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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 **May 4, 2015** at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the April 6, 2015 Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   *1. Provost’s Response to Senate Actions
   2. Presentation of the University Mace – Aylmer
   3. Report of the Textbook Affordability Task Force (see April packet) – Moody
   4. Annual Report of the Advising Council (see April packet) – Jhaj
   5. Update from APPC – Jones
   6. Preview of the School of Public Health Proposal – Bowman, McBride & Andresen

**NOMINATION OF THE 2015-16 PSU FACULTY SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT**

D. Old Business
   *1. ARC Proposals for Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas

E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Proposal for a BFA in Creative Writing in CLAS
   *3. Proposal to Amend the Constitution to eliminate the Teacher Education Committee

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. Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee
   *4. Annual Report of the Library Committee
   *5. Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
   *6. Annual Report of the University Studies Council

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
B  Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 6, 2015 and attachments
C-1 Provost Response to Senate Actions
D-1 ARC Proposals for Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas
E-1 Curricular Consent Agenda (a & c)

Secretary to the Faculty
hickeym@pdx.edu • 650MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax5-4624
FYI - AT THE JUNE 1, 2015 FACULTY SENATE:

- ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS & ELECTION OF THE 2015-16 SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT
- NOMINATION & ELECTION OF TWO NEW MEMBERS TO THE SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE FOR 2015-2017
**FACULTY SENATE ROSTER**

**2014-15 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE**
Presiding Officer… Bob Liebman;  
Presiding Officer Elect… Gina Greco; Past Presiding Officer… Leslie McBride  
Secretary… Martha W. Hickey  
Committee Members: Linda George (2016) and Swapna Mukhopadhyay (2016)  

David Hansen *ex officio*, Chair, Committee on Committees, Maude Hines, *ex officio*, IFS Representative

### 2014-15 FACULTY SENATE (62)**

**All Others (9)**
- Hunt, Marcy SHAC 2015  
- *Luther, Christina OIA 2015*  
- Baccar, Cindy EMSA 2016  
- Ingersoll, Becki ACS 2016  
- Popp, Karen OGS 2016  
- Skaruppa, Cindy EMSA 2016  
- Arellano, Regina EMSA 2017  
- Harmon, Steve OAA 2017  
- Kiedlinger, Carla EMSA 2017

**College of the Arts (4)**
- *Boas, Pat ART 2015*  
- Griffin, Corey ARCH 2016  
- Babcock, Ronald MUS 2017  
- Hansen, Brad MUS 2017

**CLAS – Arts and Letters (8)**
- Dolidon, Annabelle WLL 2015  
- Mercer, Robert LAS 2015  
- *Reese, Susan ENG 2015*  
- *Santelmann, Lynn LING 2015*  
- Perlmutter, Jennifer WLL 2016  
- *Childs, Tucker LING 2017*  
- Clark, Michael ENG 2017  
- Greco, Gina WLL 2017

**CLAS – Sciences (8)**
- *Bleiler, Steven (for Burns) GEOL 2015*  
- Eppley, Sarah BIO 2015  
- Sanchez, Erik PHY 2015  
- Daescu, Dacian MTH 2016  
- George, Linda ESM 2016  
- *Rueter, John ESM 2016*  
- *Elzansowski, Marek MATH 2017*  
- Stedman, Ken BIO 2017

**CLAS – Social Sciences (7)**
- Brower, Barbara GEOG 2015  
- *DeAnda, Roberto CHLT 2015*  
- *Carstens, Sharon ANTH 2016*  
- Padin, Jose SOC 2016  
- Davidova, Evguenia INTL 2017

**College of Urban and Public Affairs (6)**
- *Clucas, Richard PS 2015*  
- Brodowicz, Gary CH 2016  
- Carder, Paula IA 2016  
- *Labissiere, Yves (for Farquhar) CH 2016*  
- Schrock, Greg USP 2017  
- *Yesilada, Birol PS 2017*

**Graduate School of Education (4)**
- *Smith, Michael ED 2015*  
- McElhone, Dorothy ED 2016  
- *De La Vega, Esperanza ED 2017*  
- Mukhopadhyay, Swapna ED 2017

**Library (1)**
- *Bowman, Michael LIB 2017*

**Maseeh College of Eng. & Comp. Science (5)**
- *Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata ECE 2015*  
- Zurk, Lisa ECE 2015  
- *Daim, Tugrul (for Bertini) ETM 2016*  
- Karavanic, Karen CS 2016  
- Maier, David CS 2017

**Other Instructional (2)**
- *Carpenter, Rowanna UNST 2015*  
- Lindsay, Susan IELP 2016

**School of Business Administration (4)**
- *Hansen, David SBA 2015*  
- Layzell, David SBA 2016  
- Loney, Jennifer SBA 2016  
- Raffo, David SBA 2017

**School of Social Work (4)**
- Holliday, Mindy SSW 2015  
- Cotrell, Victoria SSW 2016  
- *Donlan, Ted SSW 2017*  
- Taylor, Michael SSW 2017

*Interim appointments  
†Member of Committee on Committees

Date: Oct. 17, 2014; New Senators in italics
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, April 6, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppeley, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Hunt, Ingersoll, Karavani, Labissiere, Layzell, Liebman, Luther, Maier, McElhone, Mercer, Mukhopadhyay, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Raffo, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor, Yeshilada

Alternates Present: Glaze for Babcock, ______ for Clark, Kinsella for Clucas, Messer for Carder, Ferbel-Azcarate for De Anda, Wortham-Galvin for Griffin, Ryder for Skaruppa, Hines for Reese until 3:50, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: Arellano, Brower, Lindsay, Loney, De La Vega


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2 & 9, 2015 MEETINGS

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The March 2 & 9, 2015 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN reported that ESM 351 had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda and that it would be considered at a later date.

LIEBMAN reviewed the set up and reminded senators that the Opt-In nomination process for the 2015 elections for Senate, Advisory Council, and IFS were beginning. He encouraged senators to think about nominations for Senate Presiding Officer Elect and Steering Committee, as well as Secretary of the Faculty, a position that would also be open for the coming year. He polled senators to find out if they wanted to meet with the Corraggio Strategic Planning group for a discussion about the work of the Topic Teams; a majority of senators indicated yes.
LIEBMAN stated that the proposal for a new School of Public Health would be previewed at the May meeting. He announced plans for a coffee hour for faculty to meet with PSU trustees before the next Board meeting.

APPC

JONES reiterated the importance of the Academic Program Prioritization Process as a way of ensuring that academic priorities will “share the wheel” with University fiscal priorities and of giving faculty a voice in planning for the future. He announced that the APP Committee would hold a forum 3-4:00 pm, Monday, April 27 in Cramer Hall 53, to gather input on the proposed scoring rubrics and revised timeline for scoring the 157 programs identified: http://pdxappc.blogspot.com/

IFS

HINES reviewed a list of pending legislative proposals discussed at the March IFS meeting: legislation concerning credit transfer, free tuition at community colleges, accelerated learning, faculty and staff demographics, textbook affordability, and the state-wide model for funding education. IFS is particularly interested in pushing for measures of inputs (funding positive changes) as well as outputs. IFS is committed to working with community college faculty and plans a joint conference later this year.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

LIEBMAN explained that the Senate’s work on Post-Tenure Review (PTR) would be completed in two parts—first, the votes to approve the final version of the Procedures for PTR, and then a proposal for Implementation to phase in the first five waves of faculty to be reviewed.


GRECO/SMITH MOVED to APPROVE the corrections to the Procedures for Post-Tenure Review amended March 9, 2015, as published in item D1 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda.

LIEBMAN reviewed a short list of small editorial fixes suggested for the working PTR document that had been approved on March 9. [Secretary’s note: The list was published on page 34 of the packet, on page 2 of Appendix D1.]

The MOTION to APPROVE the corrections PASSED, 47 to accept, 1 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

MERCER/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the ADDITION of the following sentence to Article I (Preamble) to the first paragraph:

Post-tenure review acknowledges and values both the continuing scholarly work of the faculty directed towards research, teaching and
outreach, and the many dimensions of service that are often a significant part of the career of tenured faculty members.

LIEBMAN stated that the sentence was intended as a bridge to the initial sections of the PSU P & T guidelines that emphasize the scholarly agenda.

The MOTION to APPROVE the addition to the Preamble PASSED, 45 to accept, 1 to reject, with 4 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

LIEBMAN requested a final motion to adopt the March 9 working document for the PTR Procedures, as now corrected and amended.

GAMBURD/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the Procedures for Post-Tenure Review as published in item D1 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda, with corrections and as amended April 6, 2015, including Article I (Preamble).

The MOTION to APPROVE the Procedures for Post-Tenure Review PASSED, 44 to accept, 2 to reject, with 5 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

2. Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review

LIEBMAN explained that since the Steering Committee had published its Implementation Proposal in the March Agenda packet, several amendments had been suggested to clarify how eligibility would be determined for the first five cycles and the determination of the funding pool (see D2, final page). The first proposal was to ensure that assignment to quintiles would not be prejudiced by whether an individual’s unit had implemented reviews required by the old Article 16 (Career Support) of the PSU-AAUP CBA.

BLEILER/MUKHOPADHYAY MOVED to APPROVE new language for item 1 in the Proposal for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review published in D2n as follows:

1. Eligibility [final paragraph]
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 ordered by the date of last successful review for tenure or promotion. Post-tenure reviews done prior to the approval of these guidelines will not be considered in judging eligibility.

