Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting

Academic and Student Recreation Center (ARSC) - PSU Urban Plaza
University Conference Room - 515
1800 SW 6th Avenue, Portland, OR 97201
Wednesday, 6/22/2016
2:00 - 5:00 PM PT

1. Call to Order / Roll / Declaration of Quorum (2:00 p.m. to 2:05 p.m.)
   Standing
   Presented by: Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair

2. 5-11-16 ASAC Meeting Notes (2:05 p.m. to 2:10 p.m.)
   Approval
   Presented by: Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair
   ASAC Meeting Minutes 5-11-16 DRAFT - Page 2

3. Equity Lens Case Study (2:10 p.m. to 2:40 p.m.)
   Presentation and Discussion
   Presented by: Carmen Suarez, Vice President, Global Diversity & Inclusion
   Multnomah County Equity Lens Website Link - Page 5
   PSU Draft Strategic Planning Equity Lens - Page 6
   Equity Lens Assessment Tool - May 2016 - Page 12
   Equity Lens Case Study - May 2016 - Page 14

4. Comprehensive Campaign / Big Idea Status Report (2:40 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.)
   Discussion
   Presented by: Sona Andrews, Provost

5. Review of Timeline for Consolidated Strategic Plan Sub-Initiatives (3:00 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.)
   Presentation and Discussion
   Presented by: Sona Andrews, Provost
   PSU Strategic Plan - ASAC Proposed Timing - Page 15

6. Student/Faculty Presentations at Meetings (3:40 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.)
   Discussion
   Presented by: Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair

7. Faculty Senate Academic Quality Taskforce (4:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.)
   Presentation and Discussion
   Presented by: Linda George, Chair, Faculty Senate Task Force on Academic Quality and Professor, Environmental Science Management and Chair,
   Academic Quality Taskforce Presentation - Page 17
MEETING NOTES

Committee members present: Chair Margaret Kirkpatrick, Sho Dozono, Maude Hines, Maria Carolina Gonzalez-Prats, Sona Andrews (ex-officio, non-voting), John Fraire (ex-officio, non-voting), and Lindsay Stewart

Committee members not present: Vice Chair Swati Adarkar, Pete Nickerson, and Wim Wiewel (ex-officio, non-voting)

Committee staff present: David Reese and Vanelda Hopes

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL/DECLARATION OF QUORUM
Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee (ASAC), called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. General Counsel Reese, Secretary to the Board, declared a quorum was present. The meeting was convened.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES—ACTION
Action: Trustee Maude Hines moved that the committee approve the minutes from the March 4, 2016 ASAC meeting. Trustee Sho Dozono seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM: BA/BS IN URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Provost Andrews presented the proposal for a new Bachelor in Urban and Public Affairs. College of Urban and Public Affairs Dean Steve Percy, Associate Dean Sy Adler, and Professor Kevin Kecskes responded to questions and explained how the program was designed to be an interdisciplinary program focused on the preparation for active and effective participation in urban and public affairs. This new flexible degree program has a less traditional target audience of students who have completed a substantial portion of their undergraduate requirements and who may have either geographic or time restraints with completing a degree.

Action: Trustee Sho Dozono moved to approve the BA/BS in Urban and Public Affairs. Trustee Maude Hines seconded the motion. The proposal was approved unanimously for advancement to the Provosts Council and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

4. COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN BIG IDEAS REVIEW
Provost Andrews provided an overview of PSU’s Comprehensive Campaign Themes: Creating Futures, Vibrant Communities, and Thriving Economies; and the current Big Ideas that are being developed with input from the PSU Foundation Board.

Action: Provost Andrews to provide a status report on the Big Ideas at the June 22, 2016 Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting.
**Action:** Provost Andrews to provide the Academic and Student Affairs Committee with draft case statements after they are revised in the fall.

