Notes: Exploratory School Discussion Workgroup, Meeting #2
April 7, 2023, 9:30-11:30am via Zoom

Attendees: Shelby Anderson, Daniel Ballhorn, Kate Barcalow, John Bershaw, Adam Booth, Mitch Cruzan, Kris Fedor (resource member), Shannon Heuberger (facilitator), Andrés Holz, Kristie Kolesnikov (logistics), Martin Lafrenz, Amy Larson, Jen Morse, Joann Ng, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Hunter Shobe, Leah Tuor, Wayne Wakeland

Workgroup Roster: https://www.pdx.edu/liberal-arts-sciences/exploratory-school-initiative#workgroup)

Workgroup Goals:
- Incorporate feedback from colleagues into a work plan for gathering information over the next two weeks. The workgroup will gather institutional data and information, research peer models, and perform outreach to students, faculty, staff and community members.
- The information gathered over the next two weeks will be translated into an informational report that will be shared with departments in early May for their feedback.
- Information gathered during this phase will be used in the next phase to draft a conceptual model that will be provided to departments for their feedback, in what will be an iterative process.

Workgroup "homework" for next time:
- ***Members of the "Institutional Data and Information" breakout group will check in via email during the next day or two, to finalize their data needs and collection plan (see detailed section below). CLAS staff will assist with collecting the data requested by the workgroup.***
- ***Members of the "Peer Models" breakout group will each interview contacts from a list of peer institutions (see detailed section below). They will meet during the next few days to solidify the work plan.***
- ***Members of the Outreach breakout group will spend the week of Apr 10 solidifying their outreach questions and surveys for faculty, staff, students and employers (see detailed section below). They will meet to finalize, and perform most of the formal outreach of this phase the week of Apr 17.*** *(Reminder: At any point in this process, input can be relayed to the workgroup via NewSchool@pdx.edu or https://forms.gle/x7Pt78YEt51mBBi18)*

Meeting Discussions:

Input Received Standing Item:
- Workgroup members from all participating departments outreached to colleagues during the last two weeks, and most received several responses. *(THANKS to all the workgroup members and their departments for their commitment to the most important part of this process!)*
- Some department members were outreached to by multiple workgroup members with similar questions. Too much outreach is far better than too little, but we discussed that it could help for workgroup members from the same department to divide-and-conquer.
- Workgroup members were asked to share what they are hearing from colleagues (without naming their colleagues). Common themes included:

- o Enthusiasm for a new school, particularly for cross-disciplinary projects, relieving faculty and staff stress through shared workload, and opportunities to enhance our visibility and partnerships in the community.
    - o Concerns/needs, which the workgroup will channel into drafting a strong model, included maintaining the strong community that departments currently have, navigating a larger unit, making sure the "theme" fits everyone, wages, resources, incorporating JEDI ideals, and building a way to grow faculty under this model.
    - o Peer models that were suggested for research included Colorado State University and the University of Maryland, Baltimore.
- There were no new communications via the two initiative inboxes.
- *Note: "Input Received" is a standing item at every workgroup meeting. Please share your input with members of the workgroup directly or by sending comments to NewSchool@pdx.edu or https://forms.gle/x7Pt78YEt51mBBi18.*

Work Time: Finalizing the Information Gathering Work Plan
- Reviewed progress from the last meeting on the Jamboard (see 3-23-23 Notes on the Exploratory School Initiative website).
- Divided into breakout group of the workgroup members' choosing for 30 min. to develop initial information gathering methods.
- As a whole workgroup, discussed proposed methodologies for full group feedback and to finalize.

See notes from each breakout group topic below.

