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Why are we here today?

• APPC has a strong commitment to engaging and communicating with the PSU community:
  • To share information
  • To solicit feedback
• APPC members are not necessarily experts in academic program prioritization (APP)
• Looking to the broader PSU community, including faculty, staff and students, for guidance, suggestions, and help.
Schedule

3:05  Introduction and Overview  (10 mins)
3:15  Discussion / Q&A  (5 mins)
3:20  What is an “academic program”?  (10 mins)
3:30  Discussion / Q&A  (15 mins)
3:45  Criteria, metrics, and questions  (15 mins)
4:00  Discussion / Q&A  (15 mins)
4:15  Next steps / scoring  (5 mins)
4:20  Discussion / Q&A  (10 mins)
4:30  End

DRAFT Criteria, Metrics, and Questions for the Academic Program Prioritization Process at PSU

Academic Program Prioritization Public Forum
Portland State University, November 24, 2014

Feedback form

Academic Program Prioritization (2014-15)

This is the website for APPC, the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate at Portland State University for the 2014-15 Academic Year.

Public Forum on November 24 (Updated)

[Updates: 1] If you are interested in attending this meeting but unable to attend because of schedule conflicts, please get in touch so that we can determine whether there is enough interest, either in arranging a time to repeat this forum for the full community, or for specific, smaller groups. (2) The draft proposed list of programs is now available from the link below.

All members of the PSU community are warmly invited to attend a public forum on Academic Program Prioritization Monday, November 24, 3-4:30pm in CN 192. (For those who don't recognize that number, this room is in the PSU Cinema whose entrance is at SW 18th St between SW 1st and 4th avenues.)

The specific topics for this public forum will be:

- To provide an overview of the APP process and an opportunity for Q&A.
- To discuss and solicit feedback on the draft proposals for Criteria, Metrics, and Questions. (Please click that link, highlighted in green, to download a copy of the document so that you can read it before the forum begins.)
- To discuss and solicit feedback on the draft proposed list of academic programs (the full list, as well as lists that are limited to smaller sections of the university is now available.)

Some dates and times may be of interest to you.

For more information, please contact the APPC at: appc@pdx.edu (or call [503] 725 8957)
Introduction and Overview

3:05-3:15

Initial Conversations in Senate in Fall 2013

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate
FR: Martha Hickey, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on November 4, 2013, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

AGENDA

A. Roll
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the October 7, 2013 Meeting
C.  Announcements and Communications from the Floor
   AAUP Bargaining Update
D. Unfinished Business
   *1. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Revision Committee Interim Report
      See Faculty Senate Schedules web page for full draft text of the proposed revisions
      Draft Addendum: http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/senate-schedules-materials
D.1b addendum
E. New Business
   *1c. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda
   *2. Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) Proposal to approve Online Grade-to-Grade Changes
F. Question Period
   1. Questions for Administrators
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
   President’s Report (16:00)
   Provost’s Report
   Report of the Vice-President of Research and Strategic Partnerships
   Report of the Internationalization Council
H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included in this mailing:
   B. Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 7, 2013 and attachments
   D-1a, QWHULP5
   E-1c
   Curricular Consent Agenda
   E-2 Proposal to approve online grade-to-grade changes
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Charge: Develop the initial groundwork for how PSU will conduct its academic program prioritization process
D-1 adopted June 2, 2015

MOTION: Faculty Senate approves the creation of the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee as described in Item "D-1."

Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee (May 12, 2014)

As per recommendations from the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee, as adopted, with some changes, by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Provost, PSU Faculty Senate proposes the establishment of the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee (referred to herein as the APPC). The President and Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, has adopted an assurance that faculty members of the Academic Program Prioritization Ad Hoc Committee will not benefit as a direct result of the Academic Program Prioritization Process.

COMMITTEE CHARGE:
The APPC is charged with conducting work in the initial, parameter-setting phase of the review process; assigning programs to prioritization categories in the second phase; and overseeing assessment and communication components of the review. In doing so the APPC will:

• Develop additional specifications for the composition and function of the Prioritization Scoring Team;
• Develop additional specifications for identifying and appointing those responsible for communication and assessment activities;
• Determine, in consultation with the President’s office and the Faculty Senate, the parameters and benchmarks against which programs will be assessed;
• Determine the type of information that must be submitted;
• Complete initial academic program reports submitted by scoring teams;
• Solicit feedback on initial reports from each academic program and develop revised assignment of programs to prioritization categories;
• Participate with existing Faculty Senate standing committees, e.g., Budget Committee, in determining final recommendations.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:
The APPC will consist of 7 faculty members with strong prior leadership experience and an understanding of PSU drawn from multiple roles across campus. The APPC may call on other persons and offices as needed for information.

