one document for PTR called a “narrative” describing where they shine in the four areas (teaching, research, community outreach, and service); having a separate scholarly agenda suggests a focus only on research. LIEBMAN conceded that requiring both a scholarly agenda and a narrative had been a major source of confusion. GRECO said she thought that the single document suggestion was completely in keeping with Psychology Department practice discussed as a model at the PTR Forum (see B1).

KARAVANEC asked how competing suggestions from RAFFO and BOWMAN for changes in III.E would be reconciled. LIEBMAN said Steering would go back to the proposers. WEBER (for DAIM) asked to what degree the PTR would be external and what discretion departments had. LIEBMAN that the PTR process was set up to be completely internal. PADIN stated that he accepted BLEILER’s proposal for III.A.

**Discussion item: Implementation of Post Tenure Review**

LIEBMAN distributed copies of a proposal for a motion in March to implement the new PTR process. He reviewed the component points regarding eligibility, funding, training, and assessment (see minutes attachment B6). He noted that OAA had not yet had an opportunity to review the proposal closely.

MAIER proposed that instead of a percentage based on an individual’s salary that the pool of funds set aside for PTR increases be divided so that each person gets an equal amount for a successful PTR to reduce salary disparities. Why should some people get more for jumping the same bar? STEDMAN supported the suggestion. DONLAN asked if the pay raise would be awarded after completion of a PDP. LIEBMAN said yes, eligible, and MACCORMACK clarified that it was not retroactive. YESHILADA thought that the eligibility of Associates in the pool needed to be clarified; we could end with two sets of reviews going on at essentially the same time, if an Associate was being reviewed for PTR and just about to be reviewed for promotion. LIEBMAN suggested this be worked out with OAA, and noted that the 5-year cycle for PTR was a fixed period, while promotion was not. RUETER pointed out that a salary pool divided equally will get smaller every year after the ‘oldest and wisest’ are reviewed first. LIEBMAN said that models would have to be run.

> [Secretary’s note: the following action was moved, after new business.]
LIEBMAN requested a motion authorizing the Steering Committee to proceed with amending language of the Post Tenure Review document along lines suggested, in conjunction with the Ad Hoc PTR Committee.

DONLAN/KARAVANECS MOVED that the Steering Committee propose an amended version for vote in March.

The MOTION was APPROVED by majority voice vote.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published.

2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture

KINSELLA reviewed the components of the proposed program focused on sustainable design methods. He said there were no new funding requirements and that the proposers had documented demand and that other disciplines supporting electives had agreed to participate.

PERLMUTTER/HARMON MOVED to approve the Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design.

The MOTION was APPROVED, 54 in favor, no opposed, and no abstentions.

3. Educational Policy Committee recommendation on the creation of the School for Gender, Race and Nations

PADIN, chair, stated that the EPC enthusiastically endorsed the proposal. He explained that when new or altered units are proposed the EPC tries to assess the impact across campus. When there are questions, proposers are given the opportunity to respond and revise their proposal. PADIN proposed that a school could be defined as federations of departments or units that share, or find they share, a philosophical commitment to some practical or applied action. EPC concluded that the School for Gender, Race, and Nations proposal satisfied this definition. External review had also established that the proposal was promising, innovative and credible. They have the resources and are programming jointly.

MERCER/HOLLIDAY MOVED to approve the creation of the School for Gender, Race, and Nations.

INGERSOLL: Are there plans for expanding the undergraduate program, to include a new minor or BA in Gender, Race, and Nations, for example?
PADIN asked the proposers to respond. Sally McWilliams (WSGS) stated the plan was to focus on the graduate level, but they have developed a co-taught undergraduate course that could form a basis for on-going conversation. Cornell Pewewardy said that theirs would be an innovative collaboration, with a program that still needed to be cooperatively built; so the focus would be on the graduate program first. MACCORMACK asked if the school would have a director. MCWILLIAMS said yes.

The MOTION was APPROVED, 53 in favor, no opposed, and 1 abstention.

4. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture

KINSELLA reviewed the Certificate’s focus on underserved communities, to address issues of inequality and development of leadership skills and summarized its components. Support for an additional .5 FTE is included in the budget request for the School.

HARMON/RAFFO MOVED to approve the Graduate Certificate in Gender, Race, and Nations.

The MOTION was APPROVED 54 in favor, no opposed, and no abstentions

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

WIEWEL stated that he believed that recent departures had not compromised PSU’s ability to move forward with important objectives, and that new hires would benefit from their opportunity to participate in current campus dialogues about shared values and PSU’s future. (See full text, minutes attachment B6.)

MARRONGELLE affirmed the central place of the liberal arts at PSU in providing students opportunities to develop necessary skills and that Deans should certainly have a hand in helping to create research and teaching synergies across Schools and Colleges. (See full text, minutes attachment B7.)

Describing the origin of the question, LIEBMAN said the Steering Committee had wondered what we understood about the impact of recent or impending changes in CLAS for the map of liberal arts. He suggested a need for follow-up.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None
G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL reported that fall term enrollment had declined 2% from 2014; at the same time non-resident enrollment had increased 4.1%. He noted the international coverage garnered by the report of high levels of formaldehyde in e-cigarettes by PSU researchers Peyton, Strongin, and Pankow. PSU has also been recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for its Community Engagement, and with a top 50 ranking in US News & World Reports of its SBA online MBA degree. Describing campus-wide outreach to gather input to the Strategic Planning Process, WIEWEL encouraged senators to take advantage of their session with the Corraggio Group on February 9. He announced the first meeting of the campus safety Implementation Advisory Committee, and the February 16 deadline for applications for the Faculty Athletic Representative. He noted that the legislative co-chairs budget had an increase, above the Governor’s budget, for higher ed.

Provost’s Report

Referring senators to the handout of announcements (minutes attachment B8), ANDREWS emphasized two items: She thanked faculty who were instrumental in organizing the new Second Thursday Social Club, to debut February 12 in OAI space. She reported that the first draft of unit strategic enrollment plans (SEM) for FY 2016 had been posted (https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/enrollment-watch/). An open forum on SEM and performance-based budgeting is scheduled for February 23. She also noted that she would chair the search for the new Chief Diversity Officer.

Second Faculty Senate session at 3:00 pm on Monday, February 9

LIEBMAN reminded senators about the second one-hour session at 3:00 pm on February 9, to allow for Senate input into the Strategic Planning Process. He asked for a show of hands authorizing the recording of the committee of the whole session. A majority of senators approved, by show of hands.

Quarterly Report of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC)

PEYTON, chair, reported increases in the Travel and FDC funds, though funding was still insufficient. He previewed a streamlined Adobe Acrobat questionnaire, and asked if faculty thought they could incorporate the Adobe file in their proposal narratives. He stressed that the funds needed to be distributed to raise PSU’s research profile

CLARK asked what the Travel Grant deadline was. PEYTON directed senators to the website and said that there might be some flexibility, if the call was undersubscribed. (See: http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/faculty-development-funding-opportunities.) MESSER said that the posted date for Travel Grant applications was March 1.
Quarterly Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board

MILLER noted that completion of the search for a new Director of Athletics and requested time at a future meeting in order to introduce him.

LIEBMAN accepted the two reports and thanked the Committees.

Graduation Program Board

GELMON, chair, announced the celebration of PSU’s annual commencement scheduled for Sunday, June 14, and emphasized its important goals and value (see slides, posted on the Senate web site: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/resources-for-items-under-discussion.) GELMON made a special plea for faculty to assist other staff volunteers with graduation set up on the Saturday before graduation, and to identify and encourage students to participate as speakers. More information is available on the Commencement website: http://www.pdx.edu/commencement/

PADIN wondered about the antiquated system for offering congratulations. GELMON recommended attendance in person.

ADJOURNMENT

**********************************************************************
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, February 9, 2015

Members Present: Babcock, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanoswka-Jeske, Childs, Clark, Daescu, Davidova, De Anda, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Gamburg, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Layzell, Liebman, Maier, Padin, Popp, Raffo, Santelmann, Schuler, Stedman, Taylor

Alternates Present: Farahmandpur for Mukhopadhyay, Hines for Reese

Members Absent: Arellano, Baccar, Bleiler, Carder, Clucas, Cotrell, Daim, De La Vega, Eppley, Griffin, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavanic, Labissiere, Loney, Luther, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Perlmutter, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Schrock, Skaruppa, Smith, Yeshilada, Zurk

LIEBMAN convened senators at 3:02 for an update from the Corraggio consultants facilitating the process on Strategic Planning and to offer input to the consultants. The meeting moved to a committee of the whole for the discussion. The consultants asked senators to weigh a list of possible issues for the Topic Teams investigating “faculty roles and structure,” “student learning and academic success,” and “innovative research, scholarship, and creative activities” to work on.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.
The Role of the “Scholarly Agenda” in Psychology’s P & Process

1. Definition of Scholarly Agenda (from Psychology’s P & T Guidelines, 2005).

“A scholarly agenda encompasses the general set of serious intellectual issues which engage a faculty member. This agenda lends direction and purpose to scholarly work. It is useful in clarifying the goals and relevance of activities and in establishing a coherent program of important work. A scholar’s agenda is embedded in a particular field and a particular historical and social moment, as well as in a particular institutional context, all of which will shape the scope and direction of a scholar's agenda.”

2. Within Psychology, a faculty member's scholarly agenda serves several functions:

- **Reflective.** The process of writing and revising one’s scholarly agenda provides an opportunity to articulate one’s own goals and reflect on one’s progress.
- **Guidance.** A scholarly agenda provides advice and guidance to a faculty member when he or she is making decisions about future projects and activities.
- **Formative.** A scholarly agenda is essential when a tenured faculty member mentors an untenured faculty member, or when the Chair mentors tenured and untenured faculty.
- **Evaluative.** Retrospective reconstruction of the scholarly agenda is the basis for the “Self-Assessment” which is a required part of documentation for consideration for promotion or tenure, and for post-tenure review.

