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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **March 3, 2014**, at 3:00 p.m. in room **53 CH**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll

B. *Approval of the Minutes of the February 3, 2014 Meeting

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor:
   *Credit for Prior Learning Policy Preview
     Discussion:

D. Unfinished Business

E. New Business
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Proposal for Undergraduate and Graduate Online Certificates in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (SBA) & new course proposals (listed under E.1.b)
   *3. Proposal to Approve the PSU Academic Program Review Policy
   *4. Proposal to Ratify IFS Bylaws

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 Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships
   *Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:

   B Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of February 3, 2014 and attachments (B1-5)
   C Credit for Prior Learning Policy Preview
   E-1 Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda (1a,b,c)
   E-2 Online Certificates in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (SBA) & SBA New Courses (E1b)
   E-3 Proposal to Approve the PSU Academic Program Review Policy
   E-4 Proposal to Ratify IFS Bylaws
   G-1 Quarterly Report of the EPC
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**Date: Dec. 17, 2013; New Senators in italics**
A. ROLL

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 6, 2014 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. The January 6, 2014 minutes were approved as published.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

MCBRIDE announced that Provost Andrews’ report would include an update on Program Array/Prioritization review, and she introduced Associate Dean Shelly Chabon to give an update on the work of the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Project Team.

Credit for Prior Learning

CHABON reported that HECC is reviewing the feedback that the PSU CPL Team and other Oregon post-secondary institutions have offered on its proposed standards for CPL. HECC will issue final standards in Spring 2014, with implementation expected by 2015-16. The PSU response was generally positive. It emphasized the
role of faculty expertise and the need for transparency when evaluating and transcripting the credit. (See presentation notes, B1 minutes attachment.) Her project team and consultants from EPC, ARC, and SSC will be bringing recommendations for a PSU CPL policy and practice framework to the March 2014 Senate meeting. See also: https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/home

CHABON introduced Peter Collier, Sociology, to report on the findings of 4 focus groups of PSU chairs and faculty on challenges, concerns, and recommendations for CPL. (See B1, pp. 2-3 and https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/focus-group-1-results.) COLLIER listed perceived benefits and losses, and reported broad consensus across groups around the need for clear criteria, rigorous evaluation that establishes authorship, and recognition of faculty work involved. The focus also groups raised more general concerns about transfer credit and articulation agreements, the difference between waiving requirements and awarding credit, and a desire for clarification regarding what PSU was attempting to maximize--getting students through to graduation as quickly as possible, or more student credit hours.

MCBRIDE complimented the Project Team on their efforts to incorporate perspectives on CPL from all across campus.

TALBOTT: Do we get to decide if we are going to do this? Does PSU have to do it?

ANDREWS: We are not required.

CHABON: Faculty Senate approved a broad CPL policy in 2005. Our group of 35 has been holding focus groups on CPL and welcomes your responses.

TALBOTT: Are you proposing that we revisit our policy and then make a decision?

CHABON: A motion is coming forward to approve a CPL policy next month.

MCBRIDE observed that the vote would be in two months and senators had the opportunity to alert their districts so that the discussion in March would be an informed one. As the CPL issue is part of a larger trend, there will probably be subsequent issues related to prior learning that Senate will need to address.

Budget Committee Update

BOWMAN, Senate Budget Committee (BC) chair, reviewed fall term activities, including evaluation of an Honors College Proposal and inauguration of new college-level budget meetings with BC and EPC representatives at early stages in the budget-setting process. BC also considered changes in PSU Summer Session. BOWMAN noted a three-year decline in summer enrollment: Initial tracking has not demonstrated that classes canceled in summer term have garnered higher enrollment during the year; and PSU no longer has campus-wide policies on summer compensation. (See minutes attachment B2, slides 2-4.) He also reported that this year, unlike years past, the BC had developed its own set of budget priority “principles,” in addition to those of the University budget team (B2, slide 6). He
reviewed the FY 2015 budget timeline and process for OAA, noting that it was to encompass both revenue enhancement activities and cuts (B2, slides 7-8).

BOWMAN emphasized that faculty can direct any questions that they have about the PSU budget to the Budget Committee (bowman@pdx.edu). They expect to have line-item details from FADM by the end of the week.

GREENSTADT observed that PSU seems to have no plan to generate revenue with Adult Education classes since the termination of the School of Extended Studies. BOWMAN said that he would add it to the BC’s list of questions.

MCBRIDE thanked members of the Budget Committee for their hard work.

**IFS REPORT**

HINES summarized the four main topics discussed at the January meeting of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (1/31-2/1): ways to address the high cost of textbooks; revision of IFS Bylaws and priority setting; governance options for the Technical and Regional Universities (TRU), given that WOU and OIT are asking for their own boards and that SOU and EOU are in financial difficulty; and the retrenchment plan for Southern Oregon University. Representatives emphasized the need to look beyond shared services to shared academic concerns over the transition and pointed to the negative implications of the SOU crisis state-wide, both for the state’s 40-40-20 goals in an isolated region of the state, and for new faculty recruitment, with the publicity surrounding layoffs of tenured faculty in Oregon.

WENDEL: When will the cuts begin?

HINES: The plan will be announced February 6, 2014.

[Rueter’s note: see: http://stateoftheuniversity.sou.edu/]

RUETE: Was there discussion about how their enrollment agreement with the University of Oregon helped or hindered SOU over the last couple of years?

HINES said that was not discussed. She invited senators to email her with questions and suggestions for priorities for IFS.

**Discussion item: Setting Academic Priorities—Looking Beyond the Budget.**

MCBRIDE moved the meeting to a committee of the whole, from 3:48 to 4:08 pm.

[Secretary’s note: SANTELMANN presented an overview of the topic; see B3 minutes attachment.]

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda**
The curricular proposals listed in “E.1.b and E.1.c” were ADOPTED as published.

2. EPC recommendation on the Proposed Academic Program Review Policy

DAASCH/RUETER MOVED to APPROVE the proposed Academic Review Policy, as published in “E.2.”

GOULD noted that the proposed policy was a response to Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Standard 2-c on Educational Resources and the NWCCU request for a “holistic appraisal” of the goals and curricular offerings of academic units and associated centers and institutes in relation to the University’s priorities and initiatives. The review occurs in association with OAA.

TALBOTT asked if this program was what was discussed at the last Senate meeting. GOULD said no, this review policy was for accreditation purposes and differed from Program Array Review. LAFFERIERE asked about proposed Guidelines for evaluation and if departments would decide what measurements were useful and appropriate. GOULD said that the motion was only to approve the policy; guidelines were still being developed and tested. He said he was unclear how or if guidelines would come back to Faculty Senate for review.

KARAVANIC noted that the policy required external reviewers and wondered why peer review was excluded, referencing Section V. 8.3 specifying reviewers with a “leadership role in higher education.” ANDREWS noted that these were desired characteristics, but not necessarily specific for every individual reviewer.

STEVENS stated that she would like to see more attention paid to current external reviews carried out according to the standards of professional accrediting bodies. She asked how these reviews would interface with the proposed activity. GOULD said it was his understanding that where there was duplication the material could be folded in. MCBRIDE noted the need for sensitivity to the issue of competing reviews. GEORGE asked if University Studies and Honors Program were included in the policy. GOULD thought yes, since University Studies was a division.

BACCAR noted that Part III referenced all academic units, although “unit” was undefined.

WENDEL asked when the Academic Program Review cycle would start. GOULD said beta testing was in process, and the cycle would probably start next year. ANDREWS noted that every program would not be reviewed at the same time and Deans would seek to time accreditation reviews to overlap with “program review.” BROWER asked if the document could be cleaned up to answer questions that had surfaced. MCBRIDE noted the need for sensitivity to the issue of competing reviews. GEORGE asked if University Studies and Honors Program were included in the policy. GOULD thought yes, since University Studies was a division. BACCAR noted that Part III referenced all academic units, although “unit” was undefined.

WENDEL asked when the Academic Program Review cycle would start. GOULD said beta testing was in process, and the cycle would probably start next year. ANDREWS noted that every program would not be reviewed at the same time and Deans would seek to time accreditation reviews to overlap with “program review.” BROWER asked if the document could be cleaned up to answer questions that had surfaced. MCBRIDE noted that if the Senate was not comfortable with the work, it could vote the motion down. LAFFERIERE raised a point of order, questioning if it were appropriate to vote to approve a document that was incomplete. BLEILER raised a point of order, asking if the motion could be tabled. LUCKETT suggested that the motion would to be postpone; however, once seconded the motion belongs to the floor and the proposal cannot be changed. CLUCAS stated that this version could be voted down and revisited at the next meeting and replaced with a revised version of the proposal. BEASLEY asked if what we wanted in a new document had been clarified, if the policy was required, and if the guidelines need to be explicit for the motion to pass. GREENSTADT suggested that the policy was mandated. LUCKETT asked if the
EPC chair needed more guidance. GOULD invited emails with explicit input. DAASCH requested recognition for Steve Harmon. HARMON said there were two separate issues. The policy was not necessarily mandated by the NWCCU, but that it is part of a requirement to do review, and every institution should have an academic program review policy. The Guidelines will be given to programs doing review to suggest what programs might look at when they begin the process.

LUCKETT/______ MOVED to CALL THE QUESTION to close debate.

The MOTION to CALL THE QUESTION PASSED by majority voice vote.

The Motion to APPROVE the proposed Academic Review Policy, as published in “E.2,” was REJECTED by majority vote.

MCBRIDE asked senators to share their concerns relating to the Program Review Policy with the EPC.

3. Proposal to create a new title of “post-doctoral fellow”

MCBRIDE noted that the item had not been previewed, but was narrowly focused. If senators felt more information was needed, they could request to postpone the vote to March. EPPLEY, one of the motion’s sponsors, introduced Niles Lehman, Chemistry, to provide a rationale.

LEHMAN stated that the problem is that PSU post-doctoral fellows are currently classified as Research Associates. This does not recognize that post docs are trainees. It also triggers contributions to PERS accounts, while the system requires 5 years to become vested, so that post docs on 1-3 year appointments can not claim the funds. PSU has a very small number of post docs because the position is prohibitively expensive. The solution is a to create a category that recognizes that they are more like graduate students and aligns with the NSF definition of post doctoral fellow. It would mirror OSU practice. (See attachment B4 slides.)

BLEILER/MAGALDI MOVED the PROPOSAL, as published in “E.3.”

