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Vote on proposed amendment to Faculty Constitution
To: Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
From: Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty  

The Faculty Senate will meet on 7 January 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in Cramer Hall 53.

AGENDA

A. Roll Call and Consent Agenda [see also E.1]
   * 1. Minutes of the 3 December 2018 meeting – consent agenda
   * 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for December – consent agenda

B. Announcements
   1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
   2. Announcements from Secretary

C. Discussion – none

D. Unfinished Business
   * 1. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on International Collaborations (Steering)
   * 2. Constitutional amendment on opt-out elections (Art. 5, Sec. 2)

E. New Business
   * 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC, UNST Council) – consent agenda
   * 2. Proposed revision of Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal (UNST Council)

F. Question Period

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   [Note: because the President is out of town, there is no President’s report]
   1. Provost’s report
   * 2. Report of Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies
   3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) report

H. Adjournment

* See the following attachments.
A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 3 December 2018 – consent agenda
A.2. December Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – consent agenda
D.1. Proposal: Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships
D.2. Constitutional amendment on opt-out elections
E.1. Curricular proposals (summaries) – consent agenda. Complete curricular proposals are on-line:
    http://unstcouncil.pbworks.com/w/page/45865388/FrontPage
E.2. Proposed revision of Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal (UNST Council)
G.2. Draft policy on Principal Investigator/Project Director eligibility & responsibility (RGS)
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Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 3 December 2018

Presiding Officer: Thomas Luckett
Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators Present:

Alternates Present:
Celine Fitzmaurice for Newlands

Senators Absent:
Bryson, Craven, George, Magaldi, Martinez Thompson, Mathwick, Podrabsky, Recktenwald, C. Reynolds, Schechter, Sorensen, Yeigh

Ex-officio Members Present:
Balderas Villegrana, Beyler, Bielavitz, Bynum, Carlson, Chabon, Clark, Duh, Hines, Jaén Portillo, Jhaj, Kennedy, Lafferriere, Lynn, Maier, McLellan, Percy, K. Reynolds, Shoureshi, Woods, Wooster

[Changes to regular agenda order: G.1, President’s Report, was given at 4:00. G.2. Provost’s Report, was dropped, the Provost being out of town. G.3. IFS Report, was dropped due to time.]

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

  1. Minutes of the 5 November 2018 meeting – approved as part of the consent agenda

  2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for November – received as part of the consent agenda

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

  1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

    LUCKETT opened with the Governor’s budget proposal released last week. From the universities’ perspective this was “a lot bad.” It included a 9.3% cut to the higher education budget, in nominal, not inflation-adjusted dollars. The state subsidy is 28.9% of PSU’s [education and general] budget; therefore the overall reduction would be 2.69%. As K. REYNOLDS explained [in October], a flat budget would be experienced next year as a cut because of roll-ups. We have to increase the budget to maintain operations at their current level; the proposed cut would be on top of that. The Governor has also recommended that tuition increases be capped at 5%, and that the ETIC [Engineering Technology Industry Council] fund, which supports several engineering programs, be eliminated. There is no help for rising PERS costs. This looks, frankly, catastrophic. The most favorable interpretation was that the Governor was sending a message to the legislature: if you don’t raise taxes, this is what will happen. It could the beginning of a negotiation—a kind of hostage crisis, in which we and our students are the hostages. In this relatively favorable interpretation, the strategy works only if the hostages do their part. We need to communicate with the legislature and the public about adequate higher
education funding. PSU’s Office of Government Relations advised LUCKETT that legislators want to hear from faculty and students. We have to be the messengers.

LUCKETT reminded senators that last June Senate passed a resolution on the Confucius Institute at PSU (CI-PSU), which advised the President to either terminate the contract or to add new language protecting the academic freedom of CI-PSU instructors. Over the summer SHOURESHI assured LUCKETT that he was working on the second option. Some colleagues expressed frustration over an apparent lack of progress. There was a reason for the delay: PSU could not offer new language until it received from the Hanban a request to renew the contract, which has now arrived. The President has mandated Ron WITZACK (Executive Director of International Affairs) and Cindy STARKE (General Counsel) to work on a revision reflecting the Senate’s resolution. How the Hanban will respond is another question. The administration, LUCKETT said, is evidently acting in the spirit of the Senate resolution.

LUCKETT reviewed the status of the centers of excellence, two of which were selected for funding in October. That selection process is distinct from the Faculty governance process to create a center or institute at PSU. This fact was, unfortunately, not communicated clearly to everyone involved, but this latter approval process is now underway since October. It could have been handled better, but everyone now involved is working in good faith to get it done. We have learned from the events and can do a better job of integration next time. We don’t want to ask Educational Policy Committee (EPC) to review many proposals if only a few will be relevant.

LUCKETT gave an update on a new system for student course evaluations. PSU had chosen an on-line platform for evaluations; the vendor is Qualtrics. This will be piloted this in a few departments this academic year, and rolled out university-wide in fall 2019. EPC issued a report [April Packet Attachment G.4] on best practices. The report doesn’t have to do with the choice of the on-line system, but rather with content: determine what to assess, establish metrics, develop unbiased instruments to measure these, select statistically valid analytics, and have clear expectations for how results are used. It is recommended that each department develop a working group to transition to the on-line system and to develop content according to these best practices. The Institutional Assessment Council can offer assistance and guidance.

HINES will finish her second term as Faculty member of the Board of Trustees [BoT] in June. She is not seeking an additional term. The Governor will make a new appointment. Therefore, LUCKETT said, we should look at how to make recommendations for a new Faculty BoT member. It is the Governor’s choice, but anyone may make recommendations. When HINES was first appointed, the Steering Committee, Advisory Council, and Executive Council of AAUP each wrote letters; her name appeared in all three short lists. Several colleagues had asked whether we should have a more formal process, such as an election in Senate. Steering Committee, having discussed this, concluded that a formal election is not a good idea. The Governor does not want this to turn into an elected position, and so an election might even be a strike against the person so chosen. Furthermore, LUCKETT said, and as HINES has insisted, this BoT member is not a representative per se of the Faculty; that person’s role is to present a Faculty perspective, but not to serve the interests of the Faculty as a constituency. That is more the role of the Presiding Officer.
LUCKETT proposed therefore that he and the Secretary (BEYLER) would solicit responses to three questions: Who might be a good colleague to serve in this position, and why? Is there some other procedure you might suggest? What are the ideal qualifications? LUCKETT thought that such a list of ideal qualifications would look much like a description of HINES. In any event, this was the occasion to contemplate what qualifications we hope for.