3. Description of the scholarly agenda a part of P & T processes.

- **Annual review, promotion and tenure.** A self-assessment of one’s scholarly work and accomplishments. A self-assessment describes: (1) the long-term goals and purposes of one’s program of research, and how accomplishments have advanced those goals; (2) an overview of the direction of and plans for future research; and (3) a description and self-evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching, service, and community outreach activities.

- **Post-Tenure review.** Each eligible faculty members prepare a statement of "Scholarly Activities and Goals." This statement includes an overview of the general set of serious intellectual issues that currently engage the faculty member, as well as the main scholarly goals that the faculty member intends to pursue in the coming year(s). It also lists any special responsibilities the faculty member will assume. The statement scholarly activities and goals may mention the most interesting scholarly experiences and accomplishments of the past year. The statement of Chair would include a description of his or her prior activities and future priorities and plans as Chair.

4. My personal opinion. I think that articulating and revising one’s scholarly agenda is one of the most important (and difficult) activities scholars undertake, and a key driver of one’s professional development. After 20 years of mentoring and advising faculty, I have found that:

- Early scholars initially find the process challenging and confusing, and often resist or resent it.
- Helping a scholar discover and create an agenda is a process of empowerment and hence a crucial part of mentoring.
- The P&T committee’s recognition of an untenured faculty’s scholarly agenda creates a protective bubble around the faculty member’s activities.
- When they are done, faculty uniformly agree that their professional development would not have been the same without the processes organized around the scholarly agenda.
Academic Program Prioritization

Faculty Senate Update
February 2, 2015

APPC
Sy Adler  Talya Bauer  Samuel Henry  Mark Jones
Karim Magaldi  John Rueter  Lynn Santelmann
Michael Bowman  Steve Harmon  Kashi Ketchson  Jason Gettel

Academic Priorities
Fiscal Priorities

These are not measurable!
The Role of APPC

APPC is about providing a faculty voice in planning for a future that aligns with our academic priorities.

Our goal is to conduct the APP process in a way that maximizes the benefits that it will provide, but minimizes the costs that it will incur.

We need the help and participation of the faculty.

---

Agenda Topics

General information and current status:

- Programs that will be included in the review
- Questions and metrics that will be used
- Planning for scoring
- Timeline

Feedback, questions, discussion, and suggestions

---

Questions?

http://pdxappc.blogspot.com
To readers of the Revised draft we posted 1/26/15:

**How we revised the Ad hoc Draft of Post Tenure Review posted 11/26/14**

The Post Tenure Review Procedures document’s chief purpose is to define eligibility for post tenure review for faculty and reviewers, give guidelines for assembling post tenure review dossiers and forming committees, establish steps for the review and reconsideration, and offer a process for the Professional Development Plan.

In keeping with PSU P&T Guidelines, it specifies the respective roles, rights, and responsibilities of faculty members as reviewed and reviewers, of chairs, Dean, Provost, and President. We felt it should be written as a go-to handbook for faculty, chairs, and deans who will implement the process. It is intended to be read in conjunction with the full P&T Guidelines (1996/2014) which describe the scholarly agenda.*

We used the January 5 Senate straw poll, nearly 25 emails from chairs and Senators, and many conversations with colleagues at PSU and other universities in a drafting process that included Steering & members of the 7 person Ad hoc committee who wrote the original draft.

Steering’s key principles for revision were

**Equitable** – a fair process that respects the diversity of faculty work and changes over a career and accommodates the variety of PSU departments/units

**Efficient** – a process in which reviewed and reviewers feel that time invested in career development and discussion of collective responsibility was well-spent. We cut a number of review and reconsideration steps

**Easily Implemented** – a process that balances past practice in departments, schools, & units with consideration of individual scholarly agenda*

We cut the document from 17 to 10 pages that target the purpose of post tenure review and interpret language from the 2013-15 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA Articles 16, 27, 28, and 30 Sec 6B)

THE REVISED DOCUMENT MUST BE MOVED 2/2 & SHOULD BE AMENDED BEFORE COMING FOR AN APPROVAL VOTE ON 3/2
FACULTY SENATE AUTHORS P&T GUIDELINES WHICH MUST HAVE MUTUAL AGREEMENT OF AAUP & OAA UNDER THE CBA.

We look forward to comments across campus as we work toward approval & mutual agreement

PLEASE SHARE THESE DOCUMENTS
B Liebman, Presiding Officer for the Steering Committee
liebmanr@pdx.edu

*Above is a spell-checked & slightly edited version of draft shared @ Faculty Senate 2/2/15*
Suggested changes from senators Raffo and Greco

Portland State University Faculty Senate Amendments offered by David Raffo SBA
Post Tenure Review Guidelines Page 2 of 11

I. Preamble

By awarding tenure, Portland State University recognizes its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty and their scholarly agenda. The purpose of tenure is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution.

A scholarly agenda:

- articulates the set of serious intellectual, aesthetic or creative questions, issues or problems which engage and enrich an individual scholar;
- describes an individual’s accomplished and proposed contributions to knowledge, providing an overview of scholarship, including long-term goals and purposes;
- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, or governance; and
- articulates the manner in which the scholar’s activities relate to the departmental mission and programmatic goals. (PSU Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014)

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their scholarly agendas will change to reflect varying proportions of time dedicated to research, teaching, advising, outreach, departmental, university, and professional service, administration, and academic leadership.

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. Whereas evaluation for tenure measures a candidate against the norms for his/her field in our peer institutions, with a focus on research, publication and/or artistic achievements, and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within the institution, the goals of post-tenure review are

- to reward and motivate faculty engagement in their scholarly agendas, not to monitor and sanction, with the understanding that an individual’s scholarly agenda will evolve over the course of a career;
- to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly with their units to ensure the unit functions as a whole and the burden of service is distributed equitably. A key aspect of this program is therefore the collaborative establishment of a scholarly agenda for each faculty member under review while upholding academic freedom and a faculty member’s proper sphere of professional self-direction
- to be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development

Post tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure. It is not intended to be used as cause for sanctions against a faculty member.
II. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility

Tenured faculty members shall undergo post tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post tenure review.

All tenured faculty members, including department chairs and program directors shall undergo post tenure review.

The Faculty Senate recognizes the workload increase imposed upon faculty as both reviewers and reviewees, and proposes this document in the spirit of a review process that leads to an increase in base pay for faculty who meet standards. In the event that the pay incentive diminishes, the Faculty Senate shall reopen this document to make adjustments that maintain an appropriate balance between workload and incentives. [GG]

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for post tenure review with regard to the year of the last review. Faculty members subject to post tenure review in an academic year shall be notified in accordance with Article IV.

III. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

A. The primary responsibility for assessing an individual faculty member’s contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish in its Promotion and Tenure Guidelines procedures and criteria for post tenure review. Departments/units must ensure that their guidelines are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Post Tenure Review Guidelines, which have priority.

B. Approval of departmental/unit procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he/she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his/her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution. The final version must be ratified by a vote of all tenure-line faculty [GG].

C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department/unit faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

D. In cases where a faculty member’s appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary teaching or research, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is responsible for post tenure review and how the other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed.

Commented [DR2]: The question was raised: What if a faculty member goes up for promotion to full professor and fails? Does that reset their clock? Because they are different reviews, it should not reset their clock.

Commented [DR3]: Gina G’s addition

Commented [DR4]: Gina G’s addition

Commented [DR5]: Question and comment from some senators and faculty: I strongly support Gina G’s addition with its emphasis on TT faculty ratification, but what happens if the TT faculty and the Dean or Provost cannot come to agreement? I am very concerned about what will happen with all aspects of the PTR process criteria that are devolved to individual departments/schools. Ultimately, all those unit criteria will have to be approved by the Dean and Provost. These individual units will be in a much weaker position to negotiate with the Dean and Provost than now where the Faculty Senate and PSU-AAUP must approve the process criteria.
constituting committees. The department chair shall select one member of the committee, the faculty member shall select one member of the committee and the two shall choose a third member.

ii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member’s scholarly agenda. An emeritus tenured faculty may be included if department guidelines allow.

iii. A non-PSU tenured faculty member should be permitted if the colleague being reviewed can justify a claim that there are not any PSU faculty who is in a position to assess the contributions.

2. Committee Review Procedures and Criteria

i. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member.

ii. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review, and any other criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines:
   a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements (Research);
   b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching);
   c. Community Outreach (Outreach);
   d. Service to the department, school, university and profession/academic community with emphasis on leadership roles and significant contributions to administration, governance, or to professional/academic communities. (Service).

iii. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. The committee will find the faculty member’s contributions either meet the standards with regard to the criteria set forth by the Department P&T Guidelines for post-tenure review or that they do not meet the standards for post-tenure review set forth in the Department P&T.

iv. In its evaluation, the committee should consider the following factors:
   a. The changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career.
   b. The faculty member’s teaching load relative to the customary teaching load and/or added preparation required for forms of instruction such as online teaching.
   c. Time and support required to transition successfully to new areas of teaching, research, outreach or service.
d. The level of resources and number of assistants provided to the faculty member in support of his/her teaching, research, outreach or service.

e. Increased departmental service as a consequence of the ratio of tenured to non-tenured faculty whose assignment to service cannot exceed 10% of their workload.

f. Departmental circumstances such as deaths, injuries or illnesses, crises, or transitions, or other circumstances that had impact on the member’s work situation.

g. Personal circumstances such as maternity, paternity, adoption, injuries, illnesses, or other circumstances in the faculty member’s life or the faculty member’s family; that had impact on the member’s work.

v. The faculty member will be found to have meet University standards for post tenure review if they can demonstrate ongoing activity in each of the four areas of review (ii above) during the review period that totals the effort expected of a full time (1.0 full time equivalent) faculty member when the employee is full time, or a prorated amount commensurate to the reduced FTE assignment during any period that the faculty member’s FTE is reduced.

vi. Academic units may add or modify review criteria to their P&T guidelines to meet the specific needs of their discipline and those additions and modifications will be approved by OAA if they are consistent with section v above.

