

Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 1 May 2023

Presiding Officer: Rowanna Carpenter

Secretary: Richard Beyler

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

Alternates present: Charles Weber for Anderson, Eowyn Ferey for Mudiamu, Carlos Mena for Raffo.

Senators absent: Baccar, Eastin, Endicott-Popovsky, Hunte.

Ex-officio members present: J. Allen, Beyler, Bowman, Burgess, Bynum, Chabon, Chaillé, Chivers, Comer, Dahlin, Estes, Ford, Harris, Herrera, Jeffords, Knepfle, Lambert, Limbu, Lubitow, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Reitenauer, Sager, Sanchez.

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

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Roll call**
2. **Minutes of 3 April meeting** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
3. **OAA response to April Senate actions** was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
4. **Procedural: Presiding Officer may move or postpone any item** – *Consent Agenda*
An item for nominations for Presiding Officer Elect was inadvertently omitted from the printed agenda. Without objection, it was added after Announcements (after item B.2).

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

CARPENTER thanked those who had attended the Spring Symposium, a conversation about budget issues. Outcomes would be forwarded to incoming President CUDD. The focus was on how to have a more collaborative, inclusive budget process.

CARPENTER announced that Julie Schmidt, Executive Director of AAUP, would be on campus May 17th for a presentation and discussion about shared governance, particularly in the context of current attacks on academic freedom in other states.

CARPENTER reminded members that with an already full agenda for June, it may be necessary to have a continuation of the meeting on June 12th.

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER reviewed procedures for nomination and election of Senate officers. Both current and newly elected senators are eligible for these positions. Voting for officers, at the June meeting, will be by continuing and newly elected senators. Nominations, including self-nominations, may be submitted in writing to the Secretary; nominations will

also be taken from the floor at the next meeting. He urged senators to consider which colleagues they thought would be effective in these positions, and to consider whether they would be willing and able to self-nominate. He noted that the ballot survey for Faculty elections was currently in the field, with the deadline at the end of the week.

Added agenda item

NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

There were no nominations from the floor.

C. DISCUSSION – none

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Eliminate validation for expired graduate coursework (GC) – postponed from April

RAI/EMERY **moved** approval of the policy change to eliminate the validation process for expired graduate credits, as specified in **May Agenda Attachment D.1**.

LUBITOW said that Graduate Council had concerns about the onerous and unequal ways graduate students were validating expired credits. Courtney HANSON and Beth HOLMES (GS) investigated the situation and drafted a proposal, approved by GC, to streamline the process and also reduce faculty labor.

HANSON gave an overview: there is a seven-year age limit on credits for master's degrees (but not for doctoral degrees). There is a process to validate expired credits for three more years: the students take a test, and there is a \$50 fee. Eliminating the validation process would mean that the only way to request use of expired courses would be by petition. Most schools do not have a validation process; some use a petition of some kind. This was the case for ten out of twelve comparators schools. Moreover, the majority of students at PSU who obtain use of expired coursework already do so by petition. There are concerns about equity with two different mechanisms being used to address the same issue. While some departments use the validation process by default, most students are submitting a petition with departmental support, which is less time, effort, and cost. If approved, this change would take effect immediately, though students now already planning to use validation could continue that until Fall 2023.

The elimination of the validation process for expired graduate credits, as specified in **Attachment D.1**, was **approved** (43 yes, 2 no, vote recorded by online survey).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – Consent Agenda

The changes to programs, new courses, changes to courses, dropped courses, courses added to University Studies Junior Clusters, and courses approved for the Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement listed in **May Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of roll call.

2. Intervention for students on academic probation (SSC)

Jennifer DAHLIN (SSC co-chair) gave an overview: ZEISMAN-PEREYO (Director, The Learning Center) approached Scholastic Standards Committee about a potential intervention for students on academic warning. The proposal includes a registration hold

unless completion of academic coaching. Currently, there is no intervention for students on academic probation beyond their being limited to 13 credits for future terms. About 100 students per term fall into this category. The average number of terms for students to return to good standing is 1.76. SSC was in agreement. Their only concern was whether the Learning Center staff is adequately prepared to offer the coaching. ZEISMAN-PEREYO said that they are. Another provision is that students have to achieve a 2.0 [overall] GPA or earn 2.25 in that term to return to good standing.

