

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda Compilations  
(Five Year)

University Archives: Faculty Senate

---

2020

## Meeting Agenda October 2016 - June 2020

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateagenda>

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Meeting Agenda October 2016 - June 2020" (2020). *Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda Compilations (Five Year)*. 7.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateagenda/7>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda Compilations (Five Year) by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **3 October 2016** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

**NOTE: Items on the *consent agenda* will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.**

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 6 June 2016 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to June notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer: welcome, rules of order, upcoming business
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary: procedures, communications, districts
  - 4. Discussion: Presidential search
  - 5. Discussion: University policies on copyright and intellectual property (Clark)
- D. Unfinished Business
  - 1. Continuous appointment for NTTF: update and next steps
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (Grad Council, UCC)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. Presentation from Presidential Search Committee
  - \* 4. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees– *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

\*\*\*\*\*

*A reception sponsored by the PSU Board of Trustees will follow the meeting.*

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 June 2016 and appendices
- C.1. OAA response to Senate actions for June
- E.1.b. Curricular proposals – *note: there is no E.1.a*
- G.4. Annual Report of CoC

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **7 November 2016** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

NOTE: Items on the *consent agenda* will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 3 October 2016 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to October notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary: update/reminder on districts
  - \* 4. Discussion: How should consideration of diversity and inclusion affect proposals for new courses and development of existing courses?
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UNST Council)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - \* 2. Provost's Report
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 3 October 2016 and appendices
- C.1. OAA response to Senate actions for October
- C.4. Equity Lens Assessment Tool(s) (OAA)
- E.1.d. Curricular proposals – *note: there is no E.1.a-c*
- G.2. Summaries of program reviews (part of Provost's Report)

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **5 December 2016** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

*REMINDER: The subsequent Faculty Senate meeting will take place on January 9th.*

**AGENDA**

Items on the *consent agenda* will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 7 December 2016 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to October notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:
    - \* a. draft University policies on copyright and on demonstrations
    - \* b. Budget Principles document
    - c. Board of Trustees committee meetings
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary
  - 4. Discussion: PTR: what has worked well, what needs modification? (Chabon, Padín)
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
  - \* 2. Graduate Certificate in Public Health, SPH (GC)
  - \* 3. Proposed resolution: “The Faculty Senate endorses President Wiewel’s declaration that PSU is a sanctuary campus” (Steering Committee)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President’s Report
  - 2. Provost’s Report
  - \* 3. Annual Report of the Internationalization Council – *consent agenda*
  - \* 4. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 7 November 2016 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to Senate actions for November – *consent agenda*
- C.2.a.1-2. Draft University policies: copyright, demonstrations
- C.2.b. Budget Principles (via BC 2014 Annual Report)
- E.1.a-c. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Proposal for Grad. Cert. in Public Health
- E.3. Text of President Wiewel’s e-mail message of 18 November 2016
- G.3. Annual Report of IC – *consent agenda*
- G.4. Quarterly Report of EPC – *consent agenda*



PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **9 January 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

Items on the *consent agenda* will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 7 December 2016 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to December notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary
  - 4. Discussion. Shared governance: What does it mean? How do we implement it more effectively?
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
  - \* 2. Graduate Certificate in Athletic and Outdoor Industry – SBA (GC)
  - \* 3. Undergraduate Certificate in Art History – COTA (UCC)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 December 2016 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to December notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- E.1.a, c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.b] – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Grad. Cert. in Athletic and Outdoor Industry
- E.3. Undergrad. Cert. in Art History

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **6 February 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

Items on the *consent agenda* will be approved as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 9 January 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary
  - 4. Introductions: Valerie Cleary (Athletic Director), Isaac Dixon (Assoc. VP of HR)
  - 5. Discussion. Copyright policy.
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - \* 3. Semi-Annual Report of the Faculty Development Committee – *consent agenda*
  - \* 4. Budget Principles, submitted by Budget Committee – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 9 January 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- E.1.b,c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.a] – *consent agenda*
- G.3. Semi-Annual Report of FDC
- G.4. BC document

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **6 March 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

Items and reports on the *consent agenda* will be approved or accepted as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 6 February 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer:
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary
  - 4. Discussion. Liberal education at PSU: what do we stand for?  
(Greco & Hamington, co-chairs, Ad-Hoc Comm. on Liberal Education)
- D. Unfinished Business
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
  - \* 2. Revision of UNST diversity goal (UNST Council)
  - \* 3. Undergrad SySc courses to be given academic area designations (ARC)
  - \* 4. WR 228 to qualify as a University writing requirement course (ARC)
  - \* 5. Proposed amendment: membership of AQC (Steering)
  - \* 6. Proposed amendment: part-time ex-officio member of Faculty Senate (Steering)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. Report by Vice Provost for Finance and Administration
  - \* 4. Quarterly Report of the Budget Committee – *consent agenda*
  - \* 5. Quarterly Report of the Educational Policy Committee – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 February 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to February notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- E.1.a,b,c. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda*
- E.2. UNST diversity goal revision
- E.3. SySc academic area designations
- E.4. WR 228 as writing requirement course
- E.5. Proposed amendment: AQC membership
- E.6. Proposed amendment: XO member for PT
- G.4. BC 2017 Winter Report – *consent agenda*
- G.5. EPC 2017 Winter Report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **3 April 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

Items and reports on the *consent agenda* will be approved or accepted as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- **It is proposed, as part of the *consent agenda*, to move item G.4, Annual Report of AAC, to between items C.3 and C.4.**
- **Item E.3, Resolution on class size, refers to Item G.3.b.**

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 6 March 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to March notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary
  - \* *Item G.4 moved here:* Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council
  - 4. Discussion. Role(s) of faculty in advising
- D. Unfinished Business
  - \* 1. WR 228 to qualify as a University writing requirement course  
(ARC, *postponed from March meeting*)
  - \* 2. Constitutional amendment: membership of AQC (Steering)
  - \* 3. Constitutional amendment: part-time ex-officio member of Faculty Senate (Steering)
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC, UNST Council)
  - \* 2. Resolution on class size (EPC/Steering, *cf. item G.3.b*)
  - \* 3. Proposed amendment: Budget Committee charge (BC/Steering)
  - \* 4. Guidelines for review of non-tenure-track faculty for continuous appointment  
(change to Promotion & Tenure Guidelines, *previewed for vote at May meeting*)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report

3. Topical reports by Educational Policy Committee
  - \* a. Suggestions on academic program review guidelines – *consent agenda*
  - \* b. Impact of increasing class size and recommendation for systematic assessment approach (*cf. item E.2*)
- \* 4. *Moved to section C above:* Annual Report of the Academic Advising Council
- \* 5. Annual Report of the Institutional Assessment Council – *consent agenda*

H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 March 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to March notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- D.1. WR 228 as writing requirement course
- D.2. Constitutional amendment: AQC membership
- D.3. Constitutional amendment: XO member for PT
- E.1.a,b,c,d. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Resolution on class size (*cf. G.3.b*)
- E.3. Proposed amendment on BC charge
- E.4. MOU on NTTF review guidelines
- G.3.a. EPC report on APR guidelines – *consent agenda*
- G.3.b. EPC report on class size (*cf. E.2*)
- G.4. Annual Report of AAC and appendix
- G.5. Annual Report of IAC – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **1 May 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

Items and reports on the *consent agenda* will be approved or accepted as submitted in the packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of Roll Call.

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 3 April 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements by Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcements by Secretary

NOMINATIONS FOR 2017-18 PSU FACULTY SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT
--

- D. Unfinished Business
  - \* 1. Constitutional amendment: Budget Committee charge (BC/Steering)
  - \* 2. Guidelines for review of non-tenure-track faculty for continuous appointment
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (UCC, GC)
  - \* 2. Undergraduate Certificate in Career & Community Studies (UCC)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - \* 2. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee – *consent agenda*
  - \* 3. Annual Report of Honors Council – *consent agenda*
  - \* 4. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board – *consent agenda*
  - \* 5. Annual Report of Library Committee – *consent agenda*
  - \* 6. Annual Report of Scholastic Standards Committee – *consent agenda*
  - \* 7. Annual Report of University Studies Council – *consent agenda*
  - \* 8. Annual Report of University Writing Council
  - 9. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments:**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 3 April 2017 and appendices – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- D.1. Constitutional amendment: BC charge
- D.2. Guidelines for NTTF review

**\*Attachments, cont'd:**

- E.1.b,c. Curricular proposals [note: there is no E.1.a] – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Undergrad Cert. in Career & Community Studies
- G.2. Annual Report of GSAC – *consent agenda*
- G.3. Annual Report of Honors Council – *consent agenda*
- G.4. Annual Report of IAB – *consent agenda*
- G.5. Annual Report of LC – *consent agenda*
- G.6. Annual Report of SSC – *consent agenda*
- G.7. Annual Report of UNST Council – *consent agenda*
- G.8. Annual Report of UWC and Action Plan

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **5 June 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Senators for 2016-17 vote on motions and amendments.
- Senators for 2017-18 vote for POE and Steering Committee and meet in division caucuses to choose members of Committee on Committees.
- Administrators' reports and IFS report (items G.1-G.3) will take place after item D.
- *Consent agenda* items will be approved or accepted as submitted in the Packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of roll call.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call
- B. \* Approval of the Minutes of the 1 May 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Results of Faculty Senate, Advisory Council, and IFS Elections
  - 3. Announcements by Presiding Officer
  - 4. Announcements by Secretary

NOMINATIONS FOR AND ELECTION OF 2017-18 PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT  
NOMINATIONS FOR 2017-19 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS (2)

- D. Unfinished Business
  - \* 1. Revised PTR guidelines

*Change in agenda order: reports from administrators and IFS are moved here.*

- G.
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

ELECTION OF 2017-19 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS (2)

- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (Grad Council and UCC)
  - \* 2. Restructuring School of Theater & Film and School of Music as School of Film and School of Music & Theater (COTA/EPC)
  - \* 3. New program: BA/BS in Sonic Arts and Music Production (COTA/UCC)
  - \* 4. New program: BA/BS in Sexuality, Gender, and Queer Studies (CLAS/UCC)



- \* 5. New program: Undergraduate Minor in World History (CLAS/UCC)
- \* 6. Judaic Studies courses to be given academic area designations (CLAS/ARC)

F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

*Items G.1-G.3 are moved above.*

*The following committee reports are accepted as printed in the Packet as part of the consent agenda unless a request for separate discussion is registered before the end of Roll Call.*

- \* 4. Progress Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Liberal Education
- \* 5. Progress Report from Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty
- \* 6. Quarterly Report of Educational Policy Committee
- \* 7. Semiannual Report of Faculty Development Committee
- \* 8. Annual Report of Academic Quality Committee
- \* 9. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee
- \* 10. Annual Report of Advisory Council
- \* 11. Annual Report of Budget Committee
- \* 12. Annual Report of Graduate Council
- \* 13. Annual Report of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

DIVISION CAUCUSES TO CHOOSE 2016-18 MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

H. Adjournment

**YOU ARE INVITED TO A RECEPTION FOLLOWING THE MEETING**

**\*See the following attachments. Complete proposals for E.1-5 viewed on-line on the Curriculum Tracker: <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>.**

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 1 May 2017 – *consent agenda*
- C.1 OAA response to May notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- D.1. Revised PTR guidelines
- E.1.a,b,c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Proposal for School of Film and School of Music & Theater in COTA (summary)
- E.3. BA/BS in Sonic Arts and Music Production (summary)
- E.4. BA/BS in Gender, Sexuality, and Queer Studies (summary)
- E.5. Undergraduate Minor in World History (summary)
- E.6. Proposed academic area designations for JST courses
- G.4. Lib. Ed. Ad-Hoc Comm. progress report – *consent agenda*
- G.5. TFFTIF progress report – *consent agenda*
- G.6. EPC spring 2017 quarterly report – *consent agenda*
- G.7. FDC winter-spring 2017 semiannual report– *consent agenda*
- G.8. Adv. Council annual report – *consent agenda*
- G.9. AQC annual report – *consent agenda*
- G.10. ARC 2016-17 annual report – *consent agenda*
- G.11. BC 2016-17 annual report – *consent agenda*
- G.12. GC 2016-17 annual report– *consent agenda*
- G.13. UCC 2016-17 annual report– *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **2 October 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

[**Note:** as part of the *consent agenda*, item G.1. President's Report, will be moved to 4:00.]

A. Roll Call

B. \*Approval of the Minutes of the 5 June 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements and Discussion

1. \*OAA response to June notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
3. Announcements from Secretary
4. Introductions from ASPSU – Brent Finkbeiner & Donald Thompson III, ASPSU Pres. & VP
5. \*Overview of Capital Advisory Comm. – Jason Franklin, Dir. Campus Planning & Design
6. Reporting and adjudicating academic misconduct – Dana Walton-Macaulay,  
Assistant Dean of Student Life & Director of Conduct and Community Standards
7. Announcement from Graduation Program Board – Sherril Gelmon

D. Unfinished Business: None

E. New Business

1. \*Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (Grad Council, UCC, UNST Council)
2. \*Undergraduate Certificate in Lactation (SPH/UCC)

F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. President's Report [*at 4:00*]
2. \*Provost's Report
3. Introduction: Leroy Bynum, Jr., Dean of COTA
4. Introduction: Marvin Lynn, Dean of GSE
5. \*Annual Report of Committee on Committees – *consent agenda*

H. Adjournment

CLAS-Sci DIVISION CAUCUS TO CHOOSE MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
--

**\*See the following attachments. Complete curricular proposals can be viewed on the Curriculum Tracker:** <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>.

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 June 2017 – *consent agenda*
- C.1. OAA response to June notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- C.5. Capital Planning at PSU
- E.1.b,c,d. Curricular proposals (summaries) [NOTE: there is no E.1.a] – *consent agenda*
- E.2. Proposal for Undergrad. Cert. in Lactation (summary)
- G.2.a,b. APR summaries: CNF, UNST (part of Provost's report)
- G.3. CoC 2016-17 annual report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **6 November 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

[**Note:** as part of the *consent agenda*, item G.1. President's Report, will be moved to 4:00.]

A. Roll Call

B. \*Approval of the Minutes of the 2 October 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements and Discussion

1. \*OAA response to October notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
3. Nominations for honorary doctorate
4. Announcements from Secretary
5. Overview of PSU response to FOIA requests – David Reese, General Counsel
6. \*Discussion: HB 2998 and possible response from IFS, faculty senates

D. Unfinished Business: None

E. New Business

1. \*Proposed constitutional amendment:
  - a) to clarify membership in the Faculty of ranked appointees
  - b) to provide ex-officio Senate representation for part-time appointees

[**Procedural note:** a constitutional amendment is introduced and discussed, and any proposed modifications to the amendment are voted on, at a given Senate meeting. The vote on the amendment, without any further modification, then occurs at the subsequent Senate meeting.]

2. \*Major Declaration Policy (ARC/EPC/Steering)

F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. President's Report [*at 4:00*]
2. Provost's Report

H. Adjournment

**\*See the following attachments.**

B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 2 October 2017 – *consent agenda*

C.1. OAA response to October notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*

C.6 Draft IFS resolution. For the text of HB 2998, see:

<https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2017R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB2998>

E.1. Proposed PT XO amendment

E.2. Major Declaration Policy

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **4 December 2017** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call
- \* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 6 November 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to November notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcements from Secretary
  - 4. Announcement from PSU Foundation – Bill Boldt
  - 5. Discussion: Commencement – Cynthia Mohr, Sherril Gelmon (Grad. Program Board)
  - 6. Discussion: on-line student evaluations of faculty teaching – David Raffo (EPC)
- D. Unfinished Business
  - \* 1. Amendment to Faculty Constitution:
    - a) to clarify membership in the Faculty of ranked appointees
    - b) to provide ex-officio Senate representation for part-time appointees
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals – *consent agenda* (GC, UCC)
  - \* 2. Resolution on tax policy for tuition waivers (Steering Committee)
  - \* 3. Process for potential nomination of Faculty member of Board of Trustees – straw poll (Steering)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
  - \* 1. Question to President regarding DACA
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. IFS Report
  - \* 4. Quarterly report of Educational Policy Committee – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment
- \* **See the following attachments.**
  - Complete proposals for E.1 can be viewed on-line:** <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>.
  - B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 November 2017 – *consent agenda*
  - D.1. Proposed constitutional amendment
  - E.1.a,c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – Note: there is no E.1.b – *consent agenda*
  - E.2. Proposed resolution on tax policy for tuition waivers
  - E.3. Options for potential nomination of Faculty BoT member
  - F.1. Question to President
  - G.4. EPC Fall 2017 Report

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **8 January 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call

- \* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 4 December 2017 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements and Discussion

- \* 1. OAA response to December notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
- 3. Announcements from Secretary
- \* 4. Discussion: writing across the curriculum

D. Unfinished Business

- \* 1. Amendment to Faculty Constitution to clarify Faculty membership of ranked appointees (postponed from December)

E. New Business

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC, UNST Council) – *consent agenda*

F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. President's Report
2. Provost's Report
3. IFS Report

H. Adjournment

- \* **See the following attachments.**

**Complete proposals for E.1 can be viewed on-line:** <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>.

B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 November 2017 – *consent agenda*

C.4. For discussion item, see supporting documents:

- [WPA Report, 2014](#)

[https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/CWPA\\_Report\\_June\\_2014.pdf](https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/CWPA_Report_June_2014.pdf)

- [University Writing Council Action Plan, 2016](#) [available on-line]

[https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/UWC\\_action\\_plan.pdf](https://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/UWC_action_plan.pdf)

- December Minutes Appendix G.3 [included in the January Packet]

D.1. Proposed constitutional amendment

E.1.a,b,c.d. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **5 February 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call
- \* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 8 January 2018 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to January notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcements from Secretary
  - 4. Announcement: Healthy Campus Initiative (C. Crespo, J. Weissbuch Allina)
- D. Unfinished Business
  - 1. Priorities in the Writing Action Plan (straw poll)
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. Reclassification of certain ANTH courses for BA/BS distribution requirements (ARC)
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. IFS Report
- H. Adjournment

\* See the following attachments.

**Complete proposals for E.1 can be viewed on-line:** <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>.

B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 8 January 2018 – *consent agenda*

E.1.a,b,c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*

E.2. Proposal to reclassify academic distribution areas for ANTH courses

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **5 March 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call

\* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 5 February 2018 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements and Discussion

- \* 1. OAA response to February notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
- 3. Announcements from Secretary: representation in faculty governance

D. Unfinished Business – none

E. New Business

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *consent agenda*
- \* 2. Renaming the School of Business Administration as The School of Business (EPC)

F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

- 1. President's Report
- 2. Provost's Report
- \* 3. Report of Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty – *consent agenda*
- \* 4. Quarterly Report of Budget Committee – *consent agenda*
- \* 5. Quarterly Report of Educational Policy Committee – *consent agenda*
- \* 6. EPC memo on DRAFT Student Pregnancy Policy – *consent agenda*

H. Adjournment

\* See the following attachments.

**Complete proposals for E.1, E.2 can be viewed on-line:** <https://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com>

B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 February 2018 – *consent agenda*

E.1.a,b,c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*

E.2. Proposal to rename SBA (for complete application, see Curriculum Tracker – Educational Policy Committee – Proposals for Academic Units, Centers, and Institutes)

G.3. TFFTIF Report

G.4. BC Winter 2018 Quarterly Report

G.5. EPC Winter 2018 Quarterly Report

G.6.a,b. EPC memo; draft Student Pregnancy Policy

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **2 April 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

*Note changes to regular order of business as indicated below*

- A. Roll Call
- \* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 5 March 2018 Meeting – *consent agenda*
- C. Announcements and Discussion
  - \* 1. OAA response to March notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
  - 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 3. Announcement on President’s Inauguration
  - 4. Announcements from Secretary
  - \* 5. PSU response to HB 2998 and Foundational Curriculum
- D. Unfinished Business
  - 1. Continued discussion of report from Task Force on Tenure for Teaching-Intensive Faculty [TFTTIF] – *incorporated into item E.6 below*
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC, UNST C) – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. Grad. Certificate in Taxation (SB via GC)
  - \* 3. Undergrad. Major in Indigenous Nations and Native American Studies (CLAS via UCC)
  - \* 4. Undergrad. Major in Special Education (GSE via UCC)
  - \* 5. AQC recommendations for task forces on undergraduate research and on interdisciplinary teaching & research – *incorporates item G.5 below*
  - \* 6. Recommendation from TFTTIF to re-evaluate P&T guidelines – *incorporates item D.1. above*
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Administrators and Committees – *item G.4. will be considered first*
  - 1. President’s Report
  - 2. Provost’s Report
  - 3. IFS Report
  - \* 4. EPC Report on Students’ Ratings of Instruction
  - \* 5. AQC Annual Report – *see item E.5 above*
- H. Adjournment



\* See the following attachments.