3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report. In its report to the chair, the committee shall explain its decision. If the committee finds the faculty member’s contributions to meet the standards set forth for post-tenure review, they shall document this in their report to the chair. If the committee finds the faculty member’s contributions to not meet standards, the report shall document the areas the committee finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas which should be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

4. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority.

5. Upon completion of the committee’s report, it will be provided to the faculty member. If the faculty member disagrees with the committee’s report, he/she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E; D. Role of the Department Chair

1. The department chair must assure that the faculty member’s post tenure review committee has followed departmental, and university post tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member’s dossier and that the committee’s report is complete and uses the proper forms. In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities may be
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Post tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure or promotion. It is not merit. These statements better reflect the intent of the faculty bargaining team during contract negotiations on article 16.
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fulfilled by a program director, area director, or post tenure review committee chair)

2. The department chair shall write a letter affirming or challenging the committee’s decision and recommendation based on the criteria in the Departmental Post Tenure Review Guidelines, and explain his/her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member’s contributions to not meet standards, the chair’s letter shall document the areas s/he finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas should be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

3. The department chair’s letter must be sent to faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee’s report (after reconsideration if any by the committee).

4. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the post tenure committee report(s) and the department chair’s letter before they are forwarded to the Dean/Provost. The faculty member should indicate s/he has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E.

5. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the Post Tenure Review committee and the department chair.

6. The department chair must provide to the Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
   i. A completed recommendation form signed by members of the Post Tenure Review Committee and chair;
   ii. The Post Tenure Review committee’s report and the department chair’s letter;
   iii. If a reconsideration was requested at either the post tenure review committee or department chair levels, a copy of the faculty member’s request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the chair and/or committee.

E. Procedures for Reconsideration of Recommendations by the Post Tenure Review Committee and Department Chair

1. If a faculty member questions the Post Tenure Review committee’s recommendation and/or the department chair’s recommendation, he/she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendations within 10 working days of receiving either of them.

2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supporting materials must be submitted to the post tenure review committee or the department chair as appropriate within 10 working days of the request for reconsideration.

3. If the reconsideration is requested for the committee’s decision, the committee chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the reconsideration.
B. Role of the Provost
   1. The Provost shall review the materials forwarded by the Dean for each faculty member.
   2. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her decision affirming the recommendation of the Dean.
   3. If the Provost finds a faculty member’s review does not meet university and procedural standards after the Dean has found the faculty member’s review does meet standards, the Provost must provide reasons in writing for his or her decision and provide evidence.
   4. The faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Provost within 10 working days of the receipt of the Provost’s letter and may add additional evidence to the file within 10 working days of receiving the Provost’s letter. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.
   5. Appeals of the Provost’s final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).
   6. Should a faculty member be deemed not to meet the standards of the post tenure review, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member’s letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.
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C. Role of the President
   1. After receiving a report of the outcome of a reconsideration requested by a faculty member of the Provost’s decision, the president shall make a final determination of the review as meeting or not meeting the standards set forth in the P&T Guidelines for post tenure review.
   2. Appeals of the president’s final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).

VI. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)
   A. Purpose and Objective
      1. A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop, in conjunction with the department/unit chair, a Professional Development Plan (PDP).
      2. The PDP can be from one year to five years in duration as deemed appropriate.
      3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member’s scholarly agenda. The PDP shall only contain tasks that...
are substantially within the faculty member’s control (e.g. the PDP could specify that the faculty member write a book but not that the book be published).

4. Based on discussions with the faculty member, and consultation with the department/unit review committee, the department/unit chair shall draft a PDP which will be forwarded to the Dean with a form (Appendix B) signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair.

B. Role of the Department Chair in Developing the PDP

1. Utilizing the information provided in the post tenure review committee’s report and the department chair’s letter the faculty member shall draft a PDP. The faculty member may consult with the post tenure review committee in developing this draft.

2. The faculty member will submit their proposed PDP to the department chair for review. If the department chair agrees with the proposed PDP, s/he will sign the PDP and forward it to the Dean for approval.

3. If the department chair disagrees or wants modifications to the PDP, s/he will meet with the faculty member to discuss modifications to the PDP. If no agreement can be reached, the department chair shall write a letter identifying the modifications they recommend for the PDP and the reasons. The faculty member’s PDP and the department chair’s letter are submitted to the Dean for resolution.

C. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP

1. If the Dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the Chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix B). Should the Dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the Chair who will then discuss the changes with the faculty member.

2. If the faculty member agrees, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the Dean, whereupon the University shall make available resources to implement the PDP.

3. If the faculty member and the department chair do not agree on modifications requested by the Dean, they may consult with the Provost to reach agreement.

D. Progress and Resolution of the PDP

1. The department chair or designee in schools where there are no department chairs shall meet with the faculty member annually to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.

2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member’s request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the
faculty member’s request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination.

3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.

4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member’s report to the Dean.

5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence, what further work is needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member.

6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair’s letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 business days of his or her request for reconsideration.

7. Should a faculty member not complete the PDP successfully, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member’s letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

8. If the Dean and department chair agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will receive whatever remuneration increase was inforce at the time of their review.

END
Following Senate approval and mutual agreement by OAA and AAUP-PSU, the PSU Faculty Senate recommends the following for the implementation of the planned Post-Tenure Review process:

1. Eligibility
   All current PSU tenured faculty, including department chairs, shall be reviewed for Post-Tenure Review during the 5-year period beginning in AY 2014-2015.

   OAA shall create a list of all current PSU tenured faculty, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion.

   A fifth of all eligible tenured faculty will be reviewed in each of the first five years, in order of the year of last review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure.

2. Opt Out
   Faculty who are within 2 years of retirement and submit their intention to retire in writing to the Dean shall be allowed to opt out of Post-Tenure Review.

   As individual faculty in a quintile opt out an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile.

3. Deferral
   With agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer Post-Tenure Review for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions.

   As faculty in a quintile are deferred, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile.

4. Funding Of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases
   Senate recommends that a faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equivalent to the percentage of salary set aside for post-tenure salary increases in Article 30 Section 6 Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases, currently 4% in the AAUP-PSU CBA 2013-2015.

5. Funding Of PDP
   A faculty member whose post tenure review finds that s/he does not meet standards must develop a Professional Development Plan in consultation with her/his department chair.* When required by the PDP, funds should be provided for support of agreed-upon activities in each year of the PDP.

   Senate recommends that funds for support of PDPs shall be drawn from a designated PDP fund for those faculty whose post tenure review finds that s/he does not meet standards, equivalent to the percentage of salary set aside for their post-tenure salary.
Motion for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review process

increases in Article 30 Section 6 Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases, currently 4% in the AAUP-PSU CBA 2013-2015.

Senate recommends that any unexpended funds shall be reserved to cover the cost of Professional Development Plans in future years.

6. Training for developing and administering PDPs
OAA and AAUP shall jointly design and implement training for Deans, Chairs, and Directors and tenured faculty for developing and administering PDPs.

7. Assessment
Faculty Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee including members from OAA and AAUP-PSU to assess the post tenure review process after the 2nd year of the review process and to make a report to Senate that calls, if needed, for changes in the post tenure review process.

END
11/26 Rev 11/29  Amended 2/2
Response from President Wiewel  
To question from Senator Tucker Childs  
February 2, 2015

Q. The rate of turnover in administrative positions recently seems to be high and is, perhaps, accelerating. Given the number of major initiatives this year, Strategic Planning, Academic Program Prioritization, and Academic Quality, stability within the administration to follow through with those initiatives seems critical.

*How has the Administration addressed the challenge of turnover at the top levels?*

And related to this question:

*What kinds of strategies will ensure continuity and consistency to do long term planning and implementation of campus initiatives?*

Changes in senior leadership are always a mixed bag. While you hate to lose good people, the change also provides an opportunity to bring in new skills sets and talents that may serve the institution even better over time.

None of the recent departures compromised our ability to move forward with our important objectives. Because our internal talent pool is deep, we were able to promote strong leaders on an interim or permanent basis who were already fully conversant with our initiatives and directions. In instances where we have recruited externally, we have emphasized our vision, mission and five strategic themes and vetted the candidates carefully to ensure they share our values and are prepared to carry forward the university’s important work.

The recent launch of the strategic planning process makes this not a bad time for new leaders to be joining the team. By participating in the campus-wide dialogue about shared values and how we can work together to move PSU forward, these new leaders will have a deeper understanding of the challenges and issues that face us and the rationale behind the directions we choose to take moving forward.
(F2) Question from Presiding Officer Bob Liebman:

In view of PSU’s history of interdisciplinary (UNST) and interdepartmental (General Studies) learning, as well as the current budget model, what is the role of the liberal arts in the University and does CLAS have the resources to provide the classic liberal arts skill sets (critical inquiry, writing, math, stats) that are needed to earn a BA/BS in CLAS and other schools such as Engineering or CUPA?

And related to this question
Do some departments believe that their needs cannot be met in CLAS while maintaining research appointments with other schools and colleges at PSU, which has a long history of joint and courtesy appointments? What are the ways that the university should/could create research synergies across colleges? What kinds of partnerships/synergies might be encouraged that would enable CLAS faculty to collaborate among departments or across schools for research and teaching?

