Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 April 2019

Presiding Officer: Thomas Luckett
Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators Present:

Alternates Present:
Brad Hansen for Dillard, Max Nielsen-Pincus for George, Maude Hines for Reese, Steven Boyce for Thanheiser.

Senators Absent:
Fountain, Henderson, Martinez Thompson, Mathwick, Matlick, McBride, Recktenwald, Sorensen, Thieman.

Ex-officio Members Present:
Allen, Beyler, Bielavitz, Boyce (also as alternate), Bynum, Carlson, Chang, Clark, Davidova, Duh, Hines (also as alternate), Jaén Portillo, Jeffords, Percy, Popp, Shoureshi, Woods, Zonoozy.

[Note: item G.1, President’s Report, was moved to follow B.1.]

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

1. Minutes of the 4 March 2019 meeting were approved as part of the Consent Agenda.

2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for March was received as part of the Consent Agenda.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

LUCKETT pointed out three annual reports in the Packet: from Institutional Assessment Council, Academic Advising Council, and Internationalization Council. Members of those committees were recognized.

LUCKETT said that it was possible that there might be journalists with cameras present. Previously, some senators expressed concerns about photos of them being taken and circulated. The Vanguard agreed that they would accommodate this; the Oregonian said also that we could contact them about such concerns.

Leadership of AAUP and Faculty Senate, LUCKETT said, had sent a joint letter to Governor Brown with recommendations for the Faculty member of the Board of Trustees when HINES’s term ends in June. AAUP and Faculty Senate leadership conducted independent surveys, both of which resulted in three names. Two names were common to both lists; the other two names, it was rapidly agreed, were also good candidates. Therefore four names were presented to the Governor: Michael CLARK (ENG), Linda GEORGE (ESM), G. L. A. HARRIS (PA), and Yves LABISSIERE (SPH). We believed
that any of them would be an excellent choice. He was grateful that there were highly qualified Faculty willing to take on this difficult job.

LUCKETT previously encouraged senators to read the Margolis Healy report on campus policing. Steering Committee plans to call a special session of Senate to discuss the report, probably on April 22nd.

LUCKETT contextualized April Agenda Attachment G.6, a draft of the proposed Copyright Policy. Two years ago an ad-hoc committee developed a draft policy on copyright, particularly looking at faculty control of research and syllabi. Senate recommended this policy. Office of General Counsel has come up with a new draft, with considerable changes from the earlier version. Brad HANSEN, who’s been involved in this, had concerns and invited senators’ feedback on the issue.

LUCKETT related an issue that had emerged during spring break. Our accrediting agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities [NWCCU], is undertaking a review of standards, and posted a draft revision for comment. One goal is streamlining; another is focusing on student success. Many clauses have been eliminated or condensed. Faculty leadership at several campuses noticed that clauses relating to academic freedom and faculty control of the curriculum had apparently been taken out, resulting in expressions of concern. NWCCU extended the comment deadline through April 15th. Steering Committee is working an a collective comment. There will be a second comment period in summer. This morning, LUCKETT said, he received a message from the NWCCU president, in which he said inter alia that based on feedback so far they had decided to include “appropriate language” on academic freedom and faculty governance. Bill Harbaugh at University of Oregon had suggested that NWCCU’s initial move was in response to pressure from the Department of Education, but LUCKETT sees no evidence for that.

FIORILLO asked if this is happening nationally. LUCKETT: no. FIORILLO thought it curious, then, that it’s happening in the Northwest. LUCKETT had asked NWCCU whether they knew of any Federal guidelines on this subject; the answer was no. If we want to advocate for academic freedom, we should say why it is important to student success.

LUCKETT encouraged senators to think about nominations for Steering Committee and Presiding Officer Elect. Both current senators and newly elected senators are eligible.

G. REPORTS

1. President’s report – moved here from its usual place

[For slides, see Appendix G.1.]

SHOURESHI wished senators a happy spring term and Nu Ruoz (Persian New Year).

On enrollment, SHOURESHI reported that for spring term the number of students is down 1.4%, credit hours down 1%, mostly for non-resident and graduate students. Colleges seeing increases are MCECS, COTA, SPH, and SB. He is more concerned about next fall, because completed applications and admissions are down 10% compared to last year, and deposits down 20%. We are stable in the number of transfer students.
SHOURESHI reported on the admitted students event on March 23rd, which had over 800 in attendance. There was good integration between admissions and the academic side. Enrollment Management is planning further activities—for example, buying names of high school sophomores and juniors, especially in Portland.

