



Exploratory School Discussion Working Group

Informational Report, May 9, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WORKGROUP ROSTER	3
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	4
Workgroup	5
This Report	6
INSTITUTIONAL DATA AND INFORMATION	7
Summary	7
Methods	7
Results	7
Recommendations	8
PEER MODELS	9
Summary	9
Methods	9
Recommendations	10
Additional Information	11
OUTREACH	12
Summary	12
Outreach Methods	12
Results	13
Recommendations	15
APPENDIX I – At-a-Glance	16
APPENDIX II – Advising	21
APPENDIX III – GTA Comparison by Department	22
APPENDIX IV – JDEI AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE	24
APPENDIX V – P&T	25
APPENDIX VI – PARTNERSHIPS	30
APPENDIX VII – STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS & QUESTIONS	32

WORKGROUP ROSTER

Shelby Anderson

Associate Professor, Anthropology

Daniel Ballhorn

Professor and Chair, Biology

Kate Barcalow

Adjunct Faculty, Anthropology

John Bershaw

Associate Professor and Chair, Geology

Adam Booth

Associate Professor, Geology

Mitch Cruzan

Professor, Biology

Andrés Holz

Associate Professor, Geography

Martin Lafrenz

Associate Professor and Chair, Geography

Amy Larson

Teaching Assistant Professor,
Environmental Science and Management

Jen Morse

Associate Professor, Environmental Science
and Management

Joann Ng

Department Coordinator, Geography

Max Nielsen-Pincus

Associate Professor and Chair,
Environmental Science and Management

Radhika Reddy

Senior Instructor, Biology

Hunter Shobe

Professor, Geography

Leah Tuor

Academic and Student Services Manager,
Biology

Wayne Wakeland

Professor and Chair, Systems Science

Becca Wilson-Ounekeo

Lab and Stockroom Coordinator,
Environmental Science and Management

Sahan Dissanayake (Resource Member)

Faculty Fellow, Institute for Sustainable
Solutions
Associate Professor, Economics

Kris Fedor (Resource Member)

Academic Specialist, CLAS

Eleanor Gaines (Resource Member)

Director, Institute for Natural Resources

Kristie Kolesnikov (Logistics)

Executive Director of Internal Affairs and
Initiatives, CLAS

Shannon Heuberger (Facilitator)

Consultant, Heuberger Strategies

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Departments of Anthropology, Biology, Environmental Science and Management, Geography, Geology, and Systems Science are exploring the creation of a new school at the nexus of these disciplines. Between June of 2022 and January of 2023, the six units all voted overwhelmingly (54-3) to discuss and develop a proposal for a new school. The Exploratory School Initiative was launched on February 24, 2023 to ask how collaboration among these units can:

- Improve and foster new interdisciplinary academic programming,
- Enhance student outcomes and opportunities,
- Make more effective use of staff resources,
- Maintain and elevate high quality research,
- Support fundraising, and
- Explore connections to faculty in other units.

The outcome of this initiative will be the development of a vision and model for collaboration that differentiates PSU programs from more traditional disciplinary offerings at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and other institutions across the Pacific Northwest. The interdisciplinary initiative will support curricula, research, and other activities that address the lived experiences of students to attract and retain PSU's diverse and first-generation student body. Collaboration will be pursued while maintaining disciplinary identity. Potential adaptations that a school could support include ideas such as:

- Lower division courses that highlight different major pathways, allowing students to make better informed decisions about academic programming.
- Shared degree programs or course offerings that reduce artificial boundaries currently imposed on students by our existing degree pathways.
- Student access to expertise in specific areas like equity and justice, adaptation to climate change, indigenous traditional ecological and cultural knowledge, complex systems modeling, and other specializations that are currently siloed in units based on past hiring opportunities.
- Streamlining and coordinating our curricular offerings to reduce relatively high teaching loads and incentivize interdisciplinary team teaching and community engagement.
- Leveraging the integration of our knowledge and problem-solving approaches for local partnerships with government, non-profit, and private sector enterprises whose realities transcend our disciplinary boundaries.
- Highlighting future areas for transdisciplinary growth (e.g., faculty hires, new staff positions, collocation space, etc.) aimed at improving student access and success by

integrating work in areas such as climate change and adaptation, environmental and climate justice, applied conservation, human health and cultural diversity, impacts of pollution and natural hazards, and complex systems and resilience thinking.

With support from the Provost’s ReImagine Initiative, this initiative fosters opportunities for faculty and staff in these units to develop a potential vision, key principles for collaboration, and a conceptual model for a new school.

