Portland State University

PDXScholar

6-13-2022

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet June 2022 (Special Meeting)

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, 13 June 2022

This meeting will take place as an on-line conference. Registration information will be provided to senators, ex-officio members, and presenters. Others who wish to speak in the meeting should contact the Secretary and a senator in advance, in order to receive registration information and to be introduced by the senator during the meeing. A link to a live-stream of the meeting will be posted to the Faculty Senate website (https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate).

In accordance with the Bylaws, the agenda and supporting documents are sent to senators and ex-officio members in advance of meetings so that members of Senate can consider action items, study documents, and confer with colleagues. In the case of lengthy documents, only a summary will be included with the agenda. Full curricular proposals are available through the Online Curriculum Management System:

pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/ Curriculum-Dashboard

If there are questions or concerns about agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay Senate business.

Items on the *Consent Agenda* are **approved** (proposals or motions) or **received** (reports) without further discussion, unless a senator gives notice to the Secretary in writing prior to the meeting, or from the floor prior to the end of **roll call**. Any senator may pull any item from the *Consent Agenda* for separate consideration, provided timely notice is given.

Senators are reminded that the Constitution specifies that the Secretary be provided with the name of any **alternate**. An alternate is a faculty member from the same Senate division as the faculty senator who is empowered to act on the senator's behalf in discussions and votes. An alternate may represent only one senator at any given meeting. A senator who misses more than three meetings consecutively will be dropped from the Senate roster.

Per Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Presiding Officer has convened this second June meeting to complete unfinished business from the June 6th meeting.

www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate

PORTLAND STATE
UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

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

Faculty Senate will meet on **13 June 2022** at **3:00 p.m.**

*This meeting will be held as an online conference. A livestream will be linked to the Faculty Senate website. Senators represented by **Alternates** must notify the Secretary by **noon** on **Monday, June 13th**. Others who wish to speak should ask a senator to send notification to the Presiding Officer and Secretary by **noon** on **Monday, June 13th**.*

AGENDA

A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda (see also G.3-7)*
*   1. *Attendance will be determined by the online participants list*
    2. Procedural: Presiding Officer may move any agenda item – *Consent Agenda*

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

C. Discussion – *none*

D. Unfinished Business
*   1. Resolution: foregrounding the APRCA guiding principles and priorities for program review/reduction process (Steering, AHC-APRCA – postponed from 22.06.06 E.6)

E. New Business – *none*

F. Question Period
*   1. Question to President
*   2. Question to President
*   3. Question to President
    Questions were presented to and answered by President and Provost at the June 6th meeting. Per the Bylaws, this agenda item is included to allow opportunity for follow-up questions from senators and ex-officio members. The original questions are attached. The President's and Provost's responses may be heard at the meeting recording posted to the [Faculty Senate website](pdx.edu) (pdx.edu login required).

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
    1. President's report
    2. Provost's report
*   3. Annual report of Academic Quality Committee – *Consent Agenda*
*   4. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee – *Consent Agenda*
*   5. Annual report of General Student Affairs Committee – *Consent Agenda*
*   6. Annual report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment (originally 22.06.06 G.5, included as background to D.1) – *Consent Agenda*
*   7. Annual report of Budget Committee (originally 22.06.06 G.4, included as background to D.1) – *Consent Agenda*

H. Adjournment

*See the following attachments.
Complete curricular proposals are available at the [Online Curriculum Management System](#).
A.1. Roster
D.1. Resolution on guiding principles & priorities for program review (Steering, AHC-APRCA)
F.1-3. Questions to Administrators
G.3. AQC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
G.4. ARC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
G.5. GSAC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
G.6. AHC-APRCA Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
G.7. BC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATORS, 2020-21

Steering Committee

Michele Gamburd, Presiding Officer
Vicki Reitenauer, Presiding Officer Elect • Isabel Jaén Portillo, Past Presiding Officer
Elected members: Jill Emery (2019-20) • Jon Holt (2019-20) • José Padín (2020-22) • Steven Thorne (2020-22)
Ex-officio (non-voting): Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty • Rowanna Carpenter, Senior IFS Rep.
Yves Labissiere, Faculty Trustee • Mary Oschwald, Chair, Committee on Committees

College of the Arts (COTA) [4]

Berrettini, Mark	FILM	2023
Borden, Amy E.	FILM	2022 *+
Heilmair, Barbara	MUS	2023
Magaldi, Karin	TA	2021

The School of Business (SB) [4]

Hansen, David	SB	2021
Loney, Jennifer	SB	2022 +
Raffo, David	SB	2023
Sanchez, Becky	SB	2022

College of Education (COE) [4]

Farahmandpur, Ramin	ELP	2022 +
Kelley, Sybil	ELP	2023
Sugimoto, Amanda	C&I	2021
vacant		2021 *

Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Science (MCECS) [5]

Anderson, Tim	ETM	2021
Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata	ECE	2021 +
Duncan, Donald	ECE	2022
Dusicka, Peter	CEE	2023
Feng, Wu-chang	CMP	2022

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences–Arts & Letters (CLAS-AL) [6]

Clark, Michael	ENG	2023
Cortez, Enrique	WLL	2023
Greco, Gina	WLL	2021 +
Holt, Jon	WLL	2021
Limbu, Bishupal	ENG	2022
Thorne, Steven	WLL	2022 +

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences–Sciences (CLAS-Sci) [7]

Cruzan, Mitch	BIO	2023
Eppley, Sarah	BIO	2022
Fountain, Robert	MTH	2021
Goforth, Andrea	CHE	2023
Jedynak, Bruno	MTH	2022 +
Lafferriere, Beatriz	MTH	2022 +
Thanheiser, Eva	MTH	2021

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences–Social Sciences (CLAS-SS) [6]

Ajibade, Jola	GGR	2023 +
Fritz, Charlotte	PSY	2021
Gamburd, Michele	ANT	2022
Meyer, Claudia	SPHR	2021
Padín, José	SOC	2023
Reitenauer, Vicki	WGSS	2022 +

Library (LIB} [1]

Mikulski, Richard	LIB	2023 +

School of Public Health (SPH) [2]

Izumi, Betty	CH	2021 *
Labissiere, Yves	CH	2022 +

School of Social Work (SSW) [4]

Chorpenning, Matt	SSW	2023
May, Edward	SSW	2021
Oschwald, Mary	RRI	2022 +
Smith, Gary	SSW	2023

College of Urban and Public Affairs (CUPA) [5]

Clucas, Richard	PS	2023
Erev, Stephanie	PS	2023
Kinsella, David	PS	2022 +
Tinkler, Sarah	ECN	2021 *
vacant		2021 *

Other Instructional Faculty (OI) [3]

Carpenter, Rowanna	UNST	2023
Lupro, Michael	UNST	2021 +
Newlands, Sarah	UNST	2021

All Other Faculty (AO) [9]

Broussard, Scott	ACS	2021
Flores, Greg	ACS	2022
Gómez, Cynthia	DMSS	2023
Harris, Randi	OAI	2022 +
Hunt, Marcy	SHAC	2023
Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2021
Kennedy, Karen	ACS	2022
Law, Anna	ACS	2023
Matlick, Nick	REG	2021

