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To: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty  

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **October 5, 2015**, at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.  

**AGENDA**  

A. Roll  
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the June 1, 2015 Meeting*  
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  
   1. *OAA Response to June Report of Senate Actions*  
   2. Senate Procedures, Districts, and Meeting Schedule  
   3. Announcement from Graduation Program Board (N. Running / S. Gelmon)  
   4. **Discussion Item:** Academic Program Prioritization  
D. Unfinished Business  
E. New Business  
   1. *Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda*  
   2. *Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence & Analytics (SBA)*  
   3. *Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems (CUPA)*  
   4. *Motion from University Studies Council*  
F. Question Period  
   Questions from the Floor for the Chair  
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   1. President’s Report (16:00)  
   2. Provost’s Report  
H. Adjournment  

*The following documents are included in this mailing:*  
   B. Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of June 1, 2015 and attachments  
   C-1. OAA Response to June Report of Senate Actions  
   E-1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda  
   E-2. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence & Analytics  
   E-3. Proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems  
   E-4. Motion from UNST Council and Rationale
FACULTY SENATE ROSTER

2015-16 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE
Gina Greco, Presiding Officer
Brad Hansen, Presiding Officer Elect • Bob Liebman, Past Presiding Officer
Richard Beyler, Secretary
Committee Members: Linda George (2016) • David Maier (2016)
Paula Carder (2017) • Alan MacCormack (2017)

Ex officio: Sharon Carstens, Chair, Committee on Committees • Maude Hines, IFS Representative.

****2015-16 FACULTY SENATE (62)****

All Others (9)
Baccar, Cindy   EMSA 2016
Ingersoll, Becki   ACS 2016
O’Banion, Liane   OAA 2016
†Popp, Karen   OGS 2016
Arellano, Regina   EMSA 2017
Harmon, Steve   OAA 2017
Riedlinger, Carla   EMSA 2017
Kennedy, Karen   ACS 2018
Running, Nicholas   EMSA 2018

College of the Arts (4)
Griffin, Corey   ARCH 2016
†Babcock, Ronald   MUS 2017
Hansen, Brad   MUS 2017
Wendl, Nora   ARCH 2018

CLAS – Arts and Letters (7)
Pease, Jonathan   WLL 2016
Perlmutter, Jennifer   WLL 2016
Childs, Tucker   LING 2017
Clark, Michael   ENG 2017
Greco, Gina   WLL 2017
†Epplin, Craig   WLL 2018
†Jaén Portillo, Isabel   WLL 2018

CLAS – Sciences (8)
Daescu, Dacian   MTH 2016
George, Linda   ESM 2016
†Rueter, John   ESM 2016
Elzanowski, Marek   MATH 2017
Stedman, Ken   BIO 2017
de Rivera, Catherine   ESM 2018
†Flight, Andrew   MATH 2018
Webb, Rachel   MATH 2018

CLAS – Social Sciences (7)
†Carstens, Sharon   ANTH 2016
Padin, Jose   SOC 2016
†Davidova, Evgenia   INTL 2017
Gambrud, Michele   ANTH 2017
Schuler, Friedrich   HST 2017
Chang, Heejun   GEOG 2018
Bluffstone, Randy   ECON 2018

College of Urban and Public Affairs (6)
Brodowicz, Gary   CH 2016
Carder, Paula   IA 2016
*Labissiere, Yves (for Farquhar)   CH 2016
†SChrock, Greg   USP 2017
Yesilada, Birol   PS 2017
Harris, G.L.A.   GOV 2018

Graduate School of Education (4)
†McElhone, Dorothy   ED 2016
De La Vega, Esperanza   ED 2017
Mukhopadhyay, Swapna   ED 2017
Farahmandpur, Ramin   ED 2018

Library (1)
†Bowman, Michael   LIB 2017

Maseeh College of Eng. & Comp. Science (5)
*Daim, Tugrul (for Bertini)   ETM 2016
Maier, David   CS 2017
Monsere, Christopher   CEE 2018
†Trehway, Derek   MME 2018

Other Instructional (3)
†Lindsay, Susan   IELP 2016
MacCormack, Alan   UNST 2017
Camacho (Reed), Judy   IELP 2018

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

School of Social Work (5)
†Donlan, Ted   SSW 2017
Taylor, Michael   SSW 2017
Hulshof-Schmidt, Michael   SSW 2018
Talbott, Maria   SSW 2018

Date: Sept. 2015; New Senators in italics
* Interim appointments
† Member of Committee on Committees
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, June 1, 2015
Presiding Officer: Robert Liebman
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Babcock, Baccar, Bleiler, Boas, Bowman, Brodowicz, Brower, Carder, Carpenter, Carstens, Childs, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clark, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, Daim, Davidova, De Anda, De La Vega, Dolidon, Donlan, Elzanowski, Eppley, Gamburd, Greco, Griffin, Hansen (Brad), Hansen (David), Harmon, Holliday, Ingersoll, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, McElhone, Maier, Padin, Perlmutter, Reese, Riedlinger, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Schrock, Schuler, Smith, Stedman, Taylor

Alternates Present: Kennedy for Arellano, Black for Karavanic, Estes for Labissiere, Devoll for Mercer, Beckett for Popp, Wong for Raffò, Morris for Skaruppa, Kinsella for Yeshilada, Daasch for Zurk

Members Absent: George, Hunt, Luther, Mukhopadhyay

New Members Present: Bluffstone, Chang, Comacho, de Rivera, Epplin, Farahmandpur, Flight, Harris, Hatfield, Jaen-Portillo, MacCormack, Monsere, Pease, Running, Gioia for Talbott, Webb


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2015 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. The May 4, 2015 minutes were approved with the following correction (p. 74): BLEILER/TAYLOR moved to assign Physical Geography and GIS courses to the science distribution area (as listed in D1).

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

LIEBMAN welcomed new senators. He explained that there were handouts that updated today’s proposed agenda and that there would need to be a handoff of clickers from old to new senators for the election votes. He thanked Committee on Committee
chair David Hansen for organizing electronic caucuses for senators to elect their representatives to the 2015-16 Committee on Committees prior to Senate.

LIEBMAN requested a vote to suspend the published order of business to make some adjustments to the order and add time limits. (See slides, minutes attachment B1.) He also noted that nothing had been withdrawn from the Consent Agenda.

BLEILER/GRECO MOVED to suspend the published June agenda to allow the proposed revisions and additions.

The MOTION was ADOPTED by unanimous voice vote.

Update of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

CPL Project Team member Peter Collier reviewed the group’s goals and accomplishments, including the nine CPL policies reviewed by Senate in 2014, a flow chart and handbook for students, guidelines for fees and faculty compensation, a training manual and webinars for evaluators, and a dedicated web site. HECC has designated PSU as a CPL pilot site. (See slides, minutes attachment B2, and https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/.)

Revision of Policy on Religious Accommodation

Chas Lopez, interim Chief Diversity Officer, introduced Cindy Starke, Office of General Counsel. LOPEZ noted that revision was required because current policy only addressed religious holidays. STARKE noted that laws on religious accommodation were evolving and the proposed new policies were intended to offer consistent guidance and to protect and support both students and faculty. LOPEZ said a comment page had been opened for senators to offer feedback until June 30: http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/university-policy-library

[Secretary’s note: Update from the Task Force on Academic Quality – shifted to E.6]

Update on the Transition of OARS

David Reese, University General Counsel, said that along with governance changes that allowed PSU to become an independent public university, as of July 1, 2014 PSU was no longer subject to the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act. All of the Oregon University System rules, IMDs and Board policies, and PSU administrative rules have rolled over and become PSU “standards” or “policies.” PSU now has its own web page home for a University Policy Library with a table that lists each old administrative rule and notes whether it is still in effect as a standard or has been superseded: http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/psu-standards-former-oars-and-former-ous-internal-management-directives-and-policies

DAASCH: Is the site searchable?
REESE: Not now, because the files are all separate PDFs, but we can strive for that.

TAYLOR: Will superseding policies go before the Board or committee for review?
REESE: Depending on what the policy is, it could be a Board resolution, or go to the University Policy Committee, or be changed by the Senate.

Presiding Officer Elect

LIEBMAN opened the floor for nominations for Presiding Officer Elect for 2015-16. Brad Hansen and Michael Bowman received nominations during May. Tom Luckett, also nominated in May, deferred. LIEBMAN shared a brief governance resume for each (see B1, slide 5). There were no further nominations.

BRAD HANSEN was elected by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

Nominations for Steering Committee

LIEBMAN brought forward the names of senators who had expressed a willingness to accept nomination: Paula Carder, Alan MacCormack, and David Maier. LIEBMAN opened the floor for additional nominations. None were offered. Nominations for a one-year appointment to replace retiring Steering Committee member Swapna Mukhopadhyay were also offered: Randall Bluffstone and Michael Taylor. LIEBMAN shared a brief governance resume for each (see B1, slide 6).

[Secretary’s note: Steering Committee vote was held after completion of Unfinished Business]

Steering Committee Elections

Paula Carder and Alan MacCormack were elected to the Steering Committee for 2015-2017 by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

David Maier’s name was added as a nominee for the one-year replacement position.

David Maier was elected for 2015-2016 by secret ballot (recorded by clicker).

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS


LIEBMAN introduced Gina Greco, Presiding Officer elect for 2015-16 and also a member of the PSU-AAUP Bargaining Team that reviewed the PTR Procedures.

In a written statement, GRECO summarized a collaborative process of joint review by the Office of Academic Affairs and PSU-AAUP of the Senate-adopted
procedures for post-tenure review. The proposed changes were intended to clarify the process, respecting Senate’s intent; to ensure that all procedures were in one document; and to set a common award for successful review for all five years of the implementation process. (See statement, minutes attachment B3.)