Response:

The crux of this question is: What is the role of the liberal arts in our university? To prepare a response to this question, I re-read a number of documents on University Studies, including Charles White’s paper from 1993, “A Model for Comprehensive Reform in General Education at Portland State University” and the recommendations of the 1992-1993 Faculty Senate Working Group on General Education. If you have not read Dr. White’s paper recently, I encourage you to do so, because, although it was written in 1993, many of the ideas, tensions, and challenges ring true today (yes, even in 1993, faculty were worried about university resources following student credit hours and how changes to general education requirements might negatively impact departments). I was impressed by the extent to which the Faculty Senate Working Group drew upon research and data, both locally and nationally to guide their thinking about the purpose of general education and how the curriculum should be structured at Portland State. There were a number of guiding principles that shaped the design of University Studies and I encourage you to reflect on them. One of those principles was: Fostering a sense of community among our students to improve their experience at PSU and to retain more students. Again, this remains germane today. What happened with the redesign in 1993 turned traditional general education on its head. The liberal arts then, and now, have a central place in providing students opportunities to develop the skills necessary to graduate from Portland State.

The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences certainly is a central player in delivering general education, but faculty across the university, not just the CLAS, participate in this delivery.
Turning to the second part of the question: Faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences collaborate not only with faculty across campus on research, but with faculty across the state, nation, and around the world. Many interdisciplinary research collaborations begin organically: faculty member to faculty member. Can and should the Deans have a hand in helping to create research synergies across Schools and Colleges? Absolutely. Let me provide an example of an interdisciplinary research collaborations that has been supported at the Dean’s level:

The School of Social Work and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences have been supporting the Interdisciplinary Center for the Applied Social Sciences, a collaboration among faculty in the School of Social Work, and the CLAS departments of Psychology, Sociology, and Speech & Hearing Sciences. Part of the charge of this group is to advance interdisciplinary research and more effectively compete for interdisciplinary research funding and expand the reach to additional faculty and interests. The EXITO grant, recently received from NIH, is another example of faculty working across Colleges successfully. And, there are many other examples of interdisciplinary teams across campus.

I would be interested in hearing from you about ways that the Deans can help create research synergies across the university.

Although Bob's question was not about interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching, it is certainly something that is valued and of benefit to our students. Our new PBB model supports instructional collaboration in a more effect way than in the past. We know some faculty do not have as clear an understanding of how that works, but the provost's issue brief and blog post at https://psuprovostblog.wordpress.com/2014/09/18/interdisciplinary-collaborations/ has information. At present, a number of interdisciplinary teaching collaborations are in progress. One being a graduate certificate in Sustainable Food Systems that is being worked on between CUPA, SSW, CLAS and ISS.
PROVOST ANDREWS’ COMMENTS: FEBRUARY 2, 2015 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Inaugural convening of the Second Thursday Social Club
Responding to suggestions from several faculty members, a committee consisting of Darrell Brown (Business), Joyce O’Halloran (Mathematics), Alan MacCormack (University Studies) and John Ott (History) with ex-officio members Sona Andrews (Provost Office), Robert Bucker (COTA Dean Office) and Rachel Martinez (President’s Office) have organized the Second Thursday Social Club.

The inaugural convening will be held:

Thursday, February 12
Office of Academic Innovation -209 Smith Mezzanine
4:00 pm – 6:30 pm

Join us for food, drink and collegiality this week, as well as on each second Thursday throughout the academic year. There will be a cash bar with food provided courtesy of the administration. PSU staff and faculty are all welcome. Because alcohol will be served, students cannot be included.

SEM (Strategic Enrollment Management) Planning:
All schools/colleges, University Studies and Honors have completed the first draft of their SEM plans and have undergone a preliminary assessment by the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, ALT (Academic Leadership Team), Dean of Graduate Studies (Margaret Everett), VPs for FADM (Kevin Reynolds) and EMSA (Dan Fortmiller), Associate VPs for FADM (Alan Finn) and EMSA (Cindy Skaruppa), Director of OIRP (Kathi Ketcheson), OIRP Analyst (David Burgess), and Provost (Sona Andrews).

Next steps are to respond to feedback, aggregate the plans and make adjustments prior to setting performance requirements for FY 16. Timeline available on the Academic Affairs site located at “PBB Working Timeline.”

Reminder: Open Forum-Strategic Enrollment Management and Performance Based Budget:
I hope you will attend the open forum designed to provide an update on the Academic Affairs FY16 Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) plans and School/College Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) process on:

February 23, 2015
2:00 pm - 3:30 pm
SMSU 327/8

Note: Forums were held on October 13 and 17, 2014 to recap the OAA FY 15 budget, to share preliminary information on the FY 16 Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) and Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) process, and to listen to concerns and questions.
Interest Based Bargaining
The University and AAUP participated in an informational session on interest based bargaining (IBB) on January 22, 2015 led by Janet Gillman, State Conciliator with the Oregon Employment Relations. Next steps are to assess if we all wish to move forward with training on this approach. Some basic information on IBB can be found on an October 2014 post on the Provost’s Blog:

HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission) and Statewide Provost Council Updates:

Academic Quality: Working in concert with IFS (Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and at the request of the HECC, the Provosts Council issued an “Academic Quality Statement” (attached) on January 22, 2015.

Search for Chief Diversity Officer to Commence
The provost will be chairing the upcoming search for the Chief Diversity Officer. The Search Committee will have faculty, staff, student and administrative representation. Details on job announcement, committee selection and timeline forthcoming.

Reminder: One Remaining Winter Term Drop-in Conversation with the Provost:
Please join me for the remaining winter term drop-in session:

February 25, 2015
1:30 pm-2:30 pm
SMSU 328

Note: Monthly Drop-in Conversation opportunities were held for faculty and staff during the fall term (October 30, November 10, and December 1) and thus far winter term (January 26). Schedule for spring quarter will be announced soon.
February 4, 2015

To: Provost Andrews
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
Robert Liebman, Presiding Officer

SUBJ: Notice of Senate Actions

On February 2, 2015 the Senate approved the Curricular Consent Agenda recommending the proposed new undergraduate and graduate courses and program changes listed in Appendix E.1 of the February 2015 Faculty Senate Agenda.

2-5-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda.

In addition, Senate voted to recommend the following actions:

1. to approve the Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture (in COTA);
   2-5-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Graduate Certificate in Public Interest Design in the School of Architecture. Steve Harmon will confirm the decision with the unit.
2. to approve the creation of the School for Gender, Race, and Nations in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences;
   2-5-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the creation of the School for Gender, Race, and Nations in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Steve Harmon will confirm the decision with the unit.
3. to approve the Graduate Certificate in Gender, Race, and Nations in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
   2-5-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Graduate Certificate in Gender, Race and Nations in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Steve Harmon will confirm the decision with the unit.

Best regards,

Robert Liebman, Presiding Officer of Faculty Senate

Martha W. Hickey, Presiding Officer
Secretary to the Faculty

Sona Andrews, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Proposal to adopt Procedures for Post Tenure Review

- as published on January 26, 2015 (D1 of the February 2, 2015 Senate Agenda), and
- as amended and published in Appendix D1 of the March 2, 2014 Faculty Senate Agenda packet.

Whereas the PSU Faculty Senate recognizes the benefits to individuals and the University of equitable, effective, and efficient post tenure review; and

Whereas the PSU Faculty Senate recognizes that an equitable, effective and efficient review should give due consideration to the changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career; and departmental and personal circumstances that had impact on the member’s workload or work situation; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate recognizes the workload increase imposed upon faculty as both reviewers and reviewees, and proposes this document in the spirit of a process that streamlines the review process and leads to an increase in base pay for faculty who meet standards,

Faculty Senate approves the adoption of the Procedures for Post Tenure Review at Portland State University as published in D1 of the March 2, 2015 Agenda.
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PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW AT PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY AFTER THE AWARD OF TENURE
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REVISED by the PSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee
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I. Preamble
II. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility
III. Departmental Authority and Responsibility
IV. Procedures for Post Tenure Review
V. Procedures for Administrative Review
VI. Professional Development Plan
I. Preamble

By awarding tenure, Portland State University recognizes its obligation to invest in and support the lifelong careers of its faculty and their scholarly agendas. The purpose of tenure is to support and maintain a vibrant and committed faculty who contribute, in their individual ways, to the mission of the university and the excellence of the institution.

The faculty narrative A scholarly agenda is defined as a document that

- clarifies general responsibilities and emphases placed by the individual upon research, teaching, community outreach, and governance service;
- articulates the set of serious intellectual, aesthetic or creative questions, issues or problems which engage and enrich an individual scholar;
- describes an individual’s accomplished and proposed contributions to the above areas knowledge, providing an overview of scholarship, including long-term goals and purposes;
- articulates the manner in which the individual’s scholar’s activities relate to the departmental needs, mission, and programmatic goals and changes in the department over time.

As tenured faculty progress through their careers, their narratives scholarly agendas will change to reflect varying proportions of time dedicated to research, teaching, advising, outreach, departmental, university, and professional service, administration, and academic leadership.