BLEILER asked how far back in time someone whose first review was a decade or more ago would have to document. LIEBMAN said that the Steering Committee thought that this should be left to departments to decide when they write their guidelines, based on local circumstances. RAFFO said that the Ad hoc Committee was torn between wanting a consistent process across campus and giving faculty a choice.
The MOTION to APPROVE the deletions and additions to item 1 PASSED: 41 approved, 3 rejected, with 7 abstentions, (registered by clicker).

CARSTENS/HOLLIDAY MOVED to REPLACE item 4 in the Implementation motion for Post-Tenure Review (as published in D2) as follows:

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.

Senate recommends that the pool for Post-Tenure Review Salary increases (currently equal to 4% of salaries of reviewed faculty per Article 30, Section 6 of AAUP-PSU CBA 2013-2015) be divided into equal increments, per the number of faculty under review in a year. A faculty member whose post-tenure review finds that s/he meets standards shall receive a post-tenure salary increase equal to this increment.

LIEBMAN asked the author of the proposal, David Maier, to provide a rationale.

MAIER noted Hansen’s estimate that the fixed increment in the funded first pool would be about $4,000. He reasoned that since faculty were all clearing the same hurdles, the reward should also be the same. He said that distributions based on a percentage of an individual’s salary only exacerbate existing inequities and salary compression, and a fixed increment would be good for morale and retention of lower-paid faculty.

STEDMAN said that most of his district members supported the fixed increment. KARAVANIC said she favored a plan that would give funds to faculty who fall below the bar. MAIER said that the funding of the PDP would come up next. SANTELMANN clarified that the pool only addresses the PTR process for post-tenure faculty. SCHROCK asked how much the annual pool would vary and the advantages or disadvantages of being in a particular cohort. MAIER agreed there would be variations, and noted that only the first year was guaranteed in the contract; the Union could choose to negotiate for the same fixed increment in the future. SANTELMANN asked if PTR was the place to address the inequities of salary compression. MAIER said he was more interested in not exacerbating existing problems, but this was a tool now available. Sarah Tinkler (ECON) noted some advantages that more senior faculty have, including tier-one retirement.

LIEBMAN asked David Hansen to address the handout with a financial impact analysis of the motion (see B1 attachment to the minutes).

HANSEN reviewed how different salary ranges and quintiles would be affected if the increment were a percentage of salary or a fixed increment (see B1). Based on salaries in each quintile, each later group would receive a lesser fixed amount,
down to about $3,300. PADIN point out that colleagues bargaining the next contract could use the first distribution as a benchmark. HANSEN said that would not change the impact on individual salaries. LIEBMAN said that was a compelling demonstration of the differences between the models, that is, who the net beneficiaries and net losers were. GRECO pointed out that many more people would be favored than would lose out. MAIER agreed saying that his approach increased the average percentage rate. DONLAN asked about the low figures defining the bottom bracket. LIEBMAN clarified that this was just the end point of a $50,000 to 70,000 range. DAASCH thought that the range could be pegged to the minimum for a tenured Associate, and asked if salaries had been adjusted based on anticipated raises. HANSEN said the projections were based on current salary, but thought salaries and quintile pools would rise relative to each other. MAIER noted a possible boost from promotions. DAASCH questioned that, but thought negotiating for a fixed increment would be a great idea. LIEBMAN said that the heart of the vote was to judge between the two models for distribution.

HOLLIDAY/GRECO called the question; with a reminder from BLEILER to gather the nays and abstentions, it was affirmed by unanimous voice vote.

The MOTION to REPLACE item 4 PASSED: 38 to accept, 9 to reject, with 4 abstentions (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN introduced the two options to amend item 5—the second a follow on to the fixed increment proposal just adopted. MAIER said that he thought that the Professional Development Plan (PDP) awards should be parallel to the fixed PTR increment for a successful review.

After some discussion of procedure, BLEILER/BOWMAN MOVED the first option to AMEND the language of item 5, adding “per year” as follows:

5. Funding of PDP [second paragraph]
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 per year to provide appropriate support needed for the completion of the Professional Development Plan.

RAFFO said that if a PDP were approved as a multiple-year plan, then funds should be available for that plan, if needed. DONLAN asked what if a faculty member did not need funding. LIEBMAN said the proposal directed unexpended funds to the general Faculty Development Fund. DONLAN asked if voting for one option excluded voting for the other. BLEILER said absolutely not. LIEBMAN noted that the Maier version did not have the “per year” language. DAASCH asked what if both options passed. BLEILER suggested that given the order of the two motions, he would encourage the proposers of the second option to consider adding the words “per year” to their motion, if the first option passed.
GAMBURD/CARSTENS called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND item 5 with the addition “per year” PASSED: 28 to accept, 13 to reject, with 6 abstentions (registered by clicker).

BLEILER/RAFFO MOVED the second option to AMEND item 5 as follows:

5. Funding of PDP [second and third paragraphs]

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 faculty members whose review finds that s/he does not meet standards shall be eligible for professional development funds not to exceed 4% per year* of their salary the increment amount given in Item 4 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 full increment in Item 4, the Senate recommends that any unexpended funds be transferred to the Faculty Development Fund.

*MAIER said that he had accepted the addition of the words “per year” to his motion. CARSTENS asked what would constitute the pool for funding PDPs. BLEILER said the language of the amended proposal prescribed a division of the 4% pool based on the total salaries in the pool into equal per person increments, so the recipient of the PDP would get his or her individual share. DAASCH thought that PDP amount would stay the same year to year. BLEILER thought that the only thing that was sure was the current contract, and the increment could be set by the next contract. GRECO pointed out that the salary increment would carry forward individually for those successfully reviewed, so that same amount should also carry forward with the individual awarded PDP funding who was part of the same quintile. DAASCH said he wanted to establish that PDP funding would stay the same for a multiple. LIEBMAN agreed. BLEILER said he thought there was a cap. HANSEN (D.) said that the fixed increment was only potentially being diverted for the period of the PDP, because successful completion of the PDP would trigger a salary increase. LIEBMAN thought there was consensus was that the fixed PTR/PDP amount moved forward with the individual.

BRODOWICZ/HANSEN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to AMEND item 5, with the addition of “per year,” PASSED: 39 to accept, 4 to reject, with 4 abstentions (registered by clicker).
BLEIER and LIEBMAN noted that this vote ended the first option passed.

LIEBMAN reviewed the other items in the proposal, including calls for training and assessment after two rounds. After Senate’s vote for approval, the proposal would still need to go to OAA and PSU-AAUP for review and potential bargaining.

GRECO/HOLLIDAY MOVED to APPROVE the Implementation motion for Post-Tenure Review as published in item D2 of the April 2015 Senate Agenda and as amended.

The MOTION to APPROVE Implementation as amended PASSED: 46 to accept, 2 to reject, with 1 abstention (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN requested a final vote to incorporate both the approved Procedures for PTR and their Implementation into the PSU P&T guidelines, following current Article VI on merit pay.

REECE/BLEILER MOVED the Faculty Senate ADOPT the Procedures for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) and their Implementation as approved April 6, 2015, as part of the PSU Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases, 1996, revised and reapproved, April 6, 2015.

HANSNEN (D.) asked if all parts discussed today were included. LEIBMAN said yes, all of appendix D1 and D2 published in the April packet, and as amended today, were included in this motion.

The MOTION to APPROVE the incorporation of Procedures for PTR and Implementation PASSED: 46 to accept, 2 to reject, with no abstentions (registered by clicker).

LIEBMAN added his thanks to all who had worked on the PTR process.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

The curricular proposals listed in appendix “E.1” were ADOPTED as published, with the exception that ESM 351 was withdrawn.

[Secretary’s note: Senate took up New Business after reports from the President and Provost.]
2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Energy Policy and Management

KINSELLA reviewed the Proposal, noting that it was coming from five collaborating units. ISS had done a study of employment trends to establish demand. Some omnibus numbered courses had to be converted to regular courses (approved in today’s Consent Agenda), and a joint Steering Committee would be formed, but no additional funding was needed.

SCHROCK/HANSEN (D.) MOVED the Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Energy Policy and Management

DAASCH asked if only post-bac students would be eligible for the Certificate. KINSELLA said that current grad students were eligible, if they wanted an opportunity to specialize.

THE MOTION PASSED, 42 to accept, 1 to reject, 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker)

3. Proposal for a BS in Quantitative Economics in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on an existing track in Economics and required no new courses or additional funding.

BLEILER/HARMON MOVED the Proposal for a BS in Quantitative Economics

INGERSOLL asked if not having BA version of the degree would cause confusion. Sarah Tinkler (ECON) confirmed it was only BS. Chair Tom Pitiowsky said students would be carefully advised to avoid confusion.

THE MOTION PASSED, 41 to accept, 3 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)

4. Proposal for a Minor in Systems in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses and had no budget impact.

REECE/CARSTENS MOVED the Proposal for the Minor in Systems.

DAASCH said he was unaware of a program based in various departments. WAKE LAND said the degree was sponsored by the School of the Environment and students would come from different departments. LIEBMAN cited the example of the liberal arts minor in computing. HARMON agreed that Schools and Colleges had sponsored minors in the past.
THE MOTION PASSED, 39 to accept, 6 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)

5. Proposal for a Minor in Water Resources in CLAS

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal based in the department of Geography, noting that the degree was based on existing courses and had zero budget impact.

