

Faculty Senate, 7 November 2022



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](https://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.

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 **Monday, 7 November 2022** at **3:00 p.m.** in **Cramer Hall 53.**

*Senators represented by **Alternates** must notify the Secretary by **noon** on **Mon., Nov. 7th**. Others who wish to speak should ask a senator to send notification to the Presiding Officer and Secretary by **noon** on **Mon., Nov. 7th**. Items on the Consent Agenda are automatically **approved** unless any Senator notifies the Presiding Officer and Secretary, no later than the end of Announcements, of a request for separate discussion and vote.*

AGENDA

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* (see also G.5)
 - * 1. Roll Call
 - * 2. Minutes of October 3rd meeting – *Consent Agenda*
 - * 3. OAA response to Senate actions of October 3rd – *Consent Agenda*
 - 4. Procedural: Presiding Officer may move any agenda item – *Consent Agenda*
- B. Announcements
 - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
 - 2. Announcements from Secretary
 - 3. Introduction: Erica Wagner, Vice Provost for Student Success
 - 4. Pronoun Project (N. DuPont et al.)
 - 5. Classroom Experience Project (M. Carlson, Y. Labissiere, J. Sepac)
- C. Discussion – *none*
- D. Unfinished Business – *none*
- E. New Business – *none*
- F. Question Period
 - * 1. Question to Provost (#1)
 - * 2. Question to Provost (#2)
 - * 3. Question to President
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
 - 1. President's report
 - 2. Provost's report
 - 3. Budget Committee interim report
 - * 4. Monthly report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment
 - * 5. Annual report of Advisory Council – *Consent Agenda*
- H. Adjournment

***See the following attachments**

A.1. Roster

A.2. Minutes for 10/3 – *Consent Agenda*

A.3. OAA response to Senate actions of 10/3 – *Consent Agenda*

F.1-3. Questions to Administrators

G.4. Background to AHC-APRCA report: Provost's Report on PRRP Stage III

G.5. AC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATORS, 2022-23

Steering Committee

Rowanna Carpenter, Presiding Officer

Vicki Reitenauer, Past Presiding Officer • Lindsey Wilkinson, Presiding Officer Elect

Matt Chorpensing (2022-24) • Sybil Kelley (2022-24) • Bishupal Limbu (2021-23) • Becky Sanchez (2021-23)

Ex-officio: Richard Beyler, Fac. Sec. • Yves Labissiere, Fac. BoT & Sr. IFS Rep. • Sonja Taylor, Chair, CoC

College of the Arts (COTA) [4]

Colligan, George	MUS	2023 *
Heilmair, Barbara	MUS	2023
Heryer, Alison	A+D	2024
Ruth, Jennifer	FILM	2025

The School of Business (SB) [4]

Dimond, Michael	SB	2025
Finn, Timothy	SB	2024 +
Garrod, Nathaniel	SB	2025
Raffo, David	SB	2023

College of Education (COE) [4]

De La Vega, Esperanza	C&I	2024 +
Kelley, Sybil	ELP	2023
Thieman, Gayle	C&I	2024
vacant		2025

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

Anderson, Tim	ETM	2025
Dusicka, Peter	CEE	2023
Greenwood, Garrison	ECE	2025
Tretheway, Derek	MME	2024
Wern, Chien	MME	2024 +

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

Clark, Michael	ENG	2023
Cortez, Enrique	WLL	2023 +
Jaén Portillo, Isabel	WLL	2024 +
Knight, Bill	ENG	2025
Perlmutter, Jennifer	WLL	2025
Watanabe, Suwako	WLL	2024

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

Cruzan, Mitch	BIO	2023
Daescu, Dacian	MTH	2025
Goforth, Andrea	CHE	2023
La Rosa, Andres	PHY	2024 *
Sterling, Nadine	BIO	2025
Tuor, Leah	BIO	2025
Webb, Rachel	MTH	2024 +

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—

Social Sciences (CLAS-SS) [6]			
Ajibade, Jola	GGR	2023	
Craven, Sri	WGSS	2025	
Ferbel-Azcarate, Pedro	BST	2024	
Lafrenz, Martin	GGR	2025	
Newsom, Jason	PSY	2023 *+	
Wilkinson, Lindsey	SOC	2024 +	

Library (LIB) [1]

Emery, Jill	LIB	2025 +
-------------	-----	--------

School of Public Health (SPH) [1]

Izumi, Betty	CH	2024 +
--------------	----	--------

School of Social Work (SSW) [4]

Chorpensing, Matt	SSW	2023 +
Donlan, Ted	SSW	2024
Hunte, Roberta	SSW	2023 *
Martin, Staci	SSW	2025

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

Clucas, Richard	PS	2023
Davidova, Evguenia	IGS	2025
Eastin, Joshua	PS	2024
Endicott-Popovsky, Barbara	HCP	2023 *
Rai, Pronoy	IGS	2024 +

Other Instructional Faculty (OI) [3]

Carpenter, Rowanna	UNST	2023
Lindsay, Susan	CIEL	2024
Taylor, Sonja	UNST	2025 +

All Other Faculty (AO) [9]

Baccar, Cindy	REG	2025
Constable, Kate	ACS	2025
Hanson, Courtney	GS	2023 *
Hunt, Marcy	SHAC	2023
Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2025
Matlick, Nick	REG	2025
Mudiamu, Sally	OGEI	2024
Romaniuk, Tanya	ACS	2024
Zeisman-Pereyo, Shohana	TLC	2023 *+

Notes:

* Interim appointment

+ Committee on Committees (some TBD)

Total positions: 59 • Status: 26 September 2022

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF PSU FACULTY SENATE, 2022-23

Administrators

Adler, Sy	Interim Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs
Allen, Clifford	Dean, School of Business
Bowman, Michael	Acting Dean, Library
Bull, Joseph	Dean, Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science
Bynum Jr., Leroy	Dean, College of the Arts
Chabon, Shelly	Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development
Coll, Jose	Dean, School of Social Work; Interim Dean, College of Education
Jeffords, Susan	Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
Johnson, Rick	Interim Dean, OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health
Knepfle, Chuck	Vice President for Enrollment Management
Lambert, Ame	Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion
Mulkerin, Amy	Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning
Neely, Kevin	Vice President for University Relations
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

Senate Officers and Other Faculty Officers

Baccar, Cindy +	Advisory Council (2022-24)
Beyler, Richard	Secretary to the Faculty
Carpenter, Rowanna +	Presiding Officer
Chivers, Sarah	Adjunct faculty representative
Chorpenning, Matt +	Steering Committee (2022-24)
Ford, Emily	Advisory Council (2021-23)
Harris, Randi	Advisory Council (2022-24)
Holt, Jon	IFS (Sep. 2021-Dec. 2024)
Jaén Portillo, Isabel +	Advisory Council (2021-23)
Kelley, Sybil +	Steering Committee (2022-24)
Labissiere, Yves	IFS (Jan. 2020-Dec. 2022); BoT
Limbu, Bishupal	Steering Committee (2021-23)
Reitenauer, Vicki	Past Presiding Officer
Ruth, Jennifer +	Advisory Council (2022-24)
Sager, Alexander	IFS (Jan. 2021-Dec. 2023)
Wilkinson, Lindsey +	Presiding Officer Elect
Wing, Kierra	President, ASPSU

