PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, May 5, 2014

Presiding Officer: Leslie McBride
Secretary: Martha W. Hickey


Alternates Present: Gabarino for Baccar, Wooster for Bluffstone, Perini for Boas, Duh for Brower, Schrock for Carder, Barham for Ingersoll, Elzanowski for Lafferriere (after 4 pm), McLaughlin for Luther, Thieman for McElhnone, Beitelspacher for Pullman, Hines for Reese, Donlan for Talbott

Members Absent: Bleiler, Eppley, Faaleava, Holliday, Sanchez


A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 7, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The April 7, 2014 minutes were approved as corrected: Loney was present; during item E.3 discussion, O’Banion affirmed that the SSC “had [not] looked at accreditation issues by colleges,” (p. 57).

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIDE shared the memos reporting on Senate Actions for March and April 2014, with acknowledgments from OAA inserted. She announced that these will be regularly posted to the Senate website in the future. [Secretary’s note: They are currently posted on the Senate “Faculty Governance & Links” sub-page: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-action-and-responses.] She reminded that senators that elections for 2014 were in progress and that the election of Senate Presiding Officer Elect and 2014-16 Senate Steering Committee members would take place at
the June meeting. Nominations for these positions can be made at the June meeting. A list of newly elected Senators, who will also be eligible, will be posted after the elections close on Friday, May 9: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-membership

EPC – IELP

GOULD notified Senate that the Educational Policy Committee would most likely be bringing a motion to the June meeting to allow the Intensive English Language Program to depart from Applied Linguistics in CLAS. The proposal and supporting documents, including the Budget report are posted on the Curriculum Tracker Wiki: https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/70816697/Educational%20Policy%20Committee

Post-Tenure Review Process

As a preface to discussing the formation of a task force to create new guidelines for post-tenure review, LIEBMAN reviewed the history of post-tenure review at PSU. He noted that the push for change comes from the under-utilization of the current system and the most recent NWCCU accreditation report, which recommended that policies and practices be strengthened so that they were more systematic and at five-year intervals. (See slides, B1 minutes attachment.) In response to these requirements, the 2013-15 PSU-AAUP contract has adopted new guidelines for the process. The process will be incentivized with funds set aside for a 4% salary increase, and is also framed by an Oregon Administrative Rule.

LIEBMAN stated that the charge to the Post Tenure Review Committee would embrace four points: 1) addition of the post-tenure review process to existing PSU guidelines for promotion and tenure; 2) a decision on how to staff the campus committee; 3) a timeline that would allow a Senate vote on a proposal by December 2014; and 4) the outline of procedures that will be easy for departments to follow.

DONLAN: Will the new institutional Board be involved with this process?

ANDREWS: We try to make sure that the Board stays engaged at a fairly high policy level. I can’t speak for the Board, but I imagine that as long as the new process meets the NWCCU accreditation standards that will be sufficient for them. They would not get involved in the details.

STEVENS: Since it is under the umbrella of the P&T guidelines in general, the measure of scholarship will still follow Boyer’s model and use the same criteria, right, for post-tenure review?

LIEBMAN: That is my interpretation. We are just adding on to that trunk.

Discussion item: Academic Program Prioritization (APP) Next Steps?

MCBRIDE said that the discussion was organized to give senators further opportunity to consider the process and the report submitted by the APP Task Force last month (published in the April minutes). The Steering Committee invited Task Force member
Mark Jones to review recommendations for the next phase for the committee that would assume responsibility for the review.

JONES humorously reviewed his own involvement in the work of the Task Force. In addition to the possible benefits of prioritization review, he also addressed what he thought were the primary sources of anxiety about such a review. (See slides, minutes attachment B2.) He argued that any hidden agendas would be exposed when recommendations go through existing faculty governance processes. He thought a successful process could be designed to maximize benefits and minimize costs. He described how the Task Force imagined that oversight and communication throughout the process would be provided by a university-level Academic Program Prioritization Committee. He offered sample criteria and categories for reporting the outcomes of the review. Those reviewing outcomes would have multiple dimensions to weigh along several different axes. (Applause.)

MCBRIDE shared a draft of the Charge for the APP Committee that draws from the recommendations from the Task Force Report. The Steering Committee had reviewed and edited the draft. Committee membership is tentatively set at seven faculty from across the institution, with the Committee on Committees engaged in the selection process. MCBRIDE encouraged senators to raise questions about the process and comment on the charge, which would be brought to Senate for a vote in June.

HINES/SANTELMANN MOVED the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 3:48 pm. MCBRIDE called a return to regular session at 4:08 pm.