You can read more at: <https://www.pdx.edu/liberal-arts-sciences/exploratory-school-initiative>

Workgroup

Following an informational “initiative launch” meeting on February 24th, 2023, and a faculty and staff engagement session on March 10, 2023, the six units formed a 17-member “Exploratory School Discussion Workgroup” of faculty and staff. The workgroup was tasked with gathering information, researching peer models, and collecting input from faculty, staff, students and community partners, to translate into a conceptual model for the school.

Key workgroup milestones include:

<i>March 23</i>	Workgroup kickoff meeting
<i>March 23 – May 4</i>	Planning, information gathering, and outreach
<i>May 9</i>	Informational Report completed and shared with departments for feedback
<i>May 10</i>	Town hall to share Informational Report findings and seek feedback
<i>May 11-19</i>	Workgroup to develop a draft “school model” for departmental discussion. <i>See Initiative Brief for characteristics that the model must have at:</i> https://www.pdx.edu/liberal-arts-sciences/sites/g/files/znlldhr1936/files/2023-03/Draft%20Initiative%20Brief%20-%20New%20School%20Initiative.pdf
<i>May 19 - June 2</i>	Revise model and continue to iterate with departments
<i>Fall</i>	Departmental reviews and refining of a proposal for the Faculty Senate Education Policy Committee (EPC)

This Report

This report summarizes the information gathered by the workgroup, to help inform their subsequent phase of drafting a “school model.” Once a conceptual school model has been developed, it will be added to an updated version of this report, to share with departments to begin an iterative process of revising and refining the model.

INSTITUTIONAL DATA AND INFORMATION

Summary

The Exploratory School Discussion Workgroup gathered institutional data and information related to academic programs and enrollment, teaching loads, GTAs & GRAs, advising, research, bylaws, and staffing across the six relevant units.

Methods

The Workgroup identified informational needs and then gathered information with assistance from department chairs and CLAS staff. Data was pulled from COGNOS reports, directly from department bylaws, or by interviewing department chairs and staff. Additionally, staff from each unit contributed information regarding their respective responsibilities, which is information that is not otherwise located in any centrally accessible format.

Results

- Personnel per unit including number of tenure-track, non-tenure track teaching, non-tenure track research, GTAs, GRAs, and staff positions (see At-a-Glance Unit Information, Appendix I)
- Degrees offered and number of declared majors/minors (see At-a-Glance Unit Information, Appendix I)
- Research activity (see At-a-Glance Unit Information, Appendix I)
- Teaching, research, service, and administrative work loads vary among units.
- Advising responsibilities are quite similar across units with most using the university pathway model for some undergraduate advising and faculty doing more degree specific and graduate advising. (see Advising Structure Across Units, Appendix II)
- GTA allocations and salaries vary across units (See Appendix III)
- Bylaws and P&T Guidelines
- Voting rights and practices vary across units
 - JDEI language and work-life balance references have explicit subsections in some unit bylaws or are imbedded throughout various subsections for most units (see Appendix IV)
 - P&T department specific language. In line with University Guidelines, the criteria for successful Promotion and Tenure (P&T) across participating

departments are similar. The same holds true for the dossier requirements faculty of the different departments need to follow. With that being said, significant differences regarding size, structure and composition of P&T committees exist. These differences include NTTF and student participation and voting rights. In one department P&T tasks are taken over by an "Advisory Committee" with diverse additional functions. See Appendix V.

- Partnerships: Associate Director for Regional Partnerships and Projects Beth Gildea and colleagues from PSU's Institute for Sustainable Solutions conducted interviews of faculty on their external partnerships. The interviews are ongoing, and a partial summary of partnership information collected so far can be found on Appendix VI

Recommendations

- All programs, majors, minors, and certificates move forward into new school
- An equitable process is needed to address differences in teaching, research, service, and administrative work loads, which currently vary among faculty and staff across units as a function of appointment, e.g., tenure-track, non-tenure track, or adjunct, rank, e.g., tenure seeking vs. tenured faculty, service effort, research related course buyouts, service related or negotiated course releases, administrative requirements, e.g., office staff or lab staff, and historic practice.
- GTA allocation, duties and responsibilities currently vary among departments and equitable assignments will need to be considered moving forward.
- Based on the existing differences among departments, an alignment of P&T guidelines and processes should be considered. However, these considerations would need to include different compositions of units in terms of tenure-track and teaching professor lines as well as other groups of non-tenure track faculty (such as research NTTF). While processes for the evaluation of NTTF vary, the transition to the new teaching professor ranks likely will result in some sort of alignment across departments.