In conclusion, GRECO stated that the Senate Steering Committee, OAA, and PSU-AAUP recommended acceptance of the changes; she asked for questions. [Secretary’s note: There were none.]

HANSEN (Brad)/CLUCAS MOVED approval of the negotiated changes and additions to post-tenure review in the Portland State Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure, Promotion, Merit Increases.

The MOTION to approve the negotiated changes and additions PASSED: 53 to accept, 1 to reject, with no abstentions (recorded by clicker).

2. Proposal to Amend the Constitution to Eliminate the Teacher Education Committee (TEC)

MACCORMACK, chair of the Advisory Council, said that the Council had reviewed the proposal to eliminate the TEC, as proposed by its members and 10 senators and saw no issues other than renumbering required.

LIEBMAN explained the process for amending the Constitution, which includes vetting by the Advisory Council after an initial Senate vote.

HOLLIDAY/BLEILER MOVED the proposal to eliminate the Teacher Education Committee.

The MOTION to Eliminate TEC PASSED, 53 to accept, 0 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

3. Proposals to Amend the Constitution (Articles III.1, V.1, & V.2, and By-laws)

MACCORMACK said that Advisory Council had reviewed the four proposed changes in wording to Articles III and V to provide successor language for PSU’s new Board of Trustees, ex officio status for Past Presiding Officer and Presiding Elect, and an elections calendar clarification, and found them straight-forward and requiring no change in policy. He noted that a fifth change had been proposed adding the new faculty ranks in May, but withdrawn by the proposers.

LIEBMAN explained that a change to add new faculty ranks approved in 2014 had been withdrawn due to confusion about the status of Research Assistants. The matter would come back for discussion in Senate in 2015-16.
HOLLIDAY/BLEILER MOVED the proposed changes to the wording of the Constitution described in item D-3.

The MOTION to PASSED, to 52 accept, 1 to reject, with 1 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

[4. Proposal for an Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Mastery of Music, College of the Arts – withdrawn due to procedural issues.]

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

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

2. EPC Motion on the Proposal for a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health

PADIN confirmed that the Educational Policy Committee recommended approval of the proposed School of Public Health. Taking a university-wide perspective, the EPC had set out to answer three questions in its review: is the new school desirable in the Portland metro region, is the joint PSU-OHSU proposal credible, and can the leading proponents deliver on the promises. The EPC believed that there was satisfactory evidence, including 3 positive external evaluations letters, to answer “yes” to all three questions.

PADIN thought that the combined degrees and tracks at all three levels, BA, Masters, and PhD, could make for a formidable school of public health, attract faculty and students, and open new funding vistas. He noted that as the venture moved forward, there would still be on-going conversations about organization and governance. He thanked the members of EPC for putting in extra hours to complete the review.

LIEBMAN acknowledged visitors from OHSU in the audience and invited interim SPH dean Elena Andresen to answer questions.

DAASCH/HARMON MOVED to approve the proposal for a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health.

MAIER: What’s the status on OHSU side, have they approved the School?

ANDRESEN: Yes.

PADIN stated that department transfers to the approved School would start happening in the fall, including the School of Community Health and tracks in
CUPA, adding that these were not determined by today’s vote. LIEBMAN concurred that the vote was to establish the school; there would be more work to do around the transfer of units and faculty governance, congruence with the PSU side and the joint school.

The MOTION to approve the School of Public Health PASSED, 46 to accept, 1 to reject, with 2 abstentions (recorded by clicker). [Applause.]

3. Proposal for a BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness in CUPA

BRODOWICZ explained that the BS in Health Studies previously had five separate concentrations. These are all anticipated to move to the new School of Public Health, but it had been determined that it would be more appropriate to revise the exercise/physical activity track as a separate major to follow standards of the National Strength and Conditioning Association (NSCA), rather than CEPH (Council for Education in Public Health) standards adopted for the other four tracks. Randy Miller (Community Health) added that changes resulting from the Affordable Care Act and rising demand in the health and fitness sector, including demand for personal trainers, made this a timely proposal.

STEDMAN/HANSEN (David) MOVED the BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness.

CARSTENS: Will the program stay in CUPA?

BRODOWICZ: We were told that it would be a standalone undergraduate degree in the School of Public Health, not having to meet the stricter CEPH criteria, as long as the program introduced some broad approaches to public health.

MILLER: Nationwide, NCSA is moving towards an accreditation process having a more science-based curriculum. The proposed degree also introduces new core courses to meet these requirements.

The MOTION to PASSED, 39 to accept, 5 to reject, with 6 abstentions (recorded by clicker).


Michael Taylor (CFS) introduced Ben Anderson-Nathe, Program Director of Child and Family Studies. ANDERSON-NATHE said the minor would allow students completing the Child and Family Studies Cluster the opportunity to round out their studies with an additional credential enhancing a professional degree or adding an applied focus.

TAYLOR/HOLIDAY MOVED the Minor in Child and Family Studies
The MOTION to PASSED, 45 to accept, 3 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

5. Steering Committee Motions on Academic Program Prioritization (APP)
[Secretary’s note: revised agenda order; published as E-7]

LIEBMAN invited Lynn Santelmann and Mark Jones from the APPC to join him. He explained that a single academic year had proved to be an unrealistic deadline for completion of the work that Senate had asked of the Ad hoc APPC. The motion would endorse the continuation of the APP Committee’s work.

SANTELMANN previewed the motion, presenting a revised time line, with a pilot to test and refine a scoring rubric over the summer, that would allow chairs to consult with their faculty in the fall when they complete the APP review forms (see slides, minutes attachment B4). A weekend scoring event is still planned, but will be moved to mid December.

HOLLIDAY/ELZANOWSKI MOVED to endorse the new version of the motion posted on May 28 and circulated as new item E5, Motion 1, in handouts:

Faculty Senate endorses the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, per the charge of June 2, 2014. APPC will make an interim report to Senate on October 5, 2015 to solicit feedback on the results of its pilot test of the scoring rubrics. Senate expects to receive the final APPC report in winter term, 2016. (For the full resolution, see minutes attachment B5.)

CARPENTER: What does the pilot look like?

SANTELMANN: There are two visions currently being discussed. One would have members on the committee who are or have been chairs volunteer their programs as guinea pigs. We have also talked about asking programs who have recently gone through accreditation or program review volunteer to be in the pilot.

LIEBMAN: One add-on would be to pilot representative types of programs, undergraduate and graduate, to determine whether the instrument or rubric is flexible enough for the variety of 157 programs to be reviewed.

SANTELMANN: With the acknowledgement that it probably won’t.

MOTION 1 PASSED, 47 to accept, 6 to reject, with 1 abstention (recorded by clicker).

SANTELMANN noted that the five large criteria proposed for the review were not the rubric, but rather the categories for data collection. The resolution handout (see
B5) describes the indicators for each measure. APPC was trying to balance academic priorities and pragmatic realities and plans on a holistic scoring process based on a combination of factors. It was also trying to minimize the burden on chairs.

BOWMAN/GRECO MOVED the following, distributed as Motion 2, item E-5 (see minutes attachment B5):

Faculty Senate approves the five criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation.

PERLMUTTER asked how historical background could be included, and not just a response to data. SANTEL_MANN replied probably under “demand/trajectory” along with the opportunity to comment on three years of enrollment data; and more particularly in the narrative for “relation to mission.” LIEBMAN pointed out that some indicators were hard data from OIRP and some were analytic narratives. PERLMUTTER responded that categories 2 through 5 all seem data-related. SANTEL_MANN said they were also asking qualitative questions about the data, for example, about student learning outcomes and advising not captured by OIRP data, and hoping to balance the two, quantitative and qualitative. LIEBMAN said the goal of the narrative was to capture “the local color.”

GAMBURD asked if there were a sense that OIRP data could be trusted, given how difficult PSU systems made it to collect. SANTEL_MANN said they were working with OIRP to identify data that it was very confident in. KETCHISON (OIRP) said OIRP would share the information with programs so that it could be reviewed and verified. SCHULER was concerned that it seemed like a very data driven process and might result in eliminating curricula that help make “the whole person”; he asked if the APP process included any measures to compensate for the short-term view of program success. SANTEL_MANN emphasized that APPC was only charged with designing a system of prioritization; her hope was that Senate would take a very active role in deciding what to do with the information. She argued that a valuable program with lower enrollments or a struggling one should be able to make the case for its retention, or its need for more resources.

GAMBURD wondered if department chairs were going to know how best to present their programs and if the system could be “gamed.” SANTEL_MANN replied that PSU’s lack of experience with APP would make trying to anticipate results impossible or inadvisable; Steering Committee would need to take up the question of what is to be done with APP results next year. RUETER advised going for a B+.

PADIN wondered why the second motion was needed if APP would be reporting back on their pilot; he was concerned about the balance of revenue related and qualitative components. LIEBMAN said the aim was to make the criteria known,
as well as to indicate whether the process could be tested with these five; he also pointed to the many indicators for each that would help identify gaps. GRECO affirmed her understanding that the criteria were not all equally weighted. PADIN asked if it even made sense to roll the results into one index. SANTEL Mann said the pilot would help work this detail out and previewed one strategy that would not reduce results to a single number—a radar graph in pentagonal form for representing outcomes (see B4, slides 8-11). LIEBMAN noted that other universities had not reported a single number for APP. HINES asked for more comment on the number of indicators. SANTEL Mann directed senators to the table at the end the E-5 handout and gave examples of the qualitative indicators under criteria like productivity (see B5, pages 2-3). HINES observed that looking at the indicators did show how quality received more weight than just 1 out of 5.