**Complete proposals for E.1-4 are available on-line:** [psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com).

B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 February 2018 – *consent agenda*

C.5. Working document on Foundational Curriculum

E.1.a,b,c,d. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*

E.2.a,b. Proposal for Grad. Certificate in Taxation and Summary

E.3. Proposal for Undergrad. Major in INNAS (summary)

E.4. Proposal for Undergrad. Major in Special Ed. (summary)

E.5/G.5. AQC report and recommendations

E.6. TFFTIF follow-up and recommendations

G.4. EPC Report on SRI

DRAFT

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **7 May 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call

\* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 2 April 2018 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements

- \* 1. OAA response to April notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- \* 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer (including information re: Confucius Institute)
- 3. Announcements from Secretary
- \* 4. Proposed revision to Information Security Policy (S. McKay)

NOMINATIONS FOR 2018-19 FACULTY SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT
--

D. Unfinished Business

- \* 1. Proposed Task Force on Revising P&T Guidelines; (Steering; cf. April agenda item E.6)
- \* 2. Student ratings of instruction (EPC; cf. April agenda item G.4)

E. New Business

*Procedural note for item E.1: heretofore, GC and UCC submitted a joint curricular memo for 400/500-level (“slash”) courses. These committees have now adopted the policy of listing such courses separately on their respective memos, with indication that the proposal is part of a dual-level course.*

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *consent agenda*
- \* 2. Master of Nonprofit Leadership (CUPA via GC)
- \* 3. Graduate Certificate in Econometric and Data Analysis (CUPA via GC)
- \* 4. Change in undergraduate writing requirement course list (ARC & UWC)
- \* 5. English language proficiency for international post-baccalaureate applicants (ARC)

*Procedural note for items E.6 & E.7: the amendments are presented at this meeting for discussion and for any proposed modifications (amendments to the amendments). Any proposed modifications must be voted on at this meeting. The final text with any approved modifications is then referred to the Advisory Council for review for proper form. The final text with any approved modifications will be debated and voted on at the June meeting. Additional modifications will not be in order at the June meeting; the debate and vote will be upon the final text with any modifications agreed upon today.*

- \* 6. Proposed amendments of textual clarification to Faculty Constitution
- \* 7. Proposed amendments of textual clarification to Faculty Senate Bylaws
- F. Question Period and Communications from the Floor to the Chair
- G. Reports from Administrators and Committees
  1. President's Report
  2. Provost's Report
  - \* 3. Academic Advising Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 4. General Student Affairs Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 5. Honors Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 6. Institutional Assessment Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 7. Intercollegiate Athletics Board Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 8. Library Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 9. Scholastic Standards Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
  - \* 10. University Studies Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

**\* See the following attachments.**

**Complete proposals for E.1-3 are available on-line:** [psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com).

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 2 April – *consent agenda*
- C.2. Information re: Confucius Institute
- C.4. Draft of Information Security Policy
- D.1. Motion to create Task Force to Address Advancement of NTTF
- D.2. Resolution regarding student ratings of instruction. See also:  
[www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/EPC\\_SRI\\_Report\\_180225.pdf](http://www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/sites/www.pdx.edu/faculty-senate/files/EPC_SRI_Report_180225.pdf)
- E.1.a.c.. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *note: there is no E.1.b – consent agenda*
- E.2. Master of Nonprofit Leadership (summary)
- E.3. Grad. Certificate in Econometric and Data Analysis (summary)
- E.4. Change to undergrad. writing requirement course list
- E.5. Change to English proficiency requirement for international post-bacc. applicants
- E.6. Proposed Constitutional amendments
- E.7. Proposed amendments to Bylaws
- G.3. AAC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.4. GSAC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.5. HC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.6. IAC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.7. IAB Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.8. LC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.9. SSC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.10. UNST Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators, Senators-Elect, and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **4 June 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

*GENERAL PROCEDURAL NOTES:*

- *Senators for 2017-18 vote on motions and amendments.*
- *Senators for 2018-19 vote for POE and Steering Committee and meet in divisional caucuses.*
- *Administrators' reports (items G.1-2) will take place at 4:00 regardless of agenda order.*
- *Consent agenda items will be approved or accepted as submitted in the Packet unless objections or requests for separate discussion are registered before the end of roll call.*

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call

\* B. Approval of the Minutes of the 7 May 2018 Meeting – *consent agenda*

C. Announcements and Discussion

- \* 1. May notice of Senate actions – *consent agenda*
- 2. Announcements from Presiding Officer
- 3. Announcements from Secretary
- \* 4. Draft of Access Control Policy
- \* 5. Draft of postdoc mentoring plan
- 6. Redesign of PSU's website

NOMINATIONS FOR AND ELECTION OF 2018-19 FACULTY SENATE PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT  
NOMINATIONS FOR 2018-20 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS (2)

D. Unfinished Business

*PROCEDURAL NOTES FOR ITEMS D.1.-2:*

- *If there are proposed modifications, including proposals to divide the question, we will vote on those proposed modifications, and then the modified text will be considered at the next regular Senate meeting in October. Any proposed modifications must be submitted in writing either in advance of the meeting or from the Senate floor.*
- *If there are no proposed modifications, we will vote on the amendments as given.*
- \* 1. Proposed amendments of textual clarification to Faculty Constitution (cf. May E.6)
- \* 2. Proposed amendments of textual clarification to Faculty Senate Bylaws (cf. May E.7)

ELECTION OF 2018-20 STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS (2)

E. New Business

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *consent agenda*
- \* 2. Graduate Certificate in Human Resource Analysis (SB via GC)
- \* 3. Undergraduate Minor in American Sign Language (CLAS via UCC)
- \* 4. MOA to correct supplemental letters for new hired faculty re: P&T guidelines (Steering)
- † 5. Confucius Institute at PSU (Steering)

F. Questions for Administrators and for Presiding Officer

G. Reports from Administrators and Committees

*PROCEDURAL NOTE: Reports from administrators, items G.1-2, will take place at 4:00 regardless of agenda order*

- 1. President's Report
- 2. Provost's Report
- \* 3. Academic Requirements Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 4. Budget Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 5. Educational Policy Committee Quarterly Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 6. Faculty Development Committee Semiannual Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 7. Graduate Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 8. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- \* 9. University Writing Council Annual Report – *consent agenda*

DIVISION CAUCUSES TO CHOOSE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: AO, CLAS-AL, CLAS-Sci, CLAS-SS (2), COTA, SB, SPH
--

H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments.**

**Complete proposals for E.1-2 are available on-line:** [psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com).

- B. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 7 May – *consent agenda*
- C.1. May notice of Senate actions
- C.2. Information re: Confucius Institute
- C.4. Draft of Access Control Policy
- C.5. Draft of postdoc mentoring plan
- D.1. Proposed amendments to Constitution
- D.2. Proposed amendments to Bylaws
- E.1.a,c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *note: there is no E.1.b – consent agenda*
- E.2. Grad. Cert. in Human Resource Analysis (summary)
- E.3. Undergrad. Minor in ASL (summary)
- E.4. MOA to correct supplemental letters re: P&T guidelines
- G.3. ARC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.4. BC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.5. EPC Quarterly Report – *consent agenda*
- G.6. FDC Semiannual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.7. GC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.8. UCC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.9. UWC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- † E.5. See documents posted to the [Discussion Resources](#) section of the [Faculty Senate website](#)

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **1 October 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

Note: items on the *Consent Agenda* are approved or received as presented in the Packet, unless notice is given to the Secretary in writing before the meeting, or from the floor before the end of Roll Call. Any senator or ex-officio member may pull any item from the *Consent Agenda* for separate consideration.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1]
  - \* 1. Minutes of the 4 June 2018 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for June – *Consent Agenda*
- B. Announcements
  - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - 3. Introduction: Richard Corsi, Dean, MCECS
  - 4. Introduction: Mark McLellan, Vice Pres. for Research & Graduate Studies
  - 5. Introduction: Luis Balderas-Villagrana, President of ASPSU
  - 6. Update: redesign of PSU website (Kristin Boden)
- C. Discussion Item: None
- D. Unfinished Business: None
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *Consent Agenda*
  - 2. Straw poll: opt-in vs. opt-out for Faculty elections (Steering)
- F. Question Period
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. Report on PSU budget from Kevin Reynolds, Vice Pres. for Finance & Administration
  - 2. Report from Task Force on Co-ops (Clifford Allen, Dean, SB)
  - 3. President's Report
  - 4. Provost's Report
- H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments:**

A.1 Minutes of the Senate meeting of 4 June 2018 – *Consent Agenda*

A.2. June Notice of Senate Actions – *Consent Agenda*

E.1.a,b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *Consent Agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **5 November 2018** at **3:00 p.m.** in **Cramer Hall 53.**

**AGENDA**

[*Note changes to regular order of business: B.3, Update from Margolis Healy, may be moved depending on representative's scheduling constraints. G.2, Provost's Report, will be given after Announcements. The President will be out of town, so there is no President's Report.*]

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.3]
    - \* 1. Minutes of the 1 October 2018 meeting – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. Minutes of the 15 October 2018 meeting – *consent agenda*
    - \* 3. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for October – *consent agenda*
  - B. Announcements
    - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
    - 2. Announcements from Secretary
    - 3. Update from representative of Margolis Healy on review of campus policing
  - C. Discussion: None
  - D. Unfinished Business: none
  - E. New Business
    - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, UNST Council) – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. Unit name change: “Graduate School of Education” to “College of Education” (EPC)
    - \* 3. Unit name change: “Office of Graduate Studies” to “Graduate School” (EPC)
    - \* 4. Policy on curricular overlap (UCC & GC) [*note: Senate will not vote at this meeting*]
  - F. Question Period
  - G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
    - 1. Report from Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
    - 2. Provost's Report [*note: this report will be presented earlier in the meeting*]
    - \* 3. Committee on Committees annual report – *consent agenda*
  - H. Adjournment
- \* **See the following attachments:**
- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 1 October 2018 – *consent agenda*
  - A.2. Minutes of the special Senate meeting of 15 October 2018 – *consent agenda*
  - A.3. October Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
  - E.1.b.c. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda* [*note: there is no E.1.a*]
    - Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**
    - <https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>
    - <https://unstcouncil.pbworks.com/w/page/45865388/FrontPage>
  - E.2. Unit name change for Graduate School of Education
  - E.3. Unit name change for Office of Graduate Studies
  - E.4. Policy on curricular overlap
  - G.3. Committee on Committees annual report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **3 December 2018** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.4]
  - \* 1. Minutes of the 5 November 2018 meeting – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for October – *consent agenda*
- B. Announcements
  - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - 3. Update on revision of departmental bylaws from Vice Provost Shelly Chabon
- C. Discussion: Faculty governance at the departmental level
- D. Unfinished Business
  - \* 1. Policy on curricular overlap (UCC & GC)
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC) – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. Proposed constitutional amendment on opt-out elections (Art. 5, Sec. 2)
  - \* 3. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships (Steering)
- F. Question Period
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's Report
  - 2. Provost's Report
  - 3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) report
  - \* 4. Educational Policy Committee (EPC) report – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments:**

- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 5 November 2018 – *consent agenda*
- A.2. November Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
- D.1. Policy on Curricular Overlap (UCC, GC)
- E.1. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>
- E.2. Proposed constitutional amendment on opt-out elections
- E.3. Draft resolution: Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships
- E.4. Educational Policy Committee (EPC) quarterly report



PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **7 January 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1]
    - \* 1. Minutes of the 3 December 2018 meeting – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for December – *consent agenda*
  - B. Announcements
    - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
    - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - C. Discussion – *none*
  - D. Unfinished Business
    - \* 1. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on International Collaborations (Steering)
    - \* 2. Constitutional amendment on opt-out elections (Art. 5, Sec. 2)
  - E. New Business
    - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC, UNST Council) – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. Proposed revision of Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal (UNST Council)
  - F. Question Period
  - G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
[Note: because the President is out of town, there is no President's report]
    - 1. Provost's report
    - \* 2. Report of Vice President for Research & Graduate Studies
    - 3. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) report
  - H. Adjournment
- \* **See the following attachments.**
- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 3 December 2018 – *consent agenda*
  - A.2. December Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
  - D.1. Proposal: Ad Hoc Committee on International Partnerships
  - D.2. Constitutional amendment on opt-out elections
  - E.1. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>  
<http://unstcouncil.pbworks.com/w/page/45865388/FrontPage>
  - E.2. Proposed revision of Ethics & Social Responsibility Goal (UNST Council)
  - G.2. Draft policy on Principal Investigator/Project Director eligibility & responsibility (RGS)

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **4 February 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.6, G.7]
    - \* 1. Minutes of the 7 January 2019 meeting – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for January– *consent agenda*
  - B. Announcements
    - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
    - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - C. Discussion – *none*
  - D. Unfinished Business – *none*
  - E. New Business
    - \* 1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Open Access Publication (Steering Committee)
  - F. Questions for Administrators
    - \* 1. Faculty salaries of former administrators – *postponed from January*
    - \* 2. Physics Department PhD program
  - G. Reports from Administrators and Committees
    - 1. President's report
    - 2. Provost's report
    - 3. Report from Kevin Neely, Assoc. Vice Pres. for Government Relations
    - 4. Report from Luis Balderas-Villagrana, Pres. of ASPSU
    - 5. IFS report
    - \* 6. Recommendation of Academic Calendar Committee – *consent agenda*
    - \* 7. Faculty Development Committee semi-annual report – *consent agenda*
  - H. Adjournment
- \* **See the following attachments.**
- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 7 January 2019 – *consent agenda*
  - A.2. January Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
  - E.1.a,b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>
  - E.2. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on Open Access Publication (Steering Committee)
  - F.1. Question regarding faculty salaries for former administrators
  - F.2. Question regarding the Physics Department PhD program
  - G.6. Recommendation of Academic Calendar Committee – *consent agenda*
  - G.7. Faculty Development Committee semi-annual report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **4 March 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1]
    - \* 1. Minutes of the 4 February 2019 meeting – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for February – *consent agenda*
  - B. Announcements
    - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
    - 2. Announcements from Secretary
  - C. Discussion: none
  - D. Unfinished Business: none
  - E. New Business
    - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC) – *consent agenda*
    - \* 2. New degree proposal: Business Minor in Social Innovation (UCC)
    - \* 3. New degree proposal: Certificate in Institutional Economics (UCC)
  - F. Question Period
    - \* 1. Question to administrators regarding FBI's advice to PSU on relations with China
  - G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
    - 1. President's report
    - 2. Provost's report
    - \* 4. Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Advancement of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
    - 5. Report from Luis Balderas-Villagrana, Pres. of ASPSU
    - 6. Report of Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate
    - \* 7. Budget Committee quarterly report – *consent agenda*
    - \* 8. Educational Policy Committee quarterly report – *consent agenda*
  - H. Adjournment
- \* **See the following attachments:**
- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 4 February 2019 – *consent agenda*
  - A.2. February Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
  - E.1. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>
  - E.2. Proposal for Business Minor in Social Innovation
  - E.3. Proposal for Certificate in Institutional Economics
  - F.1. Question to administrators regarding FBI's advice to PSU on relations with China
  - G.4. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Advancement of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
  - G.7. Budget Committee quarterly report – *consent agenda*
  - G.8. Educational Policy Committee quarterly report – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Faculty Senate will meet on **1 April 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.4-6]
  - \* 1. Minutes of the 4 March 2019 meeting – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for March – *consent agenda*
- B. Announcements
  - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 2. Announcements from Secretary
- C. Discussion: None
- D. Unfinished Business: None
- E. New Business
  - \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC, UNST Council) – *consent agenda*
  - \* 2. Resolution requesting information on administrative leadership (Steering)
  - \* 3. New program proposal: Minor in Climate Change Science & Adaptation (UCC)
  - \* 4. New program proposal: Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution (GC)
  - \* 5. New center proposal: Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative (EPC)
  - \* 6. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center (EPC)
- F. Question Period: None
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
  - 1. President's report
  - 2. Provost's report
  - \* 3. Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council
  - \* 4. Annual Report of Academic Advising Council – *consent agenda*
  - \* 5. Annual Report of Internationalization Council – *consent agenda*
  - \* 6. Draft of proposed Copyright Policy – *consent agenda*
- H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments.**

- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 4 March 2019 – *consent agenda*
- A.2. March Notice of Senate Actions and OAA response – *consent agenda*
- E.1. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *consent agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>  
<http://unstcouncil.pbworks.com/w/page/45865388/FrontPage>
- E.2. Resolution requesting information on administrative leadership
- E.3. Proposal for Minor in Climate Change Science & Adaptation
- E.4. Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution
- E.5. Proposal for Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative [center]
- E.6. Proposal for Digital City Testbed Center
- G.3. IAC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.4. AAC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.5. IC Annual Report – *consent agenda*
- G.6. Draft Copyright Policy – *consent agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-officio Members of the Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Faculty Senate will meet on **6 May 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.5-10]

- \* 1. Minutes of the 1 April 2019 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 2. Minutes of the 22 April 2019 special meeting – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 3. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for April – *Consent Agenda*

B. Announcements

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
2. Announcements from Secretary

NOMINATIONS FOR 2019-20 PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT
---

C. Discussion: None

D. Unfinished Business

- \* 1. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center (EPC)

E. New Business

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC) – *Consent Agenda*

F. Question Period: None

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. President's report
2. Provost's report
3. Report of Associate Vice President, Global Diversity & Inclusion
- \* 4. Report of Student President, ASPSU
- \* 5. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 6. Annual Report of Honors Council – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 7. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 8. Annual Report of Scholastic Standards Committee – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 9. Annual Report of University Studies Council – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 10. Annual Report of University Writing Council – *Consent Agenda*

H. Adjournment

\* **See the following attachments.**

- A.1. Minutes of the meeting of 1 April 2019 – *Consent Agenda*
- A.2. Minutes of the special meeting of 22 April 2019 – *Consent Agenda*
- A.3. April Notice of Senate Actions and OAA Response – *Consent Agenda*

D.1. New center proposal: Digital City Testbed Center

E.1.b. Curricular proposals (summaries) [*note: there is no E.1.a*] – *Consent Agenda*.

**Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**

<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>

G.4. ASPSU Annual Report

G.5. GSAC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

G.6. HC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

G.7. IAB Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

G.8. SSC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

G.9. USC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

G.10. UWC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators, Newly Elected Faculty Senators,  
and Ex-officio Members of the Faculty Senate

**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will meet on **3 June 2019** at 3:00 p.m. in **Cramer Hall 53**.

**Procedural note:** *Current senators (AY 2018-19) will vote on business items. Newly elected and continuing senators (AY 2019-20) will vote for Senate officers.*

**AGENDA**

A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also E.1, G.5-13]

- \* 1. Minutes of the 6 May 2019 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 2. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for May – *Consent Agenda*

NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

B. Announcements

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
2. Announcements from Secretary

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT  
NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF STEERING COMMITTEE (3)

C. Discussion: None

D. Unfinished Business: None

E. New Business

- \* 1. Curricular proposals (UCC, GC) – *Consent Agenda*
- \* 2. Report on Administrative Leadership & Shared Governance (Steering)

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF STEERING COMMITTEE (3)

- \* 3. Increasing the number of shared credits in 4+1 and 3+2 programs (GC)
- \* 4. School of Public Health retroactive curricular review (GC)
- \* 5. New program: MPH in Environmental Systems & Human Health (SPH via GC)
- \* 6. New program: Graduate Certificate in Applied Conflict Resolution (CLAS via GC)
- \* 7. New program: Graduate Certificate in Business Blockchain (SB via GC)
- \* 8. New program: Undergraduate Certificate in Business Blockchain (SB via UCC)
- \* 9. Resolution on Library funding (LC)
- \* 10. Amendment to P&T Guidelines regarding NTT faculty (AHC-NTTF Advancement)

F. Question Period: None



- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees
1. President's report
  2. Provost's report
  3. Report from Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
  - \* 4. Report from Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
  - \* 5. Annual Report of Academic Quality Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 6. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 7. Annual Report of Advisory Council – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 8. Annual Report of Budget Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 9. Annual Report of Graduate Council – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 10. Annual Report of Library Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 11. Annual Report of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 12. Interim Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 13. Interim Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Undergraduate Research Opportunities – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* 14. Semi-annual Report of Faculty Development Committee – *Consent Agenda*

DIVISION CAUCUSES TO CHOOSE MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
--

H. Adjournment

A RECEPTION WILL FOLLOW THE MEETING – LOCATION TO BE ANNOUNCED
--

\* **See the following attachments.**

- A.1. Minutes of the Senate meeting of 6 May 2019 – *Consent Agenda*
- A.2. May Notice of Senate Actions – *Consent Agenda*
- E.1.a.b. Curricular proposals (summaries) – *Consent Agenda*. **Complete curricular proposals are on-line:**  
<https://pdx.smartcatalogiq.com/Curriculum-Management-System/Dashboard/Curriculum-Dashboard>
- E.2. Report on Administrative Leadership & Shared Governance
- E.3. Increasing the number of shared credits in 4+1 and 3+2 programs
- E.4. SPH retroactive curricular review
- E.5. MPH in Environmental Systems & Human Health
- E.6. Grad. Cert. in Applied Conflict Resolution
- E.7. Grad. Cert. in Business Blockchain
- E.8. Undergrad. Cert. in Business Blockchain
- E.9. Resolution on Library funding
- E.10. Amendment to P&T Guidelines
- G.4. IFS Report
- G.5. AQC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.6. ARC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.7. AC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.8. BC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.9. GC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.10. LC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.11. UCC Annual Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.12. AHC-ITR Interim Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.13. AHC-URO Interim Report – *Consent Agenda*
- G.14. FDC Semi-annual Report – *Consent Agenda*

**Special Meeting of the Portland State University Faculty\* • 6 November 2019**  
**MINUTES**

- A. The meeting was **called to order** at 10:30 a.m.  
*[Since no motions were anticipated, no formal **roll call** was taken.]*

**B. Announcements**

Interim President of the University and of the Faculty Stephen PERCY opened the meeting saying it was an important moment to look at leadership. The last year or two, with changes and uncertainties in leadership, had been a tough time. Higher education in general is a changing world. It's important to ground leadership in the mission, values, and aspirations of the University. Thus, we're talking not only about leadership in general, but how to improve leadership at PSU given our own history and background.

