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TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate
FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on January 7, 1991, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA
A. Roll

*B. Approval of the Minutes of the December 3, 1990, Meeting
   President's Report

C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor

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

E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
   1. Registration Report, Winter Term -- Tufts, Holland
   2. IFS Report -- Hardt
   3. Update of Strategic Planning Process -- Mandaville

F. Unfinished Business -- none

G. New Business
   *1. Proposed Policy regarding Use of Graduate-level Course Numbers -- Brennan
   *2. ARC Recommendation regarding General Education Requirement -- Maynard
   *3. Proposed Resolution regarding the Persian Gulf Crisis -- Cabello

H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

B Minutes of the December 3, 1990, Senate Meeting*
G$_1$ Proposed Policy regarding Use of Graduate-level Course Numbers**
G$_2$ ARC Recommendation regarding General Education Requirement**
G$_3$ Proposed Resolution regarding the Persian Gulf Crisis**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 1991
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt


Alternates Present: Tamblyn for Ogle, Pollock for Settle.

Members Absent: Arick, Becker, Dunnette, Lendaris, Lutes, Manning.

Ex-officio Members Present: Hardt, Holland, Mackey, Paudler, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Savery, Schendel, Sheridan, Tang, Toulan, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 3, 1990, meeting were approved as distributed.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President RAMALEY welcomed Senators to Winter term '91 and to the new era of Ballot Measure 5. She said that new Governor Roberts' specific budget recommendations would be announced next week. What is clear already is that two percent need to be cut out of the current year's budget. The next biennium will probably require $90 million or 12 percent cuts for OSSHE. Approximately half of the loss can be made up by tuition and fee increases; the other half will have to be achieved through reductions. PSU needs to decide how many students it will be able to serve, given the revenues.

RAMALEY also said that Chancellor Bartlett did not want to use across-the-board cuts in these reductions.

RAMALEY explained the Budget Review Process (see attached) and promised to tap the ideas of faculty. The University Budget Committee will develop criteria for budget review and will present them to the Senate before the end of January. Once criteria have been drawn up, contingency plans will have to be developed, because we will not have final instructions and real numbers from the Chancellor yet. The
danger of working in a vacuum is that several options will have to be identified, some of which will never come to pass. The alternative is to work totally in private and not openly identify possible program adjustments. The president said she preferred the open discussion, because collectively we can do a better job. Senators agreed.

RAMALEY then explained the Strategic Planning Process (see attached); it is not to be confused or merged with the budget review; they are not related functionally. She said she made the following assumptions about budgets:

1. It is a restructuring not budget-cutting exercise.
2. We must protect and enhance our institutional development; therefore, we must protect the foundations we will need for the programs we will be called on to provide in our urban environment.
3. We must provide community service and when possible connect with OSU and OHSU in fulfilling our statewide mission.
4. We must generate and manage more of our own financial support and be a state-assisted school, not state-supported.
5. Since students will be asked to pay a higher percentage of their education through increased tuition and fees, we must hold down instructional costs.
6. Students will be increasingly part time; therefore, we must design programs and services for them and their time, family and financial constraints.

Even though we will serve fewer students than today, RAMALEY said we must protect access and quality--why bother to protect access to mediocrity?

KARANT-NUNN asked about the origin of the "state-assisted" concept. RAMALEY replied that a state planning document she had just received used that concept for all of the OSSHE schools. WEIKEL asked if the OSU model for reduction would be used. RAMALEY said that an amended version of that document would be used. But we also must consider our values, our criteria for adding money to programs, reducing allocation to programs, eliminating or merging programs. BUNCH appreciated the consultation with AAUP, and RAMALEY was grateful for the support, encouragement and leadership of the AAUP. She vowed not to relive the trauma of 1982 and 1986 and will do her best not to lay off faculty. However, deep cuts are required and this crisis is serious and not merely temporary.