LIEBMAN called the question; it was affirmed by majority voice vote.

The MOTION to approve the five criteria PASSED, 31 to accept, 17 to reject, with 5 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

6. Steering Committee Motion endorsing the work of the Academic Quality Task Force (TAQ)

LIEBMAN introduced Virginia Butler, chair of the Academic Quality Task Force.

BUTLER referred senators to the handout with the Task Force Report (G-11) that had been posted to the Senate website on May 28 (see minutes attachment B6). She noted that Senate and PSU-AAUP jointly convened the Task Force in the fall of 2014 and committee members had enthusiastically taken up the topic. One piece of the Senate charge was to identify aspirational comparators that can be used to address the question. The Task Force recognized that no one university would capture all aspects.

BUTLER said that in grappling with a definition for academic quality, the Task Force had created a survey in March to gather ideas from the campus community on what constitutes quality in teaching, service, and research, asking for examples of where it is supported. The response rate (15% overall, of 2600) highlights the importance of the issue for faculty. Provost Andrews provided GRA support for the analysis. The report highlights some trends and patterns, both with respect to practice and philosophy. The committee proposes completing qualitative analysis and picking five to eight indicators of quality. It will follow up with a more directed survey in winter 2016, looking to prioritize the indicators and to identify institutions that support these aspects of quality. The goal will be to ask what can be done to bring these aspirational practices to PSU, what blocks or promotes them. The Task Force will also look at data that PSU already gathers on the student take on quality. Finally, they hope to develop guidelines for a standing committee on academic quality to support on-going efforts and follow through.
LIEBMAN acknowledged contributions to the Task Force’s work from Scott Marshall, Kathi Ketcheson, Alan MacCormack and others across campus. He commented that the thoughtful construction of qualitative responses gathered would be matched with quantitative responses.

GRECO/CARDER MOVED the CONTINUATION of the work of the TAQ.

BOWER asked for clarification of the statement of the motion. LIEBMAN referred senators to the packet, item E-6.

DELAVEGA: I’m really excited about this idea of looking at what we mean by quality. In the Graduate School of Education we are constantly looking at what affects the classroom environment and how we prepare engaged teachers. Seeing no GSE members on the Task Force I would like to recommend adding a faculty member from the GSE.

LIEBMAN: The idea for the Task Force was to start small, but that’s an excellent idea.

The MOTION to PASSED, 45 to accept, 6 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

7. ARC Proposal to change the post-baccalaureate certificate PSU residency requirement  [Secretary’s note: revised agenda order]

MACCORMACK clarified that “residency requirement” did not refer to the bar for in-state tuition, but rather the number of credits that must be taken at PSU for a PSU degree or certificate to be awarded. He observed that the current standard was 30 credits at PSU, without specifying that those credits must pertain to the certificate. In addition, some existing certificates require less than 30 credits. ARC is proposing a standard modeled after the graduate certificate PSU minimum of 16 credits, or three quarters of all course work required for the certificate.

HANSEN (Brad) /HOLLIDAY MOVED to CHANGE the post-baccalaureate certificate PSU residency requirement to the greater of 16 credits or three quarters of required credit, as published in E-5 (E7 in the revised agenda).

DAASCH: Why is the minimum not just three-quarters of the credit?

MACCORMACK: We just wanted to establish some kind of floor. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approves post-bac certificates and right now, I think the lowest number of total credits required is 24.

The MOTION to PASSED, 47 to accept, 3 to reject, with 0 abstentions (recorded by clicker).
8. Steering Committee Resolution on annual reporting to the Board of Trustees

LIEBMAN stated this motion was the beginning of a project to make the PSU Board aware of the work of Senate committees and establish regular communication with the Board. He referenced remarks that he had made at the March BOT meeting (see minutes attachment B7).

STEDMAN/TAYLOR MOVED the proposal to FORWARD ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORTS to the PSU Board of Trustees, as published in E-8.

BLACK: It’s difficult to find, let alone read these annual reports, but they should be available to the Board to read, if they want to. Why not spend the effort on a website where we could actually find the reports?

LIEBMAN: The reports are easy to find in May and June Senate packets, but I take you suggestion about using the website as a useful one.

PADIN: There really should be an annual Senate report, properly presented so that it’s readable, rather than just a bunch of disparate reports.

LIEBMAN: That’s a good suggestion, to cumulate and add a front piece.

The MOTION to PASSED, 46 to accept, 3 to reject, with 1 abstentions (recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

None.

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL said that today represented the culmination of a huge amount of shared governance over the year, both formal and informal, involving the efforts of the APPC, the task forces on job security for non-tenure-track faculty and academic quality, Liebman’s and Senate’s outreach to the new Board of Trustees, lengthy discussions of post-tenure review, and the strategic planning process. It had also been a year of intense collaboration around higher-ed issues before the Oregon Legislature and with HECC
over the funding formula and capital projects. Interest-based bargaining was getting underway. Shared governance was also happening with opportunities to socialize and take advantage of administrative open office hours. The Public Safety Advisory Committee was contributing to Board deliberations. They were all time-consuming, but important activities.

WEIWEL said he was happy to announce the award of tenure to 18 faculty members. He thanked Senate members for their many hours of work over the year and acknowledged the contributions of the out-going Presiding Officer and Secretary. [Applause.]

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS declared the passage of the School of Public Health a defining moment for PSU and thanked Michael Bowman and Jose Padin for the diligence and expertise that they and their committees had brought to the approval process. She reminded faculty to attend Commencement. She encouraged senators to review presentation slides from the May 27 OAA FY 16 Budget Forum (http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/policiesreferences) and to direct any suggestions or questions not answered there to her office.

LIEBMAN thanked the Provost for her comments, and, in particular, for her innovation of sharing written comments with Senate over the past year. He reviewed the accomplishments of the past year and noted that regularizing the connections with the new Board of Trustees would be the Senate’s work for the year ahead (see B1, slide 17).

LIEBMAN expressed regret that there was so little time to acknowledge all the people whose work that was reflected in the 16 annual reports collected at the end of the May and June Senate Agenda packets. He invited applause by way of thanks, and then welcomed David Peyton, chair of the Faculty Development Committee, to introduce a revised report. [Applause.]

The following reports were accepted:

1. Annual Report of the Academic Requirements Committee


3. Annual Report of the Budget Committee

4. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees – submitted June 1, see minutes attachment B8.

6. Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

PEYTON presented several summary slides from the revised version of the report showing distribution of Faculty Development awards by rank and college (see minutes attachment B9.) He noted that the funding rate was about 45% of all requests and that full professors were included among the awardees.

7. Annual Report of the Graduate Council


9. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

10. Annual Report of the University Writing Council


In closing, LIEBMAN acknowledged the committee chairs who were present and invited senators to the end-of-year reception in Smith Center in the OAI.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14.
Welcome June 1, 2015

Be sure you have today’s Senate supplement (on the counter at the entrance)
Current Senators - June 1 mailer
New Senators – Find a friendly Senator

Welcome/Opening

Current Senators (2014-15) vote on motions – including those ending terms in June 2015
New and Continuing Senators (2015-16) vote on
Presiding Officer-Elect (after Announcements) &
Steering Committee (nominations after the election of Presiding Officer-Elect & vote after Unfinished Business)
Consent Agenda [May minutes&proposed courses]

Floor Rules – Voice Vote

Full Agenda – 108 minutes assigned
Time limits – as listed ?!
Discussants – 2 minutes
Progressive Stack/Queue
All other votes today by clicker
Good news: No ending caucus
Move: Suspend Order of Meeting, June 1, 2015
Second:

Ernest & Julio Gallo Principle

Drink No Wine
Before
Its
Time

NOMINATIONS - PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT 2015-2016

Michael Bowman, Associate Professor, Library
Senator
Chair, Budget Committee (current)
Chair, Educational Policy Committee (past)

Brad Hansen, Professor, Music
Senator
Chair, Educational Policy Committee (past)
Member, Senate Steering Committee, Budget Committee, Faculty Development Committee, Committee on Committees, Collaborative Online Learning Team (past)
Unit Rep, AAUP

NOMINATIONS – STEERING (2 for 2 year) 2015-2017

Paula Carder, Associate Professor, Community Health
Senator, multiple terms
Co-designed bi-annual survey of participation by Senators
CUPA Dean’s Search, SCH Admissions Committee (past)

Alan MacCormack, non-tenure track faculty, University Studies
Senator, multiple terms
Chair, President’s Advisory Council & Academic Requirements Committee
Chaired, Committee on Committees & Scholastic Standards Committee
Member, Educational Policy Committee, Academic Advising Council, & Ad Hoc Committee on Constitutional Change

David Maier, Professor, Computer Science
Senator, multiple terms
Chaired/member, Graduate Council (past)
**NOMINATIONS – STEERING (1 for 1 year) 2015-2016**

- **Randy Bluffstone**, Professor, Economics
  Senator, multiple terms
  Director, Institute for Economics and the Environment.
  Chair Economics (past)

- **Michael Taylor**, Associate Professor of Practice, School of Social Work
  Senator, multiple terms
  Member, Budget Committee, PSU Promotion and Tenure Guidelines work group
  Interim Director, Bachelor’s in Social Work Program.

**D. Unfinished Business**

*1. Approval: Revisions Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure, Promotion, Merit increases and Post-Tenure Review & related Appendix  G. Greco 10m (slide)*

*2. Amend Constitution End Teacher Education Committee  A. MacCormack 4m*

*3. Amend Constitution (Articles III.1 and V.1 & V.2)  A. MacCormack 4m*

*4. Undergraduate Certificate in Initial Master of Music  A. MacCormack 4m*

**ELECTION OF 2015-2017 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

(Slides: Current + Noms)

- 2 two-year terms
- 1 one-year term

**D1. Revisions Post-Tenure Review process**

April 2015, Senate approved 3 motions: 1. For criteria and procedures;
2. For implementation in conjunction with salary increases;
3. For addition of post-tenure review process to PSU’s P&T Guidelines.