The post-tenure review process is fundamentally different from other reviews such as those for the award of tenure, for promotion in rank, and for the award of merit pay. Whereas reviews for tenure and promotion measure a candidate against the norms for his/her field via external review and merit pay implies a ranking of faculty within an institution. The goals of post-tenure review are

- to assure that individual faculty members work responsibly within their units to ensure that unit contributions are shouldered equitably so the unit functions as a whole and the burden of service is distributed equitably. A key aspect of this program is therefore the collaborative establishment of a scholarly agenda collaboration in aligning for each faculty member’s career path under review with unit missions while upholding academic freedom and a faculty member’s proper sphere of professional self-direction;
- to be a collegial, faculty-driven process that supports faculty development;
- to reward and motivate faculty engagement in their scholarly agendas, not to monitor and sanction, with the understanding that an individual’s scholarly
Post tenure review is not a re-evaluation of tenure. It is not intended to be used as cause for sanctions against a faculty member. [See additions, V.B.6, VI.A.1 & VI.D.7]

The procedures for Post-Tenure Review herein are a supplement to the PSU Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Increases 1996, revised and reapproved April 7, 2014. [shifted from above]

II. Post Tenure Review Frequency and Eligibility

Tenured faculty members shall undergo post tenure review every five years after the award of tenure. Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post tenure review.

All AAUP-represented tenured faculty members, including department chairs/unit heads, and program directors shall undergo post tenure review.

In the event of changes in Article 30 Section 6b (Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases) of the University/AAUP CBA, the Faculty Senate shall reopen this document to make adjustments that maintain an appropriate balance between workload and incentives.

OAA shall be responsible for creating a list of tenured faculty who are eligible for post tenure review with regard to the year of the last review. Faculty members subject to post tenure review in an academic year shall be notified in accordance with Article IV.

III. Departmental Authority and Responsibility

A. The primary responsibility for assessing an individual faculty member’s contributions rests with the faculty of the department or unit. Therefore, each department or unit shall establish in its Promotion and Tenure Guidelines procedures and criteria for post tenure review. Departments/units must ensure that their guidelines are consistent with the procedures and criteria of the PSU Post Tenure Review Guidelines, which have priority. Guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.

B. Approval of departmental/unit procedures and criteria by the Dean and Provost is required. If a Dean disapproves of departmental procedures and criteria, then he/she will submit both the proposed departmental procedures and criteria and his/her objections and recommendations to the Provost for resolution. The final version must be returned by the Provost to the department/unit and ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the department/unit.
C. After approval by the Provost, the guidelines must be distributed to all members of the department/unit faculty and to the Dean. Department chairs shall distribute these guidelines to new tenure track faculty upon their arrival at Portland State University.

D. In cases where a faculty member’s appointment is equally divided between two or more departments or involves interdisciplinary teaching or research, there shall be a written agreement as to which department is responsible for post tenure review and how the other department(s) are to contribute to that review, and the faculty member is to be so informed.

E. In schools that do not have departments or colleges that do not have schools, the faculty in the academic discipline will establish post tenure review guidelines that: 1) describe the procedures and criteria to be used, 2) are consistent with the procedures and criteria set forth in the University’s post tenure review guidelines, which have priority, and 3) provide procedures to choose review committee members from academic disciplines closely aligned with the faculty’s member’s career interests scholarly agenda. In SBA, disciplines shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty of the School as a whole. In the Library, a committee elected by faculty in the major divisions (Resource Services & Technology and Public Services & Government Information) shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty in those divisions. In GSED, departments shall develop guidelines that are approved by a vote of the faculty of the School as a whole. The proposed unit guidelines must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of all tenure-line faculty in the unit.

IV. Procedures for Post Tenure Review

A. Notification

1. OAA shall forward the list of notify each tenured faculty members eligible for post-tenure review in any given year, to the Dean of the School/College where they have their principal appointment.

2. The Dean of the School/College OAA shall forward the list of eligible faculty to the Dean and chair/head of the appropriate academic unit, their respective departments.

3. The department chair shall notify the faculty in their department who are eligible for review. In schools without department chairs, the Dean shall notify the faculty members directly.

B. Dossier

1. The faculty member shall compile a dossier that includes

   i. Current curriculum vitae.

   ii. Scholarly Agenda, as described above

   iii. Narrative of work done since the last review (for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure) in relation to the faculty member’s career path scholarly agenda. If the scholarly agenda career path changed
significantly since the last review, the faculty member should explain how and why in the narrative.

iii. Any additional materials required by departmental/unit P&T guidelines. Documentation of teaching accomplishments in keeping with department/unit practice is expected.

iv. Any additional materials the faculty member wishes to submit that are part of the work that he/she feels are relevant for the review.

C. The Post Tenure Review Committee

1. Composition

i. The committee shall be comprised of three people. Departments/units shall specify in their guidelines a clearly-articulated process for constituting committees that is collegial, equitable, and formative, and ensures that faculty have input into the selection process.

ii. Committee members shall be selected among tenured faculty whose department, discipline, unit or work aligns with the faculty member’s scholarly agenda career trajectory. Exceptions can be made in accordance with department/unit guidelines if warranted. An emeritus tenured faculty may be included if department guidelines allow.

iii. A non-PSU tenured faculty member should be permitted if the colleague being reviewed can justify a claim that there are not enough PSU faculty who are in a position to assess the contributions.

2. Committee Review Procedures and Criteria

i. When the committee is constituted, its members shall select a chair and arrange a meeting with the faculty member.

ii. The committee shall use the criteria below for their review, and any other criteria that have been approved for inclusion in department/unit guidelines:

   a. Research, publications, and creative activities including artistic achievements (Research);

   b. Teaching, mentoring, and curricular activities (Teaching);

   c. Community Outreach (Outreach);

   d. Service to the department/academic unit, school, university and profession/academic community, with emphasis on with attention to leadership roles and significant contributions to administration, governance, or to professional/academic communities. (Service).

iii. In its evaluation, the committee should be mindful of changing priorities and weights on teaching, research, outreach, and service that occur at different stages of an academic career. The committee will find the faculty member’s contributions either meets the
standards with regard to the criteria set forth by the Department P&T Guidelines for post-tenure review or that they do not meet the standards for post-tenure review set forth in the Department P&T Guidelines.

3. The committee shall endeavor to reach consensus before writing its report to the chair. In its report to the chair, the committee shall explain its decision and provide evidence to support the decision. If the committee finds the faculty member’s contributions to meet the standards set forth for post-tenure review, they shall document this in their report to the chair. If the committee finds the faculty member’s contributions to do not meet standards, the report shall document the areas which should the committee finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

4. Should a unanimous decision not be reached, the committee report shall include the views of the majority and the minority.

D. Role of the Department Chair

1. The department chair must assure that the faculty member’s post tenure review committee has followed department/academic unit and university post tenure review guidelines, has considered the faculty member’s dossier, and that the committee’s report is complete and uses the proper forms. In units that do not have departments, the department chair responsibilities shall be fulfilled by a program director, area director, or post tenure review committee chair as the chair designee, as specified in unit guidelines.

2. The department chair shall write a letter affirming or challenging the committee’s decision and recommendation based on the criteria in the Departmental Post Tenure Review Guidelines, and explain his/her reasons. If the chair finds the faculty member’s contributions to not meet standards, the chair’s letter shall document the areas which should s/he finds do not meet the standards and provide evidence so that these areas shall be addressed in a Professional Development Plan.

3. The department chair’s letter and the committee report must be sent to the faculty member within 10 working days of the transmittal of the committee’s report.

4. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review his or her file, including the post tenure committee report(s) and the department chair’s letter, before it is forwarded to the Dean/Provost. The faculty member should indicate s/he has done so by signing the form in Appendix PT-1. If the faculty member disagrees with the recommendation, he/she may request reconsideration, as outlined in Section E.

5. The department chair must discuss with the faculty member, when requested, the reasons for the recommendations by the Post Tenure Review committee and the department chair.
6. The department chair must provide to the Dean a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed and submit to the Dean for each faculty member reviewed:
   i. A completed recommendation form (Appendix PT-1) signed by members of the post tenure review committee and the department chair or chair designee;
   ii. The Post Tenure Review committee’s report and the department chair’s letter;
   iii. If a reconsideration was requested, a copy of the faculty member’s request, the materials submitted, and the reconsideration reviews done by the chair and/or committee.

E. Procedures for Reconsideration of Recommendations by the Post Tenure Committee and Department Chair
   1. If a faculty member questions the Post Tenure Review committee’s recommendation and/or the department chair’s recommendation, he/she may call in writing for a reconsideration of the recommendations within 10 working days of receiving them.
   2. The reconsideration may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever additional material is pertinent. The supporting materials must be submitted to the post tenure review committee and/or the department chair as appropriate within 10 working days of the request for reconsideration.
   3. If the reconsideration is requested for the committee’s decision, the committee chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee’s reconsideration. The faculty member’s materials will then be forwarded to the department chair for his or her review.
   4. If reconsideration is requested of the chair’s decision, the chair must report in writing to the faculty member the results of the committee’s reconsideration and his or her reconsideration. The faculty member’s materials will then be forwarded to the Dean for his or her consideration.
   5. Should the committee or the department chair reverse their original decisions and find the faculty member’s contributions to meet standards, the department chair shall write a report of the new decision and attach it with the original report and the faculty member’s submission, and forward all materials to the Dean.

V. Roles and Procedures for Administrative Review
   A. Role of Dean or Equivalent Administrator
      1. The Dean shall provide to the Provost a statement of assurance that all eligible faculty have been reviewed.
      2. The Dean shall review materials submitted by the faculty member and the report of the post tenure review committee and the chair with regard to the dossier submitted by the faculty member in order to write a letter
affirming or challenging the recommendation of the committee and the chair

3. If the Dean disagrees with the recommendation of the post tenure committee and/or the chair, he or she must explain the his or her decision and document which criteria in the department’s post-tenure guidelines were not being met and provide evidence to support the decision.

4. The Dean’s letter shall be delivered within 20 working days to the department chair, the post tenure review committee chair, and the faculty member.

