

Proposal

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination/Reorganization

Background, Rationale, and Preliminary Discussions:

On the May 18th 2020 Faculty Forum, Provost Susan Jeffords introduced a conversation on the need for a process to examine our academic programs in order to address current challenges and strategically prepare ourselves for future scenarios. Recognizing that such a process must be undertaken through shared governance and full faculty participation, she encouraged the faculty to begin initial exploratory steps this summer 2020, to help us prepare for a full discussion during the academic year 2020-21. She stressed the importance of placing our mission and core values at the core of any program reorganization discussion, as well as of promoting transparency and inclusion.

This discussion followed preparatory conversations with Provost Jeffords at the steering committee, with participation of UCC, GC, EPC, BC, and AAUP leadership, where a set of framing themes (included in appendix A in this proposal) were discussed. These themes were echoed and expanded by comments expressed by the faculty (see appendix B) via a google form distributed in connection to the May 18th Faculty Forum.

Motion recommended by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee:

In light of the current context and informed by these conversations, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommends the creation of an Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination/Reorganization to envision a process for program reorganization at PSU. This Committee will work in Summer 2020 to:

- *Envision* and recommend a framing set of guidelines based on PSU's values and mission, with an emphasis on applying a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion lens
- *Envision* and recommend models of communication and collaboration among relevant constituents and groups (faculty, administration, staff, students, union, board) to ensure transparency, representation, and participation at all the different institutional levels (from faculty senate to units)
- *Explore* theoretical and practical models for reorganization of academic programs, including models put in place by comparator institutions.
- *Gather* evidence and data (quantitative and qualitative) about PSU's Academic Programs with the help of OIR and other relevant PSU administrative offices.

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Reorganization will consist of eight to ten members. In addition to chairs/members of UCC, GC, EPC, BC, and SC, it will include a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion advocate, as well as faculty members chosen by the Committee on Committees from among nominations and self-nominations by faculty. The committee will work closely with the administration members proposed by the Provost. Finally, the committee will present a report to be discussed at the October 2020 Faculty Senate, with the purpose of informing the next step in the process (creation of an ad-hoc committee to work during the academic year 2020-21). It is important to stress that the work conducted by the group will be exploratory and that no decisions on PSU's academic programs will be made during the summer.

Appendix 1

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EXAMINATION/REORGANIZATION

Notes from Preliminary Discussions at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee

2014 History: What went wrong in previous program prioritization efforts

- Budget vs. academic: The relationship between the budgetary aspects and the academic quality ones became conflicted.
- Transparency and trust: There wasn't a clear message about why we were undertaking program prioritization. That eroded trust.
- "Circular-firing squad" fear.
- Strategy: It seemed that we were being asked to implement a firing corporation-like strategy.
- It happened parallelly to program review required by our accreditors. It wasn't clear how both efforts intersected.

2020 Our current context: Beginning conversations on rationale and procedure

- **TRANSPARENCY:** We need to be very clear about what we are doing and why. We must communicate effectively with the faculty and make sure their voices are heard and their input truly and meaningfully incorporated in the process. Units and schools must be aware of what their counterparts are doing. Faculty are not aware of other perspectives, they want to help institutional efforts but do not know how they can do so, what are the strategic recommendations.
- **FACULTY ROLE:** The role of the faculty should be thinking about the future, long-term educational mission of PSU. We need to come up with a set of PSU principles/values before engaging in this work. There tends to be a disconnect between administration and faculty-students (the macro and micro levels). We must make sure that the efforts are focused on students, we must combine/merge them with the Student First academic efforts and they must be framed around the question: how can we do things better for our students. We tend to default to thinking about SCH.
- **GOALS:** We need a shared understanding of what are the goals in relation to the crisis and urgency: looking for opportunities for merging and restructuring in order to avoid eliminations. There are opportunities for synergies between departments that seem blocked by our current internal organization. We must think outside the box.
- **CONTEXT:** We need to look at the institutional context. What is being done in other areas (not just the academic, programs). Look at the changes that have been made in response to COVID-19 and see if they can be permanent. How do we create an environment in which the work of the faculty is recognized and valued and also aligned with what the institution needs faculty to do?
- **DYNAMICS BETWEEN FINANCE AND ACADEMICS** areas of the institution: Cutting academics in trying to attenuate the impact of budget on (mainly) no-academics, seems a loss of perspective. Often the finance area seems to be hegemonic. At a

university, academics should be at the core. Budget should inform our academic priorities but not determine them.