SHOURESHI expressed appreciation for organizers and attendees at the March 18th budget forum. The following day, he was in Salem meeting with legislative leadership. He conveyed that PSU is different from other state universities because of our demographics. Every dollar that the state contributes has a major impact; every dollar they do not provide is an increase in student debt. Jennifer Williamson, House Majority Leader, is an champion for PSU. We want legislators to see that we focus on opportunity, access, and success. But we have to work on retention and graduation. Every percentage point increase in retention translates into at least $1 million in revenue. He reminded senators that April 16th is PSU day at the Capitol.

SHOURESHI understood that later in the session there would be consideration of a resolution [E.2]. He understood the concerns [of faculty]; it is also a concern for him. In forty years in academia, he had never faced something like this. The documents provided to the media are public, and will be made available to Steering Committee or whatever body Senate determines. We are at PSU because we believe in truth and the value of facts. The facts as shown in the documents are very different from the representations in the Oregonian article. He would be more than happy to answer any questions from senators. As he said at the March meeting, he has nothing to hide. His intention is to make sure PSU is successful and make sure our students are successful. He respected the plans for a reasonable, responsible, and collegial approach.

SHOURESEHI acknowledged that budget uncertainties had created anxiety–also for him. We are trying to fill a gap of $20-26 million for next year. What are the immediate, short-term, and long-term pictures?

Referring to slide 8, SHOURESHI broke down state funding as related to mission and outcome. This is why, for example, OIT gets roughly three times per student than PSU. In the minds of the legislature, a focus on engineering and technology costs more. There are also funds from other state programs [slide 9]. For example, PSU has received $3.2 million annually from the Engineering Technology Sustaining Funds, from Oregon Solutions $1.2 million; from the Sports Lottery, $1.1 million [slide 10]–altogether roughly $5 million. The Governor’s proposed budget zeroes these. Over five years, the Oregon Opportunity Grant has provided $28 million [slide 11]. Total budget for PSU for 2017-18 was around $577 million, as compared to over $1 billion for U of O and over $1.2 billion for OSU [slide 12]. Of PSU’s roughly 28,000 students, around 21,000 are Oregonians. PSU’s annual tuition is $2100 and $2600 less than U of O and OSU, respectively. Multiplying those numbers gives a difference of $43-$58 million. They benefit by charging more, but PSU wants to remain an access university, and has a majority of in-state students. OSU is in a position to not raise tuition more than 5%.

SHOURESHI: we have to convince legislators to invest more in PSU as the access university educating Oregonians. PSU’s story is supporting low-income students.
SHOURESHI continued: we are looking at all kinds of cost containment measures. There is an Efficiency Task Force looking into resource use. Hiring must be strategic. We have eliminated some administrative positions and frozen administrative salaries.

SHOURESHI included among long-term strategies co-ops, innovative degree programs, and fundraising [slide 17]. Increasing retention will also have an impact. Fundraising has had success [slide 18].

SHOURESHI noted upcoming changes in the Board of Trustees: in addition to the faculty member, these include the staff member and three community positions.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS – continued

2. Announcements from Secretary
BEYLER reminded senators about the opt-in survey for Faculty elections, now open. Several divisions currently lacked sufficient candidates for Senate.

C. DISCUSSION – none

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals – Consent Agenda
The new courses, changes to courses, changes to programs, and changes to University Studies clusters listed in April Agenda Attachment E.1 were approved as part of the Consent Agenda, there having been no objection before the end of Roll Call.

2. Resolution requesting information on administrative leadership (Steering)
GRECO/CLARK moved the resolution as stated in April Agenda Attachment E.2. LUCKETT gave some background: Steering Committee members had been contacted by several Faculty members asking Senate to look further in some way—though are a variety of possible ways to proceed—into the circumstances that led to the publication of Jeff Manning’s article [on March 3rd]. Steering Committee discussed possible over a week. Simultaneously, AAUP Executive Council issued a statement that they are reserving judgment, and that more information was needed. LUCKETT believed this reflected also the feeling in Steering Committee. A survey of anonymous origin was circulated, which received a fair number of signatures, calling for an item on this topic to be added to the Senate agenda. The result of the petition was never actually presented to Senate leadership. In any event, the point became moot because Steering Committee was deciding on such an agenda item. LUCKETT explained that a petition of a sufficient number of Faculty [10%] can place an item on the agenda.