Support for the APPC will be provided by the Provost’s Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

TIMELINE:
The APPC will be appointed Spring 2014 by the President based on recommendations from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost through a nomination process. Assessment parameters and benchmarks, as well as type of information that needs to be collected, will be determined early so that OIRP and units can begin preparing. The APPC will receive, compile, and classify scoring reports, and will work with selected programs to collect additional information. The APPC will make revised recommendations early to mid-Spring 2015. Follow-up hearings and joint meetings with standing committees will take place during Spring Term with final recommendations delivered to the Provost and President by the first week of June 2015.

What is Program Prioritization?

(Identifying programs requires discipline-specific insight!)

Examples:
- Anthropology B.A./B.S. (including the minor)
- Religious Studies minor
- Computer Science M.S.
- Public Affairs and Policy Ph.D.
- …
- "Growth opportunity"
- "Healthy"
- "Experiencing challenges"

- Relation to mission
  - Demand
  - Quality
- Productivity
- Financial performance
- Trajectory

Leverage OIRP analysis to minimize burden on program administrators

Capture details/nuances that are not apparent in the raw numbers
Why do we need a process like this?

This is about taking stock, developing a university-wide understanding of who we are and what we do.

Without it, we risk:
Decision making in a vacuum

Why do we need a process like this?

This is about guiding strategic investments in programs that best support institutional goals.

Without it, we risk:
Stagnation, inability to respond & reallocate resources
Why now?

Allow the thoughtful, careful development of a regularized process.

Do not wait for an emergency!

APP in the Context of Shared Governance

Academic Program Prioritization (APP) does not introduce any new, special powers:

- Any recommendations that APP generates are subject to all of the usual oversight and procedures.
What is an “Academic Program”?

An academic program is any collection of activities that consumes resources and either:

• contributes transcripted courses to a credential (e.g., UNST, Honors, IELP); or

• leads to an academic credential (e.g., Minor, BA, BS, Certificate, Graduate Degree).

Collections of activities …
... that consume resources ……

... and either **contribute** classes …

- Honors
- IELP
- UNST

... or **lead** directly to a credential.

- BA/BS minors
- MA/MS certificates
- PhD

What remains?

- Honors
- IELP
- UNST
- BA/BS minors
- MA/MS certificates
- PhD

- Advising
- Athletics
- Dining
- Facilities
- Finance
- Housing
- Parking
- Research
- …
We recognize that all members of the PSU community, including those outside academic departments, contribute to the work of PSU in important and significant ways that fall outside the scope of any particular program.

... but these activities fall outside the scope of APP.
Granularity Guidelines

• Programs that share substantially the same resources should be combined
• Programs that differ significantly in the resources they use should be separate
• A typical department/unit houses multiple programs
• Defer to departments/units for final judgement

An Example: Computer Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Components:</th>
<th>08-</th>
<th>09-</th>
<th>10-</th>
<th>11-</th>
<th>12-</th>
<th>13-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Informatics 3+2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Do we have an appropriate breakdown for the programs in your department/unit?
• Look for misplaced, or missing items, as well as items that should be combined or separated
Why is APP restricted to Academic Programs?

- [Because that’s what it says in our charge …]
- Narrowing the scope allows us to adopt more specific criteria, metrics, and questions that can be applied to the items under review
- This is a faculty-driven process, so it makes sense to focus on items at the core of faculty expertise
- … but if we limit the scope, we don’t see the full picture, and we risk bad decision making …

A = “growth opportunity”
C = “experiencing difficulty”
B = everything else …
What if there are unnecessary items in B that are not part of an academic program?

A = “growth opportunity”
C = “experiencing difficulty”
D = unnecessary items outside academic programs
B = everything else …
• APP is restricted in scope to academic programs

• We concur with the previous committee’s recommendation that: APP be pursued as part of a broader evaluation that includes all parts of the University

Discussion / Q&A

3:30-3:45

Criteria, Metrics, and Questions

3:45-4:00
**DRAFT Criteria, Metrics, and Questions**

**Draft Criteria, Metrics, and Questions for the Academic Program Prioritization Process at PSU**

*Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPF)*

**Draft to Faculty Senate, November 3, 2014**

**Introduction**

This document proposes a set of six high-level criteria, together with associated metrics and questions (quantitative data and questions), for use within the academic program prioritization (APP) process at PSU. These criteria are shared here in draft, incomplete form that we hope will stimulate and focus productive conversations as the APPF, the Senate, and the faculty as a whole work together to finalize the parameters of the APP process. We welcome and strongly encourage any feedback that will help us improve the draft set of parameters described here.

