

Faculty Senate, 14 June 2021



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 meeting. 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.

Proposed amendment to Faculty Constitution

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 **14 June 2021** 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 14th**. Other members of the PSU community who wish to speak should ask a senator to send notification to the Presiding Officer and Secretary by **noon** on **Monday, June 14th**. The **Consent Agenda** is **approved** without further discussion unless any senator, prior to the end of Announcements, requests separate consideration for any item.*

Senators for 2021-22 (continuing and newly elected senators) will vote on officers. Current senators will vote on all other business.

AGENDA

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* (see also G.5-8)
 - 1. Roll call *will be effected through the online meeting participants list*
 - 2. Procedual: 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. Proposed amendment to Faculty Constitution: RESR Committee – *introduced at June 7th meeting*
- E. New Business
 - * 1. New program: Grad. Cert. in Applied Behavior Analysis (COE via GC)
 - * 2. New program: Grad. Cert. in Futures Thinking & Foresight Practice (GC)
 - * 3. New program: Grad. Cert. in Orientation & Mobility for Children, Youth, and Adults (COE via GC)
 - * 4. New program: Minor in Interdisciplinary Neuroscience (CLAS via UCC)
 - * 5. Reduce the required number of SINQs from three to two, effective AY 22-23 (USC) – *see also E.6.1*
 - * 6. Eliminate the requirement that students take the SINQ that matches the Junior Cluster, effective AY 22-23 (USC)
 - * 6.1. Appendix: BC comments on SINQ proposals
- F. Question Period
 - * 1. Question to Provost
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
 - 1. President's Report
 - 2. Provost's Report

- * 3. Report on comments on the President's Article 22 Provisional Plan for IELP (Steering, AHC-APRCA)
 - 4. Academic Quality Committee memo on 'Attend Anywhere'
 - * 5. Annual Report of Academic Quality Committee – *Consent Agenda*
 - * 6. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee – *Consent Agenda*
 - * 7. Annual Report of Faculty Development Committee – *Consent Agenda*
 - * 8. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board – *Consent Agenda*
 - * 9. Annual Report of University Research Council
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments. Complete program proposals are available at the [Online Curriculum Management System](#).**

- D.1. Constitutional amendment: RESR committee
- E.1. Grad. Cert. in Applied Behavior Analysis (COE via GC) - *summary*
- E.2. Grad. Cert. in Futures Thinking & Foresight Practice (GC) - *summary*
- E.3. Grad. Cert. in Orientation & Mobility (COE via GC) - *summary*
- E.4. Minor in Interdisciplinary Neuroscience (CLAS via UCC) - *summary*
- E.5. SING proposal #1 (USC)
- E.6. SING proposal #2 (USC)
- E.6.1. BC comment on SING proposals
- G.3. Steering/AHC-APRCA report on comments on IELP provisional plan
- G.4. AQC memo on Attend Anywhere
- G.5. AQC annual report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.6. ARC annual report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.7. FDC annual report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.8. IAB annual report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.9. URC annual report

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
<i>vacant</i>		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 *
<i>vacant</i>		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

Amendment to the Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty
 Faculty Senate, 14 June 2021
 Introduced and modified 7 June 2021

Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (RESRC)

Background, rationale, and implementation

Background: Upon the development of the university-wide Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement (RESR) for the BA/BS degree at Portland State University, the creation of a Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (RESRC) to both review and evaluate courses that will meet the RESR will be required. The proposed RESR is supported by the university administration.

Rationale: This proposed constitutional amendment creates the said committee, i.e., the **Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (RESRC)**. As with the passing of the **RESR**, this action will locate Portland State University as a leader and a model for other institutions who seek to implement a race and ethnic studies requirement in Oregon and the nation. As one of the largest public institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon, PSU will lead as a voice of authority and expertise.

Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Constitution

The Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty is hereby amended to create the Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee (RESRC), to be constituted beginning Fall 2021, by inserting the following text into Article IV, Section 4(4) in the appropriate alphabetical order, and renumbering other committee listings accordingly:

Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee. This committee shall consist of four faculty from the School of Gender, Race, and Nations (SGRN) and three faculty with relevant expertise outside of SGRN (including two with expertise in international, non-US critical race and ethnic studies). The four SGRN faculty, shall be chosen by a majority vote of the faculty of SGRN which shall notify the Committee on Committees of their elected committee members each year by June 1. It will also include one student enrolled in the SGRN MA certificate program nominated by Student Activities and Leadership Programs (SALP) in conversation with the ASPSU. All members of the committee, including the graduate student, will be voting members.

The committee shall:

1. Identify topical areas, learning goals, and pedagogies associated with the RES requirement.
2. Examine syllabi and recommend which courses will count toward the RES requirement for BA/ BS degrees.
3. Recommend courses that will meet the RES requirement to be voted on by the Faculty Senate.

4. Establish guidelines for reviewing for new courses to receive RES designation.
 5. Review transfer credits to meet the RES requirement when necessary.
 6. Act in liaison with other committees, units, and stakeholders (including undergraduate students) as needed, in providing guidance and reviewing course requirements.
 7. Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.
-

Procedural note from Secretary:

Art. VIII of the Faculty Constitution prescribes a two-stage process for consideration of amendments. The proposed amendment was introduced as item D.2 at the June 7th meeting, discussed, and modified (amendment to the amendment) in one sentence. The final text has been submitted to Advisory Council for review for "proper form and numbering."

The vote on the final text occurs at the next regular meeting. A two-thirds majority is required for approval of constitutional amendments.

7 May 2021

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Graduate Certificate in Applied Behavior Analysis

The following proposal has been approved by the Graduate Council and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Faculty Budget Committee comments, at the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\) Curriculum Dashboard](#).

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR College of Education

Graduate Certificate in Applied Behavior Analysis

Certificate Type

Graduate Certificate: Admission to graduate status required

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Overview of the Program

The proposed graduate certificate offers a concentration of coursework in behavior analysis for those interested in pursuing advanced studies in applied behavior analysis (ABA). Further, for those interested in becoming a Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA®), the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) has verified the 7 courses within the proposed certificate (32 credits) toward the coursework requirements for eligibility to take the Board Certified Behavior Analyst® examination. Our coursework is considered a Verified Course Sequence (VCS) by the ABAI and is the only VCS program in Oregon offered fully online. Students will be able to complete the program in two years, part-time.

Courses within the proposed certificate have seen consistent enrollment (e.g., M 21; range 19-24) for the past 3 offerings and include non-traditional students, licensed teachers (general / special education), PSU alumni (graduate / undergraduate), individuals providing ABA services within local and out-of-state agencies, parents of children with disabilities, as well as individuals looking to change careers. This stackable graduate certificate in ABA will increase accessibility for students who currently take the coursework as non-degree as well as promote a pathway for undergraduates looking to advanced their knowledge in ABA while earning a MA / MS in Special Education. In addition, offering this VCS allows PSU graduate students the opportunity to pursue a BCBA® which enhances job opportunities in schools and programs (in-clinic, in-home) providing ABA services and, with a BCBA®, students will be able to apply for state licensure (i.e., Licensed Behavior Analyst, LBA).

Evidence of Need

Senate Bill 365 (SB 365) was approved in Oregon in 2013 which mandated insurance coverage of ABA services for individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). In addition, the passage of SB 365 created a title act for ABA licensure

within the state ([Behavior Analysis Regulatory Board](#)) and later lead to the Oregon Health Plan's approval of ABA coverage in 2015 (ORABA.org) thus, increasing the in-state need for individuals with training in ABA services. In a recent employment demand report released by the BACB®, data suggest an increase in demand for BCBA's in every state since 2010 with an 80% increase from 2018 to 2019 (BACB 2020, p. 1). According to this report, job postings for BCBA's reached 28,967 nationwide in 2019. Providing a quality fully online graduate certificate in ABA that targets the content required for a BCBA®, will provide national and local school districts, agencies, and other community partners access to much needed content/training. Further, individuals with a BCBA® in Oregon, can apply for Oregon licensure (i.e., Oregon Licensed Behavior Analyst, LBA).

Course of Study

A 32-credit graduate certificate in Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) offers a concentration of coursework in behavior analysis for those interested in pursuing advanced studies in ABA. Each course in the sequence builds on each other, enhancing students' knowledge and skills in implementing evidence-based behavior support strategies. Further, for those pursuing a BCBA®, the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) has verified our 7-course sequence toward the coursework requirements for eligibility to take the Board Certified Behavior Analyst® examination. Applicants will need to meet additional requirements before they can be deemed eligible to take the examination. Please refer to the [BACB®](#) (bacb.com) for additional requirements.

Required Courses (no electives):

- SpEd 558 ABA: Concepts and Principles (5 credits)
- SpEd 559 Assessing Behavior (5 credits)
- SpEd 561 PBS: Behavior-Change Strategies (5 credits)
- SpEd 562 Ethical Issues in ABA (5 credits)
- SpEd 565 Research in ABA: Single-Subject Design (5 credits)
- SpEd 566 Advanced Research Methods in ABA (4 credits)
- SpEd 567 ABA Leadership Capstone (3 credits)

7 May 2021

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Graduate Certificate in Futures Thinking and Foresight Practice

The following proposal has been approved by the Graduate Council or Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Faculty Budget Committee comments, at the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\) Curriculum Dashboard](#).

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR Graduate School

Graduate Certificate in Futures Thinking and Foresight Practice

Certificate Type

Graduate certificate: Admission to graduate status required

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Overview of the Program

This certificate grows out of work that long-time (20+ year) Social Work Faculty member Dr. Laura Nissen has been doing throughout her career. In 2000, when she first arrived at PSU, she led a national juvenile justice reform project funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation which is where she first began using foresight in practice. Years later, she decided to do a deep dive and invest in obtaining training and developing scholarship in this interdisciplinary space. In the past three years, she has developed a campus-wide initiative known as the [PSU Futures Collaboratory](#) where approximately 60 people have now received futures / foresight training as well as engaged in some "future of PSU" specific projects and practical explorations. Additionally, she applied for and received a national grant from RWJF to launch a national [social work health futures lab](#) - which is an opportunity to bring futures thinking to the social work profession. She has published much of her work on her blog called [Social Work Futures](#) which is followed by people in more than 40 countries, is currently preparing a book proposal on this same topic, and has become a [Research Fellow at the Institute for the Future](#) in Palo Alto, CA.

This 18-credit learning experience includes focus on technological change, climate change, geo-political shifts and such topics as the future of work, food, learning and more. Foresight is an emerging interdisciplinary social science comprised of psychology, sociology, anthropology and social work, the arts, political science, business, technological studies, urban studies, public administration, engineering and technology sciences, economics, and other geo-political focal areas (to name a few). Futures thinking and foresight practice reflect a collection of applied skills and tools related to a specific type of anticipatory thinking, applied ethics in a futures context and related change management / navigation skills. It is also about increasing proficiency in building collective intelligence, imagination, agency and

agility in individuals, groups, organizations and civic collectives with regard to self-determination and democratically anchored futures planning. Interdisciplinary elective coursework will allow students to personalize from among a list of future forward courses that best meet their professional goals and their intended future focus.