Nominations for Presiding Officer Elect for 2014-15

MCBRIDE invited senators to place names in nomination for Presiding Officer Elect. HINES asked if nominations could still be made at the June meeting. MCBRIDE affirmed that this would be possible.

MAGALDI nominated Senator Amy Greenstadt.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

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

2. Proposal for a new Masters in Public Policy

MAIER, GCC chair, explained that the proposed Masters was an outgrowth of a recently added PhD in Public Policy that emphasizes both policy analysis and advocacy in government administration. The program has seen increasing
employer demand from outside government agencies from non-profit organizations and business with an interest specifically in policy advocacy.

CLUCAS/GELMON MOVED the proposal, as published in “E.2.”

GELMON and CLUCAS noted that the Masters of Science title in the Agenda was incorrect. The actual title is Masters in Public Policy, as it will be a professional degree.

The MOTION to APPROVE a Masters of Public Policy PASSED: 39 voting to accept, 2 to reject, and 6 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).

3. Proposal for a Major in Conflict Resolution

CUNLIFFE, UCC, said that the proposed major would provide a broad introduction to practical and theoretical issues in the field of conflict resolution and prepare students for humanitarian work in a range of advocacy, mediation, and field work positions. She noted that the Consent Agenda included a number of courses, most previously offered as omnibus courses, which would contribute to the major.

STEVEN/LABISSIHERE MOVED the proposal, as published in “E.3.”

BERTINI noted that the College of Urban and Public Affairs had courses and programs related to conflict resolution, but there was no mention of any cross-campus links. Would there be attempts to collaborate across colleges?

CUNLIFFE said that there had already been a substantial amount of collaboration, particularly around internships, as well as consultation with the CUPA programs.

The MOTION to APPROVE a Masters of Public Policy PASSED: 33 voting to accept, 8 to reject, and 9 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).

4. Proposal for a Minor in Elementary Education Science

CUNLIFFE said that the minor was designed to prepare students hoping to enter graduate programs in Education. Most of the required course work was aimed at acquiring core content knowledge, although a couple of courses were focused on the teaching of science.

MERCER/MAGALDI MOVED the proposal, as published in “E.4.”

The MOTION to APPROVE a Minor in Elementary Education Science PASSED: 43 voting to accept, 3 to reject, and 5 abstentions (recorded by “clicker”).

5. Proposal to Amend the Constitution to add a University Writing Committee

MCBRIDE noted that Senate would be voting on the proposal to amend the Constitution twice—May 5, to approve the draft proposal with any amendments
offered, and again at the June 2 meeting, after the proposal has been reviewed by the Advisory Council. In June it must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote.

KIRTLEY reviewed the work of the existing ad hoc University Writing Committee (UWC). Although active since 1996, UWC believes that their effectiveness and ability to advocate for student writing and writing instruction has been limited by the fact that they are only an ad hoc committee. The proposed committee would have an interdisciplinary membership; a number of units that have on-going interest in the support of writing requested standing membership.

LIEBMAN/MERCER MOVED the proposal, as published in item “E.5.”

MACCORMAK asked if there would be an issue of overlap with other existing committees. KIRTLEY said that feedback from the Steering Committee suggested the mission was distinct enough to merit a separate status. LIEBMAN noted that the Steering Committee had considered the fact that it would be the Writing Committee’s job to look across all colleges and units to address a university-wide core requirement. It would provide oversight analogous to the campus-wide teacher education or technology committees. KARAVANEK worried about possible structural imbalances and wondered what makes writing different from math at this level. KIRTLEY thought that communication and quantitative reasoning could both be considered shared core values. MERCER noted that writing was a universally needed skill as well as a university-wide requirement, while not every major requires math. KIRTLEY noted that she had discussions with multiple units across campus interested in more writing instruction.

KENEDY asked if the IELP program already had representation on the current UWC and if all colleges shouldn’t have representation on the proposed committee. KIRTLEY said IELP had been a long-standing member and that there had been extensive discussion about how best to balance committee membership but also keep it a workable size. KENEDY asked if this committee could be charged with assessing the quality of writing. KIRTLEY said that this was one of its charges. ZURK asked for an example of how the ad hoc committee’s effectiveness had been curtailed. KIRTLEY described the UWC’s efforts to address the loss of funding for WIC courses by proposing new guidelines for unsupported WIC classes. The committee was told that it had no authority to make guidelines and recommendations. LIEBMAN argued that support for writing was both an access and student success issue, including students who are non-native speakers of English. JAEN-PORRILLO asked if support for faculty writing would come under this committee’s purview. KIRTLEY replied that the committee was focused on student writing and faculty who were teaching writing, wherever it was happening on campus.

