

APRCA Committee Report to Faculty Senate – March 2022

Committee charge and Membership

Please see the [APRCA committee's Faculty Senate website](#) for the committee charge and membership.

Committee report

At the February 14th Faculty Senate Steering meeting, the Faculty Senate APRCA representative received several questions for consideration:

1. What is the APRCA role moving forward?
2. How can we shape the review/reduction discussion to be future-oriented and involve the whole campus in a collaborative, participatory process?
3. What can APRCA/ Senate do to make sure that discussions about curricular changes take place in our arena and are framed within faculty priorities and objectives?

This report will strive to answer these questions while also bringing Senate up to date on our activities for the month.

1. What is the APRCA role moving forward?
 - a. The APRCA committee will continue to work with OAA to consult regarding the Provost's [Program Review/Reduction Process](#) (PRRP).
 - i. During [Phase I](#) of this process, the Provost's Program Reduction Working Group created "driver" and "value" metrics used to identify 18 units for further scrutiny. APRCA created [Guiding Principles and Priorities](#) to guide the program reduction process.
 - ii. During [Phase II](#) of the PRRP process, the Provost asked the 18 units identified as falling below the median on driver metrics to write narratives. These narratives are meant to address why the unit falls below the median. The narratives provide an opportunity for qualitative discussion of research, community outreach, curricular specialties, and to capture information that is not available in university databases.
 1. OAA organized a meeting on Feb 11 for chairs from 18 units to meet with representatives from APRCA, Budget Committee, and OAA.
 - a. Morale: Talented, hard-working, dedicated faculty feeling frustrated, anxious, demoralized, and fearful. They expressed uncertainty about who the audience was for the narrative (Provost? Dean?). They expressed worries that decisions about cuts had already been made and that nothing they wrote would make a difference. 18 of 50 departments on campus are now vibrating with stress.
 - b. Marginalization: Chairs and faculty expressed their feeling that the PRRP process has stigmatized and siloed them.
 - c. Metrics: Chairs and faculty raised questions about the driver and value

departments/ units feel siloed, stigmatized, marginalized, and endangered, with the rest of the university's faculty seemingly distanced and "safe" from the process.

- b. APRCA committee members hope that we can engage the Reimagine Fellows with the faculty, with the Faculty Senate Committees, and with the whole campus (not just the 18 scrutinized units). Perhaps the Futures Collaboratory could facilitate such a conversation.
3. What can APRCA/ Senate do to make sure that discussions about curricular changes take place in our arena and are framed within faculty priorities and objectives?
 - a. The hope is that, through shared governance, the faculty can work with the Deans and the Provost to build a better future. The faculty can frame the question in an arena over which we have control: The curriculum. Simultaneously, we can create a space for participation, innovation, and excitement.
 - b. One possible university-wide project is to fulfill the faculty yearning toward a more interdisciplinary curriculum (often stymied by SCH problems) in a way that might help meet the HECC goal for graduating more students (and thus improve PSU's budget allocation from the State). We may be able to address PRRP challenges, budget issues, and goals in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research (ITR) by creating an easier pathway for students toward interdisciplinary majors.
 - c. Such an initiative would be forward-thinking, aimed at student success, and collaborative. It would not stigmatize or silo programs, departments, or units, but would instead break down barriers between disciplines.