The certificate will include a deep exploration of settings and methods where foresight is currently being practiced in both the public and private sectors, a review of foresight research and methods and profiles of futurists who lead these processes. With a special focus on leading efforts to build foresightfulness within communities and / or organizations through trend mapping, power analysis, goal setting in a "VUCA" practice environment (volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity), students will learn the fundamentals of engaging individuals, groups and organizations in a positive experience of navigating futures conceptualization and planning. Issues of equity and strategies to democratize co-creation of shared futures, acknowledge / address bias and patterns of historical bias will be prioritized. A concluding integration course will provide a culminating experience to engage in shared learning and cross-disciplinary review of foresight projects, as well as creation of a professional foresight portfolio useful to those seeking to enhance their career readiness in this area.

Evidence of Need

The current era reflects immense turbulence and change. Futures and foresight practice is an applied style of planning, useful in both the public and private sector, which prepares individuals to be effective at navigating change in innovative and future-facing ways. Current "future of work" predictions call for more, not less, turbulence and change in the workplace. The ability to plan effectively, navigate change with focus, and anticipate what trends will influence the future of modern life are sought after work skills. The PSU Futures Collaboratory has been in action for 1.5 years, and has attracted attention from students in many disciplines interested in adding these skills to their learning experiences. Dr. Nissen has had more than 200 conversations with interested students across campus as she has done guest lecturing on futures issues in the last 2 years - all interested in getting involved with the certificate. Dr. Nissen has had conversations with over 20 community partners (private and public sector) who have expressed interest in the certificate when it is available. This is a growing field of practice internationally and nationally, but we have no current competition for this specific type of educational program in Oregon.

Course of Study

Core (10 credits):

- IST 520 Introduction to Foresight and Futures Practice (4 credits)
- IST 521 Applying Foresight Frameworks and Building Futures Practice (4 credits)
- IST 522 Integrative Futures Practice (2 credits)

Electives (8 credits):

Students will then select a minimum of 8 credits from this list of electives:

- PA 513: Administrative Ethics and Values (3)
- PA 514: Global Leadership and Management (3)
- PA 516: Current Issues in Public Management (3)
- PA 536: Strategic Planning (3)
- PA 543: Creating Collaborative Communities (3)
- PA 598: Value-Based Management (3)
- USP 560: Climate Resiliency Planning (3)
- SW 510: Futures Thinking and Foresight Practice for Equity, Well-Being and Community Flourishing
- Econ 543: Global Environmental Economics (4)
- Mgmt 521: Design Thinking for. Social Innovation (4)
- Mgmt 522: Money Matters for Social Innovation (4)
- Mgmt 523: Storytelling and impact measurement for social innovation (4)
- Mgmt 518: Digital transformation of business (4)

Minimum credits: 18 hours

7 May 2021

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Paul Loikith, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Graduate Certificate in Orientation and Mobility
for Children, Youth, and Adults

The following proposal has been approved by the Graduate Council and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Faculty Budget Committee comments, at the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\) Curriculum Dashboard](#).

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR College of Education

Graduate Certificate in Orientation and Mobility for Children, Youth, and Adults

Certificate Type

Graduate certificate: Admission to graduate status required

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Overview of the Program

The Orientation and Mobility (O&M) Graduate Certificate provides learners with the knowledge and skill competencies recognized by the Academy for Certification of Vision Rehabilitation and Education Professionals (ACVREP) and the Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired (AERBVI) to promote the safe and efficient travel skills of individuals who are blind, visually impaired or deafblind. O&M Specialists provide individualized assessment, and instruction to individuals with visual impairment based upon an individual's needs, strengths, preferences and goals within settings that are important to the individual with visual impairment.

Nationwide, there is a critical shortage of orientation and mobility specialists. O&M specialists educate students with visual impairments, including those with deafblindness. The need for evidence-based instruction for individuals with visual impairments in all geographic areas is great. It is a particular need in rural and remote communities where there are too few O&M Specialists. Providing quality O&M services to people, regardless of geography, is a matter of equity. In fact, O&M is recognized in special education and rehabilitation laws, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the Rehabilitation Act (RA) of 1973. O&M skills have been associated with higher rates of education, employment and quality of life. O&M specialists teach people how to travel safely, efficiently, and with purpose in a variety of environments. The O&M program is an extension of the Visually Impaired Learner (VIL) teacher licensure program and may be added to Special Education Master's Program. VIL has been preparing teachers of students with visual impairments (TSVIs) since 1964.

Evidence of Need

PSU's O&M program was born with the support of an Office of Special Education award to address the need for O&M services in an underserved region. Certified Orientation and Mobility Educators in Training (Project COMET) Award #H325K160149, which has a total award amount of \$1,248,872 million, is designated to recruit, train, and retain 38 pre service orientation and mobility instructors over a five year period (ending in 2021), with priority for scholarships to students from OR, WA, ID, MT, AK and HI. This grant was awarded to PSU because of a demonstrated regional need that projected the number of students with visual impairments and deafblindness in the region; the estimated number of personnel serving those students; and the projected number of retirements that are projected for the region. A map with the projected personnel needs by state is available in the full proposal.

Sixty-five percent of the COMET budget is allocated to student tuition. Dr. Amy Parker and Dr. Holly Lawson were appointed in a tenure-track faculty line to help ensure the fulfillment of this award. In addition to developing an O&M program that fully aligns with AERBVI and ACVREP standards, the focus of the COMET grant is to develop and launch a program that prepares O&M candidates in three specialty areas of focus:

- ethical distance-based mentoring and consultation
- culturally and family responsive services
- serving students with additional disabilities, including deafblindness

The larger purpose of the grant is to help establish a preparation program in O&M that will meet regional needs through partnerships with agencies, schools, and mentors to engage with PSU in growing and sustaining the field. The program is currently serving grant funded and non-grant funded students.

Needs data was gathered from our regional state partners to determine the need for personnel in educational settings.

State	APH Registry Data (2017)	Estimates of students with VI as reported by PNWCVE advisory board member	NCDB Deaf-blind Child Count (2016)	TSVIs & O&Ms reported by PNWCVE advisory board member	Current Vacancies	Projected retirements in 3-5 years reported by PNWCVE advisory board member
Alaska	136	201	22	TSVI - 16 O&M - 4 Dual - 4	TSVI - 2	TSVI - 2 Dual - 2 O&M - 1
Hawaii	259	270	73	TSVI - 19 O&M - 13	Dual - 2	Dual - 3
Idaho	264	473	69	TSVI - 20 Dual - 3 O&M - 7	TSVI - 1	TSVI - 3 Dual - 3 O&M - 3 (9)

Montana	244	414	56	TSVI - 8 Dual - 5 O&M - 8	TSVI - 1	TSVI - 2 Dual - 2 O&M - 1 (5)
Oregon	630	820	89	TSVI - 40 Dual - 25 O&M - 2	TSVI - 1 O&M - 1	TSVI - 5 O&M - 4 (9)
Washington	1220	1904	269	TSVI - 100 O&M - 3	TSVI - 2	TSVI - 10 O&M - 5 (15)
Totals	2,753	4,290	578	277	10	46

* Dual Certified and teaches as both a TSVI & O&M

Total need = 56

Course of Study

Orientation and Mobility Graduate Certificate is a 34-credit program that is designed to be stackable with the Special Education Master's Degree.

Requirements

Course	Name	Credit Hours
SpEd 540	Foundations of Education for the Visually Impaired Learner	3
SpEd 541	Implications of Vision Problems of Children/Youth	3
SpEd 545	Introduction to Orientation and Mobility and Independent Living Skills	3
SpEd 549	Orientation and Mobility Methods	3
SpEd 550	Orientation and Mobility Assessment and Instruction - Children	3
SpEd 551	Orientation and Mobility Assessment and Instruction - Adults	3
SpEd 552	Orientation and Mobility Advanced Techniques	4
SpEd 554	STE I Orientation and Mobility Practicum*	3
SpEd 554	STE II Orientation and Mobility Practicum*	3
SpEd 554	STE III Orientation and Mobility Practicum*	3
SpEd 554	STE IV Orientation and Mobility Practicum*	3

TOTAL CREDIT HOURS: 34

Students complete 12 credits of Orientation and Mobility (O&M) practicum which is equal to 400 hours of clinical O&M experience that align with [ACVREP requirements](#). O&M practicum credits are variable and may be taken in 3-12 credit increments across multiple terms depending upon the practicum placement hours and the availability of a supervising Certified Orientation and Mobility Specialist (COMS). The O&M Program Coordinator works with students to arrange practicum placements based on geography, student interests, and availability of clinical partners within educational, rehabilitation and community settings. Students are eligible to sit for the national certifying exam for Orientation and Mobility Specialists within 6 months of completing of coursework. A person may be certified after

passing the national exam, submitting documentation of coursework completion, and with a signed documentation from the Program Coordinator.

7 May 2021

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Interdisciplinary Neuroscience Minor

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Faculty Senate Budget Committee comments, online by going to the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\) Curriculum Dashboard \(https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard\)](https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Interdisciplinary Neuroscience Minor**

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Overview of the Program

The “decade of the brain” occurring in the 1990s led to the development of brain science in a broad range of experimental and theoretical disciplines. This relatively new field includes, but is not limited to: Clinical, Mathematical, Systems, Anatomical, Developmental, Behavioral, Molecular, and Cognitive Neuroscience. The breadth of these approaches renders this field fundamentally and increasingly interdisciplinary, making a single department less relevant than cross department collaboration. Thus, undergraduate studies in Neuroscience will benefit from a cross departmental collaboration seated in Biology and Psychology, and including coursework in Computer Science, Linguistics, Philosophy, Public Health, Social Work, Speech and Hearing Sciences, and University Studies.

The coursework and program objectives will encourage students to explore the relationship between our brains and behavior. Mental health, memory, attention, perception, language, feeling, bias, creativity, and decision making in social contexts depend on nervous system structure and function. People in this field examine how the underlying biology, biochemistry and physiology of the nervous system relates to individuals’ psychological and behavioral processes.

Evidence of Need

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), jobs for medical scientists, including neuroscientists, are projected to grow by 13% between 2012 and 2022, which is as fast as the national average for all occupations (www.bls.gov/ooh/life-physical-and-social-science/medical-scientists.htm#tab-6). Biochemists and biophysicists (other areas in which such students could work) should experience employment growth of 19% during that same period. The BLS reports that the median annual salary for biochemists and biophysicists was \$81,480 in 2012. Medical scientists earned \$76,980.

According to a 2018 study obtained from Zion Market Research (www.zionmarketresearch.com), the global neuroscience market was valued at \$26,350 million in 2016 and is expected to reach approximately \$34,800 million by 2024. The global neuroscience market is expected to exhibit a compound annual growth rate of more than 3.5% between 2017 and 2024.