Faculty Committee Chairs

Allen, Jennifer	Budget Committee (co-chair)
Anderson, Tim +	Educational Policy Committee (co-chair)
Burgess, David	Intercollegiate Athletics Board
Cellarius, Karen	University Research Committee
Chaillé, Peter	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Collenberg-Gonzalez, Carrie	Library Committee
Colligan, George +	General Student Affairs Committee
Comer, Kate	University Writing Council
Duh, Geoffrey	Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee
Emery, Jill +	Budget Committee (co-chair)
Estes, Jones	Academic Quality Committee
Harrison, Paloma	Scholastic Standards Committee
Herrera, Cristina	Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee
Janssen, Mollie	Educational Policy Committee (co-chair)
Lubitow, Amy	Graduate Council
Oschwald, Mary	Faculty Development Committee (co-chair)
Robison, Scott	Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee (co-chair)
Taylor Rodriguez, Daniel	Faculty Development Committee (co-chair)
Thorne, Steven	Academic Computing Infrastructure Committee (co-chair)
Trimble, Anmarie	Academic Appeals Board
Watanabe, Suwako +	Academic Requirements Committee
Willson, Kimberly	University Studies Council
York, Harry	Honors Council

Notes

+ Also an elected senator

Status: 24 October 2022

**DRAFT•Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 3 October 2022•DRAFT
(Online Conference)**

Presiding Officer: Rowanna Carpenter

Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators present: Ajibade, Anderson, Baccar, Carpenter, Chorpenning, Clark, Clucas, Colligan, Constable, Cortez, Craven, Cruzan, Daescu, Davidova, De La Vega, Dimond, Donlan, Dusicka, Eastin, Emery, Endicott-Popovsky, Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Garrod, Goforth, Greenwood, Hanson, Heilmair, Heryer, Ingersoll, Izumi, Jaén Portillo, Kelley, Knight, La Rosa, Lafrenz, Lindsay, Martin, Matlick, Newsom, Perlmutter, Raffo, Rai, Romaniuk, Ruth, Sterling, Taylor, Thieman, Tretheway, Tuor, Watanabe, Webb, Wern, Wilkinson, Zeisman-Pereyo.

Alternate present: Eowyn Ferey for Mudiamu.

Senators absent: Hunt, Hunte.

Ex-officio members present: Adler, Beyler, Bowman, Bull, Burgess, Chabon, Chaillé, Chivers, Collenberg-Gonzalez, Comer, Duh, Estes, Ford, Harris, Jeffords, Knepfle, Labissiere, Lambert, Limbu, Lubitow, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Reitenauer, Sager, Sanchez, Toppe, Wooster.

The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Roll call** *was effected using the participants list of the online meeting.*
- 2. Minutes of 7 June and 14 June meetings** were **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
- 3. OAA response to June Senate actions** – *Originally on the Consent Agenda, a request was receive for separate discussion. Per A.4, this discussion was moved to be included with discussion of the AHC-APRCA update (item G.3).*
- 4. Procedural: Presiding Officer may move any item** – *Consent Agenda*
Discussion of A.3 incorporated into discussion of G.3.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

CARPENTER welcomed everyone to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the year. She reviewed key items from last academic year: a report with several recommendations from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research; a resolution defending academic freedom against efforts to curtail teaching around systemic oppression, racism, and other so-called controversial topics; passage and beginning implementation of the Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement, including the work of that committee to review and approve over eighty courses to meet the requirement; language on diversity, equity, and inclusion for the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines; regular reports from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment, and passage of a resolution asking the Provost for a report on how the principles articulated by that committee are being upheld in Phase III of the process.

CARPENTER acknowledged that this is the third fall in which Senate begins its year in a virtual format. The campus feels more vibrant that it has recently, but we are still in a

process of transition back to campus. Another transition is that we will have a presidential search this year. Enrollment has continued to decline, which means transitions in other ways. Steering Committee colleagues recognized, CARPENTER said, a need to broaden the conversation about these issues. We will be hearing about plans to engage faculty in ways that move beyond the specifics of the moment.

Logistics for the November meeting are still in planning, CARPENTER said, but we will probably meet in person but with a remote attendance option.

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER announced the formation of the Faculty Senate Districts, and reviewed how they are used.

3. Call for nominations for 2022-23 Research Awards

PODRABSKY announced that nominations for the 2022-23 research awards were now open. The RGS website contains a link to the nomination form. There are also various college-specific research awards. They plan to have a student videographer help make profiles on each award winner, as a way to get word out about the important work being done. He also announced the Three-Minute Thesis competition on November 18th.

4. Conversations for Making Our Way Through

REITENAUER announced an upcoming conversation series that she has been developing together with Abby CROMAN (SB) and Sally MUDIAMU (OGEI), at the invitation of the President, entitled This Place, Our Community, Our Purpose: Conversations for Making Our Way Through. It is designed to be a place where students, staff, faculty, administrators, and trustees can participate in conversations where we really talk about what we've learned over the last two years: the pandemic, as well as social and political upheaval and ecological catastrophes. In the spirit of appreciative inquiry, we want to re-establish connections to each other. Laura NISSEN of the Futures Collaborative has worked with them in designing the emergent conversations. She invited anyone who was interested to become a facilitator—an investment of four to five hours over the course of the term. Participating in a conversation, as one of eight to ten discussants, would involve about an hour of your time. People could participate in more than one conversation.

PERCY: the idea was to reflect with each other on what we've been through—healing, learning, figuring out the way through challenges—without putting all the burden on any one person. It is a chance to see what we've learned, to be more resilient in the future.

REITENAUER said that they hoped to have wide participation, from as many people as would like to do so. Groups can be in any modality.

5. Upcoming NWCCU accreditation visit

CARPENTER introduced Accreditation Liaison Officer Brian SANDLIN for an update on the accreditation process. SANDLIN reported that in August PSU submitted to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities in August its Year Seven Report, which focuses on an evaluation of institutional effectiveness in carrying out our mission. We identified four key themes as diversity, equity and inclusion, financial stability, and community engagement. Several reviewers from NWCCU will be visiting PSU and meeting with various campus constituents. The goal is not gotcha questions, but helping

us improve. The campus visit will end on October 14th with an exit meeting and preliminary findings. There will then be a series of back and reports and opportunity to correct any faculty errors. The commission will meet in January, we expect to have a final letter from NWCCU in late February or early March.