MERCER/RUETER MOVED the Proposal for the Minor in Water Resources

TAYLOR asked what constituted the School of the Environment. Heejun Chang (GEOG) said it was composed of the Geology, Geography, and Environmental Science and Management departments.

LIEBMAN called the question.

THE MOTION PASSED, 41 to accept, 3 to reject, 1 abstention (recorded by clicker)


FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses in multiple departments and required no additional funding. DAVIDOVA (INTL) added that the Certificate completed an existing set of area studies certificates and it would be the only such African Studies Certificate in Oregon.

MERCER/SCHROCK MOVED the Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in African Studies.

LIEBMAN called the question.

THE MOTION PASSED, 44 to accept, 2 to reject, no abstentions (recorded by clicker)

7. Proposal for an Online Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery in Music in COTA

FOUNTAIN reviewed the Proposal, noting that the degree was based on existing courses, but there were issues surrounding faculty hires to support the program in the future and the Certificate could require additional funding.

HARMON/MAIER MOVED the Proposal for an Online Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery in Music

MACCORMACK noted that the Certificate planned to target non-PSU degree students, but that currently undergraduate certificates can only be awarded at time of graduation. He added that the ARC has been looking the issue, on Provost Andrews’ recommendation; it does have consequences for financial aid and the
Registrar’s Office. FOUNTAIN agreed that the Proposal did target students who may not finish at PSU. GRECO asked what the implications for financial aid were. MACCORMACK said that students requesting financial would have to justify the utility of the certificate to the federal government. PADIN said that the policy question had come to EPC’s attention and no consensus had been reached. He asked how we could vote on a proposal that was contrary to current policies, although K-12 presented some interesting market opportunities. ANDREWS said that she had proposed that ARC look at offering pre-baccalaureate certificates a year ago, noting that most institutions offer them and PSU needed to catch up. MERCER suggested amending the Proposal with a contingency statement. BLEIRLER concurred. PADIN noted 3 statements that would need to be struck. RUETER noted that the Senate only had the Summary Proposal in hand and said that the larger policy issue needed to be addressed.

MAIER/RAFFO MOVED that the motion be tabled until next month.

The Proposal was tabled by unanimous voice vote.

8. Proposals from ARC for Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas

MACCORMACK said that both Proposals regarded adding courses to academic distribution areas to meet BS/BA requirements; in particular, ARC was recommending approval of the request from Administration of Justice to treat all of their courses as social sciences.

REECE/TAYLOR MOVED the proposed Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas as published in E.

RUETER said the issue for him was not the courses per se, but who had reviewed the content of the courses for the assignment. MACCORMACK said that the UCC had declined to review the courses. He noted that Criminal Justice had supporting documentation and that funding agencies treat their courses as social science. GAMBURD noted that ARC had tried to look broadly at how courses were assigned to distributions and encountered the issue that courses offered by the professional schools were not being counted for the BA/BS. MACCORMAK said that Criminal Justice felt their request was justified by a shift in their discipline away from an applied to a more academic focus; he added that while he didn’t think that ARC was the appropriate venue for deciding disciplinary boundaries, this request seemed discreet and justified by practice. MERCER recommended that the University have the broader conversation before it considered any additional proposals. PADIN said that extending a blanket approval to a program in transition seemed inappropriate. MACCORMACK noted that other departments do not have their courses examined individually for distribution assignment, though School of Social Work courses would be reviewed individually. HANSEN (D.) asked if demand or budget were concerns. MACCORMACK stated that most BA/BS requirements were probably fulfilled as students completed regular coursework. INGERSOLL doubted there was a reliable way to gauge if the BS/BA requirement was a motivation. SHULER
noted the split distribution preferences in his own home department of History and agreed with MERCER that there should be a broader discussion.

LIEBMAN said that further discussion and a vote on the motion would have to be postponed until the next meeting, due to the lack of a quorum.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL said that PSU-AAUP and the Administration agreed to a joint two-day training session for interest-based bargaining and he looked forward to constructive discussions during the up-coming bargaining process. He announced that PSU had moved up to #8 in the U.S. News and World Reports Top Ten “Up and Coming” universities and that a number of PSU graduate programs had been ranked in the top 50 nationally. (SEE http://www.pdx.edu/profile/portland-state-university-rankings-and-references). He described additional opportunities for faculty to have input into the Strategic Planning Process, including a forum with the Topic Teams on April 29; the full draft plan might not be available for Senate review until June or later. He regretted the inevitable evil of the tuition increase recently passed by the Board of Trustees, a result of declining state funding. He also announced that the Campus Safety Advisory Committee would be holding forums in April and May.

WIEWEL thanked Maude Hines and student leaders for their testimony before HECC in support of an outcomes-based formula for allocating funds among the state’s higher ed institutions. PSU is significantly disadvantaged by the current model. He explained that Portland City Council had amended its support for the University Urban Renewal district. The City had pledged to invest a certain $25 million dollars over the next 8 years, including money for a bond match and the redevelopment of University Place, as well as a plot of land on Fourth Avenue (the former Budget Rental office).

WIEWEL then introduced PSU’s new Vice President for Enrollment and Student Affairs (EMSA) John Fraire.

FRAIRE described his academic and theater arts background and his experience in Washington and at urban-serving universities in New York City, Kalamazoo, and Chicago. He said that he foresaw no new or different directions for EMSA, which was in good shape. He is interested in expanding out-of-state and international
enrollment, where possible. His focus will be on process and production, and creating a safe and healthy campus, with a culture of assessment and clear guidelines. He looked forward to the opportunity of working with faculty at PSU. (Applause.)

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS reported that HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission) had approved a program in Sports Product Management that the University of Oregon will offer in Portland. (See http://spm.uoregon.edu/) She said that she and others, including the President and Board Trustees, had made every effort imaginable in testifying before HECC to make sure this would be a collaborative program. They had been somewhat effective and Scott Marshall will be working with U of O as they launch the program. However, PSU will have to be much more aggressive if it does not want to see its ability to serve the many undergraduate students in this region undermined by other institutions bringing in multiple niche programs.

MAIER asked if this collaboration would include revenue sharing. ANDREWS said that was not likely with, since there is less opportunity for deep collaboration. GEORGE asked if this would be the last case. ANDREWS said no, PSU would have to keep making the argument. WIEWEL agreed, noting that the issue was a historical one. ANDREWS encouraged faculty to share information they might acquire about other non-PSU programs moving Portland. RAFFO asked what the next potential threat might be. ANDREWS mentioned Oregon Tech plans to offer an all-evening program for a Bachelors in Mechanical Engineering in Portland. BLEILER observed that PSU could market its own programs statewide. ANDREWS said that deans were beginning to work on that; SBA was marketing its on-line bachelor’s degree in Eugene. She encouraged faculty to take part. DAIM said that PBB was a barrier to some cross-disciplinary niche programs. ANDREW said PBB should, on the contrary, allow for recognizing collaborations in ways that were not possible before.

ANDREWS alerted senators to a decision that had been made to submit PSU’s application for School of Public Health accreditation because the deadline for this year was in April. (See comments, minutes attachment B2). She recognized that the Senate had not yet provided a recommendation. The actual review of PSU’s self-study would not happen until December 2015. She acknowledged the work of the Budget Committee, which had just submitted a positive report, and encouraged Senate to move on the matter before the end of the academic year.

Report of the Lower Student Costs (Textbook Affordability) Task Force

Postponed until the May meeting.

Annual Report of the Advising Council

Postponed until the May meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm.
As shown above, the proposed amendment creates significant quintile-dependent inequities. For example, at the $50,000 salary level PTR increases range from 6.57% in Q4 to 7.99% in Q1, and at the $80,000 salary level PTR increases range from 4.11% in Q4 to 4.99% in Q1. At all salary levels PTR salary increases are 21.6% higher in Q1 than Q4. Over time this approach will further distort market differences in salaries, resulting in varying degrees of salary compression and inversion among different academic disciplines. If the intent of the amendment is to address salary compression and inversion, then COLAs and market-rate adjustments are less contentious.
### Motion (4% of Salary) vs Amendment (4% per Capita)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4% of Salary</th>
<th>4% of Salary</th>
<th>4% of Salary</th>
<th>4% of Salary</th>
<th>4% of Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4% per Capita</th>
<th>4% per Capita</th>
<th>4% per Capita</th>
<th>4% per Capita</th>
<th>4% per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
<td>$3,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,996</td>
<td>$1,596</td>
<td>$796</td>
<td>$(4)</td>
<td>$(804)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,940</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$(60)</td>
<td>$(860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,647</td>
<td>$1,247</td>
<td>$447</td>
<td>$(353)</td>
<td>$(1,153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,286</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$(714)</td>
<td>$(1,514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,360</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$(640)</td>
<td>$(1,440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td>(31.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td>(31.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
<th>Delta (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>(17.9%)</td>
<td>(31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
<td>(30.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion (4% of Salary) vs Amendment (4% per Capita)**

Under the proposed amendment the difference for faculty members at the same salary level varies greatly. For example, at the $50,000 salary level the PRT salary increases would be 99.8% higher in Q1, while only 64.3% higher in Q4. At the $80,000 salary level the PTR salary increases would be 24.9% higher in Q1, but only 2.7% higher in Q4.
PTR Increase by Salary and Quintile

- 4% of Salary
- "Q1 4% per Capita"
- "Q2 4% per Capita"
- "Q3 4% per Capita"
- "Q4 4% per Capita"
- "Q5 4% per Capita"
PROVOST ANDREWS’ COMMENTS: APRIL 6, 2015 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

School of Public Health Initiative
- See attached timeline
- See recent blog post

We will be submitting our application for accreditation in April. I urge the Faculty Senate to not delay in making a recommendation on the SPH. The proposal will preview at May meeting and come for a vote in June.