Notes:
* Interim appointment • + Committee on Committees • Total positions: 60 • Status: 26 April 2021

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF PSU FACULTY SENATE, 2020-21

Administrators

Adler, Sy	Interim Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs
Allen, Clifford	Dean, The School of Business
Bangsberg, David	Dean, OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health
Bowman, Michael	Acting Dean, Library
Bynum, Leroy, Jr.	Dean, College of the Arts
Chabon, Shelly	Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development
Coll, Jose	Dean, School of Social Work
Corsi, Richard	Dean, Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science
Jeffords, Susan	Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
Knepfle, Chuck	Vice President for Enrollment Management
Lambert, Ame	Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion
Lynn, Marvin	Dean, College of Education
Mulkerin, Amy	Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning
Percy, Stephen	President
Podrabsky, Jason	Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Reynolds, Kevin	Vice President for Finance and Administration
Rosenstiel, Todd	Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Toppe, Michele	Vice Provost for Student Affairs
Walsh, Michael	Dean of Student Life
Wooster, Rossitza	Dean, Graduate School

Faculty Committee Chairs

Boyce, Steven	Budget Committee (co-chair)
Burgess, David	Intercollegiate Athletics Board
Coleman, Cornelia	Honors Council
Comer, Kate	University Writing Council
Cruzan, Mitchell +	Budget Committee (co-chair)
Epstein, Joshua	General Student Affairs Committee
Estes, Jones	Academic Quality Committee
Ginley, Susan	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Goodman, Julia	Faculty Development Committee (co-chair)
Hendricks, Arthur	Educational Policy Committee (co-chair)
Loikith, Paul	Graduate Council
Millay, Lea	Library Committee
Nadeau, Jay	University Research Committee
Parnell, Will	Faculty Development Committee (co-chair)
Sager, Alexander	Educational Policy Committee (co-chair) [also IFS]
Shatzer, Liz	Scholastic Standards Committee
Spencer, Randy	University Studies Council
Watanabe, Suwako	Academic Requirements Committee
TBD (January 2021):	ACIC

Senate Officers and Other Faculty Officers

Beyler, Richard	Secretary to the Faculty
Carpenter, Rowanna +	Advisory Council (2020-22); IFS (Jan. 2020-Dec. 2022)
Emery, Jill	Steering Committee (2019-21)
Gamburd, Michele +	Presiding Officer; Advisory Council (2019-21)
Jaén Portillo, Isabel	Past Presiding Officer
Labissiere, Yves +	Advisory Council (2019-21); IFS (Jun. 2019-Dec. 2021); BoT
Oschwald, Mary +	Chair, Committee on Committees
Padín, José +	Advisory Council (2020-22); Steering Committee (2020-22)
Reitenauer, Vicki +	Presiding Officer Elect
Sager, Alexander	IFS (Jan. 2021-Dec. 2023) [also EPC co-chair]
Sipelii, Motutama	President, ASPSU
Thorne, Steven +	Steering Committee (2020-22)
Voegele, Janelle	Advisory Council (2020-22)
Webb. Rachel	Advisory Council (2019-21)
Zonoozy, Khalil	Adjunct faculty representative

Notes
+ Also an elected senator
Status as of 26 January 2021

Portland State University Faculty Senate Motion

Foregrounding the APRCA Guiding Principles and Priorities for Program Review/Reduction Process

Background, rationale, and preliminary discussions

In February 2021, as part of Phase 1 of the Program Review/Reduction Process (PRRP), the APRCA committee crafted a set of Guiding Principles and Priorities (GPP) to complement the driver and value metrics formulated by the Provost's Program Reduction Working Group. The committee shared these principles with the faculty at a series of college- and school-level "ReImagine" meetings during the spring of 2021. Among other things, the GPP outlines the importance of communication, transparency, and consulting with stakeholders before making decisions.

The APRCA Guiding Principles and Priorities urge
1. Equitable and meaningful engagement of all stakeholders
2. Focus on student access, quality learning experiences, and completion
3. Our work will change; let's make it for the better
4. Research and data informed decision making
5. Seek feedback prior to decision making
6. Devote resources to the ReImagining process
7. Transparent process and open communication with all stakeholders

During the fall of 2021, using data from the driver and value metrics, OAA selected 18 units to write narratives in Phase 2 of the PRRP process. The units delivered their reports in March of 2022. In April of 2022, the Provost and Deans of four colleges (COTA, COE, CLAS, and CUPA) selected 5 of the 18 units to write strategic plans for Phase 3 of the PRRP process.

The Chairs of these 5 units, members of the APRCA committee, and members of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee feel that the latter phases of the PRRP process have lacked the clarity and transparency around criteria for analysis and evaluation called for in the Guiding Principles. In specific, they ask, a) What evaluation was applied to the quantitative driver metrics to determine why the 18 units were selected to write Phase 2 narratives? b) What criteria were used to evaluate the qualitative data from the Phase 2 narratives to select units to write Phase 3 plans? And c) What are the goals of the Phase 3 plans and by what criteria will they be evaluated?

Additionally, although the PRRP initially aimed to include strategic planning to position PSU well for the future, the process, as it has unfolded, seems to have devolved into being mainly a budget-cutting exercise.

APRCA and Senate Steering put before the Faculty Senate the following resolution:

Motion presented by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee

The Senate moves 1) to endorse the APRCA committee's Guiding Principles and Priorities; 2) to request a written response from OAA with a detailed plan for how the Guiding Principles and Priorities will be upheld during Phase III of the PRRP, due to APRCA and Faculty Senate Steering Committee by September 16, 2022; and 3) to urge OAA and the Deans to foreground these principles in practice during the Phase III of the Program Review/ Reduction Process to maximize consultation, participation, communication, and transparency.

Presented to the Senate on June 6, 2022

Portland State
UNIVERSITY

To: Stephen Percy, President

From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Date: 25 May 2022

Re: Question to Administrators

A Faculty Senator has submitted the following question to the President as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on June 6th:

Question to President

Given that you have announced your retirement, can you please comment on the rationale for pursuing a search for a new Vice President for Research? This is a key position for the PSU research infrastructure that needs to be in good philosophical alignment with the President. Given the financial and other costs associated with pursuing the search, it seems that this search should be postponed so it can be handled by your successor.

Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the June 6th meeting in section F. Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

Portland State
UNIVERSITY

To: Stephen Percy, President

From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Date: 30 May 2022

Re: Question to Administrators

Faculty Senator Sybil Kelley, on behalf of faculty colleagues in the departments of Applied
Linguistics, Conflict Resolution, International and Global Studies, Theater, and the Leadership in
Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership, has submitted the following
question to the President as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on
June 6th.

Question to President Stephen Percy

We acknowledge the challenge facing administration in creating a balanced
budget and acknowledge that adjusting the organizational structure and
function of our institution is necessary. We recognize that the Program
Review and Reduction Process (PRRP) was initiated and the Faculty Senate
Academic Program Review and Curriculum Adjustment (APRCA) committee
was created as a way for faculty and administrators to engage in shared
governance around these challenges.

The PRRP process has not aligned with the APRCA committee guiding
principles related to transparency, due process, and shared governance.
Criteria for evaluation have not been shared and there has not been
meaningful engagement or feedback around Phase II or Phase III narratives.
Further, the process has reinforced siloes and does not support meaningful
collaboration toward stated goals of interdisciplinary programming and
research for climate resiliency and racial justice.