LUCKETT asked whether post-doctoral fellows would be members of the PSU-AAUP Bargaining Unit, what their FTE was, and if have a teaching load. LEHMAN said current post docs research full-time with no teaching load; “fellows” would not be AAUP members. KARAVANIC asked what would dictate their benefits package. LEHMAN said they would have health care benefits following NSF guidance. DONLON (for COTRELL) asked if there had been legal analysis of the proposal, noting that OSU does not have a collective bargaining unit. PADIN highlighted two issues--the loss of retirement funds to the system, and the wish for a less expensive arrangement--and asked if colleagues had thought about ways for their post-doctoral appointees to have the benefit of retirement contributions. LEHMAN replied that faculty mentors would not be mandated to contribute to a retirement account; but post docs could choose to
make their own contributions. TAYLOR wanted the time to talk to his district about the implications of the proposal; he noted that post-docs who take other positions in Oregon after their appointment can recoup the retirement credit. LEHMAN argued the proposal mainly targeted individuals who would move on in academia. LEHMAN’s colleague John Perona stated that the proposal was about more than cost; post-docs fellows would be mentored and benefit from career guidance. GREENSTADT asked how the hypothetical savings would be used. LEHMAN said it would go towards creating new post-doc positions.

LIEBMAN asked if the title “trainee” was legitimate under the OARs. MCBRIDE clarified that although the presentation referenced “trainee,” the senators proposing the motion had agreed that the position would be called “fellow.” EVERETT, Dean of Graduate Studies, stated that the title “fellow” was approved and underscored that placing post-docs in the training category would ensure that they would continue to have developmental experiences. Graduate students could also benefit from a program organized for post docs. GEORGE pointed out that NSF recognizes post-doc fellows as a separate category and requires a mentoring plan for them. KENNEDY asked what protections post docs would lose, if not covered by the AAUP contract. LEHMAN said that they anticipate that a contract will be written for every fellow appointed in adherence with NSF guidelines. The category will only affect the positions of new, entering post docs. BLUFFSTONE requested time to confer with constituents to see if more detail is needed about the administrative structure. SANTELMANN noted that nothing in the proposal prohibited union membership. She added that as a former post-doc, she saw greater protection for fellows, because they are mandated to have their own research agenda and receive mentoring; someone hired as a Research Associate had no such guarantees.

TAYLOR/LUCKETT MOVED to POSTPONE the vote.

The Motion to POSTPONE was REJECTED by a vote of 22 to 21.

MCBRIDE called for a vote on the proposal.

The PROPOSAL to create a new title of Post-doctoral Fellow, as published in “E3” PASSED by a majority voice vote.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

1. Questions for Administrators

Dean Beatty read her response to the question from Senator Randall regarding Summer School hiring practices into the record. (See minutes attachment B5.)

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None
G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

President’s Report

WIEWEL noted that during the transition to its new governing board, PSU may extend its current strategic plan for a year or so beyond its expiration date of 2014. Discussions about program array review and academic priorities could feed into creating a new strategic plan. He added that the current plan did reference the academic priorities developed prior to his arrival at PSU.

Turning to fund raising efforts, WIEWEL announced donations of $19.2 million, a 27% increase over the first half of FY 2013, and a PSU Business Accelerator company “Open Sesame” received over $8 million in venture capital. In December, Senator Merkley introduced legislation to pilot a “Pay it Forward” college tuition plan inspired by a PSU Capstone. WIEWEL noted that enrollment and research funding have been flat, but non-resident enrollment is up about 6%, adding some funds to cushion cuts. The trend towards declining enrollment in many units is of concern, but applications for 2014-15 are trending well. Enrollment Management is aiming to make admissions decisions within 10 business days. PSU submitted a request to the Legislature for funds to renovate and expand the old Extended Studies Building to relocate the School of Education there. On January 30, the new PSU Board had its first business meeting and will soon take up budget requests for the next biennium.

Provost’s Report

ANDREWS introduced the new Dean of the School of Social Work, Laura Nissen, and thanked the CPL Project Team for their efforts.

Recalling the January Senate straw poll in support of an ad hoc committee to explore program array review, ANDREWS announced that the President’s Advisory Committee would convene the committee, with a charge based on the recommendations of the Senate Steering Committee, i.e.:

- to identify and investigate approaches used at other campuses;
- to recommend a framework for PSU;
- to determine a timeline and representation on review committee(s);
- to define “program” and recommend the scope of review.

This committee of 4 faculty and 2 administrators will report back to the Senate in March and April, and have recommendations for May. She encouraged senators to respect the work that they will do and give feedback to the committee early in the process. The Provost Office will provide support for the ad hoc committee’s work.

ANDREWS stated that OAA had indicated last year that it wanted to wait to get to the whole package of motions and changes from Senate before giving approval for new faculty ranks. She and VP Carol Mack had reviewed the revised P&T Guidelines. They have a few edits to offer, based on the need for consistent language between sections and some points that need clarifying. She also noted that as of July 1 PSU will no longer be under the governance of OUS, but have its own board, and this might require changing some language. She emphasized that she did not anticipate that the new board will want to get involved in this, though it may wish to
clarify practice in the future. She intended to meet with the co-chairs of the P&T Revision Committee and Senate leadership to review language. Any changes would come back to the Senate for confirmation. Departments with concerns about implementing the new guidelines should contact Vice Provost Carol Mack.

LIEBMAN: In past practice the governing board recommends and the campuses vote what’s right for them. Will we have the opportunity for a back and forth consultation with the new Board?

ANDREWS: Yes, a lot of back and forth. The State Higher Ed Board held hearings and open sessions for input and comment which our Board will also have. The Senate Presiding Officer presents at Board Meetings.

ANDREWS concluded her report with announcement that Provost Challenge project updates are available on the web site. PSU would be working with area community colleges to develop clear pathways and course articulation at the program level.

Report of Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships

Vice-President Fink was out of town. He asked Associate VP Mark Sytsma to deliver an update on PSU’s International Research Collaborations. SYTSMA offered to submit the slides of his presentation with some additional notes for the record. (See minutes attachment B6.)

Semi-annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee

TEUSCHER reported on the implementation of the Travel Fund lottery and the Committee’s intention to introduce two further changes that it had recommended in its 2012-13 report: 1) a 2-year waiting period before faculty given awards could reapply, and 2) the requirement that PIs with significant external funding provide additional justification for their requests for Faculty Development funding. (See minutes attachment B7.)


Presiding Officer McBride accepted the IAB Report, modified on January 31, 2014. (The amended version is attached, item B8.)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:26 pm.
PC#92: Credit for Prior Learning
Presentation to PSU Faculty Senate
February 3, 2014

PURPOSE OF THIS PRESENTATION
• Present our approach and response to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) standards
• Offer an updated project timeline
• Share the current perceptions faculty & chairs have about CPL

HECC STANDARDS
• Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning
• Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment
• Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure
• Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription
• Standard 5: Data Collection and Reporting
• Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development
• Standard 7: Oversight
• Standard 8: Transparency/Access

Process for Collecting Comments on HECC Standards
• Provost invited Project Team to provide feedback on HECC standards.
• HECC Standards document was posted for review by the entire campus community on PC#92 Google Site on November 27, 2013.
• Senators on the team were asked to invite district members and other senators and departmental and administrative colleagues to read the standards and post questions and comments by December 9, 2013.
• Team members provided their comments about the standards on December 10, 2013.
• Project Lead and Project Manager synthesized information and submitted the team response to the Provost’s office on December 16, 2014.
• Provost reviewed comments and forwarded to HECC leadership on December 17, 2013.
• HECC will review institutional feedback in January 2014 and issue Final CPL Standards in February 2014.

Summary of Comments
• Differentiating between learning outcomes and competencies as they relate to CPL.
• Affirming the role of faculty expertise in program administration, implementation, and CPL assessment standards and practices.
• Emphasizing sustainable tuition policies to ensure CPL is an affordable and accessible option for students.
• Increasing clarity and simplicity in transcripting and defining different types of CPL credits.
• Ensuring the sustainability of the program over the long term in the areas of administration, faculty education, and financial support.

UPDATED TIMELINE: WINTER 2013-14
• Develop CPL policies for PSU and seek input and approval from Faculty Senate.
• Prepare recommendations for an outcomes-based practice framework for CPL for review by PC#92 team.
• Design assessment model for review by PC#92 team.
• Identify implementation methodologies for review by PC#92 team.
• Create goals and guidelines for spring term field testing.

VISIT OUR PROJECT GOOGLE SITE
https://sites.google.com/a/pdx.edu/rethink92-cpl-3/

REPORT: FOCUS GROUPS
“ReThink PSU #92: Giving Credit Where Credit is Due”

Executive summary of data from faculty/department chair focus groups
*Prepared by Pete Collier, PSU Sociology Department*

Executive summary of data from faculty/department chair focus groups
Each discussion focused on
• experiences with current PSU process of awarding CPL
• potential benefits and challenges/concerns with PSU’s plan to increase the frequency and facilitate the process of awarding CPL
• ideas about how to make the proposed increase in awarding CPL attractive to department chairs
• suggestions for encouraging faculty buy-in re proposed increase in awarding CPL
• CPL-related issues associated with the increase in MOOCS
• important advice for administrators and ReThink project based on focus group discussion

Major higher order points
• There is a lack of clarity among faculty members and chairs as to what actually constitutes credit for prior learning.
• PSU needs to clarify what it is trying to maximize – Seat Credit Hours or speed of student pass-through.
• Need to address the issue of “waiving requirements based on past experiences” compared to “awarding credits based on prior experiences.” Don’t produce the same effects.
• Need to separate the use of a portfolio/e-portfolio from the larger issue of increasing the amount of CPL PSU awards.
Findings across all 4 focus groups:

Potential benefits of increasing awarding of CPL

- faster time to graduation for students consensus
- potentially less costly for students consensus
- could serve as a recruitment tool for programs
- could make room in bottle-neck classes
- could allow students to focus more on upper division courses once they arrive at PSU
- could provide opportunities for community members

Potential concerns with increasing awarding of CPL

- potential loss of SCH and teaching positions consensus
- lack of resources, includes faculty and staff workload and compensation issues consensus
- legitimacy of process; do correctly w/faculty oversight consensus
- how to determine quality of previous experiences and if student submitting experience–based work actually did work
- need to maintain quality of PSU degrees
- too many issues with figuring out how to award credit for MOOCS at this time

Advice to administrators and ReThink project on CPL

NOTE: Consensus on each point

- Faculty need to determine
  - what kinds of experience counts for CPL,
  - what are the criteria used to determine if something is worthy of being awarded CPL, and
  - which courses their particular department will allow CPL to be awarded for.