ZEISMAN-PEREYO said that they found that we are losing students on academic warning. For students on probation, the next step is dismissal, with no stopgaps. The intervention to meet with an academic coach will enable them to turn things around.

HANSON clarified that this is a program for undergraduates, not graduate students.

ZEISMAN-PEREYO continued: academic coaching differs from advising. Advisors help students navigate their path from their entry to PSU to graduation—motivation, study skills, time management. Academic coaches say: How are you doing? What are the barriers? Many different things can trip students up; we can point to resources to deal with barriers they are facing. It's not always academic issues. Coaches know when to refer students to others who are better equipped to deal with specific problems.

THIEMAN wondered if academic coaches mirror the diversity of our undergraduates.

ZEISMAN-PEREYO said they try their best to hire coaches who mirror the student population, and they allow students to choose the coach they would like to meet with.

INGERSOLL/WATANABE **moved** approval of the proposal for intervention for students on academic probation, as specified in **May Agenda Attachment E.2**.

The academic intervention proposal given in **May Agenda Attachment E.2** was **approved** (42 yes, 3 no, 1 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

3. Study abroad and in-residence credits requirement (ARC)

KELLEY/INGERSOLL **moved** approval of the policy change on how study-abroad credits may be used to meet the requirement for in-residence credits for undergraduate degrees, as specified in **May Agenda Attachment E.3**.

Academic Requirements Committee Chair WATANABE said that this proposal came to ARC from the Education Abroad Office of OGEI. The concept is to put a limit of 45 credits—about one year—applied from student abroad programs to degree requirements. This is motivated by Federal scholarship and financial aid guidelines. At the same time, the proposal looks at the in-residence credit requirement: 45 of the last 75 credits have to be taken at PSU. If the study abroad is a program that has an agreement with PSU, the restriction does not apply.

MATLICK clarified that there is an important distinction in the types of study abroad programs. Study abroad led by PSU faculty (internal programs) will continue to not have an [in-residence] restriction on them. The consideration here is about non-PSU faculty programs. For financial aid reasons, most students don't go over the limit. It is therefore a kind of bookkeeping to ensure this, necessary for accreditation and financial aid reasons. These credits will then be excluded from the PSU in-residence requirement, which ensures that students who want to do study abroad can do so.

The policy regarding study abroad and the in-residence credits requirement stated in **May Agenda Attachment E.3** was **approved** (unanimously, vote recorded by online survey).

4. **Proposed constitutional amendment: University Writing Council Charge**

CARPENTER reminded senators that the proposed amendment to the Faculty Constitution [**May Agenda Attachment E.4**] would be introduced today and voted on at the next meeting.

University Writing Council Chair COMER said that currently the Council is tasked with a vague set of supervisory functions. PSU has a very decentralized writing ecology. We are operating as a writing across the curriculum campus, but without a writing across the curriculum program or coordinator. This issue comes up in external reviews and action plans by the University. In the absence of a coordinator, which we do not anticipate having, we are trying to have UWC become a body that can ensure we continue to make improvements and, specifically, updating the University's writing requirement and courses that fulfill that requirement. The current charge lacks mechanisms or procedures to audit writing intensive courses (WIC) and decide how we can support them.

Many colleagues, COMER knew, find the PSU writing requirement inscrutable, because general education writing happens in three separate units, and very differently for different students. This results in many petitions; both advisors and students can be confused. The proposal works towards shared authority over that general education [writing] curriculum rather than a siloed curriculum. They would like to develop a mission and vision for writing at PSU, with a coherent requirement and revitalized WIC program. They wish to revise the charge so that UWC has the power to make recommendations to Faculty Senate to ensure that students have adequate and even excellent writing instruction at PSU.

A Senator commented that the proposal seemed similar to that for the Race and Ethnic Studies Committee. COMER agreed. She noted also that the revision would ensure that the Library and Honors College would be represented on UWC.

5. **Resolution calling for shared governance in critical decisions** (Steering)

WILKINSON introduced the resolution calling for shared governance in critical decisions [**May Agenda Attachment E.5**] on behalf of Faculty Senate Steering Committee. It is in response to what Steering sees as a lack of shared governance, including a lack of consultation and communication with relevant stakeholders in two recent decisions: the decision to remove the COVID vaccine requirement and the decision to move to armed patrols for campus police officers. Steering worried that this lack of communication around decision making erodes trust between faculty and administration, and moves us in the wrong direction in regard to strengthening shared governance practices at PSU.