Relevant Market Report Highlights:

1. The rise in the occurrences of the neurological disorders globally has triggered the growth of the neuroscience market. There has been a rapid increase in the cases of neurological disorders such as cerebral stroke, Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, and Parkinsonism which has increased the demand for the developments in the field of neuroscience. The demand for diagnostic procedures has increased, positively affecting market growth. Other factors that are expected to drive market growth are favorable reimbursement policies and growing government spending on the healthcare infrastructure.
2. North America held the dominant position in the global neuroscience market with more than a 38% share in 2016. Increasing R&D coupled with demand for novel and innovative technologies in brain mapping and other neurological studies is expected to propel market growth. Increased demand for neuroimaging devices in research activities is a primary trigger for the growth of the US neuroscience market. Additionally, a growing need for integrated software and diagnostic services ensure that these will be areas of continued jobs growth.
3. Hospitals dominated the end-user segment in 2016 by holding a major market share of above 35%. The increasing preference of patients towards hospitals for better diagnosis of their neurological disorders is one of the major factors driving the hospital segment. Other primary end users will include: academic Institutions, diagnostic laboratories, and research Institutes.
4. Lastly, a February 2019 year-end review by the Oregon Department of Labor Statistics (www.qualityinfo.org/-/2018-in-review-another-year-of-job-growth-and-record-low-unemployment) showed that health care and social assistance is a perennial driver of job growth in our state. This category added 5,300 jobs during 2018 for a growth rate of 2.1 percent. Ambulatory health care services, which include a range of outpatient services from physician offices to medical laboratories, added the most jobs within this sector. Hospitals, and nursing and residential care facilities followed.

Course of Study

This is one 28-credit minor that will be administered via three tracks:

- Track 1: Neuroscience Minor for Biology Majors
- Track 2: Neuroscience Minor for Psychology Majors
- Track 3: Neuroscience Minor for All Other Majors

Each track must complete the following Core Requirements (12 credits):

Area A: Neurophysiology (4 credits)

- Bi 462 Neuroscience I: Physiology of synapses and circuits, 4 credits

or

- Psy 200 Psychology as a Natural Science, 4 credits

or

- Psy 451 Introduction to Neurophysiological Psychology, 4 credits

Area B: Sensory/Motor Systems (4 credits)

- Bi 463 Neuroscience II: Sensory and Motor Systems, 4 credits

or

- Psy 347 Perception, 4 credits

or

- SpHr 461 Neurology of Speech and Hearing, 4 credits

Area C: Research/Outreach (4 credits)

- An approved 401 Research or 403 Thesis course, 4 credits

Electives (16 credits)

Additionally, each track must complete 16 credits of electives selected from the following list of approved courses:

Track 1: Neuroscience Minor for Biology Majors

Electives: 16 credits selected from the following list of approved courses:

- CS 441 Artificial Intelligence, 4 credits
- CS 445 Machine Learning, 4 credits
- Ling 233 Language and the Mind, 4 credits
- Ling 433 Psycholinguistics, 4 credits
- Ling 445 Linguistics and Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- PHE 466 Mind/Body Health: Disease Prevention, 4 credits
- PHE 467 Mind/Body Health: Human Potential, 4 credits
- PHE 473 Physiology of Exercise, 4 credits
- Phl 432 Philosophy of the Mind, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Psychiatry, 4 credits
- Psy 346 Learning, 4 credits
- Psy 348 Cognition, 4 credits
- Psy 399 Neuroscience and Behavior, 4 credits
- Psy 410: Cognitive Neuroscience
- Psy 410: Neuroscience Outreach: The Brain in Real Life
- Psy 434 Introduction to Psychopathology, 4 credits
- Psy 450 Psychopharmacology

- Psy 452: Advanced Neurophysiological Psychology
- Psy 471 Health Psychology, 4 credits
- SpHr 471 Neurolinguistics, 4 credits
- SpHr 495 Neurogenic Communication Disorders, 4 credits

Track 2: Neuroscience Minor for Psychology Majors

Electives: 16 credits selected from the following list of approved courses

- Bi 207 Biology for Allied Health I, 4 credits or Bi 211 Principles of Biology: Molecular Cell Biology & Genetics, 4 credits and Bi 214 Principles of Biology Lab I, 1 credit
- Bi 208 Biology for Allied Health: Evolution and Diversity of Life, 4 credits or Bi 212 Principles of Biology: Development, Evolution & Ecology, 4 credits and Bi 215 Principles of Biology Lab II, 1 credit
- Bi 209 Biology for Allied Health: Anatomy and Physiology Systems, 4 credits or Bi 213 Principles of Biology: Organisms, Biodiversity & Conservation, 4 credits and Bi 216 Principles of Biology Lab III, 1 credit
- Bi 301 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 302 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 303 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 320 Organismal Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 412 Animal Behavior, 4 credits
- Bi 456 Developmental Biology, 4 credits
- CS 441 Artificial Intelligence, 4 credits
- CS 445 Machine Learning, 4 credits
- Ling 233 Language and the Mind, 4 credits
- Ling 433 Psycholinguistics, 4 credits
- Ling 445 Linguistics and Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- PHE 466 Mind/Body Health: Disease Prevention, 4 credits
- PHE 467 Mind/Body Health: Human Potential, 4 credits
- PHE 473 Physiology of Exercise, 4 credits
- Phl 432 Philosophy of the Mind, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Psychiatry, 4 credits
- SpHr 471 Neurolinguistics, 4 credits
- SpHr 495 Neurogenic Communication Disorders, 4 credits

Track 3: Neuroscience Minor for All Other Majors

Electives: 16 credits selected from the following list of approved courses

- Bi 207 Biology for Allied Health I, 4 credits or Bi 211 Principles of Biology: Molecular Cell Biology & Genetics, 4 credits and Bi 214 Principles of Biology Lab I, 1 credit
- Bi 208 Biology for Allied Health: Evolution and Diversity of Life, 4 credits or Bi 212 Principles of Biology: Development, Evolution & Ecology, 4 credits and Bi 215 Principles of Biology Lab II, 1 credit
- Bi 209 Biology for Allied Health: Anatomy and Physiology Systems, 4 credits or Bi 213 Principles of Biology: Organisms, Biodiversity & Conservation, 4 credits and Bi 216 Principles of Biology Lab III, 1 credit

- Bi 301 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 302 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 303 Human Anatomy and Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 320 Organismal Physiology, 4 credits
- Bi 412 Animal Behavior, 4 credits
- Bi 456 Developmental Biology, 4 credits
- CS 441 Artificial Intelligence, 4 credits
- CS 445 Machine Learning, 4 credits
- Ling 233 Language and the Mind, 4 credits
- Ling 433 Psycholinguistics, 4 credits
- Ling 445 Linguistics and Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- PHE 466 Mind/Body Health: Disease Prevention, 4 credits
- PHE 467 Mind/Body Health: Human Potential, 4 credits
- PHE 473 Physiology of Exercise, 4 credits
- Phl 432 Philosophy of the Mind, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science, 4 credits
- Psy 346 Learning, 4 credits
- Psy 348 Cognition, 4 credits
- Psy 399 Neuroscience and Behavior, 4 credits
- Psy 410: Cognitive Neuroscience
- Psy 410: Neuroscience Outreach: The Brain in Real Life
- Psy 434 Introduction to Psychopathology, 4 credits
- Psy 450 Psychopharmacology, 4 credits
- Psy 452: Advanced Neurophysiological Psychology, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Cognitive Science, 4 credits
- Phl 471 Topics in Philosophy of Science: Psychiatry, 4 credits
- SpHr 471 Neurolinguistics, 4 credits
- SpHr 495 Neurogenic Communication Disorders, 4 credits
- SW 441 Psychobiology for Social Workers, 4 credits

Portland State University Faculty Senate Motion
June 2021

UNST Proposal #1: Reduce the required number of SINGs from three to two. (Effective AY 22-23)

Background and preliminary discussions

The University Studies Council proposes two changes to the UNST curriculum and requirements. These changes were approved for consideration by UNST Council by the UNST Curricular Leadership Team. In addition, this proposal was sent out for feedback to Cluster Coordinators, Advisers, Department Chairs who contribute SING and Deans (the responses received are below).

Current requirement: The UNST second year requirement is for students to take three SINGs and that one of the SINGs corresponds to the Junior Cluster the student pursues.

We are proposing changes to the current requirement based on assessment data, advising issues and budget.

We propose to reduce the required number of SINGs to two instead of three. For students transferring in at the Sophomore level their transfer requirements will be adjusted. We are proposing that transfer Sophomores take at least one SING (30-74 transfer credits - 2 Sophomore Inquiry courses required; 75-90 transfer credits - 1 Sophomore Inquiry course required).

Rationale

We have been looking at the impact of UNST courses on student retention and have found that Sophomore Inquiry, when taken during the time students "should" take it (second year for students who started as freshmen or during the first PSU year for transfer sophomores), has a significant impact on fall-fall persistence. In the figure below you can see that there is >10 % increase in fall-fall persistence for students who enroll in SING the year they "should" take it. Students report that mentors, advisors and faculty play a significant role in their persistence. Using logistic regression, UNST Director of Assessment and Research Rowanna Carpenter determined that this difference in retention was significant even when taking into account GPA, prior credits, etc. The effect of SINGs on retention diminishes after the first SING, though the second SING seems to have an effect.

Sophomore Retention by SING Status

FA 17 & 18 SO cohorts



All sophomores enrolled FA 17 or 18 matched to enrollment in a SING course during the academic year. Retention is enrollment in the fall following the cohort year.

35

In addition to the diminishing impact of the number of SINGs on retention, we are also having difficulty funding the number of graduate mentors needed to support the SING program. The SING mentor stipends are paid with SING student fees (\$59/term) and the graduate remissions come from E&G funds. In the last few years, due to budget cuts in UNST, we have asked the Colleges to help support the mentor program with their graduate remission funds. This is an increasingly difficult approach as budgets shrink. By reducing required SINGs we are reducing a fee burden to students as well reducing the need for graduate remissions.

Finally, although this was not planned, it does seem like an opportune time to reduce UNST requirements as it is likely some version of the Ethnic Studies requirement will become a degree requirement. Our goal is to align the UNST proposed change with the Ethnic Studies requirement to start in 22-23 so that there is only one major catalog change.

Motion presented by the University Studies Council

The Faculty Senate reduces the required number of SINGs to two instead of three.

For Transferring Sophomores transferring in 30-74 transfer credits, 2 Sophomore Inquiry courses required; for those transferring in 75-90 transfer credits, 1 Sophomore Inquiry course will be required.

Feedback and Response

After this motion was passed by the UNST Council, it was brought to the Steering Committee for next steps, specifically to recommend other committees that should be consulted before bringing these motions to the Senate. They recommended the Academic Requirements Committee, the Budget Committee, and the University Curriculum Committee. Those committees provided the following feedback.

The Academic Requirements Committee supported this revision because it better aligns with the needs of transfer students.

The Budget Committee agrees with our assessment that overall, the budget impacts will be positive or neutral and agrees that it will “likely have positive impacts on retention and recruitment as a result of greater flexibility.” However, they caution that graduate programs which depend on the UNST Mentor positions may suffer due to the corresponding reduction of graduate student funding. They also note that while demand for elective courses should increase due to increased flexibility this demand may be unevenly distributed across departments. Thus, the UNST Council hopes that programs and departments will use next academic year to revise their strategies to account for these possibilities before the reduction of SINQs occurs the following year (AY 2022-23).

Finally, the University Curriculum Committee supports the proposal but wants to ensure that UNST continues to work with the Writing Council to ensure that our student writing skills continue to be properly supported. The UNST Council is currently in the process of revising its Communication Goal and will take this motion into revision as it continues this work.

Portland State University Faculty Senate Motion
June 2021

UNST Proposal #2: Eliminate the requirement that students take the SING that matches the Junior Cluster. (Effective AY 22-23)

Background, rationale, and preliminary discussions

The UNST Council proposes to eliminate the requirement that students take the SING that matches the Junior Cluster. We propose to make this connection “recommended.” In fact, when the Council sought feedback on the prior motion to reduce the required number of SINGs from three to two, this revision was routinely suggested by the Cluster Coordinators, Advisers, Department Chairs who contribute SING and Deans consulted (the responses received are below).