PERCY gave an overview of the structure of the top level of the administration. The President is appointed by the Board of Trustees [BoT] according to the charter given by the Oregon state government. BoT members are nominated by the Governor and approved by the State Senate. The primary functions of BoT are to establish the mission and strategic plan of the University, set tuition and fee rates, and approve the University's budget. They also serve as ambassadors for the institution. The BoT is only six years old; they started with little precedent; they have been working to better figure out their own role. They have determined that, whenever they go forward the selection of a permanent President, they are interested in the thinking that [the Faculty] have as a the result of this conversation. Reporting directly to the President are administrators responsible for major functional areas of the University: Enrollment Management, Academic Affairs, Information Technology, Chief of Staff, Research and Graduate Studies, Global Diversity and Inclusion, General Counsel, Finance and Administration, Athletics, Institutional Research and Planning, and Internal Audit. This last office reviews compliance with state and federal laws and University policies; they oversee the annual audit of business operations; they also have a hotline for possible concerns. They are willing to be proactive about checking on processes and procedures—to answer questions in advance. The President's Executive Council meets every two weeks to explore major initiatives, challenges, and ideas across divisions. The organization has changed somewhat with changes from the last president: Academic Innovation has been folded into Academic Affairs. PERCY said that in general, however, he wants to keep the structure and work environment stable for now.

PERCY called on Thomas LUCKETT, Past Presiding Officer of Faculty Senate. LUCKETT said that when he agreed to take on the position of Presiding Officer of Faculty Senate, he did not realize that it would be in a year when so many crises would happen at the same time. Everyone is aware of the controversies that swirled around higher levels of the administration last spring, leading ultimately to the President's resignation. Faculty Senate Steering Committee had been working on a report on these issues. While it was still work in progress, the focus changed from "What's wrong right now?" to "What are some lessons we can learn?" This resulted in a report presented to Faculty Senate in June (Attachment E.2 in the June Senate Packet). Since a number of key appointments, including the presidency, are

---

\* Stephen Percy, President of the Faculty; Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

interim, it is an unusual opportunity to think about the system of administration and shared governance we would like to have. LUCKETT quoted from the report:

This moment in PSU's history—without a permanent president, and having not yet initiated a search for a president—provides us with a highly unusual opportunity to rethink the function and structure of the University administration at the highest levels. We urge the entire PSU community to seize this opportunity to examine whether the office of the presidency in its current form is necessary to our mission, and even whether a better system of administration might be designed without a president. A quarter century ago PSU gained national recognition for boldly reimagining general education when we founded the University Studies Program. Today we find ourselves at the convergence of multiple crises of university leadership, at a time when our national democracy is also in crisis. We call upon the Faculty to consider whether it is now time to reimagine governance.

LUCKETT found in conversations with colleagues that raising the question “How would you redesign administration?” doesn't necessarily mean we want to do that, but it does have heuristic value of opening up the imagination. What would be the ideal? The report ended with a petition to call a meeting of the Faculty in the form of a symposium to consider these issues. He saw the central conception of today's meeting: an invitation to everyone to think creatively, beyond tinkering with what is already in place. It's a discussion among interesting colleagues over interesting issues.

PERCY then called on Richard BEYLER, Secretary to the Faculty.

BEYLER reported results of the survey previously circulated to Faculty. [For slides see **Attachment 1.**] He cautioned that this was not a social-scientific research instrument. He also noted that reporting a statement doesn't necessarily mean that he agrees with it or that he believes it. It is important to read the results with critical awareness. They are, in any event, evidence: expressions by Faculty members of their experiences, perceptions, and feelings.

BEYLER displayed quantitative results, then reviewed recurring themes in qualitative responses. There was significant concern about administrative bloat; however, it was also noted that this should be studied comparatively and with regard to real needs for staff support. Research infrastructure was also a major area of interest; there were both positive and negative comments about this. A high rate of administrative turnover seems to be a problem, though more evidence would be useful; if it is a problem, managing transitions becomes important. Commenters voiced concerns about a cultural divide among Board, Administration, and Faculty: each doesn't understand what the others are actually doing.

BEYLER's analysis of a concern about compensation and salaries is that it is about more than just numbers; it's symbolically important both within and outside of PSU. Desire for transparency, particularly about financial decisions, was prominent. There was uncertainty about the roles of Board, Administration, and Faculty in governance, and doubt that Faculty governance bodies actually have much authority. As PERCY had mentioned, the Board also has a learning curve. Commenters voiced concern about the changing nature of faculty demographics and work, particularly around the issue of tenure. BEYLER noted statements both affirming progress in diversity, equity, and inclusion, and statements strongly criticizing a lack of progress in this area, including in the survey itself and the planning of this very meeting.

Regarding internal vs. external hires, BEYLER noted that despite an evidently common perception that there is a Faculty consensus on this issue, there were comments on both sides of the question, with people pointing out both pros and cons.

Several people indicated scheduling conflicts. BEYLER recognized that there were other important things going on at this time. Avoiding all conflicts would be virtually impossible. He had heard that once it was the practice not to schedule classes after 3:00 on Mondays, so as to allow time for such meetings, but that would probably not be feasible now.

BEYLER also highlighted singular statements that stuck his attention. They needed careful interpretation, being comments from individuals with a very decided idea about something.

There was a call to respect the work of those serving in administrative roles, and a recognition that the President has a distinctive institutional accountability. There were formulations of what good leadership is in academia in general and at this institution specifically. Ethics training for administrators was suggested. Someone mentioned that the California State University system works with an independent financial transparency agency.

A telling comment for BEYLER was that we should see administration as a support staff for faculty and students. Another was an observation that it was worse (demoralizing, frustrating) to ask for faculty input into decisions and then not act upon it, than to not ask for input at all, which would at least be more honest.

Several individuals perceived PSU to be in an existentially threatening situation.

BEYLER noted two comments that, juxtaposed, seemed to be in tension with each other: that PSU should be more agile in responding to the labor market and designing new programs, and that PSU should not turn itself into a technical job training institute.

Concluding, BEYLER noted statements that action, not talk, is necessary; and, relatedly, assertions that Faculty governance, generally, and Senate, specifically, are ineffective.

PERCY called for a voice vote to have Faculty Senate Presiding Officer Isabel JAÉN PORTILLO take the chair of the meeting (**approved** without objection).

### C. Discussion

JAÉN thanked the Steering Committee for their work in planning the meeting, and for members of the Faculty who were present and who had responded to the meeting. The voice of the Faculty is the essential element. The conversation would not end today: it was intended to carry out this conversation in several stages. Today would be about defining topics, needed information, and types of outcomes.

JAÉN invited attendees to move to one of the tables with [a sign designating] one of the discussion topics formulated with input from the survey: structure of the administration; shared governance; review of the administration; equity, diversity, and inclusion; appointments and continuity; compensation; state of research and interdisciplinary collaboration; budget and curriculum. [See **Appendix 2.**]

*[The discussion broke into small groups starting at 11:00, and then moved back into the whole group at 11:40. Table groups then reported out as follows:]*

- **State of research and interdisciplinarity.** The consensus is that research is not being adequately supported. This has largely to do with the budgetary crisis within the Research

Office itself, such as the loss of DRA positions. Funding through grant indirects has been unstable. Turnover at the head of that office is also problematic. Overall, research needs more recognition and support, including non-grant-funded research.

Action items: Maybe this unit should have more input into budget decisions. There is a Committee on Research, but it is administrative; it should be turned into a constitutional committee, appointed by the Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees.

Needed information: How do other universities fund research support / staffing?

• **Structure of the administration.** Issues intersecting here include transparency, equity, and compensation. Compensation seems to have inverted functions at PSU: administrators seek for faculty to advance their goals, rather than seek to advance faculty goals. Compare, e.g., salaries of state governors. Meanwhile, we appear to have insufficient funds to hire and retain needed faculty. Occasionally, administration seems to be in a role not supportive of the faculty—thus, pet projects of administrators that, when they leave, are left unfinished or have the funding drop out from under them. Examples include, arguably, ReThink, Digital Measures, Centers of Excellence, committing the University to risky financial relationships without faculty involvement/approval. While some administrative positions are now vacant, some faculty actually feel that they are achieving more. There is skepticism about the ability of search firms to attract civil servant educators rather than careerists. What do national educational bodies recommend in this regard?

Action items: One suggestion was “Board Buddies”: faculty to help mentor Board members and avoid gullibility. The last presidential search was not anomalous, but rather a result of extant policies; therefore, hiring policies need reconsideration. The goal should be a hire that matches the interest of the University, and not just the interest of particular Board members.

• **Equity, diversity, and inclusion.** For many departments, these issues are central to scholarship and daily work; those units need support. In other areas, such as STEM, it may not be front and center, and women and/or minorities may be underrepresented. Equity, diversity, and inclusion are not the responsibility of one department or committee; labor can't be delegated to those for whom this is the area of scholarship, nor to Global Diversity & Inclusion. It has to be a University-wide cultural shift, both up- and downstream. It shouldn't be legislated by individual grievances. It has to be a shared commitment across faculty, department chairs, upper-level administrators, and Board. To take this seriously at a structural means, for example, looking at headhunter firms: in what ways might they reproduce structural inequalities around gender and race? In what ways might we reproduce them in departmental hires? Hegemony is everywhere, including in Faculty Senate.

• **Budget and curriculum.** Each unit feels that they are wanting for tenure-track lines, but there needs to be a higher vision rather than traditional practices, cliques, or politics. The goal should be to help the vision and help grow PSU. The cluster hire model [in CLAS] a couple of years ago was an interesting attempt: faculty hires formed a cohort across departments, and it did not play so much into departmental politics. Hiring faculty needs to be done in a coherent fashion. There needs to be consideration of programs as a whole in making decisions. Cutting a single line can cripple a program operating on a “duct tape” level. Where is the balance between faculty responsibility to offer the curriculum, and administration's responsibility to make sure programs are funded? We need oversight to make sure the programs we are advertising are actually the ones we are offering.

• **Shared governance.** To talk about shared governance, we first need to be able to see it. In the organizational chart shown earlier, there were no arrows pointing to Faculty roles. Many faculty and academic professionals have had the experience of being on committees whose work ends up being inconsequential—put on the shelf—or who become the audience for presentation of a *fait accompli*. If shared governance is only lip service, it becomes devalued. Another devaluation occurs when members of minority groups are repeatedly tapped to be on committees, workgroups, etc.—a form of hidden labor that’s not rewarded. Similarly, for academic professionals, participation shared governance often means an overload. We seem to have problems of accountability, continuity, inclusivity. If we value shared governance, it needs to be meaningfully integrated into our work: identified in letters of appointment, rewarded at times of review or promotion, and not just symbolically. There has to be authority for faculty in these roles.

Action items and needed information: (1) We don’t need to reinvent the wheel. Our profession has robust thinking about this. AAUP’s first statement was in 1920. There is an extensive body of guidelines developed along with the American Association of Higher Education and the American Association of Higher Education Boards. (2) We should look at the experience of other universities, in either weaker or stronger forms.

• **Compensation.** Over the past ten years, the ratio of average faculty to administrative salaries has decreased. Compensation also goes beyond salary to include benefits, golden parachutes, travel and entertainment accounts, etc. Can we get an accounting of those things? Assuming comparisons between universities and corporations influences how we look for “talent.” We need to rethink engaging in the CEO salary arms race. Compensation should be tied to accountability. It was also suggested that compensation at the top tier should be tied to the bottom tier.

Action items: Faculty Senate should work with AAUP to generate concrete proposals. When administrators return to faculty positions they often keep the same salaries—a situation not commonly known—and Senate could offer a resolution to end that practice.

Needed information: salaries are available, but it requires some doing. We also need information about other types of compensation. We need to know what other universities do (but not necessarily to copy them). We also need to understand our local environment better. Finally, we need tools for evaluation [of upper-level administrators] beyond BoT.

• **Appointments and continuity.** From our experience with search firms, there is skepticism that we have gotten our money’s worth. Is that due to specific firms, or search firms in general? Should we try a different method? There was advocacy for going back to not hiring an external firm. There was also much discussion of internal vs. external candidates. There may be some positions that particularly lend themselves to internal hires. The underlying problem is that mission of PSU is getting lost in the hiring process. We get candidates that don’t understand our mission, or feel that they can work around it. We need to make clear to candidates, and if we use an external firm they need to communicate to them, what they are stepping into. We want them to uphold our mission, and not think that they are a one-person show, re-molding the university around themselves.

Action items, needed information: We want information about retention and comparisons to similar institutions. How are protocols for hiring affecting the situation? Exit interviews, for both administrators and faculty, would be useful; we are not sure if this happens already, or if

so, who has access to the information. We need to communicate our mission of service, rather than acting like a corporation; that's a problem throughout higher education.

Finally, we should not be afraid to let a search fail. If the set of candidates are not a good fit, we should not feel compelled to hire one of them but, instead, try again.

*[The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:06 p.m., then reconvened at 12:43. After JAÉN and BEYLER summarized the introductory announcements (item B above), the meeting again broke into smaller table groups for topical discussions. Starting at 1:33, the table groups reported out to the meeting as a whole:]*

- **Structure of the administration.** Many faculty did not know much about the structure or working of the higher administration. Rapid restructuring makes this even more challenging. Filling positions by rotation among Faculty would increase mutual knowledge. How can we make people are less siloed? It would make the work of administrators, too, more valued. Another suggestion was to have a representative body like the Faculty Senate, but for the Administration. Another was that all upper-level administrators also be faculty.<sup>†</sup>

Other institutions—Portland Community College was mentioned—have different structures that we might look at. Willingness to re-evaluate past and current practices is crucial in building a democratic structure. We should change expectations of what counts as a contribution.

Another suggestion was to avoid the nationwide bidding approach to searches. Perhaps offering “non-competitive” salaries would attract a different type of candidate, drawing more on an internal or local pool. We should avoid, in the first place, hiring candidates who manifest a need for extensive orientation to our institutional culture or training about the interests of students, faculty, and staff here.

The fact that most faculty are on nine-month contracts, whereas most administrators are twelve-month, means that faculty are often left out of some key decisions. There is also then a disparity in paid vacations.

Needed information: Which administrators are also faculty, and how is this decided? Do they return to the faculty at the end of their term? How does the totality of administrative positions and salaries at PSU compare to that of other institutions? Are there other institutions that place more emphasis on internal hires or rotation? Since BoT is new, faculty don't know much about it; we should learn more about the members, the appointment process, and requirements (if any) for experience in higher education?

Proposed action items: Develop metrics for “results per resources used,” rather than just “results” or “getting a lot done.” A regular schedule of administrative reports to Faculty Senate, like those of Faculty committees, would be useful. It was suggested to invite Board members to visit classes and attend student events. We should reassess Board structure, now with six year's experience.

- **Research and interdisciplinary collaboration.** A permanent research budget is needed, not one dependent on grant overheads. What does the intention entail to move from a teaching to a teaching-and-research university? Connected questions are evaluation of

---

<sup>†</sup> Note from Secretary: according to the PSU Faculty Constitution, most upper-level administrators are members of the Faculty in a formal sense by virtue of holding academic rank and/or having job functions within the areas defined by the Constitution.

departments that goes beyond credit hours; the draws on faculty time; and participation in research and teaching by administrators. Staff support is needed because applicants may not have technical knowledge to write grant budgets, etc.

Action items: Faculty Senate doesn't have a committee on research; this is urgently needed. We might create something for research in the spirit of UNST graduate fellows, with training in research methods, professional communication, coding or other technical skills, etc. Such a student cohort, with a common core of knowledge, would also aid collaborative faculty research.

Interdisciplinarity should not just be slogan. It was doubted whether the "pools" of the new budget model, now under discussion, would really include mechanisms to support cross-college, university-wide interdisciplinarity in teaching or research.

JAÉN interjected that Provost JEFFORDS had indicated that there would be more opportunity for faculty to offer input on budget modelling.

• **Equity, diversity, and inclusion.** We should focus on systemic problems; the diversity of the PSU student body is not reflected in the faculty. Promotion and tenure guidelines across campus don't refer to equity, diversity, and inclusion [EDI]. It's difficult to measure EDI efforts unless they are part of scholarship. Guidelines should require faculty to address how they're including this in curriculum and pedagogy; however, some departments have pushed back on this expectation. A predominantly white faculty, lacking training or awareness of alternative pedagogies, may find it difficult. Likewise, limited resources makes it difficult to recruit or retain faculty from underrepresented groups, who may have more attractive offers elsewhere. Different and additional kinds of support may be necessary; it can be stressful to be the only member of a given group in a given unit. Support for EDI should be manifested not only in words but in resources and common expectations. What are the rewards (e.g., in post-tenure review) for promoting EDI? Another question was about the resources for, and the monitoring of, ADA compliance in syllabi (particularly online courses)?

Thinking about equity requires thinking about the overall purpose of a university (what knowledge, whose knowledge) and articulation with the K-12 educational system.

Needed information and proposed action items: Much relevant information was gathered when developing the Strategic Plan a few years ago. What's become of it? Consistently applying the equity lens from that work would be a good foundation.

• **Review of the administration.** Who should evaluate administrators? Committee with broad representation would be a good approach. Under consideration are the president and administrators who report directly to the president, as well as deans. Discussion also revolved around whether to make reviews public; making annual reviews as part of the requirements for a position; self-assessment; and collecting input from faculty, staff, and other stakeholders (that is, not just the immediate supervisor).

Needed information: OAA has a process in place to evaluate deans; broadening this process would be one possibility. A suggested model for administrative review is the process of University of Arizona.

Action items: An ad-hoc Faculty Senate committee could define the scope and make recommendations, and then take that to the Human Resource Office to draft a specific policy. Once it becomes a policy, the University is bound to follow it.



- **Budget and curriculum.** The Budget Committee is advisory; their work may in the end not have any specific effect. This is a hole in our shared governance. In the budget model now under consideration, one of the main metrics is degrees granted, but several large units—UNST, IELP, etc.—are not degree-granting. How would that then work? In many instances budget decisions have an impact on curriculum; this is mostly a one-way street.

Action item: Faculty Senate resolution that curricular impacts be taken into account in budget decisions.

- **Shared governance.** Shared governance has been eroding under the current independent board structure, and replaced by neo-liberal concepts. The move away from OUS has not made us more independent, while transferring more cost burdens to students. There is an increasing sense of separation between Faculty and Administration, and lack of collaboration. Areas of adequate shared governance at PSU are hard to identify. Faculty's domain is curriculum; Administration's should be the facilitation of curriculum, but that isn't always the case. Faculty's role in larger administrative decisions has diminished, in part because of the role of BoT. Contributing to this disjunction is the long-term perspective of faculty, especially tenure-track faculty, vs. administrative perspectives that seem to be largely short-term. Performance-based budgeting has pitted faculty against one another and given power to the dean level. Thus shared governance is connected to our budgetary reality.

Action items: Add another Faculty member to the Board of Trustees. Look at the current Board makeup; it's an opportune time to expand awareness of Faculty's concerns. Senate could make a recommendation regarding the makeup of the Board and Faculty involvement. More regular meetings between the Steering Committee and President, Provost, etc., is encouraged. The Budget Committee's charge should be revised with shared governance in mind. The current charge of the Board of Trustees should be reviewed.

- In concluding remarks, JAÉN noted that this meeting was the start of a conversation that would probably move into further two meetings in the winter and spring, which would develop action items. She thanked all the participants.

*[D-G. Old & New Business, Question Time, Reports from Committees – none.]*

**H. Adjournment.** The meeting was **adjourned** at 1:58 p.m.

## APPENDIX 1: RESULTS OF PRELIMINARY SURVEY

### SYNOPSIS

230 responses (19.7%) - **Top quantitative results:**

#### Suggested topics

- Compensation
- Internal vs. external searches
- Alternative governance models
- What do administrators do?
- Faculty role in governance, changing composition of Faculty

#### Needed information

- Growth & evolution of administrative structure at PSU
- Compensation packages
- List of administrative offices & duties
- Governance structures at other institutions
- Administrative review at other institutions

#### Desired outcomes

- Statement of Faculty expectations for Presidential searches
- Resolution on system for administrative review
- •Compilation of Faculty perspectives on shared governance

### RECURRING THEMES IN COMMENTS

Concern about number of administrators – need comparative information over time (how this has developed at PSU) – need comparative information from other institutions

Despite common assumptions, PSU may well be lean compared to other institutions Despite concern about “bloat,” there is a need for adequate staff support

Value of support/infrastructure for grants, awards, professional development, etc. – negative consequences of lack thereof – comments on both sides of this issue

Concern about high rate of administrative turnover, hence: lack of momentum on initiatives, misunderstanding of PSU culture, high proportion of time spent in the learning curve (which also represents an investment of time and energy by others)

How to manage transitions better – orientation for administrators

Concern about divides between Board, Administration, Faculty – inadequate communication – each doesn't really understand what the others do

Concern about administrative compensation Conduct a cost-benefit analysis

Demoralizing in context of funding struggles and, especially, student demographics Suggestion of cap based on percentage above maximum faculty salary Compensation per se is less important than other structural issues

Need transparency about all financial decisions

Need more clarity about respective Board, Administration, and Faculty roles in governance  
Perception (reality?) that Faculty governance bodies lack substantive authority

Interest in alternative, less hierarchical administrative models E.g., instead of president, rotating faculty governance

Board needs more understanding of higher education issues and more faculty input

Desire for more administrative support for community engagement Support for student success is crucial

Desire to defend tenure as core of shared governance and concern about implications of trend towards contingent appointments

Senior administrators ought to teach, or to have experience teaching at PSU Decision-making should be based on input from faculty and students

Equity/diversity/inclusion: statements both affirming progress in this area and strongly condemning lack of progress (including planning of this meeting)

Internal vs. external hires: statements on both sides of this question Concern about centralization of functions vs. departmental autonomy Concern about expenditure on external consulting, services, etc.