Institutional Data and Information

Joann, Shelby, Martin, Kris (resource member)

With assistance from CLAS staff and Chairs, this group will collect information on the following. Many of these data priorities came from discussions at the March 10th engagement event. This subgroup will continue to coordinate via email next week (Martin will initiate an email string).
- Teaching load across ranks in participating departments
- Bylaws
- How GTAs are allocated in different programs
- Budget for different programs
- Advising structures in different programs
- Research indirect: flow chart for how it is currently allocated across the university and indirect amount per program that is coming in
- Program descriptions, including the numbers of graduate and undergraduate students, faculty, and staff
- Role of staff across the five units (note: contact PSU College of Arts to understand staffing in its four schools)
- GTA and GRA salary and FTE
- List of majors and graduate programs

Peer Models

Adam, Andrés, Daniel, Hunter, John, Jen, Kate, Wayne

Institutions that the Peer Models subgroup will research are listed below. This list was generated by workgroup members, including from their conversations with other faculty and staff colleagues. This subgroup will meet during the week of Apr 10 to finalize their plan (John will create a Google Doc)
- Arizona State University
- California State University
- Colorado State University
- Carolina State
- The Ohio State University
- Oregon State University
- PSU – WLL, English, School of Business, CUPA, School of Business
- Southern Illinois University
- Stanford
- University of Maryland, Baltimore County
- University of Michigan
- University of Washington
- Washington State University
- Western Washington

Draft Interview Questions for Contacts at Peer Institutions:
1. What college or school did you create? What existed before?
2. What was the motivation? (i.e. top-down?, bottom-up?)
3. Can you describe the process? Workgroups? Outreach? Who was included? etc.
4. Did you base your collaborative entity on analogs or use peer models?
5. What data was useful in informing your transition?
6. What resources were made available and what was actually needed to make it successful?
7. If you were part of the process, how did it go? Did the outcome meet expectations?
8. Describe the structure of your collaborative entity
    a. Are there chairs?
    b. How is course scheduling decided?
    c. Who has voting rights?
    d. How are new hires decided?
    e. How are TA assignments made?
    f. How does P&T work?
    g. Was equity established across units? Or are there still significant differences in benefits / workloads / etc.?
9. How does the new collaborative entity affect students (both pro and cons)?
10. Did the nature of your own work change? More / less academic? administrative? etc.
11. What are the main lessons that you learned?

Outreach

Amy, Leah, Max, Mitch

Key voices were identified by workgroup members and from broader input from the March 10 engagement session. This subgroup will meet early during the week of Apr 10 to finalize their plan.

- Faculty/Staff
    - o Draft questions (to be wordsmithed/consolidated when the subgroup meets): What kind of structure would you be comfortable in? How do we build community? What would enable you to do your job more effectively? What would lead to more job satisfaction?
    - o An email will go out to faculty and staff in each department with the above questions, inviting them to respond via any of the following three routes:
        - ▪ Via email,
        - ▪ By attending an in-person conversation with other faculty and staff from their department, or
        - ▪ Via a 1:1 conversation

- Students:
    - o *PSU Students*: A formal student survey will be drafted using Canvas, asking questions such as: What struggles do you have getting support? What experiences are you having, and what are you missing? What interdisciplinary degrees would be of interest? The subgroup is collecting sample student survey questions and will finalize when they meet.
    - o *PCC Pre-Transfer Students*: The existing "Chat with Leah" platform will be used to ask what would entice them to come to PSU.

- Employers: A formal survey will be drafted asking how we can best prepare students for the job market. This will be finalized when the subgroup meets. A Google doc will be used to collect employer contacts from department chairs.
- Subgroup members will reach out individually to the Learning Center, ERC, Care Team, and SPA for their ideas. Outreach assignments will be coordinated via a Google doc.

Logistics:
- Kristie will identify meeting times for the two subgroup meetings (Peer Models and Outreach)
- The workgroup will gather information between Apr 10-21
- Kristie will schedule our next full workgroup meeting for the week of Apr 24, to share information gathered with the rest of the workgroup, identify key takeaways, and begin compiling a brief report of our findings. A summary of all workgroup agendas is contained in the workgroup's Google Drive folder.
- "Homework" for workgroup members is on p. 1 of these notes