The UNST curriculum was designed with the model of a student starting at PSU as a freshman. However, most PSU students have transferred here and most transfer students start at the Junior Cluster level. Among the graduates who completed clusters, 41% took SING courses that matched their clusters. About 1.5% of students took SING courses that did not match their cluster. The rest of the cluster students ($\approx 57\%$) did not take any SING courses.

Since Junior-level transfer students do not take the corresponding SING course, cluster faculty cannot teach the course assuming the SING course was taken. For students who enter as Sophomores, we have learned from advising that when students have difficulty finding a SING section corresponding to their Cluster choice that will fit in their schedule, they change Clusters to expedite completing their degree requirements.

Given that cluster courses are not really taught assuming SING content and that the linked requirement forces students into unwanted choices, we do not think the linked requirement serves its original purpose of introducing students to the cluster. A linkage would be desirable and recommended (but not required), especially for those who want to use the Cluster to build a minor, but the Cluster and UNST Learning goals can still be taught at both levels without this requirement.

Motion presented by the University Studies Council

The Faculty Senate will eliminate the requirement that students take the SING that matches the Junior Cluster. The linkage will be “recommended”.

Feedback and Response

After this motion was passed by the UNST Council, it was brought to the Steering Committee for next steps, specifically to recommend other committees that should

be consulted before bringing these motions to the Senate. They recommended the Academic Requirements Committee, the Budget Committee, and the University Curriculum Committee. Those committees provided the following feedback.

The Academic Requirements Committee supports this revision because it better aligns with the needs of transfer students. In fact, they suggested we propose the revision for next academic year (AY 2021-22) instead of waiting until the following year (AY 2022-23) to reduce the number of petitions to UNST and ARC pending approval. The Council appreciates this support and suggestion but prefers that the motions to reduce the number of SINQs and to decouple the SINQ and Junior Clusters occur at the same time so that the PSU Catalog need only be revised once to accommodate these motions. The Academic Requirements Committee also asked in the required number of Junior Clusters would be reduced from 3 to 2, but the Council has no plans at this time or for the foreseeable future to consider such a proposal.

The Budget Committee agrees with our assessment that overall, the budget impacts of this motion will be neutral, but that it will “likely have positive impacts on retention and recruitment as a result of greater flexibility.” However, they note that while demand for elective courses should increase due to increased flexibility this demand may be unevenly distributed across departments. Thus, the UNST Council hopes that programs and departments will use next academic year to revise their strategies to account for these possibilities before the reduction of SINQs occurs the following year (AY 2022-23).

The University Curriculum Committee supports the proposal, but asked if unlinking SINQ’s and Junior Clusters if “eliminating the scaffolding model” will “remove what is unique about University Studies and signal a transition back to a distribution model of general education?”

As part of the deliberation of this motion, the Council reviewed one of the founding documents of UNST, Charles White’s “A Model for Comprehensive Reform in General Education” (1994), for the purpose of answering those questions. We concluded that this motion would not conflict with the goals of providing a curriculum that employs both thematic clusters and scaffolds student learning for the following reasons.

First, the White article discusses Freshman Inquiry (FRINQ) for nine pages (p 201-210) and five pages on Senior Capstones (p 212-217), but only a page (p 211) on SINQ and Junior Clusters. Clearly, the link between the two was not an original or essential part of the program, as it is never expressly stated. The article only suggests that SINQ and Junior Clusters should focus on interdisciplinary topics of inquiry, like “Knowledge, Values, and Rationality” or “Interpreting the Past,” but not that the curriculum of SINQ and Junior Cluster must be linked and scaffolded.

In practice, this link between SINQs and Junior Clusters only minimally exists in the courses currently offered. While the UNST Council, the Cluster Coordinators, and the Cluster Curriculum Committee do ensure that Junior Cluster courses teach the learning objectives of UNST and the Cluster, ensuring continuity between SINQs & Junior Cluster has proven difficult for a variety of reasons.

First, faculty who teach SINQ courses often do not teach Junior Cluster courses, thus there are few instructors who independently align their curriculum. Most importantly, Junior Cluster courses have no pre-requisites and as stated earlier, $\approx 57\%$ of students in Junior Cluster courses have not taken the associated SINQ. Therefore, neither instructors, coordinators, nor the Council can expect most Junior Cluster students to have the background knowledge of a specific SINQ beyond the general curriculum relevant to UNST Goals.

Ironically, students often take their Junior Cluster courses first to sample the topic and then select a SINQ during their Junior or Senior year based on those experiences, degree completion, or simply due to availability. This strategy significantly impacts the retention advantages of the SINQs and negates any possibility of scaffolding learning.

In conclusion, the UNST Council could take steps to reinforce the curricular connection between SINQ and Junior Clusters, but such a strategy would be counterproductive. Tightening the link between SINQ's and Junior Clusters would not significantly improve the curriculum for traditional students who enroll as Freshmen, but they are already reluctant to commit to a SINQ during their Sophomore year when the curriculum would have its greatest impact on retention and teaching basic academic skills, like Writing, Communication, and Quantitative Literacy. Likewise, transfer students are not helped by this link because they have either completed enough credits to not need SINQ courses, or they also avoid taking their SINQ courses until after they have completed a sample of Junior Cluster courses. This almost guarantees they are not completing their *sophomore* general education courses until their *junior or even senior years*. The impacts of this cul-de-sac on student success, retention, and degree completion should be obvious.

By removing this requirement, the interdisciplinary and thematic learning goals of the program and clusters will still be ensured separately at both levels through the current oversight processes. Traditional and transfer students will be more likely to take SINQs and Junior Clusters in the proper order and will still be encouraged and perhaps more likely to take the Junior Cluster courses associated with their initial SINQ. They will be less likely to delay the completion of their GenEd courses because committing to a SINQ will not commit them to 12 Credit Hours in a Cluster of which they have little to no foreknowledge. Most importantly, they will receive an even broader range of curriculum, since all their SINQs and Junior Clusters could be separate, while still benefiting from clustering as opposed to random electives.

To: Faculty Senate

From: Budget Committee

Steven Boyce (co-chair), Mitch Cruzan (co-chair), Jennifer Allen, Tina Anctil, Candace Avalos, Cara Eckhardt, Jill Emery, Eric Geschke, Sam Gioia, Brenda Glascott, David Hansen, Arthur Hendricks, ChiaYin Hsu, Tim Knispel, Martin Lafrenz, Janice Lee, Derek Tretheway, Sarena Velena-White, Stephen Walton

RE: Statement of Budgetary Impact on Proposed SINQ Changes

The Budget Committee reviewed a statement of Budgetary Impact of two proposals for changes to University Studies requirements. Three members of the Budget Committee were assigned to review the statement, and then we met as a committee to finalize our statement in response.

Proposal #1: Reduce the required number of SINQs to two instead of three. For students transferring in at the Sophomore level their transfer requirements will be adjusted. We are proposing that transfer Sophomores take at least one SINQ (30-74 transfer credits - 2 Sophomore Inquiry courses required; 75-90 transfer credits – 1 Sophomore Inquiry course required).

Proposal #2: Eliminate the requirement that students take the SINQ that matches the Junior Cluster. We propose to make this connection “recommended”.

Below is the Budgetary Impact statement the committee received from Linda George, Interim Executive Director of University Studies.

Roughly 60 sections of SINQ/year will no longer be necessary with the proposed curricular change of reducing the SINQ requirement from 3 courses to two. Around 1800 fewer students would be enrolling in one SINQ. The financial impact is positive for both the University and PSU students. Students would be paying \$106,200 less in mentor fees (\$59/student/SINQ x 1800 students). These fees pay for SINQ mentor stipends. The University would be reducing the need for mentor remissions costing \$133,000 (10 mentors * \$13,300 graduate tuition). Note that the proposed reduction in SINQs will not reduce the number of credits required for graduation so there would be no loss in SCH for the University.

For the second proposal of de-linking the requirement that a SINQ course match the Cluster does not appear to have significant budget implications.

Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Best,

Linda

Three committee members were assigned to review the proposal and comment on the statement of budgetary impact. We then discussed the statement as a committee and finalized our statement, which appears below.

Comment #1. Budgetary impacts for adopting this proposal primarily regard reductions in UNST's budget. The lack of funding for SINQ mentor remissions this proposal addresses has been an ongoing issue. Reducing the SINQ requirement from 3 courses to 2 courses will allow students more flexibility to take courses to fulfill their credit requirements. A potential budgetary concern is capacity for students to take an additional elective course from other units in the university, but this is not an issue because many units are facing enrollment declines. Thus in addition to these changes addressing the problem of the current lack of funding for graduate remissions, implementing these changes could reduce the percentage of under enrolled courses across campus and improve retention and recruitment of students due to increased flexibility and decreased fees. Although this change will reduce funding opportunities for graduate students, it should have minimal impact on particular graduate programs because SINQ mentors are enrolled in graduate programs from throughout the university.

Comment #2. I agree with the comments above regarding the overall impact of this change. The budgetary impacts seem minimal - the main negative impact seems to be on funding for graduate students, and as noted, these impacts will be distributed. The proposed change would likely have positive impacts on retention and recruitment as a result of greater flexibility and fewer fees. (My anecdotal understanding is that the UNST requirements are sometimes a deterrent to transfer students considering PSU).

Comment #3. I concur with comments above. The rationale for changing the SINQ requirements seems sound and the statements from the various units support it.

I think it is possible that some graduate programs will suffer as a result of the reduction in SINQs and the reduction in mentor positions: for small programs, a loss of funding for one or two graduate students may have a significant impact and cause the program to reach a tipping point (that is, enrollment decline or elimination); for larger programs this would not be significant.

Also, although demand for elective courses should increase due to the reduction in required SINQs, that demand may be unevenly distributed, and this could negatively impact departments which have faculty teaching SINQs who lose them and need an additional course within their home department.

Comment #4: It is possible this reduction of a sophomore-level requirement could affect Honors enrollment because students might decide not to pursue Honors if it requires more GE courses than UNST. Honors plans on responding to this through messaging.

Question for Provost Jeffords

Context:

Provost Jeffords, President Percy, and others in the administration have thanked the faculty and staff of this university for stepping up when the pandemic hit to shift teaching and advising online without missing a beat. You've thanked academic professionals and non-instructional faculty for helping the university save money by agreeing to furloughs. You've thanked us all for enduring the hardships of the last 15 months while at the same time continuing to put students first. Every such communication of thanks from you and the President has helped to bring us all together over the course of an extraordinarily difficult year. Your appreciation has been received by us as heartfelt and sincere.

And yet the administration's insistence on program reduction and reorganization has created a lot of anxiety and mistrust. Enrollment projections seem to be driving these initiatives, but even during normal times these are unreliable more than 2 years into the future – and these are not normal times. We, along with many other faculty and academic professionals, are convinced that PSU should not be making major strategic decisions to eliminate, reduce, or reshape academic programs when enrollment and other factors determining the university's financial health are in a state of flux. The administration's initiatives have the appearance of taking advantage of the pandemic to push through long-sought cuts and reorganization. That may not be the administration's intent, but it certainly seems that way to many of us.