Desire for 360-degree reviews

Fundraising, building relationships with donors an important part of administration's role (in contrast to faculty's?)

Scheduling conflicts for meetings of this kind

### **DISTINCTIVE STATEMENTS, PARAPHRASED**

We should respect the dedication and commitment of those serving in administrative roles The President has executive responsibility and accountability within the organization, in a way that is qualitatively different from faculty roles Good leadership provides vision, inspiration, and public advocacy

Good leadership is collaborative, inclusive, and supportive of initiatives by faculty

Good leadership aligns with general goals of enhancing democracy and strengthening public education, and specific goals of PSU's mission, especially those related to PSU's geographical and societal location

We should require ethics training for senior administrators

We should engage an independent financial transparency organization (cf. CSU system) We should think of administration as a support staff for faculty and students

Token faculty participation in decision making—asking for input but not including it in actual decision making—is a disheartening drain on time and energy

We are confronting an urgent leadership crisis – the institution is at risk

PSU should become known for developing innovative higher education leadership

We need agile responses to changing labor market and to programs from competitor institutions

We should not turn the university into a technical college or job training center

Problematic: mystification about functions of higher administration Problematic: pet projects, flashy initiatives, résumé building Problematic: lack of understanding of the PSU landscape

Problematic: gaslighting / moving the goalposts / inconsistency Problematic: doomsday scenarios, decisions taken out of fear

We need action, not more talk

Faculty Senate spends its time on pedestrian issues. Can this change?

AAUP provides organization, representation, and real force on campus; Faculty Senate and committees lack outreach, capacity, and experience

## **APPENDIX 2: TABLE TOPICS AND GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR BRAINSTORMING/DISCUSSION**

**(40 minutes: 25 discussion + 15 short summary to share with faculty in 2-minute report)**

Faculty members work at a table/topic of their choice and use the guiding questions to populate a google document. They can also choose the questions they wish to discuss. During the report session they offer a brief summary to their peers as “food” for the lunch-time discussion.

The following subquestions were included at all tables:

1. Specifically, how do you think Faculty Senate can help in relation to this topic? If you were to start planning an action item, what would that action item be?
2. In relation to this topic, what kind of information do you recommend that we gather to examine at our next meeting? Which sources would you point us to?
3. Finally, would you volunteer to help faculty gather this information? If so, please provide your name and email. Thank you!

### **I. STRUCTURE OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

1. How can we help faculty better understand how our PSU administration works?
2. How can we promote transparency regarding our administrative processes?
3. Do you know of any alternative models of administration that PSU could be exploring/emulating? How could PSU be a model of innovation in terms of administrative structure?
4. How could we guarantee a democratic process in building our administrative structure (selecting administrators, creating offices, etc.)?
5. How can we train our administrators to better understand the needs of faculty, students, and staff as well as the culture of PSU (in the case of external hires)?

### **II. SHARED GOVERNANCE**

1. How do we define shared governance in the context of our institution?
2. How effective are the lines of communication between faculty and the administration and between faculty and the Board of trustees? How could we improve these lines of communication?
3. How could we implement collaborative and effective decision making at PSU?
4. Which shared governance models are you familiar with? Would any of those work at PSU? Would they be fit our PSU culture?

### **III. REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION**

1. How could we effectively review our administrators?
2. At what level should reviews be conducted (President, Provost, Deans, Chairs...)?
3. Who should be reviewing the administrators (other administrators, faculty, students, BoT, union...)?
4. Do you have any models for administrative review that would be worth exploring for our PSU context?

#### **IV. EQUITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION**

1. What challenges and issues are we facing regarding equity, diversity and inclusion on our campus?
2. How can the administration help us hire and retain underrepresented faculty and administrators?
3. How can we be more inclusive? Which groups on campus and in the community at large should we be working with to help us?
4. Which are the roles and responsibilities of the administration and the Board of Trustees in helping us promote equity, diversity and inclusion?

#### **V. APPOINTMENTS AND CONTINUITY**

4. How should administrators (president, provost, deans, etc.) be hired? What are the advantages/disadvantages of hiring internally/externally and of hiring with or without external help (search firms)?
5. Given the high turnover in administrative positions, how can we guarantee leadership and strategic continuity? How can we retain administrators who are committed to the PSU mission and a long-term vision and strategy?
6. How do short term and contingent appointments (as opposed to tenure lines) impact student experience and success?
7. How do short term and contingent appointments (as opposed to tenure lines) they impact shared governance?

#### **VI. COMPENSATION**

1. How can we work towards more salary equity among administrators?
2. How can we work towards more salary equity between administrators and faculty?
3. Which should be the role and the limits of salary and other financial incentives when hiring administrators?
4. Which should be the relationship between compensation and accountability in administrative positions?

#### **VII. STATE OF RESEARCH AND INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION**

1. Where should administration place research capabilities in regards to our overall priorities? What are the main challenges & obstacles we are facing?  
Research is both a distinctive mission of a university and key to offer students current exposure to and education into an evolving model of knowledge. The administration should provide a stable budget from E&G funds. Permanent research budget needed (not just supported by overhead from grants). Need recognition of value of research: a university should create knowledge, not just disseminate it. Lack of understanding that creation of knowledge is central to a university.
2. How should administration directly reward cross unit collaboration & interdisciplinary work?
3. How can administration provide sufficient resources for faculty?

4. How can we argue for adequate administrative and financial support the fact that to be effective teachers we need to be effective researchers (teacher-scholar model) and be up-to-date and active in our disciplines?

#### **VIII. BUDGET AND CURRICULUM**

1. What can be done administratively to promote the health of our curriculum and academic quality?
2. How can we use shared governance to inform administrative decisions in a more continuous and adequate way?
3. How does shared governance play into the reciprocal effect of budgetary and curricular decision making?
4. What role can shared governance play in the development & maintenance of budgetary structures that result in a healthy balance of disciplines and skills needed by students?

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 June 2020  
(On-Line Conference)**

**Presiding Officer:** Isabel Jaén Portillo

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Current senators present:** Ajibade (also as newly elected senator), Anderson, Baccar, Broussard, Bryson, Chaillé, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Dillard, Dimond, Duncan, Eastin, Emery, Faaleava, Farahmandpur, Feng, Fiorillo, Flores, Fountain, Fritz, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen, Harris, Henderson, Holt, Hsu, Ingersoll, Izumi, James, Jedynek, Karavanic, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Lafrenz, Limbu, Lindsay, Loney, Lupro, Matlick, May, Meyer, Mosier, Newlands, Oswald, Palmiter, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Sugimoto, Thanheiser, Thieman, Thorne, Tinkler, Watanabe.

**Alternates for current senators present:** Karen Curtin for Dolidon, Mitchell Cruzan (also as newly elected senator) for Eppley.

**Current senators absent:** Eastin, Magaldi.

**Newly elected senators present:** Ajibade (also as current senator), Berrettini, Borden, Carpenter (also as ex-officio member), Chorpenning, Clucas, Cortez, Cruzan (also as alternate), Dusicka, Erev, Goforth, Gómez, Guzman, Hunt, Kelley, Law, Mikulski, Padín, Raffo, Smith.

**Newly elected senators absent:** Clark, Heilmair, Ito.

**Ex-officio members present:** Allen, Beyler, Boyce, Burgess, Bynum, Carpenter (also as newly elected senator), Chabon, Duh, Ginley, Jaén Portillo, Jeffords, Knepfle, Loikith, Luckett, Lynn, Maddox, Merrow, Percy, Podrabsky, Reynolds, Sager, Sipelii, Spencer, Webb, Wooster, Zonoozy.

**A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA.** The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

1. Roll call.
2. **Minutes from 4 May 2020** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
3. OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for May [**1 June Agenda Attachment A.2**] was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
4. Modification of procedure to allow the Presiding Officer to move or postpone any items at here discretion were Presiding Officer's discretion were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*. [**Several changes to the agenda order are indicated below.**]

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

JAÉN PORTILLO called attention to several upcoming events. Due to the length of the agenda, she anticipated moving several items so as to be sure to get to time-sensitive items. Even so, she believed it would be necessary to call a second meeting for June on Monday the 8<sup>th</sup> and advised members to plan accordingly.

JAÉN warmly thanked senators for their commitment and patience to the work of Faculty Senate during unprecedented events. She also recognized the work of Faculty committee chairs, many of whom were present, and also congratulated the newly elected senators.



She expressed appreciation to her colleagues on Steering Committee, whose advice and diligence made the work of Senate possible.

JAÉN called on PODRABSKY, who said he was working on a set of guiding principles for re-opening research operations on campus, which he hoped circulate soon for faculty input; he also intended to hold a town hall meeting on the subject. The return to on-campus research will be gradual, and we will have to make decisions on who comes back first. The university's values and safety for everyone should of course drive the decision.

## 2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER stated voting procedures: current senators (but not newly elected senators) would vote on motions. Continuing senators and newly elected senators (but not senators whose terms were now coming to an end) would vote for officers.

### ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

Vicki REITENAUER had been nominated at the previous meeting. There were no additional nominations.

REITENAUER was **elected** Presiding Officer Elect for 2020-21.

### NOMINATIONS FOR STEERING COMMITTEE

BEYLER stated that five nominations had been received in writing prior to the meeting. In random order these were: José PADÍN (SOC), Michael LUPRO (UNST), Steven THORNE (WLL), Andres GUZMAN (COE), and Mark BERRETTINI (FILM). There were no further nominations from the floor.

*Change in agenda order: G.2, followed by G.1 (Provost's and President's reports), moved here.*

## G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

### 2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS announced that they had reached the final stages of the CLAS Dean search and hoped to be making an announcement shortly.

JEFFORDS turned to items related to the current remote environment. The Office of Academic Innovation (OAI), along with a faculty committee, had been for this past year evaluating a shift to a different online learning management system. They were near to completing the process of looking at options, and planned to have a recommendation by mid-June. She noted that this exploration of various tools helped the rapid transition to remote instruction. Meanwhile, OAI was continuing its support of faculty developing high-quality online courses and programs in a number of departments. She had heard from students that they value these opportunities.

The Students First work also continued, JEFFORDS said. This commitment, creativity, and diligence showed in the faculty's switching to remote instruction within two weeks. One particular initiative is developing online educational resources—alternative textbook formats. Many faculty have written their own textbooks. The Persistence Committee [within Students First] is working on a role description to help with the case management

approach to student retention—a model which has been successful at other universities of identifying students who need resources and working with them to complete the degree. She plans to pilot this for one year, using grant funds. They have also been working on a dashboard to monitor student success metrics across various populations.

JEFFORDS then turned to a question on everyone's mind: how will we proceed with instruction in the fall? The University's overall response to COVID-19 is being managed by the Incident Management Team [IMT]. A subcommittee of that group is the Academic Continuity Committee, on which JAÉN and GAMBURD sit to represent Faculty Senate. A working group looked at options for fall and relevant evidence and information. This group developed two scenarios which are mixtures of remote and face-to-face, but on different ends of a continuum. Scenario One assumes that we will be principally remote, with some exceptions for face-to-face. Scenario Two proposed mixed modalities with the decision being made at the department or unit level. She shared these scenarios and the report of the working group with faculty last week, and asked for responses.

Over 630 responses were received, JEFFORDS reported, with about 68 pages of comments. She was impressed by the thoughtfulness and detail of this feedback. Many of you are concerned not only with your own health, but with that of family members and those with whom you share a household. Many also indicated concern about the impact on students not being able to resume instruction in a face-to-face environment. She wanted to use these results to open up a conversation.

JEFFORDS: they also sent a survey to students. There were over 4200 responses, including 2300 within the first four hours. They have something they want us to hear. Of the 4200 responses, about 55% favor a principally remote fall term, largely based on concerns about their own health or that of household members. Many responses also noted the complexity of a multi-modality term in which some courses would be face-to-face and others remote. While 55% is not overwhelming, it is nevertheless a majority. We asked a second-order question: whether, depending on the scenario we chose, they would consider transferring or sitting out a year. 36% said they would consider transferring or sitting out if we chose multiple or mixed modalities; 23% indicated this if we were principally remote. This is important information about our students' preferences.

Of the 630 faculty responses, JEFFORDS said, about three-to-one favor Scenario One (principally remote). Respondents gave very thoughtful reasoning through the complexities of the different scenarios. Today she wished to hear feedback from Faculty Senate about fall term. We should keep in mind that we do need to think about the remainder of the year; no one expects that on January 1<sup>st</sup> we will just return to business as usual. While we are talking specifically about fall term, we also need to think about the longer term context. Other Oregon institutions have varied responses, JEFFORDS said; she noted that they are in less dense and less urban environments.

BACCAR reviewed the temporary changes in the pass/no-pass policy that Senate had approved for spring and summer. Would Senate want to extend the changes for either or both of the two scenarios? It would be nice to have an answer to that question before the roll-out of course schedules.

GRECO wondered if the option had been considered, wherein the faculty member teaches through Zoom but classrooms will be assigned, and students who prefer to go to a

classroom with possibility of (socially distanced) interaction can do so. She thought this might add value. JEFFORDS said they had discussion with Kirk KELLY, Chief Information Officer, about whether it would be possible to install technology for Zoom-ready classrooms. He believed we could outfit a number of classrooms over the summer. It's not as sophisticated as the 'global classroom' in the School of Business where the camera follows the instructor, etc. He is looking into the technical requirements, and they are looking into the possibility of using CARES Act funding for something like this. Even if we don't use it in the fall it might be a useful option going forward. It could also give faculty members the reverse option of being able to teach in a classroom, even if the students are remote, using a whiteboard or other classroom equipment. They were actively looking into this, also for when the pandemic is over. Students may principally want to be face-to-face, but if they have to stay home they could still attend remotely.

BACCAR remarked that in a scenario where we don't have any face-to-face, we don't have to provide low-density classrooms—figure out the capacity for each room. If there is going to be access to the classrooms, we have to figure out how to manage that. Faculty would need to know all this information. It adds to the logistical complexity if we do this on a large scale.

FARAHMANDPUR asked what kind of preparation or investment we are making in medical supplies, how we are seeking the help of medical experts. Whether we open in fall or later, these conversations will need to be in place. What policies will we adopt when we do open—for example, about wearing masks? JEFFORDS: conversations are certainly already happening. The IMT was working on how to reopen in a variety of settings—for example, installing plastic shields to protect employees. Who would have interaction with students, is another question. REYNOLDS confirmed that the IMT is studying policies for shields and masks, added that a subcommittee of is working on classroom capacities, flows in and out, and signage. They also have to consider disability issues. They have to look at cost estimates for these upgrades, and whether CARES funding can be applied. They are meeting on a daily basis. JEFFORDS added that we are taking advantage of our own faculty expertise; for example, Rich CORSI (Dean of MCECS) is a national expert on airflow in buildings, and he is consulting with us about how managing that properly can contribute to decreasing virus transmission.

HANSEN observed that the results from the student survey that 36% would consider not attending in one scenario and 26% in another meant a major hit on enrollment either way. JEFFORDS: the question was whether they would consider it, not an absolute decision. The question more an indicator of students' level of happiness or unhappiness with the respective scenarios. It appeared that comparatively fewer students felt discomfort with a fully remote environment.

THIEMAN asked if units can still make their own decision about the P/NP option. The Curriculum Department didn't offer P/NP because of licensure issues for teacher candidates. BACCAR: that's the question before Senate. This is a chance to reconsider whether we want the changed policy to extend to all parts of the University or just some. Is the question whether departments or units can choose? THIEMAN: yes, because at the graduate level students can only earn an A or B [for licensure] so a Pass grade [as a potential C] is not viable. They did not choose it for spring or summer.

LINDSAY: without precautions, lecturing in a classroom could turn into a super-spreader event. Are we looking at installing plastic shielding for this reason? REYNOLDS was not sure of the exact plans. Shielding could come into social distancing in classrooms, but was more immediately relevant for service counters, etc. As mentioned previously, CORSI is working with them on analyzing airflows in particular settings.

In response to another question [on chat] REYNOLDS did not want to commit publicly to anything about parking. The current plan was to continue not charge for parking through the summer and try to mitigate the loss of revenue. They are reaching out to Tri-Met, etc., to find out what public transportation is doing for social distancing.

HSU: what about the [Cal State] system's decision to go remote in the fall? JEFFORDS had spoken with a provost at one of their campuses. Their decision was motivated by the same reasons as those informing Scenario One—for example, a lack of control over individual contacts in urban environments, in contrast to a small college in a fairly rural area with a defined campus and defined set of people on that campus. Provosts from urban universities seemed to be leaning towards remote environments.

PERCY appreciated the great work that is going on with complex variables. He suggested that when people talk about strategies it is a matter of emphasis, rather than exclusively one way or the other. All university presidents he had talked to say they are not having large classes: either breaking them up or going remote. It is interesting to see how people publicize their approach; there is a lot of variation in almost all of them. A Cal State president he talked to said that 10%-15% of their classes will be meeting in person. Hardly anyone is exclusively one way or the other.

WEBB: could departments request money for turning their own classrooms into hybrid-flex rooms? That could really change how they deliver some of their high-impact courses. Is there any CARES funding available over the summer, and if so, whom should they contact? JEFFORDS said that they were currently looking to outfit general-purpose classrooms. But if a department has a very specific request they could send it to her. Much depends about the outcome of the decision between scenarios. Whatever the decision, they want to look at how to support faculty.

CRUZAN wondered about using in-person for science labs and studios, but remote for everything else. JEFFORDS: that's what Scenario One looks like—a small percentage of classes where not being face-to-face really impedes student learning, such as studio art classes. If we take that direction, we should focus on making those environments safe.

## 1. President's report

*[Note from Secretary: in his report the President responds to the Question to Administrators which appears under item F below.]*

PERCY thanked the Senate for bringing attention to concerns about social and racial injustice. He recognized that the motion passed by Senate [last month] signals a desire to pay more attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Working together on this will be a major priority next year. He had been in conversation with the incoming Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion, Ame LAMBERT, who is paying attention to what is happening here and in our community and already beginning to make connections.

He thanked the IMT and JEFFORDS for their work [on the transition to remote]. University presidents everywhere are struggling with how to keep people safe, how to ensure that students are making academic progress, how to follow regulations. We also have to look at the research mission, and bringing back those operations in a safe way.

Turning to the Question to Administrators [*see Item F below*], PERCY stated that last week the Executive Council made the difficult decision to implement a comprehensive furlough program which affected almost every 12-month employee. The impetus for this decision was twofold: our current financial uncertainty, and opportunities given by federal stimulus legislation which provided benefits for employers and employees in what is known as a work share program. As we learned about these benefits, it became clear that we had to act quickly to secure the maximum relief for employees. The haste came from the fact that the current work share program within the federal stimulus ends on July 31<sup>st</sup>. Getting people enrolled quickly will enable them to get more benefit from it. We don't yet know whether the federal government will extend it in another legislative package. He was sorry that the speed resulted in confusion and a rocky start. Though it was not an excuse, there were many things converging at once.

PERCY thanked SEIU and AAUP for very productive conversations in negotiations over how to implement this. Unfortunately we don't have the same mechanism for people who are unclassified and unrepresented. He apologized for the challenge there. They planned information sessions this week to try to provide some clarity. Keeping communication lines open was very important. We need to know the impact on employees, on the work, and on students so they can make informed decisions going forward. They are listening to concerns, such as difficulties caused by the timing coming at the end of the academic year, preparing for graduation, etc. If we reduce workload, we cannot have the same expectations for everyone's performance. They had not implemented furloughs for people who were ineligible for the work share program. Their hope is that by implementing the program now they can reduce the need for more difficult actions in the future; he was sorry that the implementation was causing additional stress, which was not their intent. We are united in the goal of preserving our university.

More specifically about the question asked: PERCY said that beginning May 1<sup>st</sup>, senior administrators, Executive Council, vice provosts, and deans took pay cuts of between 7.5% and 15%. These were not furloughs, but rather reductions in pay without reductions in work expectations. All these people continue to work more than forty hours a week. The furlough decision announced last week was difficult; his hope is that by taking this action we can achieve key goals that align with his personal commitment to resolve our financial challenges in a fair, equitable, and sustainable manner. Wrapping up the quarter will be more difficult for everyone with the work reductions, and we appreciate that. If you are on furlough you are not expected to work during that time. The current furloughs are needed to reduce the need for more drastic actions in the future. Current federal spending allows us to keep nearly all the impacted employees whole, maintaining benefits, with all but handful experiencing the same or larger compensation. He again thanked the unions for working with us.