OAA FY15 AND FY16 E&G BUDGET UPDATE

FY15 Winter 4th Week RCAT has been shared with deans, fiscal officers, department chairs/directors and Faculty Senate Budget Committee. This is a snapshot, is based on a number of generalizations and is but one tool used in Strategic Enrollment Management and Performance Based Budgeting.

One of the items it shows is the “Difference from Revenue Target” from what was estimated to set the FY15 E&G budget and where we think we will end up. The OAA total is a negative $274,902 ($274,902 fewer dollars generates than anticipated). This is within 1% total of the estimate. All schools/colleges came within 3% (and most within 1%) of their estimated revenue requirement.

Status FY16 E&G Budget Planning
1. All Schools/colleges have submitted their budget plans based on their FY16 Strategic Enrollment Plans. ALT will review these in aggregate in mid-April and discuss the impacts.
2. Preliminary decisions on OAA FY16 E&G unit revenue requirements and expenditure budgets will be made at the end of April. There are still a number of unknowns (legislative decisions, HECC decisions on outcomes based funding, final FY15 revenue...).
3. We continue to follow the timeline established for our work.

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 Wednesday, May 27, 12:30-2:00 p.m. room SMSU 327/8

Note: Forums were held on October 13 and 17, 2014 and February 23, 2015 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.

Article 18 Task Force
The University and PSU AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 18, Section 9, called to create a joint labor/management task force to examine current employment terms and notice requirements for non-tenure track faculty, particularly the need for and timing of the end-of-year non-renewal letters.

At the start of the academic year AAUP leadership and I appointed a 10 member task force. They began their work in October 2014, meeting frequently and concluded their work with a report in February 2015.
The members of the task force examined current PSU practices; researched how other universities provide for indefinite appointments for non-tenure related faculty; looked at the roles, responsibilities and advancement opportunities; and discussed how to recognize the service of current non-tenure track faculty members. Their recommendations included:

- That PSU and AAUP write mutually acceptable contract language and implementation policies based upon the task force’s proposals and recommendations.
- That PSU and AAUP engage in interim bargaining, so that new policies can go into effect by the 2015/16 academic year.
- That implementation procedures be designed in a way that recognizes and rewards the service of current non-tenure track faculty members.
- The establishment of a committee to create a bridge funding pool to cover temporary lulls in funding for PSU research units.
- A review of the current promotional pathways for non-tenure track faculty members and exploration of ways to expand advancement.

While the task force recommended that contract language be written now, in interim bargaining through a Memorandum of Understanding, I believe the University and AAUP, with our shared interests in a positive outcome, can address this as a primary topic in interest-based bargaining (IBB) rather than using our old methods of positional bargaining. Because some items may require changes in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, it will be important to get input from the Faculty Senate as well.

I encourage faculty members to read and discuss the task force report, and to share opinions and ideas freely. My April 7th blog will be on this topic.

**Spring Term Drop-in Conversation with the Provost:**
Please join me for the spring term drop-in sessions:
- Wednesday, April 29, 10-11:00 a.m. in room SMSU 326
- Tuesday, May 12, 3-4:00 p.m. in room SMSU 262

**Commencement (June 14):**
Commencement Board has extended the deadline for student speaker applications for one more week (to April 10). Encourage students to submit their applications and videos.

Faculty are encouraged to register to attend commencement, to sign up to serve as marshals and attend the recognition luncheon on June 14; and to volunteer to help on Saturday June 13th to set up the MODA Center.

Pre-order of regalia (i.e. in order to get your specific regalia, not generic hood and gown) is due by April 17. AAUP will reimburse you for this and will also work with you on a rent-to-buy arrangement over multiple years.

All information may be found at the commencement website. Questions may be directed to commencement@pdx.edu.
OHSU/PSU School of Public Health Timeline & Milestones

2010
- May 2010: Develop collaborative SPH based on OMPH

2011
- May 2011: Brainstorming & workgroups

2012
- December 2012: Develop initial 3 PhD programs for PSU/OHSU SPH
- June 2012: Planning Meetings Steering Committee launched

2013
- September 2013: OUS Approves Epidemiology, Health Systems & Policy, & Community Health PhD programs
- May 2013: OMPH accreditation self-study submitted to CEPH

2014
- May 2014: Interim SPH Dean appointed
- April 2015: Application to CEPH for SPH accreditation
- June 2014: OHSU/PSU combined 6 MPH degree programs offered through OMPH

2015
- December 2015: Submit draft self-study
- July 2015: Applicant status PSU/OHSU SPH Opens

2016
- March 2016: National search for SPH Founding Dean
- November 2016: CEPH Accreditation Decision
- November 2016: CEPH Accreditation Decision

Funding Efforts
April 10, 2015

To: Provost Andrews

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

SUBJ: Notice of Senate Actions

**On March 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 March 2, 2015 Faculty Senate Agenda.

4-13-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda.

**On April 6, 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 April 2015 Faculty Senate Agenda, with the exception of ESM 351, which was withdrawn.

4-13-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent Agenda, with the same exception.

In addition, Senate voted to recommend the following actions:

1. to approve the adoption of new Procedures for Post-Tenure Review (D.1 as amended) and their Implementation (D.2 as amended) as a part of the current PSU Procedures and Policies for the Evaluation of Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases

4-13-15—OAA recognizes the good work of the Faculty Senate on producing the recommended procedures for the post tenure review. AAUP has filed a Demand to Bargain these procedures. We hope to work expeditiously to have guidelines in place soon. OAA will then work with departments and faculty to implement the procedures.

2. to approve a Graduate Certificate in Energy Policy and Management
3. to approve a BS in Quantitative Economics in CLAS
4. to approve a Minor in Systems in CLAS
5. to approve a Minor in Water Resources in CLAS
6. to approve an Undergraduate Certificate in African Studies in CLAS

4-13-15—OAA concurs with the approval of items 2-6. Steve Harmon will confirm the decisions with the departments and coordinate #3 through the approval processes,
including the Academic & Student Affairs Committee of the PSU Board of Trustees and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Best regards,

Robert Liebman
Presiding Officer of the Senate

Martha W. Hickey
Secretary to the Faculty

Sona Andrews
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
March 17, 2015
FROM: Academic Requirements Committee

Alan MacCormack, chair, and members Virginia Butler, Martha Dyson, Becki Ingersoll, Haley Holmes, Galina Kogan, Celeste Krueger,

Proposals for Changes in Assignment to Academic Distribution Areas:

1. Social Science Classification for Criminology and Criminal Justice Undergraduate Courses

The Academic Requirements Committee strongly endorses the following motion:

Undergraduate courses offered by the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice shall be classified as belonging to the Social Science academic distribution area for the purposes of meeting the Portland State University BA/BS requirements.

Rationale.

Currently only two courses, CCJ 220 Crime Literacy and CCJ 330 Crime Control Strategies, are listed as social sciences. This narrow definition of qualifying courses is a solitary exception to the pattern of departmental assignment of courses to academic distribution areas and does not reflect the nature of courses currently offered by the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice or the faculty offering them. The CCJ curriculum has an interdisciplinary focus based on the scientific method and incorporates Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, and Statistics. The two major CCJ professional organizations self-identify as social science organizations, their journals are indexed in Social Science Citation Index, and they are members of the Consortium of Social Science Associations.

2. Shift of Specific Geography Courses from the Social Science to the Science Distribution Area

The Academic Requirements Committee recommends that Senate approve the following motion:

Physical geography and geographic information science courses in the Department of Geography that are science-based be reclassified from the Social Science to the Science academic distribution area for purposes of meeting the Portland State University undergraduate BA/BS requirements. Courses currently offered by the Geography Department which would be reclassified are listed below.

Geog 210 Physical Geography
Geog 310U Climate and Water Resources
Geog 311U Climatology
Geog 312U Climate Variability
Geog 420 Field Methods in Physical Geography
Geog 475 Digital Compilation and Database Design
Geog 480 Remote Sensing and Image Analysis
Geog 481 Digital Image Analysis I
Rationale.

- The content of these courses clearly falls within the domain of the natural sciences and outside that of the social sciences.
- PSU has a precedent in the Black Studies Courses that are divided between the Arts and Letters and the Social Science designations.
- The Geography Department has over time developed strength and emphasis in physical geography and GIS in faculty, research, and curricula which were not present when the department was originally designated as a social science.
- The majority of colleges and universities with Geography Departments surveyed treat their physical geography courses as natural sciences, including the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. The Academic Requirements Committee already accepts physical geography courses as natural sciences when the transferring institution designates them as such.
- Some of the courses are cross-listed in science departments and are treated as science when registered under the department prefix. This motion would eliminate that inconsistency.
- This proposal has the support of both Karen Marrongelle, the Dean of CLAS, and Drake Mitchell, the Associate CLAS Dean for Natural Sciences.
April 9, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Change to Existing Courses**

E.1.a.1
- ESM 554  Grad Research Toolbox, 2 credits – change credit hours to 4

**Graduate School of Social Work**

**New Courses**

E.1.a.2
- SW 514 Cultural and Spanish Language Immersion for Social Workers Costa Rica, 3 credits
  Course includes culture and language classes with visits to social service agencies in Costa Rica. Course will prepare students to offer social work services in multicultural, multilingual settings through the context of social work values and ethics and with special attention to anti-oppressive and non-discriminatory practice with diverse populations.