LUCKETT said resolution sought Senate’s support to ask the Office of General Counsel to provide Steering Committee with the documents given to the Oregonian so that we can form our own judgment. Steering Committee was here not advising Senate what to do, but rather seeking the advice of Senate, which could be expressed in a variety of ways. The resolution could be voted for or against, amended, or postponed.
LUCKETT reminded senators that the Board had commissioned two audits, one on financial and one on personnel matters. He understood that once these were completed at least executive summaries would be presented.

GRECO supported the motion: we need to look at facts and not make a [premature] judgment. She wanted to see the same documents as the Oregonian. At a minimum there is problem of perception; if it is only a problem of perception, the only way to put it to rest is for Faculty to look at the facts and come to a conclusion.

BEYLER stated that he had received five requests that voting be by secret ballot–namely, by clickers–and so this would be the practice for the remainder of the year.

The resolution as given in April Agenda Attachment E.2 was approved (45 yes, 5 no, 4 abstain, recorded by clicker).

LUPRO observed the documents would go to Steering, and asked what the outcome would be: a summary to Senate? LUCKETT said that remained to be determined by Senate. The point of this motion was to obtain the document. In fact anyone could submit a document request and obtain them, but Steering Committee believed it would be helpful to have a mandate from Senate.

3. New program proposal: Minor in Climate Change Science and Adaptation (CLAS via UCC)

EMERY/MITCHELL moved approval of the proposal as summarized in Attachment E.3 and specified in the Online Curriculum Management System (OCMS).

LUCKETT recognized Paul LOIKITH (GGR) to give background. The minor was put together jointly by Geography and Environmental Science and Management. It combines physical science and policy studies, reflected in two tracks. It has a critical mass of courses for a robust minor, drawing on several departments, not only the above two.

KARAVANIC asked if they had considered courses from Civil and Environmental Engineering. LOIKITH: yes. Most of the relevant courses were at the graduate level, and for undergraduate courses there were often prerequisites that created issues [for the minor]. noted that institutional economics is also of interest to many historians.

The motion was approved (46 yes, 2 no, 1 abstain).

4. New program proposal: Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution (CLAS via GC)

WOODS made a distinction from a degree proposal. Conflict Resolution is currently doing an overhaul of their MA/MS program. CLARK/WATANABE moved the proposal as summarized in April Agenda Attachment E.4 and specified in OCMS.

WOODS said the aim of the certificate was to support retention of students by providing on- and off-ramps to the master’s degree program. For example, if they decided that they were not able to pursue the full MA/MS, this allowed for completion of another, smaller credential. It also provided Conflict Resolution credentials for other students on campus who did not wish obtain a full degree in the subject. This applied to people working in many fields. Graduate Council saw this as a low-risk proposal, since it didn’t depend on adding new courses; it would buttress the existing MA/MS program.

The motion was approved (45 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain).
5. New center proposal: Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative (EPC)

LUCKETT gave some background for this and the subsequent item. Last year President SHOURESHI organized a process by which faculty could propose new centers to receive start-up funding. Two were chosen from among many proposals, and announced at the beginning of October. There is at PSU a separate approval process for centers and institutes which goes through Faculty governance bodies, specifically Budget Committee [BC], Educational Policy Committee [EPC], and Senate. Next time we create such centers, we want to better integrate the approval processes. Now we’ve had the directors of the centers submit proposals to EPC, which has recommended approvals with provisions given in April Agenda Attachments E.5-6: acknowledgement from the administration that future proposals will follow this approval process; approval by Senate to any changes in the original scope of work; and annual reports to BC and EPC.

MAY/______ moved creation of a new center, the Homelessness Research and Action Collaborative, with conditions as specified by EPC recommendations in April Agenda Attachment E.5.