PEER MODELS

Summary

The Exploratory School Discussion Workgroup reached out to faculty or administrators at peer institutions where departments like ours exist within an integrated unit (School or College), and to four of PSU’s academic units. Objectives were to learn about the motivation and process for forming their unit, the unit’s structure, pros and cons, and lessons learned. Key findings included:

- Clear vision, strong administrative support, clear lines of authority, and shared governance are critical.
- Most of the examined school units had one budget; key for incentive to avoid SCH competition, and for full transparency when allocating resources to individual units.
 - Operating as a single faculty with school-wide committees is common but not universal.
- Secret sauce for PSU School of Business: having the right people in leadership roles; “advantages far outweighed the challenges.”
- Areas/disciplines are maintained and control curriculum.
- Clarity about priorities/expectations for teaching vs. research and natural vs. social science may be important.
- Clarity about purpose/benefits of school creation is very helpful.
- Students benefit from happier faculty.
- Applicants (students and faculty) are excited to come to an interdisciplinary school.

Methods

For each peer model studied, a Workgroup member reached out to a faculty member or administrator in the unit with the following questions.

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? What are their responsibilities?
 - 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. How do finances work? Is money distributed among programs or managed centrally?
 - h. Was equity established across units? Or are there still significant
 - i. 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?

The following institutions were contacted:

- Arizona State University
- California State University
- The Ohio State University
- Oregon State University
- PSU – WLL, English, School of Business, CUPA, former School of the Environment
- Southern Illinois University
- Stanford
- University of Canterbury, New Zealand
- University of Maryland, Baltimore County
- University of Michigan
- University of South Carolina
- University of Washington
- Washington State University
- Western Washington

A CLAS student employee assisted the Workgroup by researching the number of faculty and organizational charts of each peer institution.

Recommendations

- Retain existing majors, graduate degree programs and certificate programs

- Establish checks and balances in governance to avoid “absolute” power being vested in a single director, and ensure all units have representation in decision-making
- Define clear governance and organizational structure / bylaws prior to voting (i.e. new hires, P&T, GAs, allocation of shared resources, etc.)
- Secure strong upper-administrative support, i.e. fund workgroups / facilitators / fundraise, advocate, etc.
- Evaluate the effects of combining unit finances to reduce competition for SCH, curricular redundancy, and increase curricular collaboration
- Communicate consistently and clearly with all that are affected about the process / timeline, findings, what has not yet been done, with appropriate detail. Transparency.
- Control over curriculum best resides with departments (or whatever they become) rather than in the hands of one person who sets curriculum for the entire school
- Ensure all faculty / staff / students, including those that may not identify with the School theme, are included and feel respected
- Make clear in advance if the departments / units retain their own Foundation accounts or if they are consolidated
- Understand that creation process is incremental and will take years to implement
- Communicate clearly School structure to new hires (TT, NTTF, and staff)
- Nurture community through periodic social events and a plan for co-location

Items that need deeper discussion:

- Combining, and deciding structure for allocating, Budgets
- Governance / Organizational Structure - “Checks and balances”

Additional Information

For details on individual models researched, use the following link:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/14irv_rGElnE8ZH8YDMxzvhLVbH-V_7sK_BaJtqyJ7Ww/edit?usp=sharing

If you are having any trouble accessing the document, please email NewSchool@pdx.edu.

OUTREACH

Summary

The Exploratory School Discussion Workgroup reached out to faculty, staff, current and prospective students, affiliates and employers for feedback on how we can best support and prepare students, how to strategically position ourselves for the years ahead, and how to create an ideal work environment for faculty and staff.

Outreach Methods

Audience	Method	Questions
Faculty	Survey	Challenges if we continue business as usual Priorities for the next 5-10 years What would you like to see in a school structure What makes a good work environment What benchmarks indicate success
Staff	Survey, Luncheon	What would enable you to do your job more effectively What would lead to more job satisfaction What makes a good work environment What could strengthen our sense of community
PSU Students in the relevant departments	Survey	Biggest obstacles or biggest missed expectations Most important changes/improvements See Appendix VII for quantitative survey questions
PCC Pre-Transfer Students	Survey	Resources/actions/activities leading to success at PCC Resources/actions/activities critical to success at PSU
Employers	Email	Skills needed in graduates How needed skillsets are expected to change in the next 5-10 yrs How best to partner with workforce members
PSU Affiliates (Learning Center, DRC, Care Team, SPA, IELP, Portland Center, Student Life)	Email	What recommendations do you have for our process How can we best partner with you

