

Mitchell

JANUARY 2011 Discussion Item: Senate Agenda Setting in Breakout Sessions

First, what are your group's four top PSU Faculty Senate agenda priorities?

1. How do we deal with growth in order to make PSU a nicer place to work? exploit
2. Univ. Studies
3. Support for research
4. Intellectual interaction across campus.

Second, how would your group narrow or define those priorities?

- U Studies - structure, effectiveness, use of resources
- Research - Allowing/providing time for research

Third, for one or more of your priority agenda items, please answer the following questions:

Following on #1 above

1) How would your group frame the discussion?

Are there ways to guide growth to optimize student & faculty success?

-How does it reflect on the future of PSU?

This is the future of PSU.

Unmanaged growth will be detrimental (ie. status quo).

-What questions would the discussion answer?

How do we harness the tension between being a pre-dominantly undergrad. institution serving acity and striving to be a major research university?

2) What information would we need to address the topic?

Everything Roy will share with us at

The symposium, regarding revenue & use of resources

-Whom should the Steering Committee ask to present the topic preliminaries?

Good question

-What information would be needed (e.g. data, comparators) to focus the discussion and address the topic's central issues?

Are there other institutions we admire that we can/should compare ourselves with?

Gwen – Below is a summary of discussion points for four topics, but not exactly in the format you asked for. We did try to answer the specific discussion questions for one of the priorities, “managing growth”. Hope this helps! Margaret

Our table discussion covered a range of topics in four broad categories as summarized below:

Student experience

- How can we attract and retain higher achieving students?
- Need for more scholarships, especially to address the mismatch between tuition and scholarships.
- Need to look at what is happening to class sizes, costs, schedules, and resources and how that impacts academic quality and the student experience.
- Need to look at the shift toward online and hybrid learning and how that impacts both academic quality and the student experience generally.
- Need better data on retention and why students leave.
- We can't be all things to all people and should focus on what we can do best.

Governance

- The work load of faculty governance and service falls disproportionately on tenure-track faculty, and as the mix of faculty has moved increasingly toward adjuncts and fixed terms, the burden of governance has increased for tenure-track faculty.
- The structure and role of faculty senate needs to change (some discussion about the fact that faculty senate structure will be changing in the near future).
- Faculty senate needs to shift to goal setting and not merely reacting to decisions that have already been made by the administration.
- Faculty senate should be more of a partner with the administration to deal with state restructuring and to seek external resources.
- Not a lot of specifics on *how* faculty senate could play a bigger role in setting institutional priorities, but looking to other comparator institutions for models was mentioned.

Research

- We have taken the “bootstrap” approach to graduate education and research for too long. Need real resources and support for research.
- We need targeted support for research (can't do everything), but there were also some who wanted more faculty input on how those priorities are set. Humanities left out of the sustainability initiative.
- We should leverage what we are doing well, look to where students are already succeeding.
- There was quite a lot of discussion about the underfunding of library resources and its impact on research, graduate education, etc. If we are really going to move toward a research university, we will have to invest significantly in the library (including space, collections, and instructional faculty).

- Humanities, fine arts and social sciences (and their research contributions) are not highly valued and are not presented to the community as a core part of PSU's mission and identity.

Growth

- How would we choose to grow, if Faculty Senate had input?
- The academic mission of the university should be considered in decisions about growth (does growth serve the academic mission? What kind of growth?)
- What areas will grow and why?
- What infrastructure do we have to support growth?
- People voiced a lot of concern and uncertainty about hybrid and online learning as a growth strategy. Especially as it relates to shift in faculty mix toward adjuncts, lack of curricular oversight of some online courses, quality of online learning, and resources needed to support it.
- Change in ratio of tenure-track FTE to SCH
- We are dealing with decision about growth made a decade ago. How do we get in front of decisions about the next decade, rather than just reacting to the consequences?
- Mismatch between growth in students and SCH and resources (FTE, buildings, library, other resources). We have reached the limits of adding new programs, more students, without more resources.