AAUP had raised an issue with LUCKETT which is of concern for the Senate. In June 2016, Senate approved a motion to allow for continuous appointment for non-tenure-track Faculty; this requires a careful evaluation process. Each department must develop its discipline-specific guidelines. Many departments have done so, but some haven’t, and this is creating an urgent problem—a bind between the contract and the Senate’s resolutions. Departments that have not created guidelines must work on it right away.

THIEMAN suggested that departments that had experience could offer assistance for writing procedures to other departments. LUCKETT: a good idea.

LIEBMAN expressed appreciation for HINES’s contributions. [Applause.] He noted that HINES’s second term was a re-appointment; we don’t have procedures for that either. We ought to offer several (at least two) names. We should indicate strengths of those who we propose. It’s important also to have feedback. He suggested that HINES write a statement on what the job entails. HINES underlined that it should not be an election, which would make the Faculty BoT member seem beholden to constituency—as having to do what Senate says. It is important that the member be taken seriously [by other Trustees]. Similar considerations apply to a re-appointment. It’s also imperative not to undercut the Presiding Officer’s role as the spokesperson for Faculty Senate.

HANSEN asked LIEBMAN if it was correct that this was his last Faculty Senate meeting. [Yes.] HANSEN moved:

Faculty Senate formally recognizes Professor Robert LIEBMAN for his numerous and vast contributions to Faculty governance at PSU.

LUCKETT noted that such a motion was not on the agenda. BEYLER interjected that a non-agenda motion could be considered subject to two-thirds approval. The motion was then seconded. The motion was approved by acclamation. [Applause.]

2. Announcements from Secretary – none

3. Update on revision of departmental bylaws from Vice Provost Shelly Chabon

CHABON acknowledged the assistance of Susan TARDIF and Hannah MILLER in preparing slides [see Appendix B.3]; and HANSEN, the Academic Leadership Team, and LIEBMAN for support and encouragement.

Revising governance documents, CHABON said, serves important purposes of shared governance at all levels. These documents codify and clarify policies, practices, and procedures for our work together. A 2016 audit gave unsatisfactory results: 30 academic units had approved bylaws; of these, 7 were ten years old or older; 21 units had bylaws that had never been approved. P&T [promotion and tenure] guidelines fared somewhat better: 46 units had approved guidelines, of which 7 were ten years old or older; 12 included the new units approved after 2014 bargaining, but many were not fully vetted.
CHABON and OAA [Office of Academic Affairs] set a goal that all units have revised bylaws and P&T guidelines. The department creates documents; the dean reviews and forwards them to OAA; there is a three-part review, with comments sent back to the academic units for suggested and required changes. Points of reference are the collective bargaining agreement, the Faculty Constitution, and agreed P&T policies. There is a template for what should or should not be included. 15 units have not yet submitted revised bylaws. 26 bylaws are in progress at various levels. 10 have been completed since 2017. The P&T picture is similar: 20 have not yet been submitted; 22 are in progress; 10 have been completed. Progress is being made, albeit slowly.

C. DISCUSSION: Faculty governance at the departmental level
HANSEN/O’BANION moved that Senate resolve into committee of the whole. The motion was approved (by show of hands). Committee of the whole commenced at 3:44.

Comments emphasized transparency; shared and inclusive communication; independent judgment and distinctive departmental cultures; awareness of current procedures, policies, and baseline requirements (training or onboarding); and ethical foundations.

HANSEN/KARAVANIC moved to end committee of the whole. The motion was approved (by acclamation). Committee of the whole concluded at 4:04.

[Change to agenda order: G.1, President’s Report, moved here.]

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President’s Report
[For slides, see Appendix G.1.] SHOURESHI addressed the Governor’s budget proposal. We face a $19 million gap to maintain current service level. The Governor’s proposals for the Public University Support Fund, Engineering Technology Support Fund, and elimination of Sports Lottery funding create further a further gap to $26.5 million. There will be several months of negotiation and lobbying, so we don’t know the end result. She has said that if there is an increase in revenue, there will be more funding for universities. But increasing revenue probably means increasing taxes, and any agreement on that will take longer than setting next year’s [University] budget. We need to work together and work with students, because legislators listen to students. We need to say that what she has proposed is not possible for us.

Fall enrollment, SHOURESHI reported, was down by 358 from last year or 0.2% of SCH [student credit hours]. For winter so far, the number of students is down but credit hours are up. So long as we graduate more than we bring in, the total will go down; however, last fall and this fall have large incoming classes, so an upswing will appear a couple of years from now.

SHOURESHI had shared with BoT what he calls the PSU wheel of success, with sectors for student success, research, and fundraising/financial stability [see Appendix G.1, p. 3]. He proposes in each upcoming meeting to focus on one aspect of this diagram.

For enrollment, the goal for 2025 is to have 40,000 total students, with 10,000 graduate and 30,000 undergraduate students, and with about 10,000 online. We have capacity for about 30,000 on campus. This will require investment in faculty and infrastructure. The financial impact of about 13,000 new students, with a mix of residents and non-residents,
is about $200 million. A related goal is to be less dependent on state support. OSU has 6000 on-line students; they have said that they do not plan to raise tuition more than 5%.

Demographics for children and teenagers in Oregon, SHOURESHI said, are relatively flat. However, the population aged 25-64 is increasing. The main pathway to new students is not through traditional 18-year-olds. There are many adult learners interested in degrees. This is the population to focus on. Last year we had more than 800 [senior auditors] taking courses for free, a group we are targeting for philanthropic development.

PSU needs to be innovative, SHOURESHI continued, and active in designing the future of higher education. Starting in January he together with the Provost, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and Vice President for Planning will visit every school and college to hear ideas for innovations we can make and be a role model for the country. He is also establishing a Presidential Lecture Series, and wants the advisory groups to focus on innovations. Making education accessible and affordable is key.

LIEBMAN: how do we match targets for increased enrollments with curriculum? What is the role of non-credit students? SHOURESHI pointed to the target for 10,000 graduate students: certificates, or refresher courses, will be a key element of that.

LUCKETT: 40,000 means head count, not FTE? SHOURESHI: yes. Being the largest university is symbolically important for legislators, etc.