A second meeting of the Senate will be called in January, EDNER announced, and there will be a welcoming reception for Bob Frank at the K-House following the February 4 meeting.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. TUFTS reported that advance registration headcount for Winter term was up 7 percent and up 4.9 percent on Friday, January 4.
HOLLAND spoke of the special efforts that have been made to encourage students to continue their studies. Many letters have been sent and 800 phone calls have been made to students who had not pre-registered for Winter, or who had received academic warning, or to first-year students with low grades. All of this communication and offers of assistance have earned much goodwill and have been well received. Many contacts with community college students have been made to heighten transfers; these efforts will continue during Winter and Spring, particularly in areas like engineering where a conditional admit has been worked out for ease of transfer. PSU is looking for good quality students in all areas, and HOLLAND thanked everyone who has worked hard in this effort.

2. HARDT reported on the December 7-8, 1990, IFS meeting held at UO. The group met Vice Chancellor Weldon Ihrig who talked of his concerns of the effects of B.M. 5. While discussing possible cuts, IHRIG also talked about the higher enrollments in Oregon colleges being forecast and the bigger-than-usual numbers of faculty retirements coming up. The vision is to enhance the overall quality of the OSSHE and to be responsive to the needs of the state. That includes the special needs in the Portland metropolitan area and the lack of educational opportunities there.

Vice Chancellor CLARK referred to B.M. 5 as the elephant in the room around whom we have to maneuver but who takes up most of the space. She talked of the need to publicize the excellent research and scholarly activities of the state's faculty—things not as well known or as visible as they might be. The Governor's Commission recommendations regarding faculty cooperation and collaboration in the Portland area were discussed, as was the increased pressure for public accountability—i.e., state assessment—and the new focus on undergraduate teaching which is sweeping the country (and the reward structures in our promotion, tenure and merit guidelines for undergraduate teaching).

Roger BASSSETT, Director of Governmental Relations, discussed B.M. 5 and the legislative leadership. He speculated that 10 percent cuts would be possible for 1991–93 and pointed out that M.5 allows escalation to 40 percent by 1995–97. Higher education is extremely fragile, he said. He encouraged IFS and all faculty to be strong and vocal about making higher education a central issue, especially to people we meet in the coffee shop, the shopping mall, the service station.

IFS talked about the E-Board salary monies distribution on the various campuses and, not surprisingly, found considerable variations. Also under discussion are promotion and tenure guidelines at the eight schools and the different interpretations of the state guidelines and how they are effected by
contractual agreements. In February the IFS will hear Mark Nelson, lobbyist for AOF, and Bassett talk about how IFS can coordinate with the new state government. Campuses will also report on what they are planning regarding the cut-backs caused by B.M. 5.

3. Kocoaglu announced that a series of workshops/open meetings would be held on January 23 and 24 to assist with the strategic planning process. A memo with details will be distributed soon, and input is earnestly sought. One of the results will be an updated PSU mission statement.

NEW BUSINESS

1. BRENNAN presented the Graduate Council proposed policy regarding residence credit:

   Residence Credit. In a 45-credit program, a master's candidate must earn a minimum of 30 graduate credits in courses on the PSU campus during the student's graduate degree status (regular or conditional) and graduate certificate status.

   A minimum of 12 credits (25% of the required credits in a degree program greater than 45 credit hours) must be taken in residence in 500, 500/600 or 600 course level categories. The remainder of the required credits may be 400/500 courses taken for the 500-level number.*

   *Underlined section is the revised addition to the policy.

   A. JOHNSON/FISHER moved approval of the policy.

   A long discussion followed about who could take what level courses, and about what the transcript would show. Some were astonished that only one-fourth of the graduate program would be strictly graduate, but they were told that has been the case all along. Others argued that many schools across the country did not have absolutely discrete courses for graduate students. BRENNAN said that departments which were in compliance with the old policy will be in compliance under the new one. BRENNAN commented that some accreditation bodies may not allow graduate students to be in a mixed class with undergraduates. R. JOHNSON asked if departments could override the last sentence. BRENNAN answered in the affirmative and pointed to the use of "may" in that sentence; departments may choose to be more restrictive.