For "Growth", we tried to answer the specific questions:

1. How would your group frame the discussion? Where and how would we choose to grow if FS had input?
2. How does it reflect on the future of PSU? Academic quality will continue to be impacted by growth without support and resources.
3. What questions would the discussion answer? How do we get out of a reactive mode, plan for growth, and anticipate the needs of faculty lines, library resources, and building space?
4. What information would we need to address the topic? Data on mix of tenure-related, fixed-term and adjunct appointments. Data on performance of academic units to guide priority-setting. Data on hybrid and online courses (how are these courses vetted? Is it different from "bricks and mortar" classes?)

Gwen,

I had 8 people at my table. My table did not have administrative representation. Sorry.

1) Groups 4 top priorities sorted by the number of references during each

a) the long-term effects of growth in student SCH (all 8 listed this). This agenda item includes several sub-topics which will pop up in the subsequent assignments.

b) Budget, budget priorities and budget models (6 of 8). This agenda item includes topics such as when and how faculty input is gathered and processed within the administration. I think this appeared to be high because it was the discussion item in December.

c) OUS restructuring. 6 of 8. OHSU as well as OUS was brought up. The OSU, UofO in Portland did not arise. This is the larger system restructuring not the past issues of turf.

d) Faculty review of administrators. This I brought up from our list. 7 of 7 (by this time one of my table had left) liked it and felt it was potentially a hot-button.

2) Narrow priorities

The sense was growth was for growth and not for a clear purpose or reason. Infrastructure requirements for growth are not well thought through.

3) Framing

The discussion centered on growth and budget. Invert the process as it appears now. Table preferred there to be a well-reasoned mission, goals etc. to define the growth requirements.

4) New information for Senate

Historical context for the institutions strategic mission. How many missions, how long, what happened. I see this as a history lesson that perhaps no one really knows.

Information on institutions that may provide a working (not aspirational peers) of a similar growth track

Campus advising is undergoing a radical change within the context of growth. What is happening? Who makes decisions? How are the advisors being educated as to the options across campus?

--

Regards,
Rob D.

Faculty Senate discussion of 1/3/2011

Discussion Leader: Tom Lockett

Members: Karen Karavanic, Ren Su, Mark Berrettini, Annmarie Trimble, Molly Griffith, Michael Taylor, Tom Lockett

I. Primary Agenda Item: Strategic Institutional growth

Key Issues: How can enrollment growth be planned more strategically to improve student success? The quality of student/faculty experience . The quality of academic programs. Collaborative research.

A. SubThemes

Planned Growth

Collaborative Interdisciplinary Culture

Shared strategic vision

Strategically planned faculty mix (tenure-line, fixed term, adjunct)

B. Concrete Examples

1. How can we promote quality research and meet targets for degree production in STEM (Science, Technology Engineering and Mathematics) fields?

2. How can we build recognized interdisciplinary programs in the social sciences and humanities?

II. Secondary Agenda Items

Restructuring of OUS

Online courses and educational quality

Faculty Senate Discussion 1/3/11

Yves Labissiere, table discussion leader

Issues/Discussion List:

- Student retention (PSU 70%, OUS 82%)
- Jobs/wages for graduates
- Exp students of color/racial disparities
- Tension between growth and stability,
- Attracting high achieving students
- Nature of faculty jobs changing/ changing role of faculty: outreach, community engagement, advising
- High achieving strategy that includes diversity
- Affordability (tuition): PSU provides 5% of students' unmet needs; other OUS institutions provide 9% - 18%; \$21,400 is avg PSU cost (but Oregon median income is \$18,000)
- Student mix (high achieving, local, out of state, etc)
- Niche marketing – strategy to use, been successful for UNST
- “How we increase number of students who come because we’re their first choice?” With everybody understaffed & lack of resources, what’s got to give?
- Shared vision of who/what we want to be and align resources
- New budget model AND new academic model (need to be in alignment) with the shared vision of the university
- Organizational structure, budget, priorities – not align with each other – causing confusion, stress on faculty and staff who then try to respond to all the competing visions
- How do we operationalize the “Oregon is our classroom” concept? What types of students best fit for that seat? Which programs best for this classroom?
- Compensation while keeping tuition low (maybe a union issue)
- Org Structure and Budget Model
 - Relationship between PSU/OUS
 - Budget model
 - Academic model
- How do we get faculty engaged in these discussions?
- “Financial futures” as a model for changing org structure
- Focus on students needs (not faculty) as common starting point. Values and plans, org structure to support students.
- Bottom Line: “How can the values of the institution be used to guide the structure of the organization and the budget?”

Faculty Senate Topics Setting Notes: Dan F.

Priority Topics:

- 1) Online Learning
- 2) Retention & Graduation Improvements: Admissions Policies, Student Support, Role of Faculty & Departments in Improving Rates, Courses with High Preponderance of D, F, W
- 3) Policy Review & Archiving of Committee Work: Moving Governance into Modern Practice
- 4) Fiscal Sustainability

Online Learning: Framing the Discussion

Reflecting on the future: President Wiewel's goal to increase online presence, external reports indicating PSU's deficit compared to others, COLT report, and new rules coming from the DOE.

What questions should the discussion answer:

- 1) What impact might online learning have on university resources?
- 2) What impact might online learning have on the student experience?
- 3) What impact might online learning have on faculty workload, expectations and/or incentives?
- 4) What analysis is undertaken to assess what programs (opposed to individual classes) should be online given market and other considerations?
- 5) Should online programs and/or classes be approved differently through the UCC?
- 6) What about hybrid models which seem to have more allure to students?

Topic Presenters: Melody Rose, Ad Hoc Senate Committee leadership, ???

Data: Report Summaries, comparator institutions, ???

Fiscal Sustainability: Framing the Discussion

Reflecting on the future: Limited state support, possible OUS restructuring, external conditions/constraints, faculty compensation, needs of facilities & physical space to address both enrollment growth and research needs, and attempting to keep education affordable for students with limited tuition increases.

What questions should the discussion answer:

- 1) How do we stop doing some things given institutional priorities?
- 2) How do we work collaboratively to come to those decisions?
- 3) How do you prioritize and schedule over the long term to insure initiatives are properly supported before launching new initiatives?
- 4) How does technology impact fiscal sustainability?
- 5) What new skills are required of managers, department chairs and administrators?
- 6) How should faculty governance evolve to address these issues?

Topic presenters: Roy Koch, Kevin Reynolds, Budget Committee chair, George Pernsteiner, ????

Gwen,

Following is a summary of my notes from today's faculty senate meeting.

We began our discussion with a variety of issues as follows:

Make improved collaborations between PSU and OHSU a reality.

Give students better access to OHSU resources

Improved grant writing between the two institutions.

We need a clear vision of who we want to serve. There was a general feeling of some "vision drift." For example, Is it a conscious decision to grow at the undergraduate level while holding graduate enrollment relatively constant?

If we are going to be more self sufficient, we need to do more to put ourselves on a national map.

It is difficult to offer good students the resources that they need. What steps to we take to fix this?

NUMBER 1 ISSUE: Having said this we came to an agreement that the most important issue to take up as a faculty senate. HOW DO WE REACH AGREEMENT ON WHAT THE MEASURES OF QUALITY ARE AT PSU?

What measures should we use? Retention rate? Graduation rate? Measures of contributions to our community?

We need a wide and deep discussion about how we measure quality at PSU. These measures should be representative of the diverse character of an urban university and help us articulate the character of PSU.

When we drilled down on this we would frame this discussion starting at the college/ school level. This will allow for some appreciation of diversity of the missions and programs within PSU. We appreciate the delicate balancing act between program missions and the institutional missions. Yet programs are where the university directly serves constituents.