- **PROTECTING FACULTY AND PROTECTING THE MISSION:** If cuts end up being necessary, we need the University to declare exigency, so contract protections can be applied. We also must be clear about the role of the faculty and of the senate in any reorganization efforts and stay away from consumer-focused narratives and not be caught in corporate ideologies and an "offer and demand" view of higher education.
- **A ROBUST UNIVERSITY** is one that has a diversity of offerings. We must rely on the faculty's view of education and the competencies and skills that will prepare our students for their goals (not only professional skills but the fundamental skills obtained across a diversity of disciplines in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, etc.).
- **QUALITY vs. REVENUE:** In a functional university not every unit is going to generate revenue. To maintain a healthy diversity of offerings some units must support others.
- **PROCESS AND CONTINUITY:** Which is our point of departure? What is the connection between previous Academic Program Prioritization (APP) efforts and current Academic Program Reorganization (APRG) ones? Clear and multidirectional paths need to be created among the different faculty and administrative groups engaged in APRG.
- **CAUTION:** We must be careful not to undermine ourselves: The cutting body parts metaphor (cutting an arm and leg vs. cutting an organ that is not functioning well and that you can live without and be in better health). It's important to consider our mission and commitment to the community and not cut programs that no other institution is providing in the state. We must be careful to apply a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens consistently. We must be thoughtful in reorganizing and careful not to find "easy" merging solutions. It's important to be strategic and future-thinking. Academic cuts are cuts on investments.
- **AVOIDING CONSTRAINTS AND "TRAPS":** Our imagination is conditioned by efficiency arguments. We rely too much on traditional ways of evaluating the work we do. We need to rethink student success in a way that does not restrict us to SCH and quantitative factors.
- **TIMELINE AND FACULTY PARTICIPATION:** No decisions should be made during the summer, just exploratory work. For the sake of transparency and faculty participation, there must be an opportunity for the faculty to follow the process and provide input during the summer.

Appendix B

Faculty Comments on Program Examination/Reorganization (Unfiltered)

PSU is currently in the initial stages of a conversation about how to reorganize our programs to address our current challenges and to strengthen PSU's institutional position. 'Reorganization' might include eliminating, merging, or adding programs, as well as changing internal administrative structures.

1. How should Faculty be involved in program reorganization at PSU?

Have expert faculty on budget and financial planning.

I think that faculty need to be in primary positions of power. You cannot do this well without buy in from all/many academic units. I would like to see working groups around shared methods and graduate training, a steering committee or other faculty body that is part of this discussion.

We should be involved every step of the way, as it has implications for our departments, curriculum, and pedagogical approaches.

Actively, shared governance does not provide for removing courses or programs from the curriculum. Faculty governance (GC and UCC) should have an active process for these types of proposal. If for no other reason to keep the curriculum clean and healthy.

Faculty should be encouraged to work through innovation and design thinking exercises/training in order to constructively reimagine university life in a new and evolving era.

Allow departments to make their own recommendations on cuts/consolidations - local input from programs.

They should drive the process through Senate if they are willing to engage in good faith evaluation of programs, academic and non-academic.

Thoughtfully

I would keep programs but consolidate some support systems. I feel there are too many "schools" and "colleges" that seem to exist as entities which duplicate admin structures for internal control of budgets rather than providing any particular advantage to students.

We should be equal partners with admin in setting the problem, and then we should be in charge of efforts to address it by transformation or resolution.

Faculty should be involved through multiple opportunities to provide feedback and share experiences.

First we should receive a clear and unambiguous definition of what you mean by "reorganization." Both on the big and little scopes. If you're talking cutting programs and dropping certifications, then faculty should be the deciding voice on what programs can be cut. The trustees an administration should, of course, have a voice in the historical and institutional implications of those decisions, but in dialogue and debate, not a "yes/no, pick another" capacity.

Provide opportunities to broad range of faculty to share info and input.

In actual decision-making, not just consulting.

At the outset, faculty could provide feedback on what initiatives and programs currently at the university are duplicating efforts or are insufficient.