LUCKETT recognized Marisa ZAPATA, director of the center, to speak to the proposal. It is a multi- and interdisciplinary effort to address homelessness around PSU, the region, and the country. It seeks to bring people on campus together to think about innovative ways to prevent and address homelessness. Philanthropic gifts of around $940,000 had been received. Project ideas are coming in every day; stakeholders are desperate for faculty willing to work on these issues in the function or research and teaching. There is also opportunity for class projects.

JAMES asked if there is a detailed budget, including direct and indirect costs. ZAPATA: yes. LUCKETT: this had been submitted and approved by BC. ZAPATA said it included $500,000 per year from the University for three years. They had given BC several versions of the budget, from a modest version to a “unicorns and rainbows” scenario. LUCKETT noted that there was already a commitment from the administration of $1.5 million. ZAPATA: but no more than that.

ZONOOZY voiced support. It was surprising that as a major urban research university we did not have it before. ZAPATA: it is [only] the second one in the country.

GRECO wondered if they were considering the increasing [rate of] homelessness among our student population. ZAPATA: one of the first projects aimed at better understanding homelessness among our students and staff. A study will be launched this summer about housing insecurity among students and staff, as well as how people living on our campus who are not necessarily part of PSU are using our resources in order to survive. They are putting together an application to try to leverage Federal dollars to provide relevant student services. SCHECHTER agreed that a focus on students is important. ZAPATA: it is essential. They had received interest from other campuses and community partners.

O’BANION asked if they were integrated with the groups working on food insecurity on campus. ZAPATA: yes, they are partnering with them.

KARAVANIC: since PCC faces some of the same issues, there might be a synergy working with them. ZAPATA agreed; they had been in touch with PCC about the project mentioned earlier, discussing how to obtain data and implement it. They were also
bringing in a national expert on the topic, and seeking ways to adapt relevant instruments from elsewhere—for example, University of Washington and Temple University.

The motion was approved (43 yes, 6 no, 0 abstain, recorded by clicker).

6. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center (EPC)

KARAVANIC/ANDERSON moved creation of a new center, the Digital City Testbed Center, with conditions as specified by EPC recommendations in April Agenda Attachment E.6.

LUCKETT said that unfortunately the director of the center, Jon FINK, was unable to be here. Upon a question by LUCKETT, D. MAIER said that although he was a member of the center, he didn’t wish to speak to the proposal comprehensively. He instead moved postponement of consideration until the May meeting; seconded by GRECO.

SCHECHTER observed that sometimes a delay like this, even if there are good intentions, can create blowback and anxiety. Do we know that the people concerned know that it is being postponed? D. MAIER: yes, the motion is at the request of the director of the center. LUCKETT confirmed this; however, if senators feel they are ready to vote today they can do so, but if they wait they can ask pertinent questions of FINK. GRECO believed it would be good to have someone who can speak to the proposal, because the findings [in the report] are mixed—for example, regarding specific educational and grant opportunities. She would like to hear how the center would answer these questions. BROWN: that the director wishes to postpone counts for a lot.

The motion to postpone was approved (40 yes, 6 no, 1 abstain, recorded by clicker).

F. QUESTION PERIOD – none

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. President’s report – moved above between items B.1 and B.2

2. Provost’s Report

Reverting to LUCKETT’s comments on NWCCU earlier, JEFFORDS noted that NWCCU are revisiting their and streamlining the process; in addition to the conversation about academic freedom, they are seeking feedback on the changes to the standards. The proposal is available OAA website; feedback can be provided to NWCCU directly or passed to Brian SANDLIN (OAA).

On accreditation, JEFFORDS said that she and Janelle VOEGELE were working with units developing assessment plans for student learning. The annual assessment update, a brief questionnaire, will be going out shortly. Then she will report how close we are to reaching the 50% goal. Last week, she met with visitor from the Council of Graduate Schools who had been invited here by Dean WOOSTER. They gave good feedback on best practices for graduate programs; however, they professed to be “shocked” about the status of assessment. The national standard is increasingly that graduate students expect to see information about outcomes for programs to which they are applying.

JEFFORDS reported on the search for the Dean of the School of Social Work. The first finalist was here today; the others would be coming over the next few days. One
committee member, an external community partner, said it was a point of pride that people of this caliber were finalists for the job.

JEFFORDS said that the search for a Vice-President of Enrollment Management is also moving forward. A review of candidates is not underway.