Now departments and programs must embark on a process of justifying their budgets, and perhaps their existence, by providing data for dashboards designed to generate metrics of their value to the university. During normal times, many of us would take such an exercise in stride – indeed, it is reminiscent of past exercises at PSU. But is this necessary, or at all wise, while we are emerging from a pandemic and are focused on a smooth transition to Open for Fall, Open for All? Moreover, the plan for IELP retrenchment strikes us as ill-timed and unfair, coming at this particular moment and after so much progress by IELP faculty in rebalancing their programs. They, and we, would like to know that every corner of this university has been scoured for cost savings before our colleagues are put out of work.

Our question to the Provost:

So far, the ReImagine PSU initiative seems focused mainly on the revenue-generating units in OAA. How will the burden of closing the projected budget gap be distributed throughout the university? Have dashboards been designed for purposes of assessing administrative and other units, including athletics and campus police? Will these metrics be shared with Faculty Senate?

Submitted by the following Faculty Senators and Officers:

J. Ajibade (CLAS), A. Borden (COTA), M. Berrettini (COTA), M. Chrzanowska-Jeske (MCECS), M. Clark (CLAS), R. Clucas (CUPA), E. Cortez (CLAS), S. Erev (CUPA), R. Farahmandpur (COE), G. Greco (CLAS), D. Hansen (SBA), J. Holt (CLAS), Ito (CUPA), I. Jaen Portillo (CLAS), D. Kinsella (CUPA), M. Lupro (UNST), M. Oschwald (SSW), J. Padin (CLAS), D. Raffo (SBA), A. Sugimoto (COE), S. Thorne (CLAS)

And our faculty colleagues:

P. Basci (UHC), L. Batchelder (UNST), E. Beck (IELP), J. Bohling (CLAS), A. Bright (COE), AJ Brown (IELP), K. Brown (CLAS), D. Bunk (IELP), T. Burdsall (UNST), A. Cantor (CLAS), W. Comer (CLAS), J. Corbett (CUPA), K. Curtin (CLAS), P. Daurio (IELP), E. Davidova (CUPA), R. DeAnda (CLAS), E. De La Vega (COE), M. Dimond (SBA), A. Dinno (SPH), S. Dissanayake (CUPA), C. Epplin (CLAS), Y. Fang (CUPA), T. Fisher (CLAS), N. Friedberg (CLAS), K. Gallagher (IELP), B. Glascott (UHC), A. Golub (CUPA), J. Hall (CUPA), Y. Hanoosh (CLAS),

B. Hansen (COTA), M. Hara (COE), E. Harmon (MCECS), J. Hellermann (CLAS), M. Horst (CUPA), V. Hotton (UNST), A. Jokic (CLAS), P. Kapoor (CUPA), J. Kerns (CLAS), M. Leymon (CUPA), E. Ford (LIB), T. Lockett (CLAS), D. McGurrin (CUPA), K. Merrow (UHC), A. Mirpuri (CLAS), A. Mitra (CUPA), J. Ott (CLAS), C. Ozawa (CUPA), M. Patiño-Vega (CLAS), F. Pérez (UHC), J. Perlmutter (CLAS), P. Rai (CUPA), L. Rodriguez (CUPA), A. Roussell (CLAS), K. Ruoff (CLAS), J. Ruth (COTA), R. Sanders (CLAS), T. Saunders (IELP), G. Schrock (CUPA), F. Schuler (CLAS), A. Sedighi (CLAS), L. Serbulo (UNST), R. Sharma (CUPA), C. Shortell (CUPA), C. Sloan (CLAS), L. Spitzer (IELP), R. Summer (UHC), G. Sussman (CUPA), Y. Thao (COE), Y. Tunc (COE), T. Van Alst (CLAS), S. Wadley (CLAS), S. Watanabe (CLAS), K. L. Weasel (CLAS), Willson-St. Clair (LIB), K. Wu (LIB), M. Yeigh (COE), G. Zimmerman (OIA)

Faculty Senate Report on Comments on the President's Article 22 Provisional Plan for IELP

Joint report of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustment (APRCA)

6/6/2021

Committee Collaboration

The Faculty Senate charged the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments (APRCA) in October 2020, and the committee has been working since December on projects related to upcoming program reduction initiatives. One aspect of the committee's charge is to assist, if requested by OAA or AAUP, in program reduction initiatives undertaken through the PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The Faculty Senate Steering Committee has delegated some work related to program reduction to the APRCA committee. The APRCA Committee created the first draft of this report, and the Steering Committee has reviewed and refined it.

Context

On February 4th, President Percy sent a memo to the Faculty Senate Presiding Officer invoking Article 22 of the CBA for program reduction in the Intensive English Language Program (IELP). A special Faculty Senate meeting (as described in Article 22.3.c) took place from 3:00 – 5:00 PM on Monday, March 15th. According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement, during this meeting, the President was asked to “present a full description and analysis of the financial condition of the University” (PSU-AAUP CBA, Article 22.3.c).

Following the President's presentation on March 15th, a 30-day comment period ensued. The President solicited comments directly for his private consideration. In addition, Faculty Senate collected input from the community in order to craft its own feedback to the President. From the 102 comments and 19 uploaded documents received through the Senate comment process, the APRCA committee and Faculty Senate Steering Committee crafted a report entitled “[Feedback for President Percy Regarding the President's Article 22 Presentation on March 15th Related to the University Budget](#),” which was submitted to the President on April 19, 2021.

As outlined in Article 22.4, the President presented a [Provisional Plan](#) for IELP Retrenchment on May 11th, and a second 30-day comment period ensued. In order for the APRCA Committee and Faculty Senate Steering Committee to have time to review materials, write a report, and include it in the Faculty Senate packet for the June 14th meeting, the Faculty Senate's feedback form closed on May 25th. The President's feedback form runs the full 30 days, through June 10, 2021. This report summarizes the 18 comments and one document received through the Faculty Senate comment form as well as two other documents received independently.

At the conclusion of the second 30-day comment period, the President will announce a final plan and will notify IELP about how the reductions will take place.

Comments received

This report summarizes themes in comments from 18 respondents and 1 uploaded file received through the Faculty Senate feedback form, in addition to comments received directly by the Presiding Officer of Faculty Senate. In the interest of full transparency, the full text of all of the comments and documents are included as an appendix to this report.

Compared to the first set of comments, the second set of comments are sparser and less unified in their points. No former IELP students provided comments this time, but a message of support for IELP from the President of ASPSU is included in the supplementary documents. Six comments say in different ways that the President's plan appears not to consider the ideas provided by faculty members during the previous comment period. Most comments can be grouped with the simple two-word statement, "NO LAYOFFS" (5/25/21), and argue that PSU should retain IELP faculty using federal COVID relief funds and reserves until the international market rebounds. Three comments support the President's Provisional Plan as a rational way to handle reductions during a serious budget crunch. Another sector of comments focuses on the details of the plan, making arguments to lay off fewer faculty and/or deploy them elsewhere on campus.

IELP Student Support Services Needed on Campus: Provisional Plan Provides Insufficient or Potentially Inappropriate Staffing

Respondents state multiple worries about the level of staffing outlined in the Provisional Plan. One strong concern arises around PSU's new program with Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunication (NJUPT) in China. The comment notes, "PSU and the Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science will be bringing 240 students to PSU this September, and the IELP is slated to provide English instruction and course design. PSU expects 100-200 NJUPT students at PSU by 2023" (5/25/21). This commenter continues, "With imminent deep cuts to our teaching roster, we will not be able to staff all the needed course sections." IELP suggests that they would need 1.0 FTE to cover the obligation for the first year of the agreement and more as the program gets established (6/4/21). Faculty Senate heard independently from administrators in MCECS regarding this issue, and the Presiding Officer suggested that the administrators reach out to their Dean and to President Percy regarding this concern, which they have done.

A second area of concern arises around "programming to support international graduate students at PSU" (5/25/21). One respondent notes that the Provisional Plan makes no provision for staffing that aspect of the IELP program, which, according to another comment, would require at least 1.0 FTE to teach the graduate classes and another fraction to coordinate the program (6/4/21).

It is unclear to the Faculty Senate whether the Provisional Plan allows adequate staffing for instruction that IELP provides for several units on campus, including support for the Learning Center English Lab and University Studies. Related to the Learning Center, a comment states that the plan proposes that an "IELP learning center will become a hub for all ESL language support on campus, will provide workshops for educators on campus, [and] will train and manage tutors and conversation partners," but then "provides NO .FTE for this position, which historically is a full time position" (5/24/21). During the prior

30-day comment period, the course UNST 170: Multilingual FRINQ Lab figured in multiple comments. During this 30-day comment period, one entry notes, “I teach in the UNST program, and we have partnered with IELP to provide support to our multilingual students. About 40% of the students in my FRINQ classes are multilingual. For years, IELP offered a multilingual lab section to support both international and domestic students whose first language was not English. This year, the Multilingual Lab was cut. When I met individually with my students this year, the number one academic issue they struggled with was reading and writing in English. International students were unable to travel to the US and be immersed in the English language, and they struggled in their classes. Domestic multilingual students also struggled. At a time when students needed it the most, the multilingual lab was cut. This program was invaluable. Without it, retention rates could go down” (5/25/21). This comment urges that PSU maintain the Multilingual FRINQ Lab at its prior staffing level. IELP suggests that at least 1.0 FTE should be allocated to the programmatic needs in UNST and the Learning Center (6/4/21). The staffing projection provided in the Provisional Plan does not address the need to retain faculty to undertake these endeavors.

A letter of support from the University Writing Council outlines the important pedagogical functions that IELP serves on campus and urges that the university allocate and/or restore funding for IELP faculty to support the Writing Center, UNST, and an English Lab for language learners. In addition, it is worth reiterating points from the first comment period regarding the close and mutually beneficial integration between IELP and the Department of Applied Linguistics, particularly on the MA in TESOL and the IELP learning center. (Letters of support from the University Writing Council and the Department of Applied Linguistics are included in the supplementary data associated with this report.)

Another respondent suggests making layoffs based not on seniority but on expertise. “Given the new programs and innovative thinking in the IELP now, it does not make sense for layoffs to be based on seniority.... Instructors are not all equally qualified for all areas” (5/24/21). Retaining crucial aspects of the IELP capacity will require careful planning.

To cushion the blow to faculty and retain as many as possible on campus, one comment suggests that PSU “Redeploy the IELP talent-pool temporarily or permanently to other positions on campus that support student transition, retention, and success, especially to areas that serve multicultural, multilingual learners” (5/25/21). The Faculty Senate supports this plan to retain as many IELP faculty on campus as possible.

Exceptional Times

A number of comments point out that the past five years have been exceptional in different ways. During the prior national presidential administration, federal policies reduced the flow of international students. Then, in 2020, the country shut down international travel entirely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. One comment sums up this situation by stating, “The past year has been exceptional. We are in the midst of a global pandemic. This pandemic was at the tail end of a presidency which seemed openly hostile to foreign students” (5/13/21). This comment and others like it urge that PSU delay layoffs to see if the number of international students rebounds.