Representation from faculty is important, but not on individual faculty basis as that just paralyzes any process. Clearly not everyone will be happy regardless of the outcome. Representatives from the various colleges representing faculty across campus, even those not traditionally heavily involved in faculty senate for example should be formed to gather input from their units and communicate those up.

Faculty input should be collected at every stage. Beyond the chair meetings, individual faculty from each current department should serve on a committee that can provide input about how these programs should be changed. At the very least, no programs should be merged or eliminated without an opportunity for faculty in those programs to respond to questions, address concerns, or describe their function and place in the university.

There should not be cuts of academic programs; there should be cuts of other units and faculty should have a decisive voice in cutting all the units we don't need. I was very disappointed that FS voted for "program prioritization," which in the end will be done from a SCH's perspective.

Faculty should be involved in both synchronous and asynchronous manners. I am concerned that the folks who can attend and feel comfortable speaking-up publicly in these forums are the ones who will benefit from restructuring. Unfortunately, I have been unable to attend faculty forums in "real time" because of my teaching and student supervision schedules. I hope that our University leadership will weigh the fact that not all voices/perspectives are being included during the synchronous meetings and will allow other asynchronous opportunities to contribute to the discussion and be recognized for our perspectives. I also think it would be helpful to have an iterative feedback process - with multiple check-ins over time with FULL faculty (not just the working groups or faculty senate leaders). I appreciate the opportunity to provide my feedback via this google form and I hope that this will continue to be a means through which faculty feedback is garnered.

You are talking about cutting jobs. Often reorganization is done in a way that makes little sense long term. Other times it makes a lot of sense. But what does this often mean? It often means merging say a department like Philosophy and History or taking SGRN and making it into an Ethnic Studies department with one chair rather than directors. In some ways these moves can make a lot of sense as in Ethnic Studies and long term might be best. However, in other ways a move like say merging Philosophy and History make little sense. On the other hand, merging History and International Relations may make a lot more sense. Merging Philosophy with Political Science may also make a lot of sense. So, input from faculty and the AAUP is a requirement.

Also sometimes a unit or center may not "make money" for PSU, but sometimes the university needs to be more than a neoliberal institution. We can't really call ourselves a university if we do not have courses in Philosophy, Rhetoric, History, and foreign languages. This is one big worry that reorganization can mean the stripping away of those areas of instruction that matter most in times of crisis. Ethics, history, mythology, and foreign languages and culture matter during periods of reactionary politics and populism.

They should be the lead voices. Also, I don't want COB, for example, making decisions about Black Studies.

Faculty should provide leadership around this, though administration needs to be clear on what the fiscal savings need to be. Reorganization has to include the loss of positions (administrative and/or faculty) as just moving things around won't solve our problem. Faculty have to be able to have hard conversations about this and not cling to favorite program. We have tried doing this in the past and it has failed bc we are in denial about the realities of higher education.

Is the point of the university to educate young minds or not? If it is, then any reorganization needs to be primarily handled and approved by the faculty.

They should work with their Deans to determine ways to increase efficiency, reduce spending, and continue to offer high quality programs.

Fundamentally and transparently.

Faculty governance should be fully respected, and all decisions about programs fully transparent. Existing faculty structures (e.g., EPC) should be used, rather than assembling new ad hoc committees.

Rearranging the deck chairs?

Faculty should help provide information about the trends (up and down) and value of their departments/disciplines vs. numbers of students vs. future employment options based on the degrees they will earn. Learning for learning's sake is great but preparing people for careers and real jobs is also critical. How can faculty fit those concepts together?

Most importantly via working groups within the Colleges made up of a diverse cross section of faculty that heavily relies on faculty who have not spent their entire careers at PSU. We need new thinking influenced by wider experiences in the academy. These groups should be constituted by both widely disseminated public calls in each unit, appointments by directors/chairs and deans, and calls focused to women and POC who represent a cross section of TT, NTTF, and adjunct faculty. Also via senate, but keep in mind that senate is not comprised solely of faculty as it is usually understood outside of PSU—research and teaching faculty—but is filled with APs who, while super vital, are just not faculty, so they do not have the training we do, nor the wider view on the state of the US academy. They are not part of the research and teaching that drives a university, so have a different set of concerns,