There is an interrelated issue of how the faculty senate can foster a better understanding of the interconnectedness across campus. In fact, what can the senate do to foster the interconnectedness of units across the campus. It is more than just understanding how we share joint missions.

There When we think about the information we need, it is not clear that we know and understand how students (particularly undergraduates) move through the university. Also do we know and understand the faculty resources that are available to solve problems.

Do we understand the general welfare of our student body? Who is most at risk?

I think we also articulated a NUMBER 2 ISSUE: How do we support a coherent and collaborative approach to issues at PSU. The issue came up around the sense that recently we have seen very centralized approaches to institutional problems, yet the strength of PSU has been its entrepreneurial nature. There needs to be a better balance between institutional solutions that play out, not at a central level, but at a unit level.

I have copied the others that contributed to this discussion in my e-mail. Please feel free to correct any miscommunications in my summary.

Cheers,

Professor Ray Johnson, CPA

Linda G.

Dan F. (email) Martha (email)
Yves (email) Sarah?

JANUARY 2011 Discussion Item: Senate Agenda Setting in Breakout Sessions

First, what are your group's four top PSU Faculty Senate agenda priorities?

How to make Faculty Senate more relevant to ~~PSU~~ faculty? Answer? Make faculty participation important to Univ. decision-making.

Second, how would your group narrow or define those priorities?

~~Faculty participation~~ Faculty participation - strategic planning.

Third, for one or more of your priority agenda items, please answer the following questions:

1) How would your group frame the discussion?

How can Senate, chairs, ~~and~~ faculty decision-makers share in developing, coordinating & implementing decisions?
-How does it reflect on the future of PSU?

Better chance of succeeding if we maximize coordination/collaboration between adminis & faculty.
-What questions would the discussion answer?

2) What information would we need to address the topic?

What strategic plans are behind the curtains?
* Who makes what decisions? How is the budget developed?
-Whom should the Steering Committee ask to present the topic preliminaries? (All Funds budget decision)

Roy. Kevin.
Need ~~to~~ budget tutorial.

-What information would be needed (e.g. data, comparators) to focus the discussion and address the topic's central issues?

- Comparators for achieving the strategies we have identified goal
- Transparency in budgets

Priority Focus #1: Student Success, Issues Related to Retention and Graduation

How would we frame the discussion?

We *negotiate* with OUS about how to define / set retention rates (per Kevin R.), and what's negotiated sets us up for a (two? Three?)-year process. We have some say in this.

How does it reflect on the future of PSU?

What do WE want our graduation rates to be? We need to move beyond "they don't understand what kind of institution we are" because our rates are *not* okay currently. How will we define/set this for ourselves?

What questions would the discussion answer?

- What's an appropriate model to which to hold a comprehensive metropolitan university?
- Departmental registration for majors only first?
- Should we eliminate non-degree candidates (self defined) from statistics?

Whom should the SC ask to present the topic preliminaries?

- President
- OAA—Roy, Sukhwant

What information would be needed to focus the discussion and address the topic's central issues?

- What is the bottom-line number for retention (OUS)?
- What about transfer students?
- What does the President see as the five-year balance between access / quality / resources?
- Whom do we need to lobby?
- Who are our real competitors for different kinds of students?
- DFWI info (Sukhwant)
- Resolution of X grade issue
- Why are non-degree candidates here (top reasons)? Survey when entering/registering?
- Our admissions policy—is it really open?
- What's done at other institutions with major declaration—is it required? When is it enforced?

Other retention issues

- Lack of placement exams
- Uneven enforcement of prerequisites
- Student support services
- Requirement to declare major—enforced at 90 credits?

