In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, **Senate Agendas** are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that all faculty will have public notice of curricular proposals, and adequate time to review and research all action items. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full proposals are available at the PSU Curricular Tracking System: [http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com). If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate. Items may be pulled from the Curricular Consent Agenda for discussion in Senate up through the end of roll call.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of his/her Senate Alternate. An Alternate is another faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator. A faculty member may serve as Alternate for more than one senator, but an alternate may represent only one Senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than 3 meetings consecutively, will be dropped from the Senate roll.
TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **November 4, 2013**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the October 7, 2013 Meeting
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   AAUP Bargaining Update

D. Unfinished Business
   *1. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Revision Committee Interim Report
      See Faculty Senate Schedules web page for full draft text of the proposed revisions
      D.1b addendum: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials

E. New Business
   *1c. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) Proposal to approve Online Grade-to-Grade Changes

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

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report (16:00)
   Provost’s Report
   Report of the Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships
   Report of the Internationalization Council

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
  B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2013 and attachments
  D-1a Interim Report of Adhoc Committee on the Revision of P&T Guidelines
  E-1c Curricular Consent Agenda
  E-2 Proposal to approve online grade-to-grade changes

Secretary to the Faculty
hickeym@pdx.edu • 650MCB • (503)725-4416/Fax 5-4624
**FACULTY SENATE ROSTER**

2013-14 OFFICERS AND SENATE STEERING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer… Leslie McBride
Presiding Officer Elect… Bob Liebman; Past Presiding Officer… Rob Daasch
Secretary…..Martha W. Hickey

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

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

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

Business Administration (4)
Pullman, Madeleine SBA 2014
†Hansen, David SBA 2015
Layzell, David SBA 2016
Loney, Jennifer SBA 2016

Education (4)
Rigelman, Nicole ED 2014
Stevens, Dannelle ED-CI 2014
Smith, Michael ED-POL 2015
†McElhone, Dorothy ED 2016

Eng. & Comp. Science (6)
†Recktenwald, Gerald ME 2014
Tretheway, Derek ME 2014
Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata ECE 2015
Zurk, Lisa ECE 2015
Bertini, Robert CEE 2016
Karavanic, Karen CS 2016

Fine & Performing Arts (4)
Magaldi, Karin TA 2014
Wendl, Nora ARCH 2014
†Boas, Pat ART 2015
Griffin, Corey ARCH 2016

LAS – Arts and Letters (9)
Friedberg, Nila WLL 2014
†Greenstadt, Amy ENG 2014
Jaen-Portillo, Isabel WLL 2014
Dolidon, Annabelle WLL 2015
Mercer, Robert LAS 2015
Reese, Susan ENG 2015

†Santelmann, Lynn LING 2015
Lindsay, Susan LING 2016
Perlmutter, Jennifer WLL 2016

LAS – Sciences (8)
Lafferriere, Gerardo MTH 2014
†Works, Martha GEOG 2014
Burns, Scott GEOL 2015
Epbley, Sarah BIO 2015
Sanchez, Erik PHY 2015
Daescu, Dacian MTH 2016
George, Linda ESM 2016
†Ruetter, John ESM 2016

LAS – Social Sciences (7)
Liebman, Robert SOC 2014
†Bluffstone, Randall ECON 2014
Brower, Barbara GEOG 2015
†DeAnda, Roberto CHLT 2015
Hsu, ChiaYin HST 2016
Luckett, Thomas HST 2016
Padin, Jose SOC 2016

Library (1)
†Beasley, Sarah LIB 2015

Other Instructional (1)
†*Carpenter, Rowanna (for Jhaj) UNST 2015

Social Work (4)
Talbott, Maria SSW 2014
†*Taylor, Michael (Pewewardy) SSW 2014
Holliday, Mindy SSW 2015
Cotrell, Victoria SSW 2016

Urban and Public Affairs (6)
*Labissiere, Yves (for Newsom) CH 2014
Gelmon, Sherril PA 2014
†Clucas, Richard PS 2015
Brodowicz, Gary CH 2016
Carder, Paula IA 2016
Farquhar, Stephanie CH 2016

Date: Oct. 18, 2013; New Senators in italics

* Interim appointments
† Member of Committee on Committees
Minutes of the PSU Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 2013

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, October 7, 2013
Presiding Officer: Lesllie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey

Members Present: Baccar, Beasley, Bertini, Bluffstone, Boas, Brower, Burns, Carder, Carpenter, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clucas, Cotrell, Daescu, De Anda, Dolidon, Farquhar, Gelmon, George, Greenstadt, Griffin, Hansen, Harmon, Holliday, Hsu, Hunt, Ingersoll, Jaen-Portillo, Karavanic, Kennedy, Laffferriere, Layzell, Liebman, Lindsay, Loney, Luckett, Luther, Magaldi, McBride, McElhone, O’Banion, Padin, Perlmutter, Popp, Reese, Rigelman, Rueter, Sanchez, Santelmann, Stevens, Talbott, Tretheway, Works, Zurk

Alternates Present: Adler for Brodowicz, Schrock for Carder (after 4pm), Cruzan for Eppley, Wadley for Friedberg, Devoll for Mercer, Bolton for Pullman, Cal for Recktenwald, Bradley for Taylor,

Members Absent: Newsom, Skaruppa, Smith, Wendl

Ex-officio Members Present: Alymer, Beatty, Bowman, Cunliffe, Daasch, Everett, Fallon, Fink, Flower, Gould, Hansen, Hickey, Hines, Jhaj, Koroloff, Labissiere, MacCormack, Mack, Maier, O’Banion, Rimai, Rueter, Su, Wiewel

A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 3, 2013 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. The June minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Prior to roll call, McBride reminded senators that curricular items requiring discussion must be removed from the Consent Agenda by the end of roll call.