Results

Audience	Results
Faculty	<p>Business as usual results in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of hiring for faculty and staff ● “Adjunctification” ● Increasing service workloads ● Lack of innovation ● More competition for fewer resources <p>Future Priorities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More courses counting towards degrees ● Shared 100-level sequence (a school FRINQ?) ● More grad-only classes ● Interdisciplinary teaching/research themes ● More hiring of tenure track and staff ● Specialization of admin staff duties ● Use our urban setting to our advantage and be unique from OSU/UO <p>Desirable Features of a New School:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transparency in governance and workload allocation ● School-level faculty governance committees ● Preserve existing majors but allow more course options across programs ● Reduce course redundancy ● Hybridizing degrees across programs ● Reward interdisciplinary research/teaching ● Reduce committee/service loads ● Allow for a focus on climate change
Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Make sure staff are recognized as experts and professionals in their areas who are not interchangeable with each other ● Staff members acknowledge that school has potential to make staff jobs easier through collaboration, cross-training, specialization, etc. ● But they expressed strong skepticism that this potential will not be actionable, and instead implementation will end up leading to more work, more departures, and worse outcomes ● Lab prep staff are interested in more cross-training ● Some office staff are interested in more specialization ● All staff agree that more staff are needed ● Staff have appreciated getting together and developing community

<p>PSU Students in the relevant departments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scheduling and availability of classes is a key obstacle for students (breadth, online vs in-person, times offered, safety/parking) ● Making connections with other students in a cohort; feeling of belonging ● Not feeling prepared for interactions with professionals and career paths ● Centralized advising is a challenge ● Some students report negative experience with instructors not being prepared ● Grad students want more grad-only classes ● Increase BIPOC representation in faculty/curriculum
<p>PCC Pre-Transfer Students</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty office hours are important ● Integration of career advising with curriculum advising ● Alternatives to testing, and flexibility on deadlines ● More research and field work opportunities
<p>Employers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Soft skills: organization, project management, communication, listening, leadership, collaboration, problem solving ○ Technical skills: software, observation, disciplinary depth, data collection and modeling ● Future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Greater interdisciplinary training ○ Social science and policy of increasing importance ○ Emerging techniques (eDNA, SCADA) ○ Field skills ○ Flexibility ● Engaging employers and PSU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build lasting relationships built on local needs ○ Promote experiential learning ○ Invite employers to participate
<p>PSU Affiliates (Learning Center, DRC, Care Team, SPA, IELP, Portland Center, Student Life)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learning Center: Would resources to serve the school be decentralized or remain centralized? Happy to support collaboration ● IELP: Interested in developing supportive relationship with our language learners and international students (building the Sustainability class) ● DOS: Units do not adequately use CARE or conduct systems leading to tremendous underreporting and challenges engaging in student interventions. DOS would like to work with faculty and staff to have more exposure to the services and resources provided by DOS (Care team, risk intervention)

Recommendations

Curriculum, Faculty, and Student Affairs

- Preserve existing majors but allow for more flexibility in course options to address the student concerns about course scheduling and breadth.
- Consider developing school-based FRINQ, SINQs, Junior Cluster, and Capstone requirements using the Honors College as a model.
- Identify redundant course offerings and assess if any should be reworked or removed as part of a strategy to address free up faculty teaching loads, allow for a greater variety of courses, or incentivize interdisciplinary teaching.
- Allow graduate committee members to be drawn from across the school based on the expertise rather than department.
- Pool some graduate coursework across graduate programs to allow for more graduate only courses.
- Develop a deliberate approach to opportunities for experiential learning and off campus opportunities for field experiences, research, and internships.
- Secure resources to house student advising in the new school.
- Foster identity at both the school and major/program level.

Faculty, Staff & Governance

- Hire new faculty and staff to fill existing gaps and expand into emerging opportunities.
- Restructure faculty governance committees at the school level to reduce faculty service loads; include members from each department when possible.
- Position the administrative functions of the school as a federated center of specialized staff with a clear supervisory structure.
- Develop materials for faculty and staff that clearly articulate the roles and processes that staff perform behind the scenes.
- Develop a staff lounge to encourage interaction and engagement among staff.

APPENDIX I – At-a-Glance

Data as of winter 2023								
		ANTH	BIO	ESM	GEOG	GEOL	SYSCI	TOTALS
FACULTY								
	Pre-tenure	1	2	2	0	0	0	5
	Tenured	5	17	7	8	7	2	46
	NTT Teaching Ranks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NTT-CA Prob	0	4	2	1	1	0	8
	NTT-CA	0	2	1	1	1	0	5
	Fixed Terms	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
	TOTAL:	6	25	13	11	9	2	66
NTTF Research Faculty								
	Research Assistant/Associate	2	3	2	1	1	0	9