The resolution, WILKINSON continued, calls on the current and future PSU administration to engage in more collaborative governance practices when making decisions that affect the campus community, make sure we engage with relevant stakeholders, provide adequate information, and collaborate with relevant oversight bodies such as the University Public Safety Oversight Committee. The resolution calls on UPSOC to report to Faculty Senate in Fall 2023 on the [Campus Public Safety Office's]

progress toward resuming unarmed patrols, and other proactive measures related to campus public safety.

CLARK/WATANABE **moved** approval of the resolution on shared governance in critical decision making stated **May Agenda Attachment E.5**.

ZEISMAN-PEREYO asked if the resolution was in any sense enforceable. CARPENTER said a resolution like this is helpful in terms of conversations with administrators. It indicates that this is something the Senate has said, not just the PO or other particular individuals. It carries weight. Enforceable, maybe not, but it means we have made ourselves clear. WILKINSON added that there is at least one concrete action we can follow up with: the report from UPSOC. It is mainly a means of support as we move forward with our incoming President.

THIEMAN appreciated this resolution to support shared governance. She wondered, though, about times when critical decisions needed to be made quickly. The campus security decision was made, she understood, after a series of incidents, and to her understanding there was extensive communication. How can we have communication and also recognize the timeliness of some decisions that have to be made for public safety? WILKINSON acknowledged the value of the question. Even when you have to make quick decisions, there can be [more or less] transparency and clarity about the data.

REITENAUER: There may have been necessity to make a quick decision, but UPSOC was not consulted nor informed until the decision had already been made. How to handle emergent situations is a good question, but in this precipitating case there was a breakdown in consultation and sharing of information.

CHORPENNING: No one on Steering disputes the right of University administrators to make critical decisions quickly, if need be. In this instance, it's unclear the extent to which CPSO patrolled unarmed since 2020. Also it's reported that the decision was made in February, and then communicated to us in April. That issue is central to the resolution. It is a critical decision. He had heard from students who decided to attend PSU because had unarmed patrols. This is Senate saying, please let's proceed more carefully.

CARPENTER added that part of the intent is to strengthen the role of bodies like UPSOC so that can play the oversight role they were designed to do.

FORD said that neither of these decisions was brought to Advisory Council, an elected body that exists to give advice to the President.

JAÉN PORTILLO said there is a misconception that shared governance is fine until we need to make a decision quickly, and then we can put it on the side. In fact, there are very fast ways for the administration to consult with Steering Committee and for Steering Committee to put into motion communication with other governance bodies. Consultation and collaboration are essential in the University.

The resolution on shared governance in making critical decisions, stated in **May Agenda Attachment E.5**, was **approved** (40 yes, 4 no, 2 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

Before proceeding to reports, CARPENTER noted that the business items and consent agenda represented the work of five different Faculty committees. She wished to call

attention to this work going on often behind the scenes. She thanked all those who helped bring the work forward.

F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

G. REPORTS

1. President's report

PERCY appreciated the Symposium last week. We are on the way to thinking about planning and budgeting, he believed. Clearly people want information to be able to digest it. We need to create dashboards or explanations. He also appreciated the conversation today about decision making: situations where you have little time to make a critical decision, but also want to consult with people. Something we can do is figure out key groups to regularly consult in certain situations. Some consultations may need to be confidential. He appreciated conversations with the PO and POE.

Regarding campus patrols, PERCY said, a lesson learned is that despite his best efforts and those of his communications team, not everyone came away with an understanding that this is not meant to be permanent. Our policy on unarmed patrols remains in place, but supervisors can make decisions to respond to circumstances. He was aware of and concerned about the impact this has on people. We are committed to going back to unarmed patrols. He will communicate that preference to the next administration. He will be meeting with [CPSO] Chief HALLIBURTON regularly every two weeks. Also he is meeting once a month with UPSOC. They have been working mostly independently, but he was sure they will be willing and able to meet with him. He would make a change in the UPSOC charter to say that they will be consulted if there is a new policy or any significant change in practice. In a case like this we would go to UPSOC go get feedback and share information. They operate confidentially.