- Need for high quality, rigorous evaluation
- Departments and faculty need to be compensated for work of designing exams and reviewing student materials; needs to be built into FTE with formal policies to standardize the process
Budget Committee Report, Feb. 2014

Ron Babcock, Steven Balogh, Mirela Blekic, Michael Bowman (chair), Mitch Cruzan, Michele Gamburd, Jonathon Gates, David Hansen, Courtney Hanson, Jim Hook, Cheryl Livneh, Robert Mercer, Michael Murphy, Eva Nuñez, Jill Rissi, Michael Taylor, Martha Works + our consultants

Committee Activities

- Learning & discussing budgeting, RCAT, PBB, enrollment trends & the FY15 budget
- Reviewing program & unit proposals
- Line-item, All-funds budget
- Getting involved at the college/school level
- Discussing Summer
- FY15 budget principles
- Involvement in the FY15 budget process

College/School Level

- Revenue enhancement & cut proposals start here
- Little contact between Senate & the Deans
- Attempt to learn more & to influence proposals
- Also attempting to broaden the scope

Summer

- Nationwide trend of declining summer enrollment, online class enrollments are up
- PSU declined 7% last year, 8% the prior year. Decline tracks academic enrollment patterns
- Fewer students in cancelled Summer classes enrolled in the same class later than had been anticipated
- Summer now handled on a college & dept. level
**FY15 Budget Principles**

- Traditional role of the Budget Committee in the annual budget process
- Distributed to ALT to consider while developing & evaluating budget proposals
- Available at [bit.ly/1d3M1Mt](bit.ly/1d3M1Mt)

**Principles Highlights**

- Prioritize student success & academic student services
- Balance investment & support for each level of student, with attention to transfer students
- Engage faculty at all levels on budget and quality
- Transparent process at all levels
- Focus on net between revenues & expenditures and need an outward facing look at market forces. Need to understand program cycles and take a long view

---

**OAA Budget Process**

- Start with FY14 anticipated expenditures & subtract OAA’s target ($5.4m), money for unanticipated enrollment ($0.15m) & money for School of Public Health startup ($0.5m) = Z
- Each college/school asked for plans for cuts (x) and revenue enhancement (y) to meet across-the-board targets (Z)
- ALT will discuss & choose to meet the overall target (end result will not be across-the-board)

**OAA Budget Timeline**

- 2/5 – ALT discussion of enrollment management plans (revenue enhancement) (Committee 2/7)
- 2/17 – Deans submit budget templates (cuts)
- 2/19 – ALT discusses collated templates (Committee 2/21)
- 3/5 – Provost’s first pass
- 3/18 – Presented to President’s ExComm
Recall:
Some budget principle highlights
• Prioritize student success and academic student services
• Balance investment and support for each level of student with attention to transfer students
• Engage faculty at all levels on budget and quality

University Strategic Plan
2011-2014
• Provide Civic Leadership Through Partnerships
• Improve Student Success
• Achieve Global Excellence
• Enhance Educational Opportunity
• Expand Resources and Improve Effectiveness

Performance-Based Budgeting:
Basic principles
• Strategic Plan with objectives based on public/institutional values
• Performance measures based on strategic plans, with systematic measures of outcomes
• Objectives and performance measures must be linked
• Accountability based on outcomes
The view from the air:
Institutional academic priorities

• Priorities of the budget process include:
  – Student success, support and quality
• Strategic plan includes:
  – Student success, excellence, educational opportunity, civic leadership
• Performance-based budgeting requires:
  – Strategic plan with priorities based on institutional values

The view from the air:
What are PSU’s academic priorities?

• Strategic plan: Academic priorities vague;
  – Student success = graduation, retention, satisfaction, and engagement.
• Budgeting: Fiscal priorities clear; academic priorities not
  – SCH & income needs are clear
  – Fiscal goals are easy to measure
  – What other priorities are being used for budgeting decisions?

The view from the ground:
INTL/LING 471/571

• INTL/LING 471/571 Understanding the International Experience
  – Intercultural communication theory
  – Interdisciplinary & cross-listed (45 students)
  – Required for International Studies Majors, TESL Certificate Majors, MA TESOL students
  – Demonstrable impact on students’ intercultural competence & awareness
• WIC Designation (with 45 students!)

INTL/LING 471/571:
Impact of eliminating WIC TA

• INTL and LING paid for grader
  – Administrators in each department spent time negotiating how much of the grader each would pay
• Grader worked ½ the number of hours of a TA
• One writing assignment was removed; one reading assignment also removed for 571
• Reading assignments were not tracked
INTL/LING 471/571: Impact of WIC budgeting decision

- Much less interaction with grader than the TA
- Added stress for students
  - Less feedback and scaffolding
  - Less training for peer feedback
  - Weaker differentiation for graduate students
- Added stress for faculty
  - Tripled grading workload
  - Less time for meeting individual student needs
- “Qualitatively different experience”

The view from the ground and the current budget process

- The implementation of the budget still prioritizes SCH & income
- Academic priorities & quality are easily lost

Focus on income puts academic priorities at a disadvantage

- Disincentive:
  - to cross-list classes, especially across colleges
  - for cross-disciplinary work/learning
  - for support courses, e.g., BA 101 + int’l students
- Unequal burden on service courses & programs
  - e.g., Writing, Math, World Languages, IELP serve students in all colleges, but supported by CLAS
- Curriculum decisions being made based on budgetary, not academic priorities?
  - UG curriculum committee: major shift from 400 to 300 level courses

Discussion: Goals

- To (begin to) create a set of faculty-driven academic priorities for the university
  - For strategic planning
  - For budgeting
  - For assessment
  - For prioritization and investment
- To ensure awareness of academic priorities at all levels of decision making
Discussion questions

- What are our academic priorities as a faculty and institution?
- How do we make sure we are investing resources to support our academic priorities?

Finally

- Please discuss this with your constituents and send me ideas, questions and comments.
- santelmannl@pdx.edu
Post-doctoral Trainees at Portland State University

Senate sponsors: Linda George (ESM)
Erik Sánchez (Physics)
Sarah Eppley (Biology)

Faculty presenters: Niles Lehman
John Perona (Chemistry)

The Problem

At PSU, new post-docs are categorized as research associates meaning:
1. They are not properly recognized
2. Their faculty mentors must contribute* to their PERS accounts

NOTES:
- Post-docs usually cannot benefit from this, because the PERS vesting period is five years
- This costs grants about $10,000 per year, making the hiring of post-docs at PSU expensive, prohibitively so in most cases
- These contributions usually come from federal grant sources, which is an improper use of these funds

The Solution

Create a new rank of "post-doctoral trainee", designating individuals who conduct research under the auspices of a faculty member, hold a doctoral degree, and are appointed for a limited term of less than five years.

NOTES:
1. This categorizes post-docs more akin to graduate students*
2. This solution was adopted by OSU in 2007
3. This will foster greater research potential at PSU

*The following is the official definition of a post-doc adopted by BOTH the NSF and the NIH:

An individual who has received a doctoral degree (or equivalent) and is engaged in a temporary and defined period of mentored advanced training to enhance the professional skills and research independence needed to pursue his or her chosen career path. (emphasize added)
Question for College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean Susan Beatty Faculty Senate January 2014 meeting

CLAS fourth quarter (summer) department budgets have been cut by well over 50% in many departments compared with two years ago at the same time student enrollment expectations remain constant. These decisions have meant that most departments hire no tenure track faculty members in the summer, rely almost exclusively on lower cost adjunct faculty members and offer few or no advanced courses. Such staffing and curricular decisions are very different from the rest of the year and from past practice.

Why is the fourth quarter budget being cut so aggressively? Do you envision summer session in the future as being the time for courses taught largely by adjunct faculty members? What about students needing to take courses that should or must be taught by tenure track faculty members?

Answer read before Faculty Senate, February 3, 2014 by Dean Beatty:

Thank you Senator Bluffstone for raising these questions and for providing me the opportunity to respond. It is clear that we all share a desire to act responsibly and in the interests of our students. I will do my best to address the concerns reflected in your questions by providing information about who will be teaching in the summer as well as what will be taught and the context for actions taken. In summer 2013, the first year that CLAS was responsible for managing the summer term, 25% of the classes were taught by tenure related faculty, 53% fixed term and 22% adjuncts. In summer 2014, we anticipate that approximately one third or 31% of the classes will be taught by tenure related faculty, 35% will be taught by fixed term faculty and 34% will be taught by adjuncts. In summer 2013 65% of the CRN’s were at the upper division and graduate level, a drop of 5% over the prior year.

There was a 24% budget reduction from summer 2012 (when summer was managed by XSS) to summer 2013 (when summer was managed by CLAS). For summer 2014, we anticipate a 15% decrease. I do not want to minimize the degree or impact of any of these summer cuts, but a similar number of dollars cut during the regular academic year would result in an estimated four-fold greater loss of SCH than in summer.

The planning of budget efficiencies is not unique to the summer or peculiar to CLAS. Some of our departments elected to shift resources from summer to the AY because of the greater student need evidenced in these terms. Decisions about what is taught and who should teach have been and continue to be made by the departments, and will continue to include a mix of faculty. We ask departments to follow similar practices in summer as we do in the three other terms, which include small course management, offering courses that will enroll to capacity, and using faculty resources wisely to meet curricular needs.

All cuts, whether they occur in the summer or the regular academic year, are difficult, and we always work to use our resources to serve students in the best way we can.
• PSU received an analysis of international research collaborations Brad Fenwick, former VPR at U Tennessee, now a VP with Elsevier.

• This is a brief analysis using the Scopus database, which contains 50 million records from 21,000 titles and 5,000 publishers [http://www.elsevier.com/online-tools/scopus].

• It looks at over 3300 PSU peer-reviewed publications from 2009-2013.
Annotations for the attached slides:

Slide 2.
This slide illustrates the disciplinary distribution of 3,306 publications by 1,912 PSU faculty from 2009-2014. Those publications were cited 13,491 times. The disciplinary breakdown doesn’t map exactly onto PSU departments or colleges. We may be able to work with Brad to fine tune the reporting to allow us to better understand our strengths. However, the generally balanced distribution is typical of relatively young research universities that don’t have a major amount of specialization. The topical areas with the most publications are not necessarily those with the most research dollars.

Slide 3
This slide about collaborations shows the number of PSU publications that included collaborators from other countries (28.5%), other institutions in the U.S. (33.6%), others in PSU (25.3%), and single authorship (12.6%). Note that the citations per publication are substantially higher for publications with collaborators than for single authored papers. If citation rate is a measure of quality, this suggests that emphasis on single-authored papers in P&T review may be a biased measure of the contribution of a faculty member to the discipline. On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect that junior faculty will have had fewer opportunities to meet potential collaborators from overseas. The lower part of the slide shows that PSU has relatively few publications written in collaboration with industry members, and the ones we do have are cited less than our non-corporate papers. This is not the norm for more research-active institutions, where papers written with corporate partners tend to be the most heavily cited, followed by international collaborations, national, intra-PSU, and solo author papers. Brad suggested that the number of publications with corporate collaborators (4%) is low relative to other universities, which are typically around 10%. This also has implication for impact of our research, as noted on the next slide.

Slide 4.
This slide shows the impact of publications with different types of collaboration at several, selected universities. Note that corporate collaborations consistently result in higher impact. The citation impact factor used here is a “field-weighted citation impact (FWCI) factor,” which Brad suggests is more useful than other measures of impact. It includes consideration of the age of the paper (presumably older papers will have more citations) and the activity in the field. For example, there are very few papers published on the management of aquatic vascular plants every year and therefore low citation rates for scholarship in this field. In contrast, there are many people working on protein structure and synthesis and consequently many more opportunities for citation. However, we do not have access to the exact algorithm used by Elsevier to calculate the FWCI.