	Research Professors (Assist/Assoc/Full)	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
	TOTAL:	3	5	2	2	1	0	13
STAFF								
Unrepresented		0	1	1	0	0	0	2
AAUP-rep		0	1	0	1	0	0	2
SEIU-rep	OS2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
	Lab staff	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
	TOTAL:	1	5	2	2	1	0	11
STAFF VACANCIES								
Unrepresented		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AAUP		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SEIU		0	1	1	0.5	1	0	3.5

	TOTAL:	0	1	1	0.5	1	0	3.5
GRADUATE STUDENT EMPLOYEES								
GTAs		4	24	11	10	7	0	56
GRAs		5	14	9	6	4	0	38
	TOTAL:	11	50	26	21	15	0	123
DECLARED STUDENTS								
	UG Primary Major	95	568	227	54	71	NA	1015
	UG Major (any priority)	101	590	231	56	73	NA	1051
	UG Minor	41	198	119	93	59	9	519
	UG Major x Other Dept Major (in school)	1	1	0	2	2	NA	6
	UG Major x Other Dept Minor (in school)	13	18	44	4	10	NA	89

	UG Minor x Other Dept Major (in school)	3	14	18	45	13	0	93
	UG Minor x Other Dept Minor (in school)	0	4	7	9	6	0	26
	GR Major	25	35	52*	22	16	12	110
	GR Certificate	NA	NA	4	18	NA	7	29
	TOTAL:	279	1428	650	303	250	28	2938
*Includes EES doctoral students whose advisors are in GEOG and GEOL								
CURRICULUM								
	Certs	0	0	4	1	3	2	10
	Minors	1	2	3	4	4	1	15
	BA/BS	1	1	2	1	2	0	7
	MA/MS	1	2	3	2	3	1	12
	PHD	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
	TOTAL:	3	6	13	8	12	5	47

GRANT DOLLARS								
	Federal (NIH/NSF/EPA)/DOE Direct	\$618,570	\$1,440,230	\$438,026	\$388,914	\$279,286	\$0	\$3,165,027
	Federal F&A	\$137,126	\$440,014	\$106,389	\$79,878	\$102,877	\$0	\$866,284
	State/Contract/other Direct	\$106,864	\$76,456	\$797,469	\$258,590	\$4,816	\$14,573	\$1,258,767
	State and other F&A	\$17,840	\$9,673	\$224,186	\$59,378	\$2,336	\$7,068	\$320,480
	Grant Total	\$880,401	\$1,966,372	\$1,566,070	\$786,760	\$389,315	\$21,640	\$5,610,558
	TOTAL:							\$11,221,115

APPENDIX II – Advising

ADVISING STRUCTURE ACROSS UNITS

ANTH

- Advising on major and career issues is primarily done by the chair, and this year, our careers/internship coordinator with support from other faculty. More general advising is done by the pathway advisors.

BIO

- Undergraduate advising is conducted almost entirely through pathway advisors in the advising center, and is supplemented to a small degree by our departmental administrative assistant. All faculty engage in informal advising of undergraduate students, and TTF faculty are primarily responsible for advising the graduate students working in their labs.

ESM

- Advising is primarily done by our pathway advisors with support from the chair.

GEOG

- Advising is first done, where possible, by our pathway adviser.
- Four faculty undergraduate advisors assist with additional student course planning for majors and the Geography minor including evaluation of transfer courses; students are assigned to a faculty advisor alphabetically by last name.
- The other three minors each have different faculty advisers who also administer each minor.
- Two different graduate advisers review applications and advise graduate students on course planning and recommend DARS actions for the Geography MS/MA and MS GIS/Cert, respectively.

GEOL

- We have three undergraduate advisors that are TT faculty. They take this on as part of their service load. They distribute students based on last name. We coordinate with the Pathways advisor, and ask students to be referred to a Geology Dept. advisor once they've declared.

SySCI

- Grad students are assigned an adviser when offered admission, but as their research crystallizes, they are encouraged to "recruit" the best possible advisor from the larger pool of senior faculty members across campus. As needed, the program chair augments student advising needs in the program.