which can be useful, but not for a program reprioritization. They also do not have the protections that a tenured faculty member has, security that may allow us to hold positions and make arguments that may be unpopular.
Faculty should participate in suggesting how to reorganize and realize that programs will be cut.
Changes should be approved by faculty.
Intimately. Dare I say lead?
Faculty understand our programming and research better than just about anyone. We should therefore be active participants in how to make changes and reorganization. With that said, I also know that faculty can be very territorial and/or set in their ways. I think there needs to be a shared understanding that input from faculty will be given more than lip-service, and in exchange, we need to be willing to think outside our boxes.
directly involved!
At every step
2. What PSU principles and values should be followed in APRG?
Equity. Integrity in allocation of resources. Consideration of wider issues in higher education, including the long-term feasibility of boosting STEM over humanities, arts, and social sciences education.
I think this acronym is horrific and it makes me NOT want to engage in this process. It already feels like administrative overreach once you start using this acronym. Give faculty authority to make decisions, ensure that junior faculty and faculty of color are not left out.
we have to center the needs of our students and community. we have to be aware of any changes that will impact accreditation for specific schools and programs (for instance, CSWE accreditation for the School of Social Work)
DEI
Academic rigor, maintaining a breadth of disciplines but the production of scholarship must be an essential component of any program at any university.
Supporting the complete ecology of university life with an emphasis on the keystone species, namely students and faculty involved in teaching-learning, research, and applied research that ameliorates the Portland metro area and its many communities. I feel it is important to be forward thinking, such as organizing curricula around questions rather than disciplines. This said, and in addition to STEM (obviously relevant to employment as well as important academic areas), core humanities themes -- logic, critical thinking, rhetorical and writing skills, world languages and intercultural communicative ability, really need to be a part of the future of PSU, for these are precisely the sorts of disposition development that are required at elite private universities. Reduced offering in these areas would increase class division in society.
Hold to the PSU mission, let knowledge serve the city.
What is the academic mission of the university? That should guide it, along with all of the work that was done to plan for Academic Program Prioritization several years ago.
Reducing administrative expenses and overlapping or unnecessary expenditures
people! Keep people working, providing instruction and guidance to students.
I don't know what APRG means? It would be helpful to have a list of what you consider PSU principles to be. Perhaps that list also needs overhaul.
In a general sense, equity and opportunity for students are important values to uphold.
Service, Learning, and Demand -- what programs are of service to the students and community, how are we still upholding the pursuit of knowledge next to or over consumerism, what is the demand in the community (both in the arts, STEM, and business communities).
Broad and deep faculty/staff/student engagement.
commitments to the equity lens we adopted in our strategic plan

Democratic participation, transparency, and effective leadership.
Long term financial stability and prosperity of PSU, balanced with academics that are both undergraduate and graduate, the latter supported by impactful research. There is so much potential for this urban campus, but without financial stability we continue to be mediocre to the outside and bumbling on the inside.
Access, inclusion and equity are core values at PSU. These values exist to correct inequities. Tough times are hardest on those that are most vulnerable and who these values are meant to protect.
Keep all academic programs and use (like in the pre-neoliberal times) a financial balance, which means some courses attract more students and they subsidize others that enhance students' intellectual curiosity and civic responsibility.
Upholding a commitment to serving our city and state; Maintaining a students-first lens in reorganization; Transparently communicating information to stakeholders (including faculty, staff, students, and our broader community)
That a university is not a corporation that needs to deliver dividends to shareholders in profit. The dividends of a university are varied and complex. This is not to say that faculty who teach empty classes should not be helped to alter their courses to actually attract students, but that sometimes there is more to learning than getting a job. Otherwise why not shut down all departments and make PSU a "Coding Academy?"
A university is a shared community where some departments, units, and classes turn a profit and others do not, and where balance should be central to how we view the various parts of the university.
PSU is not a technical school.
This is a liberal arts college. That means we don't cut physics to bolster engineering, or enhance psychology at the expense of anthropology. We are committed to a broad liberal education and we don't pit departments against one another.
Following values should drive the process - equity, student centered, student success
Quality education
Quality of education offered in a sustainable manner.
1) We have to maintain an identity of a research-active liberal arts institution that serves the metro area with research and teaching. We need to differentiate ourselves from community colleges and technical colleges. 2) Faculty are an investment and second only to students as the lifeblood of the university. Any reorganization should consider the needs of students and faculty first and foremost.
Creating students with knowledge that can serve the city by creating thoughtful, reasonable, proactive, community members
Units that have received very positive external reviews, are distinctive to PSU, are financially not in the red, teach/research subjects of significant current relevance, and that have strong internal and external support should be given priority. Decisions on funding should be made at the margins: if two units are comparable on these criteria, units that will derive greater marginal benefit from funding should be favored.
Ways of addressing climate-change needs to be part of every discipline and every program/department.
We need to balance the mission of PSU as a teaching institution that serves underrepresented students, those who are economically challenged as well as under represented student groups in US higher education, with its desire to function as an R1, albeit one without R1 policies and resources.
Facts and fairness.
We must evaluate academic programs in terms contribution/impact/relevance as well as effectiveness/efficient utilization of resources, and innovation. These criteria would include both tangible/quantitative/measurable items and more intangible items with some form of objective evidence. Maybe develop a multi-factorial "scorecard" that aggregates the criteria into a manageable set of indicators, not to rank-order units, but to objectively assess their strengths, challenges, and opportunities.