   The motion was passed unanimously.
2. MAYNARD presented the ARC recommendation that "effective Summer Term 1991, the two courses, AJ 220 Crime Literacy (3 credits) and AJ 330 Crime Control Strategies (3 credits) be accepted as six credits in one department, satisfying part of the social science distribution requirement of the GER. We also recommend that selected elements of these courses be prepared by the appropriate instructors in the Administration of Justice Department, in cooperation with Campus Security, as part of the freshman and transfer student orientation programs at Portland State University."

WURM/RUFOLO "moved acceptance of this policy."

MAYNARD pointed out that all parties who had been consulted agreed that this proposal would work.

The motion was passed, but not unanimously.

3. George CABELLO presented a resolution "urging President Bush and his administration to explore all non-violent and diplomatic means relevant to the settlement of the crisis in the Persian Gulf and give the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations a reasonable chance to succeed." The resolution further states that "if President Bush intends to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to a war in the Middle East, he must obtain the approval of Congress to do so."

WEIKEL/D. JOHNSON "moved the acceptance of this resolution."

COOPER asked if this is to be a letter to the addresses (Bush, Hatfield, Packwood and AuCoin) or a sense of the Senate motion. CABELLO replied both.

The resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:28.
### BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>Creation of FY 91-93 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>President/ExCom/CADS refine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>starting assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Enrollment targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Depth of reductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>Faculty Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Letters to faculty/staff and reports in PSU Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Gathering of ideas for handling budget reductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Senate Budget Committee develops criteria for budget review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Senate response and adoption of criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>Board of Higher Education issues final instructions for preparation of FY 91-93 budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. President reports on financial condition of the university to Budget Committee, University Senate, and AAUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIMING AND RELATIONSHIP OF STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS AND BUDGET REVIEW

STRATEGIC PLAN PROCESS

January 1, 1991
- Explore mission

February 1, 1991
- Draft mission statement
- Planning update

April 1, 1991
- Goals and priorities

July 1, 1991
- Goals and priorities

BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS

January 1, 1991
- President/Ex Com refines starting assumptions

February 1, 1991
- Budget committee establishes criteria for budget reviews
- Review options with Admin Council, CADs and University Planning Council
- Create amended budget
- Budget committee review/report to Senate for comment

April 1, 1991
- President reports to University and transmits budget to Chancellor

July 1, 1991
- FY 91-93 begins with implementation of management priorities
- Reorganization of administrative structure

AAUP CONSULTATION

February 1, 1991
- President reports to AAUP & Senate on financial condition of University

AAUP Comment

Note: After January 31, 1991 all dates are uncertain!

Rev. 1/4/91
April
Step VI
President prepares FY 91-93 budget and transmits report to Senate Budget Committee and AAUP for comment

May
Step VII
FY 91-93 budget submitted to Board

July 1, 1991
Step VIII
Implementation of FY 91-93 budget and establishment of management priorities for transition

Transition initiated

6. Review of budget and transition plans by Senate and AAUP
PROPOSED GRADUATE COUNCIL POLICY
ON COURSE NUMBERING

In January, 1989 the state system put a graduate course numbering pattern into effect. The effective date was Fall 1990. Some confusion has prevailed since then because of differing interpretations of the numbering pattern. This proposed interpretation is believed to be consistent with the December 9, 1988 OSSHE proposal (PROPOSAL FOR CHANGING THE NUMBERING OF GRADUATE COURSES WITHIN THE OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION - Prepared for the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs Meeting December 9, 1988), but flexible enough to meet the needs of Portland State University.

A common graduate course numbering system employing 4XX/5XX and 5XX/6XX across the mathematics departments of OSU, PSU and U of O was implemented last year.

Omnibus numbers, e.g. 501-510, 601-610, are provided for academic units with access to masters and doctorate level degrees, respectively.