STEVENS proposed clarifying the proposed committee’s charge by adding the words “and learning” to the assessment of the “teaching of writing” charge, to assure a focus on student outcomes. KIRTLEY accepted the change.

The proposed draft for a constitutional amendment to ADD a Senate University Writing Committee was APPROVED by unanimous voice vote.
MCBRIDE clarified that the approval included the addition to the language of point 3 of the charge published in “E.5,” offered by STEVENS:

3. Initiate assessment of the teaching and learning of writing at PSU.

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

The President was out of town.

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS announced that OUS ratified the PSU and PSU-AAUP Bargaining Agreement on May 1, and that a campus wide budget forum would take place on May 27 (Smith Ballroom, 11:30-1:00). She also provided updates on the two open dean positions: Scott Marshall will become interim dean of SBA on August 1st and the search for a replacement will begin in early fall; 71% of faculty and staff in CLAS (with 64% responding to the survey) indicated a desire to have a conversation on the structure of CLAS in the fall. An interim dean will be appointed by July 1.

ANDREWS also offered an update on the proposed OHSU and PSU School of Public Health (SPH) and requested input from Senate about timing upcoming discussions and actions. The School, which does not formally exist, has to go through the regular faculty governance process for approval, and must also go through an accrediting process with CEPH (Council on Education in Public Health). A two-year “interim” director has been appointed to manage these steps. (See slides, minutes attachment B3.) There is a joint steering committee and meetings with faculty and students involved are on-going. The proposal for SPH is currently being developed, along with efforts to meet accreditation standards and to conduct a self-study. There is an agreement that PSU and OHSU will be equal partners, with a shared dean and core mission. The SPH will also benefit from differences between the two institutions that will be respected. ANDREWS noted that many questions remain. She asked senators what actions they would like to happen before the full SPH proposal formally enters the committee track. She was particularly anxious to avoid the impression that the SPH would arrive at Senate after going through the committee process as a “done deal,” without opportunity for faculty and Senate input.
GEORGE observed that without budget information, it is unclear how this professional-level program would be funded. ANDREWS said that they would bring a proposal to the Budget Committee, noting that some of the programs were already offered, and demand was significant. She asked if people wanted budget information earlier in the process. CLUCAS expressed interest in information about the impact on existing programs, particularly for CUPA. SANTELmann asked about the viability of CUPA, with the proposed departure of Community Health. KARAVANEc asked how SCH would be counted in the SPH. ANDREWS asked if periodic updates would be helpful, even though some questions would not be fully answerable until the self-study was completed. BOWMAN suggested that earlier access to a draft of the business plan could assist the Budget Committee. CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked if criteria to be developed for Academic Program Prioritization might be useful in looking at the SPH. RUETER commented that the questions were about when decisions were being made; if the timeline were known, then constructive comments could be offered early in the process. ANDREWS noted that there was a joint website hosted by OHSU with preliminary information. LIEBMAN asked if there were comparable cases of joint degree launched between similar institutions. FINK noted the long-standing collaboration between Arizona State and the Mayo Institute. ANDREWS emphasized the uniqueness of the PSU-OHSU effort, given the absence of a lead institution. LUCKETT asked about the likely division of labor, noting the differences in faculty assignments and faculty-student ratios at PSU and OHSU.

ANDREWS concluded that it might be best to plan to hold one or more campus-wide information sessions during the fall, as well as to come back to Senate. She thanked senators for their input.

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

FINK announced two grant submissions: a joint EXITO grant proposal submitted to NIH ($24M) for STEM training of minority students that reflects the growing relationship between PSU and OHSU; and an SRN proposal submitted to NSF ($12M) with PSU as the lead institution. The latter is the first environmental proposal to engage the entire Urban Serving Universities Coalition.

FINK also noted that nominations for the first round of Research Excellence awards are currently being reviewed, that there are internal ISS-RSP grants for activities leading to the submission of larger proposals available, and that the third RSP Quarterly Update newsletter will be focused on Education research.

**Annual Report of the General Student Affairs Committee**

Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report thanked the committee chair Michele Miller and members of the committee.

**Annual Report of the Honors Council**
Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report, and thanked the committee chair Dean Atkinson and members of the committee.

**Annual Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board**

Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report, and thanked the committee chair Toeutu Faaleava and members of the committee.

**Annual Report of the Library Committee**

Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report, and thanked the committee chair Jon Holt and members of the committee.

**Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee**

Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report, and thanked the committee chair Liane O’Banion and members of the committee.

**Annual Report of the University Studies Council**

Presiding Officer McBride accepted the report, thanked the committee chair Tom Seppalainen and members of the committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 pm.