Let knowledge serve the city! I employ that motto in all my work, as do nearly all units across campus. Although we have amazing research and researchers, we shouldn't strive to be an R-1 institution (or like an R-1 institution). We are known for our meaningful, highly-relevant community-engaged research and programming. We should embrace and elevate that.

Similarly, we should emphasize our role in advancing equity in higher education. We not only provide access to many students that would not have access to higher education at other institutions, we do so well. We need to strengthen our efforts, build on past successes, and continually weave in new opportunities to provide an excellent education for all students, particularly those who have been historically marginalized in higher education (and K-12).

Tying this altogether, climate change has shifted from "an" issue to "the" issue. All other ecological and social injustices can be nested within a climate change framework. Our service to the city and broader world should focus on adapting to climate change and building climate resilience. This lens builds on our institutional focus on sustainability, and brings together research and practice across our schools--environmental science and management, urban studies and public affairs, community development, education, public health, and so much more.

As we think about reorganization, I sincerely hope that we do so with a visionary lens! There is a quote in Margaret Wheatley's *Leadership and the New Science*: "When a system is in trouble, connect it to more of itself." As we move to reorganize, collapse, change, add, eliminate, etc., I hope we can think of ways to connect our system to more of itself.

serving students; equity, diversity and inclusion

Equity and diversity need to be front and center

3. What do Faculty members want to achieve (what would constitute success) and what do they want to avoid in APRG?

At all costs, avoid clustering units (for funding, or under schools) by administrative rather than critical definitions of research. E.g., history under humanities when historians might be doing work in public policy or urban planning.

I want to avoid this acronym. It's the worst. I would like to see more shared graduate training and reduce redundancies in certain kinds of undergraduate and graduate training so that I can be freed to teach some more specialized courses on occasion.

Saving as many jobs as possible while serving our students. Making sure that big sacrifices are made by people who can afford to make them.

A complete discussion over curriculum delivery. In particular University Studies must be part of the conversation. Often treated as a sacred cow at PSU, university studies seems to be an inefficient method of delivering curriculum that employs a high level of adjunct instructors. A successful process will evaluate the entire delivery of the curriculum and consider a radical, far reaching solution. If university studies does not work for ALL units on campus it should be redesigned or eliminated.

An obvious and self-serving issue is continued employment. Creatively adapting to, and even creating, new work-research-teaching-learning institutions would help to insure our viability as knowledge professionals.

Maintain enough staff to continue successful academic and research programs. Do not redistribute workload from staff cuts to existing workers - people are over-burdened already. Too many years of "do more with less" - we can't keep doing that.

A reasonable budget allocation that supports quality academic programs and scrutinizes the size of our administration and non-academic units; we should avoid more of the same--trimming budgets at the margins or across the board--and avoid letting the administration drive the process.

Program stability and quality

Ditto.

I do not know the possible types of actions that could occur. I am not in favor of eliminating entire departments or cutting faculty.

Becoming a business school, even outside the school of business, should be avoided. Only programs with a long history of revenue loss or unproductively low enrollment should be cut. We should uphold our rigor and status as an R2-to-R1 leaning institution, many of us faculty came because of that.

Avoid "competition" across programs/departments. Avoid creating "winners" and "looser."

Actual application of equity lens. If we need to renegotiate the worst of PERS, let's do it.