Bargaining PSU-AAUP & OAA to assure that the new process and its implementation are consistent with contract and University practices.

TODAY, vote to re-approve the post-tenure review process in light of those revisions and additions agreed to by PSU-AAUP and OAA.

Notables revisions are:
- merging the criteria, procedures, & implementation into new P&T section
- clarification in composing committees, dates for review and reconsideration, and professional development funds
- changes in the role of Provost, addition of a calendar
- PSU-AAUP Memorandum of Understanding at the end of D1 will guide the post-tenure review process in its first 5 years.

**2014-15 Steering Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Brodowicz*</td>
<td>PO- Elect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Greco</td>
<td>PPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swapna Mukhopodyhay*</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**E. New Business I**

*1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda*

*2. EPC motion on the Proposal for a School of Public Health in partnership with OHSU - J. Padin 10m (slide)*

*3. Proposal for BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness (CUPA)  G. Brodowicz 4m*

*4. Proposal for a Minor in Child and Family Studies (SSW)  M. Taylor/B. Anderson-Nathe 4m*

*New ES [7]. Steering Committee Motion: Academic Program Prioritization  L. Santelmann 9m (slide)*

*6 Steering Committee Motion endorsing the work of the Academic Quality Task Force  [C4]. Update from the Task Force on Academic Quality – V. Butler 4m*
E2. EPC Motion: Proposal OHSU-PSU School of Public Health

For 21 years, PSU, OHSU, and OSU offered Oregon Master’s in Public Health (1070 degrees). In 2010, OSU went independent. If approved, OHSU-PSU School of Public Health will continue OHSU & PSU partnership & add MS and Doctoral Programs. SPH proposal vetted by Budget Committee and Educational Policies Committee who did a joint report in support of the motion (E2, packet).

The June 1 motion is solely to create the SPH. Motions for relocation of existing academic units and their academic programs will come before the 2015-16 Senate.

E5[E7] Continuation Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC)

June 2014, Senate approved the creation ad hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, with final report in June 2015. The deadline was unrealistic. APPC & Steering Committee wrote two motions for approval: Motion 1 endorses APPC’s continuation, calls for a pilot study with results shared in October 2015, and extends the date for its report to Winter, 2016. Motion 2 approves the 5 criteria APPC adopted for review, giving the green light to do the pilot study, and move ahead.

E6 Motion endorsing work of Task Force on Academic Quality (TAQ)

TAQ grew from a 2011 Senate Resolution and was launched by mutual agreement of PSU-AAUP and the Administration in the 2015-17 contract. All of you were invited to take part in its inaugural survey of academic quality which has been summarized in TAQ’s first report to Senate, posted on the web (http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials, G11). June 1, Senate will vote its endorsement for continuing the work of the Task Force beyond the 2015-2016 academic year, when TAQ will consider making a proposal for a standing committee on Academic Quality.

Reports from Administration and Committees

President’s Report (16:00) 4m
Provost’s Report 4m (distributed)
Receive & Acknowledge Annual Reports for May & June 10-14m

Achievements – 2014-15


OHSU-PSU School of Public Health Initiative
Future: transfer units/FTE, faculty-rights of self-governance

Task Forces: Family Friendly, Academic Quality
Future: Textbook Affordability

Faculty Fundraising Awards (Leadership/Cultivation)
Campus Public Safety - Delayed but not discharged
Board of Trustees – Annual Reports + 2nd Thursday (6/11)
Future: Ex officio, lunches + faculty rep election

Acknowledge Senate Committees/Chairs

1. General Student Affairs Committee - Pamela Dusschee
2. Intercollegiate Athletics Board – Randy Miller
4. Library Committee – Jon Holt & Maura Kelly
5. Scholastic Standards Committee – Andrea Price
6. University Studies Council - Joel Beltridge
7. Academic Requirements Committee – Alan MacCormack
8. Budget Committee – Michael Bowman & Gerardo Lafferriere
9. Committee on Committees – David Hansen & Richard Clucas
10. Budget Committee – David Kinsella
11. Faculty Development Committee – Robert Fountain
12. Graduate Council – David Kinsella
13. Honors Council – Betsy Natter
14. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Susan Kirtley
15. Institutional Review Board - Karen Cellarius (Admin)
Credit for Prior Learning Initiative at Portland State University
2013-15 Evaluation Report Executive Summary, Peter Collier, Evaluator

The following set of evaluation questions guided both the formative and summative evaluation of activities performed as part of Provost’s Challenge Project #92 (PC#92).

EQ. I. Did the project team develop a set of university-wide policies to set guidelines and standardize Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) offerings?

• developed set of 9 CPL-related policies, vetted and approved by Faculty Senate (4-7-2014), shared with campus for feedback

EQ. II Did the project team develop a model of how a student would proceed from seeking CPL credit to determining if CPL is appropriate to actually demonstrating prior learning?

• developed recommendations for infrastructure including role and organizational location of CPL Program, guidelines for CPL coordinator, student fees for exam and portfolio, faculty compensation for CPL review.

• created flow chart that illustrates steps in processes of seeking CPL by exam or portfolio.

EQ. III . Did the project team develop training and support materials for faculty members and students?

For faculty members:
• created guidelines for developing CPL exams and portfolios, along with scoring rubrics

• established CPL website with links to resources

• provided a series of consultant-led workshops for a) faculty considering developing CPL courses, and b) pilot course designers

• created training manual and archive of 6 CPL webinars

For students:
• created a series of portfolio success workshops

• developed student handbook with all CPL-related information

Assessment
• developed faculty and student course evaluation instruments for use in pilot courses

EQ. IV. Did the project team develop an implementation plan?

• supported course adaptations in Geography, World Languages & Literature, English, Environmental Sciences & Management, Urban Studies, and Philosophy to include CPL elements
• launch of adapted courses scheduled for Fall 2015

**EQ. V Did the project team make efforts to involve the PSU campus community in discussions of increasing CPL offerings, policies, practices and implementation of the proposed CPL model?**

• five Faculty Senate presentations & updates

• solicited input from students w/ CPL experience at PSU

• two sets of department chairs focus groups re. department and faculty concerns and proposed CPL model

• multiple sets of adviser, faculty member, and staff focus groups re. concerns and proposed CPL model

• two Campus-wide Town Hall meetings to solicit feedback on policies, practices and proposed CPL model

• meeting w/ Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Innovation and Student Success to address faculty and staff concerns from focus groups and town halls

• phone calls to more than 40 department chairs and visits to 20-plus departments to share progress and solicit feedback

**EQ. VI What efforts did the project team make to promote the institutionalization of increasing CPL model at PSU?**

• department outreach activities including in-person presentations and development of CPL recruitment video

• established website to share CPL information and resources

• developed a marketing plan working with students from capstone course

• developed 2015-16 budget

• PSU designated as an HECC CPL pilot site in Fall 2014, the only public four-year institution in Oregon to serve in this ongoing role

Based on a review of the evaluation questions, it is clear that the **PC #92: “Giving Credit Where Credit is Due” project team successfully met the goals outlined in the initial proposal.**

*Project Documents will be available to review on the ReThink PSU website later this year*
GRECO: I wrote this out because today, time is of the essence.

I am presenting this revised version of the post-tenure review guidelines wearing two hats—that of the senate steering committee and that of faculty representative in collective bargaining.

After the senate worked hard to draft and refine this document, it went to both OAA and the AAUP for approval since it covers items related to our contract.

Let me say—and by now many of you know that I am one to speak directly, so you can trust my words—the bargaining step between OAA was very collaborative. Both teams shared two goals:

- To respect the senate’s intent
- To clarify the language of the document, since it becomes part of a contract.

First, the two documents (one for criteria and procedures, the second for implementation) were merged and redundancies eliminated.

Second, simple clarifications were made, mostly for consistency such as changing “department” to “department/unit,” and “days” to “business days.”

Third, there were some clarification changes that were more substantive. There are 3 of this type.

- The major example is that of the composition of the review committee, on p. 8 of 19. Where it previously indicated simply that the committee would be established “with input by the faculty under review,” that input was more clearly defined to state that the candidate for review will submit a list of 3 names, and the committee will include one of those persons.
- Also, the list of possible factors to consider when assessing a faculty member, at the top of p. 9 of 19, was reordered to better distinguish between professional and personal factors. But the intent of the original list remains intact.
- A timeline was added, with a full calendar for the process, and a few time delays were adjusted so that the entire process can be completed in one year.

Fourth, two changes were solely substantive.

- In regard to the role of the provost: The provost felt, and AAUP agreed, that the provost need not read every post-tenure review file. In the case of a positive review at the dean’s level, there will be no further review. The provost will review only those cases that were found not satisfactory.
- In regard to the calculation of the raise for satisfactory review, since the most highly paid faculty fall mostly into the first quintile, rather than have the salary increase be recalculated as an average each year—which would give all remaining faculty a lower raise, in particular in years 3 and 4, the raise will be calculated as an average of the salaries of quintile one faculty. That number will remain the same throughout the 5 year cycle, with adjustments for CPI—the consumer price index. Remember, otherwise the raise amount would have decreased.