6. Update on Presidential search

CARPENTER introduced Benjamin BERRY, Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees and Chair of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. BERRY reported that they have established a sixteen-person committee and engaged the AGB Search firm. AGB Search is a subsidiary of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges that specializes in services for educational institutions and foundations. AGB Search will be on campus for listening sessions with various groups to gather feedback about opportunities and challenges for the upcoming president. Written feedback may also be submitted through search webpage. They hope to have a profile ready to make public by mid-October, at which point the firm will start recruiting candidates. Interested parties may also apply directly for the position or submit names of potential candidates. They hope to bring finalists to campus during winter term.

7. Introduction: Joseph Bull, Dean of MCECS

CARPENTER invited Joseph BULL, the new Dean of the Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science, to introduce himself. BULL briefly reviewed his background. Prior to PSU, he was at Tulane University for six years, and before that at the University of Michigan. He was excited to join PSU for a variety of reasons. He is a first-generation college graduate, and is Native American, and the transformative experience that many students have at PSU resonates with him. He is looking forward to working with faculty to make the student experience and research portfolio still stronger.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – *none*

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. University Studies cluster courses (USC) – *Consent Agenda*

The new University Studies Upper-Division Cluster courses listed in **October Agenda Attachment E.1** were approved as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of announcements.

2. New academic center: Cybersecurity and Cyberdefense Policy Center (EPC)

ANDERSON (EPC Co-Chair) said that EPC had reviewed the proposal [summarized in **October Agenda Attachment E.2**] and approved it, with a consensus of support for the center as having a focus that is relevant and urgent for these times. EPC encourages the Center to have a contingency plan should there be an unfortunate or unexpected loss of current funding, but notes that they have been very successful in current fundraising efforts. He recognized the main proposer, Birol YESILADA.

YESILADA stated that the Center is a very necessary addition to PSU. Three years ago he was asked by Provost JEFFORDS to coordinate cybersecurity initiatives. He saw how much we were already doing across our colleges. They have been working to create a center to provide opportunities for research as well as public service in the form of workforce development and assistance to public institutions and private partners. They

are combining expertise in cybersecurity and cyberdefense policy. It is an interdisciplinary effort, involving four colleges. They are in the process of getting more grants, and have been recognized as a center of academic excellence by the Federal government. In about a year and a half they have brought in or have in the pipeline over \$5 million, most recently a congressional earmark of \$600 thousand, secured by Senators Wyden and Merkley, for local government cybersecurity. These achievements put PSU on the map. There are also a number of private-sector partners. Formalizing the center as an institution within PSU will enable them to go after more funding, such as from an upcoming Oregon House bill. They hope to have Senate's blessing to move forward.

RAI/EMERY **moved** the proposal for a new Center for Cybersecurity and Cyberdefense Policy as summarized in **Attachment E.2**.

WILKINSON asked about implications for students, particularly undergraduates. Will there be training opportunities? How many students will be served? What were the thoughts about credit-based programs or curriculum? YESILADA said that the initial work group is divided in two [subgroups]. He led the subgroup for non-credit workforce development and research. Here there will be opportunities for students; for example, a grant will employ four graduate students in connection with the Northwest power grid. There are also twelve cyber fellows, and partnerships with community colleges and other universities. A second subgroup is drafting an interdisciplinary cyber policy management degree that will be forthcoming this year, an effort between MCECS, CUPA, SB, and CLAS. This is an underserved area. There are over 5000 jobs available right now in Oregon, and the number is expanding. They are looking for training not only in engineering, but also social sciences and humanities and a mix between them. The aim of the degree is to bridge technology engineering with public policy, social sciences, and humanities. This is where PSU can truly make a difference. They would also like to build a K-12-plus pipeline, making it attractive for students from elementary school onward.

The proposal for the Cybersecurity and Cyberdefense Policy Center as given in **Attachment E.2** was **approved** (36 yes, 4 no, 7 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

G. REPORTS

1. President's report

PERCY looked forward to working with CARPENTER, WILKINSON, Steering Committee, and Senate this year. He was excited to see the human element to campus coming back to some more vibrancy. He appreciated those who worked to organize that and those who are coming back, rethinking schedules. He enjoyed seeing people at the picnic in the Park Blocks and the beautiful weather. They were expecting about 150 people, and 400 came. Later that day was a welcoming reception for new faculty, the first such in-person get-together in three years. Move-in day at the dorms was also fun.

We are still being cautious and vigilant about the epidemic, PERCY said. They will be facilitating vaccination clinics, and encouraging everyone to wear a mask who wants to. There will still be a need for flexibility and accommodation. PERCY was glad to see the role that REITENAUER and Senate in general were taking to create dialogue about campus life and community.

PERCY said that the reimagine campus safety recommendations from last year have been approved, and an implementation team is trying to put all those into action in different places. Oversight will go to [University Public Safety Oversight Committee]. There will be people working on lighting, engagement, alternatives to criminal law enforcement officials responding to mental health issues.

PERCY thanked people for participating in a dialogue about climate action last year, where he heard many positive ideas. This leads him to be dedicated to get through some of the challenges impeding interdisciplinary work. The Faculty Senate's report of a year ago laid out many of these issues. They are working hard to change data collection to include a code that will link every course that is taught to the unit that is providing the instruction. He knew that this had been an impediment for a long time.

PERCY hoped that senators had a chance to see the video in which he presented, again, his campus priorities. His primary objectives are not changing in his last year as president. We all have to keep an eye on and keep working on racial justice and equity. One area he has been thinking about is contracting: making sure we give opportunity to contractors who are people of color, women, small firms.

Student success remains an important [objective], PERCY continued, especially persistence which keeps student coming back to the University and moving successfully to graduation. We need to find new and innovative ways to support out students.

Another key objective, PERCY said, is engagement to revitalize our community. The new center [approved earlier] is an example. We are working on a variety of initiatives with the City of Portland We are one of the first downtown entities to come back as much as we have. There are important ways we can collaboratively re-vision the downtown and the broader community. Dr. LAMBERT is also working in [the context of] the Time to Act initiative on some important convenings with communities of color—listening to community groups about what they think is necessary for them to thrive.

PERCY also wished to talk about financial sustainability. This is a multi-dimensioned effort. It includes allocation of resources to high-demand enrollment areas, programs that bring in new students because of innovative work, academic program review, and the Huron study [on administrative services]. It [Huron report] came at a time, near the end of the academic year, which made it difficult to fully explore. They will be holding a townhall to explain what we think is in the report, and begin to think about what it means for our campus. There is a place to provide comments, and he encouraged people to do that. They haven't made any decisions; a multi-year approach will be needed. However, there were some things where it seemed important to get started. There is a group working on the notion of federated service centers; we've found that we are very decentralized on many of our baseline administrative systems because they are spread across many units. Can we be more efficient, have better outcomes, create more mobility for our employees? If we put people together, they may be able to specialize more in functions they are better at, and have more room to work up.

A second area [from the Huron report] they are beginning to think about, PERCY said, was what they called a one-stop shop for student support, or a kind of way-finding kit. We have many resources and support centers for students, but it's important that they can find their way to them when they need them.