Three comments outline another side of the “exceptional times” theme, related to PSU’s ongoing budget issues and the need to make reductions in academic programs. One respondent suggests, “I think this was a much needed action” (5/24/21). Another states, “We need to make some difficult

decisions regarding PSU in the coming years and, if PSU wants to continue bringing in students, we can't continue paying programs like IELP if they are not bringing in funds. Other departments are bearing the brunt of budget cuts because they are successful, which is not fair" (5/24/21). Similarly, another entry notes, "I fully support the President's Proposed IELP/ Retrenchment Plan. It reads as a reasonable way to make necessary reductions to a program whose staffing and infrastructure investments no longer match the market opportunity" (5/21/21). With an \$11 million gap to fill in the OAA budget, reductions will be necessary across campus in the near future.

Federal COVID Relief Funding

PSU has benefited from the CARES Act and the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA). President Percy sent a [message](#) to the University community about this topic on March 25, 2021, noting "PSU is receiving approximately \$105 million in federal relief."

Numerous respondents mention the federal relief funds. One states, "There is certainly no serious financial crisis now with the stimulus dollars PSU is accepting, so it behooves us to act honorably and not cut these pandemic hit hard jobs for the next year" (5/25/21). Another notes, "There is a great deal of worry among IELP faculty about the \$105 million PSU has received in federal Covid relief not reaching those it is intended to help. While some funds will go to help students, another portion should be provided to support employees affected by dropping enrollments caused by the pandemic" (5/25/21). Another states that "cuts should not be made final while we still lack budget transparency, including a clear accounting for the use of the stimulus funds the university has received" (5/24/21). The Faculty Senate urges the administration to make clear how the federal funds are being used. The Senate appreciates that OAA and FADM have reached out to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee to provide details on expenditures from that financial resource.

Timing: IELP Merger underway with Office of International Affairs

IELP is in the process of merging with the Office of International Affairs, as approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2020. Several respondents suggest that it would be premature to cut IELP before the merger has been completed. "There should be NO layoffs until the IELP/OIA merge is complete and the pandemic is over" (5/25/21), one comment explains; another says, "Use federal stimulus funding, or other savings realized on account of federal stimulus monies and state funding, to temporarily subsidize IELP until adequate analysis and planning is conducted and the merge with OIA can go into full effect" (5/25/21). This comment urges the administration to wait to see the effects of prior measures taken to address the budget issues in IELP before making further changes. Another comment suggests that reimagining IELP be incorporated into the ReImagine PSU initiative (5/25/21).

Processes

The program retrenchment process itself raised questions. One comment asks, "Why did these layoffs require Article 22? Why weren't the layoffs just done under Article 18?" (5/25/21). Related to the rationale that triggers the use of Article 22, a respondent notes, "IELP faculty fully support the need for a SGRN department and faculty needed to deliver its curriculum, but it is very concerning to us that the university will reportedly hire 7 new SGRN faculty at a cost of about \$800K per year while laying off 9 IELP faculty at a cost of about \$900k/year, claiming that retrenchment of the IELP is necessary to avoid serious distortion of the university's budget" (5/25/21). These and other comments express that the hiring going on in other units in OAA and the influx of federal funding indicate that the financial crisis is not as severe as suggested by the administration.

A series of other comments discussed issues of inclusivity, transparency, and participation of IELP faculty in the creation of the departmental plan. The Faculty Senate is disturbed to read, “What was submitted TO the president from 'the department' was NOT A PLAN CREATED BY THE DEPARTMENT, but rather something proposed by personnel from OIA who know very little about the IELP's inner workings or needs. The IELP NTTF Faculty and IELP Director were not involved in the creation of the 'departmental' plan” (5/24/21). While recognizing the difficulty of communicating during layoffs, the Faculty Senate urges that the administration consult with the program about proposed layoffs. Because the IELP Article 22 process is a model for other cuts to come, the Senate is especially concerned about lack of transparency and consultation.

Conclusion

The size of any cut to be implemented now should be based on data drawn from a longer time horizon with thoughtful annotations regarding the timing of external events such as the recently ended federal administration and the COVID-19 pandemic. PSU needs to determine to the degree possible where IELP would likely be today without those external events and use that understanding to estimate the likely mismatch between current faculty size and what will be needed after the rebound from these external disruptions.

The Faculty Senate understands the wider context of enrollment declines and budget reductions that frames the conversation about layoffs in IELP. The Senate urges that the administration collaborate with the program itself to understand ongoing and upcoming curricular and instructional needs and to assure that sufficient IELP staff remain with the program to cover commitments. Evidence provided during this comment period suggests that IELP needs at least 3.0 FTE of additional staffing beyond the level provided in the Provisional Plan to meet needs on campus.

TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee
FROM: Academic Quality Committee (AQC)
CC: Susan Jeffords, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; Cindy Baccar,
Associate Vice Provost and University Registrar
DATE: 5/30/21
RE: Attend Anywhere; Questions, Concerns, Recommendations

Although the initiative to create an "Attend Anywhere" (AA) course designation is motivated by a desire to provide a more flexible and accommodating environment for students to take classes through PSU, the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) has several concerns. Even if the AA option is running as a pilot in a few courses at instructor/departmental request, its formal designation as a course delivery method through a registration code has broader implications for PSU's academic community. The AQC submits this memo to generate a discussion and to request addressing these concerns, where applicable, before the AA pilot courses begin in the fall and before the AA option expands beyond the pilot program.

Many of our concerns relate to the pedagogical quality of the learning environment created in AA courses and the impact on student success. Specifically:

- It is unclear whether giving options regarding *type of attendance* is pedagogically sound, and if so, in which contexts?
- Other than convenience for the student, how is learning maintained or improved through AA instruction?
- What impact will an in-person classroom community and a remote classroom community have on individual students and the learning community as a whole?
- The division of students in two groups creates serious pedagogical inequities with regard to learning styles, circumstances, and other issues. How will such inequities be addressed?
- How will high-impact practices (HIPS) be incorporated into AA courses?
- How will issues that arise from broadcasting (i.e., zooming) a course be addressed? Examples of such issues include student privacy and the ability of students to participate freely.
- We know from the literature that supporting student identity and belonging are key to student persistence. It seems likely that AA will erode rather than strengthen a student's sense of place at PSU.

We are also concerned about the impact on instructors especially with regard to preparing material for dual modalities and managing a class that is both in-person and remote simultaneously. For example, we know from the shift to remote that not everything that works in a classroom works on Zoom, and vice-versa. Will faculty need to plan their courses and classroom activities for two different types of audiences? Or will faculty simply lecture or do some kind of low student-input activity, given the potential logistical challenges of handling the two different groups? If so, then why have a synchronous meeting to begin with?

Another set of concerns regard the expense of the visible and invisible infrastructure required of AA courses. It is important to recognize that the added workload of faculty undertaking AA

courses comes at the expense of other demands on faculty time. Similarly, the investment and maintenance of technology needed for AA courses are financial resources, including one-time CARES Act funds, that will not be available for other technology needs.

The AQC recommends a more measured approach to pursuing the development of AA courses that includes a faculty-led process to scrutinize the implementation and evaluation of AA. In addition to considering the above concerns and others that arise, we strongly recommend:

- the creation of an evaluation plan to evaluate the effectiveness of AA pilot courses and any additional AA courses in the future that includes analysis of their impact on student success.
- that the unintended consequences of giving students this choice should be explored thoroughly, including potential inequities.
- identifying what support, and at what expense, instructors teaching AA courses will need.
- ensuring that there is sufficient oversight at the department level for these courses during their implementation and evaluation of their efficacy.
- developing a set of broad principles and guidelines to guide departments regarding AA courses to help ensure consistent pedagogical practices are followed.

We appreciate that the Office of Academic Innovation has been interviewing faculty regarding AA and we recognize that some of these concerns may be well on their way to being addressed. However, if that is the case, the members of the AQC are not aware of them, indicating that a broader inclusion of faculty in the process is in order.

2020-21 Annual report to the Faculty Senate from the Academic Quality Committee

Members:

J.R. "Jones" Estes, Chair
Evguenia Davidova
Cassio de Oliveira
Michael Dimond
Sahan Dissanayake
Karla Fant
Jesse Locker
Kathleen Merrow
Andreen Morris

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:

1. Due to the demands of Covid-19 and remote instruction, the AQC began meeting in Winter term.
2. There were several emergent issues:
 - a. Submitted a memo to the Faculty Senate regarding proposed changes to the BA/BS degree requirements.
 - b. Provided feedback to the Registrar's Office on the Attend Anywhere course designation and on questions regarding building waitlist functions in Canvas.
 - c. Submitted a memo to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee regarding the Attend Anywhere course delivery model.
 - d. Explored the ramifications of sunsetting the Covid-19 response P/NP policy. Met with the Student Success and Persistence groups, Michele Gamburd, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate and Cindy Baccar, Registrar. Recommends that the policy sunsets as planned and that the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) review the policy in 2021-22. The EPC Chair has agreed.
3. Met with members of the Students Success Committee. It was suggested that AQC coordinate the efforts of OAA, IAC, and OAI regarding student success initiatives. Questions of

how do we define student success? Measure student success on campus? Encourage inclusive teaching campuswide? And remove bias from student assessment? No action was taken this academic year.

4. Discussed the concerns of AQC members regarding a lack of data on the remote student experience. As far as the committee could identify, UNST (FRINQ, SINQ, and Capstone courses) is the only unit gathering end-of-year data that addresses the unique nature of the 2020-21 academic year.

5. The AQC Chair attended Digital Course Evaluation Committee meetings as a liaison. The group met twice and is on hiatus awaiting feedback from the Provost on the policies and guidelines developed for faculty and departments.

6. The AQC Chair attended Institutional Assessment Council (IAC) meetings as a liaison and contributed to the IAC's work planning PSU's first annual assessment celebration in the fall of 2021.

7. Regular discussions regarding the role of AQC in informing the APRCA Committee and processes.

8. OIRP provided an analysis of the HIPs survey and senior exit survey from spring 2020. Due to the emergent issues listed above, the Committee will revisit the survey in fall 2021.

9. Ongoing Items for the Committee to consider in academic year 2021-22:

a. Review the work of the Ad Hoc Committees formed as a response to AQC recommendations in 2016 and follow up on recommendations.

b. Examine whether the AQC charge still fits 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).

c. Identify an AQC liaison for the Student Success Evidence Committee.

d. Develop a process for proposing HIPs designation for the course schedule.

e. Revisit the analysis of the HIPs survey and senior exit survey from spring 2020.

f. Explore what data gathering options and partnerships, if appropriate, will be useful to the campus community.

g. Consider options for expanding a Committee webpage and/or dashboard.

Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) 2020-21 Annual Report

Date: May 26, 2021

Members 2020-21

Suwako Watanbe WLL (CLAS-AL) Chair
Ari Douanpanya ACS (AO)
Veronica Hotton UNST (OI)
Debra Lindberg CCJ (CUPA)
Laura Marsh ACS (AO)
Ashley Storey ACS (AO)
Vacant (Faculty member)
Vacant (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 2020 through May 2021. We reviewed 205 petitions, of which 190 were approved (through May 10, 2021). 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 Proposals for Area Distribution

The ARC reviewed three cases of area distribution. In fall 2020, Systems Science program requested that their UG courses be designated as Social Science or Science; in winter 2021, the Anthropology department requested that their Archaeology courses be designated as Science with lab/fieldwork; and in spring 2021, the School of Social Work requested their SW courses be designated as Social Science. ARC reviewed the requests and approved. Subsequently, the motions for the three cases were submitted to the Faculty Senate, and they passed.