CLARK pointed out that OSU’s Bend campus has been tremendously successful, and there is discussion of its becoming independent. Question: do out-of-state on-line students pay in-state or out-of-state tuition? SHOURESHI: right now, out-of-state. For accessibility, pricing is an important consideration. Are we competitive?

O’BANION: how do tuition remissions impact revenue? SHOURESHI: it is a chicken-and-egg situation, in that we may need to invest in order to expand. Three foci: in the capital campaign, student success is a key element; new centers will engage students and generate revenue, and there is excitement about them in the area; the growth of co-ops means that we can repurpose some of what we are now paying as financial aid.

GRECO observed that we’ve focused much of our admission strategy on traditional students. Will we be changing our admission strategies? SHOURESHI turned to JHAJ, who suggested two areas for change. Faculty have built a robust array of on-line programs, but recruiting efforts have lagged; we need better marketing. The same applies to adult learners, particularly those who have dropped out. There are many former students who have some credits but not a degree: how do we bring them back? It is close to our mission, and achievable.

[Return to regular agenda order.]

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Policy on curricular overlap (UCC & GC)

LUCKETT reminded senators that this topic was introduced last month. Meanwhile, the specific wording had been somewhat revised, with JAEN PORTILLO taking a leading role, in particular with attention to interdisciplinary teaching. EMERY/REESE moved the policy statement [as given in December Packet Attachment D.1].
MAIER wondered if points 1) and 2) and the end of the document intended to be connected by “and” or “or.” WOODS: “or.” MAIER: should the language reflect this? LUCKETT, hearing no objection, ruled that the correction of adding an “or” after the sentence numbered 1) was adopted.

BROWN felt that the policy needed to be better linked to what actually goes on in course proposals. Departments propose courses to serve their own students, even if the subject matter is already being taught elsewhere. There has been a trend in the past few years to discourage cross-listing and [for departments] to compete for SCH and to try to hang on to SCH. This resolution doesn’t address that [problem]. LUCKETT read the passage “This review is not intended to protect the ‘academic turf’ of individual faculty members or departments. The practice of overlap review is not intended to obstruct, limit, or discourage (rather, to support) interdisciplinary teaching, inclusiveness, or diversity.” BROWN: the reality is that people are competing and holding on for dear life to their SCH. The intention may be exemplary, but the proposal does not resolve that problem.

THIEMAN asked how SCH is shared across units for cross-listed courses. If a course is cross-listed, would SCH for College of Education students taking the course go to COE? BROWN: that is what has happened historically. THIEMAN: so potentially the course could be more enticing because it is multi-disciplinary, but units don’t want to cross-list because they see that they will take a financial hit. BROWN: yes. An example is that in International Studies there was a proposal for a food studies course, but the overwhelming response from elsewhere was “don’t step on my turf.” The proposal does not address the competing processes in place. LUCKETT: this proposal does not preclude other ways to address that problem. It’s primarily about where to address the overlap issue: if it’s between two departments of the same division, it should be addressed at the dean level.

O’BANION: if there is a course on the books but that has not been taught in a while, we should consider sunsetting that course to create room for a department that want to teach it.

JAEN PORTILLO acknowledged that there is a discrepancy with current practices, but perceived this as taking a step in the right direction of removing disciplinary obstacles.

KARAVANIC was concerned about the implication that (e.g.) if any other department that wanted to propose a computer science course not already on the books, it would be approved. LUCKETT: there are other departments that deal with computer science. KARAVANIC: many, and more in the last three years since the change was made to like money to SCH.

WOODS: the proposer should reach out to cases of possible overlap. 100% overlap would be problematic. The policy is meant to prevent, say, that the Department of Fruit could [unilaterally] block anyone else from considering, say, tomatoes. Mathematics is an example. Many departments have statistics courses, but statistics is intrinsically mathematical. Does that mean that MTH should teach all statistics courses? Departments want to teach statistics in a way that matches their own discipline. KARAVANIC: perhaps they should consult MTH. WOODS: yes, that is the assumption—a collegial approach. The intent is to clarify who is the audience for such a discussion.

HOLT spoke from the perspective of being on [UCC]. [The committee] don’t want to be overlap cops; they want an honest effort to recognize what overlap there is. Often with items in the pipeline, proposers haven’t done this, so that the committee has to do the legwork. It’s incumbent on proposers to do their homework. The committee doesn’t decide, say,
“Japanese can talk about sushi, and International Studies can’t.” The committee simply wants to know, how are these courses different from each other? If we have sign-off, the process is easier and faster. It’s a workload issue.

The motion was approved (41 yes, 3 no, 4 abstain, by show of hands).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals – consent agenda

The new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs listed in December Agenda Attachment E.1 were approved as part of the consent agenda, there having been no objection before the end of Roll Call.

2. Proposed constitutional amendment on opt-on elections (Art. 5, Sec. 2)

CLARK/THIEMAN moved consideration of the constitutional amendment [as given in December Agenda Attachment E.2].

BEYLER reviewed the background—essentially, a reversion to a previous model for Faculty elections, with some updating for the digital age. There were two problems the proposal sought to address. One was the recurring problem—it had happened every year during his time as Secretary—of a lack of candidates in some (not all) divisions. The second—perhaps it was wrong to characterize this as a problem—was the sense that an opt-out model might draw a broader range of participants into Faculty governance.

There were also problems to anticipate with an opt-out model, BEYLER continued, and these needed to be carefully considered. One was the potential number of candidates, and—from essentially a graphic design perspective—how this information would be displayed. There were about 1200 Senate-eligible Faculty; the largest division, OI, had almost 200 members. Many of these would opt out, but potentially there would be a survey with hundreds of names. A second problem had been mentioned by several senators in the previous discussion. The opt-in model had been introduced largely to solve the problem of candidates who had simply forgotten or neglected to opt-out and who were not really willing and able to serve as senators. This would be a serious problem; there is a mechanism in place to solve it, but it would be cumbersome. A third problem was that this system would almost certainly result in a three-stage process with an opt-out survey, a nominations survey, and a final ballot. There was the danger of survey fatigue [which would contribute to problem number two].

BEYLER saw these as pros and cons which should be considered carefully. It was, in any event, a fact that every year during his time as Secretary he had confronted the problem of lack of candidates in certain divisions.

MITCHELL: what about recasting divisions? LIEBMAN said this had been done previously. BEYLER: that size was not necessarily correlated to the problem; there were some small divisions with good track records. LUCKETT: representation is proportional, so making divisions larger would not necessarily solve the problem.