The following graduate course numbering pattern was approved unanimously by the Graduate Council December 6, 1990:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4XX/5XX</th>
<th>Masters level graduate courses which are also offered as courses for undergraduates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5XX</td>
<td>Graduate courses offered in support of masters degree level instructional programs. Ordinarily employed for units whose majors have access to masters programs or for courses populated by masters students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5XX/6XX</td>
<td>Graduate courses offered in support of doctoral degree level instructional programs which are also offered as courses for masters level students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6XX</td>
<td>Graduate courses offered in support of doctoral degree level instructional programs. Ordinarily employed for units whose majors have access to doctorate programs or for courses populated by doctorate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7XX</td>
<td>Postbaccalaureate courses which may not be applied toward an academic degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8XX</td>
<td>In-service courses with limited application toward advanced degrees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWS/ld: 12/7/90
As a result of the course number changes, the Graduate Council has proposed replacing the following University policy:

**CURRENT POLICY**

*Residence Credit.* In a 45-credit program, a master's candidate must earn a minimum of 30 graduate credits in courses on the PSU campus during the student's graduate degree status (regular or conditional) and graduate certificate status. Twelve of the 30 graduate credits must be at the 500 level.

[plus 3 additional paragraphs, p.94 Portland State University Bulletin 1990-91]

At the December 6, 1990 meeting, the Graduate Council proposed and passed unanimously an equivalent policy requiring a minimum of 12 of 30 graduate residence credits be taken at the 500 level. The proposed policy would replace the sentence: "Twelve of the 30 graduate credits must be at the 500 level."

**PROPOSED POLICY**

A minimum of 12 credit hours (25% of the required credits in a degree program greater than 45 credit hours) must be taken in residence in 500, 500/600 or 600 course level categories. The remainder of the required credits may be 400/500 courses taken for the 500-level number.
On 16 April 1990, the Campus Security Task Force made its final report to the President of the University and made fourteen recommendations. One recommendation was that the Chair of the Administration of Justice Department request the ARC to make AJ 220 Crime Literacy (3 credits) a specific general education requirement (GER), OR that the sequence of AJ 220 and AJ 330 Crime Control Strategies (3 credits) be accepted to satisfy the social science distribution requirement of the GER, making the required six credits in one department. The Task Force also recommended that the freshman and transfer orientation programs include the parts of AJ 220 which relate to campus crime.

The ARC has considered these recommendations and has heard testimony from the Chair of the Administration of Justice Program (Professor Charles Tracy) and from the chief instructor of AJ 330 (Professor Gary Perlstein). We are satisfied that the two courses are now being taught by qualified instructors and are academic classes which qualify as social science courses. After considering the various options, we conclude that the following recommendation would best satisfy the intent of the Task Force to promote student safety and also be within the available resources of the University.

The Academic Requirements Committee recommends to the Senate that, effective Summer Term 1991, the two courses, AJ 220 Crime Literacy (3 credits) and AJ 330 Crime Control Strategies (3 credits) be accepted as six credits in one department, satisfying part of the social science distribution requirement of the GER. We also recommend that selected elements of these courses be prepared by the appropriate instructors in the Administration of Justice Department, in cooperation with Campus Security, as part of the freshman and transfer student orientation programs at Portland State University.

The ARC thanks the Administration of Justice Department, Campus Security and the Office of Student Affairs for their help in preparing its recommendation.

Gary Brodowicz, HPE
Marek Elzanowski, MTH
Hugo Maynard, PSY (Chair)
Darrell Millner, BST
Scott Wells, CE
Carl Bergwall (Student Representative)
Nancy Tang, OAA (ex officio)
Robert Tufts, RO (ex officio)
DATE December 10, 1990

TO PSU Faculty Senate

FROM G.T. Cabello, FLL

I would like to offer for consideration of the PSU Faculty Senate the following resolution:

TO: President George Bush
   Senator Mark O. Hatfield
   Senator Bob Packwood
   Congressman Les AuCoin

1. President Bush and his administration should explore all non-violent and diplomatic means relevant to the settlement of the crisis in the Persian Gulf and give the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations a reasonable chance to succeed.

2. If President Bush intends to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to a war in the Middle East, he must obtain the approval of Congress to do so.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Criteria for the Allocation of New Resources, Reallocation of Existing Resources and Reduction and Elimination of Programs

Provisional University Mission: The ultimate success of an urban university is best measured by the quality of its academic programs, by the scholarly contributions of its faculty through teaching and research, by the contributions of its graduates to society, and by the impact of its presence on the quality of life and economic development of its community.