APPENDIX III – GTA Comparison by Department

	Anthropology	Biology	Environmental Science and Management (ESM)	Geography	Geology	Systems Science
Number of incoming lines per year	3 GTA lines per 4 incoming GAs	AY 23/4: 8 Has been higher in previous higher enrollment years				No longer have GTAs
Senior GTA line allocation	Divided among 2nd year GAs	As per course need				
Additional GA support?		Some on GRAs				
Initial Minimum Salary*	\$34,002	\$54,549	\$44,118	\$44,118	\$49,752	\$34,002
Standard FTE	0.3	0.33 0.49 in some cases of GTA shortages	0.34	0.3	0.3	0.3
Allocation	By TT faculty consensus	- Priority to pre-tenured faculty - max two GTA lines per faculty, recent exceptions to maintain graduate program size	- Priority to pre-tenured faculty - Faculty recruit into open lines.	rolling basis based on time since a faculty member last had a GTA	Priority order: - TT faculty - GTA merit - MS prioritized over PhD students - First year student allocation based on “quality”	
Course assignments & Oversight	Large 100/300 level courses (>50 enrollment), Lan courses	- Lab courses - Large lecture majors’ courses -Assignments by TT faculty	- Lab courses - Grading/writing intensive courses		Course need (determined by graduate coordinator, TT faculty member who is given course release to perform these duties)	- (historical) teaching UG cluster courses, often courses of their own

		overseeing graduate affairs and grad program coordinator	- 3 as mentors for UNST SINQ courses taught by ESM faculty - Teaching lab manager drafts GTA assignments with chair and department manager oversight		Organized decision tree viewable here, currently under revision.	creation or those developed by prior PhD students or core faculty members.
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

*Continuing GAs get a COLA of between 1.5% and 3.5%, so the average salary varies based on the mix of newer and more- senior GAs. Thus, depts with PhD programs have higher average rate. GA = Graduate Assistant, GTA = Graduate Teaching Assistant, GRA = Graduate Research Assistant, TT = Tenure Track

APPENDIX IV – JDEI AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE

JDEI and Work-life Balance Statements in Bylaws and P&T Guidelines						
	Anthropology	Biology*	ESM	Geography	Geology	System Science
Bylaws	Article II - Purpose (pg.2); Article IIIB - Faculty Search Committee (pg.7); Article IX - Work-Life Balance (pg. 7)	3.6 Search Committees (pg. 13);	Article IVB - Hiring (Pg. 5) Article X - Work-Life Balance (Pg.9-10)	Article VIII - Department Culture Work/Life Balance (Pg. VIII)	Article II - Purpose (Pg. 1)	not yet updated
P&T	No JDEI topics covered explicitly in P&T guidelines	No JDEI topics covered explicitly in P&T guidelines	No JDEI topics covered explicitly in P&T guidelines	Covers JDEI topics on Pg.18, 20, 24, 27	No JDEI topics covered explicitly in P&T guidelines	not yet updated
Work-Life Balance Statement	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	not yet updated

*Information from Biology Department Draft Document Jan 2021, Combined Bylaws and P&T Guidelines

APPENDIX V – P&T

	Anthropology	Biology	Environmental Science & Management (ESM)	Geography	Geology	Systems Science
P&T committee composition and numbers	3 tenure-track Faculty (majority needs to be tenured =2). In the absence of a majority of tenured faculty, tenured faculty members from <i>other departments</i> with relevant expertise and experience will be asked to serve on the committee by the Committee Chair and agreed upon by the faculty member being reviewed.	5 tenured faculty members elected by the entire faculty (defined as all tenured and tenure track faculty, and all NTTF holding the rank of Senior Instructor I* or above.	3 elected tenured members of the faculty. Non-tenured members may also serve on this committee in a non-voting capacity and are in addition to the 3 voting committee members.	3 faculty and one student. Only tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve.	An <i>Advisory Committee</i> is taking on P&T committee responsibilities (all tenured faculty). Non-tenured faculty on continuous appointment may become members by a 2/3 vote of the committee. The <i>Advisory Committee</i> , with the addition of 2 student members with voting privileges, functions as the departmental P&T committee	3 faculty from across the campus, typically tenured

<p>P&T Chair election/ appointment</p>	<p>Faculty members with voting rights per Department by-laws will elect the P&T Committee Chair, and the P&T Chair will constitute that year’s committee.</p>	<p>The Department Chair appoints one of the elected P&T Committee members to serve as Chair of the P&T Committee.</p>	<p>The Department Chair appoints one of the elected P&T Committee members to serve as Chair of the P&T Committee.</p>	<p>The P&T chair is appointed by department chair from the three highest vote totals who serve on the committee</p>	<p>The <i>Advisory Committee</i> is constituted by all members of the tenured faculty and elects its own Chair.</p>	<p>Core program faculty member</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------------