OTHER PRIORITIES

2. Quality vs. Access v. Resources

- Growth model unsustainable
- How do we maintain what we have?
- We need healthy, less stressful adaptation
- International recruiters don't know how transfer credits work (and we have no articulation agreement)
- Increasing dependency on international student is problematic
- What kind of institution do we want to evolve into in five years' time?
- We recognize that there has to be a choice
- Perception that administration privileges certain kinds of contributions over others (e.g., grants)

3. Timely conversation on structure / re-structuring

- Deans
- Colleges
- Schools

4. Disciplinary / Interdisciplinary Tension

- CLAS—Understanding of the disciplinary worlds in which faculty live
- We oughtn't to go against the grain of national and international university culture
- Conversations about “structure” may begin shortly
- Difficulties of academic structural organization
- Departments become competitors when we allocated resources based on SCH
 - Budget conversation happening right now
- Graduation requirements (ARC) (e.g. making Criminology a Social Science)
-

Participants:

Becky Sanchez	beckys@sba.pdx.edu
Tom Keller	kellert@pdx.edu
Becki Ingersoll	ingersr@pdx.edu
Mary Ann Barham	barham@pdx.edu
Kevin Reynolds	reynoldk@pdx.edu
Leslie McBride	bcbri@pdx.edu
Doug Siegler	dougs@sba.pdx.edu
Virginia Butler	virginia@pdx.edu

January Faculty Meeting

Roundtable discussion- Faculty: Nicole Rigelman (Ed), Sue Taylor (Art), Michael Cummings (Geol), Michael Flower (Unst), Karen Marrongelle (Math), Ethan Johnson (Blk Studies),

Alan MacCormack (Unst) recording.

Our table would like to propose one priority topic for the coming months this academic year: **Faculty senate involvement in budget driven program restructuring.** The worsening state economic situation may result in a need for program restructuring at PSU. This is a constitutional responsibility for the senate. How will the senate be involved in these decisions in a timely and meaningful way? We would need the Provost or his designated representative outline the likelihood and timing of possible restructuring, the chair of the EPC could provide a description of the process which exists for faculty participation. We would want to know/be consulted in the development of criteria and objectives to guide any restructuring in a timely way.

We have three additional topics which are broader in scope and that may be appropriate for either this or the coming year.

- 1. University Accountability:** There is a national trend, seen most clearly in K-12 education, to hold institutions accountable for specific outcome measures. Portland State is in the process of lobbying for increased independence from legislative process management in exchange for meeting specific negotiated markers. We will soon begin another round of accreditation. We think that the faculty senate should act proactively to help shape the outcomes to which the institution commits itself, to the extent this is possible. We would like to hear from an appropriate faculty member or panel a report on the national political trends concerning accountability in education, from the Provost or his designee about current or future university outcome negotiations with the state and the OUS, and from Vice-Provost Rose on the accreditation process. The senate should examine how to make the time and effort associated with the various assessment processes as productive as possible.
- 2. Faculty Productivity:** We would like the Senate to consider how to enhance faculty productivity. Given a growing student population in a time of limited or declining resources and PSU's plans for more faculty research, it is critical to identify and minimize barriers to faculty productivity. We think it would be helpful to ensure that we incentivize rather than discourage faculty collaboration and initiative. Part of our governance responsibility is to clarify how our productivity is to be evaluated. This includes a discussion of how Promotion and Tenure guidelines are interpreted across the disciplines. A survey of pre-tenure faculty could help identify changes that would improve their work environment. We would also be interested in hearing from a panel of chairs & senior faculty from a range of disciplines discussing how faculty productivity and workload equity is evaluated. This discussion could also address concerns that staff shortages and facility deficiencies are impeding faculty effectiveness.

3. Student Success: The institutional trajectory for PSU relies on attracting and serving a growing student body paying higher tuition in a very difficult economic environment. We must ensure that we make every effort to maximize student success. We need to examine what consequences raising costs have on our current and potential student populations. Institutional structures and practices that impede student success need to be identified and corrected. Faculty have a responsibility to advise the administration on admissions policies that we have neglected. We need to be responsive to student needs and work to improve the value of a PSU education for our students. In addition to the more obvious sources of information, we think it would be helpful to hear from a panel of those faculty who have honored for the excellence of their teaching.