The steering committee, AAUP and OAA recommend that the senate approve these revisions.
APP Committee Report and Motions
June 1, 2015
Faculty Senate

Motion 1
• Whereas: Our purpose is to provide a faculty voice in planning for a future that aligns with PSU’s academic priorities,
• Whereas: We want to ensure shared governance in the academic prioritization process,
  Faculty Senate endorses the continuation of the work of the ad hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, per the charge of June 2, 2014. APPC will make an interim report to Senate on October 5, 2015 to solicit feedback on the results of its pilot test of the scoring rubrics. Senate expects to receive the final APPC report in winter term, 2016.

Motion 1: Background
• Provost Andrews proposed APP in fall 2013
• Senate discussed the idea in December 2013 and January 2014
• Straw poll voted in favor of ad hoc committee to explore APP
• 1st ad hoc committee reported in April, 2014 and recommended APP
• APP Committee approved Senate in June 2014, with a 1 year charge
• Based on feedback, APPC is proposing to change the timeline for reporting/scoring to fall 2015
• The 1 year charge is up

Motion 1: Rationale
• Faculty Senate is endorsing continuation of APP because we believe the process is important
• The Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC) has gathered broad faculty input and has pledged to continue to seek faculty
• An iterative process such as this takes longer than a top down approach.
• The committee is committed to incorporating appropriate feedback and engagement with faculty and to delivering these results its final report in a timely manner.

Motion 2
• Faculty Senate approves the 5 criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation.
Rationale and Background to Motion 2

- Balancing academic priorities and pragmatic realities
- Balance available quantitative data, qualitative information requests and burden on chairs
- Holistic scoring based on combination of quantitative and qualitative data
- Specific rubrics are being developed and will be piloted
- Results of pilot and revised rubrics will be presented at October Senate meeting

Potential scoring illustration: Doing well

Potential scoring illustration: Challenged

Potential scoring illustration: Mixed

Potential scoring illustration: Doing well, challenged, mixed
TO REPLACE Item E7  *(To appear in the Revised Agenda as item E-5)*

**Revised Motion on the Academic Program Prioritization process**

**Historical Background**

Provost Andrews introduced the prospect of an academic prioritization process to the Senate Steering Committee in October, 2013, and initially presented the idea to Senate in November, 2013. The idea of academic program prioritization was discussed by the Senate in a committee of the whole in January, 2014. During the committee of the whole, a straw poll was taken wherein the majority of members voted in favor of a faculty-led ad hoc committee to the explore and report on how the process might be done at PSU.

The first Ad Hoc committee presented its findings to the Faculty Senate in April, 2013. At its June 2, 2014 meeting Senate approved the creation of an ad hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC). In June 2014, a slate of seven faculty members for APPC were recommended by Senate Steering and the Advisory Council and approved by the President. The committee began its work in summer 2014. Since then, it has done two campus wide forums, several faculty senate updates, and numerous presentations in departments, schools, and colleges to solicit input from the campus community.

The initial APPC charge instructed the committee to present its final report in June 2015. Based on feedback from faculty forums and the strong desire expressed by faculty to have the work of creating reports and scoring done during the regular academic year, the committee has requested more time to finish its work and requested clarity for its charge from Senate. The motions below were written jointly by members of the Steering Committee and the Ad Hoc APPC.

*Whereas*: Our purpose is to provide a faculty voice in planning for a future that aligns with PSU’s academic priorities,

*Whereas*: We want to ensure shared governance in the academic prioritization process,

**Motion 1:**

Faculty Senate endorses the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, per the charge of June 2, 2014. APPC will make an interim report to Senate on October 5, 2015 to solicit feedback on the results of its pilot test of the scoring rubrics. Senate expects to receive the final APPC report in winter term, 2016.

Rationale:

Faculty Senate is endorsing continuation because we believe the process is important. The Academic Program Prioritization Committee. APPC has gathered broad faculty input and has pledged to continue to seek faculty input about the process at every step along the way of the process. An iterative process such as this takes longer than a top down approach. The APPC is
committed to incorporating appropriate feedback and engagement with faculty and to delivering these results its final report in a timely manner.

**Motion 2**

Faculty Senate approves the 5 criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation.

**Rationale:**

Faculty Senate is endorsing the use of these the 5 criteria, based on the work of the Ad Hoc APPC and feedback from faculty at campus forums and smaller meetings. The process that yielded these 5 criteria aimed to find a balance between key academic priorities of PSU and the pragmatic needs of gathering reliable and comparable information. In addition, the measures for the criteria are designed to match available quantitative data with additional qualitative reports by programs that provide context for understanding their activity. The committee has endorsed a process whereby these criteria will be scored holistically based on a combination of data provided by OIRP and qualitative information provided by programs, requiring, if needed, minimal data collection by program heads.

**Background:**

The preliminary indicators that the committee has developed for each category are in Table 1 below. These indicators focus on areas that faculty have most responsibility for: academic quality and student learning while attending to the realities of demand and cost. Specific rubrics to evaluate these measures are under development by the committee, and will be piloted ahead of the October 5, 2015 Senate meeting and refined before being applied to the full set of programs at PSU.

**Table 1: Criteria for APP with draft indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for APP with draft indicators</th>
<th>Relation to Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIRP will provide data for:</strong></td>
<td>Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>Narrative discussing how program supports mission and priorities of school or college, and university mission and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of credits required for the program</strong></td>
<td>Putting OIRP data into context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Number required from within the program</td>
<td>Coherence of credits for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Number required from outside the program</td>
<td>Program's investment in and process for advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty demographics and highest degree</td>
<td>Program's measures for ensuring educational quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of class sizes for lecture or seminar courses</td>
<td>Program’s assessment of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of majors and degree recipients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand/Trajectory

**OIRP will provide data for:**
- Trends in majors
- Non-majors taking courses in program
- Number of degrees by program
- Program degrees as percentage of total department degrees awarded

**Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:**
- Putting OIRP data into context
- Program’s connections to other programs
- Future directions for program

### Productivity

**OIRP will provide data for:**
- Graduation rates, by major
- Program degrees/certificates awarded
- Time to degree, by program
- Number of credits accumulated at graduation

**Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:**
- Putting OIRP data into context
- Faculty scholarly/creative activity
- Faculty community engagement
- Student involvement in scholarly/creative activity and/or community engagement

**SCH per faculty FTE**

**Sponsored research expenditures**

### Financial Performance*

**OIRP will provide data for:**
- Revenue and expenditures summary
- Faculty by full-time/part-time and tenure status

**Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:**
- Putting OIRP data into context

*The University Budget Office is working to determine whether additional data could be provided that might be useful indicators for APP.
2014-2015 Report of the Portland State University Task Force on Academic Quality (TAQ)

Virginia Butler (Anthropology, CLAS)
Annabelle Dolidon (World Languages and Literatures, CLAS)
Linda George (Environmental Sciences and Management, CLAS)
Christian Grand, (Associated Students of PSU, Senator), replaced by Eric Noll (Associated Students of PSU, President, April 2015)
Karen Karavanic (Computer Science, Engineering & Computer Science)
Kathi Ketcheson (Institutional Research & Planning, Presidents Office)
Yves Labissiere (UNST, Interim Director)
Scott Marshall (Vice Provost for Academic and Fiscal Planning, OAA & Interim Dean, School of Business Administration)
Alan MacCormack (UNST faculty, AAUP representative)
Todd Rosenstiel (Biology, CLAS)
Vivek Shandas (Urban Studies & Planning, Urban & Public Affairs)
Angela Strecker (Environmental Sciences & Management, CLAS)

I. Introduction

To address concerns that the quality of our worklife needed to be considered along with the quantifiable markers of achievement (e.g., enrollment numbers, grants obtained, papers published, number of community partnerships), a Task Force on Academic Quality was formed in December 2014, through a joint resolution of Faculty Senate and AAUP[1]. Our Task Force, which includes seven tenure-line faculty, one AAUP representative (NTTF), three administrators, and one student, first convened in mid-January 2015 and has met approximately weekly since then.

From January to June 2015, our time has been devoted to: discussion and interpretation of our charge and goals; creation, dissemination, and analysis of a campus survey regarding academic quality; and development of a roadmap for future work by TAQ. In this report, we discuss each of these efforts, and offer our suggestions for the future work of the Task Force.

II. Formation of TAQ

- brief description of 2011 effort [2]
- brief description of 2014 charge [1][3]

III. Discussion and Interpretation of our Charge

At our initial meetings, we discussed at length our charge—in what ways could we contribute to campus discussions, including direction and new policies regarding “Academic Quality” (AQ)? Presiding Officer of Senate, Bob Liebman, and Executive Director of AAUP, Phil Lesch came to our meeting to share their suggestions about near and long-term goals. As outlined in the Senate Resolution, one goal of the Task Force was to identify “aspirational comparators” that could be used to address issues of AQ at PSU.

The term “comparator” is generally associated with identifying similar institutional characteristics (public/private, urban/rural, etc.) for the purposes of comparing salary structure and student demographics. Our group decided that for the purpose of identifying
aspirational comparators of AQ it would be more productive to identify aspirational practices - independent of institution type - that promote AQ. A working definition of an aspirational comparator for our group is an institution that implements aspirational practices.

Our group decided that to identify aspirational comparators, we needed to develop a clearer definition of AQ. This led to the idea of a campus wide survey, described in detail in the following section.