Collaboration with the ARC-UCC Joint Taskforce on BA/BS Requirements

At the request of Michele Gamburd, the FS presiding officer, Nick Matlick, Becki Ingersoll, Cindy Baccar, and Suwako Watanabe served on the ARC-UCC joint taskforce to review the current BA/BS requirements to streamline the matriculation processes in terms of the content of the requirements and administrative processing. The taskforce administered a survey among the advisors and faculty involved in advising and contacted concerned departments to gain insights as to the essential components of the BA and BS requirements. They concluded that the basic framework of the BA/BS requirements should remain the same and recommended that (1) the current requirement of 28 credits be reduced to 23 to accommodate transfer credits without changing the spirit of the requirements for BA and BS respectively, (2) the requirement of 72 upper division credits be reduced to 62 credits, (3) the residency requirements of 45 out of the last 60 be changed to 45 out of 75, and (4) PSU accept the Humanities and Social Science designations for courses of Oregon community colleges listed in AAOT General Education List. ARC and the Steering Committee jointly submitted the proposals for the four recommendations, and they were approved at the Faculty Senate in April.

Review of Proposals related to University Requirements

The Committee was asked to give feedback on the following three proposals related to the university-wide requirements.

- (1) Chuck Knepfle, Vice President for Enrollment Management, joined the ARC meeting in January and explained that PSU would lower the required GPA for admission from 2.50 to 2.00, and the ARC expressed its support for the change.
- (2) The ARC invited the group working to propose the Race and Ethnic Studies requirement in April and asked about processing transfer credits that may fulfill the RES requirement, the RES course designation procedure, and requiring students to take at least one course at PSU. The motion to add the RES requirement has been submitted to the Faculty Senate in May and is expected to be voted on in June. The ARC was initially requested to write the motion, however, there was confusion as to who is leading the proposal, i.e., whether it is the group of faculty who had been working on the requirement, the steering committee, or ARC. More frequent communication among the governance units and committees and familiarity with the entire processes of submitting a motion to the Faculty Senate at an initial stage will be helpful.
- (3) Two proposals from UNST. Albert R. Spencer, UNST Council, requested the ARC's feedback on the two proposals to change the UNST requirements. One proposal is that the number of required Sinq will be reduced from 3 to 2. The other is to eliminate the requirement for students to take the Sinq that matches Junior Cluster. Based on the types and natures of the petitions related to UNST that ARC receives, they concluded the changes will help reduce UNST-related petitions. ARC reported that the committee has received quite a few petitions involving a mismatch among clusters and suggested that the cluster requirements should be another area that could be enhanced for students to meet the UNST requirements.

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

Faculty Development Committee Report 2020-2021
May 19, 2021

1. The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) was made up of the following 15 members:

MEMBERSHIP 2020-21

Co-Chairs: Julia Goodman, Will Parnell

Name	Division (Department)	Start of Service
Ballhorn, Daniel	CLAS-Sci (BIO)	2019
Beer, John	CLAS-AL (ENG)	2020
Cotik, Thomas	COTA (MUS)	2020
Franzoni, Amanda	OI (IELP)	2018
Gildersleeve-Neumann, Christina	CLAS-SS (SPHR)	2019
Goodman, Julia	SPH (HMP)	2016
Keller, Thomas	SSW	2017
Lewandowski, Marie	AO (OAI)	2020
Mirpuri, Anoop	CLAS-AL (ENG)	2020
Parnell, Will	COE (C&I)	2019
Taylor Rodriguez, Daniel	CLAS-Sci (MTH)	2020
Tunalilar, Ozcan	CUPA (IOA)	2019
Wang, Jian	LIB	2019
Wern, Chien	MCECS (MME)	2017
Yang, Liu-Qin	CLAS-SS (PSY)	2020

2. The FDC developed a sub-group working process this year to help move along the work and offer a more hands-on small group approach to the phases of the work.
- a. Sub Group 1: (November) Reviewed the call and website materials for updates.
 - b. Sub Group 2: (December) Reviewed and updated the rubric to be added to the call. The call went out over December break.
 - c. Sub Group 3: (February) Reviewed the scoring rubric and developed a process for reviewer scoring to augment validity and reliability in scoring.
 - d. Committee of the Whole: Reviewed and scored proposals against the rubric.
 - e. Sub Group 4: (April) Reviewed the final scores and developed 2 approaches to final decision-making scoring criteria. Presented at the final meeting and reached a unanimous vote on final awards (and non-awards).
3. The committee received and reviewed 64 proposals. 50 proposals are accepted for funding at a total of \$674035. The committee is finalizing the details on the letter to recipients and non-recipients.
4. Outstanding questions from Committee Chairs:
- a. Can any remaining funds not allocated be allocated in next year's budget (as an addition to the FY 2021-2022 AY \$675,000)?

To: Portland State University Faculty Senate

Subject: Annual Report

From: Intercollegiate Athletics Board

Date: May 27, 2021

Members 2020-21 Academic Year:

David Burgess, Chair, (OIRP); David Brown (student); Toeutu Faaleava (MCNAIR); Bruce Irvin (CMPS); Karen Karavanic (CMPS); and Derek Tretheway (MME).

Ex-officio Members:

Valerie Cleary, Director of Athletics; Dana Cappelucci, Associate Athletics Director; and Brian Janssen, Associate Director, SALP and Faculty Athletics Representative

Faculty Senate charges the board to:

1. Serve as the institutional advisory body to the President and Faculty Senate in the development of and adherence to policies and budgets governing the University's program in men's and women's intercollegiate athletics.
2. Report to the Faculty Senate at least once each year.

I. Budget:

E & G support for athletics:

University E & G Support for Athletics - FY 12 through 21

Report Type	Fiscal Year	Athletics' E&G Support (millions)	% of University Total E&G Rev. Going to Support Athletics	PSU's Total E&G Rev. (millions)
Budget	FY21*	2.39	0.69%	347.1
Actuals	FY20	2.41	0.72%	335.4
	FY19	2.37	0.68%	349.4
	FY18	2.29	0.68%	335.1
	FY17	2.26	0.69%	326.3
	FY16	1.41	0.45%	317.0
	FY15	1.13	0.39%	293.7
	FY14	2.28	0.80%	283.5
	FY13	2.20	0.82%	267.8
	FY12	2.13	0.81%	264.2

* Total University adopted all funds expenditure budget by division

** Lower amounts in FY15 and 16 reflect the attempt to make the dept. more self-supporting which was found not to be sustainable.

The E & G funds were restored as a strategic investment in FY17.

a. **FY21** - Currently it is expected to have a \$4 million budget deficit for FY21.

b. **FY22** – At the time of this report FY22 budget had not been finalized. IAB will report FY22 budget in the Fall 2021 report to the Faculty Senate.

II. Athletic Policy:

Covid Protocols; The athletics administration in partnership with the coaching staff, the Campus Covid Response Team, and the Student Health and Counseling (SHAC) develop procedures and policies for student-athletes, facilities, practice protocol and competition to mitigate virus transmission. These policies and procedures adhered with the Oregon Health Authority and the Campus Incident Management Team.

- Student Athletes were given the option to “opt-out” this year, no Student Athlete accepted this option
- All student athletes’ scholarships maintained (NCCA regulation)
- Enhanced health and counseling services offered through SHAC
- Covid testing protocols implemented for practice and competition days
- Fall Sports:
 - football cancelled
 - women’s volleyball postponed to spring
 - men and women’s cross-country postponed to winter
 - women’s soccer postponed to spring
- Winter Sports:
 - women’s basketball condensed season
 - men’s basketball condensed season
- Winter/Spring Sports:
 - women’s track condensed season
 - men’s track condensed season
 - women’s golf condensed season
- Spring Sports:
 - women’s softball condensed season

III. Athletics Futures Committee (AFC):

August 2020 the President’s office appointed a framing committee to create recommendations on questions and topics for the eventual formation of the Athletics Futures Committee which was formed in January 2021. The input from the framing committee along with additions and refinements by AFC resulted in a request for proposals from consulting firms to provide benchmarking analysis and assessment of Portland State University (PSU) Athletics. The consultant’s report along with recommendations from the AFC will be presented to university leadership and will be used to make informed decisions about a strategic plan that addresses the future structure of Intercollegiate Athletics at PSU.

The University hired the consulting firm Collegiate Consulting. Collegiate Consulting plans to submit their report to the Athletics Futures Committee (AFC) and President Percy with a **deadline of presenting by June 2021**. The proposed scope of work would include utilizing public data to determine and compare the results within Division I Football Championship Series institutions and the Big Sky Conference.

Benchmarking and data will include:

Current overall athletics budget, Sports and Unit operational budgets,

Review of sources of funding, Institutional Support, State Support, Student Fees, External Revenue, Scholarships and Financial Aid comparison, Expense analysis, Facilities analysis, Sport sponsorship analysis, Staffing and Org. Chart, Qualitative Interviews with key stakeholders.

- IAB
- University Administration
- Athletics Administration, Staff, and Coaches
- University Faculty and Staff
- Students (Athletes and Non-Athletes)
- Donors, Corporate Sponsors
- Alumni
- Portland State University Foundation
- Board of Trustees

IV. **Academic Progress Rates (APR):**

Academic Progress Rate, holds institutions accountable for the academic progress of their student-athletes through a team-based metric that accounts for the eligibility and retention of each student-athlete for each academic term: **Overall 2019-20 single year APR for PSU: 978** (up from 973 previous year)

APR Team results (Jan, 2021)

2019-20 (**multi-year APR**) – score of 930 or above required to compete in championships

NCAA had not published at the time of this report. (IAB will report Fall 2021)

2019-20 (**single year APR**) Six (6) teams with **perfect (1,000) APR**: men's tennis, women's basketball, women's golf, women's soccer, women's tennis, and women's volleyball.

Remaining seven (7) teams: men's basketball (980), men's x-country (993), men's football (952), men's track (993), women's x-country (955), women's track (977) & women's softball (988).

V. **Graduation Success Rate: IPEDS-GSR** also known as federal graduation rate, (FGR):

The student-athlete graduation rate calculated directly based on IPEDS-GRS (which is the methodology the U.S. Department of Education requires) is the proportion of first-year, full-time student-athletes who entered a school on athletics aid and graduated from that institution within six years. This federal rate does not account for students who transfer from their original institution and graduate elsewhere; (they are considered non-graduates at both the college they left and the one from which they eventually graduate.)

2019-20 FGR: PSU student-athletes recorded a **63%** six-year graduation rate for the latest report period, (2013-14 cohort). The corresponding graduation rate for the general student population at PSU was 46%.

The NCAA **GSR** differs from the federal calculation in two important ways. First, the GSR holds colleges accountable for those student-athletes who transfer into their school. Second, the GSR does not penalize colleges whose student-athletes transfer in good academic standing. Essentially, those student-athletes are moved into another college's cohort. The Division II ASR additionally includes student-athletes who did not receive athletics aid, but did participate in athletics.

The **2019-20 GSR** for the 2013-14 student athlete cohort was **85%**, (2018-19 GSR: 84%). GSR for Asian student athletes was 75%, for black student athletes was 83%, native Hawaiian/pacific Islander student athletes 92% and white student athletes 89%. Women's basketball, women's golf and men's tennis all had 100% GSR for their respective 2013-14 cohorts.