PERCY said that they would be working in the next week or ten days to develop criteria to call people back. At the top of the list will be community members engaged in sponsored research projects. We are working hard to minimize the disruption—there will

be some—on students, research, and overall operations. We appreciate this effort to allow us to participate in a program whereby salary reductions associated with a furlough have some compensation coming from another source.

GRECO: do we have an estimate of the savings from this, and of how much of the COVID hole it will fill? REYNOLDS, answering: it depends on exactly how many participate and for how long, but essentially as much as \$1.5 million a month—a significant savings on an all funds basis. There are many unknowns and we are trying to anticipate multiple scenarios. We do anticipate on the general fund a significant reduction in our allocation from the state, but we don't know how many millions that will be. Again, auxiliary enterprises are also seeing a significant reduction: we are being hit on both levels, and a furlough program helps mitigate that. We likely won't know that reduction from the state until July or August, and are trying to prepare for that.

LOIKITH: how does the furlough pertain to employees funded entirely on external research grants? PERCY did not have the specifics to give a thorough response. He would make sure to get back with an answer. In the interest of time JAÉN asked that detailed further questions be held till the next opportunity.

***Return to regular agenda order.***

**C. DISCUSSION** – *none.*

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – *none.*

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

***1-6. Postponed until additional meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup>, at discretion of Presiding Officer.***

**7. Sharing credits between graduate certificates (GC)**

LOIKITH summarized the recommendation from Graduate Council [**June Packet Attachment E.7**]. The aim is to allow credits between graduate certificates in unusual circumstances where that might be required—for example, when a student is very close to a certificate but unable to achieve it because of a small number of shared credits. If this passes, going forward when new graduate certificates are proposed there will be a screen for potential overlap, to see if this could be problematic.

EMERY/WATANABE **moved** the proposed policy as stated in June Packet **Attachment E.7**. The motion was **approved** (35 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

***8-14. Postponed until additional meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup>, at discretion of Presiding Officer.***

**F. QUESTION PERIOD**

*The following question to the President was received prior to the meeting. [The President in effect responded to this question in his report, item G.1, which in a change to the agenda order was moved above.]*

PSU's employment landscape is complex and variegated. Please provide a brief overview of the pay cuts and furloughs taken by different groups and units on campus. We would be particularly interested in learning the rationale behind the decisions and understanding the principles underlying the equitable application of these emergency measures.

JAÉN observed that the question had been answered previously, but opened the floor to follow-up questions.

RAFFO asked about the rollout strategy for a new online learning management system. Will it be this fall? JEFFORDS: the plan all along has been to have an overlap, continuing with D2L as we begin to ramp up a new system or revised version of D2L. There's no expectation that on a certain date we completely switch over. There's a need for transition and learning a new system, for both faculty and students. RAFFO: is the main driver [of the decision] cost or capabilities? JEFFORDS: it's actually about capabilities. Among the systems out now, D2L has sometimes been described as clunky. More to the point, there are many new plugins and add advantages to a learning management system, but D2L is less capable of automatically adopting these plugins. This creates difficulties for faculty who hear about these tools and want to try them. For many faculty, the attraction is less that features of the system per se than its adaptability and flexibility to incorporate newly developed tools.

ZONOOZY congratulated President PERCY on his appointment [to the regular position], appreciating his leadership at a crucial time, with experience and a sense of conversation and communication with people. PERCY replied with thanks, saying that he was humbled.

OSCHWALD asked about the potential for twelve-month research faculty to come off furlough in July. If we don't spend our directs [grant funding], PSU doesn't get the indirects, either. PERCY recognized the need to get an answer soon. It's to everyone's advantage to continue [research] as long as we can do so safely.

## **G. REPORTS**

***Prior change in order: G.1. President's report and G.2. Provost's report moved above.***

### **3. ASPSU report**

JAÉN asked the representatives from ASPSU to introduce themselves: Motu Sipelii, incoming ASPSU President; Kyle Leslie-Christy, former ASPSU President; Victor Chavez-Gonzalez, incoming ASPSU Vice-President.

Leslie-Christy said that when he became President, at the end of winter term, his goals were that ASPSU be more accountable to themselves, and to provide an opportunity for people interested in actually doing the work. They were working on events such as the succulents and census event, where they handed out 350 plants while encouraging students to be active with the census, voter outreach, etc. They also organized the admin town hall, involving by seven administrators, and established some new relationships of mutual respect with administrators. It seemed to Leslie-Christy that much frustration [among students] stemmed from lack of understanding and lack of knowledge of opportunities. It's important going forward to create opportunities to get to know the administration and faculty more deeply. In the voting campaign, they worked with other schools around Oregon to create Tik Tok videos of people showing how they voted. They are also working with the commencement planning team, and with the people in charge of the CARES Act emergency fund. They promoted information in ways that were accessible to students, to dispel some misinformation, and got good feedback from that. The Day of Service event focused on community involvement. In uniting around a common purpose and meaningful collaboration they find success.

GAMBURD noted that a number of Faculty committees had seats open for student members. She would be grateful to work with ASPSU to get student representation.

SIPELII said that listening to the conversation showed the care that [faculty] have; students don't really get to hear these conversations. He hoped to be a liaison between students, administration, and faculty. If faculty need student representation or want students to attend an event, they have [in him] a contact person.

**4-5. Postponed until additional meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup>, at discretion of Presiding Officer.**

*The following reports from committees were **received** as part of the consent agenda. See the respective **June Packet Attachments G.6-12.***

- 6. Annual Report of Academic Quality Committee (with appendices)**
- 7. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee**
- 8. Annual Report of Graduate Council**
- 9. Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council**
- 10. Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board**
- 11. Annual Report of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
- 12. Annual Report of University Writing Council**

JAÉN announced that there would be an additional meeting in one week, on June 8<sup>th</sup>, to deal with the business that had been postponed today. BEYLER noted that there would probably be one additional item about the pass/no-pass policy, and probably a few additional reports. Voting would be by current senators.

## **H. Adjournment.**

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:14 p.m.

After the main meeting was adjourned, **DIVISIONAL CAUCUSES** chose new members of the **COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES** as follows:

COTA	Amy BORDEN
CLAS-SS	Michele GAMBURD
SB	Jennifer LONEY
LIB	Rick MIKULSKI
MCECS	Malgorzata CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE
CUPA	David KINSELLA
OI	Michael LUPRO
AO	Randi HARRIS



**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 June 2020  
(On-Line Conference)**

**Presiding Officer:** Isabel Jaén Portillo

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Anderson, Baccar, Broussard, Bryson, Chaillé, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Dillard, Dimond, Duncan, Eastin, Emery, Faaleava, Farahmandpur, Feng, Fiorillo, Flores, Fountain, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen, Harris, Henderson, Holt, Hsu, Ingersoll, Izumi, James, Jedynek, Karavanic, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Lafrenz, Limbu, Lindsay, Loney, Lupro, Magaldi, Matlick, Mosier, Newlands, Oschwald, Palmiter, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Sugimoto, Thanheiser, Thieman, Thorne, Tinkler, Watanabe.

**Alternates present:** Karen Curtin for Dolidon, Mitchell Cruzan for Eppley.

**Senators absent:** Fritz, May, Meyer.

*Attendance of ex-officio members was not taken.*

**A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA.** The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

1. Roll call.
2. Modification of procedure to allow the Presiding Officer to move any agenda items was **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

JAÉN PORTILLO thanked senators for participating in this second June meeting, necessary because of the complex agenda and need to get to certain items before summer.

JAÉN called attention to a new agenda item, introduced under the authority of the Presiding Officer under the Bylaws to add items under extraordinary circumstances: a proposed resolution to ask our administration to help us in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues, and in making our university a safe, inclusive, and supportive environment for everyone. The statement, proposed by Steering Committee, had been circulated by email [**June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment E.2**]. The document echoes a number of statements already circulating on campus. We have invited senators to share any of those statements with us so we can create a unified wider response.

JAÉN clarified that the organs of Faculty governance ordinarily do not operate during the summer, since many faculty are on nine-month contracts. However, the presiding officer team—the incoming PO, PO Elect, and herself as Past PO—will be available during the summer for consultation with the administration. A June 2019 resolution said the administration should not make any permanent decisions when the Senate is not in session. This is, however, an extraordinary year, and we need to be prepared for the administration needing to consult with Senate on any emergency issue. We would probably have to call a special meeting which, apparently, had never been done, but which is contemplated in the Constitution and Bylaws.

**2. Announcements from Secretary**

BEYLER reviewed the voting procedures.

**C. DISCUSSION** – *none***D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** (*all items postponed from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting*)**1. New program: Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management** (SB via UCC)

WATANABE/SANCHEZ **moved** approval of the Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management, a new program in SB, as summarized in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.1** and given in full in the [Online Curriculum Management System \[OCMS\]](#). The **Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management**, summarized in **Attachment D.1**, was **approved** (48 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**2. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Real Estate Property Management** (SB via UCC)

EMERY/GAMBURD **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management, a new program in SB, as summarized in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.2** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management**, summarized in **Attachment D.2**, was **approved** (49 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**3. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Transformative Messaging** (CLAS via UCC)

GAMBURD/WATANABE **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging, a new program in CLAS, as summarized in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.3** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging**, summarized in **Attachment D.3**, was **approved** (41 yes, 3 no, 5 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**4. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Women's Leadership** (CUPA via UCC)

CHAILLÉ/GRECO **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership, a new program in CUPA, as summarized in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.4** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership**, summarized in **Attachment D.4**, was **approved** (52 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**5. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign** (CUPA via UCC)

CHAILLÉ/KINSELLA **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign, as summarized in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.5** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership**, summarized in **Attachment D.5**, was **approved** (43 yes, 2 no, 7 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**6. Gen. ed. requirement for students transferring with over 135 credits** (USC)

THORNE/LINDSAY **moved** approval of the change to the general education requirement for students transferring with over 135 credits, as stated in the University Studies Council [USC] memorandum of 7 May 2020 (p. 2), **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.6**.

SPENCER said that this represented a bottom-up reform. Requirements for transfer students haven't been reviewed for a long time. With the recent closure of several higher

education institutions in the Portland area, we have had a wave of transfers coming in at the senior level. They are then asked to take a Capstone, which is a crown jewel of our general education requirements, and also twelve hours of junior cluster credits. This creates some frustration for students who are already ready to finish their education. We have heard from registration and advising that many students have chosen not to come to PSU for that reason. UNST Executive Director GEORGE and Dean CHABON also believed it was time to work on this issue. With COVID there will probably be more students transferring to PSU rather than fewer, and sadly more closures of higher ed institutions. This provision is a way to make PSU a safe landing place for these students who are already facing upset and uncertainty. It applies only for those with the equivalent of senior standing, so most transfer students continue with the current requirements.

The policy change for students transferring with more than 135 credits stated in **Attachment D.6** was **approved** (44 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**7. Non-COTA courses used for Fine & Performing Arts credit (ARC)**

KARAVANIC/THORNE **moved** the proposal from the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC), **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.7**, to allow certain designated film courses outside of COTA to count towards the fine and performing arts (FPA) distribution requirement for undergraduate degrees.

DUH stated that ARC had been working with COTA see whether some non-COTA courses could be counted towards the FPA credits required for the BA and some other degrees. Mostly the FPA credits come from that college—architecture, art and design, music and theater, and film—but there are also film courses in several other departments. The list is given in **Attachment D.7**. ARC has been receiving a number of student petitions asking for these courses to count towards the FPA requirement; this proposal would cover such petitions going forward.

HOLT saw one of his classes on the list. If there is another one that he would like to propose for inclusion, how should he do that? DUH: contact COTA, who had been working with ARC on this issue, to see about submitting the course for inclusion.

The change to the list of courses usable toward the FPA distribution credit for undergraduate degree requirements, as proposed in **Attachment D.7**, was **approved** (46 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**8. Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization (Steering)**

AJIBADE/GAMBURD moved the proposal to create an Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization, with membership and charge defined in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.8**. JAÉN adverted to the discussion at the Faculty Forum in May about the examination of programs. This proposal is for a committee to do exploratory work during the summer—framing a set of guidelines, looking at models in other universities, gathering evidence and data, thinking about how to shape the work in the next year. This committee is just taking preliminary steps; another committee will be formed in the fall. There will be eight to ten members chosen by the Committee on Committees; chairs of the main constitutional committees; and a diversity, equity, and inclusion advocate. The committee will work with administration

members proposed by the Provost. It will present a report in the fall, with the purpose of informing next steps. JAÉN stressed that the work will be exploratory, information gathering—no decisions on PSU programs can be made during the summer.

JEDYNAK: will Faculty Senate be involved in deciding or suggesting which programs to cut? JAÉN: we don't really know yet how the process is going to be shaped. That's why we are conducting this exploratory work.

WATANABE: the title is "summer research committee" and refers to "academic program and reorganization." What is the structure of this committee that has several topics to work on? JAÉN: the organization is given in the charge. Basically they will look at models elsewhere, and frame some guidelines based on our situation and applying the diversity lens. This work has to tie into data. As for its composition: part of the committee will be chairs of key constitutional committees, and part will be other Faculty members. They will, of course, be working with the administration. WATANABE: it's only during the summer? JAÉN: yes, that is why this group is only doing exploratory work and not reaching any decisions.

GAMBURD's vision of what we're trying to do is to set up a process, or find examples from other universities that have gone through similar experiences. What have been the pros and cons of those processes? The exercise is to take a holistic look at our curriculum, which we haven't done for a while. Departments and programs do that in their own assessment; in this project we do it together. We are not being asked to figure out what to cut. It's broader and hopefully more generative. We are figuring out what we want our future curriculum to look like, so that as the University and Provost make difficult decisions we are not shooting ourselves in the foot by reorganizing or cutting something critical to our academic mission. It's an opportunity for Faculty as a whole to consider where we are and where we want to be in ten years, for the Provost to consider as she weighs decisions on how to move forward during the present crisis.

HANSEN's understanding is that during the summer the [committee] will not make recommendations [on its own]; the product will be recommendations to the Faculty Senate as to the process for considering changes to programs throughout campus—to ensure it will be fair and equitable. We then apply that process to a holistic view of our curriculum and programs. Decisions would still have to go through the process of reviews by the relevant committees (EPC, BC, GC, UCC) and Faculty Senate, which will have a yea or nay on whatever recommendations come out of the committee. JAÉN agreed that the report will not make any set-in-stone decisions.

GRECO asked about compensation for people on the committee who are on nine-month contracts, and about who will appoint the DEI advocate. JAÉN: there will be compensation for faculty on nine-month contracts; they have already talked with the Provost about that. The Committee on Committees will decide the best process for staffing the committee. It doesn't have to be only current senators.

JAÉN reiterated that the work will be exploratory, and no decision making will happen over the summer.

ZONOOZY urged that any committee or ad-hoc committee that participates in decision making for the future recognize the contribution of adjunct faculty to the quality of education at PSU, and the efforts to achieve equity with other faculty members.

The Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization, with composition and charge as given in **Attachment D.8**, was **approved** (44 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

#### 9. EPC memo on budget cuts and education policy

KARAVANIC/WATANABE moved the **resolution** calling for adherence to the principles on budget cuts and education policy set forth in the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) memorandum of 16 April 2020, **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.9**.

SAGER said this a follow-up to the work EPC did on elimination and suspension of programs [May meeting]. It responds to faculty members' expressed anxiety about potential cuts or talk of reorganization, while not knowing what the administration sees as the range of scenarios or the prioritization of the values guiding decisions. EPC's position is that faculty voices are absolutely crucial. We also need some statement from senior leadership about how they see the situation. EPC here suggests some key principles. There is a great deal of worry that important decisions will be made over the summer, and we want to state strongly that that shouldn't be the case. Faculty need to be present, on contract, to provide input. This is necessary for the quality of decisions, and if Faculty voices are absent the University will be the poorer for it.

The **resolution** endorsing the principles stated in **Attachment D.9** was approved (41 yes, 3 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

#### 10. EPC memorandum and OAA/OIA response on Confucius Institute contract

SAGER summarized the next item: EPC's memo [**June 8<sup>th</sup> Packet Attachment D.10**] following up on Faculty Senate resolutions about the renewal of the contract for the Confucius Institute (CI) at PSU, and Faculty concerns about a number of matters, including academic freedom. Since the time the previous memo was released, we learned that the contract had in fact been signed. EPC had a very useful dialogue with Ron WITCZAK (Director, Office of International Affairs), Susan JEFFORDS, and the Office of General Counsel to clarify several questions: about the jurisdiction and about the language the contract was written in. It seemed that there were two contracts, one in Chinese and one in English. The appendices to the memo show the exchange. We arrived at a point where we thought the legal questions had been answered, but that the response did not fully address broader concerns such as academic freedom, salient to PSU faculty. One call is for discussion to be brought to Senate so faculty could provide input.

GAMBURD/THORNE **moved the resolution** given in **Attachment D.10** regarding steps to be taken at the next renewal of the contract of the CI at PSU.

GAMBURD asked what happens next. It seems that we are taking steps so that things don't get lost over the summer, and that we have clarified that the English version of the contract is the one we are moving forward with. It seems that we should also make sure to have on somebody's watch list that we need to have a conversation about the renewal of this contract when it comes up again.

SAGER: when this comes up for renewal we will know in advance and know that it should be brought to the Senate and EPC. He would very much like to see a conversation with Senate so as to incorporate feedback from faculty.

HOLT said he had asked his colleague Steve WADLEY to compare the Chinese and English versions. No translation is perfect; we need to have everything in one language to know what is being discussed. He [WADLEY] had pointed out a couple of questionable places [in the translation]. HOLT therefore supported what EPC is doing, and wanted to remind the administration that we need to be careful—can't be of two different minds for these processes at PSU. JAÉN agreed that it is crucial to have a process that respects shared governance. It appears that previously there was not an efficient way to share resolutions with our administration so that everybody is clear about the next steps to be taken. PERCY has been working on that, she said.

The **resolution** on steps to be taken upon the renewal of the CI contract, given in **Attachment D.10**, was approved (43 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

#### **11. Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews (Steering)**

JAÉN indicated that the next topic arose from conversations earlier in the year, in particular the meeting of the Faculty in November. One theme in the comments was the importance of establishing an effective process for review of our administrative mechanisms, taking stock of what is already in place and exploring models at other universities: what monitors would be efficient and work for our mission and values? A committee of six to eight members will study the issue and report back to Senate.

GRECO/KARAVANIC **moved** the proposal for an Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews, with composition and charge defined in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.11**.

PALMITER wondered what members of the administration the reviews would include, specifically department chairs. JAÉN believed that is the understanding. We have some mechanism for review [of department chairs] in place, and the idea would be to look also at other models and think about how to optimize our own mechanisms.

JEDYNAK: previously we discussed forming a group to look at the future of the University in terms of programs. This has to do with reviewing the future of the administration. Why does it not include things such as the size of the administration, a more global discussion of who the administration should be? Why does it focus only on current administrators? JAÉN replied that is an important question—slightly different from the one the committee will be working on, but related. It will likely be part of the conversations. She also pointed to the draft of report to be shared with the Board of Trustees [**June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment G.4**] which addresses this issue. She asked for any comments senators had on the draft report. Ultimately, the question is how to optimize our ability to serve students.

CHABON observed, reverting to the earlier question, that chairs are identified in the proposal; the question of what members are included is still a good one. JAÉN said an early task for the committee will be to determine which members of the administration are in question. BEYLER: there are some mechanisms in place; the task of this group would not be to re-invent the wheel, but see what could be improved, changed, etc.

JAÉN: yes, thus this starts as exploratory work—to determine what we already have, and then what other universities are doing.

BACCAR asked if this is an evaluation of individuals in specific positions, or a review of their areas of responsibility JAÉN: that point that will have to be clarified through exploratory work. She thought the idea was to assess whether what is happening in a particular role is the work as we want it to happen—and as needed, to make adjustments.

ZONOOZY: a long and difficult year will soon be behind us; however, multi-faceted emerging challenges will continue to present us with challenges. Thank you to the capable leadership and accomplishments of our Presiding Officer. JAÉN expressed her thanks for the kind comment. She hoped for a continuation of these effective actions.

The motion to create the Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews, with composition and charge given in **Attachment D.11**, was **approved** (40 yes, 0 no, 4 abstain, recorded by online survey).

## **12. Recommendations from Diversity Action Council Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty**

KARAVANIC/HOLT **moved** the resolution to endorse the recommendations of the Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty of the Diversity Action Council, contained in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.12**.

GRECO (chair) said the report represented a year's work for the committee. Their charge was to look at how the University could do a better job recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. There are separate groups working on staff and on students. One of the big things needed is money, so a subgroup is going to apply for an NSF catalyst grant that's focused on data collection and analysis, and then a larger institutional transformation grant for diversity in STEM. The report also makes recommendations not connected to the grant; they are things that we think should be going on, period. In many cases they have already started, but flounder due to a lack of administrative support, or no one in charge, or failure to track outcomes. The University could be doing a better job; exit interviews are one example. The committee also thinks there need to be specified diversity advocates immediately on all searches for upper administration, and eventually on all searches. The University's current data is difficult to understand; that's one reason for the catalyst grant. proposal. Nearly all recommendation they found echoed in the words of our strategic plan and findings of earlier task forces. Bringing the statement before Faculty Senate and publishing it might give more momentum.