A third specific recommendation, PERCY said, is expanding and improving onboarding system for new employees. We haven't been able to do that in person for a while. We are trying to figure out better ways for people to find their way through the maze of decision about benefits, health care, etc., also to make people feel welcome and comfortable here.

PERCY reported on fall enrollment numbers. The Board of Trustees had spent quite a bit of time on this last week. Enrollment has been dropping for about a decade. Before that, enrollment was growing, for a variety of reasons, up through the great recession. About ten years that growth stopped and started moving in the other direction. We have about 6000 fewer students than ten years ago. There are demographic explanations, more competition, and other things going on. Entering this [academic] year, we planned on being down 1.5% in SCH. The final numbers are not in, and won't until about the fourth week. There are also different fiscal impacts depending on the mix of students: undergraduate or graduate, in-state or out-of-state, etc.

PERCY had to be honest and state that we are going to fall significantly short of our enrollment target. Current numbers show SCH generation is down 7.5% from last year, or six percentage [points] below our plan. That is not final, but there will unlikely be changes that remove being down below our plan.

PERCY wished to be clear: this is not the result of people just doing what they've always done, or not being attuned. Our enrollment management people have worked very hard; for much of the year, recruiting was very hard because they couldn't do it in person. OAA has been working very hard on persistence and innovative programs such as the summer [bridge] program. We have been reaching out to students who were close to graduation but dropped out.

However, we are facing major headwinds, PERCY said. Our community college partners have experienced even bigger enrollment declines since the start of the pandemic. This initially hit the specific work training programs, but more recently the [number of] people going for a two-year degree has dropped. Also we could not get to community colleges to talk to students in person. We are working to understand our persistence and retention numbers in the context of an extremely positive job market. Our students are often working to support themselves and their families, and have many different pressures and things to consider. Our persistence numbers have dropped slightly, representing a few hundred students. He is not saying that people haven't been doing their work, because they have, sincerely. But these are challenges we have to work through. We are trying to figure out strategies to improve enrollment, growth, and persistence.

PERCY thanked Senate for approving the cybersecurity center. This was an example of a positive future for PSU, as communities and regions are being attentive to their economic development, workforce development, and vitality. Universities will have a role to play in this. An example: when Intel announced they were moving \$10 billion of investment to Ohio, many people in Oregon began to worry. We have great semiconductor work capacity and knowledge in our state, so many began to question [why that decision was made]. Governor Brown, Senator Wyden, and Congresswoman Bonamici set up a task force on how to advance the semiconductor industry in Oregon; he [PERCY] represented the institution on it. One of the four planks [in the report] is higher education—the need for research, intellectual property development, innovation. One of the things that is

needed most, to WILKINSON's point earlier, is workforce: not only on the production floor, but also managers, researchers, technicians, HR, etc. There is both Federal and State money coming into this. We will be working to find a role for PSU in this opportunity. The work of YESILADA and colleagues is an example of how our research and teaching can create great programs that will allow students to build careers.

LA ROSA asked if enrollment was declining at other institutions in the state. PERCY: It looks like OSU may increase a little bit. But other urban university presidents report the same thing about enrollment being down. Some of the people who said they were coming didn't end up coming. We don't know why that is. Our students are [in large] different from students in more traditional universities—more on the financial margin. They've been through a difficult; they have more financial needs. Universities like ours and some of the regional universities are facing somewhat different challenges than the larger [traditional] universities. PERCY did not think that our situation was atypical compared to other urban universities across the country.

DONLAN had heard from many academic professional colleagues that their numbers have been dropping rapidly, so that many are not able to do the work they would like to do: financial aid, enrollment-related departments, etc. Had he heard anything about this? Might it be contributing to the lack of [student] persistence? PERCY didn't know of any major, severe challenges. When we've tried to hire people, it has been very competitive, and we have probably lost [some people because of that]. He didn't have the overall numbers, but he thought the overall job turnover was changing. Whether particular units have been hit hard is something we would take a look at. We've been working very hard to keep people in important staff positions. They haven't been cut, but whether we've been able to keep them filled in the current economy he didn't know.

2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS shared the excitement of starting her fifth academic year at PSU, of seeing students continuing their educational journeys. She was glad that they had been able to persuade the new MCECS Dean Joseph BULL to come to PSU. She wished to acknowledge that Erica WAGNER had officially started this fall as Vice Provost for Student Success; she [JEFFORDS] was grateful for the leadership she will bring to our student success efforts. JEFFORDS also wished to recognize a couple of faculty who had been working in OAA on campus-wide issues. Jeff ROBINSON (COM) has been serving as a Provost's Fellow to lead the faculty components of our accreditation process, and is continuing in that role this fall. Erin SHORTLIDGE (BIO) is serving as the Provost's Fellow focusing on issues of student success, particularly in STEM courses that have high DFW rates. She is going to be analyzing data and developing faculty learning communities to improve student success. She has a national track record and recognition in this area. YESILADA had made extraordinary efforts to pull together opportunities for faculty, students, and community partnerships in the cybersecurity proposal. She asked him to play that role in other strategic areas as well, and serve in that capacity in OAA.

JEFFORDS announced the launch of a search for a new Dean of the Library, chaired by [COTA] Dean Leroy BYNUM. The Library has a crucial role in student success, research, and engagement across the institution. She thanked Michael BOWMAN for the admirable job he has done, and continues to do, as Interim Dean.

As the President indicated, JEFFORDS continued, we face some challenging issues but also have some wonderful opportunities. One is the Student Success Equity Initiative, funded by the Gates Foundation, which pulls us together with other institutions that share the student demographics we have, to learn best practices from each other. Vice Provost WAGNER and Assistant Vice President Lindsay ROMASANTA are leading this work.

JEFFORDS suggested that in facing enrollment challenges we should meet our students where they are and help them transition from current circumstances into the opportunity for a college degree. One way might be a credit for prior learning program. She applauded Senate for engaging with this issue previous and providing parameters on policies. This positioned us to be competitive for a state grant. The School of Social Work put forward a proposal that has brought in about \$2.5 million from the state. She hoped would could translate best practices from that project across the institution.

JEFFORDS called attention to two significant building projects; we continue to go back to the State to seek full funding: the Vernier Science Center and the new Art and Design building. She commended the faculty, staff, and students involved in the design process for these two buildings, which centered student learning, and especially BIPOC student learning, so that the buildings reflect institutional priorities. This is nationally distinctive.

Throughout this year, JEFFORDS said, we intend to move forward with racial justice and equity work. She acknowledged leadership of VP-GDI LAMBERT. Perla PINEDO, Lindsay ROMASANTA, and Becca LAWRENCE from GDI recently spoke to the academic leadership team: what works are activities that are culturally engaging, responsible, validating, relevant, and familiar. They've given us a roadmap to improve the work we do on behalf of students.

3. Update from Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustment *[including discussion of A.3]*

CARPENTER indicated that discussion of the OAA Response to the Summary of Senate Actions for June (item A.3, pulled from the Consent Agenda) would be incorporated into discussion of the AHC-APRCA report.