5. **PSU STRATEGIC PLAN SUB-INITIATIVE REVIEW**

After the March 4, 2016 Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting, committee members were asked to identify which 10 PSU Strategic Plan Sub-Initiatives in Goals 1, 2, and 4 were most important for committee engagement. The sub-initiatives identified by the committee, Vice President Fraire and Provost Andrews were discussed. Provost Andrews agreed to consolidate the sub-initiatives the committee would like to pursue for further discussion at the June 22, 2016 meeting.

**Action:** Provost Andrews to consolidate the PSU Strategic Plan sub-initiatives for Academic and Student Affairs Committee engagement into categories for discussion at the June 22, 2016 meeting.

**Action:** Provost Andrews and Vice President Fraire to provide the committee with a timeline of which categories/sub-initiatives they recommend the committee review first.

**Action:** Provost Andrews to invite the Faculty Senate Task Force on Academic Quality to present at the June 22, 2016 Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting.

**Action:** General Counsel Reese to order additional copies of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) Effective Committee Series on academic affairs and student affairs committees.

**Action:** General Counsel Reese to review the AGB Effective Committee Series on academic affairs and student affairs committees, and to share ways that the ASAC can engage with the university at the June 22, 2016 meeting.

**Action:** Vice President Carmen Suarez to be invited to a future ASAC meeting to discuss the equity lens and how it was applied to the PSU Strategic Plan.

6. **ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE CHARTER**

General Counsel Reese explained the history of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee Charter, and noted that it was based on the Association of Governing Boards’ template and was approved at the board’s first meeting. General Counsel Reese will remove the references to the university compact and the creation/closure of degree programs, and will research how ASA committees have oversight over athletic programs.

**Action:** General Counsel Reese to research ASAC charters of other Oregon and Coalition of Urban Serving universities and bring an updated draft for review to the June 22, 2016 meeting.

**Action:** General Counsel Reese to research how ASA committees are involved in the oversight of university athletic programs for discussion at a future committee meeting.

7. **OTHER AND ADJOURNMENT**

Portland State University and University of Oregon signed a memorandum of understanding regarding the University of Oregon’s proposal to create a new Sports Products Design Program in Portland.

Portland State University and regional business leaders have formed the College Affordability and Success Coalition to develop a plan to raise a minimum of $25 million a year for need-based scholarships and other
forms of student support. President Wiewel will co-chair the committee with Greg Ness, Chairman, President and CEO of The Standard.

Trustee Gonzalez-Prats asked if there was a written summary of the trustee meetings with the faculty of Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies. Provost Andrews stated that they were in the form of brief emails and had been sent to those attending.

Trustee Gonzalez-Prats reminded the committee that Dr. Cornel Pewewardy, Director of Indigenous Nation Studies would like to invite the board of trustees to tour the Native American Student and Community Center, and meet with the Native student group UISHE and various members of the Native Indigenous Alliance to discuss their concerns and applaud supportive initiatives at PSU. Maria Carolina will provide the date of the meeting to the committee once it is available.

A special board meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 25, 2016 from 10:00 a.m. to Noon in the fifth floor boardroom (Room 515) of the Academic and Student Recreation Center. The trustees will hear from students and address questions and concerns.

The Governor will appoint a new student board member to replace Trustee Gonzalez-Prats whose term ends on June 30, 2016. The new board member will be appointed by the end of May.

With no further comments or questions from the committee, Trustee Kirkpatrick adjourned the meeting.
Multnomah County Equity Lens Website Link:
https://multco.us/diversity-equity/equity-and-empowerment-lens

Please review for useful framing of what an equity lens is and what it is used for.
Strategic Planning Equity Lens

Based on a suggestion by Dr. Charlotte Goodluck, the Project Support Team has created an Equity Lens through which we may review both the strategic planning process and its eventual outputs. In order to design our lens using the best and most current thinking on the subject, we have enlisted the help of a small group of experts from within the PSU community and other regional experts. This advisory group includes Ann Curry-Stevens, Ashley Horne, Carlos Crespo, Chas Lopez, Cornel Pewewardy, Steve Percy, Veronica Dujon, Yves Labissiere, Ann Marie Fallon, and Sonali Balajee.