McBride welcomed senators to the start of a new academic year and reported on the previous Monday’s orientation on shared governance and Senate procedures for new senators. She introduced the members of the 2013-14 Senate Steering Committee: Rob Daasch, as Past Presiding Officer, herself, Bob Liebman as Presiding Officer-Elect and Pro tem, Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty, four serving senators, Karin Magaldi (Thr), a Amy Greenstadt (Eng), Gary Brodowicz (CH), and Lynn Santelmann (Ap Ling), and two ex officio members, David Hansen, chair of the Committee on Committees, and Maude Hines, ranking IFS representative. McBride noted that the Steering Committee’s role is to coordinate and expedite Senate business by ensuring that issues are ready for Senate presentation. Members
will be happy to respond to questions about what issues or concerns are appropriate for Senate consideration or where else they might be directed (see slide 4, minutes attachment B-1).

MCBRIDE encouraged senators to sit below the railing in the hall so that the microphone can pick up their comments and reminded senators who miss roll call to check in with the Secretary at the end of the meeting [or to send a note forward], and to please identify themselves and their departments when offering comments during the meeting. She also urged senators to submit the names of their alternates for the year, to read the agenda packets before Senate, and familiarize themselves with the contents of the Faculty Governance Guide, which includes the Bylaws of the Senate and committee rosters (see slides 5-9, B-1). Each senator will receive an email later in the week with the contact information for the faculty members who have been randomly assigned to each senator’s district. She thanked Mark Jones and Martha Hickey for managing the district assignment process and she asked senators to provide any edits or updates that they may have to ensure the accuracy of the district list that they receive. The plan is to send out meeting previews and additional information over the course of the year to suggest ways for senators to communicate with, or to alert or seek input from their districts.

MCBRIDE reminded Senators of the need for the divisions listed in the agenda (ED, LAS-SS, LAS-Science) to elect representatives to the Committee on Committees after the meeting. The Committee on Committees plays a key role in ensuring that the committees that conduct the business of university governance are fully staffed, and have appropriate representation in their membership.

MCBRIDE invited former presiding officer Rob Daasch, who has agreed to serve as parliamentarian for the year, to talk about essential provisions of Roberts Rules of Order. DAASCH observed that the principal goal of Roberts Rules is to protect members’ rights to free and fair debate. He reviewed the Presiding Officer’s role in recognizing speakers during debate and the procedures for making motions, including moving to a committee of the whole to allow for open discussion that could lead to recommendations for future action. Debate during committee of the whole is not recorded in the minutes. (See slides, minutes attachment B-2.) Last year committee of the whole was used in connection with a discussion item introducing new faculty ranks available under amended Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) that led to a series of motions on adopting the new ranks later in the year. DAASCH also reminded senators that the motion to defer to a specific date was more appropriate than the move to table.

MCBRIDE announced that the President’s report would begin at 4:20 and the inclusion of a report from IFS on the agenda. She introduced Liane O’Banion, Scholastic Standards Committee chair, and Registrar Cindy Baccar to talk about a forthcoming motion for online grade changes.

1. Online Grade-to-Grade Changes

BACCAR noted that the grade changes under discussion were those that come in after the end of term, changing one letter grade to another (A-F). She described the current grade-to-grade process that requires the submission of a signed paper
Supplemental Grade Report form (SGR) and is accompanied by somewhat unpredictable accounting practices. The proposed process that would allow individual faculty to make grade-to-grade changes online within a year of the course offering and would trigger the generation of a report that would compile usage data each term. (See slides 1-5, October meeting appendix C1.)

O’BANNION enumerated the benefits of the online option, including its timeliness, certainty, and sustainability, as well as the ability to track usage over time. She reported that various stakeholders, including Deans, chairs and the SSC, had been consulted to hear potential concerns, and she invited anyone with questions to contact her before the November Senate meeting when the motion to approve would come forward (slides 6-8, October appendix C1).

_________ suggested that it would be helpful to know what specific information would be in the report to the chairs at the November meeting. BACCAR replied that they could mock something up, but they were open to specific suggestions.

MCBRIDE introduced Shelly Chabon, Associate Dean of CLAS and project lead for the Rethink Proposal “Giving Credit where Credit is Due,” noting that credit for prior learning is a topic that Senate would be dealing with on a fairly regular basis during the coming year.

2. Rethink Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)

With intention of setting the stage for an on-going conversation with Senate about CPL at PSU, CHABON previewed the organization and action plan of the faculty working groups assembled under the auspices of Rethink Proposal #92, funded by the 2012-13 Provost’s Challenge. Their membership and charge was outlined in a handout distributed to senators. (See minutes attachment B-3). The project acknowledges that there are a variety of ways that we learn outside of the classroom, both through formal and informal instruction. CHABON suggested that the project serves the mission of PSU in that it can potentially provide pathways for PSU’s non-traditional students. She noted that surveys have shown that non-traditional students have rated opportunities for CPL over class size and access to financial aid as important to their choice of institution. Oregon legislative action and OUS policy require us to develop standards for CPL. The Rethink project intends to build on the policy that PSU Senate approved in 2005 by proposing a rigorous, reliable, faculty-driven framework for awarding CPL at PSU. She invited senators to join one of the focus groups scheduled for November (listed in B-3).

Discussion item – Consensual Relationship Policy

MCBRIDE asked Bob Liebman, the Faculty Senate representative to the University Policy Committee that is reviewing PSU policy on consensual relationships, to preside over the discussion.