Slide 5
The FWCI for the entire world is set at 1. This figure illustrates how collaboration influences FWCI for publication from selected countries. These countries are relatively small and highly innovative and therefore may be more likely to have international and/or corporate collaborators. Note, however, that corporate and international collaboration gives papers from authors in these countries significantly greater impact.

Slide 6
This slide benchmarks the change in PSU’s international collaborations against the world. Our international collaborations are increasing at a slightly greater rate than the world average. The world average includes many poorly funded universities from developing countries, and thus represents a low bar for comparison.
Returns on Types of Collaboration

Data Source: Scopus via Refinitiv Data Analytics Portal
This slide benchmarks PSU international collaborations against several other similar ‘urban-serving’ universities (not all are our generally accepted comparators, but similar). We are keeping pace with these other universities in growing our international collaborations. This has occurred with limited strategic thinking about how to grow research collaborations. Could we increase the rate of collaboration, and the impact of our research, with some thoughtful investment?

This figure shows the number of collaborating institutions where PSU authors had collaborators in various regions.

This table shows the top collaborating institutions for PSU faculty. Note that the top collaborators are generally local. The small colored arrows indicate whether the collaboration is increasing or decreasing.

Tsinghua University (“the MIT of China”) is our top collaborating institution in that country, in terms of the number of coauthored publications with PSU faculty. Most of these are in Computer Science and Engineering. The strong collaborative relationships we have with nearby OHSU, OSU, UW, WSU, Intel, and UO is also typical of a younger research university. If one looked at UW, the schools they work most closely with probably are spread all over the world.

This table shows the top collaborating institutions in the Asia Pacific region. Note that the greatest number of coauthored publications were with collaborators at Tsinghua, but that papers resulting from collaboration with Peking University received more citations. In many fields, these are two of the top three universities in China.

This provides some detail on the Tsinghua collaborations. About ¼ of the joint publications with PSU faculty are in Computer Science and Engineering. 40 PSU authors collaborated with 12 Tsinghua authors in the past five years. The FWCI was >1, therefore the “quality” of the publications was greater than the world average.

There are a lot of institutions in China that PSU has not collaborated with in the past.

This table narrows down the list of potential collaborating institutions in China based on a matching of the disciplinary focus showed for PSU in the first slide. Of these potential collaborators, two have FWCI >1, are therefore producing presumably high-quality papers, and could be the target of efforts to increase the number of collaborations with Chinese universities. This research productivity information could be leveraged in a targeted way to increase the number of nonresident students coming from China to PSU. For instance, administrators from PSU visiting a university in China to recruit students could show some of these tables and graphs as a way to entice “better” Chinese universities to pay us more attention.
This analysis was a cursory one, but it illustrates the power of the analytics that can be done with access to large databases of research information.

How can PSU use this type of information to provide direction and focus to our internationalization efforts?

How can these kinds of data help us better define the quality and impact of our research?
Faculty Development Committee
Intermediate Report
Faculty Senate Meeting, Feb 3, 2014
Christof Teuscher, chair
Portland State University
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE)
Department of Computer Science (CS)
Systems Science Graduate Program (SySc)
www.teuscher-lab.com | teuscher@pdx.edu

Overview

- Travel:
  - Policies and procedures
  - Statistics
- Faculty Enhancement:
  - Policies and procedures
- Funding situation:
  - The administration has agreed to fund the faculty development program at the same level as last year ($250k for travel, $500k for enhancement).

Travel Program: Policies and Procedures

- Lottery-based system
  - Simple
  - Efficient
  - Fair
- PSU travel authorization
  - No more chair approval, but travel application needs to be approved.
  - We fund total travel amount minus matching.
- Lottery is biased by:
  - Previous travel awards
  - Paper/poster presentation (or performance/exhibition)
  - Details published on travel website. We adjust the numbers for each round, depending on the number of submissions we get.

Travel 2012-2014

![Graph showing travel funding from 2012 to 2014]
Travel 2012-2014

Faculty Enhancement: Policies and Procedures
- 2-year waiting period
- Extra justification if PI has significant funding.
- Award duration is 2 years.
- Updated scoring rubric.
- Submission deadline: Fri, Mar 28, 2014, 5:00pm
- Award notifications: week of May 5, 2014.
- Info session: Feb 10, 2-3pm, MCB 316

Faculty Enhancement Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max. points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact of the research on the PI's career development, professional</td>
<td>40 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development, or scholarly agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of the proposed research on the PI's field.</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How realistic is the project scope and timeline? Can it be accomplished</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in two years? Are the outcomes and deliverables of the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research clearly specified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How appropriate is the budget and the budget justification with regards</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the proposed research? Are all budget items clearly justified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the broader impact of the project? i.e.: Does it involve</td>
<td>15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students? Does it have an impact on the local community and on PSU?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this project lead into a new research direction? Will the PI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek further funding? Does the PI leverage PSU resources? Total</td>
<td>100 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB)

Semi-Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Winter Term

January 6, 2014

IAB Members 2013-14 Academic Year

Chair: Toeutu Faaleava, UNST, OAA-McNair
Melissa Trifiletti, ADM
Randy Miller, PSC
Robin Beavers, ADM
Marlon Holmes, Student
Tyler Spencer, Student

Ex-officio Members
Monica Rimai, Vice President of Finance and Administration
Professor Robert Lockwood, C&CJ and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative
Torre Chisholm, Athletics Director
Valerie Cleary, Associate Athletics Director, Senior Woman Administrator (SWA)

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

Budget

The Intercollegiate Athletics budget for FY14 is $13,618,610. This includes $3,067,000 in fee
remission support; $2,263,901 in education and general funding; and $3,702,409 in incidental
student fee support. Primary expenses are scholarships at $4,230,000 and personnel at
$5,101,110.

President Wim Wiewel notified Athletics and the PSU community in December 2013 that
starting in FY15, PSU Football must operate as a self-support program. However, the program
will continue to receive university fee remissions. It is anticipated that direct and related
football expenses for FY14 will exceed football related revenues by approximately $800,000.
The President has directed Athletics to develop a plan to implement this policy. As a result, it is
expected that education and general funding to Athletics will be reduced to approximately $1,500,000 for FY15. Athletics’ initial request to the SFC is for $3,677,096, which represents a modest decrease from FY14. It is anticipated that Athletics will account for the reduction in direct institutional support and student fees by playing an additional football guarantee-game versus a PAC-12 opponent, and by implementing further spending reductions in football.

Athletics Performance

Basketball season has begun and the Men’s team is 5-7, while the Women’s team is 4-10 as of 01/15/2014. Athletic teams had a mostly successful Fall sports season. Women’s Soccer and Women’s Volleyball both won Big Sky Conference Regular Season Championships. Football posted a 6-6 record, a 3 game improvement over the previous season. Men’s and Women’s Cross Country made improvements, including Sarah Dean recording PSU’s best ever conference meet performance. Women’s Golf completed the fall portion of their season, winning the New Mexico State tournament under new Head Coach Kailin Downs. Softball also debuted under a new Head Coach, Barb Sherwood, going 5-1 in the Fall, including a win over Oregon.

Academic Performance

Student-athletes posted outstanding academic performances over the past year. The most recent Federal Graduation Rates (FDR) were published with PSU’s student-athletes scoring 69% for the most recent data measured, compared to 60% last year. Additionally, the NCAA has certified PSU’s Academic Performance Ratings (APR) for the 2012-13 season. The program average is 968 and no teams are subject to penalties.

Compliance Manual

Matt Billings and Dana Cappelucci of the Compliance Office have completed a draft of the PSU Athletics Compliance Manual. IAB approved the manual at its meeting on December 17, 2013. This manual fulfills one of the commitments PSU Athletics made as part of the OUS Audit process last summer. The completion of this manual is an important step in our ever-expanding rules education and culture of compliance processes.

Academic Services Philosophy and Responsibilities

IAB also approved at its December 17, 2013 meeting PSU Athletics’ Academic Services Philosophy and Responsibilities standing procedures and policy that clarify Academic Services’ responsibilities and duties.
Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)
Academic Policy Recommendations

What is CPL?
Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) typically refers to 5 distinct types or ways of earning credit for demonstrated student learning outside of the traditional classroom:

- **PSU Challenge Exams** - exams developed and administered locally by academic departments to allow students to test out of certain PSU courses. (May result in credit awards, or degree requirements being waived.)
- **Credit-by-Exam** - credit awarded for certain scores on nationally normed, standardized exams administered by third party organizations such as Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and International Baccalaureate (IB).
- **Recommendation Services** - example; ACE recommendations for military service/training.
- **Prior Learning Assessment (PLA)** – portfolio based assessment process which allows students to provide narrative statements and documented evidence of prior learning. Faculty evaluate the portfolios and determine credit awards.
- **Industry Certifications** - credit awarded for completion of certain recognized industry training and certification programs.

History of CPL at PSU:
Currently, PSU awards three of the five types of CPL:
1) PSU Challenge Exams offered by several departments
2) Credit-by-Exam for AP, IB and CLEP exam scores, and
3) Credit for Military Service Training per ACE recommendations.

The practice of awarding this type of credit is longstanding at PSU and is common among colleges and universities of our type and size.

In 2005, the Faculty Senate approved the use of the PLA portfolio mechanism to assess learning outcomes and award institutional credit. The 2005 document contained administrative process details that were never implemented, and it did not address many of the academic policy implications and questions raised in this proposal. The purpose of the current effort is to build on and clarify the policy regarding portfolio assessment that was approved in 2005.

Purpose of the Motion Coming in April:
The motion coming in April seeks adoption of the following **CPL Academic Policy Statement**, which includes a set of 9 specific academic policies that will guide the award of the various types of CPL. These 9 policies specifically address how CPL will be recorded on the official PSU transcript; be treated with respect to various degree requirements; and be otherwise limited or restricted. Clarification and development of CPL policy with regard to the various types is necessary to support the work of the Provost Challenge # 92 CPL pilot programs launching in fall 2014, and to guide PSU as it responds to the new HECC standards and guidelines for increasing CPL options within Oregon universities and community colleges.
The policy recommendations below do not address assessment and evaluation methodologies, criteria, process and/or procedure, which are being addressed by other groups.

**Who developed these academic policy proposals?**
The initial policies were developed by the Policy sub-group of the Provost Challenge #92 Work Group, which includes among others, the chairs of Academic Requirements Committee (ARC), Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC), Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC). Members of the Policy committee are:

- Cindy Baccar, RO – Chair
- Steve Harmon, OAA
- Becki Ingersol, ACS and ARC member
- Liane O’Banion, Chair SSC
- Alan MacCormack, Chair ARC
- Robert Gould, Chair EPC
- Rachel Cunliffe, Chair UCC
- Deanna Smith, Financial Aid

**What process was used to inform policy development?**
The Policy sub-committee reviewed numerous resources comparing best practices at other institutions, including research provided by the Educational Advisory Board, and the draft standards for CPL issued by the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission. The policy issues were vetted with the ARC, SSC, EPC, UCC, and the Honors Council. Based on the Policy sub-group work, and the input from faculty focus groups facilitated by Pete Collier, the following *CPL Academic Policy Statement* was approved by the Provost Challenge #92 Steering Committee/Work Group for submission to Faculty Senate for approval.