E.1.a.3
- SW 516 Motivational Interviewing, 3 credits
  Teaches the central theoretical and empirical tenets of Motivational Interviewing (MI), as well as the clinical skills necessary to deliver the intervention to a wide range of clients in diverse settings. Students will learn and practice both the spirit and techniques of motivational interviewing.

E.1.a.4
- SW 517 Health Across the Lifespan I, 3 credits
  This is a three-term advanced concentration course for students in health related settings. Focus on self-awareness, ethics, chronic disease, teamwork, disparities, health literacy, and use of interpreters. Role of social work across numerous settings explored. Relevant legal reporting, medical terminology and introduction to theory. Prerequisites: SW 511 or SW 589.
E.1.a.5
• SW 518  Health Across the Lifespan II, 3 credits
  Advanced concentration course for students in health related settings. Intervention and assessment modalities and important practice theories. Transitional planning across the continuum of care, health reform, integrated medicine, advance care planning, moral distress, critical thinking about medical model and oppression, navigation of team dynamics, bias, privilege, pain management. Prerequisite: SW 517.

E.1.a.6
• SW 519  Health Across the Lifespan III, 3 credits
  Advanced concentration course for students in health related settings. Peer consultation, ethics committees, social determinants of heath, group work, surrogate decision making, harm reduction models, assessment tools, intervention and evaluation of practice, NASW Practice Standards, basic pharmacology, policy related to systems of care. Prerequisite: SW 518.

E.1.a.7
• SW 521  Advanced Anti-Oppressive Practice, 3 credits
  This course builds student capacity for anti-oppressive practice in the micro and mezzo practice arenas, with an emphasis on the micro levels of intervention. The focus is on the positional privilege of social worker and the oppression experiences of service users (clients) and communities. Prerequisites: SW 539 and SW 532, or SW 589.

E.1.a.8
• SW 528  Facilitation of Multidisciplinary/Care Coordination Team Meetings, 3 credits
  Addresses the theoretical foundations, applications and facilitation skills required for collaborative participatory decision-making in the context of social work practice across populations. Develop framework for facilitating in-depth strengths, needs assessment and problem solving. Gain understanding and skills in balancing power dynamics, clinical perspectives, and timely decision-making within agency parameters.

E.1.a.9
• SW 542  Social Work in Native American Communities, 3 credits
  Introduces and expands social work knowledge and methods appropriate for working with tribal and urban Indian communities. The historical, social and cultural contexts of social work practice with individuals, families, groups, and communities in Indian Country will be examined.

E.1.a.10
• SW 543  The African American Family: Multigenerational Trauma and Issues of Violence, 3 credits
  Exposes students to historical events and policies which have led to contemporary social problems and structural inequalities that continue to negatively impact African Americans. Will provide practical tools to inform practice at the five levels of service and empower individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities throughout the change process.

E.1.a.11
• SW 586  Children, Youth and Families I, 3 credits
  Advanced concentration course for students working with children, youth, and families. Focus on ethics, self-reflection and identity, and social location, critical analysis, and multidisciplinary system work. Theories and frameworks for multidimensional assessments are examined. Prerequisites: SW 511 or SW 589.
E.1.a.12
- SW 587 Children, Youth and Families II, 3 credits
  Advanced concentration course for students interested in working with children, youth, and families. Student will continue to explore, learn, and apply methods for multi-systemic social work practice. Demonstration of practice methods and skills for working through barriers created by social policies that impact children, youth, and families will be addressed. Prerequisite: SW 586.

E.1.a.13
- SW 588 Children, Youth and Families III, 3 credits
  Third advanced concentration course for students interested in working with children, youth, and families. The course requires a deepening of practice skills. Students address secondary traumatization, burnout, and self-care. Also will examine impact of policy on service-users and promoting service user influence on policy. Prerequisite: SW 587.

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.14
- SW 526 Social Work and the Law, 3 credits – change course title to Applied Ethics and Law in Social Work Practice; change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.15
- SW 533 Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services I, 3 credits – change course title to Clinical Social Work Practice I; change course description; change prereqs and corequisite

E.1.a.16
- SW 534 Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services II, 3 credits – change course title to Clinical Social Work Practice II; change course description; change prereqs and corequisite

E.1.a.17
- SW 535 Advanced Practice for Direct Human Services III, 3 credits – change course title to Clinical Social Work Practice III; change course description; change prereqs and corequisite

E.1.a.18
- SW 544/644 Mid-Life and Beyond, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.19
- SW 555 Social Work Perspectives on Mental Health Disorders, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.20
- SW 558 Abuse and Trauma: Theory and Intervention, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.21
- SW 560 Social Work with Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Individuals, Families, and Communities, 3 credits – change course title to Understanding and Working with LGBT populations in Social Work; change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.22
- SW 571 Substance Use, Abuse and Addiction and Social Work Practice, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs

E.1.a.23
- SW 575 Multicultural Social Justice Work in Action, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs
E.1.a.24
• SW 585  Fundraising, Grantwriting, and Human Services Entrepreneurship, 3 credits – change course title to Fund Development and Grant Writing; change course description; change prereqs
E.1.a.25
• SW 589  Advanced Standing Seminar, 2 credits – change course description
E.1.a.26
• SW 591  Child and Adolescent Behavior and Development in the Social Environment: Advanced Theory and Research, 3 credits – change course description; change prereqs
April 13, 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 Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses

E.1.c.1
- ESM 357 Business Solutions for Environmental Problems (4)
  Environmental science perspectives and business perspectives on environmental issues, focusing on smaller scale problems amenable to entrepreneurial solutions. Contextualization and analysis of issues using approaches and tools from both disciplines in search of local, sustainable, cost and scale-effective approaches.

E.1.c.2
- Intl 445 Cities and Third World Development (4)
  Critical survey of historical, economic, cultural, political, and urban aspects of Third World development, starting with the colonial era. Includes historical patterns of integration of the Third World with the emerging world market system. Covers development theories and problems of the post-independence period, focusing on urban issues and policy alternatives. This is the same course as USP 445 and may be taken only once for credit. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

E.1.c.3
- Intl 470 Intercultural Leadership and Change (4)
  Prepares students for citizenship, leadership, scholarship, and research in a changing and globalized world. Culls perspectives from extant intercultural scholarship. Develops analytical tools to reflect upon politically created difference in race, religion, class and gender in cosmopolitan societies. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

E.1.c.4
- Soc 380 Sports in Society (4)
  An objective examination of sports in America as social phenomena. Study of various socio-cultural structures, patterns, and organizations or groups involved with sports. Issues such as race, gender, and class within the context of sports will be explored through a critical sociological lens.

E.1.c.5
• SpHr 385 Autism Spectrum Disorders (4)
Examines current issues related to diagnosis and intervention for children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). It focuses on current research related to theories of development across varied domains (social and communicative, motor, sensory, cognitive and adaptive behaviors) and interdisciplinary practice for serving children with ASD.

Changes to Existing Courses

E.1.c.6
• Span 301 Third Year Spanish – change description.
E.1.c.7
• Span 302 Third Year Spanish – change description.
E1.c.8
• Span 303 Third Year Spanish – change description.

Undergraduate Studies

New Cluster Courses

E.1.c.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add New Cluster course</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFS 340</td>
<td>Queer Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 306</td>
<td>Introduction to Nonviolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 326</td>
<td>Mexican American History 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST 333</td>
<td>Food, Power &amp; History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 343</td>
<td>From Silver to Cocaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 350</td>
<td>The City in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 350</td>
<td>The City in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 360</td>
<td>Bollywood: Understanding Contemporary India and South Asian through its Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTL 364</td>
<td>Modern Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 344</td>
<td>Manga: Japanese Graphic Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN 344</td>
<td>Manga: Japanese Graphic Novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 13, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Fountain  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of UCC for Faculty Senate

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2014-15 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Program  
BFA in Creative Writing (Summary attached)  
FSBC comments: See the Curriculum Tracking wiki for comments.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
BFA in Creative Writing

Overview:
This is a proposal to establish the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree (BFA) in Creative Writing in the Department of English at Portland State University. Under this plan, the Department would add the BFA degree to its existing undergraduate options of a BA in English, minors in English, Writing, and Film Studies. The BFA will use existing faculty and courses to feature concentrations in fiction, nonfiction, and poetry writing, while also drawing upon the department's strengths in such other areas as literature and publishing.

A BFA represents a more focused and avowedly artistic practice in writing, with higher degree standards than a BA entails. BFAs in any art form generally have a competitive entry process, are based in performance and cohorts, and generate a certain esprit d'corps. By employing competitive admissions, tiered workshops, and a graduation portfolio, our proposed degree program will draw upon a national pool of students to build a highly motivated cohort of creative writing students.

Evidence of Need:
As the only public writing BFA in the West, with substantial advantages in tuition, curriculum, and core faculty, we expect our out-of-state enrollment rates to match our current MFA out-of-state application rate of 75%. Of the maximum BFA size of 36 students/year, we expect 27 out-of-state students yearly.