REITENAUER (co-chair together with ESTES) reminded senators that the committee is now moving into its third year of working with OAA and the Provost's Office around academic program review and the program reduction process. Senate ended last [academic] year with passing a resolution that foregrounded the APRCA's guiding principles for the program review/reduction process [PRRP]. This took up all of our final meeting [June 13th], apart from a few announcements; it was a discussion coming from many corners of the University, certainly including the five units that continue to be involved in the process. In that resolution Senate endorsed the guiding principles and priorities stated by [AHC-APRCA] and asked the Provost's Office and OAA for a detailed plan for how these principles and plans will be upheld during Phase III of PRRP.

REITENAUER continued: The resolution effectively urged OAA and the deans to foreground these principles in practice during Phase III of PRRP so as to maximize consultation, participation, communication, and transparency. There was conversation from colleagues in the affected units, and beyond that a sense that the principles and priorities have not always been upheld. In Phase III we are looking for confirmation that

they will be. We entered into summer asking for a kind of break over the summer. What she heard in many conversations as Presiding Officer was a sense of despair. We asked that there be a limit to the pressure placed on units to be proactive over the summer, when faculty were really needing a break; however, Senate did not want to get in the way of collaboration for the scrutinized units. Therefore there have been adjustments to the timeline.; January 15th is the new deadline for reports. Phase III units were eligible for and have continued to receive Reimagine funds so support collaborative work.

AHC-APRCA has not yet met, REITENAUER said. The Provost sent the report [to Steering and AHC-APRCA] over the weekend, so the committee has not yet seen it. She assumed it would be shared out with members of the scrutinized units and Faculty Senate as a whole. She didn't want to speak on behalf the committee, which had not met yet this fall. She is a new member of the committee, though she has been involved in the conversations in a variety of ways. She now wanted to create room for others, including those in the scrutinized units, to speak.

KELLEY said that a group of twelve to fifteen faculty the five Phase III units (Conflict Resolution, Applied Linguistics, International and Global Studies, Theater Arts, and Leadership for Sustainability Education) had been meeting over the summer, and she wished to present something of their discussions, together with John HELLERMANN (LING). [For slides see **October Minutes Appendix G.3.**] HELLERMANN recapped the process so far: in Phase I, units across the University were evaluated against quantitative measures, largely SCH. In Phase II, eighteen units were identified and given seven weeks to submit reports to provide more qualitative measures—to basically justify our existence. In Phase III, five units were identified to produce another report.

These five units, HELLERMANN said, received little to no guidance about how to augment or adapt the Phase II report. They feel that they have been communicated at, not communicated with. He noted that the June AHC-APRCA report envisioned two avenues to push for greater campus-wide participation. One was a faculty-led conversation about curriculum, rather than participating solely in an administration-led conversation about budget. The second avenue involves pushing for greater financial transparency, more consultation with stakeholders, and clearer communication. They hoped that Faculty Senate will continue to operate in accord with this resolution and the recommendations from the AHC-APRCA report.

KELLEY noted that they have not yet had chance to thoroughly review the Provost's report, which came out over the weekend. Prior to that it has felt that the feedback was not really meaningful; they haven't had clear metrics.

HELLERMANN: a side-by-side comparison of letters received by Conflict Resolution and Applied Linguistics, in response to the Phase II reports, shows that large portions of the letters have identical text [see **slide 4**]. This was the guidance they received to produce the Phase III reports.

KELLEY said that [representatives from the five units] have been meeting through the summer and organizing support from students, alumni, and community. They recognize that PSU has serious challenges. They are not resistant to change. In fact, they believe that we need University-wide structural changes to address the challenges of today's world. Academic reorganization must follow principles of transparency, fairness, and

shared governance, and must emerge from a clear strategic vision. Currently it seems that the five units have been charged with fixing things. They continued to invite cooperation and collaboration with the Provost for a strategic vision—once that treats declining student enrollment as deeply related to curriculum, more than simply a budget matter. They would welcome a process for a faculty-led conversation about curriculum. What they are proposing aligns with the Huron report, which examined administrative and student support services [see **slide 6**].

REITENAUER hoped that we will move forward in alignment with the AHC-APRCA principles.

KELLEY wished for clarification about the timing of [the OAA response to Senate actions of June 13th, item A.3]. CARPENTER: she believed that we received the OAA memo [A.3] on September 16th. *[Note from Secretary: it was September 23rd.]* JEFFORDS said that they worked hard over the summer to be responsive to all the questions that came up. She invited senators to look at the FAQs on the PRRP website. KELLEY: but the memo was dated June 22nd. If it wasn't received until September 16th, what was the gap in the timeline? JEFFORDS: Is the question about the official response to the Summary of Senate Actions, or the OAA report? CARPENTER: These are two different documents. The date on the memo is when we submitted it to OAA. *[The original Summary of Senate Actions for June was dated June 15th and sent to OAA on June 16th.]* The OAA Response is embedded in the original [Summary of Senate Actions]. REITENAUER commented that there was a crush of business at the end of last year, but it might be possible to reconstruct the timeline if that is important.

KELLEY recognized Alyssa HARTIG (LING): The document in question is the response from the Provost to the June 6th Summary of Senate Actions. *[As noted above, the Summary was dated June 15th and submitted to OAA on June 16th.]* The response says that OAA concurs with the resolution in the ways stated below. They were surprised, because they didn't receive such a clear summary at the time. On July 11th, they received an email that included the same bullet points, but not the clarity of how OAA was responding to the resolution. If that was an official communication, to whom was it addressed? JEFFORDS: The regular practice is for the Secretary to send a Summary of Senate Actions to the OAA, and they developed and submitted their response to that. It hasn't been their practice to notify the various units upon sending that memo. Questions about its distribution should be directed to the Secretary. *[Following routine practice, the official OAA response, received on September 23rd, was included in the next month's materials packet and posted to the Faculty Senate website.]*

CARPENTER noted that Steering Committee and AHC-APRCA have received the Provost's Phase III report. She expected that this would be discussed at the next meeting.

H. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:00 p.m.

DIVISION CAUCUSES TO CHOOSE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

After the meeting, caucuses chose new members of Committee on Committees for the following divisions:

CLAS-Sci: STERLING

COTA: COLLIGAN (Fall), HERYER (Winter), HEILMAIR (Spring)

Office of the Faculty Senate, OAA
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207



To: Susan Jeffords, Provost
From: Portland State University Faculty Senate
(Rowanna Carpenter, Presiding Officer; Richard Beyler, Secretary)
Date: 11 October 2022
Re: Summary of Faculty Senate Actions

At the regular meeting on 3 October 2022 (held as an on-line conference), Faculty Senate **voted to approve** the new Institute for Cybersecurity and Cyberdefense Policy, as proposed in October Agenda Attachment E.2.