IV. Campus Survey

The Task Force felt that our task would be helped by soliciting ideas from the campus community at large. Besides particular insights from the community, we thought that, if our long-term goal was to improve AQ at PSU, a participatory, “bottom-up” approach to engaging the university community was essential; and an on-line survey was the most efficient way to get the greatest participation. We designed our survey to obtain perceptions about AQ for the three core areas of University activity -- research, teaching, and service -- from faculty, academic professionals, and administrators. Although initially we thought to include students in our survey, we decided that soliciting this valuable form of input would require a different approach that fell outside of the scope of our initial five-month window for results. The survey (see Figure 1), created in Qualtrics and administered by OIRP (under Dr. Kathi Ketcheson’s supervision), was e-mailed on March 3, 2015 and was open for responses until March 17.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What do you think represents academic quality in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching/student experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Scholarly Work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Please list up to five colleges or universities that you feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>embody or support these characteristics and suggest why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If we could institute changes at PSU to improve academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality, say over the next 5 years, what general and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific elements could you recommend, in regards to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching/student experience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Scholarly Work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Please share any additional comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: TAQ Survey March 2015

The response rate was extremely high (see Table 1). Out of 2597 surveys distributed across campus, 392 individuals provided responses to the questions, which represent an overall return rate of 15%. The highest proportion of respondents was Tenure-line faculty (30%) and Administrators (25%). The high rate of participation indicates the extent that the PSU community is concerned about Academic Quality; and suggests their interest in developing actions/activities to promote quality in our long-term planning and initiatives.
Table 1. Frequency of responses to Academic Quality Survey by job category, March 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th># SENT</th>
<th># COMPLETED (excludes partial records)</th>
<th>% response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-line</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Fixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Professional</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per the 2014 Senate Resolution, PSU administration (Provost Andrews’ office) provided funds to hire one half-time graduate research assistant experienced in qualitative research to synthesize the responses. Our GRA began work the week of April 6, 2015.

Interpretation and use of the survey requires careful consideration of these factors:

- Choice of specific representative institutions might be greatly influenced by the knowledge of specific institutions gained by: direct attendance, previous employment, attendance of a family member or friend, prior or current collaborative activities, field of expertise, and/or advertising materials; and
- Knowledge of a broader or narrower range of institutions might be influenced by job category at PSU (e.g., faculty, administrative, academic professional).
- Given the wide range of quality normally found within an individual institution, that might include some renowned programs or departments, some average, etc., it would be misleading to conclude that any institution mentioned embodied Academic Quality in all aspects.
- For these reasons and as discussed previously in relation to aspirational practices, we decided to place at least equal consideration on the specific characteristics mentioned as Aspirational Practices, in addition to the listing of specific institutions. This would address the likelihood that the list of institutions embodying the characteristics of Quality is larger than the list directly cited by survey participants.
The survey responses will require several more months of review to draw any firm conclusions. Even in this early phase of analysis, we are seeing some interesting trends that suggest the survey’s value in helping us understand campus perceptions about AQ. For example, in response to the first question, “What do you think represents academic quality in Teaching/student experience,” respondents listed ~25 different ideas, but these seven concepts were noted repeatedly across all job categories:

- Faculty need to stay current with trends in their field and provide relevant instructional materials.
- Faculty need to encourage students to ask questions and be engaged, getting them to think beyond their comfort zone.
- Classes should provide opportunities for students to engage with the community.
- Classes should connect concepts from classroom discussion with real-world events and problems.
- Teachers have a passion for their subject.
- Teaching needs to be evaluated by peers and not only student evaluations.
- Smaller class sizes—which gives instructors a greater chance to give feedback on writing.

These ideas include relatively specific practices (small class size, new approach to teacher evaluation) and more abstract concepts (engaged and impassioned teaching). In future analysis and conceptualizing our task, we suggest it will be important to distinguish indicators of quality (e.g., Student learning, Achievements, Competence in some way, classroom environment) from practices that may promote quality (e.g., small class size, community partnerships). Future work will develop a comprehensive list of respondent views of AQ (for research, service, and teaching); that could then form the basis of a future campus survey, with more directed questions including priorities. These themes suggest areas of AQ the Task Force will want to explore in more detail in the 2015-2016 academic year, as we explain below.

V. Roadmap

In May 2015 we requested that the PSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee extend the charge of TAQ through the 2015-2016 academic year. The key elements of the roadmap are:

- Complete qualitative analysis of the campus-wide survey.
- Determine an initial set of specific indicators of AQ, 5-8 examples. These will be identified from the spring 2015 survey and a more directed campus-wide survey (launched perhaps Winter 2016) that will help us prioritize concepts/goals about AQ.
- Our focus again is on aspirational practices, rather than aspirational comparator institutions.
- We would develop for each aspirational indicator, a quantifiable metric to compare our current (baseline) score to our future goal.
- We would identify institutions that have been successful in the selected practices.
- With the results of the survey, we could do targeted case studies (purposive sampling) of the other institutions we will have identified, in order to examine those practices that engender academic quality.
• We would then discuss resources and practices (at PSU) that might serve to advance or block the achievement of our aspirational practices.
• Discuss scalable and affordable means of soliciting student input
  o Start with summarizing data that PSU already collects on student views/perceptions of AQ.
• Develop guidelines for the creation of a standing committee on Academic Quality that would continue beyond 2015-2016 academic year.
  o Serve as resource for administrative requests
  o Serve as liaison-resource to relevant committees and Task Forces, e.g. Program Prioritization
  o Monitor progress towards aspirational qualities at a broad University level
  o Translate goals into specific resource requests
  o Report annually to the PSU Board of Trustees

[1] 2014 PSU Faculty Senate Resolution on Academic Quality, available at: **


** https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/task-force-on-academic-quality
March 12, 2015

Statement by the Presiding Officer, PSU Faculty Senate
To the PSU Board of Trustees

Good afternoon.

Board Chair Peter Nickerson asked me if he could come before the Faculty Senate to open communication between the Board and the faculty. He came in January and gave a great speech. How do I know? First, no one left. Second, his speech brought questions about communication between the faculty and the Board. It was a learning moment for the Senate.

Peter’s remarks opened the questions that all university boards must answer: What is shared governance on their campus? What are the roles of the president, faculty, and the board in it?

I want to share an answer by a college president, Steven Bahls, written for board members & faculty in Trusteeship, the magazine of AGB which will devote a session to shared governance at its national meeting that some of you will attend next month.

Bahls asks:
1. What is shared governance?
2. How should it work?
3. What is the payoff?

His answers
1. Shared governance is a partnership. It links president, faculty, and the board in a broad institutional vision, that AGB calls integral leadership. Faculty and board members play different roles: the board has fiduciary responsibility (revenues, bonding); the faculty set academic policy (admissions, degree requirements, hiring) and are responsible for academic quality. To be effective, they must work in tandem. Bahls calls on boards to put faculty leaders at the table for key decisions and to learn directly from faculty how they do research, teaching, and service.

2. How should shared governance work?
Bahls suggests an ongoing process of dialog, and deliberation among partners. He urges boards, presidents, and faculty to meet outside board meetings, to allow for a full and open exchange of ideas, away from the spotlight. Universities honor the principle that people agree to disagree. In practice, they need time to talk to agree on the purposes and priorities of the university.

3. What is the payoff?
For Bahls, to increase social capital between board members and faculty. Social capital often means who you know; your networks
Here it means knowledge: what you know ... about the university and about each other. That’s key because universities are learning organizations as well as teaching organizations. When partners learn, things change fast. To know each other, Bahls invites board members to hear faculty report on their research, scholarship, teaching. And he encourages faculty to learn from board members. This builds trust which he sees as critical in for moving from a shared governance to a shared responsibility model.

Can PSU learn from Bahls? Yes!

Having a campus board creates opportunity for partnerships and processes that couldn’t happen with the statewide OUS (OSBHE) board that it replaced.

For example, the Task Force on Academic Quality that I spoke of in June is at work on a State of the Faculty report to guide launch discussions about PSU’s comparator universities. Who are we like? Who might we like to be? How can we get there? The Task Force will share it with the Board and ask for your feedback.

Another possibility: The OUS Board had the custom of having coffee with faculty before every meeting in order to discuss the issues of the day. A campus board could start a chain of conversations about the continuing concerns of faculty and students at PSU: how to balance access and quality by directing resources to teaching and advising, how to recruit and retain strong faculty, and how to facilitate work/life balance for faculty and staff.

Continuing conversations are building blocks for trust, but building trust requires more than talk alone. Partners must share ongoing work.

On other campuses, board members and faculty join hands in discussions of plans and policies. At the University of California, faculty and staff serve as advisory members to the Regents who sit on all 10 standing committees. They have expertise and insider knowledge that is needed for thoughtful decision-making. In many cases, they wrote the books or articles that set the standards for due diligence. http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/committees.html

**Based on the experience of faculty on other campuses, PSU Senators are discussing a Resolution for faculty engagement on Board committees.**

We feel that it is best practice that faculty partner with the Board in discussions and deliberations that inform policy that bears on the educational mission.

Shared governance is perennially a work in progress in which working partnerships build knowledge and trust needed for decisions that all must own. I look forward to working with you.

Bob Liebman
*revised for clarity & links added*
Committee on Committees (ConC)
Annual Report to Faculty Senate, June 1, 2015

Co-Chairs: Richard Clucas (CUPA), David Hansen (SBA); Chair-Elect: To be determined
Members: Christina Luther (AO), Malgorzata Chranowska-Jeske (ECS), Michael Smith (ED), Corey Griffin (FPA), Lynn Santelmann (LAS-AL), Susan Reese (LAS-AL), John Reuter (LAS-SCI), Steven Bleiler (LAS SCI), Roberto de Anda (LAS-SS), Sharon Carstens (LAS-SS), Michael Bowman (LIB), Rowana Carpenter (OI), and Ted Donlan (SSW).

Committee Charge: The ConC is responsible for (1) appointing the members and chairpersons of constitutional committees, (2) making recommendations to the President for numerous committees established by administrative action, and (3) ensuring appropriate divisional representation.