In building a review process, this group—or some subset thereof—will serve as an Advisory Panel that will review the answers to our Equity Lens questions around race/ethnicity, and will suggest revisions or actions for improvement. An additional Advisory Panel will be formed to perform the same task to address additional marginalized communities including (but not limited to) persons with disabilities, women, transgender and gender non-conforming persons, and those in the LGBTQ community.

What follows is the set of equity questions that we propose be asked of the plan and the process. While we understand that simply answering these questions may be insufficient to address actual inequities, their challenging nature should shape thinking and planning in a positive direction, and will result in a plan that is more balanced than it would have been otherwise.

It will be important to track the equity outcomes of this plan—that is, to measure the actual impacts in terms of student, faculty and community outcomes, as well as smaller but still significant domains such as changes in behavior, attitude, capacity-building, resource allocation, and decision-making. Because the work of the Strategic Plan Development Team will be completed and the team will be dissolved, it will be important that the Topic Team on Equity, Opportunity, and Access recommend a mechanism by which these outcomes can be measured on an ongoing basis, so that the resulting data may be used for future iterations of PSU’s strategic plan.

This approach borrows heavily from the Multnomah County Equity and Empowerment Lens, and from the Protocol for Culturally Responsive Organizations by Ann Curry-Stevens, Marie-Elena Reyes & the Coalition of Communities of Color.
Foci of the Lenses

We have identified the importance of implementing a set of Equity Lens questions asked about race/ethnicity separately from the questions asked about other groups that may be affected, including non-dominant gender identities, LGBTQ status, and people with disabilities. While the same questions will be asked for each grouping, the separation of the answers will allow our two advisory panels to apply their specific expertise to the answers, allowing for a more thorough and thoughtful process:

› Race/ethnicity
› Women, transgender and gender non-conforming persons, those in the LGBTQ community, persons with disabilities, and other marginalized communities that the team identifies as significant

Guiding Principles

This Equity Lens supports attending to equity issues throughout the work of Strategic Planning. It will also infuse the processes selected for operationalizing our work sessions, and the substantive areas being focused on in each team’s work—including those elements not included in the work. We also recognize that equity is a larger societal construct (alongside inequity), and that prevailing disparities in issues such as education, income, employment, occupation and health have traditionally been reinforced by institutions of higher education.

In accordance with these challenges, we have designed a set of required questions that each formal working unit of Strategic Planning will need to answer.

We begin with a set of guiding principles that we ask each team to adhere to:

• PSU has a commitment to narrow racial disparities in society, and advance social justice
• At PSU, equity is given the same emphasis as other university priorities
• PSU is committed to ensuring that its Strategic Plan reflects the interests of those most affected by our decisions: our students, their future employers, and the service users, customers and/or communities they will ultimately serve
• PSU is cautious of making decisions on behalf of marginalized communities and aims to directly include these communities and their advocates wherever practical. Decisions to not include these stakeholders need to be justified
• PSU aims to create a strategic plan, and the processes that lead up to it, that maximizes the benefits for communities of color and for other marginalized communities
Equity Lens for the Project Support Team

The purpose of the Equity Lens for the Project Support Team is to ensure that the process of strategic planning is deliberately inclusive and that process decisions are evaluated to identify where there are opportunities for greater empowerment, and also to identify when the process has failed to live up to the promise of equity.

The Equity Lens for the Project Support Team questions will be answered by the Project Support Team—once at the mid-point of the process, and again near the end of the process. These questions will be asked twice: first considering race/ethnicity, then a second time for all other groups, including those with non-dominant gender identities (women, transgender and gender non-conforming people), LGBTQ status, and people with disabilities, plus additional marginalized communities the Team sees as important to address. The answers to these questions will be reviewed by each of the Advisory Panels, and suggestions for improvement or mitigation will be returned.

People

- How have we adequately ensured that our operational processes are inclusive, and that the elements of the process have not created barriers to meaningful participation?
- Which stakeholder groups would we like to have included but were unable to facilitate?