LAFFERRIERE noted that several Senate committees have membership determined by division, and there have sometimes been problems recruiting members. BEYLER: that is an analogous but distinct issue; the amendment is strictly about Faculty elections.
KARAVANIC felt it would be important to make clear that the opt-out survey is distinct from the survey about committees. These usually come out near the same time, and there is often confusion about them. Wording needs to be clear.

PALMITER noted that in current opt-in system, [senators] attend and stay and appear to be more vested; the discussions are better. Previously, under the opt-out model, people felt that Senate was almost optional; there were many absences. HINES had seen the same thing, but pointed out that at the same time as the switch to the opt-in model the size of the Senate was approximately halved. It might be difficult to tell which of these changes was the relevant one.

O’BANION agreed with PALMITER’s observation, but suggested that a potential benefit [of the opt-out model] would be better participation by new Faculty. When she had talked with people at the orientation, there was a sense of “I shouldn’t be on Senate because I am new.”

BACCAR had initially been in favor, but having heard counterarguments was reconsidering. Would there be another way to work the problem—say, by talking with departments where there was a shortage of candidates, or strong-arming? BEYLER said he had talked with departments, with limited success. If it were a matter of strong-arming, we needed to figure out who had strong arms. LUCKETT: there is no such thing as a perfect system.

WATANABE saw both good and bad points. Nevertheless, every Faculty member is responsible for service, and that should be the premise. After several years of the opt-in system, there is a sense for some that they can leave the business to those limited number of people who are interested. She believed it might be wise to change this attitude.

SIDERIUS wondered if there could be some mechanism to verify whether people really were willing to serve, as opposed to just forgetting to opt out. CARPENTER: if they voted for themselves?

3. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships (Steering)

GRECO/O’BANION moved to postpone this item until January. The postponement was approved (by show of hands).

F. QUESTION PERIOD – none

G. REPORTS (cont’d)

1. President’s report – see above, following item C.

2. Provost’s report – The Provost being out of town, there was no report.

3. Educational Policy Committee quarterly report – received as part of the consent agenda [December Agenda Attachment G.3].

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.
Are Governance Documents Important?

- The process of creating and revising governance documents is an example of faculty governance in action.
- These documents codify and clarify department practices, policies, and procedures.

PSU Governance Document Audit

- An audit was completed on 12/8/16 of our 51 Academic Units.

Bylaws Approved: 30

- Last Updated 2006-2016: 23
- Last Updated 2005 or Older: 7
- Bylaws Never Approved: 21

P&T Guidelines Approved: 46

- Last Updated 2006-2016: 39
- Last Updated 2005 or Older: 7
- P&T Guidelines Never Approved: 5
- Number with New Ranks Included: 12

Process of Creating & Revising Departmental Bylaws

1/2017
1. Department Revises and Creates Document(s)
2. Dean’s Office Reviews Document(s)
3. OAA Reviews Document(s)
   - OAA generates a Summary of all comments, observations and feedback sent to the Dean’s Office.
   - Invitation to meet with OAA sent to Dean’s Office and Academic Unit

Tools used for “clean-up”

Guidance Documents

- Collective Bargaining Agreements
  - AAUP CBA
  - PSUFA CBA
- Constitution of the PSU Faculty
- Policies & Procedures for Evaluation for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases
- Bylaws Template
- AAUP & OAA Governance Document Template
- PSUFA & OAA Governance Document Template
- Deans’ Review Comments
- Instruction Sheet for Revisions related to NTTF Continuous Employment
OAA Summary Sheet

- Comments/Observations
- Editing/Formatting
- Required Changes
- Suggestions
- Questions/Clarifications

Face Time

- Drop in Bylaws Office Hours
- Scheduled Meetings upon request
- Post OAA Review Meetings

Governance Document Review Results
Since 2017:

Bylaws
- Never Submitted: 15
- In Progress: 26
  - In OAA: 6
  - With Units: 20
- Completed: 10

P&T
- Never Submitted: 20
- In Progress: 22
  - In OAA: 4
  - With Units: 18
- Completed: 10

Keep It FRESH
Proactive Measures to Keep Governance Docs Up To Date

- Ensure that all hyperlinks are working properly.
- Confirm that all governance documents are posted to Department’s website.
- Review CBAs
- Check OAA website
- Monitor Faculty Senate website
Values Behind Governor Budget

- We must renew and strengthen Oregonians’ faith in democracy
- We must spend every dollar wisely
- We must address the affordability crisis
- We must prepare for the future
- We must finally fix our underfunded education system

Impact of Governor’s Recommended Budget

FY20 relative to FY19 will decrease by $7.5 million:

- No increase in the Public University Support Fund (PSU: -$3.5 million)
- Elimination of Engineering Technology Support Fund (PSU: -$3 million)
- Elimination of Sports Lottery Funds (PSU: -$1 million)

This is on Top of $19M Gap
Governor Proposed $1.9 billion in investments

- $120 million in additional funding for the Public University Support Fund
- $60 million in additional funding for Engineering Technology Support Fund
- Full funding of the Sports Lottery Funds ($14 million)
- Increase of $121.5 million in Oregon Opportunity Grants for use in community colleges and public universities

Enrollment

Fall 2018 Enrollment

Headcount: 27,226; down 358 or 1.3%
SCH: 280,806; down 601 or 0.2%
Non-Resident SCH: 68,077; down 2,200 or 3.1%
Resident SCH: 212,729; up 1,599 or 0.8%
Graduate SCH: 36,464; down 2,480 or 6.4%
Undergraduate SCH: 244,342; up 1,879 or 0.8%

Winter 2019 Enrollment

Headcount: 18,748; down 253 or 1.3%
SCH: 224,035; up 966 or 0.4%
Non-Resident SCH: 51,697; down 1,404 or 2.6%
Resident SCH: 172,338; up 2,370 or 1.4%
Graduate SCH: 26,299; down 1,031 or 3.8%
Undergraduate SCH: 197,736; up 1,997 or 1.0%
December Minutes Appendix G.1

PSU Wheel of Success

Children

Number of children

Age 5-17
Age 0-4
Forecast

Year

Adult Population

Number of persons

Age 25-64
Age 45-64
Age 18-24
Forecast

Year

Elderly Population

Number of persons

Age 65-74
Age 75-84
Age 85+
Forecast

Year
Designing Future of Higher Education: A New PSU Innovation

Designing the Future
- Brainstorming Meetings with Each School/College
- Presidential Lecture Series
- Campus & Community Advisory Group
- Support for Innovative Ideas
- White Paper on “Inventing Future Higher Education”

Thank you!
Questions?
At its regular meeting on 3 December 2018, Faculty Senate approved the curricular consent agenda with the new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs given in Attachment E.1 to the December Agenda.