LIEBMAN outlined the purpose of the discussion item. The intent is to introduce information and allow consideration of a topic to make informed voting possible. In this instance, it is the question of whether the current PSU consensual relations policy
is known, fair, properly implemented, and fits with our values, or needs rewriting in line with the character of today’s PSU faculty and the culture of the University. He introduced University General Counsel David Reese, to provide an overview of the current policy and proposed changes, and Chaz Lopez, from the Office of Diversity and Global Inclusion, who also has had a role in the process.

Providing context for the discussion, REESE noted that the University Policy Committee had been charged with reviewing all University-wide policies to access their clarity, dissemination, date of review. This has led to the recent rewriting of campus policies on discrimination, disabilities, use of email, and last year, to a consideration of policy on personal, intimate relationships wherever there is a power differential and potential conflict of interest between the parties, as required by the State Board (see slide 2, minutes attachment B-4). REESE said that most people consulted seem to think that current policy is too lenient, and offered contrasting examples from Indiana University, William and Mary, Stanford, and OSU (see slides 3-4, B-4). REESE said that the Office of the General Counsel is inviting comment on the policy on its web site (http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/policy-library) and plans for further discussion with the Senate about the next steps in the revision process.

LOPEZ gave an overview of the current policy requiring disclosure of the relationship and proposed revisions and clarifications. The revised policy will cover any supervisor-supervisee relationship on campus, and extends to “casual relationships.” It offers examples of relationships involving power differential. It will include an anti-retaliation provision, specify the need for immediate reporting, and set up consequences for failure to report (see slides 5-7). He highlighted more restrictive policies that prohibit all consensual romantic relationships where professional or supervisory responsibility is involved. The goal of the PSU policy is to mitigate any conflict of interest and prevent discrimination or sexual harassment. LOPEZ also encouraged feedback from faculty, noting that additional resources, including the full draft Revisions to the PSU Consensual Relationships Policy and the policies of other Universities are available on the web: http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/consensual-relationships-policy.

JHAJ/________ MOVED that the meeting to committee of the whole.

BURNS/_______ MOVED return to regular session.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Consent Agenda

BEASLEY/RUETER MOVED the curricular consent agenda.

The curricular proposals listed in “E-1” were APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.
2. Proposal for a PhD in Health Systems and Policy

MAIER, Grad Council (GC) chair, directed senators to the Curriculum Tracker Wiki where all course and program proposals are posted as they reach Senate committees: https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/19621708/FrontPage

He noted two special aspects regarding the proposed PhD--that it emerged from a track of the existing Public Affairs and Policy PhD in the Hatfield School, and that it is part of an effort to propose a joint School of Public Health with OHSU.

CLUCAS/BURNS MOVED TO APPROVE the PhD in Health Systems and Policy, as recommended by the Grad Council and listed in E-2.

BROWER: At what point does the proposal go through the steps of the new program development Work Flow Chart?

MAIER: Since the degree was an existing program, the GC approved an abbreviated process that omitted some early program development steps. It had not accepted the proposal to call it a “change” of program. The proposal has been through the GC and Budget Committee, and now comes to Faculty Senate for approval.

EVERETT: The proposal did go through the full proposal review process for a new program, but did not have to complete all the pre-proposal steps required.

MCBRIDE called for a vote on the recommendation.

The Proposal for a PhD in Health Systems and Policy was APPROVED by majority voice vote.

F. Question Period

1. Questions for Administrators

None

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

BURNS asked if clickers would be supplied for future votes. MCBRIDE said yes.

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

President’s Report

Welcoming faculty back to campus, WIEWEL announced that although enrollment for the fall was flat overall, enrollment was up 8.5% for freshmen, and 4% for transfer students, where strategic recruitment efforts had focused. US News has again ranked PSU in the top ten “up-and-coming” universities and PSU was ranked among the top 100 “best buys” by Institutional Research and Evaluation, Inc (http://www.pdx.edu/profile/portland-state-university-rankings-and-references). He noted the achievements of PSU transportation faculty, Susan Conrad (LING), Julie Esparza Brown (ED), and Susan Kirtley (ENG), and reminded faculty of the ten days of festivities planned for the Portland State of Mind celebration (October 18-27), noting...
that Anderson Cooper had agreed to give the keynote address at the Simon Benson Awards dinner (10/22).

WIEWEL then turned to the make-up and responsibilities of the new PSU Board of Trustees, which the Oregon Legislature is expected to confirm in December. He introduced prospective members—all good friends of PSU—noting that the Governor had chosen them from PSU’s list of nominees (see slide 2, minutes attachment B-5). Former Senate Presiding Officer Maude Hines will represent faculty on the Board. De Muniz had to withdraw because of a conflict of interest due to his on-going work as a judge post-retirement; his Board position is still open. WIEWEL reviewed the Board’s charge (slide 3), a list of good practices derived from the Association of Governing Boards. As President, he still expects to lead the process of establishing the strategic direction of the University, and expects the Board will have great deference to the principles of shared governance. The historical practice of delegation of Board authority for the every day operation of the University should continue (slide 4). While ultimate financial authority will rest with the Board, the President reserves the right to challenge rulings inconsistent with the mission of the University. WIEWEL noted that despite fears of boards overreaching their authority, cases of inappropriate intervention have typically resulted from the actions of individual board members. He was optimistic but predicted a learning curve: Training for the new board members and strong board leadership will be important. Deans and faculty will also have to learn to respond to suggestions from board members with, “We’ll have to take that up with the board chair.”

Lastly, WIEWEL offered a preview of the new structure of higher education in Oregon, shared services like payroll to be facilitated by staff in Corvallis and Portland (slides 5 and 6, B-5). The big change is in the combining of community colleges and universities in the budget allocation process. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is revising the funding model to be more achievement and performance based. HECC will have the authority to review and approve new university degrees for all campuses.