If the Provost refuses to stop the PRRP and start over with meaningful faculty
engagement, will you intervene to do so?

Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the June 6th meeting in section F.
Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

Portland State
UNIVERSITY

To: Susan Jeffords, Provost

From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Date: 30 May 2022

Re: Question to Administrators

Faculty Senator Sybil Kelley, on behalf of faculty colleagues in the departments of Applied Linguistics, Conflict Resolution, International and Global Studies, Theater, and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership, has submitted the following question to the Provost as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on June 6:

Question to Provost Susan Jeffords

We acknowledge the challenge facing administration in creating a balanced budget and acknowledge that adjusting the organizational structure and function of our institution is necessary. We recognize that the Program Review and Reduction Process (PRRP) was initiated and the Faculty Senate Academic Program Review and Curriculum Adjustment (APRCA) committee was created as a way for faculty and administrators to engage in shared governance around these challenges.

The PRRP process has not aligned with the APRCA committee guiding principles related to transparency, due process, and shared governance. Criteria for evaluation have not been shared and there has not been meaningful engagement or feedback around Phase II or Phase III narratives. Further, the process has reinforced siloes and does not support meaningful collaboration toward stated goals of interdisciplinary programming and research for climate resiliency and racial justice.

Due to the lack of transparency, due process, and shared governance in the implementation of the PRRP, will you stop this process and start over with a renewed process that aligns with the guiding principles of the APRCA committee?

Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the June 6th meeting in section F. Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

2021-22 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate from the Academic Quality Committee

Members:
> J.R. "Jones" Estes, Chair, OI
> Evguenia Davidova, CUPA
> Cassio de Oliveira, CLAS-AL
> Michael Dimond, SB
> Sahan T.M. Dissanayake, Economics, CUPA
> Karla Fant, MCECS
> Maria Kapantzoglou, CLAS-SS
> Jesse Locker, Art History, COTA
> Kathleen Merrow, Honors College, OI
> Ex officio: Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP

Charge:
1. Research, identify, and recommend practices that promote and sustain academic quality for faculty and students at Portland State University.
2. Conduct and review biennial surveys of faculty and students.
3. Report on issues, concerns, and potential for actionable ideas.
4. Conduct research on implementation of best practices and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
5. Maintain a "dashboard" that evaluates progress on implementation of academic quality initiatives.
6. Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

Action Items:

Picking up the agenda set in spring 2022, the Committee began fall term by examining whether the AQC Faculty Senate Charge remains relevant to the role and resources of the committee. Specifically, whether or not the AQC should continue collecting data for "dashboards" to evaluate "progress on implementation of academic quality initiatives" (Committee Charge).

Through discussion and consultation with Kathi Ketcheson, OIRP, the Committee determined that its Charge remains appropriate. However, rather than concentrating on the no-longer-funded mandate of conducting, analyzing, and posting its own surveys; the AQC will continue to work collaboratively with campus partners to contribute questions on existing surveys.

Regarding dashboards, it was suggested that AQC coordinate the surveys of OAA, IAC, and OAI regarding student success initiatives related to academic quality. The AQC will explore this option in the 2022-23 academic year.

In further fulfillment of its Charge, the Committee:

1. Reviewed the work of the four Ad Hoc Committees formed as a response to the AQC recommendations to the Faculty Senate in 2016 to follow up on the progress of those recommendations. Both the Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research and the Undergraduate Research Ad Hoc Committees filed reports with the Faculty Senate

(respectively, [Report of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research 2020-21](#) and [Undergraduate Research Committee website and report](#)). The remaining ad hoc committees were on writing and the graduate student experience. We were unable to locate their reports or connect with their committee members this academic year. From initial efforts, it appears that the recommendations for each have been absorbed into the work of the University Writing Council and the Graduate School. We will continue this work in 2022-23.

2. Continued collaborations with the Institutional Assessment Council (IAC). The AQC Chair attended meetings as a liaison and contributed to the IAC's work in planning PSU's first annual assessment celebration in the fall of 2021. Committee member Maria Kapantzoglou began attending IAC meetings as an additional liaison in 2022.

3. Followed up on the AQC's concerns and memo on Attend Anywhere. The AQC Chair met with Cindy Baccar, Registrar, and Michelle Giovannozzi, OAI, in January for an update on the assessment plan for Attend Anywhere. Michelle said OAI will continue to survey faculty and students through the 2022-23 academic year and issue a report of the findings. A report of DWF rates from courses (all delivery modes) will be available late spring 2022. Cindy reported that it became clear during the move back from remote-only instruction that students did not understand course delivery labels. Consequently, they would work with a focus group to propose new labels.

4. Made some progress on developing a HIP course designation. Specifically, the AQC Chair participated in the study formation for the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Civic Engagement Assessment through the Office of Academic Innovation (OAI). Using the AAC&U Values Rubric, this work will result in an assessment report from AAC&U evaluating the level of civic engagement present in sampled student work. The report is scheduled to be available by fall 2022.

5. Expanded our collaboration with other Faculty Senate Committees and campus initiatives that impact academic quality, including:
   a. adding an AQC liaison to the Student Success Evidence Committee (Sahan Dissanayake and Kathleen Merrow) and
   b. establishing a partnership with the Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee (ACIC) to address shared, ongoing concerns regarding a lack of data on the remote/online student experience.

6. Had discussions throughout the year regarding APRCA processes and informed the APRCA Committee regarding impacts on academic quality.

7. Explored what data gathering options and partnerships are useful to the campus community. The AQC Chair joined the Student Success Student Experience workgroup. This collaboration led to a merging with the Digital Evaluation Committee (DEC) and allowed the Student Experience workgroup to utilize the substantial work already completed by the DEC.

8. Revisited the OIRP analysis of the HIPs survey and Senior Exit Survey from spring 2020, and requested OIRP administer the same survey spring 2022. The Committee will use this as we continue to develop criteria and process for HIPs course designation in the course schedule.

Emergent Issues:

The Committee had discussions throughout the year regarding how students were faring with the return to campus in fall, the return to increased Covid-19 cases in winter, and the burnout of spring term. With one exception, AQC members noted student inability to work in groups, both in-person and online, including when students reported the desire to engage and collaborate with classmates. Similarly, members noted a significant decline in class discussion as well as cases of incivility, particularly in online courses, ranging from rude to aggressive.

Faculty discussed the strains of supplying two, sometimes more, curricula for students who stopped attending in-person. Faculty noted a significant decrease in the knowledge of majors in upper-division courses and general education.

Carryover items for the Committee to consider in academic year 2022-23:

There was one area of carryover from the 2021-22 academic year that the AQC did not attend to:

1. Consider options for expanding Committee communication with campus, e.g., creation of a webpage and/or dashboard. We will pick up this topic in 2022-23.

2022-23 Committee Priorities:

The AQC will continue its work outlined above with the understanding that it is possible new developments in the Academic Program Reduction Process and the lingering effects of the pandemic may redirect our focus. Regardless, we will revisit the Attend Anywhere memo the AQC sent to the Provost in spring 2022 to evaluate the program's impact on academic quality. This will include related issues such as examining how new course delivery titles and descriptions are utilized by departments and student demand for "attend anywhere" accommodations regardless of the course delivery method.

Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)
2021-22 Annual Report

Date: June 6, 2022

Members 2021-22:
Suwako Watanabe WLL(CLAS) Chair
Ari Douangpanya ACS (CLAS)
Jane Mercer UNST
Amy Donaldson
Laura Marsh ACS (CLAS-Sci)
Ashley Storey ACS (SB)
Vacant (Faculty Member)
Adrian Perez (Student Member)

Consultants:
Rebecca Ingersoll ACS
Nicholas Matlick RO

Support Staff:
Jill Borek

The Responsibilities of the Academic Requirements Committee are:
1) Develop and recommend policies regarding the admission of entering freshmen.
2) Develop and recommend policies regarding transfer credit and requirements for baccalaureate degrees.
3) Adjudicate student petitions regarding such academic regulations as credit loads, transfer credit, and graduation requirements for all undergraduate degree programs. Adjudicate student petitions regarding initial undergraduate admissions.
4) Make recommendations and propose changes in academic requirements to the Faculty Senate.
5) Report to the Senate at least once each year.
6) Act, in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairpersons of the Scholastic Standards and Curriculum Committees, and with the chairperson of the Graduate Council.

The ARC met regularly (about twice per month) via Zoom from September 2021 through May 2022. We reviewed **170** petitions, of which **161** were approved (through May 23, 2022). The number of petitions has increased from previous years. This increase is attributed to hardships experienced by many students across campus because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The University Studies Cluster Requirement remained the most common focus of the petitions this year. The average turnaround time for petitions from submission to implementation has remained at 10 days, which is similar to previous years.

The Committee has been working with one faculty position vacant throughout this year. Currently we are missing the faculty's perspective in the areas of Sciences and Fine Arts, and we hope that these areas will be filled next academic year.

Significant issues that we worked on:

Review of Proposal for Transfer Admission GPA
The ARC received from the Undergraduate Admissions office a proposal to change the transfer admission GPA calculation with regard to repeated courses. It proposes that if a non-repeatable,

articulated course is taken more than once across the student's transfer history, then *only one grade* will be counted in TAGPA and attempted credits. UGADM proposes using the highest grade received in the course repeated in calculating the TAGPA. The ARC members reviewed the proposal and agreed that the proposed change is in alignment with NCAA practice and supported it.

Discussion of HB2056
Christopher Skinner contacted ARC for feedback regarding the new HB2056 that honors the linguistic heritage of Oregon's students allowing them to take arts and letters courses in a language other than English. Access to Linguistic Inclusion equips Oregon schools and districts with new tools to honor and recognize the achievements of Oregon's multilingual and multicultural students. At least 160 different languages are spoken by students in Oregon. This law honors the linguistic heritage of Oregon's students and communities and paves the way for a multilingual educational environment in Oregon's schools. It also removes structural barriers to high school graduation for students in the process of learning English, and recognizes that content learning can and should occur in multiple languages.

We contacted the Writing Council, but since it is still in a preliminary stage, we don't know what impact it will have on the university's admission standard. We will need more information such as practices done at other institutions.

The committee wishes to thank Becki Ingersoll, Nicholas Matlick, and Jill Borek for their excellent support of our work.

General Student Affairs Committee 2021-2022 Report
Membership
Chair: George Colligan (SOMT)
Members: David Burnett (ECE), Karen Haley (COE), Heather Petzold (UNST),
Bethany Potts (Enrollment Management), Ariana Peters (Student)
Liaisons: Michele Toppe, Vice Provost for Student Affairs; Alex Miller,
Executive Assistant

Committee Charge (from Faculty Constitution)
1. Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of
   student affairs, educational activities, budgets, and student discipline.
2. Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations
   regarding policies related to student services, programs, and long-range
   planning, e.g., student employment, educational activities, counseling,
   health service and extracurricular programming.
3. Nominate the recipients of the Presidential Community Service Awards.

Report

● One of our main accomplishments this year was the revival of the PSU
Presidential Awards for service. Out of 35 eligible candidates, the committee
selected 4 candidates (2 at the undergraduate level and 2 at the graduate level)
to receive these awards based on service to the community or the university,
respectively. All of the candidates were extremely impressive. The committee
reviewed materials submitted by faculty members and staff from the from the
various units within the university. The awards were presented during an SALP
event on May 13th.

https://www.pdx.edu/student-affairs/presidential-awards

● The GSAC acted as a liaison between the Faculty Senate and the Pronoun
project. The members of the project (Andrea Garrity, Delaney Ybarra, Cliff
Allen, Jeff Conn, and Nicolle DuPont) made a presentation at one of our
meetings and the GSAC members agreed that they should present their ideas in
a Faculty Senate meeting.

● The committee has worked closely with Michele Toppe and will continue to do so. Specifically, Vice Provost Toppe's collaborations with PSU Landing, the Incident Management Team, the Student Communications Network, the "Persistence Network," and other student life offices have kept the committee apprised of ongoing efforts to promote campus community and student well-being.

● While this past year has seen a reopening of the campus and in some ways a return to normal activities, Covid -19 is not exactly over. The mask mandate is not currently in effect, however, masking and other aspects of in-person activities have become more based on personal choice and personal risk factors. Quarantine regulations have eased, but many students and faculty are getting sick, although it seems as though generally the new variants have a much milder effect, especially for the fully vaccinated and boosted. While there is the appearance of normalcy, the effects of this somewhat tumultuous period should not be underestimated. GSAC can be part of the effort to help the transition back to as normal an experience as possible.

● George Colligan will continue as chair of the GSAC for 2022-2023.

Recommendations to the 2022-2023 Committee

● The implementation of the PSU Presidential Awards for service is the most definitive achievement of the GSAC committee this year. We consider these awards to be extremely valuable. The awards are incredibly symbolic, however, we agreed that adding a monetary component to the award would add to the value. Even $500 dollars would be incredibly useful to our deserving students. The committee should push for funding from either the President's office and/or finding a donor to help with the funding of this award.

● Continue collaborating with ASPSU, including but not limited to student members of the committee, on addressing the most pressing concerns that students face and the sense of campus culture and "belonging" more broadly. Although we tried to recruit students for participation on the GSAC committee, we were only able to have one student (Ariana Peters) attend meetings on a regular basis. The committee agreed that we need more students on the committee and to make sure we listen to them and address their concerns.

● Continue working with Vice Provost Toppe's office on student communication, student resource publicizing, and possibilities for reinvigorating a Fall Convocation for new students (possible now that on-campus activities have returned for the most part.) Finding the best way to communicate with students and making sure they are aware of activities, opportunities, and resources has been an ongoing discussion with the GSAC Committee.

● Find new opportunities for public-facing education and engagement efforts that have emerged from the last two very difficult years; investigate ways of working with the surrounding communities on questions of public health, drug safety, and social justice.

● Campus Safety continues to be an ongoing issue and a discussion topic with the GSAC committee. While there are other committees who are dealing with this issue more directly, it is important to have a forum where students can voice their opinions and concerns on the issue.