5. If the Dean finds that the faculty member’s contributions do not meet standards, the department chair, chair of the committee, and/or the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the Dean’s letter. The conference must be held before the Dean’s recommendations are forwarded to the Provost. The faculty member has 10 working days to provide additional materials to the Dean in support of the reconsideration.

6. If upon reconsideration, the Dean reverses his or her original decision and finds the faculty member’s contributions meet standards, the Dean shall so report in writing and send with the original letter and all materials to the Provost.

7. If the Dean finds that the faculty member has met standards when the post tenure review committee’s and the department chair’s finding disagree, the Dean’s letter to the Provost shall give his or her reasons.

B. Role of the Provost

1. The Provost shall review the materials forwarded by the Dean for each faculty member.

2. The Provost shall notify each faculty member, the chair, and the Dean in writing of his or her final decision affirming the recommendation of the Dean.

3. If the Provost finds a faculty member’s review does not meet standards after the Dean has found the faculty member’s review does meet standards, the Provost must provide reasons in writing for his or her decision. The Provost will audit the decisions by the Dean, department chair or chair designee, and PTR committee to ensure that they comply with university guidelines. If the Provost finds that the review does not comply with university guidelines, then he/she must give reasons for his/her decision, addressing evidence provided at earlier levels of review.

4. The faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Provost within 10 working days of the receipt of the Provost’s letter and may add additional evidence to the file within 10 working days of receiving the Provost’s letter. If requested, the Provost shall meet with the faculty member.

5. Appeals of the Provost’s final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).
6. Should a faculty member be deemed not to meet the standards of the post tenure review, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA or unilateral changes in the faculty member’s letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

C. Role of the President

1. After receiving a report of the outcome of a reconsideration requested by a faculty member of the Provost’s decision, the president shall make a final determination of the review as meeting or not meeting the standards set forth in the P&T Guidelines for post-tenure review.

2. Appeals of the president’s final decision should follow the grievance procedure found in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR 577-42-0005).

VI. The Professional Development Plan (PDP)

A. Purpose and Objective

1. A faculty member whose contributions have been determined to not meet standards shall develop, in conjunction with the department/unit chair or chair designee, a Professional Development Plan (PDP). As per Article 16, Section 3 of the PSU-AAUP CBA, an unsatisfactory review shall not be the basis for just cause sanctions pursuant to Article 27, or unilateral changes in the faculty member’s letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

2. The PDP can be from one year to five up to two years in duration as deemed appropriate. In exceptional circumstances, a third year may be approved.

3. The PDP shall contain goals, specific actions to be taken, expected results/benefits, timeline, and proposed budget that is consistent with the faculty member’s career path scholarly agenda. The PDP shall only contain tasks that are substantially within the faculty member’s control (e.g. the PDP could specify that the faculty member write a book but not that the book be published).

4. Based on discussions with the faculty member, and consultation with the department/unit review committee, the department/unit chair shall draft a PDP which will be forwarded to the Dean with a form (Appendix B) signed by the faculty member and the Department Chair.

B. Role of the Department Chair, or Chair Designee, in Developing the PDP

1. Using the information provided in the post tenure review committee’s report and the department chair’s letter, the faculty member and his or her chair shall jointly agree on the PDP. The chair will forward the PDP to the Dean.

2. If the faculty member and the department chair cannot agree, or want modifications to the PDP, they will meet with the Dean to discuss modifications to the PDP. If no agreement can be reached, the faculty
member and the chair shall write a letter identifying the modifications they recommend for the PDP and the reasons for the modifications. The faculty member’s PDP and the department chair’s letter are submitted to the Dean for resolution.

C. B. Role of the Dean in approving the PDP
   1. If the dean agrees with the PDP forwarded by the faculty member and the Chair, the Dean shall sign the PDP form (Appendix PT-1).
   2. [separately enumerated:] Should the dean seek modification to the PDP, he or she shall discuss the requested changes with the chair who will then discuss the changes with the faculty member.
   3. If the faculty member and the chair agree on the modifications requested by the dean, a revised PDP shall be drafted and signed by both the faculty member and the chair, whereupon the University shall make available the appropriate resources to implement the PDP.
   4. The provost will make the final determination if the faculty member, and the department chair and Dean do not agree on the modifications requested by the Dean. They may consult with the Provost to reach agreement.

D. C. Progress and Resolution of the PDP
   1. The department chair or designee in schools where there are no department chairs shall meet with the faculty member every 6 months for the duration of the PDP annually to discuss progress on the PDP. If the PDP needs to be revised, the faculty member and department chair shall reach agreement on the revisions. Significant revisions shall be approved by the Department Chair and Dean.
   2. If the faculty member wishes to extend the PDP timeline and/or requires additional resources, the faculty member shall make the request in writing to the department chair. The department chair shall review the request and make a determination whether or not to support the faculty member’s request within 10 working days. If the department chair supports the faculty member’s request, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean who shall reply within 15 working days. If the Department Chair does not agree with the request, the request shall be forwarded to the Dean and the Dean will make the final determination within 15 working days.
   3. When the PDP is completed, the faculty member shall submit a report of completion to the department chair. The faculty member and the department chair shall meet to discuss whether the objectives of the PDP have been reached.
   4. If the department chair agrees that the objectives of the plan have been reached, the chair shall send a letter of completion and the faculty member’s report to the Dean.
   5. If the department chair does not agree, the chair must write a letter to the Dean describing which objectives have not been reached and provide evidence of that finding along with a description of what further work is
needed and provide a revised timetable for completion of the PDP. A copy of the letter must be provided to the faculty member.

6. When the chair decides the objectives have not been reached, the faculty member may request in writing a conference for reconsideration by the Dean within 10 working days of the receipt of the chair’s letter to the Dean. The faculty member may provide additional materials in writing within 10 working days of his or her request for reconsideration.

7. Should a faculty member refuse to create and/or follow the PDP (except due to circumstances that are substantially outside the faculty member’s control), she/he shall be notified and not complete the PDP successfully, he or she shall not be subject to sanctions pursuant to Article 27 of the PSU-AAUP CBA. or unilateral changes in the faculty member’s letter of offer or supplemental letter of offer.

8. If the department chair and Dean agree that the PDP has been successfully completed, the faculty member will be eligible for the post tenure review increase that is currently in force effective at the start of the following academic year.

9. The Professional Development Plan, with information on how it was fulfilled, must be signed within 20 working days of completion by the faculty member, the department chair/unit head, and dean and filed with the Provost Office.

END
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[Appendix PT-1]. APPRAISAL SIGNATURE SHEET AND RECOMMENDATION FORM FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

For implementation in the forthcoming Academic Year, 20_______

Name ____________________________________________

Last                                                     First                  Middle

College or School/Department _____________________________________________________

Date of First Appointment at PSU _____________  Current Rank_________________________

Date of Tenure, Promotion, or most recent Post-Tenure Review __________________________

Each voting member of the Departmental Committee and each reviewing Administrator is required to sign and indicate his or her vote or recommendation. Please use M to indicate meets standards and U NM to does not meet standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>SIGNATURES</th>
<th>Meets/Does not meet standards</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PDP Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE MEMBERS*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE CHAIR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT CHAIR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEAN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If more space is needed for committee membership, please attach an additional page.

I have been apprised of the recommendations indicated on this form and have been given the opportunity to review my file before its submittal to the Dean’s Office.

Faculty Signature ___________________________ Date __________________
February 5, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
      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 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

Graduate School of Education

New Courses
E.1.a.1
- CI 518 Implementing Mathematics Reform, 3 credits
  Exploration of worthwhile mathematical tasks provides the context for examining learning, teaching, and assessment. Topics include effective learning environments, strategies for planning lessons with a focus on student thinking/understanding, and analysis of materials and resources. Prerequisite: Students are required to complete at least four content-focused pedagogy courses.

E.1.a.2
- CI 519 Mathematics Leadership: Influencing and Facilitating Improvement, 3 credits
  Develop an understanding of the role of and the challenges faced by mathematics instructional leaders in their work. Attention to the multiple levels of learning i.e., classroom and the professional learning community within grade-level, building, district, and beyond - each focusing strategies for influencing and facilitating improvement in mathematics instruction.
February 5, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain  
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 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**Change to Existing Programs**

E.1.c.1  
- Graphic Design Minor – changes to course requirements; reduces total credits from 52 to 44. FSBC comments: TBA

E.1.c.2  
- Photography Minor – changes to course requirements; reduces total credits from 32 to 28. FSBC comments: We consider that these changes in the program are minor and do not have budgetary impact or faculty impact. No additional budget information is required.

E.1.c.3  
- Theater Arts BA/BS – changes core course requirements and approved optional credits. FSBC comments: No budgetary concerns. The number of credits needed for the major is not changing; roughly equal number of courses being dropped and new courses being added.

**New Courses**

E.1.c.4  
- ArH 110 Visual Literacy (4)  
  Course is intended to equip students with the necessary skills to critically view and interpret global visual culture, and to provide them with a strong foundation for future art courses in art history, art, and design, through critical analysis, reading, discussion, and writing.

E.1.c.5  
- Art 333 Friendtoship: Design, Art, and Social Change (4)  
  Mentoring high school students through hands on creative projects around themes such as social justice, art literacy and community. This course should be of particular value and interest to students who have a desire to teach and inspire, increasing access to arts learning for under-served teens.

E.1.c.6  
- Art 353 Typeface Design (4)
Focus on developing the skills and critical thinking necessary for producing digital typefaces. History, technology and contemporary practices of the industry. Basic lettering skills and theory explored, to aid in the primary focus of creating a functional, flexible and useful typeface. Prerequisite: Art 254.

- **E.1.c.7**
  - Art 358 Video, Design, and Community (4)
  Focus on collaboration in video production and community-based media. Production of a promotional/informational video for community organizations in Portland. History of community and independent media. Basic video and audio recording, post-production, interviewing, and group decision-making skills.