BURNS asked if he saw PSU having interactions with the other institutions, as the President of OHSU Ed Ray had advocated in a recent op ed for the Oregonian—http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2013/09/with_new_university_boards_hig.html.

WIEWEL replied that he was committed to that, having seen that sometimes when you no longer force people to be together, they actually become more collaborative. He cited the creation of a Council of Presidents to discuss the issue of shared services, and argued that as we move forward we will need to bring other groups like the provosts, research faculty, and government relations together. Meeting with the presidents earlier in the day (10/7), the Governor had urged them to continue working together. With collaboration, there could be a real opportunity to reverse the disinvestment in higher ed in the 2015 legislative session. WIEWEL declared himself “agnostic” on the question of the governance of the four regional institutions.

Citing comments in a recent article highlighting Oregon’s higher ed changes in Pro Publica, LIEBMAN asked if decentralization will be more effective or efficient, or a better deal for PSU than present (http://www.propublica.org/article/breaking-away-top-public-universities-push-for-autonomy-from-states).
WEIWEL remarked that it was a good compromise and PSU will be better off than not having a board with U of Oregon alone having one. It will give us a tool to be a better university and opportunities for more fund-raising and developing an identity as the regional university. The plan does not seem to be to turn HECC into a hundred-person bureaucracy, which would certainly be a lost efficiency.

LAFERRIERE: Will the Board have a structural relationship with the legislature that is at a different level?

WIEWEL: The Board will have members from both sides of the isle, which should be helpful. We have already done some good work organizing other constituencies on our behalf, but we have a long way to go. Right now, given rising student debt, the mood in the Legislature is to spend every new dollar to lower tuition. This is great for the students but does not give us money to operate the institution; we lose money on every Oregon student we admit. We will strongly support the “Oregon idea” [“pay it forward”] and the governor’s 2015 tactics.

**Provost’s Report**

The Provost was out of town.

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

FINK said he planed to take up questions regarding the conduct and level of research at PSU at the next meeting.

**IFS Report**

HINES reported that because PSU is now considered a TRU campus (a Technical Resource University), they were being asked to respond to questions about the impact of changes to the system. Due to its dire financial situation and the desire to use tenure track faculty in the classroom, Southern Oregon is undergoing reorganization of its departments into interdisciplinary centers, eliminating chairs. IFS senators discussed opportunities for collaboration, for example, on inter-institutional transfers, and sharing online learning services. As IFS representative to the Council, she has been asked by the Provost’s Council to solicit faculty response to the ideal of virtual review of programs within already existing programs—an option that might allow a highly qualified reviewer who was unable to travel to the review site to participate. (Write to mhines@pdx.edu with feedback.) IFS is very active now at the state level in working with state-level governing bodies.

MCBRIDE introduced Robert Gould, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC). GOULD reminded senators of the up-coming vote on new Work Flow charts.

HANSEN requested that senators from the Ed, LAS Social Science and Science divisions complete their caucus to select Committee on Committee representatives.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.
Meeting of the Portland State
Faculty Senate

October 7, 2013
3:00 p.m.
Cramer Hall 53

Senate: Representative of the Faculty

The Faculty shall have power, subject to legal limits, to take
action to promote faculty welfare. The Faculty shall have
power to act upon matters of educational policy, to enact such
rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or
enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new
courses of study. This power shall include, but not be confined
to, action upon the establishment, abolition, or major
alteration of the structure or educational function of
departments or of programs which include more than one
department or instructional unit of the University. The
Faculty will normally exercise this power through its
representative, the Senate. From ARTICLE III, Section 1.
Faculty Powers – PSU Faculty Constitution

Senate Steering Committee

AY 2013-14

- Past Presiding Officer: Rob Daasch
- Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride
- Presiding Officer Pro Tem Elect: Bob Liebman
- Secretary to the Faculty: Martha Hickey
- Senate members:
  - Gary Brodowicz – SCH
  - Amy Greenstadt – ENG
  - Karin Magaldi – TA
  - Lynn Santelman – LING
- Ex officio members:
  - David Hansen, Committee on Committees, Chair
  - Maude Hines, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, Rep.

Steering Committee Expedites
Senate Work

- Refer issues to appropriate committees
- Coordinate work of different committees
- Schedule Senate action on committee work
- Assure the Senate that agenda items have
  been properly prepared for Senate action
  - Initiate motions for Senate referral to
    committees or for direct Senate action
  - Make representation pursuant to Senate
    resolutions
Senator Guidelines During Meetings

• Sit below the railing boundary so microphone can pick up your comment
• If arrive after roll call, notify Secretary after meeting
• Identify yourself by name and department before speaking

Senator Responsibilities

• Provide Secretary with name of alternate (Faculty Governance Guide, p. 11)
• Read your packet prior to meeting
• Review Faculty Governance Guide
• Communicate with members of your district

Faculty Governance Guide

• Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty
  • Article IV, Organization of the Faculty
  • Article V Faculty Senate
• Faculty Senate Bylaws
  • Functions and Procedures
  • Meeting and report schedules
  • Senate Rosters
• All-University Committee Rosters
• Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Constitution, Roster of PSU IFS Representatives, meeting schedules

Senate Districts

• District lists essentially ready
• Senators’ email lists going out by week’s end
• Addresses may need slight updating—always the case—send to Secretary of the Faculty.
• Instructions will accompany your lists.
Committee On Committees

- Main Responsibility
  - Appoints members and chairpersons of all constitutional committees
  - Makes recommendations to the President concerning membership and chairpersons of most administrative committees
- Two year term
- Member of Senate while serving on Committee
- Current Vacancies
  - ED, LAS SCI, and AO; LAS SS (2)

