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Understanding University Growth
During the year the EPC worked on developing a better understanding PSU’s short term and long term policies regarding enrollment growth. The purpose of this discussion has been to understand the PSU’s policies for growth and the benefits and consequences of that growth. Some of the broader questions of the committee are as follows:

How has the administration weighed the pros and cons of growth?
What is the primary purpose of growth?
• To increase access?
• To backfill state budget reductions?

Do we have a strategic plan for growth over the next 3-5 years?

The table below outlines only a few of the changes that PSU has experienced in the last decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001-2</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Div</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Div</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>18,107</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001 04</th>
<th>2009 04</th>
<th>% growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite Tenure</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tenure</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Term- Full Time</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Term - Adjunct</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>103.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Planning
The committee raised a variety of preliminary concerns that are the byproduct of university growth. Some of these are as follows:

**Issues that may affect student success**
- Concerns about admitting students that are not ready for university level study. We acknowledge that the administration has taken steps to address this issue which may improve student success.
- Faculty raised concerns about jamming 50 or 60 students into classrooms that were designed to hold 40 – 45 students. We are filling flat classrooms to absolute capacity, sometimes with chairs brought in from the hallway, and it is affecting the quality of discussion and student interaction in the classroom.
- Faculty are more frequently having full classes and are turning away students in required courses. This is more than just an issue of getting a class at a convenient time. Rather, faculty are seeing more students having to wait a term to get a required class in the curriculum. The result hampers student’s ability to make timely progress towards degrees. When students are blocked out of full classes, have we reduced the opportunity for students to make regular progress towards degree completion?

**Do we have the appropriate faculty and infrastructure to accomplish growth?**
- Many faculty feel that we are serving more students by:
  - Moving more full time faculty to administrative positions to manage new programs and growth, with the addition of adjunct faculty rather than tenure track faculty
  - When faculty buy out of teaching to work on research grants, this also contributes to hiring more adjunct faculty.
- With a higher proportion of adjunct faculty committee staffing is problematic.
- Do we have the physical capacity to accomplish growth? See the comments above about jamming students into classrooms.
- How has the median or average class sizes changed during the last decade?
- Are we fighting among ourselves to obtain students? As departments become more revenue driven, is there an issue where we are all trying to serve the same students?
- At what point does the cost of new facilities to accommodate growth, and adding full time faculty to accommodate growth, cost more than revenues gained by additional students?
- Do we have the facilities and space to accommodate growth in both students and research?
- The library is cutting back on acquiring journals and books that are often needed by faculty and students due to space and budget constraints. The library is also sending books and journals off-site to make more room for students.
- The library is more crowded with students occupying most of the seats on a typical day. There are long waits for computers in the library.
- Growth often means new programs and new grants that bring additional dollars into the university. These programs and grants rely on additional resources, yet the library is typically not allocated any additional dollars with new grants and programs--even when such funds are written into the grant budget! The library is concerned that funding for collections and services is not keeping up with demand as expanded grants and new programs come into place.
- To we have the housing infrastructure to accommodate out of state or foreign students?

**Questions about planning for growth?**
- How are we planning thoughtfully for growth at the department level?
- Is there a plan for expected growth from:
  - Freshman?
  - Transfer students?
  - Graduate students?
• How are we planning for growth with out of state and foreign students vs. in state students? Are we looking to substitute out of state students for in state students? Or are we looking for additional students from out of state and foreign locations?
• What happens if the economy gets better and we don’t accomplish planned growth?
• Is online learning intended to be a new revenue center and as source of growth in student FTE?

This continues to be a work in progress. This issue surrounding university growth and the resultant change in faculty mix are in large part reflected in the Proposed Joint Resolution of the Faculty Senate and the AAUP that passed the faculty senate in May 2011.

Recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

In principle, the EPC would like to see a higher level of faculty involvement in university discussions involving planning for university growth. Faculty have participated on the Financial Futures Committee and as the report of the Financial Futures Committee becomes public, hopefully there will be a deeper campus wide discussion of the principles set forth in that report. As PSU develops a revenue driven budget process, hopefully discussions about growth will allow for a bottom up proposals about where growth can and should be accommodated. The EPC also recommends that discussions about institutional growth, and its implications for university resources, become part of the annual budget discussions on campus.