(Martha Hickey's table)

Our top four priorities for Faculty Senate were never labeled as such, so this list is based on the amount of discussion given over to these and related concerns. Item 2 of our list partly explains why there are few suggestions for intervention...

Senate should:

1. draw attention to the need to improve the work environment and make it more equitable, especially re: infrastructure and resource allocation:
 - programs and faculty are under-resourced in terms of (office and classroom) space, building maintenance (heat, cleanliness), staff support, resources to meet the demands of teaching more students and conducting research
 - how will PSU sustain/promote leadership at the departmental level when chairs have so many responsibilities and little autonomy or support?
 - it is not clear how resources are allocated
 - if a program is successful in bringing in external resources it can create a strains on internal resources (i.e. no space to put a new program, researcher)
 - a sense of community and equity among faculty have been eroded

Framing question: "How can we make PSU a better place to work?"

Specific strategies

- create venues where faculty can meet and talk with faculty outside of their departments (like today's forum or like the "Portland room" before it became the Multi-Cultural Center)
- engage, collaborate with the AAUP in this effort, invite AAUP to Senate to report
- improve communication among faculty

2. promote faculty governance and enhance faculty participation (voice) in the decision-making process related to matters that are within faculty purview.

Framing question that needs to be answered for many: What are the matters legitimately within the Senate's purview and how can we express our interest effectively through the Senate?

3. promote discussion and creative thinking on how to meet the need for more resources and to manage the challenges of growing enrollment, and

Framing questions for an open forum: "What do faculty like about PSU that we want to sustain, encourage, promote/market?" How do faculty (as opposed to administrators) envision a future PSU?

4. Ask for more clarity about what the University's leading priorities are and challenge it to match expectations to resources
 - research one publication expectations seem to be applied universally, yet access to support (course release, summer support) is not universal
 - there is a need for more transparency about what priorities drive the decision-making process
 - what is the purpose of innovations like Digital Measures? what does it say about University

priorities?

A specific opportunity to test/define number 2, 3 and 4 emerged from discussion: **the expansion into on-line instruction:**

Unanswered questions that the Senate could probe:

--to what degree is this a priority for PSU and who decided?

--ask for a clear articulation of the goals (% of classes on-line)? and definition of "success" and quality instruction? (What is the plan?)

--participate in (re)defining "success" or the limits of this initiative

--require a report on progress, measures that will allow "success" to be assessed or changes in "the plan"

-- how does this plan affect the kind of place the University becomes?

Date: Tue, 4 Jan 2011 14:55:59 -0800

From: "Karen L. Karavanic" <karavan@cs.pdx.edu>

To: shustermang@pdx.edu, luckett@pdx.edu

Subject: followup to faculty Senate Notes

Tom had suggested supplying some background or explanation of what "STEM" is, since my suggestion for faculty senate discussion involved discussion of increasing the number of graduates in STEM majors, and also discussing the relationship of STEM fields to other fields.

Here is a link to a brief summary and explanation of the issues as defined at the national level:

<http://www.gradschools.com/article-detail/stem-fields-179>

Karen

Karen L. Karavanic
Associate Professor
Dept of Computer Science
Portland State University
www.cs.pdx.edu/~karavan
503-725-5491

Notes from Faculty Senate Meeting on January 3, 2011

Faculty colleagues: Michael Bowman (LIB), Alan Cabelly (SBA), Sue Danielson (ENG), Marek Elzanowski (MTH), Mark Jones (CS), Serge Preston (MTH), and Patricia Schechter (HST).

We enjoyed a lively conversation together, the only downside of which was that we were too engaged to hear the scheduling prompts indicating when it was time to move on to the next part of the discussion!