**Questions Addressed by the Policy Statement:**
- Which courses are eligible for CPL?
- How will CPL be recorded on PSU official transcripts?
- How will CPL be graded?
- Can CPL be used to repeat a D or F grade?
- Does CPL count in meeting the PSU residence credit requirement?
- Are there limitations on degree applicability within the Major or UNST?
- Are there any admission & enrollment status requirements?
- Does CPL credit count in establishing UNST placement?
- Is there a limit on the amount of CPL that can be awarded to a student?

**Motion Coming in April:** A motion, sponsored by the chairs of APC, EPC, UCC, and SSC will be presented in April to approve the following *CPL Academic Policy Statement*.

**CPL and Financial Aid**
None of the CPL types are eligible for federal Financial Aid.
CPL Academic Policy Statement

Key Presumptions:
These policy recommendations presume that each academic unit, as designated by course prefix, will determine whether any of the various types of CPL options are appropriate for credit within their discipline, and for which particular courses. It also presumes that necessary administrative support and resources will be available to guide the student and department through the process.

Which courses are eligible for CPL?
Policy Recommendation #1:
CPL can be awarded for any discrete numbered course in any subject area that PSU offers, including course numbers 100-level through 400-level, at departmental discretion. CPL cannot be awarded in subject areas/academic disciplines that PSU does not offer.

Comments:
This policy raised considerable diversity of opinion, with some advocating to limit CPL to discrete numbered courses, and others to broaden it to allow omnibus numbered credit awards. ARC in particular was concerned about making a decision to include omnibus numbered courses, prior to fully understanding how the portfolio review process will work. Based on input from the Steering Committee and feedback from Pete Collier’s work with faculty focus groups, the recommendation is to limit CPL awards to discrete numbered courses which should have well defined learning outcomes established, having received full curricular review.

How will CPL be recorded on PSU official transcripts?
Policy Recommendation #2:
AP, IB, CLEP and MIL credit, like transfer credit will not be included on the official PSU transcript.
PSU Exam and Portfolio credit, like institutional credit will be included on the official PSU transcript.

Comments:
*Third party evaluations - treated as transfer credit.*
Certain types of CPL, such as standardized exams (CLEP, AP, IB) and military credit (awarded per ACE recommendations), in which the credit award is based on accepting third party administered tests and evaluation/assessment, will be treated as “transfer” credit and will not be included on the official PSU institutional transcript. This type of CPL award will be available to the DARS degree audit system and will be recognized in the Banner registration system to meet prerequisites for registration. *This is current practice for these types of credit.*
*PSU faculty evaluations - treated as PSU institutional credit.*
Other types of CPL, such as PSU challenge exams and PLA portfolio based credit (measures TBD by the assessment working group), in which credit is awarded by PSU administered testing and in-house evaluation/assessment based on PSU curriculum standards/learning outcomes, will be recorded as PSU institutionally awarded credit on the official PSU transcript. CPL will be labeled on the PSU transcript so that receiving institutions can easily identify CPL in transfer.

| **How will CPL be graded?** |
| **Policy Recommendation #3:** |
| CPL is limited to Pass only grading. If the CPL review process results in a non-award of credit, no record will be entered on the transcript. PLA portfolio and PSU Exam credit will be counted in the current 45 credit P/NP limit. AP, CLEP, IB and MIL credits will continue to be exempt from the 45 credit P/NP limit. |

Comment:
Although there was broad agreement by the Policy group that CPL grading should be Pass and not A-F, there was vigorous discussion and examination of this issue by the combined Steering and larger Work Group. The P-Only proponents felt that the workload required for faculty to accurately and consistently assign A-F delineated grading would be overly burdensome. Student members of the workgroup felt that P-grading was appropriate, and the feedback from the faculty focus groups was overwhelmingly in favor of P-only grading. The A-F proponents had some concern that limiting CPL to P-grades would diminish the value of CPL in some way, or eliminate the possibility of these credits counting for major requirements, which often requires A-F grading. The committee concluded that exceptions to such restrictions in the major can be made by the academic units as appropriate by working with the Registrar’s Office and the DARS system (for example: allowing a Pass to be used toward certain major requirements).

| **Can CPL be used to repeat a D or F grade?** |
| **Policy Recommendation #4:** |
| CPL cannot be used to repeat (i.e. replace the gpa effect) of a D or F grade. |

Comment:
The current repeat policy prevents replacing a D/F grade with a Pass grade. Since the proposal is for CPL to be restricted to Pass-only grading, as described in #3, it follows that CPL credits cannot be used to replace D/F grades under the repeat policy.

| **Does CPL count in meeting the PSU residence credit requirement?** |
| **Policy Recommendation #5:** |
| CPL will not count toward the necessary residence credits, nor will it interrupt the calculation of the requirement that “45 of the last 60 credits must be at PSU”. |

Comment:
There was strong consensus that CPL should be residency neutral.
**Are there limitations on degree applicability within the Major or UNST?**

**Policy Recommendation #6:**
CPL can be used in all areas of the baccalaureate degree requirements, unless it is restricted in a major by a particular academic unit.

**Comments:**
The general view is that the academic department controls whether CPL can apply to their major requirements since they will control the degree to which they offer CPL credit options. The combined Steering/Larger Work Group agreed that the CPL policy should not categorically exclude the University Studies program courses. The UNST Council in collaboration with the UNST department will determine to what extent it is appropriate to develop CPL options for the UNST general education program.

**Are there any admission & enrollment status requirements?**

**Policy Recommendation #7:**
- AP/IB/CLEP/MIL credit will be evaluated and awarded as transfer credit at the time of admission, prior to matriculation/enrollment.
- PSU Exam credit requires the student to be admitted and matriculated/enrolled.
- PLA, portfolio based CPL requires the students to be admitted, matriculated/enrolled, and in good academic standing.

**Comments:**
There was clear consensus that PLA portfolio credit, which requires a strong commitment of faculty/institutional time and resources, should be promoted as an option or pathway for PSU *degree seeking students*, rather than being promoted as an assessment service to prospective students and non-degree seeking students. The combined Steering/Larger Workgroup considered the original suggestion that Portfolio based CPL be allowed only after the student had accumulated at least 12 credits at PSU. In the end, this stipulation was dropped based on concerns that it might limit students who need to earn CPL for a course during their first term, so that it will serve as a prerequisite for courses in the second term.

**Does CPL credit count in establishing UNST placement?**

**Policy Recommendation #8:**
PSU Exam and Portfolio type PLA credit will not be used to establish UNST placement. AP/IB/CLEP/MIL type CPL credit will continue to be used to establish UNST placement.

**Comment:**
There was strong consensus on this point related to portfolio PLA and PSU Exam options. Recommendation #7 limits the PLA portfolio and PSU Exam credit to post-admission. Recommendation #2 treats these two types as Institutional credit on the PSU transcript. Based on the fact that UNST placement is set at the point of admission, and is based on transfer credit it follows that these two types of CPL would not be used in setting UNST placement.
Currently, AP/IB/CLEP/MIL credit DOES count in establishing UNST placement and should continue to do so since it is being treated as transfer credit, and being evaluated at the point of admission, as described in #2 and #7.

**Is there a limit on the amount of CPL that can be awarded to a student?**

**Policy Recommendation #9:**

There is no limit on the number of CPL credits a student can be awarded, although there are limitations on the number of credits that will be applied to the degree based on previous policy limitations, including P-grading limits in #3 and PSU Residency requirements in #5 above.

Comment:

The NWCCU accreditation body limits the use of CPL credit to 25% of credits required for degree, which at PSU is 45. PLA portfolio and PSU Exam credits, which are treated like institutional credits, are restricted by the 45-credit Pass limit referenced in #3 above. Therefore no more than 45 credits of PLA and PSU Exam credit can apply to the degree. AP, CLEP, IB and MIL are treated like transfer credit will continue to be limited by the PSU residency credit requirements.

---

**Addendum: Legislative Goals as Outlined in HB 4059**

from HECC House Bill 4059 Report, December 31, 2013

House Bill 4059 (HB 4059) passed by the 2012 Oregon Legislature requires the HECC to work with the State Board of Higher Education, community college districts, independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education and the for-profit career colleges to carry out the following goals:

(a) Increase the number of students who receive academic credit for prior learning and the number of students who receive academic credit that counts toward their major or toward earning their degree, certificate or credential, while ensuring that credit is awarded only for high quality course-level competencies;

(b) Increase the number and type of academic credits accepted for prior learning in institutions of higher education, while ensuring that credit is awarded only for high quality course-level competencies;

(c) Develop transparent policies and practices in awarding academic credit for prior learning to be adopted by the governing boards of public universities, community colleges and independent institutions of higher education;

(d) Improve prior learning assessment practices across all institutions of higher education;

(e) Create tools to develop faculty and staff knowledge and expertise in awarding academic credit for prior learning and to share exemplary policies and practices among institutions of higher education;

(f) Develop articulation agreements when patterns of academic credit for prior learning are identified for particular programs and pathways; and

(g) Develop outcome measures to track progress on the goals outlined in this section.

The bill also requires the HECC to submit an annual report on the progress associated with these goals to the Legislative Assembly no later than December 31 of each calendar year.
February 6, 2013

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier
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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

Graduate School of Education

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.1 • ESL/Bilingual Endorsement – change name to ESOL/Bilingual Endorsement
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.2 • Graduate Certificate in Analog and Microwave Circuit Design – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.3 • Graduate Certificate in Communication Systems – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.4 • Graduate Certificate in Computer Architecture and Design – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.5 • Graduate Certificate in Design Automation – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.6 • Graduate Certificate in Digital Design – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.7 • Graduate Certificate in Digital Signal Processing – eliminate program
FSBC comments: No budgetary impact
E.1.a.8
• Graduate Certificate in Energy Systems – eliminate program
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

E.1.a.9
• Graduate Certificate in Image Processing – eliminate program
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

E.1.a.10
• Graduate Certificate in Integrated Circuit Testing, Verification, and Validation – eliminate program
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

E.1.a.11
• Graduate Certificate in Laser and Optoelectronics – eliminate program
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

New Courses
E.1.a.12
• CE 554  Introduction to Multimodal Transportation Engineering Data Analysis, 4 credits
  An introduction to multimodal transportation engineering data sets through applied analysis and visualization techniques. Includes an overview of data types, techniques for graphical analysis of data, and exposure to common software and statistical tools and visualizations in transportation engineering. Prerequisites: graduate admission in Civil and Environmental Engineering.

E.1.a.13
• ECE 558  Embedded Systems Programming, 4 credits
  Equips students with the skills required to program modern embedded systems. Topics include object oriented and event-based programming, multi-tasking, advanced sensors, databases, location-based services, and networking. Heavily project-oriented, allowing students to acquire hands-on experiences based on the foundational material taught in the lectures. Prerequisites: ECE 485 or ECE 585. Expected preparation: CS 202 and/or experience with Object-Oriented programming and Java.