Discussion Item

- Purpose: Inform senators on issues
- Guide Senate on future action
  - Consider as motion or resolution
  - Create ad-hoc committee
  - Assign to standing committee
- General procedure and format
  - Introduction and presentation
  - Motion to Committee of the Whole, suspends minutes
  - Presiding Officer chairs discussion/Q&A
- Conclude and return to regular assembly
Robert’s Rules of Order
The First Step to Running Effective Meetings
or (Leslie) Rules!
Rob Daasch, Past-Presiding Officer

Organizing Principles
- Robert’s Rules facilitate transaction of Faculty Senate business
- Protect member’s right to free and fair debate
- The majority has the right to decide
- Only Presiding Officer recognizes speakers
- Agenda and reports are recommendations
- Committee of the Whole
  - No final decisions
  - Recommendations for future action
- Debate begins after motion stated and 2nd
  - Changes to motion are managed by rules for amendments

Senate Discussion Item
- Purpose: Inform senators on issues topics
- Guide Senate for future action
  - Consider motions or resolutions
  - Create ad-hoc committees
  - Assign standing committees
- General procedure and format
  - Introduction and presentations
  - Motion to Committee of the whole, suspends minutes
  - Presiding Officer chairs discussion and Q&A
  - Conclude and restart minutes

Debate
- Debate is not discussion between members
- Speakers recognized by Presiding-Officer
  - Identify themselves by name and unit
  - Members address the Presiding-Officer
- Members speak in turn
- To speak again Member waits for all others
- Non-members contribute at the request of Senator
  1) Presiding-Officer recognizes Senator
  2) Presiding-Officer then recognizes visitor
Common Phrases

- Speak after Presiding officer recognizes you
- Main Motion
  - Say “I move...”
- Amendments
  - say “I move to amend...”
- Voting on motion Question
  - Say “I move the previous question”
- Refer to committee
  - Say “I move to refer the motion...”
- Point-of-Order
  - Say “I rise to a point of order...”

Motions

- Acknowledged member makes Main Motion
- Another member seconds the Main Motion
  - Required to discuss motion
  - Presiding-Officer restates the motion
  - Discussion
    - Presiding Officer has discretion to limit discussion time
  - Amendments take a similar path as Main
  - Motions are (not) carried by voting
    - by Hand, by Voice, by clicker, by roll call

Amendments

- Motions are amended to add, remove or substitute words in the original motion
- One amendment considered at a time
- Requires a second to proceed
  - Discussion follows on the amendment
  - Vote on the Amendment
    - If amendment (not)carried discussion resumes on (un)amended main motion
  - After further discussion, a vote is taken on the amended Main Motion

Other Motions

- Table to Definite Date
  - Use: when apparent more information is needed before action
- Limit Debate
  - Use: to limit debate and establish an end-time for discussion of contentious issues
- Withdraw/Modify Motion
  - Use: to withdraw or modify the motion previously made which has not yet been voted on
  - Before debate maker of the motion may request unanimous consent to modify the motion
- Point of Order
  - Use: call to the attention of the Presiding-Officer Robert’s Rules are not being followed
  - Examples – members are speaking over one another, a motion was not voted on
I call it a "parliamentary" cold—sometimes the eyes have it and sometimes the nose.
RETHINK #92: GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

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

What is CPL?
The HECC Report states that Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) is the granting of college-level credit for prior learning. Per HB 4059, “prior learning” is defined as “the knowledge and skills gained through work and life experience, through military training and experience, and through formal and informal education and training from institutions of higher education in the United States and other nations.”

According to Standard Five of the HECC framework, there are 6 Types of CPL:

**Portfolio:** Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside the classroom.

**Challenge Exams:** Credit granted through the assessment of student learning offered by the institution or credit granted for tests of learning, including DSST/DANTES, CLEP, Excelsior, NYU Foreign Language, etc. May result in credit being awarded, or degree requirements being waived.

**Military Credit:** Credit granted through evaluation of ACE published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs offered by non-collegiate agencies, both civilian employers and the military.

**International Baccalaureate:** Credit granted for International Baccalaureate.

**Advanced Placement Exams:** Credit awarded through the evaluation of Advanced Placement Exam scores.

**Other Credit for Prior Learning:** Credit granted for other prior learning experience not listed in other areas, such as credit granted for industry certifications for proof of applied knowledge and skills in an industry-identified area.

Rationale

- CPL serves PSU’s mission of providing access to a quality liberal education.
- CPL provides a non-traditional pathway for degree completion that will give PSU a competitive edge in attracting a new and currently underserved student population. In deciding on colleges, non-traditional students rated credit for prior learning as more important than class size or the availability of financial aid. (University of Wisconsin System CPL Review, 2010)
- Credit for prior learning has been shown to improve academic outcomes, graduation rates, and motivation, especially among underserved student populations, as well as saving students and universities considerable time and money. (Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, 2010)
- CPL provides opportunities for those who might otherwise be unable to complete a degree. CPL programs free up classroom space, provide incentives to begin and finish a degree, and give more flexibility and control to the student. (University of Wisconsin System CPL Review, 2010)

Why Now?

- February 2012: Passage of HB 4059
- January 2013: Credit For Prior Learning Advisory Committee appointed by HECC to achieve the goals of HB 4059
- September 2013: CPL Committee identifies eight standards to ensure quality in granting credit for prior learning across the OUS
- October 2013: CPL standards distributed to OUS institutions for review and comment.

With the passage of HB 4059, the Oregon legislature has indicated strong interest in implementing mechanisms for incorporating CPL as an option to a time and cost saving path to college degrees.

In late 2012, the HECC appointed a Credit For Prior Learning Advisory Committee (CPL) to achieve the goals of HB 4059. The committee identified a set of eight standards to ensure that OUS colleges and universities develop and maintain high quality processes for granting prior learning credit.