Place

- On the basis of PSU’s social, physical and cultural location, how does this process compensate for access limitations of various stakeholder groups?
- How have we modified our process to support access by marginalized community stakeholders?

Process

- How are our processes supporting the empowerment of communities historically most affected by inequities?
- How are processes ensuring that participants’ emotional and physical safety needs are addressed?
- How are processes supporting participants’ need to be productive and feel valued?
- How are our process building ongoing community capacity for involvement with PSU (beyond the strategic planning process) by those communities historically most affected by inequities?
- How are we using this opportunity to contribute to the leadership development of those from marginalized communities?
- What types of biases have influenced the work of the groups and how have these been identified and addressed?
- What improvements to team processes can you support for naming and identifying unaddressed bias?
• What have we learned about effective empowerment practice that we recommend being continued by PSU in other program and initiative development processes?
• What recommendations do we suggest for the future work of PSU?

Equity Lens for the Topic Teams & SPDT

The purpose of the Equity Lens for the Topic Teams & SPDT is to ensure that each specific element of the plan (such as vision and mission) and each initiative proposed intentionally creates a future for PSU that advances equity for historically marginalized groups.

The Equity Lens for the Topic Teams & SPDT questions will be answered by the working groups who formulate each part of the plan. In some cases, this will be the entire SPDT, in other cases it may be a small working group. Each of the Topic Teams will also be asked to answer these lens questions. Like the Process questions, these questions will be asked twice: first considering race/ethnicity, then a second time for all other groups, including gender identity, LGBTQ, and people with disabilities. The answers to these questions will be reviewed by the respective Advisory Panels, and suggestions for improvement or mitigation will be returned.

People
• Who is affected—positively, negatively, or not at all—by the elements of this part of the strategic plan and what are the specific advantages and/or barriers to each group?
• How have we considered environmental justice in this (initiative/plan element)—that is, how will these initiatives support the rights of all people to live in a healthy environment?

Process
• How does this (initiative/plan element) foster the development of processes that address barriers to inclusion and contribute to the development of community capacity?

Power

The Equity, Opportunity and Access team needs to consider which demographic groups have the greatest need for greater inclusion and which steps PSU as a whole should take to mitigate these needs. Each Topic Team will also be asked to answer these questions, tied to each initiative proposed:
• How will this (initiative/plan element) support the empowerment of people from historically marginalized communities?
• What are the specific ways that this (initiative/plan element) is expected to reduce disparities and advance social justice?

Implementation/Documentation

1. Decisions made during the planning process will be by a general consensus model, with opportunities for dissenting opinions to also become part of the plan.
2. Efforts are expected to equalize participation of those at the table.
3. Efforts are expected to ensure voices of stakeholders not at the table are gathered and that these perspectives have influence in the process.
4. Two Equity Advisory Panels (as described at the beginning of this document) will assist the Project Support Team in vetting the Equity Lens process, and in ensuring that it is adequately applied to both the process and the resulting plan.
5. The answers to all Equity Lens questions will be included as part of the strategic plan documentation. The Advisory Panels will review portions of the plan as they are completed, and will provide guidance as to whether the Equity Lens has been adequately applied. In some cases, this may necessitate outreach to an affected community to ensure that the community’s concerns are addressed.
6. When the answers to the questions highlight an inequity that may result from the implementation of that portion of the plan, the team working on that portion will be asked to provide mitigation measures, which will also be included in the plan documentation.
7. To the degree that results may fall short, minority reports will serve as a complaint process to highlight where the plan or the process has not lived up to the ideal, and may make recommendations for future processes or initiatives.

Definitions

Equity
Empowerment
Environmental Justice
Gender non-conforming
LGBTQ
Communities of color
Community wellbeing
Community capacity
Marginalized communities
Equity Lens Assessment Tool(s)

Below are the current equity lens questions for use in planning, decision-making and implementation for policies, practices, and programs. These are a guide only, and there may be other factors to consider.

The first section, titled “racial equity lens” is an appropriate starting place for any group.