The BFA program in Creative Writing will serve students from a variety of academic and cultural backgrounds, including non-traditional students -- which historically includes older students who may have family or work responsibilities. Creative Writing programs nationwide tend to draw individuals from traditionally underrepresented cultural groups who wish to find and develop their literary voices and contribute to the communal cultural production of their ethnic, cultural, and religious heritage.
Approximately 50 students graduate each year with both a B.A. English and a Writing Minor. While they would not be the BFA’s only internal pool of students -- others may be interested, and after its first year it will draw students both regionally and nationally -- these current PSU students do give an indication of the demand for an BFA degree.

A November 2013 poll, made of all recent B.A. English + Writing Minor graduates listed in Datamaster, found strong demand for a BFA:

Question 1: Would you prefer PSU to also offer a BFA in Creative Writing degree in its English program?
   YES: 91% (32 of 35 respondents)
   NO: 9% (3)

Question 2: If a Creative Writing BFA had been available while you were at PSU, would you have considered applying for it?
   YES: 86% (30 of 35 respondents)
   NO: 14% (5)

Question 3: While at PSU, did you consider transferring or attending a different university to obtain a Creative Writing degree?
   YES: 41% (14 of 35 respondents)
   NO: 59% (21)

The effect of the BFA on retention and enrollment may be even greater, as this poll was of our graduates, and does not show how many others, deterred by the lack of this degree option, actually did leave or never came here in the first place.

Among student comments accompanying the poll were the following:

- “While I found the program quite satisfying, I would have preferred a stronger emphasis on the creative aspect of my personal goal in achieving my degree. A BFA would've been ideal. I support PSU's potential add [of] the degree option.”
- “I did manage to fit in a fair amount of creative writing while I was a student, but would have loved to focus my degree in that direction.”
- “I wanted a BFA in creative writing, but didn't want / wasn't able to attend the schools that offered it.”
- "I considered Marylhurst at first because it had such a program [not a BFA, a BA English + Creative Writing concentration], but public transport to PSU was much better.”
- "I think it's great that you are looking into this. I frequently wished a BFA in Creative Writing was available to me at PSU.”

Course of Study:

Admission Requirements

Admission to the degree program is based on (a) general admission to the university. See page XX for more information, and (b) admission to the Creative Writing program, which includes submission of an Admissions Sample of creative writing (10-15 pages of poetry, or 15-25 pages of prose).

Requirements for B.F.A. in Creative Writing

In addition to meeting university B.A. degree requirements, the Creative Writing major will meet the following requirements for the B.F.A. degree: Required Courses, Fine Arts Courses, Writing
Electives, Literature Electives, and a Senior Portfolio.

**Required Literature Courses (16 cr)**
ENG 204 Survey of English Literature I
ENG 205 Survey of English Literature II
ENG 253 Survey of American Literature I
ENG 254 Survey of American Literature II

Required Writing Courses (12 cr)
WR 212 Introductory Fiction Writing
WR 213 Introductory Poetry Writing
WR 214 Introductory Nonfiction Writing

**Fine Arts Electives (8 cr)**
Two courses in arts appreciation, theory, or performance (8 credits):

This requirement is fulfilled through courses in the College of the Arts (e.g. prefixed ARCH, ARH, ART, FLM, MUS, and TA.)

**Writing Electives (28 cr)**
• 16 credits in the genre of portfolio (fiction, nonfiction, or poetry), at least 8 of which must be 400 level:
  * Courses may be repeated for credit.
    WR 312 Intermediate Fiction Writing*
    WR 313 Intermediate Poetry Writing*
    WR 328 Media Editing
    WR 399 Special Studies
    WR 407 Writing Seminar
    WR 412 Advanced Fiction Writing*
    WR 413 Advanced Poetry Writing*
    WR 456 Forms of Nonfiction
    WR 457 Personal Essay Writing
    WR 458 Magazine Writing
    WR 459 Memoir Writing
• 12 credits of additional upper-division WR courses, 8 of which must be 400-level.

**Literature Electives (12 cr)**

12 ENG credits of upper division literature, each covering different centuries or eras. (With advisor approval, one upper division WLL literature course may be applied to this requirement.)
Graduation Requirement: The Senior Portfolio

The Senior Portfolio is submitted for approval by the quarter of graduation. This portfolio showcases the clean revised copy of the student's creative writing in a chosen genre (i.e. fiction, nonfiction, or poetry), and should contain: (a) An introductory statement of artistic intent. This statement should provide an overview and analysis of the development and revision of their portfolio work. (6 - 10 pages); and (b) Writing within a genre: 30 - 50 pages (fiction or nonfiction), or 20 - 30 pages (poetry).

Total credits = 76

Additional Information on Requirements

• Creative Writing majors in upper-division English courses are expected to be able to write a library research paper when required. The department recommends that majors without prior training in research paper writing enroll in Wr 222.
• Only courses in which a student receives a C or above can count for the Creative Writing major.
• Only courses taken for a letter grade can count toward the Creative Writing major.
• No more than 12 credits taken for the Minor in English may be applied to the

Creative Writing major.
• A minimum of 24 credits in English and/or Writing at PSU is required to graduate from PSU with a major in Creative Writing.
Proposed Motion to Amend the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty

The Teacher Education Committee recommends a Motion to Amend the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty to sunset the Teacher Education Committee (TEC).

Rationale:

In her 2014 annual report, TEC chair, Maude Hines, wrote,

*TEC recommends re-considering the composition of the committee and how to best make use of the value of its membership. Several options have been discussed.*

The two options were to 1) Reconstitute itself with membership drawn primarily from the GTEP Content Advisors, or 2) Sunset the committee.

As the TEC Chair for 2014 – 2015, Karin Magaldi met with with William Fischer (TEC co-chair in Fall 2014) and Maude Hines (former chair) to follow up Maude’s suggestion to consider whether the committee was meeting its charge (Article IV, Section 4h, PSU Constitution) to

1) ensure that the subject matter content and prerequisites address relevant state and national standards
2) provide input on admissions requirements,
3) facilitate the development of clear pathways to admissions to Graduate School of Education teach preparation programs, and
4) assist in the recruitment of teacher candidates.

It became clear from meetings with Associate Dean Caskey and Professor Lenski, that the GSE Content Area Advisors are responsible for and have handled the first two charges and the GSE covers the last two charges. Professor Lenski and Associate Dean Caskey strongly recommended that we sunset the committee since it no longer fulfills its original function and is therefore no longer needed.

The undersigned members of TEC propose the elimination of the Faculty Senate Teacher Education Committee:

Karin Magaldi, Chair  
Lisa Aasheim  
Teresa Bulman  
Lois Delcambre  
Debra Glaze  
Maude Hines  
Randy Hitz  
Sheldon Loman  
Susan Lenski  
Jane Meinhold  
Jane Mercer  
Deborah Peterson  
Gwen Shusterman  
Eva Thanheise

The following members of the 2014 – 2015 Faculty Senate, support this Motion to Amend the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty: Michael Bowman, Gary Brodowicz, Linda George, Brad Hansen, Yves Labissiere, Robert Mercer, Swapna Mukhopadhyay, John Rueter, Lynn Santelmann
Committee chair: Pamela Dusschee, SBA
Committee Members: DeLys Ostlund, WLL; Erik Geschke, ART; Dawn Schneider, SHAC; Arun Rana, CEE; Douglas Beyers (Student); James Schofield (Student); Brian Reverman (Student).

This committee is charged by the Faculty Senate to:
1) Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets and student discipline.
2) Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs and long-range planning, e.g., student employment, educational activities, counseling, safety, health service and extra-curricular programming
3) Nominate the recipients of the President’s Awards each spring term

The committee met three times throughout the year. Spring term will be dedicated to the review of nominations and selection of the President’s Awards.

After a meeting with Interim VP EMSA, Dan Fortmiller, the committee decided to address PSU’s progress towards Title IX and Safe Campus. In particular, assessing the Safe Campus Module and student participation. In addition, the committee decided to collect information from various campus stakeholders to assess progress and identify in potential gaps.

Advisory capacity: The committee was not contacted for advisory services. However, the committee did meet with the Interim EMSA VP to solicit potential areas to assess.

President’s Awards: In Spring 2014, the committee participated in the review and selection of the President’s Awards. The process will be the same this year, with the review being conducted in spring term. The committee now selects the “best of the best” awards from amongst the winners for each college/school for Academic Achievement, Community Engagement and University Service for the undergraduate, master’s and doctoral levels in each category.

Review and recommendation capacity: PSU progress towards Safe Campus

ACTIONS completed:
- Met with Interim VP EMSA, Dan Fortmiller to discuss potential focus areas.
- Met with President Wim Viewel to learn about PSU’s Administration’s commitment to Title IX. President Viewel indicated that he felt PSU is doing a good job relative to compliance and response, but that there could be more work in prevention and awareness.
- Committee members met with various PSU Stakeholders, Julie Caron, Office of Equity & Compliance; SHAC staff; two members of the Sexual Assault Task Force; Director of Counseling Services; and Women’s Resource Center Advocate.
- Committee members reviewed the student Safe Campus Module.
- Committee members reviewed the U.S. President’s Report – “Not Alone.”
- Invited guest, Julie Caron from Office of Equity & Compliance to give a review of current campus initiatives.
ACTIONS to be taken in spring term:

- Meet with new VP EMSA, John Fraire to review findings and assess alignment with committee.
- Outreach to faculty to participate in bringing awareness to Safe Campus initiatives.
- Formalize advisory to PSU on committee findings.