VI. **New Coach Hires:**

Chelsey Gregg – Women's Basketball: Coach Gregg was the Associate Head Coach at PSU from 2018 to 2021 and has been at PSU since 2015-16. Gregg graduated from the University of Great Falls with an M.A. in Secondary Education (2011) and a B.S. from Southern Oregon.

Jase Coburn – Men's Basketball: Coach Coburn was the Associate Head Coach at PSU from 2018 to 2021 and coached at PSU for eight years. Coburn received a Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education-History from Arizona State (2006).

VII. **Athletics Achievements:**

Competition Results

2020-2021 – Winter-Spring Sports

Men's Cross-country: 5th place Big Sky Tournament

Women's Cross-country: 6th place Big Sky Tournament

Women's Golf: (1-0), 3rd place Big Sky Championship

Women's Tennis: (9-11), Big Sky Tournament - first round loss

Men's Tennis: (7-10) Finished 5th place regular season, Big Sky Tournament - first round loss

Men's Basketball: (9-13) Big Sky Tournament - first round loss

Women's Basketball: (12-13) Big Sky Tournament - second round loss

Women's Volleyball: (6-12)

Women's Soccer: (0-8)

Women's Softball: (15-26) **Big Sky Tournament Champions**

Men's Outdoor Track: Big Sky Tournament

10th place in 10,000 Meters, **Ian Vickstrom JR – Architecture**

7th place 3,000 Meter Steeplechase, **Joshua Snyder JR – Applied Health & Fitness**

Women's Outdoor Track: Big Sky Tournament

7th place in 5,000 Meters, **Cayla Seligman GR – Ed Leadership**

NCAA Championship West Prelims.

39th place in 10,000 Meters, **Kaila Gibson SR – Health Science**

University Research Committee: Annual Report to the Faculty Senate: Charge, Work Groups, and Accomplishments during the 2020-2021 Academic Year

Submitted 05-07-2021

COMMITTEE CHARGE

The committee charge consists of four distinct areas:

1. Conduct periodic surveys of Faculty regarding the infrastructure, training, and services available to faculty for the conduct of research, scholarship, and creative activities;
2. Recommend to the Provost and President suitable policies and standards for University-level investments and initiatives pertaining to research, scholarship, and creative activities; Work with relevant members of the administration to develop ideas and plans to improve and increase research, scholarship, and creative activities across the University; and suggest paths forward through identified challenges;
3. Work with relevant members of Faculty and Administration to develop Data Management infrastructure and policies; and
4. Act in liaison with appropriate committees, including the Academic Quality Committee and the Faculty Development Committee.

Finally, the committee reports at least once a year to the Faculty Senate.

PROGRESS

In 2021, the committee organized into three Work Groups corresponding to the first three Charge areas. Accomplishments in Spring 2021 were as follows:

1. The **Survey Work Group** created and distributed an online survey on research, scholarship, and creative activity experiences at PSU. In an effort to avoid duplicate surveys, they worked closely with the Data Management Work Group and Research and Graduate Studies (RGS) to develop the survey. The survey was first shared with the entire committee, who offered feedback and tested the survey for technical issues. It was subsequently distributed to the entire Faculty, with over 500 total responses. The Work Group analyzed the data and provided a preliminary report; key results are presented here. RGS is in the process of conducting further analysis and will create a more detailed report over the summer. The Committee is reviewing the faculty survey results to determine whether there are any policy recommendations to make to the President and Provost related to research.
2. The **Data Management Work Group** is developing a "Research Data Guidebook" that will serve as a central reference point for data management related policies, procedures, and support. The process of creating such a resource is also a strategy for completing our charge: in consolidating existing data management related resources, the Subgroup will be better able to identify the infrastructure and policy gaps that need to be addressed. The process thus far has involved meeting with representatives in the Office of Information Technology, the University Library, and Research and Graduate Studies.

-
-
3. The **Administration Work Group** met with the Dean of the Graduate School, Rossitza Wooster, and the Interim VP of the Graduate School, Jason Podrabsky, to discuss issues such as creation of an Office of Undergraduate Research and approaches to creation of Certificates and other types of training.

Portland State University (PSU) Faculty Survey of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities

(A joint project of the PSU Faculty Senate Research Committee and Research and Graduate Studies)

Preliminary Results

Prepared for June 7, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

In order to avoid duplicate surveys going out to faculty, the University Research Committee collaborated with Research and Graduate Studies (RGS) to form a single survey. The survey link was distributed via the Faculty Senate's google group of all faculty on April 1, 2021. Between April 2nd and 13th, **530** responses were received. Survey development and analysis were conducted by the Faculty Survey Work Group of the University Research Committee.

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Demographics: The majority of respondents identified as male or female with **slightly more women than men**. Approximately **three-quarters respondents identified as white**. The next highest portion of respondents identified as Asian, followed by Hispanic or Latino, Black, African or African American, and American Indian or Alaska Native. No one identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, though some preferred not to say. Respondents ranged in age from their 20s to their 70s, falling mainly between the **ages of 35 to 64** with more clustered in the center of that range (age 45-54). Approximately **half reported having children at home or other caregiving** responsibilities.

PSU: Respondents were **predominantly from CLAS**, followed by the Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science, CUPA, and the Schools/Colleges of the Arts, Business, Education, Social Work, and Public Health. The Library, Honors College and other units were also represented. Almost half came from the **social sciences**, one-quarter from **the natural/physical sciences and engineering**, followed by **the humanities, arts and other fields**. Respondents **predominantly held the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor**, followed by adjunct professors, instructors/senior instructors, and research faculty. More than half had been at PSU for more than 10 years and almost three-quarters had an FTE of 1.0. **Approximately half were tenured. Almost one-third were not tenure track.**

MORE THAN 75% OF RESPONDENTS CONDUCTED RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Of the respondents who conducted research, scholarship, or creative activities, about **two-thirds worked on research and one-third on creative arts or humanities**. Of the time spent on those projects, about one quarter of it was taken up by administrative activities.

RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT TO PSU'S EDUCATIONAL MISSION

Almost all respondents indicated that **research experience is moderately to extremely important in the general education of PSU students**. Of those who taught undergraduates, almost all reported incorporating their research, scholarship, or creative activities into their teaching at least once each term (half reported doing so at least weekly). Respondents indicated that their **research, scholarship, or creative activities provide (1) educational opportunities** for graduate, undergraduate, and even high school students, including for completing capstones, and master's projects or theses; **(2) student employment and financial aid**, including GRAs, stipends and tuition remissions; and **(3) faculty and staff compensation** (course buy-outs, soft money). Despite these contributions to PSU, more than half of respondents felt that research, scholarship and creative activities were **undervalued** by the university (compared to less than a fifth who felt undervalued by their department).

"I often feel as though PSU wants to have its cake and eat it too, in the sense that it really wants the prestige and funding that come from being a research institution, but it also really leverages discourses that I associate with teaching-focused institutions."

DESIRE TO COLLABORATE ACROSS DEPARTMENTS IS HIGH, BUT BARRIERS EXIST

Respondents predominantly reported collaborating with (1) colleagues at higher ed institutions other than PSU, (2) students, and (3) colleagues in their own departments. Collaborations across PSU departments appear to occur at about half the rate of collaborations within departments. Respondents expressed strong interest in interdepartmental or interdisciplinary work with other faculty across PSU, but cited institutional barriers for doing so, including **fragmentation of departments** and the **lack of interdisciplinary frameworks**, such as like the former School of the Environment and the de-funded Portland Center for the Public Humanities. Some identified University Studies as a gateway for interdisciplinary programs that might integrate research, civic engagement, and undergraduate education even more comprehensively than the present arrangement.

OVER 50% OF RESPONDENTS WORK WITH DATA FOR RESEARCH OR ANALYSIS

About half of those who reported working with data had written protocols for managing data, including a **data management plan, data security plan, or data use agreement**. For some, the distinction between these documents and IRB protocols was unclear. Respondents stored their data primarily on a PSU office or lab computer, Google Drive or a Network drive. Respondents also saved data on their **personal computer or hard drive** and/or used **personal funds** to pay for at least part of their data storage. Few identified compliance standards and regulations that applied to their data, most commonly protections for human subjects' research (**IRB**), student records (**FERPA**), and health records (**HIPAA**). The majority of those who shared data did so mainly via email or data depositories such as **PDXScholar** or **Genebank**. At least one respondent used **Dropbox** to share data, which is discouraged by PSU due to its history of being hacked.

MOST FUNDING SOURCES ARE EXTERNAL

More than half responded that their research, scholarship, or creative activities were **most often financially supported by external grants or fellowships**, followed by internal (PSU or departmental) grants or fellowships and/or PSU IPDA funds. Almost one-third had used their own **personal funds** to finance at least some of their activities. Of those who submitted **external funding proposals**, approximately one-half submitted all or most of them through the Sponsored Projects Administration unit within Research and Graduate Studies (**SPA**), one-quarter sometimes submitted proposals through SPA, and one-quarter had never submitted their external proposals through SPA. Respondents appeared to have an **approximate acceptance rate of 50%** for proposals to conduct research, scholarship, or creative activities as a Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, collaborator, or equivalent. Funding applications or proposals for other types of work, such as planning grants, book writing, or artistic performances or screenings had success rates of less than 10%.

COMMUNICATION COULD BE ENHANCED

The majority of respondents felt that they **knew little about highlights and successes** of research, scholarship, and creative activities happening at PSU. Suggestions for spreading the word included putting research, scholarship and creative activities on the PSU homepage more often, press releases, up-to-date searchable webpages, a research vlog or video newsletter, and social media posts (including Linked-In). Over half of respondents were **unfamiliar with the University's Open Access Publication Policy**, and less than one-quarter had deposited their work in **PDXScholar**.

MORE INTERNAL SUPPORTS ARE NEEDED

A large portion of the respondents who reported needing help to develop funded or unfunded research, scholarship or creative activities also indicated that **the university did not help them at all** to do so. Many cited a lack of university funding to hire research support within SPA or individual departments as a barrier to submitting proposals for external funding. The majority of **those who did receive support, got it from SPA**. Development support was also provided to a lesser extent by: (1) partners at other universities or organizations; (2) faculty, chairs or classified staff in the respondent's department; (3) faculty in other departments; (4) the PSU Foundation; (5) PSU Innovation and Intellectual Property (IIP); and (6) consultants hired by individual departments. Some respondents reported using their **personal funds** to pay for consultants and assistants external to PSU to help them develop and submit proposals.

When provided with a list of **potential university supports** for helping to grow or develop their work, potentially building it into a larger project, the ones most often identified as helpful or very helpful were: **(1) departmental funds** to cover a percent of a respondent's FTE, **(2) an increase in IPDA** (Professional Development) funds, **(3) funded course buy-outs**, and **(4) an overall reduction in course load / teaching responsibilities**. Other identified supports appeared to be less important for the respondent pool as a whole, but could have more importance for specific subgroups of respondents, such as non-tenure track faculty or teaching faculty. These supports included **funded GRAs and GTAs, sabbaticals for pre-tenure or non-tenure track faculty, and an increase in the number of advisors** to relieve faculty from that responsibility, among others.

"...spending typically two plus days on the 40-hour work week on admin and university service means doing scholarship in overtime. We need more administrative staff in departments to support work of curriculum committees, grad admissions, etc."

NEXT STEPS: A more in-depth analysis of the survey responses is currently being conducted by RGS.