The second set of equity lens questions provide more global considerations, in addition to specific, and speak to macro issues such as policy as well as individual project, program or micro issue decision making, action and implementation.

These questions come from the PSU strategic planning process document, Portland State 20/20 Strategic Planning Equity Lens.

The Lens is an ever evolving tool for decision making, that changes as our constructs and understandings change.

**Basic Racial Equity Lens** (From a Home for Everyone)

1. What is the policy, program or decision under review?
2. What group(s) experience disparities related to this policy, program or decision? Are they at the table? (If not, why)
3. How might the policy, program or decision affect the group(s)? How might it be perceived by the group(s)?
4. Does the policy, program or decision improve, worsen, or make no change to existing disparities? Please elaborate. Does it result in systemic change that addresses institutional racism?
5. Does the policy, program, or decision produce any intentional benefits or unintended consequences for the affected group(s)?
6. Based on the above responses, what are the possible revisions to the policy, program, or decision under review?
7. What next step is recommended and how will it be advanced?

**Multi-Dimension Equity Lens**
(Broad inclusion of multiple as well as intersecting historically marginalized groups and underserved populations)

**People**

- How have we adequately ensured that our operational processes are inclusive and that elements of the process have not created barriers to meaningful participation?
Which stakeholder groups would we like to have included but were unable to facilitate?

Who is affected—positively, negatively, or not at all—by this decision, process, and actions? List positives and negatives.

What are the specific ways this decision, process, or action, etc. is expected to reduce disparities and advance social justice?

How have you intentionally involved stakeholders who are also members of the communities affected by the strategic investment or resource allocation? How do you validate your assessment?

**Place**

On the basis of PSU’s social, physical and cultural location, how does this process compensate for access limitations of various stakeholder groups?

How have we modified our process to support access by marginalized community stakeholders?

**Process**

How are our processes supporting the empowerment of communities historically most affected by inequities?

How are processes ensuring that participants’ emotional and physical safety needs are addressed?

How are processes supporting participants’ need to be productive and feel valued?

How are our processes building ongoing community capacity for involvement with PSU (beyond the strategic planning process) by those communities historically most affect by inequities?

How are we using this opportunity to contribute to the leadership development of those from marginalized communities?

What types of biases have influenced the work of the groups and how have these been identified and addressed?

What improvements to team processes can you support for naming and identifying unaddressed bias?

What have we learned about effective empowerment practice that we recommend being continued by PSU in other program and initiative development processes?

What recommendations do we suggest for the future work of PSU

What are the barriers to more equitable outcomes? (E.g. mandated, political, financial, programmatic, or managerial)
Macro OAA Case Study

Portland State has over 23,000 undergraduate students and over 5,500 graduate students. We offer over 200 degrees (90+ bachelors, 80+ Masters and 35+ Doctoral programs).

Our strategic plan, Goal #1, Initiative #4 calls for: **Designing and offering academic programs that lead to future success.** Specifically:

4.1 Develop an academic plan with programs that prepare students for competitive advantage in life and career.
4.2 Provide flexible degrees to accommodate the diverse needs of students.
4.3 Assess opportunities for innovative academic programs that align with career paths, locally and globally.
4.4 Increase opportunities for students to participate in scholarly activities, research efforts and creative endeavors. Initiative.

New academic programs at PSU go through a rigorous shared governance approval process. They are recommended for approval to the Provost by the academic department(s), college curriculum committee(s), dean(s), Educational Policy Committee, Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate. The Provost in turn 1) seeks approval from the PSU Board of Trustees, 2) a recommendation from the Statewide Provosts’ Council, 3) approval of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) and 4) approval from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).

We recently initiated a 5-year Program Review Process. Approximately one-fifth of all programs are evaluated in any given year. The process requires a self-study, external evaluators and a dean’s action plan. The provost, dean and department chair agree on the plan. A one-year and a three-year follow-up is done to measure progress made.