Activities for 2014-2015

- Over the course of the academic year the ConC conducted most committee activities via e-mail and Doodle. Thanks to the efforts of Richard Clucas, all the interim committee vacancies were filled, with the exception of representatives from the School of Social Work on the Faculty Development Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and a representative of the Graduate School of Education on the Honors Council. Multiple attempts were made by the ConC to recruit replacement committee members through other channels, but without success. This effort was unsuccessful largely due to insufficient numbers of available candidates from the respective senate divisions responding to the annual Committee Preference Survey.

- The work of filling Senate committees for AY 2015-2016 began in early April with the release of the results of the annual Committee Preference Survey. Via e-mail exchanges and a committee meeting in late May, the ConC has appointed, or recommended for appointment, nearly 95% of the 211 constitutional and administrative committee positions.

- As of the drafting of this report, the ConC has affirmed all but twelve of the 211 appointments/recommendations, including alternates. Of the remaining, seven are pending, and five are associated with senate divisions having no candidates available in the annual Committee Preference Survey.

General Comments and Observations: (1) It would be very helpful if the annual Committee Preference Survey, in addition to identifying a candidate’s senate division, also identified the academic department or the administrative unit of the survey respondents. (2) Based on the results of the Committee Preference Survey, there seems to be a general insufficiency of faculty members interested in and available for committee service, and it may be of value to the Senate to explore other avenues for encouraging committee service. (3) Though the turnover in appointments/recommendations was nearly 25%, to promote greater opportunity for participation on high demand committees, term limits should be considered for committees not requiring significant institutional memory, or committee-specific expertise. (4) To attract greater interest in committees with low survey response rates, one-year terms of service, rather than two-year terms, should be considered. (5) Limit survey choices (first, second, or third) to one of each.
**SpringReport: Faculty Development Committee (FDC), May 15, 2015**

Members: David Peyton (Chair, CHEM), Andrew Black (CMP), Berrin Erdogan (SBA), Georgia Harris (PAD), Barbara Heilmair (MUS), Betty Izumi (UNST), Anoop Mirpuri (ENG), Mary Kristen Kern (LIB), Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP), Tom Kindermann (PSY), Tom Larsen (LIB), Peter Moeck (PHY), Sarah Tinker (CLAS-SS), Angela Zagarella-Chodosh (ITAL)

1. **Travel Awards (annual allocation is $500,000) Statistical breakdown:**
   - Summer: $123,466, Fall: $123,628, Winter: $75,573, Spring: $167,337
   - Requests for the Year: $731,570; Funded: $495,004 (w/adjustments)
   - Funding Rate: 246 awarded/345 requested = 71% (weighted lottery (date since last & if present’n) Graphs on Next Page.

The increase in available funds into this budget has allowed the Professional Travel of Faculty to more approach more closely the appropriate level for a Research University. It is the opinion of the Committee that a minimum of one trip per research active faculty member per year should be attained.

2. **Faculty Enhancement Awards ($650,000):**
   A summary sheet was requested as part of the application packet to give specifics on:
   A. Contribution to Career Development:
      The expected number & character of outcomes related to the development of your career. E.g., publications (number and in what venues), grant applications (number, and to what agencies), recital performances (how many, where), recording opportunities, conference presentations, or invitations to exhibit.
   B. Broader Impacts
      How many student research assistants will be involved in this research (whether or not they are funded through this proposal)?
   C. How else will this research impact the community & the university’s standing in it?
   D. Prior Funding: I was last funded through the Faculty Development program in: ___.

   **Statistics:**
   - Total applications: 112
   - Total amount considered: $1.47M
   - Annual allocation for FY16: $0.65M
   - Funding rate: 44.6%.
   - Graphs are presented on next page.

The Committee established criteria, published to the FEG solicitation website.

**Items requested (from the cover page):**
- Title; <201 word abstract; itemized Budget & Justification; S of other funding; Summary Sheet (see above (Point A); Proposal Body; Dept Head Authorization; 2 page Vita; Bibliography.

The review process included 3 changes:
1) increasing the Committee size by about 3 members,
2) using a hosted website (EasyChair) to allow for tracking reviews and allowing on-line discussions by the Committee members, and
3) including both explicit review criteria on the proposal call, and a questionnaire for the proposers to make clear their goals.

The combination of these 3 steps has enhanced both the quality of the submissions (in the Committee’s opinion), and also helped to make the review process more fair and comprehensive.
### Faculty Enhancement Grants ($):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Awd</th>
<th>Reqst</th>
<th>$amt</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$369,516</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$72,713</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$14,118</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$65,277</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$70,771</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,600</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Enhancement Grants (rank):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appt</th>
<th>Rqsts</th>
<th>Awd</th>
<th>Rate (%)</th>
<th>$amt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTTF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$21,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Prof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$27,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$312,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assc Prof</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$144,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$140,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Travel grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>ask</th>
<th>awd</th>
<th>$amt</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>%ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$211,333</td>
<td>$1,921</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$53,616</td>
<td>$1,787</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$23,787</td>
<td>$2,643</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$40,710</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$70,365</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCECS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$24,769</td>
<td>$2,752</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,106</td>
<td>$1,553</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMSA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$16,127</td>
<td>$1,613</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$25,034</td>
<td>$2,503</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 4, 2015

To: Provost Andrews

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

SUBJ: Notice of Senate Actions

On June 1, 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 June 2015 Faculty Senate Agenda.

6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the Curricular Consent agenda.

In addition, Senate voted to recommend the following actions:

1. to approve the changes and additions proposed by OAA & PSU-AAUP to the PSU Procedures and Policies for the Evaluation of Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review adopted April 2015;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the changes and additions regarding Post-Tenure Review.

2. to approve amendments to the PSU Constitution to eliminate the Teacher Education Committee, provide ex officio status to Presiding Officer Elect and Past Presiding, provide successor language for the Board of Trustees, and update the elections calendar;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the amendments.

3. to approve a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval of a joint OHSU-PSU School of Public Health. It is a promising initiative for both campuses. Congratulations to all parties who cooperated on this venture.

4. to approve a BA/BS in Applied Health and Fitness in CUPA;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval. Steve Harmon will notify CUPA and coordinate the proposals through the PSU Board of Trustees, the Provosts’ Council and HECC.

4. to approve a Minor in Child and Family Studies in the School of Social Work;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval. Steve Harmon will notify Social Work.

5. to approve a change in post-baccalaureate certificate PSU residency requirement from 30 to 16 credits or three-quarters of the required credit for the certificate, whichever is higher;
   6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval. Steve Harmon will coordinate
notifications of change.

6. to endorse the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC), per the charge of June 2, 2014; 6-12-15—OAA concurs with the endorsement. Members of the APPC are recognized for their continued service.

7. to approve the five criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation; 6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval of the five criteria.

9. to endorse the continuation of the work of the Academic Quality Task Force; 6-12-15—OAA concurs with the approval. Members of the Academic Quality Task Force are recognized for their continued service.

10. to recommend that Faculty Senate communicate all its annual reports to the Board of Trustees. 6-12-15—OAA concurs with the recommendation.

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
September 16, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

Robert Fountain
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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**

**New Courses**
E.1.b.1
- GEOG 412/512 Global Climate Change Science and Socio-Environmental Impact Assessment, 4 credits
September 16, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
       Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

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

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

School of Business Administration

New Program
- Graduate Certificate in Business Intelligence and Analytics (two-page summary attached)

   FSBC comments: See the Curriculum Tracker
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR

GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYTICS

Overview
The area of Data Intelligence and Analytics has many touch points at PSU, specifically in the areas related to data analysis and statistics. Particular areas of strength include: Data mining, data modeling, regression analysis, and product marketing analytics. Four units in three colleges offer graduate coursework in these areas. They are Math and Statistics (CLAS), Engineering Technology Management (MCECS), System Science (CLAS), and Business (SBA).

The immerging area of Big Data and the Internet of Things is an important growth segment in the regional economy, and a number of PSU MA/MS and MBA graduates work in these industries. However, despite the university’s collective strengths, individual units are able only to offer limited opportunities for depth study and skill development related to harnessing data, visualizing the data into clusters, communicating the findings, and creating predictive business decisions based on this work. There are few Analytics courses offered in any specific unit, and units schedule their offerings independently. In addition, the SBA offered no classes in Data Communication which is critical in tying all aspects of analytics into a cohesive strategy. This makes it difficult for degree students to craft a concentration in Business Intelligence and Analytics, even if they are selecting courses from across campus.

The four units identified above propose to join their efforts and work closely with the Portland region’s industries to offer a certificate that will meet a range of intellectual, institutional, employee, and industry needs. While two new SBA courses are proposed, the three other units are leveraging four existing courses and sequencing them with the new SBA courses for a comprehensive certificate.

The certificate proposal has been reviewed by industry leaders, who have expressed support and offered input on aligning course offerings and the structure of the certificate with industry and employee needs. The individuals are executives from different vertical markets, yet all have needs for data analytics. These companies include Nike, Intel, Boeing, and Hanna Andersson among many. Engagement with the industry will continue on an ongoing basis to assure the relevance of certificate course offerings to employees and job seekers (many of whom are, or will be, PSU graduates).

Evidence of Need
The certificate was crafted by a group of faculty in the four units who have taught data analytics and statistics related graduate courses for a number of years and have strong connections with the regional vertical industries such as aerospace and athletic and outdoor products. It is the outcome of extended discussions in that group that have drawn on their observations of student and industry needs to consider different curricular possibilities. To objectively assess market demand for a certificate, the SBA sponsored a scoping study by the Education Advisory Board that collected information about: industry employment trends, analytics certificates and graduate programs at other universities, and the assessments of need (collected from interviews and surveys) offered by industry executives and managers from the major regional employers.