College of the Arts

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.14
• MA/MS Music – change to existing program; increase history requirement, decrease pedagogy requirement
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact. It is simply a swapping of pedagogy credits for history credits and electives. There are no new courses, faculty or resources needed. In fact, many of the pedagogy credits students needed had to come through "by arrangement" classes so the change will relieve the need for faculty to teach courses outside their load.
School of Social Work

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.a.15

• Master of Social Work – change to existing program; curriculum redesign
  FSBC comments: No budgetary impact

New Courses
E.1.a.16

• SW 515  Skills for the Helping Process – Groups, 3 credits
  Help students to develop assessment and intervention skills across multiple levels. Assess
types and stages of groups, roles, and group dynamics. Develop a group proposal. Learn how
to begin, facilitate, and end a group with clients, organizations, and communities.

Change to Existing Courses
E.1.a.17

• SW 500  Field Instruction I-VI – split into two courses; SW 511 Foundation Field Placement & Seminar, 4 credits, and SW 512 Advanced Field Placement, 4 credits
E.1.a.18

• SW 520  Social Work and Social Welfare Policy, 4 credits – change course title to Social Welfare History and Policy, change course descriptions, change credit hours to 3
E.1.a.19

• SW 530  Generalist Social Work Practice I, 3 credits – change course title to Skills for the Helping Process – Individuals and Families, change course description, change prereqs
E.1.a.20

• SW 531  Generalist Social Work Practice II, 4 credits – drop course
E.1.a.21

• SW 532  Generalist Social Work Practice III, 4 credits – change course title to Advocacy and Empowerment, change course description, change credit hours to 3, change prereqs
E.1.a.22

• SW 539  Social Justice in Social Work, 3 credits – change course description
E.1.a.23

• SW 540  Human Behavior in the Social Environment: Micro Theory, 3 credits – change course title to Human Development Thru the Lifespan, change course description, change prereqs
E.1.a.24

• SW 541  Human Behavior in the Social Environment: Macro Theory, 3 credits – change course title to Societal, Community and Organizational Structures and Processes, change course description, change prereqs
E.1.a.25

• SW 550  Foundations of Social Work Research, 3 credits – change course title to Research & Evaluation I, change course description
E.1.a.26

• SW 551  Data Analysis in Social Work Research, 3 credits – change course title to Research & Evaluation II, change course description
February 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier
Chair, Graduate Council

Rachel Cunliffe
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

*School of Business Administration* - *COURSES REMOVED FROM THE CURRICULAR CONSENT AGENDA (To be voted on with the new Certificates of Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship, item “E.2.”)

**New Courses**

**E.1.b.1.**

- MGMT 421/521s  Design Thinking for Social Innovation, 4 credits
  Engagement with the applied process of social problem analysis and solution development using principles of lean entrepreneurship and design thinking. Exposure to the dynamic and growing field of social innovation and social entrepreneurship through direct communication with leading global social innovators, research, analysis and practical application. Prerequisites: Sophomore standing or better, competitive PSU or transfer GPA (3.0 or higher with consideration made for special circumstances), and satisfactory completion of a short essay question. Prerequisites not required for graduate students.

**E.1.b.2.**

- MGMT 422/522s  Money Matters for Social Innovation, 4 credits
  Participants will learn how to assess market size, create a business model, evaluate and prepare common financial statements, develop nonprofit and for-profit budgets, and identify and utilize the best funding sources and legal forms for social ventures. Prerequisites: Mgmt 421/521s and sophomore standing or higher.

**E.1.b.3.**

- MGMT 423/523s  Storytelling and Impact Measurement for Social Innovation, 4 credits
  Mastery of storytelling and impact measurement is a key element for effective social innovation. Students will develop effective personal and organizational storytelling skills, examine and apply concepts of personal leadership, marketing strategy, impact analysis and reporting, and approaches to scaling innovation. Prerequisites: Mgmt 422/522s; sophomore standing or higher.
CURRICULAR CONSENT AGENDA:

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

New Courses
E.1.b.4.
• CE 489/589  Introduction to Advanced Environmental Fluid Mechanics, 4 credits
  Advanced introduction to the geophysical fluid flows, including properties of seawater; conservation of mass, energy and momentum; dimensional analysis; the the Navier-Stokes, Reynolds and turbulent kinetic energy equations; geostrophy and potential vorticity; long and short waves; and turbulence and boundary layers. Lecture and laboratory. Prerequisites: EAS 215, Mth 256, CE 361, CE 362.

E.1.b.5.
• CE 495/595  Sustainable Transportation in the Netherlands, 5 credits
  Introduction to transportation engineering and planning applications in the Netherlands, focusing on pedestrian, bicycle and public transport. Contrasts between U.S. and Dutch engineering principles, policies and standards. Design principles and practice will be explored through field trips and guest lectures while abroad and in Portland. Faculty led study abroad course. Prerequisites: Minimum GPA 3.0, senior status or graduate level from all disciplines and majors.
February 10, 2014

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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**New Courses**
E.1.c.1.
- Mus 356 Jazz and American Culture: How History Shaped Our Music, Then and Now (4)
  Examines jazz and its development in the context of American history. Jazz, pre-jazz, contemporary practice, and related sub-genres explored through listening and analysis. The cultural context from which the music emerged dissected and discussed. Covers period from the mid-1800s to today.

**School of Business Administration**

**New Courses**
E.1.c.2.
- Mgmt 442 Human Resources Information Technologies (4)
  Fundamental HR information technology concepts and best practices. Designed for Human Resources Management and Management majors. Topics include: HRIT management, Application Service Providers (ASP), Software as a Service (SaaS), HR software evaluation, Social Media trends, HRO outsourcing, enterprise resource planning, and System Development Life Cycle. Prerequisites: Mgmt 351.

E.1.c.3.
- Mgmt 481 Entrepreneurship (4)
  This course focuses on the entrepreneurial practices and tools for development of a startup company, for intrapreneurial efforts in growing business, and also directing a personal career path. Topics include innovation, idea generation, evaluation, financial analysis, feasibility, business planning development and competition. Prerequisites: admission to the School of Business Administration.

**Changes to Existing Courses**
E.1.c.4.
- Mktg 430 Entrepreneurship (3) – drop.
Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes in Existing Courses
E.1.c.5.
- CE 351 Transportation Systems: Planning and Design (4) – change title to Introduction to Transportation Engineering; change description.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Changes to Existing Programs
E.1.c.6.
- BA in Applied Linguistics – increase the total number of credits (from 48 to 60); increase the number of required credit; and change which courses are required. FSBC comments: The department is able to cover the changes with existing personnel, except for the need for an adjunct for advising during the transition. The department states is can cover this cost.
E.1.c.7.
- BA/BS in Communication – changes requirement that “at least 16 credits must be in courses numbered 400 and above” to “at least 16 credits must be in courses numbered 410 and above. FSBC comments: no budgetary impact.
E.1.c.8.
- BS in Geography – the change of Geog 380 (a required course for the major) from 5 credits to 4 credits (proposal approved) changes the BS major require credits from 13 to 12. FSBC comments: no budgetary impact.
E.1.c.9.
- Minor in Geography – changes total required number of credits from 29 to 28 due to a reduction in credit for one required course Geog 380 from 4 to 3 credits. FSBC comments: no budgetary impact.
E.1.c.10.
- Minor in GIS in Geography – changes number of required credits for core courses (17 to 16) due to a reduction in credit for required course Geog 380 from 4 to 3 credits; also changes total required credits from 29 to 28. FSBC comments: no budgetary impact.
E.1.c.11.
- BA in International Studies: European Studies – now requires Intl 452 for European Studies majors; now requires a minimum of 36 credits hours in Intl courses. FSBC comments: Proposal states they have the capacity in the core faculty to handle this change and there would be no additional cost. If so, then no budgetary impact beyond shifting SCH from other departments into INTL. There is no budgetary information in the proposal, however.
E.1.c.12.
- BA/BS in Speech and Hearing Sciences – adds 8 credits of ASL and adds 4 credits in Speech & Hearing electives. FSBC comments: no budgetary impact.
New Courses
E.1.c.13.
  • Anth 357 Archaeology in Popular Culture (4)
    Study relationships between archaeology, archaeology in popular culture, and modern society. Build knowledge of science in archaeology through analysis of archaeological representations in popular culture (e.g., films, television).
E.1.c.14.
  • Comm 320 Introduction to Political Communication (4)
    Communication activities relating directly to the election of candidates and the passage of initiatives. Presented through the context of deliberative democracy and the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which provides a set of "political rules of the road" for democratic processes.
E.1.c.15.
  • Ling 183 Community Reporting (4)
    Students explore American culture at PSU and in the Portland community by creating a class newsletter. Focus on interviewing and reporting techniques, writing and revising articles, and developing proofreading and editing skills. Students select articles and design the layout.
E.1.c.16.
  • Ling 184 Cultural Themes in Reading (4)
    Students develop reading skills, cultural knowledge, and communicative ability by reading and discussing authentic, unabridged texts. Improve critical thinking and discussion skills through writing and answering questions, paraphrasing and relating ideas, and delivering presentations. Cultural themes rotate each term.
E.1.c.17.
  • Ling 185 Practically Speaking: Conversational English (4)
    Students improve conversational fluency by learning strategies for oral communication and focusing on common words and phrases used in spoken American English. Learn about the cultural knowledge required to navigate everyday interactions. Improve pronunciation and practice speaking in authentic situations.
E.1.c.18.
  • Ling 186 Communication through Volunteering (4)
    This course provides community and classroom opportunities for the development of oral communication skills, critical thinking, and intercultural competence. Experience Portland culture and practice communication strategies through group projects with PSU students, elementary schools, and other community partners.
E.1.c.19.
  • Ling 187 Multimedia Listening (4)
    Students expand their listening skills and increase their familiarity with American culture through a wide variety of sources such as music, movies, TV shows, Internet videos, radio programs, extended conversations, and live entertainment. Cultural themes rotate each term.
E.1.c.20.
  • Phl 367 Philosophy of Sport (4)
    An examination of the central conceptual, ethical, and existential issues concerning sports. Topics include the nature and role of sports in human flourishing, theories of
embodiment, and the morality of sports as an institution and culture including competition and violence.

E.1.c.21.

- Psy 429 The Psychology of Race and Gender in Sport (4)
  Using a social psychological approach, this course will examine how issues of race and gender affect the sporting domain. Specifically, the course will emphasize how social psychological theories of intergroup relations, stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination impact athletes, coaches, referees, and fans. Prerequisites: upper-division standing.

Changes in Existing Courses

E.1.c.22.
- Anth 362 African Prehistory (4) – change course description.

E.1.c.23.
- Bi 343 Genes and Society (4) – change course number to Bi 346.

E.1.c.24.
- Comm 200 Principles of Communication (4) – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.25.
- Comm 212 Mass Communication and Society (4) – change course number to Comm 322.