At present, our departments, committees, Senate, deans, provost and Board of Trustees do not have an equity lens to make decisions on program approval, the array of programs we have, how programs are delivered and how students can participate in program opportunities. Even if a lens where adopted for new courses and programs, we have thousands of existing course and hundreds of existing academic programs.

How does the university address the need for, and apply, an equity lens for these issue while upholding our processes of shared governance and faculty ownership of the curriculum?

May 12, 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY ORDER (1-5)</th>
<th>GOAL AND INITIATIVE (may take one or more meetings depending on topic)</th>
<th>QUESTIONS BOARD MIGHT ASK</th>
<th>RATIONALE FOR ORDER AND OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTAINING COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.1 Explore and put in place new strategies to contain the cost of completing a PSU degree.</td>
<td>• What do we need to know (data, current practices and plans)?&lt;br&gt;• What outcomes do we want to see?&lt;br&gt;• What Board policies/actions might be needed?</td>
<td>Committee discussion prior to January to provide input to Finance Committee in advance of budget and tuition decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT WELLNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 1: 1.4 Explore and commit to measures that improve overall student wellness, safety, food and housing security and other concerns that can become barriers to student success</td>
<td>• What do we need to know (data, current practices and plans)?&lt;br&gt;• Should we require a regular report?&lt;br&gt;• What outcomes do we want to see?&lt;br&gt;• What new areas need to be explored?&lt;br&gt;• What Board policies/actions might be needed?</td>
<td>Will provide foundation information for subsequent conversations related to student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC PATHWAYS AND CAREER SUCCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal 1: 2.3 Create programs and services in conjunction with community colleges and other institutions to ensure clear pathways for transfer students.</td>
<td>• What do we need to know (data, current practices and plans)?&lt;br&gt;• What outcomes do we want to see?&lt;br&gt;• How do our current programs address this need?&lt;br&gt;• What Board policies/actions might be needed?</td>
<td>Provides foundation for discussion of containing cost and student progress toward degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 1: 3.1 Increase advising capacity, revitalize advising systems and improve the visibility of student support services.</td>
<td>Provides foundation for discussion of containing cost and student progress toward degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal 1: 5.3 Increase access to, and education about, scholarship opportunities, particularly for socio-economically disadvantaged students.</td>
<td>Committee discussion prior to January to provide input to Finance Committee in advance of budget and tuition decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal 1: 5.5 Improve preparation for career placement and advancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal 1: 4.1 Develop an academic plan with programs that prepare students for competitive advantage in life and career.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal 1: 4.3 Assess opportunities for innovative academic programs that align with career paths, locally and globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal 2: 2.1 Assess the array of academic program offerings on a regular basis to ensure relevance, quality and equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal 2: 2.2 Provide mechanisms to ensure that academic priorities, informed by faculty expertise and student needs, are appropriately reflected in planning for new programs and growth, and in decisions regarding program reduction and elimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What is the current university array of programs? 
- What do we want to know about career and job placement? 
- How do we assess this for the approval of new programs? 

Will benefit from Atlas project underway by Faculty Senate

**INCLUSIVE CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal 4: 1.3 Develop and utilize an equity lens in campus decision-making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal 4: 2.1 Adopt best practices for recruitment, retention and advancement of diverse faculty, staff and administrators to better reflect the diversity of the student body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What evidence does the Board wish to see? 
- What outcomes does the Board expect? 

Understanding the equity lens is critical to how decisions and actions are made
ACADEMIC QUALITY TASKFORCE

SPRING 2016

STRATEGIC PLAN:
“We commit to curiosity, collaboration, stewardship…to solve problems…in the Portland region.”
Taskforce on Academic Quality (TAQ)

2015-2016 TAQ

Annabelle Dolidon-Chair Spring (WLL)
J.R. Estes (UNST)
Linda George – Chair F/W(ESM)
Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP)
Yves Labissiere (SCH)
Scott Marshall (OAA)
Anindita Mukarjee (grad student)
Judith Ramaley (CUPA)
Todd Rosenstiel (BIO)
Vivek Shandas (CUPA)
Angela Strecker (ESM)
TAQ 2014 Charge
“The University agrees to provide support to fund the identification and description of PSU’s aspirational comparators.”