JAÉN thanked the committee for the report, and also for the grant application. She adverted to Senate's previous resolution [March meeting], and also to the report to the Board of Trustees. These pieces all agree on how important it is to support diversity, equity, and inclusion at our University.

JEDYNAK suggested that including a statistician in the composition of the committee and in writing the grant proposal might be useful. GRECO observed, first, that the committee is drawn from anyone who signs up to be one it. Second, regarding data analysis: first it's necessary to get the data, and so far we have three data sets each with a different number of faculty. We want to look at a variety of questions and will get someone who can help with statistical analysis. But just obtaining the data—finding the

right coding—is a time-consuming problem. Even looking what we do have, we can see that there's a problem. She noted that it's a subset of the committee working on the grant, including a colleague Larry MARTINEZ (PSY) who does this kind of workplace analysis. But they could use help, so feel free to sign up. JAÉN observed that the recommendations are not necessarily based on quantitative data, but on a combination of situation and experiences discussed throughout the year. Quantitative data is useful, but so is qualitative.

PALMITER called attention to a STEM strike being called for Wednesday, June 10<sup>th</sup>.

GRECO reiterated that the recommendations are separate from the grant application per se, and noted that diversity advocates are already a practice in, for example, MCECS.

The **resolution** endorsing the recommendations of the DAC Committee on Retention and Recruitment of Diversity Faculty given in **Attachment D.12** was **approved** (unanimously, recorded by online survey).

## E. NEW BUSINESS

### 1. P/NP policy for fall term (Steering)

SANCHEZ/HOLT moved the continuation of the current modified pass/no-pass policy into fall term, as stated in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment E.1**.

BACCAR said that the question is whether to extend into fall the temporary change we made for spring and summer. The motion [passed in April] granted an extension to fall if we will be fully remote; however, that is not the case for either of the scenarios discussed previously. They are each a blend. One line of reasoning is that whereas in spring the change was very quick, now students are familiar with remote learning. The other line of reasoning is that the modification was necessary not because of the suddenness of the change [to remote] but rather because of the impact on family life, travel, personal concerns, etc.; the suggestion is that this stress might continue into fall, regardless of the scenario. Data [given in **Attachment E.1**] showed how students have utilized the P/NP option. BACCAR also noted there have been requests to expand the option beyond week 10 because of students' involvement with the marches, etc.

LAFRENZ observed that settling the policy in advance also helps faculty, to as they do grading that students have this option.

HOLT: keeping things in a certain groove from spring and summer into fall makes it easier for faculty and students. His question is whether there is worry if students have too many P grades and not enough letter grades, say for the major. BACCAR said they hadn't thought in these terms, since if departments give students this option they are implicitly approving those courses. She noted that they are putting comments [about the policy] on transcripts. It would be hard for this to go on forever without some deep analysis, but we haven't run into many issues like this so far.

IZUMI advocated that we think about it in terms of the students who are most impacted by COVID-19, and also by the racial injustices and protests. It would be most equitable to support this policy.

EPPLEY supported the policy, but questioned why we are doing it the day before grades [are due]. U of O is doing it after grades are due. She believed it was too fast for both



faculty and students, not to have the ability two days later. BACCAR: at first we were making decisions very fast, responding quickly. The idea of going into finals [week] was proposed by some faculty. But others pointed out it is not necessarily fair between, say, students who get their final on Monday and those who get it on Friday. What resulted was this compromise. If we let it go till after grades roll, systems break down; it is difficult to manage—degree clearance, etc. EPPLEY observed that U of O has a two-week window. BACCAR: we could think about that for the fall.

HANSEN wanted to make sure that students could elect letter grade—for example, because of requirements for a scholarship. BACCAR: yes, it is an individual choice as before. This is assuming the department as set up having this option for the course. The students still have to decide how they want to take it. HANSEN: are some units mandating pass/no-pass? BACCAR said we are talking about courses that are typically set up as letter-grade only. Some colleges or departments wanted all the graded courses set up as optional. This wasn't uniform. Some colleges set up courses with the option, and some stuck with graded courses because of the impact on licensure, etc.—where they thought it would not be in students' interest.

THIEMAN asked about the logistics for faculty—say there is the option, but the student has chosen a letter grade. The weekend after finals week, the faculty member posts a letter grade and then leaves—this is not uncommon. On the day that grades roll up, the faculty member might be no longer there. What happens if the student changes their mind after this point? BACCAR: the Registrar's office can look at this and flip the grade to pass, sending an email to the instructor. If the instructor says, if I had known they were taking P/NP, my evaluation might have different and I might have given a pass grade—they still can change it. These are little wrinkles; we are trying to find the best approach. THIEMAN, following up: in the COE graduate program, a pass is A or B, not C. JAÉN thanked BACCAR for dealing with this complexity.

The motion to extend the current temporary change in the pass/no-pass policy through the fall 2020 term, stated in **Attachment E.1**, was **approved** (43 yes, 8 no, 0 abstain).

## 2. **Statement and Resolution Against Racism and Discrimination and in Support of Underrepresented Faculty, Students, and Staff** (Steering)

*This item was added to the agenda at the discretion the Presiding Officer pursuant to the Bylaws, section 'Agenda,' subpoint (a).*

INGERSOLL/MOSIER **moved the resolution** contained in **June 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment E.2**, calling on the administration to take action on the resolutions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been approved by Faculty Senate during this academic year, and to present to the Steering Committee by October 15<sup>th</sup> an plan of action for discussion in Faculty Senate.

JAÉN reminded senators that we have a new Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion, Ame LAMBERT. This resolution is tied to the previous resolution passed in March. It encourages the administration to communicate with Senate more closely. There is a call for immediate action, and a request for a plan for further action by October.

PALMITER thought this was a good idea, and appreciated that it mentioned Jason WASHINGTON. She wished, however, that it included resolutions dating back to 2018

so as to include the conversations on the Margolis Healy report on campus policing. Could it be backdated? BEYLER stated that senators are free to propose amendments. JAÉN observed that the resolution pertains to prior motions, not simply conversations; also, it's understood that these motions are themselves product of more than a year of conversations. Point one is calling for action on an item that previously called for action, but now we feel it's a more urgent situation.

PALMITER/LINDSAY **moved to amend** the closing words of point one of the resolution to read "academic years 2018-20," thus:

- 1) Work together with the Faculty to take immediate action regarding the recommendations of the resolutions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been approved by the Faculty Senate during academic years 2018-20.

*Discussion of amendment to E.2*

LINDSAY felt strongly that the conversations we've had previously around arming the campus police should be noted in this document that we are putting out now.

MOSIER believed that there was a resolution already in 2014 against arming the police, voted on by two-thirds of the senators. She wondered if we should go back to look at that resolution—stretch the timeframe even further back and re-engage with that conversation. JAÉN observed that point one was written to support previous resolutions specifically on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

KARAVANIC supported passing the resolution as originally written: in the interest of time, we should vote on something now rather than delve into past discussions—the timely way to move forward.

LABISSIERE stated that there was lots of conversation [in Steering, around the crafting of the statement]. He appreciated that the motion is a commitment to look forward, to work together and sustain action. It's an accountability strategy.

JAÉN suggested looking at how conversations have developed in the last few days, but it's also important that we re-open the conversation in the fall. Clearly the faculty wants to revisit certain topics. If the statement focuses on resolutions passed this year, that doesn't foreclose debate on the other topics.

The **amendment** was **approved** (30 yes, 13 no, 2 abstain).

*Return to main motion E.2 as amended*

The **resolution** stated in **Attachment E.2, as amended**, was **approved** (47 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**F. QUESTION PERIOD** – *none*

**G. REPORTS**

**1. President's report**

Prior to the President's report, JAÉN thanked PERCY for stepping forward as Interim and expressed congratulations [on his appointment as President].

PERCY indicated that since last week there had been some planning about how people would come off the workshare plan, and he hoped to get information out about this soon. They are looking into the concern about people working on grant-funded research.

When he saw [E.2], PERCY said, he was heartened because we're on the right track. We need to step up. This time of sorrow, grief, reflection, protest causes us to look at what we've accomplished, but also how much more we need to do. It's a job for us at all levels. We are already taking steps. Presidential Fellows are updating the African-American students retention report. We are working on a plan to advance relationships with Native American tribes. We are working on how to apply the equity lens in our decision making and assessment. He thanked the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diversity Faculty for their work; he had the pleasure of co-chairing that committee before stepping into his current role. He is committed to try to do even better.

PERCY: words were lacking to express his appreciation for the work faculty did to go remote. We are all still experiencing the change and reflecting on its meaning. We kept the learning going; we kept serving students. He talked with students who appreciated what faculty did. PERCY gave heartfelt thanks for all faculty did alongside the unexpected distractions. It's a huge accomplishment. We overcame the initial crisis; now, there's a lot more to do and a lot to learn. We're not done.

LUPRO observed that there are many young, intelligent talents on the waterfront, downtown, and in Irving Park tonight, demanding that institutions do a better job representing our population. The sooner PSU takes the lead on putting our money where our mouth is, the sooner we are going to attract that top talent and reinvigorate our city. Money is tight, but it could be made up in recruitment and retention of students who are looking for an institution that's going to lead on this issue. We should act while the market is in our favor: find new, talented instructors and professors and bring them in, so we can tell students that we mean it and we've done something about it.

JEDYNAK: we have been discussing the two options [for fall]. How does he [PERCY] see this as it pertains to faculty work? Some might prefer to go back to their office; some might prefer to, say, go elsewhere or to be closer to family if they know they will be working online. PERCY: this period of disruption led to different models and new ways of doing things that we haven't used before; maybe we can learn more flexibility out of that—learn how to enhance the access of our students. The prime consideration is the safety and security of our students, but also to meet them where they are. There are areas where remote doesn't work very well, so we may try to do some face-to-face, on campus but with social distancing. There are many things to figure out, including faculty coming to their offices, or mundane things like organizing bathrooms so people have access to them but they don't become disease-spreading places. We'd like to be as flexible as we can, recognizing that public safety requirements could ease up and then change back.

BRYSON seconded LUPRO's comments, and urged action to disarm PSU. That would be a statement that we're actually trying to attract students and faculty of color.

## **2. Provost's report**

JEFFORDS expressed gratitude to JAÉN for the leadership she has shown as Presiding Officer, the partnership and collaboration she has brought to all their conversations, and

her commitment to faculty and shared governance. She admired the way JAÉN had expressed this leadership and impacted the institution. She felt privileged to have worked closely with her. JAÉN: thanks for those kind words.

JEFFORDS said they continue to look at the implications of fall term scenarios. Over 600 faculty sent feedback; the large majority supported a principally remote environment with some face-to-face exceptions. So that is what they are exploring right now. She had been discussing with PERCY using CARES Act funding for stipends for faculty to participate in a series of workshops and meetings over the summer. The people who have already provided great service to the institution have enthusiasm for this idea, and they are putting together a full package of summer programming. In addition, they are looking into technology to outfit classrooms for remote delivery. We hope that by the fall we will have support for faculty in multiple ways by enhancing technology.

JEFFORDS thanked the Senate for extending the P/NP availability for students. They extended the deadline this term, which created some upheaval for faculty; nonetheless, they had received numerous emails of thanks from students. It is deeply appreciated by them; they feel that the institution is expressing support for what they are going through, and the work they are doing to improve our society and combat racism. JEFFORDS reiterated her thanks for this willingness to be flexible on behalf our students.

JAÉN thanked JEFFORDS and PERCY for their support of faculty. It had been a pleasure to work with them. The collaboration is an indication of good things to happen, and that we are on the same page about what our institution needs.

### **3. Budget Committee Annual Report and questions to FADM**

JAÉN said that the questions in the report were the product of multiple conversations with the administration. Let the Budget Committee know if you have further questions that should be added. It is an ongoing conversation.

### **4. Report to Board of Trustees on administrative leadership**

JAÉN summarized this piece as a report they have been building throughout the year for the Board of Trustees, to let them now our thoughts about administrative structure and leadership. The report is open this week for comments and suggestions. We have tried our best to capture ideas and comments we have received, and not leave anything out.

JAÉN thanked those who had sent statements relating to social justice; the idea there is to create a unified response and archive.

JAÉN said it had been a pleasure to work with Senate, Steering Committee, and administration. Despite all the challenges, she was pleased with how things have worked year. She thanked senators for their service, and wished all a wonderful summer.

*The following reports from committees were **received** as part of the consent agenda. See the respective **June 8<sup>th</sup> Packet Attachments G.5-7.***

### **5. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee**

### **6. Annual Report of Library Committee (with appendix)**

### **7. Annual Report of University Studies Council**

**H. ADJOURNMENT.** The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:35 p.m.

PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE



**To:** Faculty Senators and Ex-Officio Members of the Faculty Senate  
**From:** Richard H. Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty

Faculty Senate will meet on 8 June 2020 at **3:00 p.m.**

*This meeting will be held as an on-line conference using the Zoom platform. Senators, Ex-Officio Members, and presenters will receive a meeting invitation by email. A link to a livestream of the meeting will be posted to the Faculty Senate website. Senators represented by **Alternates** must notify the Secretary by **noon on Monday, June 8<sup>th</sup>** so they can receive a meeting invitation. Other members of the PSU community who wish to speak during the meeting should ask a Senator to send notification, including an e-mail address, to the Presiding Officer and Secretary by **noon on Monday, June 8<sup>th</sup>**.*

*Items of business or procedure on the **Consent Agenda** are deemed to be approved without further discussion unless any Senator or Ex-Officio Member calls for separate consideration. Notice should be given to the Secretary or prior to the meeting if possible, and in any event before the end of Roll Call.*

*If a Senator or Ex-Officio Member is contemplating an **amendment** to any proposed motion, if at all possible submit it in writing to the Presiding Officer and Secretary prior to the meeting.*

**AGENDA**

- \* See linked document
- A. Roll Call and *Consent Agenda* [see also G.5-7]
  - 1. Roll Call
  - 2. Minutes of the 1 June 2020 meeting – *Consent Agenda*
  - 3. Procedural: Presiding Officer may move any agenda item – *Consent Agenda*
- B. Announcements
  - 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer
  - 2. Announcements from Secretary
- C. Discussion– *none*
- D. Unfinished Business – *postponed from June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting*
  - \* [1.](#) New program: Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management (SB via UCC)
  - \* [2.](#) New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Real Estate Property Management (SB via UCC)
  - \* [3.](#) New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Transformative Messaging (CLAS via UCC)
  - \* [4.](#) New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Women’s Leadership (CUPA via UCC)
  - \* [5.](#) New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign (CUPA via UCC)
  - \* [6.](#) General education requirement for students transferring with over 135 credits (USC)
  - \* [7.](#) Non-COTA courses used for Fine & Performing Arts credits (ARC)

- \* [8.](#) Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization (Steering)
  - \* [9.](#) EPC memo on budget cuts and education policy
  - \* [10.](#) EPC memo, OAA/OIA response on Confucius Institute contract
  - \* [11.](#) Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews (Steering)
  - \* [12.](#) Recommendations from Diversity Action Council Committee on Recruitment & Retention of Diverse Faculty
- E. New Business
- \* [1.](#) P/NP policy for fall term (Steering)
  - \* [2.](#) Resolution against racism and discrimination (Steering)
- F. Question Period
- G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and from Committees
1. President's Report
  2. Provost's Report
- \* [3.](#) Annual Report of Budget Committee (with questions to FADM)
  - \* [4.](#) Report to Board of Trustees on administrative leadership
  - \* [5.](#) Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* [6.](#) Annual Report of Library Committee (with appendix) – *Consent Agenda*
  - \* [7.](#) Annual Report of University Studies Council – *Consent Agenda*
- H. Adjournment

# PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE, 2019-20

## STEERING COMMITTEE

Isabel Jaén Portillo, Presiding Officer

Michele Gamburd, Presiding Officer Elect • Thomas Luckett, Past Presiding Officer

*Elected Members:* Rowanna Carpenter (2020) • Jill Emery (2021) • Jon Holt (2021) • Michael Lupro (2020)

*Ex-Officio Members:* Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty • Rowanna Carpenter, Senior IFS Rep.

Karen Karvanic & Susan Lindsay, Co-chairs, Comm. on Committees • Yves Labissiere, Faculty member of Board of Trustees

## FACULTY SENATE ROSTER (61)

### College of the Arts (4)

*Dillard, Chuck	MUS	2020
James, Meredith	A+D	2020
†Magaldi, Karin	TA	2021
[vacant]		2022

### College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—Arts & Letters (6)

Dolidon, Annabelle	WLL	2020
†Greco, Gina	WLL	2021
Holt, Jon	WLL	2021
<i>Limbu, Bishopal</i>	ENG	2022
†Thorne, Steven	WLL	2022
Watanabe, Suwako	WLL	2020

### College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—Sciences (7)

<i>Eppley, Sarah</i>	BIO	2022
Fountain, Robert	MTH	2021
George, Linda	ESM	2020
†Jedynak, Bruno	MTH	2022
†Lafferriere, Beatriz	MTH	2022
Palmiter, Jeanette	MTH	2020
Thanheiser, Eva	MTH	2021

### College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—Social Sciences (7)

*Ajbade, Idowu	GGR	2020
Fritz, Charlotte	PSY	2021
<i>Gamburd, Michele</i>	ANT	2022
Hsu, Chia Yin	HST	2020
*Lafrenz, Martin	GGR	2020
†Meyer, Claudia	SPHR	2021
†Reitenauer, Vicki	WGSS	2022

### The School of Business (4)

†Dimond, Michael	SB	2020
Hansen, David	SB	2021
<i>Loney, Jennifer</i>	SB	2022
<i>Sanchez, Becky</i>	SB	2022

### College of Education (4)

†Farahmandpur, Ramin	ELP	2022
Sugimoto, Amanda	C&I	2021
Thieman, Gayle	C&I	2020
[vacant]		2020

### Maseeh College of Engineering & Computer Sci. (5)

Anderson, Tim	ETM	2021
Chrzanowska-Jeske, Malgorzata	ECE	2021
<i>Duncan, Donald</i>	ECE	2022
<i>Feng, Wu-chang</i>	CMP	2022
†Karavanic, Karen	CMP	2020

### Library (1)

†Emery, Jill	LIB	2020
--------------	-----	------

### School of Public Health (2)

*Izumi, Betty	CH	2021
†Labissiere, Yves	CH	2022

### School of Social Work (4)

Bryson, Stephanie	SSW	2020
May, Edward	SSW	2021
Mosier, Miranda	SSW	2020
†Oswald, Mary	RRI	2022

### College of Urban and Public Affairs (5)

Chaillé, Peter	PAD	2020
†Eastin, Josh	PS	2021
*Henderson, Kelsey	CCJ	2020
<i>Kinsella, David</i>	PS	2022
*Tinkler, Sarah	ECN	2021

### Other Instructional (3)

†Lindsay, Susan	IELP	2020
Lupro, Michael	UNST	2021
Newlands, Sarah	UNST	2021

### All Others (9)

Baccar, Cindy	REG	2020
Broussard, Scott	ACS	2021
Faaleava, Toeutu	OAA	2020
*Fiorillo, Marie	ACS	2020
<i>Flores, Greg</i>	ACS	2022
<i>Harris, Randi</i>	OAI	2022
Ingersoll, Becki	ACS	2021
<i>Kennedy, Karen</i>	ACS	2022
†Matlick, Nick	REG	2021

-----  
*Newly elected senators in italics*

\* Interim appointment

† Member of Committee on Committees

**Date: 27 April 2020**

## EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF FACULTY SENATE, 2019-20

Ex-officio members of Faculty Senate include certain administrators, elected Faculty officers, and chairs of constitutional committees. Administrative ex-officio members are ineligible to be elected senators. Ex-officio members do not vote (unless they are also elected senators), but may make motions and participate in Senate discussions without further recognition.

