

 Portland State
UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

**January Discussion Item:
Academic Program Array Review**

B2 minutes attachment for Jan. 6, 2014 meeting

 Portland State
UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

**University of Saskatchewan on Program
Prioritization**

“TransformUS differs from previous work, such as systematic program review, in that its mandate is not to review but to prioritize; it is not in series but simultaneous; and it is entirely about resource allocation — we are very much aware that the outcome of program prioritization must be that the university stops doing some things and both saves and shifts significant resources. Like workforce planning, prioritization will result in changes to units, but these will be in future years as decisions are implemented.”

 Portland State
UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Tentative List of Principles and Caveats

1. The process should take the long view, both in terms of creating a reasonable timeline for the review and in terms of aligning it with PSU's mission, vision and strategic planning.
2. The process must be faculty designed and driven, and must be founded on a clear agreement between faculty governance bodies and administration as to how governance decisions will be executed.
3. For review purposes, agreement is needed on a definition of "program."
4. Senate should set benchmarks and receive reports from the committee charged with overseeing the process at critical stages of the process.
5. Resources and faculty support (e.g., release time, staff support) will be needed to conduct the work.
6. Tenure-line faculty in programs slated for elimination will have reassignment rights.

 Portland State
UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Questions That Have Surfaced:

- a. Should a horizon for data gathered be stipulated – no less than (5, 7, 10 year?) look back?
- b. How to articulate the charge to the committee/committees—what its priorities are—to define and carry out steps of the process?
- c. Due diligence requires research on how other campuses have successfully engaged in this kind of review. Should there be “faculty research appointments” involving a 1-term course release for committee service and charged with defining process and criteria?
- d. What kind of committee can most effectively think about process and criteria—one with representation by expertise, by school/college, or from existing Senate committees? How are major stakeholders, including students and alumni, ensured an appropriate voice?
- e. How will the outcomes be shared? Will there be a process for interrogating and/or appealing priority recommendations?
- f. What happens after PAR?



Questions That Have Surfaced:

g. Should a small Ad Hoc Committee be formed and charged with laying initial groundwork for the larger process?

Responsibilities could include such things as: identifying and investigating approaches used at other campuses (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators) and, based on that research, recommending a framework for PSU; determining timeline; determining representation on committee(s); defining "program" and recommending extent of review--academic programs, institutes and centers, non-academic programs.

This Ad Hoc Committee would make recommendations to Senate at its April meeting allowing time for Steering to develop a formal charge for the new working committee(s) and for review and approval of the charge by Faculty Senate. The new committee(s) would begin planning process spring term.



Question for President Wiewel

On behalf of the PSU Department of English, the Steering Committee has posed the following question to President Wiewel.

"How is PSU responding to the University of Oregon pursuing the establishment of competing programs at their White Stag building in Portland? Are you concerned?"