12-17-18— OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the new courses, changes to courses, and changes to programs.

The Senate also voted to approve:
• A policy statement, given in Attachment D.1 to the December Agenda, regarding curricular overlap for new course proposals being considered by the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

12-17-18— OAA concurs with the recommendation, and approves the policy statement.

Best regards,

Thomas M. Luckett
Presiding Officer

Richard H. Beyler
Secretary to the Faculty

Susan Jeffords, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Proposal: Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships

Portland State University’s policy on International Partnerships (available at the website of the Office of International Affairs) currently includes no provisions addressing the academic freedom and rights of free expression of faculty at both Portland State and its partner institutions. The Senate Steering Committee believes that concerns expressed by Portland State faculty members in recent months over safeguards of academic freedom in international partnerships demonstrate the need to consider such a policy, especially in regard to partnerships with institutions dependent on regimes that may be undemocratic or otherwise known to have a problematic record on human rights. Steering Committee therefore recommends the creation of an ad hoc committee to study this question and recommend revisions to University policy.

Motion recommended by the Senate Steering Committee:

An Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships shall be created to examine best practices in policies governing international academic partnerships, with respect to safeguards of the academic freedom of the faculty from both collaborating institutions who are involved in the partnership, and to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate and the University regarding the development of such a policy at Portland State.

The ad hoc committee will consist of six to eight members chosen by the Committee on Committees from among nominations by heads of academic units and self-nominations by faculty. The ad hoc committee will present an interim report to Faculty Senate by the end of academic year 2018-2019, and a final report in academic year 2019-2020.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY
For Presentation to Faculty Senate on 3 December 2018

Article V, Section 2.2 is hereby amended by replacing the current language with the following language:

2) Opt-Out

After the certification of Faculty membership, but no later than six weeks prior to the date of Senate elections, the Secretary to the Faculty shall circulate the certified list to Faculty in each division, with the directions that Faculty members who do not wish to be potential candidates may respond by opting out.

3) Nomination

No later than four weeks before the Senate election, the Secretary to the Faculty shall distribute a list of potential candidates to the Faculty in each division, with the instructions that each Faculty member may submit a number of nominations up to twice the number of Senate vacancies occurring in that division for the next academic year. In each division, those persons who receive the most nominations shall be declared final candidates, with the number of final candidates in each division equal to twice the number of vacancies in that division. In the event of a tie for the final position, all persons involved in the tie shall be declared final candidates.

Article V, Sections 2.3 through 2.5 are accordingly renumbered 2.4 through 2.6, respectively.

* * * * * * * * * *

In accordance with Article VIII of the Faculty Constitution, the proposal of the amendment is endorsed by Senators Carpenter, Craven, Dolidon, Hansen, Hsu, Lindsay, Lupro, Newlands, O’Banion, Reynolds, Thieman, and Yeigh.
December 6, 2018
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Mark Woods
Chair, Graduate Council
RE: January 2019 Consent Agenda

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, as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals, by going to the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS) Curriculum Dashboard (https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard) to access and review proposals.

**School of Business**

**Changes to Existing Courses**
E.1.a.1
- ISQA 521 Analytics Communication and Management, 2 credits – change course title to Data Visualization, change course description

**College of Education**

**Change to Existing Programs**
E.1.a.2
- M.Ed. in Education – change, add, and remove course requirements

**New Courses**
E.1.a.3
- ITP 537 Instructional Design and Assessment, 1-3 credits
  This yearlong course explores the theoretical frameworks and practical strategies that assist novice teachers in planning effective classroom curricula, assessments and instruction, while focusing on the developmental and learning needs of learners.
  Prerequisite: Admission to the Graduate Teacher Education Program (GTEP).

**Change to Existing Courses**
E.1.a.4
- ITP 538 Integrated Methods and Curriculum Design, 1-6 credits – change course title to Integrated Methods, change course description, change credit hours to 4 credits
E.1.a.5
- ITP 539 Elementary Mathematics Methods, 3 credits – change course description, change credit hours to 1-4 credits
E.1.a.6
- ITP 540 Foundations of Literacy, 3 credits – change credit hours to 4 credits
E.1.a.7
- ITP 543 Professional Collaboration in Elementary Education, 1-3 credits – change course description

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 400-level section please refer to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consent agenda memo.
Drop Existing Course
E.1.a.8
- ITP 544 Clinical Support for Elementary Teachers, 3 credits

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

New Courses
E.1.a.9
- *Ph 512 Quantum Mechanics II, 4 credits
  Introduction to the three-dimensional Schrödinger equation and applications such as band theory, selection rules, and molecules. The first half of the course will focus on exactly solvable models and analytic solutions. The second half will emphasize approximation methods in quantum mechanics, including perturbation theory, the variational principle, and the WKB approximation. The use of scientific software and modeling to solve quantum mechanical problems will be emphasized. Expected preparation: Ph 434 or Mth 322. Prerequisites: Ph 511 or permission of instructor; Ph 311 and Mth 256.

E.1.a.10
- *Phl 548 Biomedical Ethics, 4 credits
  Advanced study of central ethical issues in medicine, biomedical research, and health care systems, such as patient autonomy and medical paternalism, justice in provision of health services, protection of human subjects in research, and death, dying, and end of life care.

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.a.11
- *Geog 513 Biogeography of Pacific Northwest, 4 credits – change title to Disturbance Biogeography of Pacific Northwest, change course description

Drop Existing Courses
E.1.a.12
- BSt 570 African Art, 4 credits

School of Social Work

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.a.13
- SW 553 Racial Disparities, 3 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.a.14
- SW 556 Advanced Clinical Practice in Integrated Health Care, 3 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.a.15
- SW 559 Community and Organization Research, 3 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.a.16
- SW 562 Loss & Grief Across the Lifespan, 3 credits – change prerequisites

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 400-level section please refer to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consent agenda memo.
December 6, 2018

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Drake Mitchell
    Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: January 2019 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, as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments on new and change-to-existing program proposals, by going to the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS) Curriculum Dashboard (https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard) to access and review proposals.