Portland State University serves the people of the Portland metropolitan area, the state of Oregon, the nation and the world through teaching, research and service.

Portland State University is engaged in many forms of scholarship, including: educating the citizens of this region in order to enhance the ability of Oregon workers to compete in national and international markets; strengthening Portland's capacity to address complex social needs; augmenting the capacity of the leadership of Portland to guide urban growth and sustain environmental quality; and contributing to the cultural, artistic and community life of this region.

Portland State University is committed to providing educational opportunities to citizens of Oregon, non-residents and international students. The university maintains a strong commitment to supporting the educational aspirations of minority students and students with special needs, including disabled students, disadvantaged students and adult-returning students.

The University is dedicated to an effective integration of teaching, research and service and supports the thesis that the quality of instruction and community service is enhanced when faculty engage in scholarly activities.

The special qualities of the urban setting of Portland State University lends a distinctive character to the programs offered here and the agenda of the institution will be created in partnership with the citizens of this region. Our curriculum and scholarship will reflect the special opportunities created by our location and by the status of Portland as a "global community."
DEFINITION OF A PROGRAM

The unit of review for these criteria is a "program." A program has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. has the term "college," "school," "department," "center," "office," "institute," "division," "council," "service," "program," "major," "minor," or "option," as part of its title;

2. is headed by a person titled "dean," "director," "chair," "head," "coordinator," or "manager;"

3. is identified as a degree or certificate program in OSSHE listings or PSU publications;

4. offers a degree, a certificate, or a credential;

5. has a sequence of specifically required courses;

6. is an established track or specialty within a larger unit;

7. has been approved as a distinct function or activity of the university by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education;

8. constitutes an organized and identifiable activity or function not described in 1-7 above.

GENERAL FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING THE CONTRIBUTION OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM TO THE MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

Given the diversity of our programs and activities, some of the following criteria will not be appropriate in each case, subject to availability of information. In every instance, however, attention should be given to issues of quality, centrality and societal need and demand.

1. QUALITY

Where possible, the results of internal evaluations or external program reviews and accreditation should be used as a starting point for assessing the quality of an academic program.

For academic programs, the following issues should be considered:

a. quality of the faculty as determined by academic and
professional credentials, productivity and innovation in teaching, scholarly activity, community service and national and international recognition of the impact of faculty scholarship

b. quality of students as determined by levels of performance, merit awards and scholarships, admission to graduate and professional schools, job performance, employer satisfaction, and professional advancement

c. quality of the curriculum as judged by the standards set for student performance, relevance to current community needs and compliance with prevailing national standards

d. overall quality of the program as determined by accreditation status, national rankings and level of community support

2. CENTRALITY TO MISSION

Programs that are central to our mission include those that make up the academic core of any first-class university, those that reflect the distinctive urban character of our region, and those that respond in specific ways to the special needs of our community.

3. DEMAND

In addition to the usual measures of demand for an academic program, such as:

a. the number, sources, and quality of applicants

b. credit hours generated by level (lower division, upper division, masters, doctoral)

c. impact of budgetary cuts or additions on enrollment in other programs or on the capacity to provide core instruction for other programs

d. institutional enrollment trends as compared to national trends in the particular discipline

e. identification of permanent versus temporary or cyclical trends in enrollment

consideration should be given to the ability of place-bound students to find a comparable program of similar quality and cost in the Portland metropolitan area and the ability of such programs to absorb additional students in the event that Portland State University were to eliminate that program or decrease access by reducing the size of the program.
4. EQUITY IN WORKLOADS

In considering the reduction or elimination of programs, an effort should be made to avoid exacerbating any existing inequities in faculty workloads as measured by national standards for credit-hour production in undergraduate, master's level and doctoral programs offered by comparable institutions.

Attention must also be given to assuring sufficient time for scholarly activity and community service and to accommodating the needs of rapidly growing programs.