In October 2013, the standards will be distributed to OUS institutions for review and comment. Our group has been tasked with assisting in that review here at PSU.

CPL at PSU is Not a New Concept

On February 7, 2005 the PSU Faculty Senate:

- Approved creation of a Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Program to be housed within the School of Extended Studies
- Approved the creation of a Credit for Prior Learning Coordinator to administer the program
- Approved development of the 1-credit course “Assessment of Prior Learning”
- Approved development of a CPL Handbook and program website
- Approved training of one faculty assessor in each department accepting CPL

Although these initiatives were approved, they were not implemented in a comprehensive manner.

(PSU Faculty Senate Report, February 7, 2005)
ReThinking CPL at PSU

Funded by an award from the Provost’s Challenge 2012, the ReThink #92 cast has been charged with:

- Building a flexible, faculty-led, academically and fiscally sound individualized approach for prior learning assessment (PLA), competency based learning, and concurrent learning assessment (CLA) for Portland State University.
- Working with Faculty Senate on approval of policies related to PLA, competency based learning assessment, and CLA.
- Piloting implementation of the PLA and CLA approach in at least one department in CLAS.
- Providing a framework for clearly defining and assessing campus-wide sustainability learning outcomes.
- Creating a program to allow students to earn an undergraduate Certificate in Sustainability in their field of interest.

In addition, we will be assisting in reviewing HECC standards for CPL.

Who We Are

Administration & Analysis Group:
Shelly Chabon - Project Lead
Assoc. Dean of Humanities, CLAS
Cornelia Coleman – Project Manager/English, CLAS

Policies Group:
Cindy Baccar - Group Lead
Director of Registration & Records, EMSA
Rachel Cunliff - Conflict Resolution/Chair, UCC, CLAS
Rob Gould - Conflict Resolution / Chair, EPC, CLAS
Steve Harmon - Curriculum Coordinator, OAA
Becki Ingersoll - Advising & Career Services / ACS & ARC, EMSA
Joan Jagodnik - Transfer Student Services & Community College Relations, EMSA
Alan MacCormack- University Studies/Chair, ARC, UNST
Liane O’Banion - Learning Center/Chair, SCC, EMSA
Deanna Smith - Assistant Director, Student Financial Aid & Scholarships, EMSA

Practices Group:
Annabelle Dolidon - Group Lead / WLL, CLAS
Maude Hines - Co-Lead / English, CLAS
Rowanna Carpenter - University Studies, UNST
Jeanne Davidson – Library, LIBR
Joan Jagodnik - EMSA
Annie Knepler - University Studies, UNST
Yves Labissiere - University Studies, UNST
Tyler Matta - School of Business Administration, SBA

Evaluation Group:
Peter Collier – Group Lead / Sociology, CLAS
Kathi Ketchison – Institutional Research & Planning, OAA
Beth Lloyd-Pool – Institute for Sustainable Solutions, ISS
Bill Jones – School of Business Administration, SBA

Implementation Group:
Veronica Dujon - Group Lead
Dean of Curriculum Development & Enrollment Mgmt, CLAS
Aleksandar Jokic – Co-lead / Philosophy, CLAS
David Raffo - School of Business Administration, SBA

Pilot Groups

Institute for Sustainable Solutions
Beth Lloyd-Pool - Group Lead, ISS
Jennifer Allen - Director, ISS and Associate Prof., Public Administration, ISS
Thad Miller - Urban Studies & Planning, UPA
Angela Hamilton - Institute for Sustainable Solutions, ISS
Jacob Sherman - Sustainability/University Studies, ISS/UNST
Tyler Matta - School of Business Administration, SBA
Bill Jones - School of Business Administration, SBA
Darrell Brown - School of Business Administration, SBA
Roy Koch - Civil Engineering & Environmental Science, MCECS
Barry Messer - Urban Studies & Planning, CUPA
Joe Maser - Environmental Sciences & Management, CLAS
Sarah Lincoln – English, CLAS
Harrell Fletcher – Art, COTA
Avram Hiller – Philosophy, CLAS

World Languages & Literatures
Annabelle Dolidon - Group Lead / WLL, CLAS

Communications
Jeffrey Robinson -Group Lead/Communications, CLAS

Join A Focus Group!

Have you had experience developing, implementing or evaluating any form of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) at PSU or another college or university? If so, we would like to invite you to participate in a focus group exploring ideas, concerns, and perceptions of the benefits/costs of CPL. Those participating will be given a small stipend.

Department Chairs Focus Groups:
Friday / Nov 8 / 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm
Monday / Nov 18 / 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

Faculty Focus Groups:
Wednesday/ Nov 13 / 10:30 am – 12:00 pm
Friday / Nov 15 / 10:30 am – 12:00 pm

If you would like to participate, please email Cornelia Coleman (colemanc@pdx.edu).
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Consensual Relationships Policy

Oregon State Board of Higher Education
Policy on Consensual Relations
(Adopted September 9, 2005)

"The Board recognizes the potential conflict of interest that occurs when romantic or sexual relationships develop in which there is an inherent power differential between the parties to the relationship. Accordingly, whenever such potential conflict occurs, any employee involved in such a relationship has a duty to disclose the relationship and to cooperate in institutional efforts to prevent an actual conflict. Institutions shall develop policies to address problems that result from consensual relationships."

Institutions shall periodically assess the effectiveness of their policy, notification and training.

Policy Continuum

Prohibited with any undergraduate, or graduate student involving professional responsibility

College prohibits consensual romantic or sexual relationships between faculty members and undergraduate students and graduate students for whom the faculty has direct professional responsibility. Deans may grant exception in "exceptional circumstances."

Prohibited in all cases involving professional responsibility

Violation of the Code of Academic Ethics to "engage in amorous or sexual relations with students for whom they have professional responsibility, even when both have consented to the relationship."