APRCA Committee Report to Faculty Senate – June 2022

Committee Charge

Faculty Senate created the Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments in October 2020 with the following charge:

- Focus holistically on PSU's collective future

- Ensure faculty participation in meaningful, inclusive, and formative discussions of curricular adjustments related to budget reduction

- Recommend principles and priorities based on PSU's values and mission, with an emphasis on applying a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens, and share these with OAA to guide decision-making

- Plan and implement transparent communications, including but not limited to periodic town hall forums on budget information, regular campus-wide emails, and a website or Google Drive for material, including data on which decisions about reorganizing or eliminating programs are based

- Solicit input and feedback from faculty, including but not limited to implementing surveys and arranging other forums for gathering input and suggestions. Ensure input and involvement from Deans and Chairs/department heads. Facilitate communication with and incorporate input from students, staff, and other stakeholders

- Plan and implement meetings and interactions (preferably with professionally mediation), including but not limited to meetings of Colleges/Schools

- Assist, if requested by OAA or AAUP, in contractually mandated retrenchment hearings arising from elimination of positions as per Article 22 of the PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement

In April 2021, Faculty Senate extended the charge of the committee to June 2022. In May 2022, Faculty Senate further extended the charge of the committee to June 2023.

Committee Membership

In 2021-2022, the committee had designees representing five key Constitutional committees, including Michele Gamburd (Steering), Mitch Cruzan (Budget), Peter Chaille (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee), Yangdong Pan (Graduate Council), and Joan Petit (Educational Policy Committee). The committee also included five members appointed by the Committee on Committees: Rachel Cunliffe, Jones Estes, Candyce Reynolds, Kellie Gallagher, and Michelle Swinehart (diversity advocate). In addition, four consultants were appointed by OAA: Sy Adler, Laura Hickman, Vanelda Hopes, and Amy Mulkerin. Michele Gamburd and Rachel Cunliffe co-facilitated the committee.

Committee report

The APRCA committee has submitted monthly reports throughout 2021-22. This document summarizes the committee's activities for the year, provides a report for the month of May 2022, and suggests priorities for 2022-23.

Yearly report

Accomplishments of the past year include communicating with OAA about the Program Review/ Reduction Process (PRRP), liaising with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee about fiscal issues, and reporting to Senate.

May report

In late April, the 18 units identified in Phase 2 of the PRRP process received letters from the Provost and the Deans of their colleges in reply to the careful and detailed narratives that were sent to OAA. Each letter contained a page of boilerplate text followed by several bullet points tailored to the unit. 2 units received additional funding, 11 received no additional funding, and 5 received instructions to craft a viable strategic plan by November 1, 2022, or else the university will "move forward with steps toward program reduction." The five units that received instructions to craft Phase 3 plans are Applied Linguistics (CLAS), Conflict Resolution (CLAS), International and Global Studies (CUPA), Theater (COTA), and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership (COE).

Faculty Senate 5/2/2022

At the Faculty Senate on 5/2/2022, Provost Jeffords received a question regarding Phase 3 of the PRRP process regarding how having only five units develop strategic plans is a strategic way to address the larger goals of the university. The Provost replied,

> I know that the question around the strategic decisions of the University has been something that was brought forward by the APRCA committee from the beginning of this process. How do we know that any of these conversations are contributing to an overall strategic vision of the university? And I totally understand the value of having that conversation. What I will say is that was not the framing within which we began this discussion. We started this discussion as part of an overall effort to get to a place where our [extended pause] where the institution could be in a healthier budget situation and we would not have to constantly be having conversations about cutting budgets, which was a message that I heard loud and clear since the time I got here. And so I would say, and I know this doesn't feel like a very good response to those who raise this point, that we entered into this conversation in an effort to focus on overall sustainable financial conversations. We did not have a context or a framing in which, as a broad university, we were able to discuss what are the most strategic components of the university and how do we want to emphasize those. That's a conversation I think lots of folks would welcome. I just don't think that this was the framing within which that conversation took place, but I do acknowledge that this is a question that has come up from the APRCA committee since the beginning of this process. [Video recording time stamp: 1:32:49 – 1:34:58. Link: https://media.pdx.edu/media/t/1_tr4a7nmy]

In conversations with the APRCA committee and Budget Committee meetings, the administration has clarified that reductions through PRRP is one of several strategies to close the $7 million gap between expenditures and revenue that OAA needs to bridge in the next two years. Other strategies include faculty uptake on the retirement transition option, meeting enrollment targets, and potential efficiencies realized by acting on the findings from the Huron Report on support services.

APRCA committee members would appreciate clear estimates from OAA and FADM regarding how many faculty and staff positions will be lost in order to close the budget gap. We understand the many sources of uncertainty in the budget process. At the same time, over a third of our academic units (18 of 51) have come under Phase 2 scrutiny and nearly a tenth (5 of 51) remain in jeopardy. In the interests of transparency, the faculty request additional budget information on this important topic.

APRCA has urged in the past and will continue to urge that strategic planning and whole-university conversations be part of the program review process. Instead of trimming around the edges and carrying on as usual elsewhere, it would benefit PSU more to engage the entire campus in a conversation about strategies and goals so that we come out of the budget reduction process well situated to meet the challenges of the next five years.

APRCA meeting with the 5 units on 5/5/2022

At its meeting on 5/5/2022, the APRCA committee met with the chairs and interested faculty from the 5 units that have been asked to write Phase 3 Plans for Nov 1st. (This deadline has since been extended into December.) Recognizing that they had not yet had a chance to meet with their Deans, the APRCA committee nevertheless felt it was important to offer support and help plan a way forward.

Several themes emerged from the discussion. The first issue revolves around the lack of clarity about goals and criteria for the PRRP process. The five units do not understand how their Phase 2 narratives were evaluated, and without receiving clearly articulated goals and targets, they are unsure of how to write a viable Phase 3 plan. The chairs articulated their wish for greater transparency around a series of questions: a) What evaluation was applied to the quantitative driver metrics to determine why the 18 units were selected to write Phase 2 narratives? b) What criteria were used to evaluate the qualitative data from the Phase 2 narratives to select units to write Phase 3 plans? c) What are the goals of the Phase 3 plans and by what criteria will they be evaluated? The APRCA committee supports the units in pointing out the lack of clarity around goals and criteria. Specificity around strategies and goals will facilitate the effective writing of "viable" Phase 3 plans.

A second theme that emerged from the conversation involves the mistrust and exhaustion that the 5 units are experiencing. They have expended and will continue to expend a great deal of energy on writing narratives and plans. In the absence of clear criteria for the success or failure of the 18 units' narratives, the selection of the five units to write Phase 3 plans appears arbitrary or predetermined, and is thus traumatizing and cruel. The current situation suggests that the chairs have failed to save their own jobs and that of their colleagues. This discourse shifts the blame and shame to the units. In the 13 other units targeted to write narratives, faculty do now know what 'not being on the list of 5' means and fear that their jobs may still be in jeopardy. The prolonged and unclear process damages hope, drains self-esteem, and diminishes creativity.

A third theme that arose in conversation with the 5 units relates to the need for engaging the entire campus in strategic thinking about the future of the university. At the moment, only members of the 5 units are tasked with creative planning – which should be part of a campus-wide strategic effort. If cross-unit collaboration is a goal, can other programs trust that reaching out to the 5 targeted units will not drag them down? The current process encourages isolation and the siloing of programs. In addition, what scale of savings can result from collaboration? It would be helpful to have the administration articulate how they see the collaboration helping OAA reduce the gap between revenue and expenditures.