5. RESPONSIVENESS TO SOCIETAL NEEDS FOR ACCESS TO EDUCATION

In evaluating the impact of various program reduction or elimination proposals, the effect of reductions in the variety and capacity of educational programming at Portland State University must be assessed by evaluating trends that predict future educational needs in this region, such as:

a. estimates of number of high school graduates continuing on to higher education

b. changing patterns of participation in higher education by adults and the educational needs of professionals in the community

c. work force requirements in the Portland metropolitan area

d. estimates of participation of minority and high-risk students in K-12 and post-secondary education and the role that Portland State University can play in increasing the number of minority students who complete high school and enter post-secondary programs

e. changing character of the Oregon economy and demands for technological competency in the work place

f. population growth patterns in the Portland metropolitan area

g. the growth of economic and social ties with other countries, especially along the Pacific Rim

h. contributions to restructuring of the resource-based economy of Oregon and responsiveness to the educational demands created by new industries and trade policies

i. success in attracting and retaining minority faculty, staff and students at this institution
The information will be gathered and provided by the appropriate university office for use by academic programs.

6. SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS FOR ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE AND DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS

A significant factor in the quality and viability of any academic program is the responsiveness and adequacy of the environment provided by this institution.

a. adequacy of core support areas (facilities, library holdings and data bases, computing equipment and computing environment, laboratories and studios, research and teaching equipment, etc.)

b. adequacy of campus-wide support services such as student services (admissions, registration, financial aid, student records), support for faculty scholarship, and support for fund raising and preparation of grants and contracts

c. estimates of the minimum level of support necessary for a viable program

d. consistency with relevant accreditation standards

7. POTENTIAL FOR GENERATING EXTERNAL SUPPORT

a. current level of outside funding

b. national trends in sponsorship of research, curricular development, scholarship support for students, and sponsorship of community-based activities in the discipline or areas of specialization in the program

c. potential for local or regional sponsorship of student access or community-based activities in the program

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES

1. ENHANCEMENT OF PROGRAM

a. the program has potential to generate significant revenue with relatively little input of University resources

b. the program is central to the mission of the University

c. the program is in high demand

d. there are appropriate financial resources available to cover enhancement costs

e. the program contributes substantially to economic
development in the region

f. the program has the potential to achieve national prominence within five years or less

2. REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION

a. the program's contribution to the University mission does not justify the maintenance of its present size and reasonable projections indicate that productivity or demand will not increase substantially over the next five years

1) the average credit hours at the undergraduate or graduate level per FTE faculty has declined significantly over the past five years, is significantly below the university average, or below national average for comparable institutions

2) the teaching, research and service productivity of the unit, expressed in whatever terms are most appropriate for the unit, has declined significantly over the past five years, resulting in a significant increase in the cost of the program relative to the tuition or other revenue generated by the program

b. the program is not distinctive or unique in the region or a fundamental element of an university environment

c. the program is not currently of high quality and is not likely to become so without a significant infusion of resources

d. the program is normally one which would be expected to be accredited but is not, or is one which is exposed to a substantial risk of loss of accreditation, or has been deemed to be of a level of quality or size which raises questions about its viability or continuation in the absence of substantial infusion of resources

e. the program is one whose reduction or elimination would not substantially impair the viability or quality of other university programs

f. another institution is better equipped to provide the instruction, research or service currently offered by this program

g. the program was not created as a result of specific legislative action or defined by statute

h. the elimination or reduction of the program would not
have a substantial impact on access to education or the ability of the university to respond to societal concerns in the Portland metropolitan area

i. the elimination or reduction of the program would not result in significant loss of revenue currently derived from grants, contracts, endowments, or gifts

j. any major capital investment or major equipment assigned to the program can be disposed of without significant financial loss to the institution

k. the program is one for which the present and probable future demand is insufficient to justify its maintenance at existing levels of support. Insufficient demand may be indicated by significant decline in one or more of the following areas over a period of at least five years:

1) number of completed applications for admission to the program

2) student credit hours generated at either the undergraduate or graduate level or both

3) numbers of degrees or certificates conferred

4) weakening demand for graduates as indicated by the difficulty of graduates in obtaining employment in their chosen field

5) in the case of programs for which sponsored funding is available, significant reductions in the level of grant/contract funding

6) national data and trends indicating steadily decreasing demand for the program as indicated by enrollments and employment statistics