Another search, JEFFORDS said, is for the Dean of the Library. She met with Library faculty and staff regarding pros and cons of a national vs. an internal search. She believed that they would soon be moving forward with an internal search. WOOSTER had agreed to lead the search.

JEFFORDS is meeting with colleges to prepare for a 2.4% to 4% budget cut. She appreciates how painful those scenarios will be; however, given the numbers that SHOURESHI, short of dramatic changes from the state, we will need to address a budget shortfall. She’d also met with the co-chairs of BC, and looked forward to feedback from that committee. There are several possibilities to address budget, but one important way is to increase retention and graduation rates. This is part of our mission to academic integrity, but it also helps with our budget.

LYNN called attention to the upcoming forums for the SSW Dean search.

BROWN: given budget pressures, the earlier resolution [E.1], the Oregonian article, etc., is there a common talking point when candidates ask questions. JEFFORDS said this was a fair question. The search firm has asked the same thing. Her response would be that we are recruiting someone to PSU and to a particular school. The powerful draw here is this institution and its mission; the faculty, staff, and students of the school; the colleagues who are the deans; the work of this institution. We want to focus on that, not on newspaper articles. The draw isn’t one individual, it’s this place, what we stand for, and the work that we do. LYNN agreed. Another thing we talked about is that the Board is handling the issue. JEFFORDS agreed with the tenor of the previous discussion that it is not our place to jump to conclusions absent information and opportunity to deliberate. LYNN said that no one so far has asked about this. There was more interest in the accreditation issue. JEFFORDS: yes, she hears this everywhere she goes.

INGERSOLL appreciated the steps JEFFORDS had taken to communicate to students about accreditation. Are we also communicating with prospective students, especially given that confirmations are down 20%? JEFFORDS acknowledged that it is a good point. She will talk with the interim VP of Enrollment Management about getting right information in front of prospective students and families. She hopes to dispel uncertainties. She appreciated the deans who had come to the admitted students event.

3. Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council

Because of the current focus on assessment, LUCKETT had asked chair of the Institutional Assessment Council (IAC), Janelle VOEGELE, to discuss what departments can do and what Senate can do to help. [For slides, see Appendix G.3.]

VOEGELE gave some context to the current assessment situation. We are not starting from scratch. In 2014, IAC was recommissioned, and worked then with a consultant to do an institutional scan. It showed appreciation for groundwork on assessment, such as that by then-chair CARPENTER. But there were also concerns: consistency, expectations, and resources.
IAC created an action plan, VOEGELE continued. The first item was to work with partners to develop support structures and put processes in place for faculty. Then, they sought to identify relevant offices and clarify roles. Her office, OAI, provides resources but does not set policy. We now have a program assessment rubric and template, adapted from NWCCU; it clarifies what is expected in a program assessment plan. This is new, and we can expect further modifications. IAC, collaborating with OAA, modified the assessment guidelines in academic program review [APR], so that they are aligned, consistent, and transparent. IAC also provided feedback to departments on the assessment section of APR. OAI receives annual summaries, gives feedback, and suggests resources; it’s intended as formative. Departments shouldn’t have to wait seven years [for the accreditation cycle], or have to figure out each year what to do. The goal for the IAC website is to provide robust, vibrant resources—particularly usable examples.

Addressing the first of the two main questions, VOEGELE said senators should encourage districts, departments, and programs to make or revise assessment plans as soon as possible. Initial plans do not have to be perfect; often they are in progress, but this opens up a dialogue for progress. It’s also key to get early feedback as plans evolve; OAI is available to do this.

How can Faculty Senate help? VOEGELE noted things that are already happening. IAC is linking to appropriate Faculty committees. It’s hoped that assessment updates can continue, including sharing exciting work across campus. Senate should advocate approaches grounded in the assumptions of the learning organization. IAC appreciates the direct and specific way Senate has been addressing NWCCU directives; at the same time, it would be good if senators can articulate to colleagues how assessment enhances our work and values as an institution. What we need for reporting will be there as a result. We should celebrate what we are learning about ourselves as an institution.

SCHECHTER thanked VOEGELE and OIA for their approachable, instructive leadership. She appreciated the patient attitude. We don’t have to do this alone in our units; we have dedicated and talented people to help us. VOEGELE pointed to members of IAC also as helpful resources.