RECOMMENDATIONS to 2015-16 committee chair:

- Build engagement with EMSA and other PSU stakeholders to ensure General Student Affairs Committee adds value to PSU Mission.
- Stakeholders across campus have been working hard to create awareness around sexual assault on campus. The committee should continue its work around Safe Campus, including summarizing activities and making recommendations for next actions that bring awareness to these efforts.
- Work with EMSA to promote student awards, in addition to nominating students for the President’s Awards.

To learn more about the Safe Campus module for students, visit:  
http://www.pdx.edu/sexual-assault/safe-campus-module
Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB)

Annual Report, April 2015

Members 2014-15 academic year

Chair: Randy Miller, PSC
Toeutu Faaleava, UNST
Robin Beavers, ADM
Michael Smith ED (Added November 2014)
Antoinette Wayne, Student

Ex-officio Members
Professor Robert Lockwood, C&CJ and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative
Mark Rountree, Athletics Director (Began January 2015)
Valerie Cleary, Senior Associate Athletics Director/Senior Woman Administrator in Athletics (Left PSU April 2015).
Matt Billings, Deputy Athletics Director
Wim Wiewel, President

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

I. Athletic Department Staff changes

- Mark Rountree (Deputy Athletics Director at Miami University of Ohio) Mark began on January 20, 2015. Mark has spent his first few months learning the strengths of the staff before making too many substantive changes to the Athletics Administration. He has recently submitted a revised Organizational chart for the Athletics Department
- Head Women’s Basketball Coach Sherri Murrell was let go from the University in late February and Lynn Kennedy was named the head coach last week. Coach Kennedy comes to Portland State with 14 years experience as a collegiate head coach and more than 20 years coaching experience overall. For the past 10 seasons, he led the Southern Oregon women’s basketball program to outstanding success. The Raiders went 27-5 this past season, ranked in the top 10 in the nation, and reached the NAIA Division II Sweet 16. In all, Kennedy was 208-105 as head coach at Southern Oregon, leading three teams to the NAIA National Tournament.
- Associate Athletic Director for External Affairs (Zack Wallace), Dan Valles (EMSA office and Student Affairs budgetary manger) and Associate Athletic Director/Senior Women’s Administrator left Portland State for new jobs at other institutions.
- Robert Lockwood (Faculty Athletics Representative) has announced he will be extending his term serving as the FAR until September, 2015. The process for selecting the next Faculty Athletics
Representative failed to attract any qualified candidates during the initial search. The position description has been revised and the position search will reopen this month. Members of the IAB have been encouraged to begin speaking with potential candidates and actively recruit their interest in this vital position.

II. IAB Oversight and Review as Required under the PSU NCAA Certification Agreement

Operating Principle 1.1 (O.P. 1.1---Institutional Control and Shared Responsibilities)

IAB has maintained an active role in policy and procedure development and revision in Athletics. It has reported on athletic policy issues and student-athletes’ accomplishments, and has reviewed Athletics’ budget requests submitted to the Student Fee Committee (SFC).

IAB approved the *PSU Athletics Academic Services Policy* at its meeting on January 7, 2015. This manual fulfilled one of the commitments PSU Athletics made as part of the OUS Audit process. The completion of this manual was an important step in PSU’s rules education and culture of Student Athlete support services in Athletics. *The Athletics Department has acknowledges that there may be revisions to both the previously adopted compliance policy and this Academic Services policy as a result of the Portland State University internal audit and input from new Athletic Director Mark Rountree.*

III. Discussion of concussion policy

- The department of Athletics recently submitted a policy to guide the handling of Athletes who suffer a concussion. The policy will guide and monitor an athlete’s return to participation and return to academic work. Athletics is currently a thorough review of this important document by the Intercollegiate Athletics Board. The development of the final language of this document and should be the board’s final approval in the next meeting.

IV. Possible change to the committee structure

- Discussion was held to determine how to make the Intercollegiate Athletics Board better serve the needs of the campus community. (*Do we expand the number of members?*, *Do we keep it as faculty only or open the membership to staff as well?*, *Do we include a student athlete as a student member in addition to those students who represent ASPSU?*, *How often should this body report to the Faculty Senate?*) Further discussion of this has been held using a recent survey on Athletics governance from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics as a guide.
- Further discussion remains as the committee awaits the final report from the internal audit. *The Final report from the auditor should be ready for review at the next IAB meeting.*

Viking Pavilion construction:
Meetings are ongoing with the architecture firm to develop the final vision for the renovated facility. Fortis Construction was chosen recently as the building contractor. Preliminary estimates are for construction to begin in mid-December 2015 or early January 2016 depending upon design review and the permitting process. Anticipated completion of the project is set for early 2019 at the latest. When final plans are confirmed they will be distributed to the IAB.

Academic Progress Reports are due to be released by the NCAA in the next week or two. The results of PSU Athletics scores will be added to a revised copy of this report if they are received in time.

A last minute request from Senate President Bob Liebman, I was asked to speak to the steering committee about a request from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics asking PSU to call for a vote on urging our congressional delegates to support the creation of a Presidential Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. Given the short notice an email was circulated to the members of the IAB asking for their input. The responses were definitely mixed and highlighted the need for further discussion of this matter at our next meeting. At this time we cannot make any recommendation to the Faculty Senate steering committee.

We are scheduled to meet next week and we will be sending an amended version of this draft updating any final decisions on subjects in this report.
IAC Annual Report 2015

Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

April 1, 2015

The Institutional Assessment Council (IAC) Council welcomed eight new members for the 2014/2015 academic year. Members represent a wide range of departments and programs, and have significant roles related to assessment practices and policies.

IAC Members 2014-2015 Academic Year:

Thomas Bielavitz, LIB
Rowanna Carpenter, UNST
Micki Caskey, ED
Amy Donaldson, SPHR
Robert Halstead, OAA
Jim Hook, MCECS
Charles Klein, ANTH
Suzanne Matthews, OAI

Leslee Peterson, ED
Gerry Recktenwald, MCECS
Aimee Shattuck, EMSA
Brandon Sheldon (student representative), Ps
Karen Strand, ARTS
Janelle Voegele (Co-chair), OAI
Erica Wagner, SBA
Vicki Wise, EMSA (Co-chair)
Lindy Wortman (student representative), ED

Ex-officio:

Margaret Everett, OGS
Sukhwant Jhaj, OAA
Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP
Leslie McBride, CUPA

IAC Charge:

The Institutional Assessment Council (IAC) will promote and advocate for the continued implementation of assessment across the campus, working closely with: Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies, Institutional Research and Planning, Office of Academic Innovation, and Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. The IAC will create principles and recommendations for assessment planning that are sustainable and learning-focused, and provide counsel aimed at enhancing the quality of student learning through assessment activities.

In cooperation with the ex-officio members, the Council will design a framework for promoting assessment long term and will provide guidelines for implementation. It will serve as the primary advisory mechanism for institutional planning and will coordinate with the assistant and associate deans group the implementation of systemic annual reporting by the schools and colleagues. It will create an annual document on the status of assessment that will form the basis for institutional reports, such as those required by the PSU faculty senate and the regional accreditation body, NWCCU.

IAC Priorities 2014/2015

The IAC’s priorities were informed by a two-year work plan approved by the Council in April 2014 [Insert Link here]. The plan incorporated foundational IAC work during the years 2008-2013, as well as recommendations created by Dr. Bill Rickards, consultant in higher education research and evaluation [Insert link to Rickards PSU visit and report here]
Rickards recommended the following short-range priorities:

(1) Mapping current assessment practices across colleges and programs;

(2) Engaging faculty as co-investigators in questions stemming from real issues in programs (ex: retention, class size), as well as initiatives impacting curricular change (ex: Provost’s Challenge, Flexible Degrees);

(3) Highlighting assessment practices at program and department levels, including exploring assessment practices with specific curriculum content.

The IAC identified an additional short range priority:

(4) Leading campus conversations on assessment communication cycles as a means of sharing program curricular activities, innovations and findings, preparing for program review, and building documentation for reports as required by the regional accreditation body, NWCCU.

These priorities formed the basis for five goals:

**Goal 1: Updated campus inventory of program assessment activity and outcomes** - complete

Led by Assessment Coordinator Suzanne Matthews, a campus-wide inventory of program assessment activity was conducted to (1) compare current program assessment activity with findings from a similar inventory conducted in 2009-2010, (2) establish a baseline understanding of changes to program assessment activity, (3) inform the IAC’s strategic planning goals.

The Undergraduate Programmatic Assessment Evaluation (Template D) used in 2009-2010 to evaluate program assessment activity was modified to create a template and rubric that formed the basis for evaluating current program assessment activity in the colleges and academic programs. Indicators of “established” program assessment activity are:

- clearly defined program-level outcomes,
- a plan for assessing each of the outcomes,
- strong indication that the results from assessments are reviewed on a continuous basis,
- the inclusion of assessment results within decision-making and planning processes,
- updated information on department websites on program-level outcomes and curriculum revisions.

Initial inventory results revealed progression in several programs from early to midstage assessment activity, or midstage to established program assessment activity. Next steps are to (1) follow up with departments for which assessment information is missing, (2) develop exemplars from “established” programs, using current media technologies to highlight the departments’ perspectives on processes used and impact of assessment work, and (3) establish partnerships with programs for sustainable assessment planning that creates a added value to departments’ current initiatives.