TAQ 2014-2015 modification of Charge
“Identify aspirational comparators of academic quality … by identify aspirational practices – independent of institution type – that promote AQ”

Campus survey
1. What do you think represents AQ in Teaching, Research, Service?
2. Five institutions that embody this?
3. What can PSU do to improve AQ in T, R, S?

TAQ 2015-16
- Analyze campus-wide survey and conduct literature review
- Identify aspirational practices and potential indicators
- Explore case studies to examine implementation of aspirational practices at other institutions
- Preliminary recommendations for implementation at PSU
External Metrics

HECC Indicators
- Freshman retention rate
- Freshman graduation rate
- Student-faculty ratios

NWCCU Indicators
- Total graduated and retained
- Programs completing academic review

Taskforce on Academic Quality

What do we mean by academic quality?
Develop Academic Quality construct based on survey:
“What do you think represents academic quality and what should we do to improve?”

Faculty Metrics?
- i.e. what do the faculty think is important to measure?

Shared Governance
- Academic Quality
- Fiscal Priorities

Fiscal Metrics?
- $$$$
- $$$$$
- $$$$$
AQC Role – Flowchart

Bi-Annual Survey of Faculty and Students → Academic Quality Committee → Annual Recommendations to Faculty Senate

PSU AQ Dashboard

Ad Hoc/Taskforces
5 aspirational practices

- Undergraduate research
- Graduate experience
- Writing
- Interdisciplinary teaching and research
- Support for faculty scholarly activities
Why these AP?

FROM THE SURVEY

- Classes should connect concepts from classroom discussion with real-world events and problems.
- Faculty need to encourage students to ask questions and be engaged, getting them to think beyond their comfort zone.
- Classes should provide opportunities for students to engage with the community.
- Smaller class sizes—which gives instructors a greater chance to give feedback on writing.
- Faculty needs to stay current with trends in their field and provide relevant instructional materials.

- Interdisciplinary teaching and research
- Professional development, support for teaching and research
- Undergraduate research, writing, Graduate experience
- Undergraduate research, interdisciplinary teaching and research
- Writing, Graduate experience
Undergraduate participation in research improves student understanding, confidence, and career awareness; it helps faculty achieve research agenda.

This AP is aligned with **PSU Strategic Plan** Goal to Elevate Student Success and to uphold Community Engagement and Civic Leadership.

- **Best practices**
  - mentorship, funding for students and research, undergrad research office, journals

- **Implication for faculty**
  - can improve research output by faculty, but may require more time to train and mentor students - could be alleviated by linking URO to course work/existing teaching load
  - interpretation of faculty scholarship would shift - recommend a higher emphasis be placed on scholarly work with undergraduate students

- **Preliminary recommendations for new Ad Hoc committee on Undergraduate Research**
  - Funding for research experiences for students and integration of research into curriculum
  - Funding for an undergraduate research office, and initiatives to coordinate undergrad. Research campus wide.
  - Mapping patterns of undergraduate research at PSU and developing metrics for **dashboard**.

- **TAQ task - Fall 2016**
  - explore indicators (% UG students with volunteer or paid research experience at PSU, % UG with senior thesis projects)
Graduate student success is critical to undergraduate success, improving research capacity and training next generation professionals.

This AP is aligned with PSU Strategic Plan Goal to Elevate Student Success and to promote Innovative Research and Scholarship.

- **Best practices** → Addressing financial and professional needs

- **Implication for faculty**
  - Improving conditions for grad students and improving mentor training will likely reduce faculty workload and increase research productivity.

- **Preliminary recommendations for** [Ad Hoc on Grad Student Experience](#)
  - Expand number of GTAs
  - Professional mentor training for faculty
  - Last mile scholarship for graduate students
  - Career center resources expanded to graduate student

- **Metrics for Implementations** – [Dashboard](#)
  - # of GTA awarded per School/Dept.
  - % of faculty trained to be grad mentors
  - Graduation rate of graduate students
  - # of graduate students using Career Services

- **TAQ task - Fall 2016** → Work with Graduate school
Improving student writing is a critical learning outcome, highlighted by faculty survey and educational literature. This AP is aligned with PSU Strategic Plan Goal to Elevate Student Success and to support Educational Opportunities.