**Scope**

The scope of the APP process is in academic programs, which are defined as the formal instructional units of the university, exclusive of such units as academic units and departments, centers, institutes, student services, and any combination of such units.

To include all of these activities would require the development and use of evaluation procedures and criteria that may be different from those used in APP. For this reason, we also agree with the previous committee’s recommendation that academic program prioritization be pursued as part of a broader evaluation that includes all parts of the university.

**Timeline**

In keeping with the charge to APPF, it is our goal to finalize the selection of criteria and associated metrics and questions for the legislation by APPF before the end of Fall 2014. As a result of interactions with other ongoing, university-wide projects, we expect that this timeline will allow us: (1) to consider and refine the selection of criteria in light of essential revisions to the

---

**Draft, incomplete, proposed, …**

**Feedback strongly encouraged!**

---

**Proposed Criteria**

- **Demand**, including both internal (within PSU) and external
- **Quality**, of program inputs and outcomes
- **Productivity**, taking considerations of size and scope into account
- **Financial Performance**, including revenue and costs
- **Relation to Mission**, including contributions to knowledge, scholarship, and community engagement
- **Trajectory**, including past history and future opportunities

---

**Metrics and Questions**

- **Quantitative** metrics and qualitative questions are needed:
  - to identify specific data that will be needed/used in the APP scoring process
  - to clarify and explain the meaning of each criterion in more concrete terms
- Numeric data alone will not capture important details of context and nuance that are needed to document and understand the contributions of each program

---

**Critical Challenges and Goals**

- Select metrics and questions (and develop associated scoring instruments) such that a **consistent, rigorous approach** can be applied uniformly across all programs
- Data collection will impose a **burden** on program administrators; we need to **minimize** this!
  - Eliminate unnecessary metrics/questions
  - Leverage OIRP and other sources where possible
  - Provide clear, strong guidance on what is expected for remaining items
**Current Status**

- We recognize that the formulations of metrics and questions in the current draft **DO NOT MEET** these standards

- **Commitment:** No data collection will begin until these issues have been resolved, and until the rubrics or other scoring instruments have been developed and shared with the campus community

**Other Considerations**

- Previous committee proposed that data for APP be provided for a spread of three years

- Some data can only be provided at the unit/department level: it will provide a context but not a direct match for evaluating programs

- We must be sensitive to discipline-specific standards, expectations, and natural variations between programs

- Data from SEM Planning will be available to programs in timeframe for data collection

- Strategic planning: revised mission in near term

**Examples from the Document**

**Criteria Labels:** Demand; Quality; Productivity; Financial performance; Relation to Mission; Trajectory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Label</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Src</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>How does the program support the mission, signature areas of focus, and strategic priorities of PSU?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>What are the expected outcomes and timelines of any current or recently completed special initiatives that are in support of, or carried out as part of the program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>Comment on the expected future for the program, using data collected here or from other sources as support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metric:</strong></td>
<td>Number of degrees awarded by level &amp; concentration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metric:</strong></td>
<td>SCH attributed to program from within and outside the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Proposals to Parameters**

- **Add** what is missing, **remove** what is unnecessary, **clarify** what remains

- This applies to criteria as well as metrics and questions:
  - Example: should there be a new criterion (i.e., column) for “Research, Scholarly, and Creative Work”?
  - The table already includes some metrics and questions that address this particular topic
  - Adding a new column provides a way to recognize this component of the work of our academic programs
  - What do you think?
Discussion / Q&A
4:00-4:15

Next Steps / Scoring
4:15-4:20

Overview of Process

PSU Community
Communication

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

Phase 2: data gathering and analysis (Program Scoring Teams)

Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

Assessment

future iterations of the process

Next Steps

• We are keen to receive your feedback on the criteria, metrics and questions
• We hope to finalize the choices for this iteration of APP before the start of the winter term
• In the meantime, APPC is focusing on scoring:
  • Development of scoring instruments, rubrics, etc.
  • Appointment of program scoring team members
  • Please consider putting your name forward as a potential scoring team member
• Expect another public forum on this topic in Winter!
### Founded: 1946

**Moved to the South Park Blocks:** 1952

**Campus Acreage:** 50

**Total Number of Students:** 29,452

**Employees (Full- and Part-time):** 6,521

**Annual Full-time Tuition & Fees:** $7,878

**Alumni:** 150,000

**TOTAL:** 197,799

---

**Discussion / Q&A**

4:20-4:30

---

**Thank You!**

http://pdxappc.blogspot.com/

appc-discuss@lists.pdx.edu

pdxappc@gmail.com