- **E.1.c.8**
  - Art 425 A+D Projects (4)
  Advanced development of graphic design skills with emphasis placed upon conceptual development, research, visual and written messages, multi-task time and materials management, budgets and production. Emphasis will be placed on studio management, teamwork and production. Prerequisite: Successfully pass the sophomore review and instructor permission.

- **E.1.c.9**
  - Art 441 Interface Design (4)
  Studio course in Interaction Design, with an emphasis on design concepts and techniques in several media including mobile and non-conventional interfaces. Thorough examination of design trends, usability testing and prototyping, and communicating content within the interactive space. Topics include interaction design patterns, user experience, environmental design, information architecture, and understanding industry standards in UX design. Prerequisite: Art 341.

- **E.1.c.10**
  - Film 258 Documentary Film Production I (4)
  An introductory study of aesthetic, technical, and content-related principles of digital filmmaking in nonfiction, documentary formats. Prerequisite: Film 131.

- **E.1.c.11**
  - Film 361 Documentary Film Production II (4)
  An intermediate study of aesthetic, technical, and content-related principles of digital filmmaking in nonfiction, documentary formats. Prerequisites: Film 131, Film 258.

- **E.1.c.12**
  - Film 362 Documentary Film Production III (4)
  An advanced study of aesthetic, technical, and content-related principles of digital filmmaking in nonfiction, documentary formats. Prerequisites: Film 131, Film 258, Film 361.

- **E.1.c.13**
  - Mus 105 Introduction to Music Theory (3)
  Preparatory level of music theory introducing main terms and concepts: music notation, meter, beat, rhythm, intervals, circle of fifth, key signatures, major and minor scales, triads and dominant seventh chord, and their implementation in blues form and popular song. No previous musical knowledge required. Complements Practical Musicianship.

- **E.1.c.14**
  - Mus 106 Aural Skills (3)
Designed to train the student to aurally recognize meters, rhythms, intervals, triads and seventh chords. Students learn to sing melodies on sight as well as develop strategies for composing and harmonizing melodies for instrumental or vocal accompaniment.

E.1.c.15
  • Mus 128 Recording Live Sound (4)
    Provides students with the skills necessary to set-up and operate professional sound reinforcement equipment. Guides students through the ins and outs of sound system components, setups, mixing and troubleshooting, as well as principles and concepts fundamental to live sound reinforcement. Provides video tutorials with hands-on demonstrations providing tips and techniques used in real live sound situations from indoor venues to outdoor stages.

E.1.c.16
  • Mus 129 Desktop Music Production (4)
    Provides students with the necessary skills and techniques to produce CD quality music using modern music technology. Students will learn to record and edit audio from a variety of sources, processing and effects, MIDI and Podcasting.

E.1.c.17
  • Mus 200 Musical Instruments (4)
    Study of the conventional classification, history, construction, and the use of instruments in classical, folk, and popular music. Instruments are explored in terms of: manner of producing sound, tuning and transposing, technical capabilities, virtuosity, and compatibility with other instruments/vocal parts as demonstrated in the literature. Develops aural recognition of each instrument.

E.1.c.18
  • Mus 228 Sound Design (4)
    Up-to-date introduction to the art of sound synthesis and sampling with special emphasis on today's technology and the evolving market place. Comprehensive overview of specific techniques for creating new sounds, capturing and manipulating existing sounds and application.

E.1.c.19
  • Mus 229 Recording Theory (4)
    Up-to-date introduction to the art of audio recording with special emphasis on today's technology and the evolving marketplace. Comprehensive overview of microphones, specific techniques for recording drums, individual instruments and vocals. Considerations for Home studio development are discussed including DAW selection and acoustic conditioning.

E.1.c.20
  • Mus 232 Music and Style (4)
    Focus on analysis of the inner workings of the nine selected compositions that marked the development of musical form and overall period style. Study of fugue, character piece, symphony, chamber forms, opera, and musical, and program and absolute music. Each week brings one significant piece.

E.1.c.21
  • Mus 233 Music Notation (4)
    Provides students with thorough study in the principles of music notation, providing a comprehensive overview of specific techniques for creating music manuscripts that are not only correct in terms of notation, but legibly written and clearly communicating the composers’ intentions.
• TA 121 Introduction to Design for Theater (4)
  Introduces the four primary fields of theatrical design - scenery, costumes, lighting and sound, with an emphasis on analysis, research, and the exploration of design ideas. Basic artistic skills and techniques introduced to aid development of the skills required to communicate design. Technical skills are not required.

• TA 134 Workshop Theater: Scenery, Costume & Lighting Production 1 (0-1)
  A study and practical application of skills related to scenery, costume, and lighting for the theatre. Students will learn through participating on construction and implementation and/or run crews for the departmental production.

• TA 151 Introduction to Theater Arts & Practices (4)
  Investigates theater as both a dramatic art and an industry. Students introduced to topics in theater history, playwriting, performance, design, and theater management. Students exposed to a variety of productions and theater professions in the Portland community.

• TA 234 Workshop Theater: Scenery, Costume & Lighting Production 2 (0-1)
  A study and practical application of skills related to scenery, costume, and lighting for the theatre. Students will learn through participating on construction and implementation and/or run crews for the departmental production. 200 level workshops assume familiarity with the shop(s); a higher level of responsibility will be expected.

Change to Existing Courses

• Art 118 Introduction to Typography and Communication Design – change co-requisite.
• Art 262 Photoimaging I – change description and prerequisites.
• Art 360 Photographic Exploration I – change prerequisites; concurrent enrollment.
• Art 455 Time Arts Studio – change title, description, prerequisites.
• Art 485 Studio Art Seminar – change title, description.
• TA 111 Technical Theater 1 – change title, description, co-requisite.
• TA 112 Technical Theater 2 – drop.
• TA 114 Technical Theater Production – drop.
• TA 115 Technical Theater Production – drop.
• TA 248 Acting 1: Process – change prerequisites.
• TA 301 Script Analysis – change course number.
School of Business Administration

New Courses

- Mktg 449 Portfolio Workshop (2)
  Three-day weekend intensive designed to stretch students’ ability to quickly assess business problems, gather research and prepare creative communication strategy for presentation to clients. Students work for real clients, who judge presentation one week after faculty critique. Helps build student portfolio work. Prerequisites: BA 311, Mktg 340.

Change to Existing Courses

- Actg 335 Accounting Information – change prerequisite.
- Actg 360 Management Accounting – change prerequisite.
- Actg 381 Financial Accounting and Reporting I – change prerequisite.
- BA 316 Working with Customers for Business Minors – change title.
- BA 326 Working with People for Business Minors – change title.
- BA 336 Working with Information for Business Minors – change title, description.
- BA 346 Working as an Entrepreneur for Business Minors – change title, prerequisite.

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs

- Economics BA/BS – gives students a choice of two microeconomics courses to satisfy a core requirement. Clarifies how electives are used in the major. FSBC Comments: TBA.
- History BA/BS – changing course numbers required for the History Reading Seminar/Research Seminar courses from Hst 405 Reading Colloquium and Hst 407 Seminar to Hst 491 Reading Seminar and Hst 492 Research Seminar. FSBC Comments: No budgetary impact; changes reflect course number changes only.
Environmental Sustainability minor – adds new courses to requirements and lists of options. FSBC Comments: TBA.

New Courses

• Ar 330 Topics in Arab Culture and Civilization (4)
  Survey of the development of culture, thought, and the arts in the Arab world, from pre-Islamic times to the present with focus on particular themes or periods. Does not replace Ar 301, Ar 302, or Ar 303. Taught in English.

• ASL 330 Deaf Culture (4)
  Introduction to major aspects of American Deaf Culture such as the history of deaf culture and community, its art, literature, folklore and language (American Sign Language), including current attitudes, movements, policies, and trends that affect the Deaf as a linguistic minority.

• Bi 214, 215, 216 Principles of Biology Labs I, II, III (1, 1, 1)
  Laboratory work to accompany Principles of Biology (Bi 211, Bi 212, Bi 213). Completion of, or concurrent enrollment in appropriate lecture course is required. One 3-hour laboratory. Graded only. Expected preparation: Prior or concurrent enrollment in Ch 227 for Bi 214, Ch 228 for Bi 215, Ch 229 for Bi 216.

• Jpn 344 Japanese Literature in Translation: Manga (4)
  Readings of masterpieces of Japanese comic books, analysis of writing about the graphic-novel form. Readings of the manga are followed by discussion of the artistic style, questions about Japanese society, and each novel’s place in the history of the genre. Readings /discussions are in English. Expected preparation: 8 credits of literature.

• Kor 361 Korean Culture and Society through Film (4)
  Introduces salient elements of traditional and contemporary Korea by means of watching and discussing selected Korean movies that offer rich cultural and historical contexts. Examines how the creators of the movies interpret and represent them in their work. Taught in English.

• Soc 250 Introduction to Sociology for the Health Sciences (4)
  Comprehensive overview of sociological concepts that are important to the health sciences.

• Span 395 Spanish in the World (4)
  The expansion of Spanish through media, Spanish and the other official languages of the Iberian Peninsula, Spanish in the USA, and the language politics of Latin America. Prerequisite: Span 303 or concurrent enrollment.

• Stat 241 Application of Statistics for Business (4)
  Introduction of statistical analysis as part of management practice. Content includes statistical analysis, theoretical foundations and tools, as they relate to the application of statistics to problem solving in uncertain business environments. Emphasizes application
of statistical tools to real world datasets and ability of students to make managerial recommendations. Prerequisite: Mth 95 or placement.