PSU Performance Measures
During Spring Term 2011 the EPC began a project related to PSU Performance Measures. The draft charge to the committee is as follows:

The general purpose of performance measures it to provide an organization with important information about its products, services, and the processes that produce them. They are tools to help stakeholders understand, manage, and improve what organizations do.

The Oregon University System tracks the performance of its seven universities in order to monitor improvement and examine trends that may affect higher education in the state. However, many university performance measures focus on more traditional institutions. Portland State University is the urban university in the Oregon University System, and as such, many of its characteristics are significantly different from the other OUS institutions. For example, in the Fall of 2004 PSU admitted 1,087 new freshmen students. Six years later in June of 2010 only 34% of those entering freshmen had graduated. This might lead one to believe that PSU granted about 370 undergraduate degrees in 2010. Yet in June of 2010 PSU actually granted 3,532 undergraduate degrees. Portland State University needs better metrics of student success.

While traditional university performance measures may be important to track, it is important for PSU to develop its own performance measures that are useful for understanding and managing the university. Performance measures should:

• Help us understand how well we are doing as an urban university.
• Tell us something important about our services and the processes that produce them.
• Be understandable and help us identify if, and where, improvements are necessary.
• Help us determine if we are meeting our goals.
• Be sensitive to the campus themes of providing civic leadership through partnerships, improving student success, achieving global excellence, enhancing educational opportunity, and expanding resources and improving effectiveness.

The EPC is charged with working with the PSU administration to develop a limited set of performance measures that will help the university better understand and manage the process of achieving university goals. In the long term measures should be developed surrounding undergraduate education, graduate
education, research and community outreach. In the near term it is particularly important to develop useful and informative measures surrounding student success, first at the undergraduate level and then at the graduate level. It would be particularly helpful if an initial draft of student success measures were completed during the spring term 2011. The EPC can then continue the project in other areas during academic year 2011-2012.

Recommendations to the Faculty Senate:

At this stage the EPC has formulated two recommendations surrounding university performance measures. First, if PSU is going to better understand student progress toward degree completion we need to have adequate data about student goals – particularly the degree programs in which students intend to major. Departments and faculty must be able to identify students seeking their degrees, and we need to be able to track student progress toward degree completion at the college/school and department level students through their junior and senior years. PSU is taking steps to ask every student to declare a major by the end of their sophomore year. However, as of today we understand that we cannot identify the major for every student enrolled at the junior and senior level. The EPC recommends that PSU takes all deliberate steps to ensure that we have good departmental level data on student progress toward degree completion.

The second area of EPC concern surrounds the issue of “Academic Quality.” PSU does not have a common way of talking about academic quality. Some discussions about academic quality focus on the quality of an institutions educational mission. Other discussions more broadly include the institutions research and community outreach missions. The EPC believes that this should be a significant focus for the committee in the fall of 2011, and that the committee should develop a position paper, or set of discussion questions, to be addressed in a broader faculty senate discussion in December of 2011 or January of 2012.

Academic Honesty and Integrity

A recent issue that has surfaced in the EPC revolves around faculty concerns regarding academic honesty and integrity. The EPC heard from a statistics professor attesting to increasing problems with academic honesty. These issues have also been the subject of Chronicle of Higher Education articles such as a recent article on “shadow scholars” who ghost write essays and reports for students (http://chronicle.com/article/The-Shadow-Scholar/125329/). After a variety of discussions, including bringing this issue to the PSU Faculty Senate Steering Committee the EPC would like to make the following recommendation to the faculty senate.

The EPC would like to recommend that the Dean of Students regularly report to the faculty senate on the number of academic honesty and integrity incidents that are reported to the Dean of Students and generally categorize the resolutions of those issues. Further, it would be helpful if this information was broken out by lower division students, upper division students, and graduate students.

Approvals Processed by the Educational Policies Committee

During the year the EPC processed a variety of approvals that are referred to the EPC. The EPC forwarded its approval to the Faculty Senate for the following items.

- Center for Integrated Multi-Scale Modeling
- Name Change for from the Department of Native American Studies to the Department of Indigenous Nation Studies
- Proposal for a new prefix for classes taught by the Library
- Name Change for from the Department of Theater Arts to the Department of Theatre and Film