**College of the Arts**

**New Courses**

E.1.b.1
- Art 313 Textile Processes, 4 credits
  This course is intended for upper division students wanting to incorporate 2D textile materials and processes into their established creative practice. Students gain exposure to sourcing and manipulating experience textiles through a combination of hand and digital processes - including submersion dye, block printing, hand and machine sewing, and digital fabric design. Students develop projects around the skills learned that intersect with goals for their individual practices. Prerequisites: Art 101 and upper-division standing, or instructor approval.

E.1.b.2
- Art 316 Fabric & Form, 4 credits
  This course covers sculptural approaches to using textiles for studio art and design practices. Students will learn the fundamentals of flat patterning and sewn construction for 3D form, wearables, and installation. Students will learn techniques for manipulating commercial patterns, adding structure to fabric and pliable material, and advanced methods of machine sewing. Lectures and readings expose students to the history of fiber, the use of textiles in contemporary art, and applications in fashion and costume. Prerequisites: Art 102 and Art 215, Art 315, or instructor approval.

E.1.b.3
- FILM 231 Advanced Film Analysis, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.4
- FILM 257 Narrative Film Production I, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.5
- FILM 258 Documentary Film Production I, 4 credits – change prerequisites

E.1.b.6
- FILM 280 Classical Film Theory, 4 credits – change prerequisites

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
E.1.b.7
- FILM 358 Narrative Film Production II, 4 credits – change prerequisites
E.1.b.8
- FILM 359 Narrative Film Production III, 4 credits – change prerequisites
E.1.b.9
- FILM 360 Topics in Film Production, 4 credits – change prerequisites and course description
E.1.b.10
- FILM 361 Documentary Film Production II, 4 credits – change prerequisites
E.1.b.11
- FILM 381 Film History I, 4 credits – change prerequisites
E.1.b.12
- FILM 382 Film History II, 4 credits – change prerequisites
E.1.b.13
- FILM 383 Film History III, 4 credits – change prerequisites

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

New Courses
E.1.b.14
- *ME 456 Mechatronics, 4 credits
  Students will gain an understanding of mechatronic (mechanical-electrical) systems and apply this knowledge directly in hands-on lab experiments. They will build circuits, collect sensor data, use a microcontroller, and control a motor. The format of the course will be one lecture and one lab per week. Prerequisite: ME 351.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.b.15
- Systems Minor – add new requirement and expand course options
E.1.b.16
- World Language B.A. – changing program requirements for the Spanish major

New Courses
E.1.b.17
- Comm 319 Social Media, 4 credits
  This course provides students with a deeper understanding of social media and its role in identity/personality, close and less close relationships, and societal change. Prerequisite: Comm 300.
E.1.b.18
- *CR 447 Civil Society and Conflict Resolution, 4 credits
  Explores the multi-faceted conflict resolution roles of civil society and non-governmental actors in helping societies experiencing strife, rebuild, manage and prevent conflict. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
• **Eng 489 Advanced Topics in Contemporary Literature, 4 credits**
  Study of specialized topics in late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century literature, focusing on specific literary movements, genres and forms, or modes of cultural representation. Topics may include postcolonialism, magic realism, posthumanism, queer theory, or digital/electronic literary forms. Course may be repeated for credit with different topics. Up to 8 credits of this course number can be applied to the English major. Prerequisite: Eng 300 and Wr 301.

• **Jpn 345 Manga Now!, 4 credits**
  Readings of new, critically acclaimed Japanese comic books and analysis of recent writings about the graphic-novel form. Readings of the manga are followed by a discussion of the artistic style, questions about Japanese society, and what kind of new developments are happening in the genre. Readings and discussions are in English. Expected preparation: Jpn 344.

• **Ling 457 Writing Workshop for Multilingual Graduate Students, 2 credits**
  The Graduate Writing Workshop is a 2-credit course designed to support multilingual graduate students with their existing writing projects. Students should have an existing writing project or regular written assignments that they wish to receive guidance on. Through seminar-style discussions and peer workshops, students will develop a critical awareness of their own writing needs and the conventions of American academic writing. Prerequisite: Graduate student standing.

• **Ph 412 Quantum Mechanics II, 4 credits**
  Introduction to the three-dimensional Schrodinger equation and applications such as band theory, selection rules, and molecules. The first half of the course will focus on exactly solvable models and analytic solutions. The second half will emphasize approximation methods in quantum mechanics, including perturbation theory, the variational principle, and the WKB approximation. The use of scientific software and modeling to solve quantum mechanical problems will be emphasized. Prerequisites: Ph 411 or permission of instructor; Ph 311 and Mth 256.

• **Phl 448 Biomedical Ethics, 4 credits**
  Advanced study of central ethical issues in medicine, biomedical research, and health care systems, such as patient autonomy and medical paternalism, justice in provision of health services, protection of human subjects in research, and death, dying, and end of life care. Expected preparation: Phl 355. Prerequisite: Upper-division standing.

• **SySc 342U Systems Thinking for Social Change, 4 credits**
  Why are complex social problems like poverty, homelessness, and climate change so hard to solve? How can we identify effective leverage points for change? This interdisciplinary course addresses social challenges using the methods of systems thinking. We’ll dig into real-world examples and learn how to create interactive systems “maps” using causal-loop diagramming. Causal mapping enables a rich understanding of
context, interrelationships, and perspectives. Students will gain practical tools they can use in their future work.