PERCY said he is fast-tracking communication with the Reimagine Campus Public Safety Committee. This includes cyber-security. He urged everyone to complete the training, a notice of which went out recently. Following on a suggestion from the Reimagine group, he would be introducing training on what to do in a bystander or observer situation—how to be safe for self and colleagues.

CPSO has changed their staffing, PERCY noted, to concentrate armed patrol officers in evening and weekend shifts and deploy the unarmed patrols for the day shifts. They are working with the Portland Policy Bureau to enhance their response. They continue to work on lighting and safety features. They are working to increase vitality downtown.

There were good conversations at the Symposium, PERCY said, though there will be many more after that. We can work on transparency: what do people want to know? Then we can find processes to bring that forward. The report, which we will get soon, he will share with the Executive Council, but also invite others to look at it and provide input.

PERCY said is working with a group to get over impediments to interdisciplinary connectivity. An ad-hoc committee a couple of years ago had a very important report. One barrier in the instructional area has been aggregation of student credit hours. He was pleased to say, thanks to work of David BURGESS and the OIRP team, there is a new system that aggregates SCH by the unit that offers the course. It would be available in Banner, he believed. It will become easier and follow and summarize this information.

One of the best things to do as President, PERCY said, had occurred this past week when he signed many promotions, tenure decisions, and continuous appointments. There are wonderful people giving to the institution. He congratulated everyone that did it.

PERCY announced that they are in the final stages of recruiting a new Executive Director for Tribal Liaisons. Earlier today HECC has sponsored a wonderful event looking for strategies to create wrap-around support for the academic achievement of our Native American and Indigenous students. It's morally what we need to do, and is also good for us in many different ways. At PSU we have the largest number of Native American / Indigenous students of any Oregon public university, but we hope for more. Scholarship support from the legislature is an exciting development.

PERCY noted the recent and upcoming visits of finalists for Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies. It is a strong set of candidates. He thanked Jason PODRABSKY for his work as Interim Vice President. PERCY wanted to continue the positive movement in our research. He will be working with the new {resident to make sure the appointment is someone [CUDD] feels can be effective in the job.

PERCY appreciated the attention given to AAUP bringing someone to campus to take about academic freedom. Every month he is on a Zoom call with presidents of other urban universities. They talked about what's happening. What are you doing? What strategies do you have? In the last two meetings, the conversation has been largely about states seeing major criticisms of DEI work, questions about what can taught in in the curriculum, and possibly abandoning tenure. These are challenging times for academic freedom PERCY said. It is a dangerous trend, and we need to pay attention to it.

RAI offered thanks for the SCH work; it is a big deal. PERCY said he understood the concerns, but the solution was very technical, working through the HR system.

KELLEY asked if more information would be shared about interdisciplinary work since the report a couple of years ago. PERCY: Yes, a group is putting together a report that he can bring to you, including some proactive efforts going forward. There's a lot of work to be done—for example, [is it] campus-level promotion and tenure guidelines that recognize interdisciplinary work, or do departments do that? We should talk about how to get support people, how to apportion workload. How do we find people to do the work? Can we use technology to build community? How do we find ways to make community that don't involve a long survey—to be able to say: I'm interested in what you're doing; it relates to my work. KELLEY: Some in the room are hitting on these issues—for example, the Sustainable Food Systems Certificate. There are structural things that make that work hard. Students are coming, even without any marketing. PERCY noted that when he was Dean of Urban and Public Affairs they created an undergraduate degree to which all departments contributed. Another example is Emergency Management and Community Resilience. The challenge is, who does the administration, marketing, etc.? If we don't figure that out, it can fall apart quickly.

RUTH asked what the university presidents are saying about what is going on in Texas and Florida, and about attempts to abolish tenure in Texas and Georgia. What can be done? Christina Paxson, President of Brown University, wrote an opinion piece in the *New York Times* about how this is an assault on academic freedom. There are discussions around the Calvin Report, in which many presidents, chancellors, and administrators are

in effect saying we have to maintain neutrality. But the report itself says that if something is undermining the mission of a university, then presidents should speak up. Have they discussed a petition? She knew there was a range of attitudes. PERCY believed some presidents are being coached to keep a low profile, which is frustrating to them. They are trying to figure out if these things have legs or not, what is contentious in state legislatures. They are very worried. If DEI work is problematic, for example, can it be done in a different way? Judith RAMALEY hold him of an organization of former university presidents, which he will be joining, trying to speak to these things. RUTH: PEN America is organizing that.