- **Best practices** → Writing across the curriculum and writing in the discipline

- **Implication for faculty** → Need for investments in GTAs and faculty development in order to target writing improvement.

- **Recommendations** – for UWC
  - PSU should re-institute writing intensive courses that are focused on Writing in the Discipline (WID).
  - Institute regular campus-wide assessment of student writing.

- **Metrics for Implementations** – [Dashboard](#)
  - Improvement in standardized writing scores for lower and upper division students
  - Increase in the number students completing WID courses
  - Increase in faculty satisfaction with student writing (bi-annual survey)

- **TAQ task – Fall 2016** – Work with UNST and UWC
AP - Interdisciplinarity

Interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary degrees better prepare students for today’s world as it combines professional training, critical thinking skills and the possibility to practice problem-solving from different points of views or disciplinary techniques.

This AP is aligned with PSU Strategic Plan to “commit to curiosity, collaboration in the Portland region.” It is a potential domain of excellence for PSU as an urban university in a central location in Oregon with many community-based learning opportunities.

• Best practices
  • Interdisciplinary programs, certificates and degrees, collaboration between units

• Implication for faculty
  • Finding outlets (publications, conferences) for interdisciplinary projects
  • Professional development (interdisciplinary teaching)

• Preliminary recommendations for Ad Hoc on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research
  • Working with the library and ORSP to create an interdisciplinary support system/space for research, grant seeking and publication
  • Launching a new university-wide project like ReThink around interdisciplinarity
  • Cultural change: Valuing interdisciplinary work and reflecting it in the budget and performance model (SCH as roadblock).

• TAQ task – Fall 2016
Reviewing the viability of current interdisciplinary programs and initiatives
Setting-up on ongoing data collection system (maintaining a dashboard)
Exploring the feasibility of a stronger partnership with the library and ReThink-type project
AP – Faculty activities

Faculty need to stay current in their research and update teaching material + open to other approaches relevant to their discipline in order to stay engaged. This AP is aligned with PSU Strategic Plan Goal to promote innovate research and scholarship and to create educational opportunities.

- **Best practices**
  - Decreasing faculty student ratio
  - Allow flexible time off (sabbatical leaves, courses buy-out) for research
  - Eliminate barriers to external funding
  - At PSU:
    - Project to develop writing support for international faculty
    - Stacking up courses to be able to take time off teaching (junior faculty in Business)
    - Clear letters of hire (template now available)
    - Mentorship program

- **Implication for faculty** → Finding time to write and publish, clear expectations for tenure

- **Preliminary recommendations**
  While the taskforce does not see this AP as a current priority, we recommend keeping track of all efforts and the development of metrics for tenure success → dashboard
RECOMMENDATION: Creation of a standing Senate-appointed committee

Proposed Charge for Academic Quality Committee

• The Academic Quality Committee (AQC), utilizing a centralized dashboard, researches, identifies, and recommends practices that promote and sustain academic quality for faculty and students at Portland State University.

UPDATE : ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE APPROVED JUNE 2 2016 by PSU Faculty Senate
AQC Role – Flowchart

Bi-Annual Survey of Faculty and Students → Academic Quality Committee → Annual Recommendations to Faculty Senate

PSU AQ Dashboard

Ad Hoc/Taskforces
Proposed features and activities of AQC:

- Joint faculty and administration (OAA) committee
- Conducts and reviews bi-annual survey of faculty and students
- Reports on issues, concerns and potential for actionable ideas
- Conducts research on implementation of best practices and makes recommendations to Faculty Senate
- Maintains a "dashboard" that evaluates progress on implementation of academic quality initiatives

Resources needed: Annual graduate student stipend and fee remission