**Changes to Existing Courses**

**E.1.b.25**
- Anth 314U Native Americans, 4 credits – change course description

**E.1.b.26**
- Eng 305U Topics in Film, 4 credits – change description, repeatability, and grading option

**E.1.b.27**
- Eng 422 African Fiction, 4 credits – change description, repeatability, and grading option

**E.1.b.28**
- Geog 363U Africa, 4 credits – change title to Geography of sub-Saharan Africa

**E.1.b.29**
- *Geog 413 Biogeography of Pacific Northwest, 4 credits – change title to Disturbance Biogeography of Pacific Northwest, change description

**E.1.b.30**
- Per 341 Introduction to Persian Literature, 4 credits – change prerequisites

**E.1.b.31**
- Ph 201 General Physics, 4 credits – change prerequisites

**E.1.b.32**
- Ph 284 Workshop for Ph 201 General Physics, 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 201/231 General Physics, change description, change co-requisites

**E.1.b.33**
- Ph 285 Workshop for Ph 202 General Physics, 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 202/232 General Physics, change description, change co-requisites

**E.1.b.34**
- Ph 286 Workshop for Ph 203 General Physics, 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 203/233 General Physics, change description, change co-requisites

**E.1.b.35**
- Ph 294 Workshop for Ph 211 General Physics (with Calculus), 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 211/221 General Physics (with Calculus), change description, change co-requisites

**E.1.b.36**
- Ph 295 Workshop for Ph 212 General Physics (with Calculus), 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 212/222 General Physics (with Calculus), change description, change co-requisites

**E.1.b.37**
- Ph 296 Workshop for Ph 213 General Physics (with Calculus), 1 credit – change title to Workshop for Ph 213/223 General Physics (with Calculus), change description, change co-requisites

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
School of Social Work

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.b.38
  • SW 339 Introduction to Oppression and Privilege, 3 credits – change to 4 credits

Undergraduate Studies

Changes to Existing Courses
E.1.b.39
  • UnSt 195 Career Planning, 1 credit – change title to Career Exploration

College of Urban and Public Affairs

Change to Existing Programs
E.1.b.40
  • Urban and Public Affairs B.A./B.S. – change elective requirements

Drop Existing Courses
E.1.b.41
  • PS 426 The Politics of the News, 4 credits
E.1.b.42
  • PS 428 The Politics of Law and Order, 4 credits
E.1.b.43
  • PS 453 Power Transitions: Past, Present, and Future, 4 credits

* This course is part of a dual-level (400/500) course. For any revisions associated with the 500-level section please refer to the Grad Council consent agenda memo.
December 6, 2018

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Evguenia Davidova, Chair, University Studies Council

RE: Motion for consideration: Proposal for a Revised UNST Ethics and Social Responsibility Goal

Dear Steering Committee,

Please find attached:

1. University Studies Council’s Motion for PSU Faculty Senate: Proposal for a Revised Ethics and Social Responsibility Goal. It provides a summary of history and process; rationale, and outcomes.
The University Studies Council submits the following motion for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

The University Studies learning goals are hereby changed by replacing this text (1996):

**Ethics & Social Responsibility**

Students will expand their understanding of the impact and value of individuals and their choices on society, both intellectually and socially, through group projects and collaboration in learning communities.

with the text (2018):

**Ethics, Agency, & Community**

Students will examine values, theories and practices that inform their actions, and reflect on how personal choices and group decisions impact local and global communities.

**Summary of History & Process**

In Fall 2015, the UNST Council discussed revising two of its four curricular goals (the Diversity Goal and the Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal) and concluded they should be revised to remove dated language, to better reflect the curriculum of UNST faculty, and to align with the revised University Studies Vision & Mission Statement (2015), PSU's Diversity Action Plan (2014), and the strategic plan for Portland State University. Revision of the titles of the goals was also within the scope of the charge.

Thus, rather than revising both goals simultaneously, the subcommittee charged with these revisions decided to focus on them separately in order to ensure a thorough inquiry with as much input from current scholarship, a representative and interdisciplinary group of UNST faculty, and the broader campus community as possible. The subcommittee elected to revise the Diversity Goal first given its direct relevance to the contemporaneous revisions of the aforementioned strategic goals. The process of research and discussion continued throughout the year until a final draft was ratified by Faculty Senate (Winter 2017) and implemented by UNST (Spring 2017).

In Fall 2017, the UNST Council voted to organize a new subcommittee co-chaired by members of the previous subcommittee (Albert Spencer and Kimberly Willson-St. Clair) and charged to replicate the same process and timeline for revising the Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal. Research began in Winter 2018, forums were conducted in Spring 2018 (4/24 & 5/7), a draft was developed for discussion in Council (5/31), multiple revisions were made, and the proposed draft was unanimously ratified via email by the 12/16 Council’s members who voted (6/9).
After seeking comments by the University Studies faculty and mentors and the broader PSU community in October 2018, the Council approved (12/6) the submission of the final draft of the revised goal to the Faculty Senate.

Summary of Rationales

The Council justified a revision of the Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal for the following reasons:

- The language is confusing and should be simplified so students, faculty, parents, and community partners can understand it.
- Most of the language is vague and does not provide a clear enough definition of what ethics or social responsibility are in order to guide curriculum development.
- Some language is too concrete and reduces the goal to a specific pedagogical practice, i.e. group work and learning through service praxis, rather than addressing students across the curriculum throughout their undergraduate experience.

Summary of Outcomes

The following outcomes emerged through the conducted research, forums, and discussions to ensure that the proposed revision is:

- Aligned with the strategic goals and language of the revised UNST Mission & Vision Statement.
- Consistent with the curriculum and rubrics of all levels of University Studies, i.e. freshman inquiry, sophomore inquiry, junior cluster, and senior capstone.
- Informed by relevant faculty experts, professionals, campus stakeholders, and community partners.
- Representative of interdisciplinary theory, approaches, and practices of ethical conduct and social engagement.
- Broad enough to apply across programs, while concrete enough to guide curriculum development.
- Inclusive of a plurality of personal, cultural, political, religious, and philosophical values and commitments.
- Focused on student empowerment to develop their own mature ethos and self-directed, lifelong, community engagement.

Conclusion

The current revision suggests how UNST faculty should design their curriculum in alignment with goal, while allowing enough flexibility for a diverse range of disciplines, professions, theories, approaches, topics, and assignments. It also connects these curricular goals to student action, growth, and community engagement. Finally, it accomplishes these outcomes in language intelligible to most audiences and inclusive of diverse backgrounds.
UNST Council Members
Evguenia Davidova, Chair (INTL/UNST), Amy Spring (RSP), Annie Knepler (UNST), Ben Anderson-Nathe (SSW), Joseph Smith-Buani (BST), Rick Lockwood (CH), Kimberly Willson-St Clair (LIB), Alexander Jokic (PHL), Jeff Conn (SPHR), Leslie Batchelder (UNST), Amy Larson (ESM), Albert (Randy) Spencer (PHL), Christof Teuscher (ECE), Rachel Webb (MTH), Michael Dimond (SB).

Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal Subcommittee (2017-2019)
Albert R. Spencer (Co-Chair), Kimberly Willson-St. Clair (Co-Chair), Leslie Batchelder, Aleksander Jokic, Joseph Smith-Buani, Amy Spring

Advisors: Oscar Fernandez (Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Coordinator) & Seanna Kerrigan (Capstone Program Director).