<i>Adler, Sy</i>	<i>Interim Dean, College of Urban and Public Affairs</i>
<i>Allen, Clifford</i>	<i>Dean, The School of Business</i>
Baccar, Cindy*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
<i>Bangsberg, David</i>	<i>Dean, OHSU-PSU Joint School of Public Health</i>
<i>Beyler, Richard</i>	<i>Secretary to the Faculty</i>
<i>Bielavitz, Thomas</i>	<i>Dean, University Library</i>
Boyce, Steven	Co-chair, Budget Committee
Burgess, David	Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Board
<i>Bynum, Leroy, Jr.</i>	<i>Dean, College of the Arts</i>
<i>Carlson, Matthew</i>	<i>Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</i>
Caron, Julie	<i>Interim Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion</i>
Carpenter, Rowanna	Steering Committee (2018-20); IFS (Jan. 2020-Dec. 2022)
<i>Chabon, Shelly</i>	<i>Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Leadership Development</i>
Coleman, Claudia	Chair, Honors Council
<i>Coll, Jose</i>	<i>Dean, School of Social Work</i>
<i>Corsi, Richard</i>	<i>Dean, Maseeh College of Engineering &amp; Computer Science</i>
Cruzan, Mitchell	Co-Chair, Budget Committee Committees
Duh, Geoffrey	Chair, Academic Requirements Committee
Epstein, Josh	Chair, General Student Affairs Committee
Gamburd, Michele*	Presiding Officer Elect, Advisory Council (2019-21)
GINLEY, Susan	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Goodman, Julia	Co-Chair, Faculty Development Committee
Greco, Gina*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
Hansen, David*	Advisory Council (2018-20)
Harrison, Paloma	Co-chair, Scholastic Standards Committee
Hendricks, Arthur	Co-chair, Educational Policy Committee
Jaén Portillo, Isabel	Presiding Officer
<i>Jeffords, Susan</i>	<i>Provost &amp; Vice President for Academic Affairs</i>
Kirtley, Suan	Chair, University Writing Council
<i>Knepfle, Chuck</i>	<i>Vice President for Enrollment Management</i>
Labissiere, Yves*	Advisory Council (2019-21); IFS (Jun. 2019-Dec. 2021); Faculty Trustee
<i>Leslie-Christy, Kyle</i>	<i>President, ASPSU</i>
Loikith, Paul	Chair, Graduate Council
Luckett, Thomas	Past Presiding Officer
<i>Lynn, Marvin</i>	<i>Dean, College of Education</i>
<i>Maddox, David</i>	<i>Interim Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning</i>
Merrow, Kathleen	Chair, Academic Quality Committee
Millay, Lea	Chair, Library Committee
Miller, Michele	Co-chair, Scholastic Standards Committee
Parnell, Will	Co-chair, Faculty Development Committee
<i>Percy, Stephen</i>	<i>Interim President</i>
<i>Podrabsky, Jason</i>	<i>Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies</i>
<i>Reynolds, Kevin</i>	<i>Vice President for Finance and Administration</i>
Sager, Alexander	Co-chair, Educational Policy Committee
Sanchez, Becky*	IFS (Sep. 2019-Dec. 2020)
Spencer, Randy	Chair, University Studies Council
<i>Toppe, Michele</i>	<i>Vice Provost for Student Affairs &amp; Dean of Student Life</i>
Webb, Rachel	Advisory Council (2019-21)
<i>Wooster, Rossitza</i>	<i>Dean, Graduate School</i>
Zonoozy, Khalil	Adjunct faculty representative

\* Also an elected senator • *Administrative members in italics* • Date:27 April 2020



13 May 2020

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Budget Committee comments, in the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\)](#).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
School of Business**

**Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management**

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Overview of the Program**

The *Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management* is designed for non-business majors interested in real estate property management as a field of study and career option. The proposed minor brings together core business courses from PSU's existing Business Minor plus a new set of courses specific to real estate property management, to teach a mix of technical skills (marketing/leasing, finance, building maintenance) and people management skills (critical thinking and problem solving, human resource management, and customer service).

The 100 and 300 level courses in the proposed minor provide foundational business planning, organizational leadership, marketing, financial analysis, and management skills required to understand the language of business as well as an introductory knowledge of real estate and economics, socioeconomic factors such as gentrification, property management, and the built environment's ability to create community and impact communities. The 400-level courses enable students to gain foundational knowledge in multifamily and commercial property management operations and leasing. This combination will equip participants with the skills required to effectively lease and manage various forms of real estate, including apartments, retail malls, office buildings, and industrial sites, to name just a few.

**Evidence of Need**

The Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM), the Building Operators and Managers Association (BOMA), and the National Apartment Association (NAA) have identified a shortage of talent in the property management field. According to a 2015 survey completed by CEL & Associates in conjunction with IREM, 55% of property management field respondents expect to retire by 2025.

There are two categories of property managers: multifamily property management (i.e. apartment management) and commercial property management (i.e. all other income-producing property management, such as retail, industrial, office, etc.). PSU's Center for Real Estate was approached in fall, 2018, by the above three property management industry organizations, sharing the strong demand by employers for college-educated, entry level talent to fill a growing

number of jobs in the market and requesting that PSU consider offering this industry-specific curriculum. Detailed information about both categories of demand are provided in the full program proposal.

### **Course of Study**

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Credits</b>
BA 101	Introduction to Business and World Affairs	4
BA 306U	Essentials of Finance for Non-Business Majors	4
BA 316U	Essentials of Marketing for Non-Business Majors	4
BA 326U	Essentials of Management for Non-Business Majors	4
BA 332	Property, Management and Society	4
MGMT 432	Multifamily Property Management	4
MGMT 433	Commercial Property & Asset Management	4
<b>Total Credits</b>		<b>28</b>

13 May 2020

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Budget Committee comments, in the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\)](#).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
School of Business  
Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management**

**Certificate Type**

Undergraduate certificate: Earned with baccalaureate; admission to University required

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Overview of the Program**

The *Certificate in Real Estate Property Management* is designed for business majors to specialize their studies in real estate property management with the goal being to find employment in property management or other commercial real estate careers. The proposed certificate, which is part of PSU's undergraduate business curriculum, brings together a new set of courses specific to real estate property management, to teach a mix of technical skills (marketing/leasing, finance, building maintenance) and people management skills (critical thinking and problem solving, human resource management, and customer service) combined with core real estate, management, and planning courses from PSU's existing course offerings in the business and planning schools.

The objective of the Certificate is to offer business students a unique, industry-specific set of knowledge that will expose them to and create pathways into the field of real estate property management. Business fundamentals such as marketing, finance, accounting and management are key skillsets used in real estate property management, and when combined with property management specific knowledge and training students will have a high probability of finding employment in the growing field of property management or in other real estate related jobs. Students will gain foundational knowledge in multifamily and commercial property management operations and leasing. This combination, combined with electives in planning and business classes, will equip participants with the skills required to effectively lease and manage various forms of real estate, including apartments, retail malls, office buildings, and industrial sites, to name just a few. This new Certificate is being offered as a result of increased industry demand and an industry-identified skills gap in the market. Multiple representatives from the property management industry approached PSU's Center for Real Estate in fall, 2018, sharing the significant lack of college-educated, entry level talent in the growing field of real estate property management.

## Evidence of Need

The Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM) and the National Apartment Association (NAA) have identified a shortage of talent in the property management field. According to a 2015 survey completed by CEL & Associates in conjunction with IREM, 55% of property management field respondents expect to retire by 2025, and there currently is not a university on the west coast who offers a degree program in the field of property management.

There are two main real estate sectors that property managers can work within: multifamily property management (i.e. apartment management) and commercial property management (i.e. all other income-producing property management, such as retail, industrial, office, etc.). PSU's Center for Real Estate was approached in fall, 2018, by the leading property management industry professional organizations and firms, sharing the strong demand by employers for college-educated, entry level talent to fill a growing number of jobs in the market and requesting that PSU consider offering this industry-specific curriculum. Detailed information about both categories of demand are provided in the full program proposal.

## Course of Study

Students are required to complete degree requirements specified for a business administration major in order to be awarded the Real Estate Property Management Certificate.

### Core real estate management Courses (12 credits):

BA 332	Property, Management, and Society	4
MGMT 432	Multifamily Property Management	4
MGMT 433	Commercial Property & Asset Management	4

### Plus 7-8 elective credits:

*Choose a minimum of 4 elective credits from these courses:*

USP 312U	Urban Housing and Development	4
USP 323U	Real Estate Development and Finance	4
MGMT/MKTG/ACTG/GSCM/FIN 404	Internship	1-4

*Choose 4 elective credits (if needed):*

MGMT 351	Human Resource Management	4
MGMT 461	Reward Systems and Performance Management	4
MGMT 464	Contemporary Leadership Issues	4
MKTG 464	Marketing Strategy and Management	4
MKTG 338U	Professional Selling	4
FIN 439	Real Estate Valuation	4

*Minimum credits: 19*

13 May 2020

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Budget Committee comments, at the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\) Curriculum Dashboard](#).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging**

**Certificate Type**

Undergraduate Certificate: Earned with baccalaureate; admission to University required

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Overview of the Program**

This certificate foregrounds communication skills in multiple social change contexts. The gateway courses CR 101 and CR 201 are new, but draw on tested and seasoned faculty competencies in Conflict Resolution. This certificate can be embedded within the CR major or minor, or it can stand alone alongside another major. The learning in this certificate can augment the work of conflict managers, activists, communication specialists, or students pursuing academic fields that feature the many intersectional and transdisciplinary domains of human communication.

This new certificate joins the fewer than twenty available in CLAS with completion of the baccalaureate degree. As such, it adds a focused competency AND a form of legibility in the context of a major PSU. That is, by highlighting a set of courses on a theme, a broad major like Conflict Resolution or Psychology gains a pointedly applied dimension and a readable or conversation-starting "handle" for the employment world. Our society is communication-dense, even overloaded. The new certificate in Transformative Messaging provides theoretical grounding and practical training to navigate this critical area of social and political life.

**Evidence of Need**

The need for this new certificate is two-fold. First is to serve undergraduate students who need to make their skill competencies legible to themselves and to outsiders. The Certificate adds texture and a degree of customization to this general student interest in skill acquisition. The second need for this certificate is as a marketing tool for the major and minor. The phrase "Conflict Resolution" is not as obvious as some others departmental titles. It doesn't sound traditionally academic nor does it clearly identify a skill set. Our cognate fields, "Peace Studies" and "Dispute Resolution," are more easily pegged as academic (the former) and legalistic/law school-based (the latter). The Certificate in Transformative Messaging sounds skill based, and also flags the multidisciplinary nature of the credential in the word "messaging." "Messaging" is also very

current and topical in terms of today's students and their immersion in digital technologies. The phrase has power and currency.

Ultimately, the Certificate supports student success, specifically: coherence and legibility of skills, embellishment of a student's competency portfolio and, hopefully, enhanced employability.

### **Course of Study**

#### **4 credits required**

CR 101	Nonviolent Interaction	2 CR	Required
CR 201	Social Movement Messaging	2 CR	Required

#### **12 credits elective**

COMM 220	Public Speaking	4 CR	Elective
COMM 319	Social Media	4 CR	Elective
COMM 314U	Persuasion	4 CR	Elective
CR 306U	Nonviolence in History & Campaigns	4 CR	Elective
CR 303U	Consensus Building	4 CR	Elective
WR 228	Media Writing	4 CR	Elective
ENG 490	Advanced Topics in Rhetoric	4 CR	Elective
PSY 343	Social Psychology	4 CR	Elective
PSY 426	Stigma and Social Inequality	4 CR	Elective

*Minimum credits: 16*

13 May 2020

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Budget Committee comments, in the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\)](#).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
College of Urban and Public Affairs  
Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership**

**Certificate Type**

Undergraduate Certificate: Earned with baccalaureate; admission to University required

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Overview of the Program**

The Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership is being developed in response to both campus and community-wide interest in increasing the presence of women in leadership positions. The courses offered will be primarily from the social sciences, and will provide an interdisciplinary understanding of the current issues facing women leaders today. In addition to generating content expertise, the certificate will also require participation in a skill-building seminar (PS 381) designed to foster students' confidence and leadership ability. This certificate is open to any undergraduate with interest in women's leadership.

The certificate draws on a range of disciplinary foundations and seeks to:

- Provide increased opportunity for students and faculty to develop their knowledge of the complexities of women's leadership in modern society.
- Offer new opportunities for faculty to convene around common research interests by strengthening the connections between schools, departments, and faculty.
- Position PSU as a leader and core participant in the diversification of leadership in Oregon and the US.
- Cultivate networks with women leaders in Portland through experiential learning opportunities for students.
- Increase the number of PSU graduates in leadership positions.

**Evidence of Need**

The primary evidence of market demand is from a similar program run by PSU's Center for Women's Leadership. This similar program – NEW Leadership Oregon – is a 6 day, residential, summer leadership training program for college women from all over the state. It is not offered for credit, and is a summer program only. There is so much demand for the summer program that

they cannot accommodate all interested students, and many (including PSU students) get turned away. For example, here are the NEW Leadership Oregon application/enrollment data for the past three years:

<b>Year</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Applicants	113	113	68
PSU Applicants	31	28	24
Accepted	56	50	46
PSU Students Accepted	15	15	15

## **Course of Study**

### **Required Core Courses (12 Credits)**

PS 381	Women's Leadership
PS 380U	Women & Politics
WS 101	Introduction to Women's Studies

### **Electives (8 Credits)**

Choose 8 credits from approved electives below.

CCJ 350U	Ethical Leadership in Criminal Justice
PS 471	Comparative Women & Politics
PA 312U	Foundations of Community Leadership
PS 425	Women and the Law
NAS 344	Indigenous Women Leaders
WS 307	Women, Activism, and Social Change
WS 451	Interrupting Oppression

*Minimum credits: 20*



13 May 2020

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Susan Ginley Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Undergraduate Certificate in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign

The following proposal has been approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and is recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

You may read the full text of the program proposal, as well as Budget Committee comments, in the [Online Curriculum Management System \(OCMS\)](#).

**PROPOSAL SUMMARY FOR  
College of Urban and Public Affairs**

**Undergraduate Certificate in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign**

**Certificate Type**

Undergraduate certificate: Earned at completion; admission to University not required

**Effective Term**

Fall 2020

**Overview of the Program**

This certificate program is intended to prepare students for high-level, meaningful work on a campaign for a candidate or ballot measure, such as field organizer, strategist, pollster/analyst, communications director, or manager (or in a role directly assisting one of those positions). Students completing the certificate will acquire marketable skills at the same time that they develop a well-grounded academic understanding of the mechanics and dynamics of the campaign process and its linkages with the party system and the broader political system.

The program is housed primarily in the Political Science Department with additional coursework in the Communications Department. Students completing the certificate will acquire marketable skills at the same time that they are developing a well-grounded understanding of the mechanics and dynamics of the campaign process and its linkages with the party system and the broader political system.

**Evidence of Need**

PSU has a vibrant group of Political Science majors, many of them studying American politics. While many of these students are interested in non-campaign endeavors (legislative staff work, elected office, academic pursuits), many are directly interested in the campaign side of politics. Even those students not certain they want to work on campaigns have a decent level of interest in the mechanics of campaign organizations. The creation of this certificate program is, in fact, a direct response to student interest and not something that is being created from above and dropped down onto them – that is, students with an inclination to work on a campaign at some point in their career, and there are many at PSU already and more on their way as Portland grows and PSU itself becomes ever more attractive to prospective students, will be drawn to the program without having to be sold on its value to them.

## Course of Study

### 6 Required Certificate Courses and Campaign Internship

1. **3 Required Classes** (students must take all 3 courses in any order) – 12 credits
  - PS 399 (proposed as PS 310): How to Win a U.S. Political Campaign
  - PS 416 Parties and Elections
  - **EITHER** PS 318U Media, Opinion, and Voting or PS 427 The Politics of Public Opinion (the course not taken as a requirement may count as an elective)
2. **3 Electives** (students must take a minimum of 3 of the following, as specified) –12 credits
  - PS 318U Media, Opinion, and Voting **OR** PS 427: The Politics of Public Opinion (the course not taken as a requirement may count as an elective)
  - COMM 314U Persuasion
  - PS 331 Oregon Politics
  - PS 413 Congress
  - PS 417 Interest Groups
  - PS 475 Comparative Political Parties and Elections
  - Comm 410 Political Campaigns
  - Comm 420 Political Communication
3. **Internship** (4 to 12 credits) – Students will be placed with a candidate or ballot-measure campaign. Students who have previously worked on a campaign can apply for a waiver of this requirement by obtaining a letter of performance from the campaign manager and writing a report for the instructor of PS 399/310 outlining duties and examining lessons learned and skills acquired. Internship will be supervised by the program director or assigned to another full-time PS faculty member.

*Minimum credits: 28 credits*

May 7th, 2020

Steering Committee Members:

By unanimous vote, the UNST Council has moved to revise the general education requirements for transfer students by adding a category which states that students transferring to PSU with over 135 credits will only need to take a Senior Capstone to complete their UNST requirements for graduation (see Appendix) effective Fall 2020. This solution was proposed to the Council by Executive Director Linda George after consultation with Dean Shelly Chabon in response to concerns voiced by the Academic Requirements Committee.

Its immediate purpose is to remedy several ongoing challenges faced by our current transfer students from financially-related school closures and to prepare for the likely influx of transfers resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Within the last two years, the Portland area has seen the closure of multiple institutions: Marylhurst University (Summer 2018), Art Institute of Portland (Summer 2018), Oregon College of Art & Craft (Summer 2019) and Concordia College (Summer 2020), which have generated spikes in transfer students hoping to complete their degree at PSU. While challenging and jarring under any circumstances, these closure have been particularly frustrating for Senior Transfers (incoming students with 135+ Credit Hours).

Likewise, this influx of transfers will continue to tax PSU support services, specifically Admissions, Advising, and the Registrar's Office, who now must cope with the challenge of helping students while observing social distancing guidelines. The only recourse available to Senior Transfers is to petition the Academic Requirements Committee resulting in more delays, uncertainty, and an increase workload for PSU staff and faculty. Indeed, Advising and Career Services confirms that the Junior Cluster requirements and the petitions process has deterred students they have counseled from transferring to PSU.

The likelihood of school closures has increased and it is likely that students elsewhere in the Oregon University System, particularly at schools with high residential populations like University of Oregon and Oregon State, will transfer to PSU for AY 2020-2021 and beyond. Right now, thousands of students across the state are reassessing their educational priorities and wrestling with tough choices. They are looking for a safe place to land and the support they need to finish their education in the face of an uncertain future. PSU has served students during past crises and will help them to weather the current ones.

While the proposed revision was initiated in response to high-credit students transferring from closing institutions, the PSU general education transfer policy has not been reviewed in some time. In reviewing this change, UNST Council considered the time and cost burden placed on transferring Seniors against the possible benefit gained by taking a Junior Cluster. Transferring Seniors have very likely taken many courses outside their major in order to have accumulated over 135 credits, thereby accruing breadth to their education -- one goal of the Junior Cluster. Individual analysis of transcripts to verify this would be burdensome since there are approximately 300 students/year who transfer with Senior status.

In conclusion, the increased frequency of financially-related school closures alone warrants a reconsideration of general education requirements for transfers, but the high cost of education and the changing demographics of our students make this a timely change. In the interest of placing the needs of students first and simplifying its policy to ease this transition for the students and staff involved, the UNST Council is proud to have taken this action and looks forward to working with the Faculty Senate and other stakeholders to ensure it is implemented quickly.

Sincerely,

Albert R. Spencer

UNST Council, Chair

## **APPENDIX**

### **Current Policy**

<b>Credits Transferred</b>	<b>University Studies Requirements</b>
<b>0-29</b>	<a href="#">Freshman Inquiry</a> - UNST 1X1, 1X2, 1X3
<b>30-59</b>	Three <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> courses - UNST 211-299
<b>60-74</b>	Two <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> courses - UNST 211-299
<b>75-89</b>	One <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> course - UNST 211-299
<b>90+</b>	Three <a href="#">Upper-Division Cluster</a> courses (12 credits) and <a href="#">Senior Capstone</a> (6 credits)

### **UNST Council Approved Policy**

<b>Credits Transferred</b>	<b>University Studies Requirements</b>
<b>0-29</b>	<a href="#">Freshman Inquiry</a> - UNST 1X1, 1X2, 1X3
<b>30-59</b>	Three <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> courses - UNST 211-299
<b>60-74</b>	Two <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> courses - UNST 211-299
<b>75-89</b>	One <a href="#">Sophomore Inquiry</a> course - UNST 211-299
<b>90-134</b>	Three <a href="#">Upper-Division Cluster</a> courses (12 credits) and <a href="#">Senior Capstone</a> (6 credits)
<b>135+</b>	<a href="#">Senior Capstone</a> (6 credits)

11 May 2020

To: Faculty Senate

From: Geoffrey Duh, Chair of Academic Requirements Committee

Re: Non-COTA courses used for Fine and Performing Arts (FPA) credits

This memo proposes the inclusion of several PSU film courses offered outside the College of the Arts (COTA) to be used as Fine & Performing Arts (FPA) credits for degree requirements. The list of courses is attached at the end of the memo.

FPA credits are required for students to complete a BA degree and some programs at PSU. FPA courses are currently defined as any course with a subject code/pre-fix that comes from COTA, which include the FILM courses. There are some 'film' courses coming from other colleges. COTA routinely allows their FILM majors to substitute and count these courses in the major. COTA reviewed these courses and verified that these 'film' courses meet the Fine & Performing Arts objectives and learning outcomes. They request to have these courses counted as the Fine & Performing Arts credits.

ARC supports the idea of allowing non-COTA courses that are approved by COTA to be used as FPA credits. All courses in the approved list that are currently in the Social Science Distribution would remain there, but can be counted as FPA credits for degree requirement.

ARC received a dozen student petitions per year, requesting that these courses meet their FPA requirements. COTA Pathway advisors always support these requests and ARC approves them. Most often, these students are double majors (not COTA majors) who have greatly exceeded PSU's credit requirements and who are out of financial aid. Students correctly assert that the classes are identified in a Film major and feature "film" in their titles, logically indicating that these are FPA courses. Further, many COTA courses are restricted to COTA majors, which creates access/scheduling challenges for students with non-COTA majors. By allowing these courses to be used as FPA credits, we can remove some of the barriers for students to complete their BA degrees and reduce the advising and administrative load.