APRCA meeting with the Provost on 5/23/2022

On Monday, May 23rd, the APRCA committee hosted the Provost at our last meeting of the academic year. The Provost provided an update on the PRR process. Several key points emerged from the conversation.

Most significantly, the Provost made clear that the goal of the plan that each of the 5 units is asked to write will be to show how the unit can continue to meet their goals and offer their programs viably with their current staffing, resources, and budget. The plan should show how the unit can sustain their programs within the current budget or alter their programs to fit the current budget. The APRCA committee members felt that what we heard from the Provost was significantly less threatening than what we had understood from the letters the units received in response to the Phase 2 narratives.

Recognizing that units have asked for additional clarity, goals, and criteria, the Provost said that she and the Deans will provide additional communication, in the form of a letter, clear instructions for the plan, and greater feedback for the units. (Letters went out on 5/27; see below.)

The Provost said that she will extend the Phase 3 Plan deadline from November 1 to December 1. In addition, in order to keep the workload manageable, she will limit the length to 10 pages. She will provide help with

accessing university data if plan-writers want it, and she will make it simple for people to access funding of $25,000 per unit to support writing the report, both for the units and for other units that the 5 units might want to be in conversation with over the summer.

The Provost also emphasized that the Phase 3 plan was not, in her words, a "charade" and that no decisions have been made. She envisions a serious dialog about how the units will move forward with 'constrained resources.'

5 units' letter to APRCA on 5/27/2022

On Friday, May 27, the Departments of Applied Linguistics (CLAS), Conflict Resolution (CLAS), International and Global Studies (CUPA), Theater (COTA), and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership (COE) sent a letter to the APRCA committee, with copies to Senate Steering, the Board of Trustees, PSU-AAUP, Provost Jeffords, President Percy, and the chairs of the 5 units.

In the letter, appended in full to this report, the units address "fundamental issues that undermine our confidence in the integrity of [the Program Review and Reduction] process as it has been implemented." They emphasize, "The issues that we find most concerning relate to the lack of transparency, due process, and shared governance in the implementation of the PRRP. Without substantive action by OAA to address these concerns, the process is at odds with the Guiding Principles set forth by APRCA. In light of this, we ask for the Committee's support in stopping the PRRP."

On the topic of transparency, the letter points out the lack of clarity on how the driver and value metrics crafted by the Provost's Program Reduction Working Group in Phase 1 of the process were used to select 18 units to write Phase 2 narratives, as well as lack of guidance and criteria for how the Phase 2 narratives would be evaluated. Similarly, Phase 3 plans need to be 'viable,' but not criteria have been provided for 'viability.'

On the topic of due process, the letter indicates the lack of engagement, dialog, and feedback on the Phase 2 narratives and the mismatch between the detailed documents provided by the units and the form letter response provided by OAA and the Deans. Without clear criteria or explanation of the analysis used, the narratives and plans seem like "glorified busywork." The 5 units question whether OAA is engaging in good faith.

On the topic of shared governance, the letter points out that the lack of transparency and stake-holder consultation undermines the [APRCA Guiding Principles and Priorities](#) and faculty participation in the PRRP, effectively silencing faculty voices. They ask that the PRR process be stopped for these reasons. The letter further calls for greater budget clarity, if budget is indeed the sole driving force behind the Phase 3 process for these five small units.

Provost's letters to the 5 units on 5/27/2022

On Friday, May 27, the Provost and Deans sent letters to the 5 units that mirror what the Provost discussed with APRCA on Monday, May 23.

The letters reiterate PSU's need to reduce budgets across all of its areas of operation, including in OAA. The letters emphasize that no decisions have yet been made about program reduction or elimination. OAA offers $25,000 per unit of summer money for the unit and/or other adjacent units they want to consult with. In addition, Vice Provost Amy Mulkerin will work with the Colleges' Financial Officers to provide detailed budget material to the units. In a plan (limited to 10 pages plus appendices and due on December 1), each unit is asked to answer one key question: Can the unit fulfill its goals while making do with its current budget? Units are asked to address trends in current and future enrollments, as well as potential reorganization.

Avenues to pursue next year

Moving forward in the upcoming academic year, APRCA envisions two avenues to pursue. One is to push for greater, campus-wide participation in a faculty-led conversation about curriculum rather than solely participating in an administrative-led conversation about budget. A second avenue involves pushing for greater financial transparency, more consultation with stakeholders, and clearer communication.

From: The Departments of Applied Linguistics (CLAS), Conflict Resolution (CLAS), International and Global Studies (CUPA), Theater (COTA), and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership (COE)

To: The Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments (APRCA) Committee
CC: The Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Board of Trustees, AAUP, Provost Jeffords, and President Percy, Chairs of 5 departments targeted for Phase III

To the APRCA Committee:

We write to you today as members of the five departments that have been asked to engage in Phase III of the Program Review and Reduction Process (PRRP). We are writing to draw your attention to fundamental issues that undermine our confidence in the integrity of this process as it has been implemented. The issues that we find most concerning relate to the lack of transparency, due process, and shared governance in the implementation of the PRRP. As it stands, the process is at odds with the Guiding Principles set forth by APRCA, and we ask for the Committee's support in stopping the PRRP.

Background: The APRCA Committee and Shared Governance in the PRRP
In communications from OAA, the Provost has foregrounded the APRCA Committee's role in the PRRP. This emphasis suggests an acknowledgement of the PRRP as a fundamentally curricular process, and thus subject to review by the Faculty. APRCA's members include representatives from five main Faculty Senate committees: the Steering Committee, the Budget Committee, the Education Policy Committee, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Graduate Council. The APRCA Committee thus plays an important role in the exercise of the powers held by the Faculty Senate under its Constitution, specifically the Faculty's "power to act upon matters of educational policy, to enact such rules and regulations as it may deem desirable to promote or enforce such policies, and to decide upon curricula and new courses of study. *This power shall include, but not be confined to, action upon the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments or of programs which include more than one department or instructional unit of the University*" (Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty, Article III, Section 1. Faculty Powers, emphasis added). The part of the Committee's specific charge that is most relevant to the issues addressed in this letter is their role in "ensur[ing] faculty participation in meaningful, inclusive, and formative discussions of curricular adjustments related to budget reduction" (APRCA Committee Charge).

We have based the discussion that follows on the Guiding Principles set forth by the Committee in order to fulfill this charge. We will be grounding our discussion of transparency in the seventh guiding principle and our discussion of due process in the first and fifth guiding principles. Other principles are referred to below as relevant to the discussion.

Transparency

Our first concern is transparency. Transparency, as we understand it[1], refers to the responsibility on the part of those who are entrusted with making decisions that shape the future of the university to make the goals and criteria for those decisions clear and available to the community. At the beginning of Phase I of the PRRP, the initial Driver and Value metrics developed by the Program Reduction Working Group (PRWG) were made available to the community, thereby fulfilling the requirement of transparency at this stage of the process.