Strongly discouraged with disclosure and recusal required

"At a university, the role of the teacher is multifaceted, including serving as intellectual guide, counselor, mentor & adviser. The teacher’s influence & authority extend far beyond the classroom. Consequently & as a general proposition, the University believes that a sexual or romantic relationship between a teacher & student, even where consensual & whether or not the student would otherwise be subject to supervision or evaluation by the teacher, is inconsistent with the proper role of the teacher, & should be avoided. The University therefore very strongly discourages such relationships. If it does occur, the relationship must be disclosed and faculty must be recused from evaluative & supervisory role."

Disclosure and recusal required

Consensual Relationships require disclosure and recusal to eliminate conflicts of interest.
Current PSU Policy

• "The University recognizes that two consenting adults should be free to conduct a personal relationship if they so wish..."
• If such a relationship develops where there is a power differential, the instructor or supervisor should report the matter to the supervisor.
• The University is then to make arrangements to eliminate the potential conflict of interest.
• Such relationships "have the potential for very serious consequences and should be avoided, where possible."

Draft Revised PSU Policy

• Retains the fundamental approach of the existing policy: All consensual relationships involving a power differential must be disclosed and the conflict of interest managed through recusal of the more powerful party or other actions.
• As required by the State Board of Higher Education, adds anti-retaliation provision.
• Clarifies that the policy covers relationships that one or both of the parties considers "casual, informal, temporary, or episodic."
• Explains different ways unequal power may exist and lists examples.

Draft Revised PSU Policy (continued . . .)

• Required Reporting
  • Requires both parties in consensual relationship to report, but confirms primary responsibility is on the individual with greater power.
  • Expands options of reporting to HR or OAA in addition to supervisor.
  • Clarifies reporting should be immediate and occur before the more powerful party makes any decisions that could be influenced by conflict of interest.
• Provides guidance on how to resolve conflict of interest.
• Provide additional resources for individual questions about the policy.
• Clarifies that the Office of Equity & Compliance is responsible for evaluating whether the policy has been violated.

Next steps....

Presentation Materials
Relevant PSU and OUS Policies
Policies from Other Universities
Opportunity to Comment or Ask Questions....

http://www.pdx.edu/ogc/consensual-relationships-policy
A New Governance Model for Portland State University
Presentation to the Faculty Senate
President Wim Wiewel, October 7, 2013

The Board’s Responsibilities

- Determining the mission of the University and ensuring that the mission is kept current and aligned with public purposes.
- Establishing the University’s strategic direction.
- Changing the President with the task of periodically leading a strategic planning process; participating in the strategic planning process; approving the strategic plan, and monitoring its effectiveness.
- Selecting, supporting, and evaluating the President and reviewing the President’s compensation.
- Ensuring and protecting, within the context of faculty shared governance, the educational quality of the University and its academic programs, and preserving and protecting the University’s assets; and preserving and protecting the University’s assets for posterity.
- Ensuring the currency of Board governance policies and practices.
- Conducting the Board’s business in an exemplary fashion and with appropriate transparency, adhering to the highest ethical standards and complying with applicable open-meeting and public-record laws.
- Ensuring the currency of Board governance policies and practices.
- Periodically assessing the performance of the Board, its committees, and its members.

Shared Governance

“The ultimate responsibility for the institution rests in its governing board. Boards cannot delegate their fiduciary responsibility for the academic integrity and financial health of the institution. Traditionally, and for practical reasons, boards delegate some kinds of authority to other stakeholders with the explicit and sometimes explicit condition that the board reserve the right to question, challenge, and occasionally override decisions or proposals it judges to be inconsistent with the mission, integrity, or financial position of the institution.”

“Governing boards should state explicitly who has the authority for what kinds of decisions. What is it, in whom, and whether that delegation is subject to board review. For example, curricular matters and decisions regarding individual faculty appointments, promotions, and contract renewal formally would fall within the delegated decision-making authority of appropriate faculties operating within the framework of policies and delegations of the board.”

“Boards and chief executives should establish deadlines for the conclusion of various processes of academic governance, a single individual or group should not be empowered to impede decisions through inaction.”

From: AGB Board Basics—AGB Statement on Institutional Governance and Governing in the Public Trust: External Influences on Colleges and Universities
Post-SB 270 Structure

The Higher Education Coordinating Commission

The HECC is responsible for:

• Development of a consolidated higher ed budget request, after receiving the budget requests from each institutional Board of Trustees;
• Allocating legislatively approved resources;
• Review and approval of institutional requests for state bonds for capital projects;
• Review and approval of significant changes to the academic program of universities and community colleges, such as new schools, colleges or campuses;
• Approval of new degrees;
• Approval of university missions statements; and
• Approval of any proposed tuition increases of more than 5% for resident undergraduate students.
Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of the P & T Guidelines
October 19, 2013

The committee’s recommended revision of the P & T Guidelines is online

http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senato/senate-schedules-materials

*Strike-outs are used for deletions; underlining for additions

To prepare for discussion November 4, 2013, we invite you to focus on
III. Ranks
IV. Academic Appointments
VI. Administrative Roles and Procedures for Promotion for Non-Tenure Track

The charge to our committee
At the March and April 2013 meetings, the PSU Faculty Senate voted motions to add new non-tenure track (NTTF) ranks.
http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senato/senate-schedules-materials

The Steering Committee created the 2013 Ad hoc P&T Guidelines Revision Committee to recommend
• Addition of the new NTTF ranks of Assistant, Associate, Full Professor of Practice/Clinical Professor
• Revision of NTTF Senior Instructor rank to reflect the ranks of Senior Instructor I and Senior Instructor II.
• Revision of NTTF Senior Research Assistant rank to reflect the ranks of Senior Research Assistant I and Senior Research Assistant II.
• Revision of NTTF Senior Research Associate rank to reflect the ranks of Senior Research Associate I and Senior Research Associate II.