E.1.c.26.
- Ec 101 Contemporary Economic Issues (4) – change course number to Ec 200, change description.

E.1.c.27.
- Geog 380 Maps and Geographic Information (5) – change credit hours to 4.

E.1.c.28.
- Geog 497/597 Spatial Quantitative Analysis (4) – change undergraduate prerequisites.

E.1.c.29.
- Hst 339 The Environment and History (4) – change description.

E.1.c.30.
- Mth 254 Calculus IV (4) – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.31.
- Mth 311 Advanced Calculus (4) – change title to Introduction to Mathematical Analysis I; change description; change prerequisite; combine into Mth 311, 312 sequence.

E.1.c.32.
- Mth 312 Advanced Multivariate Calculus I (4) – change title to Introduction to Mathematical Analysis II; change description; change prerequisite; separate from Mth 312, 313 sequence; combine into Mth 311, 312 sequence.

E.1.c.33.
- Mth 313 Advanced Multivariate Calculus II (4) – change title to Advanced Multivariable Calculus (4); change description; change prerequisite; separate from Mth 312, 313 sequence.

E.1.c.34.
- Span 325 Spanish Phonetics and Phonology (4) – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.35.
- Span 330 Peninsular Culture and Civilization (4) – change prerequisites.

E.1.c.36.
- Span 331 Latin American Culture and Civilization (4) – change prerequisites.
E.1.c.37.  
• Span 341 Introduction to Hispanic Literature (4) – separate sequence, change title, description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.38.  
• Span 342 Introduction to Hispanic Literature (4) – separate sequence, change title, description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.39.  
• Span 343 Introduction to Hispanic Literature (4) – separate sequence, change title, description and prerequisites.

E.1.c.40  
• Span 344 Introduction to Hispanic Literature (4) – separate sequence, change title, description and prerequisites.

**College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**New Courses**

E.1.c.41.  
• PHE 327 Community Nutrition (4)  
  This course provides students with an understanding of community nutrition as a career. Course topics include program planning, policies, resources, and issues specific to community nutrition.

**Changes to Existing Courses**

E.1.c.42.  
• PHE 455 Film and Health – change course number to PHE 351.
February 6, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: David Maier  
Chair, Graduate Council

Rachel Cunliffe  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

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 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals.

**School of Business Administration**

**New Programs**

- Undergraduate and Graduate Certificates in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship  
  (two-page summary attached)

  FSBC comments: Presume that revenue will pay for ongoing costs once reTHINK money is gone.

**Portland State University School of Business Administration**

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ONLINE CERTIFICATE IN SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

**Overview:**

Portland State University proposes an online certificate in Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship composed of three online courses and a practicum. A recipient of support from PSU’s Provost’s Challenge reTHINK grant, this rigorous certificate program will provide students with a broad understanding of emerging trends and best practices in design thinking, social entrepreneurship, and social innovation, delivered with a strong emphasis on applied learning.

The program will be offered on a for-credit basis to both graduate and undergraduate students at the university, and to professionals on a not-for-credit basis. Graduate students will be required to complete more rigorous research and project assignments than undergraduates. By encouraging greater participant
diversity, the certificate is designed to create a richer learning environment that better reflects the real-world collaboration and cross-sector engagement required for successful social entrepreneurship.

PSU’s Impact Entrepreneurs, an initiative of the School of Business Administration with support from the Institute for Sustainable Solutions, has led the design of program content based on materials previously developed and delivered for PSU’s MBA curriculum and global clients including Mercy Corps and The Rockefeller Foundation. There is no other similar graduate certificate program of this kind in the Oregon University System.

**Evidence of Need:**

In a recent survey by Net Impact (an international organization for business students and professionals committed to generating positive change) 65% of graduate and undergraduate university students said they “expect to make a positive social or environmental difference in the world at some point through their work.” Reflecting this demand, Net Impact now has more than 40,000 members and 300 global chapters. Since 2007, more than 875 companies have adopted B Corp certification for triple-bottom-line businesses in more than 29 countries, and Benefit Corporation legislation has passed in 20 states, including Oregon.

Universities are recognizing and responding to student demand. A Bridgespan Group study focused on the 10 top-ranked MBA programs found that the number of social-benefit related courses increased by 79% from 2005 to 2007, and social-benefit coursework increased by an average amount of 111% over the same period. PSU is already a recognized leader in the field of social entrepreneurship, with its recent designation as an Ashoka U Changemaker Campus, as well as the PSU Social Innovation Incubator’s selection as one of *Fast Company*’s 51 Brilliant Urban Ideas. By leveraging this expertise and recognition through expanded social innovation and social entrepreneurship offerings including the certificate, PSU hopes to meet this increased demand and position the university for further growth and thought leadership in the field.

"The [Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship certificate program] at Portland State offers a great path for social intrapreneurs aiming to launch a new program within an existing organization, or to managers looking to guide the development of their staff as innovators and entrepreneurial leaders."

— Kazi Huque, CEO, Grameen Intel

"Portland is a hub for innovation in both for-profit and nonprofit sectors. This program provides new social entrepreneurs and those interested in social impact careers with the tools to turn great ideas into viable social enterprises that drive positive change."

— David Griswold, President and Founder, Sustainable Harvest Coffee Importers

**Program Objectives:**

The certificate will combine theoretical concepts with continuous applied learning to enable students to effectively design solutions to social and environmental problems, experience the entrepreneurial startup process while taking the courses, develop connections to a broader network of social entrepreneurship leaders, increase their personal leadership effectiveness, and develop an entrepreneurship mindset that will serve them in any path they undertake. The certificate is designed to greatly enhance an individual’s likelihood of transforming world-changing ideas into reality, whether working within an established organization or launching their own.

**Course of Study:**

1. MGMT 421/521: *Design Thinking for Social Innovation*, 4 credit hours
2. MGMT 422/522: Money Matters for Social Innovation, 4 credit hours
3. MGMT 423/523: Storytelling and Impact Measurement for Social Innovation, 4 credit hours
4. MGMT 409/509: Social Innovation Practicum, 4 credit hours

Learning Outcomes:

Students will exit the program equipped with a firm understanding of design thinking, social innovation, and lean entrepreneurship that will provide:
1. Foundational definitions and an overview of the history and present trends in the fields of social innovation and social entrepreneurship
2. Experience using Human-Centered Design to identify, understand and design solutions to social and environmental problems
3. Fundamental skills in social entrepreneurship including designing customer-driven business models, startup financing, financial projections, and legal issues
4. Leadership effectiveness in businesses for social change
5. Marketing fundamentals and differentiation of beneficiaries, customers, and funders
6. Knowledge of approaches and challenges to achieving scale in social enterprise impact
7. Social impact measurement connecting theory of change and the social impact value chain

Cost:

Through the reTHINK PSU process, the office of the Provost at Portland State University has already allocated funds for instructional design, video production, program administration, academic advising, student retention, and instruction in support of the certificate program. Funding is sufficient to fully enable certificate design, and to cover delivery costs for the first five quarters of the program; after that period, student credit revenue is forecast to be sufficient to pay for ongoing instruction, administration and support. Instructors and support staff will be shared with other PSU School of Business programs, reducing overhead and overall costs.

*NOTE: Three proposed new courses to support the Certificates are itemized in “E.1.b”*
Motion: The Educational Policy Committee moves that Faculty Senate approve the adoption of the proposed Portland State University Academic Program Review Policy, available in PSU’s Curriculum Tracker on the 2013-14 Comprehensive List of Proposals for EPC motions.

Background

The Educational Policy Committee reviewed and suggested changes to the proposed PSU Academic Program Review Policy, and at EPC’s November 13, 2013 meeting unanimously voted to approve this policy document to be submitted to the Faculty Senate. After presentation to the Faculty Senate on the February 3, 2014, EPC suggested additional revisions for Section II Reason for Policy/Purpose, Section IV Definitions (of Academic Programs), and Section V Policy/Procedure, subsection 8 Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers to address concerns raised during the February discussion of the motion.

Academic Program Review Policy

https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/w/page/70816996/Academic%20Program%20Review%20Policy

I. Policy Statement

It is the policy of the Office of Academic Affairs that all PSU academic programs, as required by Northwest Commission on Colleges and University (NWCCU) standard 2c Educational Resources, and any associated centers or institutes go through a periodic academic program review in order to improve the effectiveness and quality of the academic programs offered by PSU.

II. Reason for Policy/Purpose

The academic program review process at PSU is designed to provide continuous improvement of academic quality within academic units through self-study, external review, and internal action plans. For the purposes of this document, “program review” refers to an academic unit’s holistic appraisal over five years of its curricular offerings and where applicable, its centers/institutes. Center and institute review should follow Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University. Program review provides academic units the opportunity for reflection and discussion of their programs on a regular cycle, and is explicitly designed to be collaborative in nature, and inclusive of student, faculty, community, and administrative input as well as external evaluation, as determined by the dean. The overall goal of program review is to assist academic units in:

• articulating their goals and objectives in relation to the University's priorities, and initiatives,
• instituting a regular process of internal and external review of qualitative and quantitative information about program activities and impact,
• demonstrating progress toward achievement of department goals,
• using outcomes for program improvement and goal-setting,
• provide deans and the provost with more thorough and reflective evidence of program progress.

The academic program review process is accomplished through a recurring minimum 7 year cycle of goal setting, data gathering and analysis, and reporting. Through the college’s planning process, the academic department:

• establishes its goals and objectives related to teaching, scholarship and service for its respective programs;
• provides analysis of data received and/or collected to demonstrate progress toward the stated goals and objectives;
• reports on its progress toward meeting its goals and objectives within the unit’s and the University’s mission.

Academic units may consult the Criteria for Program Review, attached here, for program review questions.

III. Applicability
This policy applies to all academic units, programs (undergraduate and graduate), schools and colleges under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs.

IV. Definitions
Academic Program. Academic units offering academic courses under the direct supervision of a Dean or Vice Provost.

Action Plan. A document outlining the Academic Program’s and dean’s strategies for addressing issues found during the Academic Program Review.

Review Schedule. An annual timeline for program review listing all academic programs designating the academic year in which the academic program will go through the Academic Program Review process. The Review Schedule is recommended by the deans of the schools and colleges in cooperation with department chairs and/or divisional directors and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs which will also maintain and publish the review schedule.

Self-Study. A systematic and thorough examination of all of an academic program’s components in light of its stated mission.

V. Policy / Procedure
1. Review Schedule
1.1. An annual timeline for program review and a master schedule of departmental rotation will be published on the OAA website.
1.2. Deans, with approval of OAA, are responsible for setting review schedules for their units on a 7 year cycle (unless otherwise influenced by the specialized accreditation agency).