E.1.c.60
• Viet – new prefix for Vietnamese language and literature.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.61
• Ar 330 Arabic Calligraphy: Reading and Writing – change course number to Ar 331.

E.1.c.62
• Bi 251, 252, 253 Principles of Biology I, II, III – change prerequisites and add required co-requisites.

E.1.c.63
• Ec 312 Macroeconomic Theory – change description and prerequisite.

E.1.c.64
• Ec 338 Political Economy of Latin American Development – drop.

E.1.c.65
• Ec 339 Political Economy of Japanese Development – drop.

E.1.c.66
• Ec 348 The Globalization Debate – drop.

E.1.c.67
• Ec 432 Advanced Environmental Economics – change prerequisite.

E.1.c.68
• Ec 440 International Trade Theory and Policy – change prerequisite.

E.1.c.69
• Ec 451/551 Microenterprises in Developing Areas – drop.

E.1.c.70
• Ec 461/561 The Economics of Empire and War – drop.

E.1.c.71
• Ec 465 Labor Economics – change prerequisite.

E.1.c.72
• Ec 466/566 The Political Economy of Mexican Migration – drop.

E.1.c.73
• Ec 480 Mathematical Economics – change prerequisite.

E.1.c.74
• Ec 487/587 Economic Planning – drop.

E.1.c.75
• Mth 211, 212, 213 Foundations of Elementary Mathematics I, II, III – change from a sequential course to independent course numbers and removing sequence requirements; change descriptions.

E.1.c.76
• Mth 356 Discrete Mathematics – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.77
• Soc 348 White Identities in the United States – drop.

E.1.c.78
• Span 345 Present-Day Cultural and Literary Expression – change prerequisite.

E.1.c.79
• WS 305 Women of Color Feminisms – change title, description.
Proposal for Implementation of the Post-Tenure Review process

Proposed by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for consideration 3/2/15

Following Senate approval and mutual agreement by OAA and AAUP-PSU, the PSU Faculty Senate recommends the following for the implementation of the planned Post-Tenure Review process:

1. Eligibility
All AAUP-represented tenured faculty members, department chairs/unit heads, and program directors shall undergo post tenure review during the 5-year period beginning in AY 2014-2015 following the Procedures for Post-Tenure Review adopted by Faculty Senate (date TBA).

Successful reviews for promotions in rank of tenured faculty shall be considered as reviews in lieu of post tenure review and shall re-commence the countdown to the next post tenure review.

OAA shall create a list of all current PSU tenured faculty, ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion.

A fifth of all eligible tenured faculty will be reviewed in each of the first five years, in order of the year of last review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure.

2. Opt Out
Only tenured faculty who provide a letter stating they will retire within 2 years shall be allowed to opt out of Post-Tenure Review.

In these cases, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile.

3. Deferral
With agreement from the Dean, faculty are allowed to defer Post-Tenure Review for sabbatical, personal circumstances, such as illness, injury, pregnancy, adoption, or eldercare, and when returning from special assignments on- or off-campus, such as field research or professional or administrative positions.

As faculty in a quintile are deferred, an equal number of faculty will be moved from the immediately following quintile into that quintile.

4. Funding Of Post Tenure Review Salary Increases
Senate recommends that a faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equivalent to the percentage of salary set aside for post-tenure salary increases in Article 30 Section 6 Post-Tenure Review Salary Increases, currently 4% in the AAUP-PSU CBA 2013-2015.
5. Funding Of PDP
A faculty member whose post tenure review finds that s/he does not meet standards must develop a Professional Development Plan in consultation with her/his department chair.

In keeping with Article 30 section 6 of the 2013-15 University and AAUP CBA that provides for a salary pool equal to 4% of base salaries of all AAUP represented tenured faculty who are reviewed, those whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional developments funds not to exceed 4% of their salary to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the Professional Development Plan.

Recognizing that some PDPs will not require funds equal to the 4% amount set aside under Art 30 Section 7, the Senate recommends that any unexpended funds be transferred to the Faculty Development Fund.

6. Training for developing and administering PDPs
OAA shall design and implement training for Deans, Chairs, and Directors and tenured faculty for developing and administering PDPs.

7. Assessment
Faculty Senate shall convene an ad hoc committee including members from OAA and AAUP-PSU to assess the post tenure review process after the 2nd year of the review process and to make a report to Senate that calls, if needed, for changes in the post tenure review process.

END
2/16/15
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Winter Report 2015

Members

*Members:* Ron Babcock (Music), Mirela Blekic (University Studies), Todd Bodner (Psychology), Michael Bowman (Library, chair) Mitchell Cruzan (Biology), Michele Gamburd (Anthropology), Jonathen Gates (student), David Hansen (SBA), Courtney Hanson (Graduate Studies), James Hook (MCECS), Gerardo Lafferriere (Mathematics & Statistics), Krystine McCants (student), Robert Mercer (CLAS), Eva Nuñez (World Languages & Literatures), José Padin (Sociology, EPC chair, ex-officio), Candyce Reynolds (Educational Leadership & Policy), Jill Rissi (Public Administration), Michael Taylor (SSW)

*Consultants:* Sona Andrews (OAA), David Burgess (OIRP), Alan Finn (Budget Office) Gina Greco (World Languages & Literatures), Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP), Kevin Reynolds (FADM)

Strategic Enrollment Management Plans

Committee members read the college and schools’ draft strategic enrollment management plans. Feedback on specific plans was presented to the Provost and Deans. The “final” version of the plans are available to read at [https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/academic-enrollment-management-plan/home](https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/academic-enrollment-management-plan/home) and the Committee highly recommends all faculty read their college/school’s plan.

Proposals

School of Public Health

The Committee received a draft of the School of Public Health proposal the first week in February, and the draft budget in the second week. The Committee has discussed the proposal twice (as of February 7) and is continuing discussions to develop a budget impact statement.

Process Change

We have made a change in the process by which we review proposals. The two-person review panels post their comments into a shared Google doc for the rest of the Committee to review before they go to Steve Harmon for posting to the curriculum tracker.

College/School Liaison Program

Budget Committee members serve as liaisons to their college/school deans. Members are also designated to serve as liaisons to Honors, IELP, and University Studies. The goal is to keep the Committee informed about planning at the college/school level and also to attempt to get some faculty input into planning at the early stages, where it has the highest potential impact. We are also working with divisional members of the Educational Policy Committee on this. Engagement has varied from unit to unit, and this is an ongoing process.

Committee Role

The Committee is engaging in periodic discussions on the Committee’s role in the new budget process.

VP for Academic & Fiscal Planning Search

Members of the Committee participated with members of Senate Steering Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee in interviewing the candidates for the Vice Provost for Academic and Fiscal Planning position. Members provided feedback to the Provost.
Updated Budget Forecast

The Committee received an updated budget forecast from Kevin Reynolds in February. Details to be presented at the Senate meeting.

Chair’s Activities

The Chair has served on the Fee Advisory Committee this quarter. This Committee provides recommendations on non-mandatory fee changes to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The Committee has had good discussions on what tuition should cover and what students should take away from an activity or which they are being charged a fee. The Committee has a guiding principle of trying to reduce the students’ cost.

The Chair also observes the Board of Trustees’ Finance and Administration Committee monthly meetings. The goal is to learn what the Board is asking about the budget. To date, the focus has primarily been on determining what authority they have, particularly regarding authorizing bonds. Minutes of the Finance and Administration Committee meetings are available online at www.pdx.edu/board/finance-and-administration-committee.
February 9, 2015

To: Martha Hickey, Senate Steering Committee

From: José Padín, Chair, Educational Policy Committee

Re: EPC Winter 2015 Report (Draft)

EPC is an advisory body to the Faculty Senate and the President and the Senate on matters of educational policy and planning. This charge the Faculty Governance Guide breaks down as follows:

1. **On its own initiative**, take notice of significant developments bearing on educational policy and planning, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
2. **By referral** from the President, faculty committees, the Faculty Senate, prepare recommendations on educational policy and planning.
3. **In consultation** with appropriate Faculty committees, recommend long-term University plans and priorities.
4. Evaluate, and make recommendations to the Senate, regarding proposals for the creation, major alteration, or abolition of the educational function or the structure of academic entities (department, programs, schools, colleges, centers, institutes, and other significant academic entities).

### Overview of EPC Winter 2015 Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for a <strong>Department of International Studies</strong></td>
<td>Review completed. EPC motion presented to Faculty Senate, January 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for a <strong>School of Gender, Race and Nation</strong></td>
<td>Review completed. EPC motion presented to Faculty Senate, February 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Draft of <strong>“Guidelines for Proposals to Transfer the Academic Home of Units across Schools and Colleges at PSU”</strong></td>
<td>EPC reviewed these guidelines in January 21, 2015. EPC recommendations for revision communicated to Provost 4-Feb-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for a new <strong>School of Public Health</strong></td>
<td>First draft of the proposal received 20-Jan-2015. EPC review started, February 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Education Educational Quality Standards</td>
<td>EPC subcommittee started work in January. EPC will make recommendation to Faculty Senate by March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPC Memorandum to OAA and Faculty</td>
<td>EPC subcommittee has prepared a draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate on the expectation to be involved in program and policy planning from earliest phases of conception.</td>
<td>It will be ready February 23, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Prioritization Review</td>
<td>EPC attended fall town hall, discussed, and shared recommendations with Mark Jones. APPR is main EPC agenda item February 23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other items that have been brought to EPC:**

1. Advisability of establishing a PSU Bachelors of Applied Science degree including PSU accepting a large block transfer of “vocational” (i.e., non-academic track) community college credits.

2. Advisability of starting to offer “Pre-baccalaureate/non-baccalaureate” Certificates.

   Preliminary discussion January 2015. Both identified as areas of EPC concern and interest.