10.13.2022 — OAA concurs with the approval of the new Institute for Cybersecurity and Cyberdefense Policy

Additional new members of Committee on Committees were chosen by divisional caucuses: CLAS-Sci: Nadine STERLING; COTA: COLLIGAN (fall term), Alison HERYER (winter term), and Barbara HEILMAIR (spring term).

10.13.2022 — OAA concurs with the addition of new committee members

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rowanna Carpenter".

Rowanna Carpenter
Presiding Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard H. Beyler".

Richard H. Beyler
Secretary to the Faculty

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Jeffords".

Susan Jeffords, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Office of the Faculty Senate (OAA)
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751



To: Susan Jeffords, Provost
From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty
Date: 7 November 2022
Re: Question to Administrators

A Faculty Senator has submitted the following question to the Provost as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on November 7th:

Question to Provost Susan Jeffords

Provost Jeffords, over the past several years in the process of working with APRCA and your efforts to "close the budget gap" we have heard from you in several venues that this work for APRCA and Program Review and Reduction Process are so that we will not have to engage in this work in the future.

Yet, on Monday, October 24th, PSU Currently published the [Presidential Profile](#), which is being utilized by the AGB search firm to recruit candidates for the Presidential Search, that highlights on page 15 that a future president will build on efforts "reducing and reorganizing programs." With Stage 3 PRRP report deadlines facing 5 departments in January, how do you reconcile the conflict of the University declaring reductions prior to the reports being completed? Further, how does reducing programs during the year of a presidential search support that very search and a positive growth future of the university?

Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the November 7th meeting in section F. Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

Office of the Faculty Senate (OAA)
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751



To: Susan Jeffords, Provost
From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty
Date: 7 November 2022
Re: Question to Administrators

A Faculty Senator has submitted the following question to the Provost as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on November 7th:

Question to Provost Susan Jeffords

Collectively, this multi-year Program Review and Reduction Process (PRRP) has cost significant amounts of time, money, and goodwill for both faculty and administration. If faculty positions are cut, it will also result in a loss of revenue in the future, both from loss of tuition and from loss of external funding. Although this question has been asked several times during the past year, we have not received a clear answer whether the PRRP will prove to be an effective means of “balancing the budget.”

What are the projected budget savings from merging 5 smaller departments with other bigger ones, as they have been asked to do?

Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the November 7th meeting in section F. Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

To: Stephen Percy, President
 From: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty
 Date: 7 November 2022
 Re: Question to Administrators

A Faculty Senator has submitted the following question to the Provost as a Question to Administrators for the next Faculty Senate meeting on November 7th:

Question to President Stephen Percy

Cutting revenue-generating units, especially in isolation from broader strategic reorganization, does not make sense. According to the [Huron report](#), conducted by an independent consulting group, “Due to work being managed and performed by so many disparate employees, PSU is surprisingly over-invested in some administrative functions” (p. 6). Additionally, the [Howard Bunsis report](#) shared by AAUP last spring similarly shows that there has been steady growth in management positions at PSU but a decline in others (the chart below is from the Howard Bunsis report, p. 82), also while faculty and many staff positions have been in an indefinite hiring freeze.

PSU Number of Non-Instructional Employees, 2017 to 2022 per IPEDS

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	% Change		
							2017 to 2020	2020 to 2022	2017 to 2022
Business and Fin Ops	520	506	494	466	443	438	-10.4%	-6.0%	-15.8%
Community Legal, Sports, Media	218	228	224	219	218	204	0.5%	-6.8%	-6.4%
Office and Admin Support	204	207	207	203	208	179	-0.5%	-11.8%	-12.3%
Computer, Engineering, Sci	185	182	183	184	179	177	-0.5%	-3.8%	-4.3%
Management	96	94	139	136	144	143	41.7%	5.1%	49.0%
Librarians and Acad Affairs	111	111	108	133	132	129	19.8%	-3.0%	16.2%
Maintenance	72	74	70	77	79	74	6.9%	-3.9%	2.8%
Service	44	44	53	49	45	45	11.4%	-8.2%	2.3%
Healthcare	19	24	16	17	14	15			
Sales	4	4	3	5	3	5			
Total	1,473	1,474	1,497	1,489	1,465	1,409	1.1%	-5.4%	-4.3%

When and how will the whole University be engaged in creating a vision for PSU and collectively balancing the budget as opposed to taking the non-strategic, ad-hoc reduction of 5 small units?


Per the Senate Bylaws, this will appear on the agenda for the November 7th meeting in section F. Please let the Presiding Officer or me know if you have any questions.

**Office of Academic Affairs**

Post Office Box 751 503-725-3422 tel
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751 503-725-5262 fax

Date: September 30, 2022

To: Rowanna Carpenter, Presiding Officer of the PSU Faculty Senate
Lindsey Wilkinson, Presiding Officer Elect of the PSU Faculty Senate

From: Susan Jeffords, Provost and VP of Academic Affairs 
Su

Subject: OAA Report to Faculty Senate in Response to the June 13, 2022 Resolution

At its June 13, 2022 meeting, the Faculty Senate passed a Resolution [Foregrounding the APRCA Guiding Principles and Priorities for the Program Review/Reduction Process](#). One component of that Resolution requested “a written response from OAA with a detailed plan for how the Guiding Principles and Priorities will be upheld during Phase III of the PRRP.” The Resolution also asked the questions listed below:

- a) What evaluation was applied to the quantitative driver metrics to determine why the 18 units were selected to write Phase II narratives?
- b) What criteria were used to evaluate the qualitative data from the Phase II narratives to select units to write Phase III plans? And
- c) What are the goals of the Group phase III plans, and by what criteria will they be evaluated?

In response, this report outlines how OAA has upheld the [Vision, Assertions and Guiding Principles & Priorities](#) during Phases I and II of the Program Review/Reduction Process (PRRP), along with intentions to continue those commitments in Phase III. Answers to the specific questions are also presented below.

Provost and OAA leadership acknowledge that the [Program Review and Reduction Process](#) (PRRP) has been, and continues to be, a disruptive and difficult process, particularly for those units most affected by the work. Such processes are not, nor should they be, undertaken lightly or without the kind of serious deliberation that has gone into this process. In PSU’s case, the significant budget shortfalls that have accompanied a ten-year decline in enrollments have served as the principal cause for the initiation of the PRRP. Our commitment to and tradition of shared governance led to designing an approach that recognized the combined roles and responsibilities of administration and Faculty Senate in development and implementation of the PRRP.

It is important to acknowledge that a great deal of deliberation, research, and reflection has been undertaken by both the administration and the Faculty Senate in developing and implementing this process. The Provost and Deans are grateful to Faculty Senate

leadership, the APRCA committee, and faculty in the involved units for their ongoing commitments to continued collaboration and transparency as we complete this process. The Provost and Deans commit to continued engagement with the Faculty Senate, APRCA, and units involved in PRRP as we complete Phase III.