The results of the study showed that the employment forecast for graduates has increased dramatically in the past four years. Industries such as Finance, Insurance, and Digital Media have seen growth rates of 15%, 32%, and 129% respectively since 2010. Regionally this demand has doubled since 2010. The top seven northwest companies looking for analytics professionals have seen tremendous growth and in 2014 represented job openings of: Amazon: (434), Microsoft: (180), Providence: (72), Boeing: (66), Nike: (60), Intel : (49), and OHSU: (38).
Program Objectives

The certificate will improve the fundamental knowledge and applied skills of students in technical graduate degree programs by improving data analysis and communications skills and enhancing their competitiveness on the job market. It will offer current industry employees an opportunity to enrich their training and advance their careers. It will provide employers with a new option for employee training and workforce development. And it will allow post-baccalaureate students to improve their job prospects and explore PSU graduate degree offerings prior to committing to a program. Lastly it will provide technical members of the MBA program offered in the SBA a new elective track.

Course of study

The certificate builds on four existing and two new courses. Implementing program objectives, the certificate requirements include: (1) one core Statistics course, (2) one data mining Systems Science, course, and (3) two Engineering Technology Management courses, and (4) two new Business courses. Students will be able to take the courses either full-time or part-time.

Proposed Curriculum & Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Course</th>
<th>Term 1 (Fall)</th>
<th>Term 2 (Winter)</th>
<th>Term 3 (Spring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETM 540 Operations</td>
<td>SySc 531 Data Mining</td>
<td>ISQA 520 intro to Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Management</td>
<td>With Information Theory – 4 SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science – 4 SCH</td>
<td>ISQA 521 Analytics Communication Management – 2 SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT564 Regression</td>
<td>ETM 538 Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis – 3 SCH</td>
<td>Support Systems: Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing – 4 SCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETM 538 & 540, Stat 564,and SySc 531 are existing courses and may be taken in any order.
ISQA 520 & 521 are new courses, the ETM, Stat, & SySc courses are pre-requisites for the ISQA courses.
ISQA 520 is a pre-requisite for ISQA 521.
ISQA 521 will be offered at the end of the spring term.

Learning Outcomes

The certificate is designed to provide students with three distinct categories of knowledge and experience. These are (1) fundamental knowledge of how to statistically analyze and harness data, (2) focal knowledge of Data Mining and visualization, and (3) specialized skills that enhance the communications of data analysis employees with business organizations to address and predict current and future marketing, supply chain, and financial decisions.

Cost and Organization

There are two new budgetary resource requirements to instruct the SBA courses, this is expected to be under $10,000. There are no other resource (e.g., library) requirements. Expected enrollment is 15-20 current students per year range and 15 new students per year expected. There will be a 50-50 split between current degree seeking students and certificate only new students. Current faculty will offer the courses. Administrative support will be provided by existing staff in SBA, which will initially serve as the primary point of student contact. A steering committee made up of faculty from each of the four units will provide governance. An advisory committee will be made up of PSU faculty, students, alumni, and energy industry representatives from public, private, and non-profit employers.
September 16, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Kinsella
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

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

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

**College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**New Program**
- Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems (two-page summary attached)

  FSBC comments: See the Curriculum Tracker
PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR

GRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS

Overview
The Graduate Certificate in Sustainable Food Systems was developed in response to campus-wide faculty and student interest in food systems, as well as growing career opportunities in this field in the region and around the world. The certificate will provide students the opportunity to add content expertise to their primary graduate education. The certificate draws on a range of disciplinary foundations including: Public Administration, Community Health, Urban Studies, Urban and Regional Planning, Business and Sustainability Education. The courses offered will showcase this range of expertise to provide an interdisciplinary understanding of the complex issues, perspectives, strategies and solutions employed to create sustainable food systems, preparing students for meaningful employment in a growing and increasingly competitive field.

The faculty involved, many of whom have been meeting since June 2012 to conceptualize the certificate, are all currently engaged in food systems research, have numerous related publications, and have professional relationships with community based and food related organizations. From this group, a small team of faculty will form a Faculty Governance Group (FGG) to ensure the continued engagement among faculty in collaborative planning and problem solving and will work closely with the program director and the Deans of the schools and colleges involved in the certificate. There is collective commitment to the high functioning and successful implementation of an integrated, interdisciplinary certificate program.

Evidence of Need
Portland State University faculty and students share the robust regional interest in better understanding and helping to support sustainable food systems through student engagement, leadership and studies; faculty research; partnerships with community based organizations and efforts; and active community outreach and education on the topic. The collective effort of an interdisciplinary graduate certificate program will bring a range of multi-disciplinary lenses such as health, nutrition, policy, planning, social issues and education to bear on developing more robust knowledge of food system dynamics.

To ensure interest and need amongst students in a certificate, an online survey was conducted; the results are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses (n=101)</th>
<th>Academic Interest: Topics on Food Systems Sustainability</th>
<th>Perception of Usefulness of Food Systems Certificate in Meeting Career Goals</th>
<th>Interest in Obtaining a Food Systems Certificate</th>
<th>Topics of Interest (top 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Graduate* (42% of total respondents) | 25/39 respondents or 64% engage in food systems topics regularly, frequently or have food systems as a primary focus | 20/38 or 74% respondents consider the certificate useful to very useful to meeting career goals | 23/39 or 64% moderate to extreme interest in obtaining a certificate in food systems | • 24/35: Food Access Issues
• 21/35: Justice and Equity
• 19/35: Food Policy
• 19/35 Sustainable Agriculture
• 17/35: Urban Agriculture |

Course of study
The Food Systems certificate will utilize an innovative curriculum model that relies on a Certificate Outcomes Matrix (see application) and that supports PSU’s efforts to provide for Flexible Degree Completion (see below). Based on student interest and the quarter a class is offered, students will select courses that have been determined to meet the specific outcomes required for completion. Each graduate level course being offered in the program...
has been “mapped” onto the matrix and table view to reflect its course objectives that will facilitate student learning in core competencies of the certificate program.

The certificate will be awarded for a minimum of 18 credits depending on the courses chosen and their respective credit hours. Outcomes will be satisfied on a per class basis and students may count only one course per outcome toward the certificate, therefore requiring a minimum of 6 courses. In addition to the courses relevant to the certificate outcomes, matriculated students have the option to combine other program requirements such as 504 / 506/ 509 courses1 or a community based learning experience to satisfy Learning Outcome 3 for up to 6 credits. An independent study may also be pursued with approval from the program director or other designated faculty.

Students must select one course from each of the below options. As noted above, a course may not be used more than once to meet the requirements and students must enroll in 6 courses and a minimum of 18 credits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>Course List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>ISQA 558, MKTG 535, GEOG 549, PA 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #2: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>USP 576, PHE 522, ELP 548, USP 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>USP 568, #PHE 527, ELP 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #4: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>USP 576, ELP 548, GEOG 549, PA 571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #5: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>PHE 527, any other approved 504, 506, 509 course, or internship for credit (to be arranged with advisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #6: 3 – 4 credits</td>
<td>USP 576, PA 571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcomes**

1. Students will describe the complex and broad range of food system networks and perspectives that exist in the sustainable food systems movement.
2. Students will give examples of how power and privilege exist within and affect the contemporary food system.
3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of food system improvements through an experiential learning opportunity with a partnering community based organization.
4. Students will critically examine the interconnected social, political, economic, and ecological components that provide definition to food systems.
5. Students will evaluate interventions and leverage points for improving food system equity and sustainability.
6. Students will relate and explain the connections between learning experiences in the certificate program to their primary, masters level program.

**Cost and Organization**

The program is structured around existing courses and faculty lines and would require little additional investment. The Public Administration Division will provide faculty leadership for the program and the Institute for Sustainable Solutions will provide staff support as needed in order to provide adequate direction and administration of the certificate in the first 2-3 years of implementation. A small support staff FTE commitment would be funded from existing ISS and college operational budgets. The Deans of the schools and colleges involved have signed a memorandum of agreement demonstrating their support for this program and will review enrollment and resource needs periodically; the program may shift fully to an academic unit if ISS support is no longer needed. A letter of support from CUPA’s librarian, Emily Ford, and GSE’s librarian, Bob Schroeder, has been provided. The program would contribute to the successful recruitment of new faculty with food system interests by providing a platform for teaching, research and collaboration with other colleagues. No additional resources have been identified as needed.

---

1 These course numbers reflect required applied learning experiences or internships within masters degree programs. There may be additional course numbers within programs that are not listed here that may be eligible for students to use to apply to fulfill the requirements of learning outcome 3.

06-08-2015
September 2015

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Joel Bettridge, Chair, University Studies Council

RE: Motion to Change Cluster Course Approval Process

Motion: The University Studies (UNST) Council moves that existing courses approved by the UNST Council for inclusion in clusters proceed directly to the Faculty Senate curricular consent agenda.

Rationale: The UNST Council is a Faculty Senate Constitutional Committee that reviews existing courses to determine alignment with UNST Cluster learning goals. This is a separate process from the new course approval process conducted through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC). Currently cluster proposals start with the cluster curriculum subcommittee (three cluster coordinators, an UNST Council representative and the Director of Assessment and Upper Division Clusters), move to the full UNST Council for approval, on to UCC for review and then to the senate consent agenda. This change will eliminate one step in the process allowing cluster courses to move forward to senate in a more timely fashion, saving approximately 4 weeks. This does not change UCC’s role related to approving new courses for the curriculum and still provides for review by a Faculty Senate constitutional committee.

We have consulted with Robert Fountain, chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He brought it to the UCC for discussion. This motion has support from the UCC.