CLARK seconded SCHECHTER’s comment. How do we know when assessment is working? VOEGELE responded that, at the program level it’s a matter of collecting the appropriate evidence to answer the questions they want to ask—what is valuable for students? At the institutional level, IAC is working on a process whereby as we have more reports, we can make comparisons across programs and over years to show both similarities and differences. This will tell an institutional story.

C. MEYER wondered about examples, direct and indirect measures, etc. She was looking for a rubric. VOEGELE: it’s not called a rubric, but that’s essentially what it is.

GRECO thanked VOEGELE for saying that it’s always a work in progress. In her department she told people that perfection will paralyze us. We need to move forward, and it will get better. VOEGELE said that IAC definitely takes this stance. We want encourage the view that it’s OK to find something unexpected.
LUCKETT added that Ken AMES, former chair of Anthropology, once said that their departmental goal was to earn about a B, not an A. He saw this as a healthy attitude. D. MEIER: get rid of that incomplete! [Laughter and applause.]

The following two annual reports from committees were received as part of the Consent Agenda. See April Agenda Attachments G.4 and G.5, respectively.

5. Annual Report of Internationalization Council
6. Draft of proposed Copyright Policy
   This policy draft was received as part of the Consent Agenda [cf. item B.1, Announcements from Presiding Officer].

H. ADJOURNMENT
   The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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## State Programs & One Time Funds

### 2017-18 Public University State Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Initiative</td>
<td>$3,575,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Innovation Challenge</td>
<td>$5,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Women's Initiative</td>
<td>$2,077,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health Research Fund</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Art &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Cultural Trust</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Pacific Education</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Police Research</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Soil &amp; Water Research</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$25,575,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017-18 Public University Targeted and One Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Culture &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$1,177,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Initiative</td>
<td>$3,575,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Research Foundation</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Art &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Police Research</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Soil &amp; Water Research</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$24,240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Oregon Opportunity Grant

### Oregon Opportunity Grants: Total Disbursements over time by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>4-Year Public Universities</th>
<th>Independent Colleges and Universities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$9,021,254</td>
<td>$8,956,520</td>
<td>$2,903,815</td>
<td>$21,871,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$9,312,891</td>
<td>$10,471,726</td>
<td>$3,312,910</td>
<td>$23,097,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$13,990,198</td>
<td>$14,406,494</td>
<td>$4,675,550</td>
<td>$33,072,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$15,083,712</td>
<td>$14,508,913</td>
<td>$5,063,649</td>
<td>$34,656,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$29,621,042</td>
<td>$32,481,568</td>
<td>$5,809,986</td>
<td>$68,922,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$43,408,248</td>
<td>$28,499,080</td>
<td>$4,664,202</td>
<td>$76,571,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$6,619,945</td>
<td>$9,774,401</td>
<td>$2,440,101</td>
<td>$18,833,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$19,227,760</td>
<td>$20,009,390</td>
<td>$4,103,573</td>
<td>$43,340,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$23,539,066</td>
<td>$23,955,074</td>
<td>$4,173,309</td>
<td>$51,667,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$24,043,194</td>
<td>$26,399,213</td>
<td>$4,520,399</td>
<td>$54,922,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HECC Office of Research and Data and Office of Student Access and Completion, 2016

## Sports Lottery

### 2017-19 Sports Lottery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$456,620</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>$456,619</td>
<td>$456,620</td>
<td>$913,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,119,996</td>
<td>$4,120,004</td>
<td>$8,240,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Funding

### 2017-18 Institution Operating Budgets (All Sources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public University Support Fund</td>
<td>$59,898,508</td>
<td>$59,684,493</td>
<td>$59,898,508</td>
<td>$360,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State General Fund</td>
<td>$28,012,717</td>
<td>$27,470,534</td>
<td>$27,470,534</td>
<td>$82,953,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted &amp; One-Time Funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State Lottery Fund</td>
<td>$54,811,225</td>
<td>$57,155,068</td>
<td>$57,155,068</td>
<td>$170,121,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State General Fund</td>
<td>$28,012,717</td>
<td>$27,470,534</td>
<td>$27,470,534</td>
<td>$82,953,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal State Lottery Fund</td>
<td>$54,811,225</td>
<td>$57,155,068</td>
<td>$57,155,068</td>
<td>$170,121,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State Education &amp; General Revenue</td>
<td>$19,101,081</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$57,726,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Non-State Education &amp; General Revenue</td>
<td>$19,101,081</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$57,726,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Non-State Education &amp; General Revenue</td>
<td>$19,101,081</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$19,312,964</td>
<td>$57,726,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Total</td>
<td>$108,195,307</td>
<td>$105,282,508</td>
<td>$105,282,508</td>
<td>$323,700,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Funding Options
Main Strategy Is to Ask for More Funding
1. Increase PUSF (Shared)
2. New State Program (Independent)
3. One-time Funding (Independent)
4. Sports Lottery (Shared)
5. Oregon Opportunity Grant (Shared)