1. reduction or elimination of the program will not have a significant impact on the current diversity of faculty, staff and students at this institution (i.e. the program is not currently staffed by members of under represented groups on campus, as defined by our affirmative action guidelines, and does not serve a significant number of such individuals)

3. REORGANIZATION OR CONSOLIDATION

a. two or more programs have a substantial similarity or affinity of objective such that economies of operation or improvement in quality may reasonably be expected from closer cooperation, sharing of resources or program consolidation
b. the clarity of a program's identity and function, both locally and to a national audience (where appropriate), will either not be impaired or may actually be enhanced by reorganization or consolidation with another program.

c. the nature and function of the program is such that its support might appropriately be transferred in whole or in part to grant, contract, user fees or other sources of support.

d. the consolidation or reorganization will not endanger the quality and/or accreditation status of one or more of the programs affected.

e. the reorganization or consolidation will not have a significant impact on the ability of the program to recruit and retain quality faculty, staff and students.

4. REDUCTION OF COURSE OFFERINGS AND ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

To achieve economy of scale and to assure that the institution has done all it can to maintain educational access by the most efficient use of its resources, the following instructional options should be considered:

a. elimination of courses that do not contribute to the "core" educational needs of a program.

b. elimination or consolidation of courses that are consistently under-enrolled.

c. creation of jointly-sponsored core methodology or theory courses that could be taught on a rotating basis by several cooperating departments, thus eliminating unnecessary duplication and freeing faculty time for more specialized courses in the disciplines.

d. elimination or consolidation of courses that do not properly introduce students to the discipline or that do not contribute effectively to the general education curriculum.

e. elimination from the state-supported budget of courses that could be offered on a self-supporting basis or that could be more effectively taught at another institution in the Portland metropolitan area.

f. careful curricular planning so that valuable but poorly enrolled courses can be offered less frequently.
g. creation of collaborative courses with other institutions in the area to permit pooling of faculty expertise and the maintenance of critically needed components or specialties in the curriculum (e.g., Oregon Historical Society, Northwest College of Art, Oregon Health Sciences University)

h. opportunities exist for significant cost reductions without a significant reduction in the amount or quality of instruction provided, through:

1) the provision of instructional services by fully qualified adjunct faculty, where such instruction does not compromise accreditation standards

2) by other means

CRITERIA FOR THE REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY OPERATIONS:
ADMINISTRATIVE AND SERVICE UNITS

1. Assessment of the productivity and quality of the unit

Each program must provide appropriate measurements including internal evaluations or outside consultation to be used in evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the program and benchmarks to be used for evaluating improvements in productivity and in client satisfaction with any direct service provided to members of the university community or the general public. Attention should be given to both current and long term impact.

2. Criteria for considering elimination, reduction or restructuring of one or more administrative and service units

a. opportunities exist for significant cost reductions or cost avoidance without a significant reduction in the amount or quality of service provided through:

1) reorganization/restructuring of service units and programs

2) purchase of service from external providers

3) other means

b. opportunities exist for a significant improvement in service or productivity through sharing of resources, consolidation of services or reorganization of staff
c. similar essential services can be provided in a different way at less cost or at greater convenience to users

d. similar essential services are better in quality or more accessible if provided in another way

e. the service is not essential to support the core mission of the institution

f. consolidation or restructuring will eliminate unnecessary duplication of services offered by other administrative units at the university or within OSSHE or within state government

3. Conditions that preclude a consideration of reorganization or consolidation of one or more administrative units

a. similar essential services are otherwise unavailable or could only be obtained at a substantial increase in cost or with an unacceptable level of inconvenience to users

b. unit or service is recognized for its effectiveness; it enhances PSU's reputation with its internal and/or external constituents.

c. services available from alternative providers are inferior in quality or level of service to those that could be provided after the reorganization

d. the service or activity provided by the unit is mandated by federal or state statute, funding agency regulations or administrative rules and regulations of OSSHE and there is no alternative way to comply with these regulations

e. the services are essentially self-supporting, resulting in limited opportunity for significant budget savings
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