Pedro Ferbel-Azcarate (Chair), Michael Lupro, Joseph Smith-Buani, Albert R. Spencer, Kimberly Willson-St Clair.
Research Policy: Principal Investigator/Project Director
Eligibility and Responsibility

1.0  Policy Summary Statement

The Principal Investigator (PI) or Project Director (PD) is the individual designated by Portland State University (PSU) and approved by an external funding agency (sponsor) to direct a sponsored project awarded to the University. Proposals submitted for extramural funding of research, training and public service projects, as well as awards received for such projects (sponsored projects) must name an eligible employee of the institution to serve as PI/PD. Eligibility to act as a PI/PD or Co-Investigator (Co-I) on sponsored projects is a privilege limited to employees of Portland State University. The PI/PD on a PSU sponsored project is accountable for all aspects of the project and is fiscally responsible for funds awarded to (PSU). Therefore, individuals serving as PIs must have sufficient authority as an employee of PSU to hold this role. This policy outlines the assignment-related criteria for serving as a PI on a PSU sponsored award.

2.0  Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to outline the assignment-related criteria for PSU employees to be assigned to the role of Principal Investigator/Project Director (PI/PD) and Co-Investigator on an externally-funded sponsored project. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that sponsored projects are conducted by those who have the requisite training, skill, commitment and resources as well as the appropriate relationship to the University.

3.0  Definitions

**Principal Investigator (PI):** The individual assigned by PSU who meets assignment-related criteria established by PSU and approved by the sponsor to direct the project or activity being supported by the award; responsible and accountable to both PSU and the sponsor for the appropriate fiscal management, conduct, and reporting of the sponsored project. This role is typically associated with research projects.

**Project Director (PD):** This term is synonymous with Principal Investigator (PI) for purposes of this policy and by many sponsoring agencies. It is often used to describe the individual assigned to direct sponsored projects for training or non-research activities.

**Co-Investigator (Co-I):** An individual who is assigned by PSU and shares with the PI/PD the responsibility for the conduct of a sponsored project and makes a significant contribution to the project.
**Sponsored Project**: Externally-funded activities in which a formal written agreement, such as a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, is entered into by the University and the sponsor, typically in response to a proposal submission.

### 4.0 Policy

PSU is legally and financially responsible and accountable to sponsors for awards issued to and accepted by PSU. The Principal Investigator (PI) is the individual assigned by Portland State University (PSU) and approved by the sponsor to direct a sponsored award. The PI is the primary individual in charge of the sponsored award and has primary responsibility for achieving the technical success of the project and proper stewardship of the funds. The PI is directly responsible and accountable to the University and sponsor for the proper programmatic, scientific or technical conduct of the project and its financial and day-to-day management.

An individual may be assigned a PI/PD role if they have the requisite education, training, skill, and commitment as determined by the head of the PSU division in which they are employed, as well as the appropriate relationship to the University as outlined in this policy.

#### 4.1 Principal Investigator/Project Director (PI/PD) Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible for assignment as a PI/PD on a PSU sponsored project, the individual must be a faculty member paid by PSU with an active PSU employment agreement in the following employee groups (rank and tenure status):

- Tenure-related faculty with the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.
- Faculty in academic service (Examples include: Deans, VPs, Chairs, Department/Unit Heads, and Directors).
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty with the rank of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor and an appointment of 0.5 FTE or greater as defined in the AAUP collective bargaining agreement
- Emeritus faculty of any rank or tenure status (with the approval of their department chair and dean).

Faculty in roles other than those described above, and individuals affiliated with PSU only through a courtesy appointment are not eligible to be assigned as PI/PD. In rare circumstances, these individuals may be authorized to serve as a Co-Investigator if an exception is granted in accordance with section 4.3 of this policy.

In instances where sponsor-specific PI requirements are more restrictive than this policy, PSU will follow the more restrictive requirements, as necessary. If the sponsor’s requirements are less restrictive than PSU’s policy, PSU’s policy shall take precedence.

#### 4.2 Co-Investigator (Co-I) Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible for assignment as a Co-Investigator on a PSU sponsored project, the individual must have qualifications consistent with a Research Associate or higher ranks and have written endorsement from the department chair and dean, or meet the eligibility requirements to serve as a PI as outlined in section 3.1.

#### 4.3 Exceptions to PI/PD Eligibility Requirements

Individuals in employment categories not listed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 may be assigned to the role of PI/PD or Co-Investigator on a case-by-case basis or provided blanket status through an exception process managed by the office of Research and Graduate Studies.
For projects in academic units, application for PI/PD or Co-Investigator status must be submitted by a Dean or University Center Director (Division Head) on behalf of an individual applicant to the Associate Vice President in Research and Graduate Studies following RGS procedures.

For projects in non-academic units, application for PI/PD or Co-investigator status must be submitted by the appropriate senior administrative official in the division (Division Head) to the Research and Graduate Studies following RGS procedures.

In all cases, the Division Head will affirm they understand that their unit is responsible for: (1) ensuring the individual follows all pertinent compliance and award administration requirements, (2) completion of all required reports and deliverables, (3) any financial liabilities such as over-expenditures, and (4) providing space and access to other facilities and/or resources needed to effectively carry out the project through the term of the award.

4.4 Principal Investigators for External Awards for Students or Other Trainees

Faculty advisors or mentors will be designated as the PSU Principal Investigator of record for external fellowships or other student awards. Trainees, whether or not they are employees (such as postdoctoral scholars or students), may apply for external fellowships and mentored career development awards only with the approval of a PSU faculty advisor or mentor as indicated either on the application and/or the PSU proposal internal approval form. Graduate students, postdoctoral scholars and other trainees may not normally serve as a PI or Co-PI on investigator-initiated sponsored awards.

4.5 Responsibilities of the Principal Investigator

PIs/PDs/Co-PIs must faithfully execute their responsibilities including conducting research and production of deliverables as required in the grant or contract, following applicable federal, state and local guidelines and regulations, following PSU policy and rules, submitting required reports in a timely manner, and any other specific guidelines required by the research sponsor or PSU. Failure to fulfill PI duties and responsibilities may result in the loss of PI role assignment, and/or result in discipline for just cause.

References:
Procedure: Principal Investigator/Project Direct Eligibility Exception Request
Principal Investigator/Project Direct Eligibility Exception Request Form
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