Cost Reduction Measures
- Efficiency Taskforce
- Strategic Hiring
- Elimination of Administrative Positions
- Several Proposals under Consideration
  - Salary Freeze of Top Executives

New Funding Options
PSU Has a Different Story
State Needs to Pay for PSU Mission
Possible options for increased funding
- Low income tuition support;
- Student success;
- Adult attainment;
- Other ideas

Long-Term Strategy
- We need to focus on what makes PSU Unique
- We need to develop innovative programs that attracts both non-traditional, as well as traditional students
  - Interdisciplinary programs
- We need to enhance our recruitment efforts regionally, nationally, and internationally
- We need to engage our alumni
Appendix G.1

Fundraising & Development
- Currently Cultivating Four Eight Figure Major Gifts

- Since August 1, 2017:
  - 17 Principal gifts of a $1M+
  - 8 Portland Professorships

- $42.7M raised in FY2018, a Record at PSU

Thank you!
Questions?
Learning from Ourselves: Moving Forward with Program Assessment

Janelle Voegele, Director of Teaching, Learning and Assessment
Office of Academic Innovation (OAI)
Chair, Institutional Assessment Council
voegelej@pdx.edu

Context
• IAC scan of campus experiences with assessment (2014)
• Appreciation for groundwork in assessment so far
• Concerns:
  • Consistency
  • Gaps of time between assessment efforts
  • More specific expectations
  • How can programs get regular feedback on their assessment efforts?
• Resources
  • What’s good program assessment? How do we know?
  • Guidance on scope: can program assessment be effective within a specific, focused, manageable scope?

Senate Steering Questions
• Recommendations for programs
• How can Senate help?

IAC Actions
• Recommended and developed institutional support structures
  • OAA
  • OAI
  • IAC members’ constituent feedback
  • Senate Steering and committee feedback
  • Associate Deans, Chairs
  • Successful program models
  • Scholarly literature in assessment
• Clarified roles of various offices and groups working in assessment; alignment of efforts
What is in place now?

- **Program assessment rubric and template**
  - Adapted from NWCCU
  - Available in APR guidelines and IAC website
  - Clarifies what is expected in a program assessment plan
  - Will be further modified with campus feedback
- **Modified APR assessment section guidelines to align with the program assessment rubric**
- **IAC feedback on Academic Program Review** (assessment section only)
  - IAC receives APR assessment sections from OAA
  - Program assessment rubric is used to give feedback
  - Congratulations, suggestions, links to resources, best practices, and relevant scholarship

What should programs be doing?

- Make (or revise) an assessment plan
- Initial plans are often “in progress”
- Get early feedback
- Access resources (digital and staff)

What is in place now, cont.

- **Annual Assessment Update & feedback**
  - OAI receives AAU summaries from OAA
  - OAI assessment staff give feedback to all programs each year
  - Program assessment rubric used to give feedback
  - Congratulations, suggestions, links to resources, best practices and relevant scholarship (tailored to specific programs at specific point in time)
- **Updated assessment resources on IAC website**
  - Goal: Increased campus program examples and templates
  - [https://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/](https://www.pdx.edu/institutional-assessment-council/)

How can Faculty Senate help?

- Facilitating collaborations between IAC and other Senate committees
- Time on Senate agenda for brief assessment updates
- Advocating approaches to assessment that are grounded in “learning organization” assumptions

  What we do is grounded in what we value, what’s good for our programs, students and faculty. What we need for reporting is there as a result.

  Ex: Senate members could attend campus assessment events and celebrations, encourage colleagues in their districts to share successes and examples.