SAGER noted that we have an interdisciplinary general education program, with faculty from cross campus, in many disciplines, which should be part of the conversation.

2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS joined PERCY in acknowledging the impressive dossiers of faculty going forward for promotion this year. The opportunity to read the dossiers is a wonderful chance to look across the institution and see the extraordinary work being done in department, unit, programs, in all parts of the University. She finds it affirming about the value of the work we do and the quality of the experiences that we can offer students. She congratulated everyone who successfully achieved promotion, and also thanked all those who participated in the process by reviewing, providing feedback, writing letters—a team of hundreds of people who participate in the process annually. It is one of the high points of the year, JEFFORDS said, to read all the files.

Apropos of the search for VP-RGS mentioned earlier, JEFFORDS noted that they let each candidate know that if they are interested in the position they must be able to support and enhance interdisciplinary research. She was excited to have strong finalists.

Other searches underway, JEFFORDS said, are Dean of the School of Public Health, which result they hope to announce soon; and Dean of the Library, beginning in the fall. She thanked Michael BOWMAN, who has done an exceptional job as Interim Dean, and who generously agreed to stay on until they are able to complete the appointment.

JEFFORDS wished to clarify an issue which had come up in conversations with the Presiding Officer. We use the term “program review” in two different ways. One was as a component of the Program Review and Reduction Process [PRRP]. A second way throughout the history of the institution was the cyclical review for each department, which is one of the chief ways we can affirm to our accreditors that we are actively engaged in assessment and making continuous improvement in our academic programs. Generally these take place every seven years; they are detailed, thorough, deliberative, and reflective. They also take an enormous amount of time, and not everyone saw an immediate value. They were put on hiatus during the pandemic. Prior to that Gigi HARRIS as a Provost's Fellow did a scan of other institutions' practices and provided a report. She would now like to take up this practice again, working collaboratively with Senate to make the process more meaningful for academic units.

JEFFORDS said her office is finalizing the report on PRRP. They are in the middle of thinking about how to appoint two Provost's Fellows who can help share the knowledge and learning of that process.

JEFFORDS called attention to programs that OAI is putting together on AI and ChatGPT. She herself had been learning much about how it can be used, both positively and negatively, in higher education.

In the OAA budget process, JEFFORDS reported, they have completed all the IPEB [Integrated Planning for Enrollment and Budget] with the units, with the participation of the Faculty Budget Committee. They have received guidance from FADM relating to overall budget reductions. As of now, the overall budget reduction for OAA for FY 24 is just over \$3 million. We carry forward a deficit from this year's budget, to which that is added, bringing us to \$14.3 million that we are funding from reserves. That's a big number, so we will have some challenges going ahead.

3. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

SAGER recalled to senators the presentation about Transfer Council [at the April meeting]. PSU is a transfer-friendly institution. He had heard that some universities have had to change the credit structure because it doesn't align with the community colleges, or even upend their general education. There have been concerns about degree programs where prerequisites are needed. SAGER thought there had been a lot of good work. If your department is one with one of the common big transfer courses, there are opportunities almost weekly to participate in these conversations or attend meetings, to see what HECC is doing and look for our needs at the University.

Another major topic at IFS, and indeed around the country, SAGER reported, is university boards. There have been some institutions and some states where boards have taken troubling actions, IFS colleagues are concerned about these actions. There have been interesting developments around adding a graduate student and a second undergraduate student to boards. There was a conversation about governance in our own board, which he was heartened to hear.

A third topic, which SAGER found potentially concerning, because we have not figured out the implications, is that community colleges can now grant applied baccalaureate degrees. For example, Chemeketa is offering a leadership and management degree; Mt. Hood, cybersecurity; Lane, business. There have been questions about oversight. Do these programs get input from the universities? His understanding is that this has been a HECC[-driven] process. There has recently been representation from the Provosts Council. We have a [relatively] small pool of students in Oregon, and we are competing for the same students. There is an incentive for some of the community colleges to offer these applied baccalaureates; meanwhile, for many of our rural colleagues, they are already having trouble finding faculty to teach in some of these programs, and are being stretched even thinner. There is reason to think, SAGER said, that there should be more coordination between community colleges and universities.