This level of transparency was not maintained in the application of these metrics to departments during the transition into the Phase II narratives. When 18 departments across campus were asked to provide Phase II narratives, only the quantitative Driver metrics, which relate primarily to the size of the program and the number of majors[2], were provided as justification. The departments received a template that indicated that the narratives would allow us to provide context for the Driver metrics in addition to a chance to incorporate the kinds of qualitative data required by APRCA's fourth guiding principle and to address topics relevant to the Value metrics. Beyond the template and a cover letter indicating which Driver metrics were areas of concern for the department, there were no verbal or published guidelines given for how the Phase II narratives would be evaluated, despite repeated requests from the departments for such guidance. Given that the Phase II narratives were the aspect of the PRRP that departments ostensibly had the most control over, the lack of guidance on how we would be evaluated left us to guess what aspects of our programs to emphasize and what kinds of strategic plans to suggest. This situation has become even more serious with the Phase III narratives, in which we are asked to demonstrate that we have a "viable" department or we may be subject to elimination, but there are no criteria for what constitutes viability.

Due Process

The lack of transparency in the criteria for the evaluation of the Phase II and Phase III narratives appears to stem from more fundamental issues of due process. Due process requires that decision makers consult with and provide meaningful feedback to affected parties and allow them to respond before a final outcome is decided. When the PRRP entered Phase II, the 18 departments were informed that there were three potential outcomes for their Phase II narratives: targeted investments, program redesign, or targeted reductions. We were informed that these outcomes would be based on an evaluation of the evidence that we provided in the Phase II narratives together with the information from the quantitative Driver metrics from the dashboards. We invested significant time and energy into creating narratives that addressed the areas outlined in the OAA template, and we assumed that the process would move forward in good faith.

---

[1] The update from Provost Jeffords in the monthly report of the APRCA Committee from the May 2, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting suggests that the Provost has a different understanding of this term.

[2] As several of us noted at the time, these Driver metrics put smaller departments at a disadvantage. We also note that the majority of the Driver metrics were based on AY 2019-2020 and AY 2020-2021, the two years most directly impacted by the pandemic.

The Provost's response to these narratives suggested otherwise. Rather than engaging with any of the additional context, qualitative data, or plans that we had provided in response to this request, the Provost sent each department a form letter with a brief set of minimally customized bullet points that suggested, at best, a brief skim of the narratives, and at worst, not having read them at all. The impression that this gave was that the request for the Phase II narratives was intended to provide cover for decisions that had already been made. If this is the case, the Phase II narratives were little more than glorified busywork that wasted time and resources in 18 departments across campus, all while exacerbating existing morale issues. This is a far cry from the meaningful engagement and substantive feedback prior to decision making that are required by the first and fifth APRCA principles, which ensure due process in the PRRP.

Shared Governance
The issues of transparency and due process outlined above all point to a far more significant concern: a lack of shared governance. Shared governance requires that the Faculty have meaningful representation in making decisions that affect the future of the university. The APRCA Committee is the only representative of the Faculty in the PRRP. If the principles that the APRCA Committee has set forth to guide this process are not being meaningfully implemented, their role is symbolic rather than substantive. While OAA continuously describes the APRCA principles as "so important" in their official communications, the failure to follow these principles in practice means that the only faculty voice in this process has effectively been silenced. Moreover, if the Driver metrics developed by the Program Reduction Working Group (PRWG), a committee appointed by the Provost with nine administrators (mostly financial officers) and two program directors, are in fact the only basis for the selection of departments to be reduced or eliminated, as the due process issues outlined above suggest, OAA has effectively created a workaround to avoid having to include teaching and research faculty in the decision making process.

Conclusion: Call to Action
We call on the APRCA Committee to use their authority to stop the PRRP. If the PRRP is indeed a curricular matter, then the APRCA Committee's charge to "ensure faculty participation in meaningful, inclusive, and formative discussions of curricular adjustments related to budget reduction" on behalf of Faculty Senate must be upheld. If the PRRP is instead a budgetary matter, we call for your support in pressing the Provost's office to demonstrate that this is in fact the case by providing clear answers on the budget costs and projected budget savings for both the overall PRRP and the reorganization or elimination of five smaller departments.

Signed:

Applied Linguistics (CLAS)
Conflict Resolution (CLAS)

International and Global Studies (CUPA)
Theater (COTA)
The Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership (COE)

To: Faculty Senate

From: Budget Committee

Jill Emery (co-chair), Mitch Cruzan (co-chair), Jennifer Allen, Travis Bell, Cara Eckhardt, Derek Garton, Sam Gioia, Brenda Glascott, David Hansen, ChiaYin Hsu, Martin Lafrenz, Anna Law, Janice Lee, Anoop Mirpuri, Amanda Sugimoto, Derek Tretheway

RE: June 6, 2022 Annual Report

Committee Charge and Roles

The Budget Committee has a multipart charge:

1) Consult with the President and his or her designee(s) and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.

2) Consult with academic leaders of colleges/schools, Intensive English Language Program, and University Studies, and make recommendations for the preparations of their annual budgets and enrollment plans. Each Budget Committee member from one of the above listed units shall serve as liaison to his/her unit for this purpose, with other members assigned as liaisons as needed.

3) Recommend budgetary priorities.

4) Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the program, and report this to the Senate.

5) Analyze budgetary implications of the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the unit, and report this to the Senate.

6) Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared.

7) Review expenditures of public and grant funding as requested by the Faculty Senate.

8) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.

9) Report to the Senate at least once each year.

University Budget

The committee received updates on the university budget by Kevin Reynolds and Andria Johnson. The first presentation in the fall of 2021 included a recap from FY21 and an update on FY22. The second presentation in April included updates on the budget for FY23, the use of reserve funds, and the tuition increase recommended by TRAC. The committee has also met with Kevin Neely regarding updates to funding from the state, including modifications to the allocation formula used by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. Enrollment continues to decline due to a loss of continuing students even as we had an increase in new students in the fall of 2021. The expenditures for the FY22 year are expected to be less than what had been budgeted for because PSU received unanticipated additional funding from the state due

to modifications of the Student Success and Completion Funding Model for the distribution of funds to campus, and due to recovery of reserves through the use of federal aid related to the impacts of the pandemic.

The FSBC learned that a structural budget variance (a surplus) exists between budgeted revenues and expenses as compared to actual revenues and expenses. The University Budget Office and OAA are working to revise current budget processes to minimize this structural variance in future budget planning.

FY22 OAA Budget Process

The Office of Academic Affairs follows a budget process called Integrated Planning of Enrollment and Budget (IPEB). This budget process has the revenue generating units develop enrollment plans. Enrollment plans detail the student enrollment outlook. These are accompanied by enrollment narratives that explain the impact on students via persistence, recruitment, degree completion, and program management strategies.

Budget Committee co-chairs were invited and attended the launching of the IPEB process in November. The Budget Committee worked with Amy Mulkerin to modify the IPEB timeline to allow liaison meetings with deans and directors to occur in February so that more accurate FY23 budget information would be available.

Context:

Members of the Budget Committee (FSBC: Faculty Senate Budget Committee) met with the deans, directors, and financial officers of eleven colleges and academic units across campus between 2/8/2022 and 2/28/2022. Each unit was provided with a list of questions developed by the FSBC (see Appendix 1). Reports from nine of eleven of these were provided in the form of written responses and notes taken by FSBC members. Members of the APRCA committee were invited to provide additional perspectives on the longer-term process of reorganization and reduction processes initiated by the provost, and they attended most of these meetings. Below is a summary of common trends noted by committee members from across the interviews with representatives of the eleven units.