The committee was charged to present its recommendations to the PSU Faculty Senate no later than the November 2013 meeting for review and amendments and to return with final motions for adoption of the revision. The P&T revisions will be voted as one motion and without amendments.

The committee was composed of equal numbers of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, and 3 ex officio members of the administration.

Our process
The committee met regularly from May through October. At the start, committee co-chairs met with Carol Mack, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel & Leadership Development. We circulated draft job descriptions and promotion criteria/procedures to Associate Deans of all schools and colleges, directors of major research institutes, and PIs and chairs in sciences and
engineering. We consulted with Senators at other Oregon public universities and with AAUP-PSU.

Our draft
Our goal was not to rewrite the key principles of the 1996 PSU P & T Guidelines but to follow their lead in the tasks of writing new job descriptions, promotion criteria, and evaluative procedures, in keeping with the Senate’s approved motions for grandfathering, reclassification, and maximizing promotion possibilities under the new ranks.

We applied these principles in favor of
• assuring a career orientation including appointment and advancement in a profession
• creating broad guidelines and letting the departments decide how best to implement them (eg choosing either professor of practice or clinical instructor),
• specifying procedures for the evaluation of non-tenure track faculty.

Please send comments to the co-chairs (starred below)

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Bartlett       BIO micb@pdx.edu
Rachel Cunliffe    CR rachel.cunliffe@pdx.edu
*Sandra Freels     WLL freels@pdx.edu
Christina Gildersleeve-Neumann  SPHR cegn@pdx.edu
Julie Haun         IELP dbjh@pdx.edu
*Bob Liebman       SOC liebmanr@pdx.edu
Michael Taylor     SSW motaylor@pdx.edu
Gayle Thieman      GSED thiemag@pdx.edu
Diane Yatchmenoff  RRI yatchmd@pdx.edu
Ex officio
Carol Mack         OAA
October 14, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rachel Cunliffe
    Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Consent Agenda

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

You may read the full text for any course or program proposal by going to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System at http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com and looking in the 2012-13 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**Change to Existing programs**
E.1.c.1.
- BA/BS in Music – change total required credits from 76 to 66; change required credits and required courses in Option 1 and Option 2 to reflect the change in total required credits.

**Changes to existing courses**
E.1.c.2.
- Art 257 Video I – change title to Introduction to Video Art, description and prerequisites.
E.1.c.3.
- Art 498 BFA Thesis Exhibition – change description.

**College of Liberal Arts & Sciences**

**New Courses**
E.1.c.4.
- Ling 182 Social Media: Interacting Online (4)
  Students develop computer communication skills by examining and researching the social aspect of the Internet. Explore and examine the use of social media and its importance in society. Participate in weekly online discussions and create individual blogs.
E.1.c.5.
- Mth 300 Introduction to Mathematical Reasoning (4)
  Fundamental abstract concepts common to all branches of mathematics, including first order predicate calculus, sets and functions, and elements from group theory and the foundations of analysis. Special emphasis is placed on the ability to understand and construct rigorous proofs. Prerequisites: Mth 253 and Mth 261.
E.1.c.6.
- WS 346 Genes and Society (4)
Explores the principles of genetics, molecular biology and biotechnology within social and historical context. Emphasis on the ethical issues arising from the intersection of genetics, technology and society, with attention to the role of gender, race and class in the formation and application of scientific knowledge. This is the same course as Bi 346 and may be taken only once for credit.

**Changes to Existing Courses**

**E.1.c.7.**
- Anth 102 Introduction to Archaeology – change description.

**E.1.c.8.**

**E.1.c.9.**
- Anth 361 European Prehistory – change title to The Archaeology of Europe and description.

**E.1.c.10.**
- Anth 364 Pacific NW Prehistory – change title to The Archaeology of the Pacific Northwest and description.

**E.1.c.11.**

**E.1.c.12.**
- Anth 366 Mesoamerican Prehistory – change title to The Archaeology of Mesoamerica.

**E.1.c.13.**
- Bi 486 Pathogenic Bacteriology – change prerequisites.

**E.1.c.14.**
- Ch 371 Environmental Chemistry – drop.

**E.1.c.15.**
- Ec 201 Principles of Economics – change title to Principles of Microeconomics and description.

**E.1.c.16.**

**E.1.c.17.**
- Fr 325 French Phonetics and Phonology – change prerequisites.

**E.1.c.18.**
- Ling 101 – 454 IELP Course Credit Hour Changes – Bulk change request – change credits from 3 to 4.

**E.1.c.19.**

**E.1.c.20.**

**E.1.c.21.**
- WS 308 Topics in Gender Lit and Pop Culture – change description.

**E.1.c.22.**
- WS 377 Topics in Feminist Spirituality – change description.
The Scholastic Standards Committee presents the following motion to the Faculty Senate:

CURRENT PRACTICE: Grade-to-grade changes can only be made using a Supplemental Grade Report (SGR), which must be signed by the Department Chair.

The SGR is a paper carbon-copy form which is signed and sent through a rigorous workflow process before it can be entered into the Banner system to reflect the grade change.

MOTION:

The instructor of record can make grade-to-grade changes online through Banweb within one year of the term in which the course was offered. The Registrar’s Office will provide Department Chairs with a report at the conclusion of each term that includes all grade-to-grade changes made within that term.

Rationale:

Eliminates paper process entirely, automates and speeds up the change process. Supports sustainability efforts. Allows Department Chairs to see a comprehensive list of all grade-to-grade changes at one time for audit purposes.