In this connection, SAGER announced, IFS passed a motion in support of bridge funding for technical and regional universities. He was interested to learn that PSU is considered to be among the regionals. At University of Oregon and Oregon State, enrollment is going up; at the other four-year institutions, enrollment is going down. The resolution was in response to significant layoffs and large budget cuts, especially at Western Oregon and Southern Oregon universities. There was recognition at IFS that these regional institutions serve many otherwise underserved students, and they are hurting—in crisis.

SAGER said there had been interesting conversations around dual credit programs. We have Senior Inquiry through University Studies, the Challenge Program, and various summer camps where high school students can get university credit. The issue is how full credit is distributed. Much of it is provided for community colleges, and depends on which school district you go to. There are many places not served by dual credit. How can we provide more access throughout the state?

Another conversation, SAGER said, is about higher education in prisons. Pell grants have returned for incarcerated students—a major change, since they were eliminated in the '90s. There have been efforts throughout Oregon, but largely at Portland State. There is a 2+2 program with Chemeketa and PCC, and PSU will be the only four-year institution that's ready for Pell [in this kind of program]. The Department of Corrections is proving technology, and there's a move to offer online classes, which would be a game-changer.

4. Monthly report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment

REITENAUER (Co-Chair of AHC-APRCA) said she did not have so much a report as an update on where the committee is going. She and Co-Chair ESTES developed a critical reflection that they invited current and past members of the committee to complete, as well as faculty and chairs from all of the units involved in Phases II and III of PRRP. They received a robust response. They will analyze the data for themes, and draft a report for discussion with committee members next week.

REITENAUER said that she and ESTES had been approached, not in the context of the group meeting, by a faculty member who felt that their unit was being pressured to effectively go through a reduction process in ways that circumvent Senate processes. They have been in further conversation with CARPENTER.

REITENAUER stated that AHC-APRCA has not been apprised of what has happened with the fifth unit that was part of Phase III. The clock running down on this academic year, there is some concern about what will ultimately happen, the more so after reading the reflection submitted by the chair of that unit.

CLARK was concerned about the program [alluded to as being pressured into reductions]: was the pressure internally or externally motivated? REITENAUER: How are you defining internal and external? It was reported to her that the communication came from the Dean; she did not know if it originated someplace else.

LA ROSA asked where comments or questions can be submitted for the final report. REITENAUER said they could be sent to her. The survey form was emailed to the chairs of the units involved, and chairs were asked to share it with interested faculty.

DONLAN thanked REITENAUER for responding to faculty, from his position as Vice President for Grievances and Academic Freedom with AAUP. He was approached by faculty members who were very concerned.

KELLEY said that REITENAUER's remarks gave her pause. The Provost talked about the other kind of program review that we will be enmeshed in; [it feels as though] we have to go through this all again. She was also concerned about the Provost's Fellows who are supposedly contributing to the report. The narrative about transparency is a lot of broken mirrors. Who are the fellows, and how is that communicated? She was in one of

the five Phase III units, and this was the first she had heard about it. It was problematic that other units not involved in the process to begin with were now feeling pressure.

BURGESS noted that the cyclical program review mentioned by JEFFORDS was something we'd been doing for fifteen or twenty years. All programs cycle through every seven years. It's a peer review process for the department. Departments can ask for whatever metrics they want; it's driven by the department, not the Provost's office. It's not a new process. KELLEY was familiar with it. Her point was that we have a process which is in line with shared governance. Then a section of campus had to go through this other process, and probably will be asked to do it again. BURGESS: The Provost's Fellows we have also had for many years. They don't always study program review; they study whatever—either the Provost gives them a brief, or they pursue something they're interested in. CARPENTER said there are two things happening: Provost's Fellows chosen as described, and then Provost's Fellows coming out of PRRP. She gave feedback to the Provost that the terminology was confusing that then we have to be clear what we are talking about. PERCY noted that program review [in the sense described] does not evaluate budgetary matters; also, some accrediting bodies require specialized evaluation. He conceded that the terminology might have been confusing.

CARPENTER noted that Steering has been discussing issues around budget and curriculum, and specifically situations in which budget reductions make certain programs impossible to deliver. Appropriately, we should go through shared governance to reduce or eliminate programs. Steering continues to push on this issue.

5. Annual Report of Scholastic Standards Committee – *Consent Agenda*

The Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee [**May Agenda Attachment G.5**] was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*

H. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:02 p.m.