Background

As part of efforts to support the President's priority of achieving financial sustainability and reflecting our mutual commitments to shared governance, the Provost and Faculty Senate collaborated to develop one component of the overall strategy of [Closing the Gap: the Program Review and Reduction Process](#) (PRRP). While additional efforts would be undertaken as part of Closing the Gap (such as participation in the [Support Services Review](#) and efforts to stabilize enrollments), joint conversations between the Provost and Faculty Senate leadership concluded that the multi-year practice of eliminating vacant positions to balance budgets was eroding units and, in some cases, instructional and scholarly capacity, often where enrollments were increasing. Consequently, it was jointly decided that the Provost, in partnership with the Faculty Senate, should undertake a more intentional approach to considering program reductions. In recognition of the importance of articulating guidelines for this process, in October 2020, the Faculty Senate appointed the [Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments Committee](#) (APRCA). After considerable deliberations, APRCA set forth its [Vision, Assertions, and Guiding Principles & Priorities](#) to frame the Program Review and Reduction Process.

Throughout the PRRP, these principles and priorities have guided and informed the work undertaken by OAA. The Provost met regularly (see below) with the APRCA committee and the chair of APRCA to consult on processes and concerns raised by faculty. The PRRP was also a regular topic of discussion during the Provost's regular meetings with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and monthly meetings with the Presiding Officers and Presiding Officers Elect.

While guidance and feedback from APRCA shaped the overall approach and implementation of PRRP, input from the APRCA committee was utilized throughout to revise and alter the process, including:

- Ensuring that meetings were held in each college/school to discuss PRRP
- Ensuring that ReImagine funds would be available to support units throughout the process
- Supporting the creation of the APRCA website
- Extending deadlines for both the Phase II and Phase III reports;
- Providing summary reports of Phase II narratives rather than posting the entire reports
- Making OAA resources available to support units with the information needed to develop their reports (i.e. making Vice Provost Amy Mulkerin available to discuss budget materials)
- Discussing how a trauma-informed approach could be used in the process
Convening a session with Laura Nissen to explore how a Futures lens could inform the PRRP reports

Responses to Questions Posed by the Faculty Senate

Numerous questions were raised during the discussion of the PRRP and the Resolution at the June 13 Faculty Senate meeting. As promised, those questions were collected so that OAA could provide responses. Those responses are presented in the [Program Review/Reduction Process Frequently Asked Questions webpage](#).

In addition, the Resolution posed the following specific questions:

- 1) What evaluation was applied to the quantitative driver metrics to determine why the 18 units were selected to write Phase II narratives?
 - a) Units asked to write Phase II narratives had multiple entries in the Driver Metrics [Dashboards](#) that fell below University medians
 - b) As a component of these deliberations, Value Metrics were reviewed by the deans and provost to consider contributions that units made in support of the Value Metrics
- 2) What criteria were used to evaluate the qualitative data from the Phase II narratives to select units to write Phase III plans?
 - a) Phase II narratives were reviewed in light of efforts that units had taken/were undertaking to address areas in which their Dashboard data fell below the median
 - b) Qualitative assessments focused on those areas articulated in the APRCA Guiding Principles in reviewing the narratives: *Focus on Student Access, Quality Learning Experiences and Completion*
 - c) Qualitative data was reviewed in light of College/School priorities and plans
- 3) What are the goals of the Phase III plans, and by what criteria will they be evaluated?
 - a) The goals of the Phase III plans are:
 - i) To inform decision-making relating to how the PRRP can contribute to Closing the Gap
 - ii) To ensure that information is available to be considered as part of that decision-making process
 - iii) To ensure that units have opportunities to present information they believe should be considered in reviews of the reports
 - iv) To ensure that stakeholders have clear opportunities to participate in the process
 - b) Decision about units will be informed by:
 - i) Phase II and Phase III unit reports
 - ii) Unit and college/school data
 - iii) Unit budgets in context of overall college/school and university budgets
 - iv) Assessment by the Provost and deans of proposals put forward by units for mechanisms to address questions raised in response to Phase II narratives

Communications

OAA was committed throughout the process to sharing information and ensuring communications with stakeholders. While not comprehensive, the following list of events/conversations shows opportunities where input and feedback about PRRP were sought from multiple stakeholders. To ensure access, various formats were utilized, including webinars, school/college meetings, emails and newsletters, participation in Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate committee meetings, and presentations to the PSU Board of Trustees by the Provost and by the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate.

Date	Communication
12-07-20	Creation of the Faculty Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments (APRCA) webpage for transparent information sharing and school/college meeting information
03-11-21	Program Review / Reduction Process Forum - click this link for the video
04-01-21	Email: Academic Affairs Budget Town Hall Follow-Up: Closing the Gap
April 2021	Development of the Program Review/Reduction Process webpage for sharing information about the process with campus partners.
04-28-21	Email: ReImagine PSU and Call for Proposals
Spring 2021	School/College Meetings held with APRCA, the Program Working Group, and the Provost to discuss and seek feedback on the principles, priorities, and metrics for PRRP and to outline the PRRP process and timeline - FAQ Page
06-08-21	Email: School and College Meeting Follow-Up
11-12-21	Email: Closing the Gap
01-24-22	Newsletter: PRRP Phase II Timeline and ReImagine PSU Project Announcement
01-27-22	Email: Phase II of the Program Review/Reduction Process

02-11-22	Unit Narrative Report Discussion for the 18 units asked to write unit narrative reports to meet with the Provost and Laura Nissen for Q&A and futures thinking exercises to assist with report writing
03-23-22	Newsletter: Deadline for Unit Narrative Reports Extended
04-05-22	The Provost presents the PRRP Process to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the PSU Board of Trustees
06-13-22	Email: Academic Affairs Closing the Gap Progress Report
08-15-22	Posting of the Phase II Unit Narrative Report Summaries Including Provost Responses webpage .
08-16-22	At their request, the Provost met with the Applied Linguistics Department regarding their Phase III report.
Multiple	Members of the Program Reduction Working Group met with several chairs and associate deans regarding the development of the metrics used in the dashboards.
Multiple and Ongoing	Engagement between deans and the units asked to prepare Phase II and Phase III reports
Multiple and Ongoing	The Provost meets with Academic Deans to discuss the PRRP process and unit progress.
Multiple and Ongoing	Regular updates to Faculty Senate through reports from APRCA and the Provost
Multiple and Ongoing	Faculty Senate Budget Committee Meetings - Regular attendance by the Provost and Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning
Multiple and Ongoing	Faculty Senate Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments Committee - Regular attendance by the Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning and Chief of Staff to the Provost and frequent attendance by the Provost

Multiple and Ongoing	Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Attendance by the Provost
Multiple and Ongoing	Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee: Attendance by the Provost
Multiple and Ongoing	Regular Updates by the Provost at Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the PSU Board meetings

Continuing to Uphold APRCA Principles in Phase III

A number of questions have arisen as to how the APRCA principles and guidelines will continue to be upheld as we enter Phase III of the PRRP. Efforts to enact each guideline are identified below:

- 1) Equitable and Meaningful Engagement of All Stakeholders:
 - a) Stakeholder engagement happens at multiple levels throughout the process, from engagement with the Provost to faculty meetings at the unit level;
 - b) Units are encouraged to include stakeholders in the development of their Phase III plans;
 - c) Deans will continue to engage with stakeholders through meetings with chairs, units, and college-level meetings;
 - d) The Provost will continue to engage through meetings with the deans, Faculty Senate Committees, APRCA, and through campus communications;
 - e) The Provost will continue to be available to meet with units at their request.
- 2) Focus on Student Access, Quality Learning Experiences, and Completion
 - a) Key metrics in the dashboards reflect attention to student success priorities. These include three-year trends in the number of majors/minors/graduate enrollees, the number of degrees awarded, and the percentage of BIPOC students.
 - b) Funding from a previous position in OAA was repurposed to appoint the Vice Provost for Student Success to provide critical leadership for student success efforts. The Vice Provost will provide feedback on student success goals during the Phase III process.
- 3) Our Work Will Change, Let's Make it for the Better
 - a) ReImagine funds have been utilized throughout the PRRP to support units in developing ways to adapt to the university's changing enrollment patterns, student demographics, student demands, and financial constraints. Projects that took place during summer 2021 and the 2021/2022 academic year can be found on the [ReImagine PSU Project Information webpage](#). ReImagine funds were awarded to projects supporting units asked to prepare Phase II reports (for example, [Linguistic Diversity and Discrimination Awareness](#), [Collaborative Model for Interdisciplinary](#)

[Programs: International Development Studies](#), [Universal Design Learning Course](#), Evaluating Future Scenarios for Doctoral Education in CUPA, [Reimagining a Community Centered Climate Change and Sustainability Graduate Education at PSU](#)) and all five units that were asked to prepare Phase III reports have been allocated ReImagine funds.

- b) Numerous units throughout the Phase II process have shown remarkable innovation in developing ways to revise curricula and programs to support student success. The Provost and Deans encourage and will continue to support these efforts as we continue the PRRP process.
 - c) The Provost continues to invest in opportunities to support faculty in adapting to these changing contexts, including increased support for the development of online classes, support for the implementation of the RESR requirement, and allocating resources to Advance Curricular and Pedagogical Innovation through the [President's Strategic Investment Plan](#).
- 4) Research and Data-Informed Decision-Making
- a) While data from the dashboards prompted the initial identification of units asked to develop Phase II reports, Phase III reports will benefit from additional research and data that units choose to provide. For example, a number of Phase II reports added contextual information about national enrollment and degree trends in their respective fields. OAA is available to support units in gathering data needed for development of their Phase III reports. OAA is available to support units in gathering data needed for development of their Phase III reports.
- 5) Seek Feedback Prior to Decision Making
- a) Summaries of Phase II narratives have been posted on the [Phase II Unit Narrative Report Summaries Including Provost Responses webpage](#). In reflection of this principle, summaries rather than full reports were developed at the request of the APRCA committee. While OAA developed the summaries based on unit reports, summaries were reviewed by each unit for correction or editing.
 - b) As in Phase II, OAA will consult with APRCA as to the best format for sharing Phase III plans on the [PRRP website](#).
 - c) The Provost will be available to meet with units as they develop their Phase III reports and as the responses to those reports are developed.
 - d) As responses to the Phase III reports are developed, the Provost will share updates at appropriate Faculty Senate committee meetings to seek feedback.
 - e) As outlined below, the Provost and relevant Deans will consult with units asked to develop Phase III reports before final decisions are made.
- 6) Devote Resources to the ReImagining Process
- a) ReImagine Funds have been made available to each of the five units asked to develop Phase III reports; funds have been transferred to each college for units to access on timelines of their choosing.
 - b) Throughout the PRRP, [ReImagine Funds](#) have been committed to units.

- 7) Transparent Process and Open Communication with All Stakeholders
 - a) Deans will continue to be in direct consultation with their units throughout Phase III.
 - b) Communication from the Provost will happen in the following ways:
 - i) Updates to the [Program Review and Reduction Process](#) website
 - ii) Attendance and updates at various Faculty Senate committee meetings
 - iii) Provost emails and OAA Newsletters
 - iv) Presentations at the [Academic and Student Affairs Committee](#) of the PSU Board
 - v) Posting of the Phase III communications section of the PRRP website with links to communications and presentations.

To sustain these commitments during Phase III of the PRRP, OAA will continue to affirm the following practices:

- Ensuring that Deans remain engaged with units writing Phase III reports as the narratives are developed
- Ensuring that ReImagine Funds are available to support units in developing their Phase III reports
- Continuing to meet regularly with APRCA for guidance and feedback
- Continuing to include data in the decision-making process
- Continuing to inform campus on activities relating to Phase III
- Providing time for feedback from units as decisions are formulated and finalized

Phase III Timeline

Date	Action Item
04-28-22	In the response to their Phase II Unit Narrative Reports, five units were asked to develop Phase III Unit Narrative Reports
05-27-22	The Provost sent a memo to the five units asked to develop Phase III Unit Narrative Reports with further clarification of what those reports should contain
07-11-22	After the June 13, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting and resolution regarding the PRRP, the Provost sent the five units further clarification about their Phase III Unit Narrative Reports
04-28-22 - 01-15-23	Deans engage with units throughout this period in support of development of Phase III reports; the Provost is also available to meet with units as requested
01-15-23	Phase III Unit Narrative Reports due to Provost and Deans
02-01-23	Complete review of Phase III Unit Narrative Reports by Provost and Deans
02-15-23	By February 15, 2023, the Provost and respective Deans will meet with each of the five units asked to prepare Phase III Unit Narrative Reports to review and seek feedback on proposed responses to those reports
03-01-23	By March 1, 2023, the Provost and respective deans will meet with the APRCA committee and FSBC to seek feedback on proposed outcomes
03-01-23	Decisions on Phase III outcomes will be finalized and shared with campus

CC: Steven Percy, President

Advisory Council 2021-2022
Report to Faculty Senate
October 2022

Advisory Council Membership 2021/2022

Rowanna Carpenter, University Studies

Emily Ford, Library

Isabel Portillo, World Languages and Literatures

Alex Sager, Philosophy

Becky Sanchez, School of Business Administration

Janelle Voegele, Office of Academic Innovation, Chair

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the Advisory Council focused on the following:

Transition back to campus;

Transition from remote learning to various modalities and flexible models for curriculum and course design;

The role of research as part of PSU's larger mission and vision for the future;

Questions to the Advisory Council from the Secretary to the Faculty on the interpretation of the Faculty Constitution;

Holidays and traditions across diverse faculty and student groups - respect and acknowledgment;

Justice, diversity, equity and inclusion and campus organizational structures;

University planning for financial stability;

Recommendations for safety related to continued COVID strains;

Recommendations put forward by the task force on campus safety;

Career readiness connected to academic curriculum.

Respectfully submitted,

Janelle D. Voegele, Chair