<p>NTTF evaluation and P&T committee participation</p>	<p>When a NTTF member is reviewed, and there is more than one NTTF member in the Department, at least one NTTF member will be on the review committee. NTTF members who are appointed at .5 FTE or higher may participate as <i>observers</i> or serve as needed at the discretion of the P&T Chair, and with the approval of the faculty member under review.</p>	<p>For P&T decisions on NTTF faculty members, if possible (i.e. if there are two or more NTTF faculty in the department available to participate) one of the 5 tenured faculty members will be randomly removed from the committee and replaced by a NTTF faculty member selected by the entire faculty.</p>	<p>The P&T Committee, with the addition of a NTTF faculty member chosen as specified in the ESM Guidelines for NTTF Review on the years requiring NTTF review, organizes reviews of NTTF for continuous appointments. All members vote on the NTTF candidate(s); tenure track members will vote on TTF candidates.</p>	<p>Annual probationary NTTF reviews will be conducted by the NTTF Review Committee. This committee, as per GEOG Bylaws, consists of 3 faculty members (1 NTTF, 2 TTF), appointed by the GEOG Chair. The committee chair, as per GEOG Bylaws, is NTT faculty with CA status. The Department Chair may not serve as a member of the committee.</p> <p>In the event that a member of the NTTF Review Committee is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will appoint an additional committee member solely for the purposes of reviewing the other member’s dossier so that no one serves as both reviewer and reviewee of the same case. The additional committee member will also be NTT faculty, from within GEOG unless there is no one available, in which case the member will be chosen from <i>outside GEOG</i>.</p>	<p>The NTTF Faculty Review Committee is the Advisory Committee and a NTTF representative appointed by the Chair. The NTTF member cannot be the NTTF representative when their own file is under consideration. Procedures for review of NTTF are included in the department’s guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.</p>	<p>Have had only one NTTF in the past ten years, treated as a full regular faculty member</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>Student participation on P&T and PTR committees</p>	<p>No information</p>	<p>Yes – 2 student members. A graduate student member will be <i>selected by the P&T committee</i> from graduate students volunteering to serve and an undergraduate biology student with upper division standing will be selected by the P&T Committee from students volunteering to serve. The student members shall participate in P&T Committee deliberations but are no voting members.</p>	<p>No information</p>	<p>Yes – 1 student. The student member will be a GEOG graduate student <i>chosen by the students</i>.</p>	<p>Yes – 2 student members.</p> <p>The student members receive one vote total. In the event that the student members cannot reach a consensus, they may abstain from voting. The Office Coordinator shall oversee the elections (by secret ballot) of the student members and shall ensure the eligibility of students to vote in each election.</p> <p>1. One Geology graduate student elected by a majority of the department’s MS and PhD students.</p>	<p>Informally only</p>
---	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	---	--	------------------------

					<p>2. One undergraduate Geology or Earth Science major elected by a majority of the senior students enrolled in fall term courses. Here, senior students are those who have earned passing grades in all 300-level courses required for the Geology major.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX VI – PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships identified so far (note: this is a partial list, and faculty from Biology have not yet been interviewed)

Government Partners:

Oregon Department of Energy
City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Port of Portland
USGS
Clackamas River Water Providers
Water and Environment Services
Portland Water Bureau
US Forest Service
Clean Rivers Coalition (Multnomah County)
National Parks Service
Metro
Oregon Fish and Wildlife
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Health Authority
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
Oregon Health Authority

Private Sector

AltaRock Energy
OMSI
NW Natural
Environmental Defense Fund
Providence Healthcare
Weyerhaeuser

Initial Observations:

- Most partnerships have formed out of individual relationships, and dependent on individual relationships for maintenance
- Most are with government (at all levels)
- One reason why they favor government partnerships is because of funding. Nonprofits, community groups and smaller businesses have a harder time with funding projects

- When partners have an interest in science and scientific method it leads to collaboration, better work, and a more satisfying relationship. It can also lead to a deeper, longer-term partnership
- Figuring out the administrative side of partnerships was difficult for both faculty and partners. It can also be difficult to create synergy between faculty/partner timelines; and making timelines work with SPA.
- There seems to be a lack of staff who are dedicated to creating inroads to new organizations/partnerships
- Faculty are mostly unaware of partnerships that others hold--there is a desire to know who is working with who and on what

APPENDIX VII – STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS & QUESTIONS

[Undergraduate Survey Results](#)

[Graduate Student Survey Results](#)

We want to hear about your experience in your program. The Anthropology, Biology, Environmental Science & Management, Geography, Geology, and Systems Science Departments and Programs are collaborating to learn more about your experience and inform an initiative designed to create a vision for future coordination and collaboration among our departments and programs (you can learn more about this initiative at the [Exploratory School Initiative](#) website). Ideally, this initiative will foster more interdisciplinary programming, better student services, and increase cross-disciplinary student experiences in the years ahead. We want to hear from you early in the process.