**Goal 2: Updated campus inventory of program outcomes mapped to campus wide learning outcomes (CWLOs)** – complete
This inventory mapped program level outcomes to one or more campus wide learning outcomes to determine overall coverage across the colleges. Next steps are to (1) compare findings between 2010 and 2015 inventories, and (2) incorporate strengths and gaps for each outcome into strategic planning for promoting assessment practices within specific curricular content.

**Goal 3: Program assessment examples identified (Departmental, College, Provost Challenge, Flexible Degree) – 80% complete**

Examples have been identified from program-driven efforts to study and improve student experience, retention, success and learning outcomes. These include examples from individual departments, University Studies, Provost Challenge outcomes, and assessment in Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. Next steps are to organize examples into thematic categories, create multimedia resources, and make these resources available as part of an institutional assessment portfolio, as well as planning and implementation of student learning assessment in Flexible Degree projects.

**Goal 4: Updated assessment resources – 50% complete**

In addition to program and department exemplars, print and multimedia resources are being updated and are available at [http://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/resources](http://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/resources)

**Goal 5: Accreditation Report Standard Four: Effectiveness and Improvement draft - complete**

Four IAC members participated on the Standard Four Subcommittee: Effectiveness and Improvement for the PSU Year Seven Self Evaluation Process. The report summarized assessment activity across colleges on the undergraduate and graduate levels.

**Goal 6: Draft proposal: Assessment Communication Cycles – 50% complete**

The IAC drafted a proposal and process for the periodic communication of assessment activity across programs and colleges. The benefits of this process to academic programs include creating an accessible record of assessment activity for program improvement, keeping assessment processes relevant and localized to department concerns and initiatives, “telling the story” of programs and colleges and their contribution to the PSU student experience, creating a current repository from which information can be easily located and shared by departments for purposes of educating prospective partners, and housing easily accessed data for purposes of internal or external reporting requirements. Next steps: IAC subcommittees will refine the proposal and implement outreach to various segments of the campus community for feedback.

The IAC will continue to work with the Office of Academic Innovation to incorporate feedback from faculty, chairs, associate deans and deans on assessment strategic priorities and goals. Additionally, the IAC will foster collaborations with colleges to examine PSU education with attention to student persistence and success, will incorporate multiple data sources as resources to understand student learning at Portland State, and refine approaches to supporting programs in assessing educational initiatives as they emerge.
To: Faculty Senate  
Re: Library Committee Annual Report 4/13/2015  

Committee Chair: Jon Holt  
Committee Members: David Bullock, Susan Chan, Maura Kelly, Susan Masta, Brian Turner and Ivan Reihsmann  
Ex Officio: Thomas Bielavitz, Barbara Glackin, Claudia Weston, and Marilyn Moody

For the 2014-2015 academic year, the Library Committee discussed the following items:
1. Integration of a new library cataloging system  
2. Initiatives to empower student learning through the library  
3. Impacts on the library from budget decreases

For the 2014-2015 year, one of the big challenges to the library has been its integration of a new catalog system that began in Summer 2014. Librarians used committee meetings to help PSU faculty understand the challenges as this process was still underway in late 2014 and to help understand why aspects of library service (e.g., the ability to find and order certain books outside of Millar) might be impacted. This integration is now complete (Spring 2015) and service levels have returned and improved.

Discussion of Task Forces to help promote student learning through library, leveraging library resources to efficiently and economically empower students. More specifically, faculty and library staff shared feedback on textbook reserves, e-reserves, and alternative methods of textbook delivery.

Discussion of the current and upcoming Library budgets, to help faculty members understand the challenges the library faces in maintaining its service levels (e.g., acquisition or book-buying power); in these discussions, faculty members were able to express their concerns about how cutbacks in services might affect their research and teaching.

A plan from 2013-2014 Library Committee (under Holt) to promote a library-faculty questionnaire for graduate students to gather their feedback on library use and resources was cancelled after further discussion, lacking the full support of both faculty and librarians.

In sum, the faculty Library Committee for 2014-2015 has been able to hear about exciting initiatives and work going on within the library; we have also been able to provide our voices, helping shape work and future work that will lead to student success at PSU in both our classrooms and in our library.

Jon Holt  
Chair, Library Committee  
Assistant Professor of Japanese  
World Languages and Literatures
Scholastic Standards Committee  
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate  
Submitted to Faculty Steering Committee on April 8th, 2015 by Andrea Price

Chair: Andrea Price, OIA

Faculty: Megan McLaughlin, OIA  
Michele Miller, IELP  
Scott Broussard, CLAS  
Paloma Harrison, CLAS  
Randy Zelick, BIO  
Courtney Sandler, UHRL  
Linda Liu, SSS  
Liane O’Banion, LC  
Domnic Thomas, DOS

Student: None Appointed

Ex-Officio: Mary Ann Barham, ACS  
Nicolle DuPont, RO  
Margaret Everett, OGS  
Sukhwant Jhaj, OAA

I. Committee Charge

- Develop and recommend academic standards to maintain the integrity of the undergraduate program and academic transcripts of the University.
- Develop, maintain and implement protocols regarding academic changes to undergraduate transcripts.
- Adjudicate undergraduate student petitions for academic reinstatement to the University.
- Report to the Senate at least once a year.
- Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of the Academic Requirements and Curriculum Committees, and the Graduate Council.

II. Committee Membership

The committee consists of ten faculty members, selected at large by Committee on Committees, two students and the following ex-officio members: Associate Registrar for Registration, Records & Operations; Director of Advising & Career Services; Vice Provost for Academic Innovation & Student Success; and a designee from the Office of Graduate Studies & Research.

III. Function of the Committee

(all petitions can be found at www.pdx.edu/registration/)
A. The committee reviews petitions for all **retroactive** changes to the undergraduate academic transcript including:

1. Adding of courses
2. Withdrawals
3. Drops
4. Tuition refunds
5. Change of grading option
6. Extension of incomplete past one year

B. The committee adjudicates petitions for academic reinstatement for any term.

C. The committee makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate on any changes, additions or policies that have impact on the academic transcript or academic/registration deadlines, including grading.

D. The committee is responsible for the academic standing policy and interventions therein such as the registration hold that is applied for undergraduate students on academic warning. Changes to any of these policies must be presented by the SSC and approved by Faculty Senate.

IV. Changes to SSC Process for 2014-15

In order to respect the university’s effort to become more environmentally conscientious, the committee is now reviewing **past** SSC petitions in the university’s OnBase database system. When a new SSC petition is submitted by a student who has prior SSC petitions on file, these prior petitions are no longer printed and attached to the current SSC petition. Instead the committee is notified to check the OnBase system to review any such prior petitions.

V. Petitions by the Number 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition Type</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>105 (59%)</td>
<td>58 (32%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>235 (71%)</td>
<td>67 (20%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add/Drop Overall</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>249 (69%)</td>
<td>84 (23%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including add only, simultaneous add/drop, drop only no refund/withdrawals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete Extension</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Many Thanks!!

Thank you to all committee members for your continued work and support of students. Special thanks to Nicolle DuPont and Liane O’Banion who helped make the transition to the new chair for the 2014-15 year a smooth process. Many thanks to Domanic Thomas and Nicole Morris for your continued willingness to share information relevant to the petition process. And finally a huge thank you to Kalialani Cruz, who works tirelessly to support our committee and the students, as they are finding their way through the petition process.
2014/2015 UNST Council Report to Faculty Senate

Prepared by Joel Bettridge, Chair


Ex-officio: Mirela Blekic, Rowanna Carpenter, Yves Labissiere

The UNST Council membership was not assigned until the end of the Fall term. It then meet three times in the Winter Term and is scheduled to meet four times in the Spring Term. Its activities comprised the following:

1. Curriculum
   a. The UNST Curriculum Committee (Chaired by Rowanna Carpenter) reviewed and recommended a number of courses for inclusion in various clusters. The Council voted to approve their inclusion. The classes and clusters are: CR 306U (approved for a new cluster), INTL 343, INTL 364, JPN 344, CFS 340, HST 333, HST 326, INTL 350, INTL 360
   b. The Council is currently considering a new Freshman Inquiry theme, titled “Health, Happiness, and Human Right.” This FRINQ is designed to attract/serve students who are interested in learning about Health Sciences. The Council, however, had major concerns with the proposal. In particular, it was not clear how writing instruction was incorporated into the class, nor was it clear how interdisciplinary the class was in practice. The Council asked the faculty members proposing the new FRINQ to revise the proposal and resubmit it by Friday April 17th. The Council’s hope is that its concerns will have been addressed and that the new FRINQ can be approved for next year.
   c. The Council approved the reapplication of the Science in the Liberal Arts cluster, which will now be titled “Science in Social Context.”
   d. The Council is scheduled to meet with the Credit for Prior Learning team in the Spring term.

2. First-Year Experience Review follow up
   a. Based upon the findings of the report, the Council decided that it wanted to participate in the University’s strategic planning process, so it scheduled a meeting with the Student Learning and Academic Success team and Equity, Opportunity and Access team. The goal of this meeting was to highlight the student success issues that emerged out of the report.
   a. In the Spring Term, the Council is going to focus on how to improve faculty experience within the Freshman Inquiry. In particular, it is going to decide which areas identified by the report aught to be prioritized.