Reorganization over mere elimination.

I want to avoid doing nothing. Success is making a change.

There is no success in eliminating people's livelihood! To put it mildly, this is a wrong question.

To enable our institution to emerge from a period of fiscal challenge academically stronger, not weaker; and, if possible, to realize a financial savings that could be applied to the state's substantial and continuing budget cuts for higher education.

A university that serves its students better in 10 years or 20 years is what the faculty want. What faculty do not want is a spreadsheet approach that sees the functioning of the university in neoliberal zero sum ways that seen some units and departments as failing because of the profit motive and others as "good" because they are profitable. The labeling of some units as "Zero Rev Units" is common and downright wrong.

We shouldn't even be undertaking this step without a sober and PUBLIC analysis of the university budget. Instruction and research are the core mission here and should be last on the chopping block, not first. Even as a former DI athlete, perhaps athletics should be something we should look at, as well as myriad other ways that the administration has prioritized various moneypots, decisions we have had no hand in, or even knowledge about. I am again reminded of the decision to arm campus police, a move that I can find no fixed dollar amount for, and which doesn't seem to be in the conversation as a cost saving measure. I find all this premature.

Achieve a university that will survive and is able to identify what we do well and what we might not need to continue to do. Avoid seeing the administration as the enemy and see this as collaborative.

I think success would look like restructuring so that more faculty are sharing administrator roles and reducing class sizes, so that we come out of this actually raising the quality of education instead of cutting programs.

Avoid holding on to programs that are bloated. Success constitutes a re-sizing of programs commensurate with the actual needs of the program based on a trend of steady or increasing success.

For me, success in an APRG plan would be the creation of synergy among the faculty, students, and administration. Another positive outcome would be for the administration to better understand colleges and departments. Both outcomes would ensure that the mission of the university is strengthened. We have an opportunity to rethink the role of upper administration and to be a leader in higher education in making changes that would likely benefit many universities.

To be avoided: further fragmentation and increasing hierarchical organization through the professionalization of administration.

Achieve: Create a strong sense of support and community, a sense of shared pride in our University and the University experience for our students. Avoid: loss of valuable departments and faculty.

Success would be rational decision-making, arrived at by faculty in a transparent process. What should be avoided is administrators being allowed to make decisions without consultation or justification, for their own convenience, taking advantage of mere "targets of opportunity".

We need to get to a point where we're not constantly being told that we have to cut our budgets.

Success would be to trim those structures that don't directly serve the educational mission of the university and a rebalancing of resources between units that are currently able to grow from units that are shrinking. We shouldn't just cut programs that are underperforming, but reimagine how they can be served by remaking how they are run and function. It's also about a rebalancing of staff and capital resources between units and a reimagining of general education that supports academic programs as opposed to our current UNST structure that feeds itself and does not

support, for instance, CLAS programs. It's also about identifying those units that are working very well -- the Honors College is the only unit up for fall 2020 as far as I know, and reproducing not only their management actions, but their management styles. Success would also be in persuading units that have decided to shrink to stay within their means, because they have not been given the resources they need to grow or even meet current demand, that they will be supported in the future. So much of success would be in identifying talented, successful faculty managers and reproducing their approaches across campus. Success would also be marked by a wildly better up and down structure of communication throughout the university and addressing the persistent problem of marginalizing poc and women by elevating them to leadership positions within colleges. What to avoid? Don't let senate kill any changes, which it may try to do because it often functions as a conjoined twin to PSU—AAUP, which advocates more so for job security for its members than in making difficult choices to benefit the educational institution.

Meeting goals with as little pain as possible

An intelligent strategy for making reductions at PSU based on a thoughtful, detailed assessment similar to methods used for program self-assessment and external reviews, with data on educational success factors, revenue vs. cost, scholarly productivity, curriculum development, innovation, community connections, broader impact, etc.

I think I have answered this question, but to summarize and state it a bit differently, to me, success will mean that we are creative, visionary, and inclusive as we make changes to the university. Let's make stronger connections and collaborations within our institution. What I want to avoid is fear-based, short-sided decisions that undermine the mission and vision of our institution--a mission and vision that I think are largely shared across the university.

avoid cutting programs that serve students and that are our core values; avoid making cuts that do not use an equity lens in decision making

I want to avoid ripping apart the fabric of our community.