Challenges:

1. Impacts of faculty attrition.
   a. Loss of Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) and Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) through cuts, retirements, and retention failure has had a negative impact on curricula, and consequently the retention and recruitment of graduate and undergraduate students. This impact varies among units across campus. Some units mentioned loss of students because of class cancellations, and other difficulties imposed by lack of curriculum continuity when departments had to rely on adjunct faculty for essential course offerings.
   b. Cuts have reduced the number of NTTF, adjunct faculty, and GTAs to the point where the reductions in course offerings will negatively impact our ability to recruit new students and will negatively impact continuing students' ability to complete their degrees.
   c. For many departments the growth of graduate programs is limited by the number of TTF who act as graduate student mentors. TTF attrition has resulted in reductions in graduate enrollment.
   d. Difficulty funding competitive start-up packages is reported by several colleges.

e. The general decline in the diversity of course offerings has had negative impacts on undergraduate retention and recruitment, and on the quality of our students' education experiences.

f. Units that rely on adjunct faculty to produce or increase SCH over several years might be in a vicious cycle (e.g. A+D) resulting in increased reliance on adjunct faculty, which has negative impacts on curriculum continuity.

2. Impacts of staffing shortages:

a. Lack of faculty support services has shifted more of these responsibilities onto faculty. This has had a negative impact on their ability to complete their teaching and research responsibilities.

   i. Existing staff have been asked to take on additional responsibilities, which reduces their efficiency, and results in burnout. Consequently, we have lost many experienced staff across units so their responsibilities have been transferred to less experienced individuals, which reduces efficiency.

   ii. Several units mentioned a general lack of advising and recruitment resources, which negatively impacts retention and recruitment. Centralization of advising services has removed advisors from contact with faculty within departments, which hampers their ability to provide accurate advice to students. In some cases this has led to students taking unnecessary courses that did not contribute to their graduation. Advising caseloads of 150:1 in programs such as TRIO, ATMOS and Exito produce high retention and graduation rates. While NACADA recommends advisor to student ratios at 250:1, ACS advisors each serve closer to 450 students. Some units mentioned the lack of discipline-specific recruiters as one factor contributing to enrollment declines.

   iii. With a budget model that rewards retention and graduation (not to mention new enrollments), colleges with the resources for staff dedicated to student success activities have built-in advantages. Should there be an intentional approach to allocating this staff to the colleges? Should there be guidance for where these staff should be housed (departments vs. dean's offices) – noted that Architecture has this staff, but does the dean's office in COTA as well? Do the other schools in COTA?

3. Concerns with the budgeting process:

a. Several units expressed concerns over transparency and a shared understanding of how budgeting decisions are made. There was a general concern of too much focus on SCH, and not enough focus on revenue.

   i. The growth of several units (or departments within them) are limited by a lack of adequate resources. These are units and departments that have been receiving more applicants than they can accommodate for many years, yet their budgets have not been adequately adjusted to meet this demand. There was a general call for more TTF to provide adequate course offerings and research. In some cases (e.g., SB) they have the minimal number of TTF for accreditation. In other cases (e.g., COTA) more TTF are required to provide curricular stability.

ii. Disproportionate budget reductions for some units will lead to additional loss of SCH and degrees in the majors they support. Under the current budget model (the "three-year trend" model), this will impact future budgets and will lead to disproportionate declines in some units.

iii. There is a concern that by basing each future year's budget on past three-year trends, the focus negates the ability to look forward and really expand where successful recruitments and generation of revenue can happen.

iv. There seems to be a built-in disparity in how much wiggle room is in the colleges' allocations. Some colleges have the resources to meet student demand and amass significant reserves and others do not.

Opportunities:

1. Expansion of online curricula.

    a. Several units mentioned past success and future plans for increasing the number of online course offerings. There was a general appreciation of the fact that some types of courses are not effective or even possible in an online format. Units and departments are continuing to look at their curricula to identify courses that would be effective in an online format.

2. Shifting resources to capacity-limited units and programs.

    a. As mentioned above, some units (e.g., HON, SB, SSW) and departments (e.g Computer Sciences, Architecture, Counseling Education in COE) have enrollments that are limited by inadequate resources. As additional resources become available, it may be prudent to invest additional resources in existing programs rather than generating new ones.

3. Investment in discipline-specific advising.

    a. One unit (SPH) highlighted the success of implementing discipline-specific advising (Career Mentorship Bridge) to the existing Pathways model of advising. As mentioned above, retention degree completion could be improved through additional discipline-specific advising efforts.

4. Additional opportunities:

5. Giving credit for Prior Learning. Some units (e.g., COE, SB) mentioned the possibility to increase recruitment in some areas by providing credit for prior experience in the field.

6. Other successful recruitment efforts were mentioned by UNST including Senior Inquiry and the Higher Ed in Prison Program. Look for opportunities to expand these programs.

7. Intentionally design college-EM recruiting partnerships. Should every college have a dedicated staff person doing recruiting and retention work? (Related: COTA mentioned ARCH has a staff person doing this – would this be better in the dean's office if the other 3 colleges in COTA don't have this staff?)

Summary:

As the university is expected to continue to experience budget challenges for the next few years, the challenge will be to make funding adjustments and investments that will take advantage of

units and departments with growth potential while not crippling programs that are essential to student success. We encourage the following:

1. A holistic view that allows some units to continue to operate at deficits that are offset by units with positive revenue.

2. Effective use of bridge (reserve) funds to insulate colleges, departments, programs, and units from further damage. This should include the prudent use of funds to refill TTF lines to restore instructional and research capacity.

3. A focus on direct revenue (rather than indirect expenses) from the RCAT to provide a more equitable and reliable tool for revenue assessment.

Proposal Reviews

The committee has completed reviews of one proposal for new academic programs, four proposals for new certificates, 45 proposals for academic program changes, and 2 proposals for academic program eliminations. These proposals were reviewed by two-person or three-person review panels which report their recommendations (no significant impact/modest impact/significant impact) to the committee via an online google document. This system enables other committee members to review and comment on proposals not assigned to them. Major proposals such as those for completely new programs are discussed in committee meetings. We have been using google docs to facilitate communicating these recommendations to Andreen Morris, the Curriculum Coordinator, who posts the final recommendation in the curriculum proposal system.

Upcoming Agenda Items (postponed until the 2022/23 AY)

1. Discussion of IPEB funding decisions, enrollment projections, and the use of reserves for the FY23 budget with Amy Mulkerin and Susan Jeffords.

2. Discussion of the Program Reorganization and Reduction process Phase II decisions with Amy Mulkerin and Susan Jeffords.

3. Discussion of enrollment strategies and early enrollment projections from Chuck, Knepfle, VP of Enrollment Management

Acknowledgements

We thank administrators, staff, and XO member faculty who have contributed to thoughtful and informative conversations over the past academic year including Susan Jeffords, Amy Mulkerin, Kevin Reynolds, Kevin Neely, Chuck Knepfle, Kathi A. Ketcheson, David Burgess, Vanelda Hopes, Tim Anderson, and Michele Gamburd.