Our group identified two high-level priorities for the Faculty Senate Agenda:

Governance:

- What are the decision making processes within the University?
- What ability do we have to engage in and impact these processes?
- What does the administration want as input from faculty?
- What are they willing to accept from us?
- How much confidence do we have in university administration?

Who Are We? / The Changing Face of Faculty:

- What are our goals, both now and with changes in the future?
- What do we want to be as an institution?
- How do the goals that are set and announced by the President relate to the goals of the faculty?
- What is our "product"? More degrees awarded? A more educated workforce? Scholarship?
- Tenure line and fixed term issues.

As a way to explore aspects of both of these topics in the Senate, we thought that it would be useful to host a review of the Sustainability initiative at PSU. There is a perception among many faculty that this initiative was developed and announced without sufficient faculty input and involvement. At the same time, the initiative has clearly provided significant funding and support in some parts of the University, although others struggle to understand how it might relate in any way to their academic discipline. We imagine a review of sustainability that would provide faculty with a brief overview of current work in this area, and serve as a case-study for the decision making processes at PSU. Some of the questions that it might seek to address include:

- What is the story of sustainability at PSU?
- Where has sustainability money been spent?
- What were the decision making processes with respect to the sustainability initiative?
- What kinds of faculty input were considered?
- What role could the faculty have played in this process?
- What opportunities does this example suggest for improved faculty/administration communication in the future?
- What can we learn from this, and what might we do differently in the future?

Possible speakers at such a review might include the director of the ISS, one or two PIs talking about their work, and key members of the administration (Provost, President) to talk about the process and decision-making aspects of this initiative.

There were also some suggestions that the review might be more effective as a conversation or round table rather than a series of more formal presentations, but we did not develop these ideas further.

In the remainder of this report, I'll capture other questions or issues that came up in our conversations. Some of these overlap with the main points above. There is no significance in the order in which these points are listed.

Question: How does the President establish goals for PSU, and how do we as faculty contribute to or guide these decisions?

Observation: There is a mismatch between the year-round operation of the University and the fact that most faculty are away during the summer at a time when some important decisions must be made. This is an obstacle to effective faculty participation in the decision making process.

Question: How do we balance the tensions between seemingly incompatible initiatives? For example: access vs high achieving students.

Question: Who do we want to be as an institution? There are different visions for higher-education in Oregon. What do people value? How to make decisions that people can buy in to?

Question: There are "Two PSUs": A media facing view that emphasizes sustainability, engagement, etc. and an internal view that focuses on retention, productivity, etc. These seem very different; how do we reconcile them?

Question: What is the role for liberal arts at PSU?

Question: Scholarship was not included in the President's list of goals for the university. Scholarship deals primarily with academic disciplines, and not with PSU. What is a baseline for scholarly activity at PSU? How should scholarship be reflected as a goal of the university?

Conversation: How should the university deal with issues of retention? Student success and retention are different issues. Denying admission to weaker students may be more honest than trying to provide additional support for those students within the university, but might also conflict with access goals. Access is one of the things that distinguishes PSU from OSU and U of O. Are the state metrics appropriate for us? What do the communities that we serve expect/need from us? Completed degrees may not be important to some who instead value the potential for lifelong learning more highly. Looking only at completed degrees does not tell the full story.

Table: Mack, Koning, Bowen,

Q. Are we only concerned by one jurisdiction
or anything, i.e. restructuring.

- Topics:
1. making Senate more productive (silly debate)
(eg Senate elects its programs)
 2. Consequences of distance learning on students
(lose regular services, retention?)
 3. streamlining bureaucracy, but better
quality control.
 4. program review. Once approved,
never reviewed.
 5. lack of trust for administration

How we do something in here, that's
all faculty will care about.

(Green) What are the most pressing things in your mind?
Class growth \rightarrow student/faculty ratio \rightarrow workload.
Faculty mix & inequities
Quality
Funding/resources.
 \rightarrow WORKLOAD
 \rightarrow Improving student experience

feedback loops
support - data, data, data
more staff
summer info.