2. Preparation
2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) sends a reminder to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) and to the deans listing the programs or departments he or she has indicated will be subject to review during the academic year.
2.2. Reviews will begin in Fall term and must be concluded by the end of Spring term.
2.3. The dean meets with the programs or departments to develop a process for the reviews and to finalize any decisions about information that will be required beyond what is typically provided by OIRP.
2.4. The program or department prepares review materials according to the Academic Program Review Guidelines (see link below), using the Criteria for Program Review in the Guidelines and any additional materials as required by the dean.
2.5. Core data elements will be available through Cognos reports at www.datamaster.pdx.edu, or directly from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (Those departments subject to specialized accreditation should also use these data, but may prepare other materials as required by their accrediting agencies.)
3. Review Process
3.1. The dean is responsible for initiating the process for a review of the program or department, including coordinating external reviews, and where relevant, community members input.
3.2. Department/program creates a self-study using the established standards/criteria listed below,
3.3. Self-study and list of potential external reviewers submitted to the dean for review and comment,
3.4. Self-study and program materials submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies, when applicable, for review and comment.
3.5. Self-study and dean’s response submitted to external reviewers, Depending on the program and at the discretion of the dean the review by external reviewers can either be through a site visit or done virtually,
3.6. External reviewers prepare a team report and submit it to the department chair or the review committee,
3.7. The dean and/or the department chair prepares a final report and action plan for the department/program based on the self-study and the external reviewers’ report,
3.8. The department/program prepares a response to the final report and action plan,
3.9. Departments/programs with institutes and centers will simultaneously initiate a review of those centers and institutes following the “Guidelines for Center/Institute Review at Portland State University”,
3.10. The complete review packet (self-study, dean’s response, external review report, final report and action plan, and department/program response) submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

4. Implementation
4.1. Following the review of the self-study report, the dean’s response, the external review report, the final report and the action plan, the Office of Academic Affairs will meet with the college/school dean and the department chair or divisional director to discuss the recommendations made in the program’s Action Plan.
4.2. This Action Plan must be agreed upon by the Office of Academic Affairs, the college dean, and the departmental administrator. It becomes a part of the review record and should be used to guide any follow-up activities.

5. Follow-Up
5.1. The Office of Academic Affairs will call a meeting with OAA, the dean and department chair or director three years following the initial meeting to review the progress that has been made (or not made) with regard to the implementation of the Action Plan.

6. External Reviewers
6.1. Academic programs undergoing program review are expected to include 2-3 external reviewers in the process.
6.2. The selection of external reviewers shall be determined by the deans, in consultation with the program chairs/directors, from a list of candidates provided by the departments/programs.
6.3. Two to three external reviewers should receive and review the self-study written by the department, as well as the dean’s response to the report in advance of their visit to campus.
6.4. Deans may determine whether one or more reviewers make a site visit, or if a virtual visit is adequate for review purposes.
6.5. Deans or departments are expected to cover expenses related to these site visits.
7. Specialized Accreditation and Academic Review
7.1. To the extent possible, attempts will be made to coordinate the APR so that it occurs at a time most convenient to the accreditation cycle, as requested by the school/college undergoing specialized accreditation review.
7.2. Reviews of programs with specialized accreditation will be scheduled, whenever possible, to coincide with their accrediting agencies’ visit.
7.3. In addition, to minimize the duplication of effort and maximize the value of all review processes, documentation prepared as part of the department/programs accreditation and/or external review processes may be submitted or included in the materials submitted for APR.
7.4. These reports will be reviewed for completeness and alignment with the university’s APR guidelines. Requests for additional information will be made if necessary.

8. Guidelines for Selection of External Reviewers
8.1. External Reviewers should be scholars/teachers/practitioners in the field.
8.2. It is desirable for external reviewers to hold a terminal degree in the appropriate discipline.
8.3. It is desirable for external reviewers to have experience with program administration and/or significant leadership role in higher education.
8.4. It is desirable for external reviewers to have experience with student learning assessment, regional accreditation, and/or professional accreditation.
8.5. It is desirable for external reviewers to have prior experience conducting reviews or are or have been officers in related professional organizations.
8.6. It is desirable for external reviewers to be currently employed at a peer institution with a similar degree program.
8.7. External Reviewers must have no conflict of interest such as recent employment or consultation with Portland State University.

VI. Links To Related Forms
Link to APR “Action Plan” template.
Link to APR Guidelines.

VII. Contacts
Questions regarding this Policy should be directed to the Office of Academic Affairs at (503) 725-4596 or can be e-mailed to harmons@pdx.edu.

VIII. Policy Adoption
Recommended: _____________________________ Date: ______
Faculty Senate Presiding Officer

Approved: _____________________________ Date: ______
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

IX. History/Revision Dates
Adoption Date: To be added.
Next Review Date: To be added.
Preamble

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) represents the faculty of Oregon's public universities. As a dedicated partner in higher education shared governance, we are committed to applying our collective expertise to ensuring the quality of higher education in Oregon. The decades-long heritage of IFS is grounded in a collaborative spirit of information sharing, timely communication, transparency, and protecting the best interest of our most valuable resource: our students.

I. Roles and Responsibilities

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate shall-

1. Gather on a regular basis and facilitate the exchange of information on behalf of the faculty of Oregon Public Universities and their Senates.
2. Provide advice and recommendations to higher education stakeholders, the Oregon State Legislature, and other governmental agencies and officers on matters of academic importance.

II. Process and Procedure

1. Meetings of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate should be run in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order.
2. Standing rules and regulations covering all other matters pertaining to the conduct of the business of the Senate may be passed or amended with a majority vote of those present at the meeting.
3. These By-Laws may be amended after presentation of the text of the proposed amendment at one meeting and approved by an affirmative vote of a two-thirds majority of those present and voting at the next regularly called meeting.

III. Officers, Duties and Responsibilities

1. The Executive Committee of the Senate shall consist of the President, Vice-President Elect and Secretary, Provost Council representative, immediate Past President and one member elected at-large from members of the Senate. The President shall serve as the Chair of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will (a) assist the President with the preparation of the agenda for meetings; (b) perform such task during the interim between meetings as may be needed for the effective and efficient operation of the Senate. During the summer period the Executive Committee shall have authority to act on behalf of the Senate in matters of urgent necessity as determined by the Executive Committee; (c) convene special meetings of the Senate; and (d) assist the President with long range planning efforts.
2. The President shall (a) preside at meetings of the Senate and the Executive Committee; (b) be responsible to the Senate for the supervision and execution of its business; (c) represent the Senate in discussions stakeholders on matters of academic importance; (d) request expenditures of State funds in connection with the Senate activities; and (e) perform other duties and responsibilities and requested by the Senate.
3. The Vice-President Elect shall (a) assume the duties of the President, when the President is unable to serve; (b) serve on the Senate Executive Committee; (c) be responsible for carrying out other necessary duties as may be delegated by the Senate, the Executive Committee,
or the President, (d) become as familiar as possible with all aspects and workings of higher education in Oregon that may affect the best interests of the Senate.

4. The Secretary shall (a) keep the minutes and records of the Senate; (b) serve on the Senate Executive Committee; and (c) perform other duties as requested by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the President.

5. The Provost Council Representative shall (a) represent the best interests of the Senate Oregon Public University faculty during meetings of the Provost Council; (b) regularly report to the Senate on the business conducted and issues discussed at Provost Council meetings; (c) inform the President if they are unable to attend a meeting of the Provost Council; (d) serve on the Senate Executive Committee. After consultation with the Provost Council Representative, the President will appoint a member of the Senate to attend the meeting.

IV. Elections

1. At its last meeting of the calendar year, the Senate shall elect a President, Vice-President, Secretary and a Provost Council representative. The term of these officers shall be two one calendar year and commence on January 1.

2. Elections will be conducted by secret ballot of those present. A majority of those present is required for election to office.

3. Elections will be held in the following order; (1) President-Elect; (2) Secretary; (3) Provost Council Representative; (4) At-large Executive Committee member.

4. If the institutional term of an IFS senator expires while the senator is serving a term as an officer or member of the executive committee, the senator will continue to serve until the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate term expires. Constituent institutions will be limited to the normal number of votes (three two votes for Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Oregon Health Sciences University; two votes for, Eastern Oregon University, Southern Oregon University, Western Oregon University and Oregon Institute of Technology) to be decided by the institution’s senators.

5. If the institutional term of the Provost Council Representative expires while the senator is serving as Provost Council Representative, the Senate shall elect a replacement at the last meeting which occurs during that senator's active term.

V. Attendance

1. Regular, informed participation by all members is essential to the success of the Senate.

2. In order to facilitate timely and regular participation in Senate meetings, appropriate technology (Skype, Google Hangouts, etc.) will be leveraged in extraordinary circumstances. However, electronic participation on a regular basis should not be substituted for in-person participation.

3. While absences from meetings may be unavoidable, it is the responsibility of any Senator who anticipates being absent from a Senate meeting to inform the President, and to ensure representation from his/her home institution arrange for their institution’s alternate attend the meeting.

4. Senators who are regularly absent from Senate meetings are not serving the best interests of their institutions or the Senate. Senators who miss more than one regularly scheduled meeting during an academic year without ensuring representation from their institutions will consult with the Executive Committee between their second missed meeting and the next regular meeting of the IFS on an appropriate course of action. In the event that absentee Senators do not engage in such a consultation, the President will inform appropriate parties at the Senator's home
Date: February 10, 2014
To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee
From: Robert Gould PhD, Chair,
  Educational Policy Committee
Re: Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report

The following is a summary of the Winter Term, 2014, Educational Policy Committee activities and decisions:

1. Faculty Senate approved the new and revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, recommended by EPC. The Faculty Senate also approved the EPC recommended flow charts on Research/Membership Centers and Institutes, and Public Service/General Service Centers and Institutes.

2. EPC unanimously approved renaming Center for Women, Politics, and Policy to the Center for Women’s Leadership. EPC decided that this was not a significant enough change to warrant Faculty Senate consideration, and was forwarded to the Provost.

3. Last spring, EPC provisionally approved the proposal to create a Center to Advance Racial Equity (CARE) in the School of Social Work. However, intra-campus consultations continue this year to create a broader base for this center.

4. Steve Harmon, EPC member and OAA staff, added EPC documents and minutes to the PSU Curriculum Tracking System. This allows EPC and others to track the progress of EPC activities.

5. EPC representatives joined the ad hoc FSBC meetings with all college deans, concerning the budget decisions that are being pushed out to the colleges. Although this is currently an ad hoc process, EPC may propose a constitutional amendment to create ongoing college level EPCs.

6. EPC unanimously recommends approval of a proposal to rename the Honors Program to the Honors College.

7. EPC is unanimously voted to approve an Academic Program Review Policy proposal, where individual programs are reviewed to meet the concerns of our accreditation reviewers. Currently, we are in the process of revisiting this document to make changes suggested by the Faculty Senate. We are in the process of reviewing and revising a Centers and Institutes Review Policy proposal. We also anticipate an additional proposal for Program Array Review that is part of the Provost’s Challenge prioritization process.

8. EPC is also reviewing the policy recommendations from the Credit for Prior Learning Policy Subcommittee. At some point in the future, we will consider a full CPL proposal.

9. EPC is considering ways to more effectively engage student committee members in shared governance processes.