1. What year in school are you? (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, post-bac, masters, doctoral)
2. Was the 2022-2023 school year your first year at PSU? (Yes, No)
3. Did you start your degree at PSU, or did you transfer from another school? (Started at PSU, Transferred from another school)
 - a. If the selected option for #2 is “Transferred from another school”, then
 - i. I transferred from:
 1. Portland CC
 2. Clackamas CC
 3. Mt Hood CC
 4. Other: _____
4. What major are you currently pursuing?
 - a. If the selected option for #1 is an undergrad or postback level, then
 - i. Anthropology
 - ii. Biology
 - iii. Environmental Science
 - iv. Environmental Studies
 - v. Geography
 - vi. Geology
 - vii. Other: _____
 - b. If the selected option for #1 is at the grad level, then
 - i. MS in Anthropology
 - ii. MS in Biology
 - iii. MS in Environmental Science

- iv. MS in Geography
 - v. MS in Geology
 - vi. MEM in Environmental Management
 - vii. PSM in Environmental Science & Management
 - viii. PSM in Applied Geosciences
 - ix. PhD in Biology
 - x. PhD in Earth, Environment, and Society
 - xi. PhD in Systems Science
5. Do you have a minor? _____
 6. If you previously had a different major, what was it?
 7. Do you plan to be a student at PSU in the fall of 2023? (Yes, Maybe, No I plan on graduating before then, No I do not plan to be a student at PSU in the Fall 2023 for other reasons)
 - a. If the selected option for #4 is “No I do not plan to be a student at PSU in the Fall 2023 for other reasons” then,
 - b. Why are you not planning to be a student again in fall 2021? (select the best option from the list below.) allow checking multiple boxes
 - i. I need a break from school
 - ii. I have financial concerns about being able to afford school
 - iii. I have family obligations that prevent me from continuing
 - iv. PSU is not a good fit for me
 - v. Other: _____
 8. Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your connection with [Major Program of Study]. (select one answer for each statement – 5 point scale from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree.)
 - a. I feel like I belong in [Major]
 - b. I feel like I am part of [Major]
 - c. I feel like I can be myself in [Major]
 - d. Overall, I feel happy to be in [Major]
 - e. I think that people in [Major] care about me
 - f. I don't have close bonds with others in [Major]
 - g. I feel isolated in [Major]
 - h. I feel excluded in [Major]
 - i. I feel disconnected from [Major]
 - j. I feel ignored in [Major]
 9. Please rank your overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the following experiences at PSU. (Select one answer for each item – 5 point scale from Highly Satisfied to Highly Dissatisfied + Not Applicable)
 - a. Availability of classes
 - b. Class sizes
 - c. Quality of courses
 - d. Access to faculty and instructors
 - e. Quality of teaching assistants
 - f. Course requirements for the major / degree

- g. Access to courses or other activities outside my department
 - h. Extracurricular activities for my major / degree
 - i. Research experiences
 - j. Quality of advising
 - k. Facilities
 - l. Options for committee members with relevant expertise [GRAD ONLY]
 - m. Availability of funding to support graduate school [GRAD ONLY]
 - n. Sense of community with my major or graduate program
 - o. Overall quality of my major or graduate program
10. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your major or degree program? (5pt scale: Strongly agree to Strongly disagree)
- a. My major's requirements reflect the state of the art in the field
 - b. My major's requirements prepare me for practical applications in my field
 - c. My major's requirements are relevant to my professional goals
 - d. My major's courses are offered when I need them
 - e. My major's courses help me understand current issues in my field
 - f. Faculty in my major are interested in my success
 - g. My major is designed to be appropriately rigorous
11. How much do you agree or disagree that your major or degree program prepares you for the following
- a. My major is helping me improve my critical thinking skills
 - b. My major is helping me improve my written communication skills
 - c. My major is helping me improve my oral presentation skills
 - d. My major is helping me understand how to analyze and interpret data
 - e. My major is helping me apply theoretical knowledge to practical problems
 - f. My major is helping me prepare to interact with professional
 - g. My major is helping me prepare for a career
12. What have been the biggest obstacles or biggest missed expectations relative to your success toward in your major or graduate program?
13. What would be the most important changes/improvements that PSU could make to improve your education experience?

Closing Page

Thank you for your participation. Your responses have been recorded. If you would like to be entered into a raffle for the daily Starbucks gift card, please click [here](#). You will be taken to a separate site where you can enter your name and contact information to be entered into a daily \$20 gift card drawing. If you'd rather not enter the raffle you can close this browser window.

1. First and last name
2. Email
3. With which of the following Departments or Programs do you most closely identify?
 - a. Anthropology
 - b. Biology
 - c. Environmental Science & Management

- d. Geography
- e. Geology
- f. Systems Science