This proposal is collaboratively developed by:

- Mark Berrettini, Director, School of Film
- Cindy Bacchar, Registrar
- Pam Wagner, DARS
- Nick Matlick, Degree Requirements
- Becki Ingersoll, ACS
- All Pathway Advising Directors

- LCM Pathway Advisors Shayna Snyder and Roxanne James
- WLL and English department chairs

**COTA approved courses that can be used as FPA credits for degree requirements:**

- AR 399 Special Studies - ARABIC CINEMA
- BST 353U African Women in Film
- BST 356U Cuban Film: Politics and Culture
- BST 363U African Cinema and African Cultures
- BST 425 Black Cinema: the 1970s
- BST 426 Contemporary African American Cinema
- COMM 362 Bollywood: Communicating Contemporary South Asia through Cinema
- DANE 361U Danish Films from Dreyer to Dogmer
- ENG 305U Topics in Film
- ENG 335U Topics in Literature and Film
- ENG 435 Advanced Topics in Film and Media
- FR 105 French Film
- FR 305 Topics in French Film
- GER 399 Special Studies - HISTORY OF GERMAN FILM
- GER 399 Special Studies - NEW GERMAN CINEMA
- GER 410 Selected Topics - MODERN GERMAN FILM
- HEB 399 Special Studies - ISRAELI CINEMA
- HST 497 Film and History
- JPN 361U Japanese Literature Through Film
- KOR 399 Special Studies - INTRO KOREAN CLTR/SOC FILM
- MGRK 361 Modern Greece Through Film
- PS 317U Film and Politics
- RUS 331U Russian Film Topics
- SOC 454 Sociology through Film
- SPAN 430 Major Topics: Ibero-American Film
- SPAN 436 Major Topics: Latin American Multiple Genres
- USP 314U The City in Film
- WR 416 Screenwriting
- WS 309 Disney: Gender, Race, and Empire

## **Proposal**

### **Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination/Reorganization**

#### **Background, Rationale, and Preliminary Discussions:**

On the May 18th 2020 Faculty Forum, Provost Susan Jeffords introduced a conversation on the need for a process to examine our academic programs in order to address current challenges and strategically prepare ourselves for future scenarios. Recognizing that such a process must be undertaken through shared governance and full faculty participation, she encouraged the faculty to begin initial exploratory steps this summer 2020, to help us prepare for a full discussion during the academic year 2020-21. She stressed the importance of placing our mission and core values at the core of any program reorganization discussion, as well as of promoting transparency and inclusion.

This discussion followed preparatory conversations with Provost Jeffords at the steering committee, with participation of UCC, GC, EPC, BC, and AAUP leadership, where a set of framing themes (included in appendix A in this proposal) were discussed. These themes were echoed and expanded by comments expressed by the faculty (see appendix B) via a google form distributed in connection to the May 18th Faculty Forum.

#### **Motion recommended by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee:**

In light of the current context and informed by these conversations, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommends the creation of an Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination/Reorganization to envision a process for program reorganization at PSU. This Committee will work in Summer 2020 to:

- *Envision* and recommend a framing set of guidelines based on PSU's values and mission, with an emphasis on applying a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion lens
- *Envision* and recommend models of communication and collaboration among relevant constituents and groups (faculty, administration, staff, students, union, board) to ensure transparency, representation, and participation at all the different institutional levels (from faculty senate to units)
- *Explore* theoretical and practical models for reorganization of academic programs, including models put in place by comparator institutions.
- *Gather* evidence and data (quantitative and qualitative) about PSU's Academic Programs with the help of OIR and other relevant PSU administrative offices.

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Reorganization will consist of eight to ten members. In addition to chairs/members of UCC, GC, EPC, BC, and SC, it will include a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion advocate, as well as faculty members chosen by the Committee on Committees from among nominations and self-nominations by faculty. The committee will work closely with the administration members proposed by the Provost. Finally, the committee will present a report to be discussed at the October 2020 Faculty Senate, with the purpose of informing the next step in the process (creation of an ad-hoc committee to work during the academic year 2020-21). It is important to stress that the work conducted by the group will be exploratory and that no decisions on PSU's academic programs will be made during the summer.



## **Appendix 1**

### **ACADEMIC PROGRAM EXAMINATION/REORGANIZATION**

#### **Notes from Preliminary Discussions at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee**

#### **2014 History: What went wrong in previous program prioritization efforts**

- Budget vs. academic: The relationship between the budgetary aspects and the academic quality ones became conflicted.
- Transparency and trust: There wasn't a clear message about why we were undertaking program prioritization. That eroded trust.
- "Circular-firing squad" fear.
- Strategy: It seemed that we were being asked to implement a firing corporation-like strategy.
- It happened parallelly to program review required by our accreditors. It wasn't clear how both efforts intersected.

#### **2020 Our current context: Beginning conversations on rationale and procedure**

- **TRANSPARENCY:** We need to be very clear about what we are doing and why. We must communicate effectively with the faculty and make sure their voices are heard and their input truly and meaningfully incorporated in the process. Units and schools must be aware of what their counterparts are doing. Faculty are not aware of other perspectives, they want to help institutional efforts but do not know how they can do so, what are the strategic recommendations.
- **FACULTY ROLE:** The role of the faculty should be thinking about the future, long-term educational mission of PSU. We need to come up with a set of PSU principles/values before engaging in this work. There tends to be a disconnect between administration and faculty-students (the macro and micro levels). We must make sure that the efforts are focused on students, we must combine/merge them with the Student First academic efforts and they must be framed around the question: how can we do things better for our students. We tend to default to thinking about SCH.
- **GOALS:** We need a shared understanding of what are the goals in relation to the crisis and urgency: looking for opportunities for merging and restructuring in order to avoid eliminations. There are opportunities for synergies between departments that seem blocked by our current internal organization. We must think outside the box.
- **CONTEXT:** We need to look at the institutional context. What is being done in other areas (not just the academic, programs). Look at the changes that have been made in response to COVID-19 and see if they can be permanent. How do we create an environment in which the work of the faculty is recognized and valued and also aligned with what the institution needs faculty to do?
- **DYNAMICS BETWEEN FINANCE AND ACADEMICS** areas of the institution: Cutting academics in trying to attenuate the impact of budget on (mainly) no-academics, seems a loss of perspective. Often the finance area seems to be hegemonic. At a

university, academics should be at the core. Budget should inform our academic priorities but not determine them.

- **PROTECTING FACULTY AND PROTECTING THE MISSION:** If cuts end up being necessary, we need the University to declare exigency, so contract protections can be applied. We also must be clear about the role of the faculty and of the senate in any reorganization efforts and stay away from consumer-focused narratives and not be caught in corporate ideologies and an "offer and demand" view of higher education.
- **A ROBUST UNIVERSITY** is one that has a diversity of offerings. We must rely on the faculty's view of education and the competencies and skills that will prepare our students for their goals (not only professional skills but the fundamental skills obtained across a diversity of disciplines in the humanities, sciences, social sciences, etc.).
- **QUALITY vs. REVENUE:** In a functional university not every unit is going to generate revenue. To maintain a healthy diversity of offerings some units must support others.
- **PROCESS AND CONTINUITY:** Which is our point of departure? What is the connection between previous Academic Program Prioritization (APP) efforts and current Academic Program Reorganization (APRG) ones? Clear and multidirectional paths need to be created among the different faculty and administrative groups engaged in APRG.
- **CAUTION:** We must be careful not to undermine ourselves: The cutting body parts metaphor (cutting an arm and leg vs. cutting an organ that is not functioning well and that you can live without and be in better health). It's important to consider our mission and commitment to the community and not cut programs that no other institution is providing in the state. We must be careful to apply a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens consistently. We must be thoughtful in reorganizing and careful not to find "easy" merging solutions. It's important to be strategic and future-thinking. Academic cuts are cuts on investments.
- **AVOIDING CONSTRAINTS AND "TRAPS":** Our imagination is conditioned by efficiency arguments. We rely too much on traditional ways of evaluating the work we do. We need to rethink student success in a way that does not restrict us to SCH and quantitative factors.
- **TIMELINE AND FACULTY PARTICIPATION:** No decisions should be made during the summer, just exploratory work. For the sake of transparency and faculty participation, there must be an opportunity for the faculty to follow the process and provide input during the summer.

## Appendix B

### Faculty Comments on Program Examination/Reorganization (Unfiltered)

PSU is currently in the initial stages of a conversation about how to reorganize our programs to address our current challenges and to strengthen PSU's institutional position. 'Reorganization' might include eliminating, merging, or adding programs, as well as changing internal administrative structures.

#### 1. How should Faculty be involved in program reorganization at PSU?

Have expert faculty on budget and financial planning.

I think that faculty need to be in primary positions of power. You cannot do this well without buy in from all/many academic units. I would like to see working groups around shared methods and graduate training, a steering committee or other faculty body that is part of this discussion.

We should be involved every step of the way, as it has implications for our departments, curriculum, and pedagogical approaches.

Actively, shared governance does not provide for removing courses or programs from the curriculum. Faculty governance (GC and UCC) should have an active process for these types of proposal. If for no other reason to keep the curriculum clean and healthy.

Faculty should be encouraged to work through innovation and design thinking exercises/training in order to constructively reimagine university life in a new and evolving era.

Allow departments to make their own recommendations on cuts/consolidations - local input from programs.

They should drive the process through Senate if they are willing to engage in good faith evaluation of programs, academic and non-academic.

Thoughtfully

I would keep programs but consolidate some support systems. I feel there are too many "schools" and "colleges" that seem to exist as entities which duplicate admin structures for internal control of budgets rather than providing any particular advantage to students.

We should be equal partners with admin in setting the problem, and then we should be in charge of efforts to address it by transformation or resolution.

Faculty should be involved through multiple opportunities to provide feedback and share experiences.

First we should receive a clear and unambiguous definition of what you mean by "reorganization." Both on the big and little scopes. If you're talking cutting programs and dropping certifications, then faculty should be the deciding voice on what programs can be cut. The trustees an administration should, of course, have a voice in the historical and institutional implications of those decisions, but in dialogue and debate, not a "yes/no, pick another" capacity.

Provide opportunities to broad range of faculty to share info and input.

In actual decision-making, not just consulting.

At the outset, faculty could provide feedback on what initiatives and programs currently at the university are duplicating efforts or are insufficient.

Representation from faculty is important, but not on individual faculty basis as that just paralyzes any process. Clearly not everyone will be happy regardless of the outcome. Representatives from the various colleges representing faculty across campus, even those not traditionally heavily involved in faculty senate for example should be formed to gather input from their units and communicate those up.

Faculty input should be collected at every stage. Beyond the chair meetings, individual faculty from each current department should serve on a committee that can provide input about how these programs should be changed. At the very least, no programs should be merged or eliminated without an opportunity for faculty in those programs to respond to questions, address concerns, or describe their function and place in the university.

There should not be cuts of academic programs; there should be cuts of other units and faculty should have a decisive voice in cutting all the units we don't need. I was very disappointed that FS voted for "program prioritization," which in the end will be done from a SCH's perspective.

Faculty should be involved in both synchronous and asynchronous manners. I am concerned that the folks who can attend and feel comfortable speaking-up publicly in these forums are the ones who will benefit from restructuring. Unfortunately, I have been unable to attend faculty forums in "real time" because of my teaching and student supervision schedules. I hope that our University leadership will weigh the fact that not all voices/perspectives are being included during the synchronous meetings and will allow other asynchronous opportunities to contribute to the discussion and be recognized for our perspectives. I also think it would be helpful to have an iterative feedback process - with multiple check-ins over time with FULL faculty (not just the working groups or faculty senate leaders). I appreciate the opportunity to provide my feedback via this google form and I hope that this will continue to be a means through which faculty feedback is garnered.

You are talking about cutting jobs. Often reorganization is done in a way that makes little sense long term. Other times it makes a lot of sense. But what does this often mean? It often means merging say a department like Philosophy and History or taking SGRN and making it into an Ethnic Studies department with one chair rather than directors. In some ways these moves can make a lot of sense as in Ethnic Studies and long term might be best. However, in other ways a move like say merging Philosophy and History make little sense. On the other hand, merging History and International Relations may make a lot more sense. Merging Philosophy with Political Science may also make a lot of sense. So, input from faculty and the AAUP is a requirement.

Also sometimes a unit or center may not "make money" for PSU, but sometimes the university needs to be more than a neoliberal institution. We can't really call ourselves a university if we do not have courses in Philosophy, Rhetoric, History, and foreign languages. This is one big worry that reorganization can mean the stripping away of those areas of instruction that matter most in times of crisis. Ethics, history, mythology, and foreign languages and culture matter during periods of reactionary politics and populism.

They should be the lead voices. Also, I don't want COB, for example, making decisions about Black Studies.

Faculty should provide leadership around this, though administration needs to be clear on what the fiscal savings need to be. Reorganization has to include the loss of positions (administrative and/or faculty) as just moving things around won't solve our problem. Faculty have to be able to have hard conversations about this and not cling to favorite program. We have tried doing this in the past and it has failed bc we are in denial about the realities of higher education.

Is the point of the university to educate young minds or not? If it is, then any reorganization needs to be primarily handled and approved by the faculty.

They should work with their Deans to determine ways to increase efficiency, reduce spending, and continue to offer high quality programs.

Fundamentally and transparently.

Faculty governance should be fully respected, and all decisions about programs fully transparent. Existing faculty structures (e.g., EPC) should be used, rather than assembling new ad hoc committees.

Rearranging the deck chairs?

Faculty should help provide information about the trends (up and down) and value of their departments/disciplines vs. numbers of students vs. future employment options based on the degrees they will earn. Learning for learning's sake is great but preparing people for careers and real jobs is also critical. How can faculty fit those concepts together?

Most importantly via working groups within the Colleges made up of a diverse cross section of faculty that heavily relies on faculty who have not spent their entire careers at PSU. We need new thinking influenced by wider experiences in the academy. These groups should be constituted by both widely disseminated public calls in each unit, appointments by directors/chairs and deans, and calls focused to women and POC who represent a cross section of TT, NTTF, and adjunct faculty. Also via senate, but keep in mind that senate is not comprised solely of faculty as it is usually understood outside of PSU—research and teaching faculty—but is filled with APs who, while super vital, are just not faculty, so they do not have the training we do, nor the wider view on the state of the US academy. They are not part of the research and teaching that drives a university, so have a different set of concerns,

which can be useful, but not for a program reprioritization. They also do not have the protections that a tenured faculty member has, security that may allow us to hold positions and make arguments that may be unpopular.
Faculty should participate in suggesting how to reorganize and realize that programs will be cut.
Changes should be approved by faculty.
Intimately. Dare I say lead?
Faculty understand our programming and research better than just about anyone. We should therefore be active participants in how to make changes and reorganization. With that said, I also know that faculty can be very territorial and/or set in their ways. I think there needs to be a shared understanding that input from faculty will be given more than lip-service, and in exchange, we need to be willing to think outside our boxes.
directly involved!
At every step
<b>2. What PSU principles and values should be followed in APRG?</b>
Equity. Integrity in allocation of resources. Consideration of wider issues in higher education, including the long-term feasibility of boosting STEM over humanities, arts, and social sciences education.
I think this acronym is horrific and it makes me NOT want to engage in this process. It already feels like administrative overreach once you start using this acronym. Give faculty authority to make decisions, ensure that junior faculty and faculty of color are not left out.
we have to center the needs of our students and community. we have to be aware of any changes that will impact accreditation for specific schools and programs (for instance, CSWE accreditation for the School of Social Work)
DEI
Academic rigor, maintaining a breadth of disciplines but the production of scholarship must be an essential component of any program at any university.
Supporting the complete ecology of university life with an emphasis on the keystone species, namely students and faculty involved in teaching-learning, research, and applied research that ameliorates the Portland metro area and its many communities. I feel it is important to be forward thinking, such as organizing curricula around questions rather than disciplines. This said, and in addition to STEM (obviously relevant to employment as well as important academic areas), core humanities themes -- logic, critical thinking, rhetorical and writing skills, world languages and intercultural communicative ability, really need to be a part of the future of PSU, for these are precisely the sorts of disposition development that are required at elite private universities. Reduced offering in these areas would increase class division in society.
Hold to the PSU mission, let knowledge serve the city.
What is the academic mission of the university? That should guide it, along with all of the work that was done to plan for Academic Program Prioritization several years ago.
Reducing administrative expenses and overlapping or unnecessary expenditures
people! Keep people working, providing instruction and guidance to students.
I don't know what APRG means? It would be helpful to have a list of what you consider PSU principles to be. Perhaps that list also needs overhaul.
In a general sense, equity and opportunity for students are important values to uphold.
Service, Learning, and Demand -- what programs are of service to the students and community, how are we still upholding the pursuit of knowledge next to or over consumerism, what is the demand in the community (both in the arts, STEM, and business communities).
Broad and deep faculty/staff/student engagement.
commitments to the equity lens we adopted in our strategic plan

Democratic participation, transparency, and effective leadership.
Long term financial stability and prosperity of PSU, balanced with academics that are both undergraduate and graduate, the latter supported by impactful research. There is so much potential for this urban campus, but without financial stability we continue to be mediocre to the outside and bumbling on the inside.
Access, inclusion and equity are core values at PSU. These values exist to correct inequities. Tough times are hardest on those that are most vulnerable and who these values are meant to protect.
Keep all academic programs and use (like in the pre-neoliberal times) a financial balance, which means some courses attract more students and they subsidize others that enhance students' intellectual curiosity and civic responsibility.
Upholding a commitment to serving our city and state; Maintaining a students-first lens in reorganization; Transparently communicating information to stakeholders (including faculty, staff, students, and our broader community)
That a university is not a corporation that needs to deliver dividends to shareholders in profit. The dividends of a university are varied and complex. This is not to say that faculty who teach empty classes should not be helped to alter their courses to actually attract students, but that sometimes there is more to learning than getting a job. Otherwise why not shut down all departments and make PSU a "Coding Academy?"
A university is a shared community where some departments, units, and classes turn a profit and others do not, and where balance should be central to how we view the various parts of the university.
PSU is not a technical school.
This is a liberal arts college. That means we don't cut physics to bolster engineering, or enhance psychology at the expense of anthropology. We are committed to a broad liberal education and we don't pit departments against one another.
Following values should drive the process - equity, student centered, student success
Quality education
Quality of education offered in a sustainable manner.
1) We have to maintain an identity of a research-active liberal arts institution that serves the metro area with research and teaching. We need to differentiate ourselves from community colleges and technical colleges. 2) Faculty are an investment and second only to students as the lifeblood of the university. Any reorganization should consider the needs of students and faculty first and foremost.
Creating students with knowledge that can serve the city by creating thoughtful, reasonable, proactive, community members
Units that have received very positive external reviews, are distinctive to PSU, are financially not in the red, teach/research subjects of significant current relevance, and that have strong internal and external support should be given priority. Decisions on funding should be made at the margins: if two units are comparable on these criteria, units that will derive greater marginal benefit from funding should be favored.
Ways of addressing climate-change needs to be part of every discipline and every program/department.
We need to balance the mission of PSU as a teaching institution that serves underrepresented students, those who are economically challenged as well as under represented student groups in US higher education, with its desire to function as an R1, albeit one without R1 policies and resources.
Facts and fairness.
We must evaluate academic programs in terms contribution/impact/relevance as well as effectiveness/efficient utilization of resources, and innovation. These criteria would include both tangible/quantitative/measurable items and more intangible items with some form of objective evidence. Maybe develop a multi-factorial "scorecard" that aggregates the criteria into a manageable set of indicators, not to rank-order units, but to objectively assess their strengths, challenges, and opportunities.

Let knowledge serve the city! I employ that motto in all my work, as do nearly all units across campus. Although we have amazing research and researchers, we shouldn't strive to be an R-1 institution (or like an R-1 institution). We are known for our meaningful, highly-relevant community-engaged research and programming. We should embrace and elevate that.

Similarly, we should emphasize our role in advancing equity in higher education. We not only provide access to many students that would not have access to higher education at other institutions, we do so well. We need to strengthen our efforts, build on past successes, and continually weave in new opportunities to provide an excellent education for all students, particularly those who have been historically marginalized in higher education (and K-12).

Tying this altogether, climate change has shifted from "an" issue to "the" issue. All other ecological and social injustices can be nested within a climate change framework. Our service to the city and broader world should focus on adapting to climate change and building climate resilience. This lens builds on our institutional focus on sustainability, and brings together research and practice across our schools--environmental science and management, urban studies and public affairs, community development, education, public health, and so much more.

As we think about reorganization, I sincerely hope that we do so with a visionary lens! There is a quote in Margaret Wheatley's *Leadership and the New Science*: "When a system is in trouble, connect it to more of itself." As we move to reorganize, collapse, change, add, eliminate, etc., I hope we can think of ways to connect our system to more of itself.

serving students; equity, diversity and inclusion

Equity and diversity need to be front and center

### **3. What do Faculty members want to achieve (what would constitute success) and what do they want to avoid in APRG?**

At all costs, avoid clustering units (for funding, or under schools) by administrative rather than critical definitions of research. E.g., history under humanities when historians might be doing work in public policy or urban planning.

I want to avoid this acronym. It's the worst. I would like to see more shared graduate training and reduce redundancies in certain kinds of undergraduate and graduate training so that I can be freed to teach some more specialized courses on occasion.

Saving as many jobs as possible while serving our students. Making sure that big sacrifices are made by people who can afford to make them.

A complete discussion over curriculum delivery. In particular University Studies must be part of the conversation. Often treated as a sacred cow at PSU, university studies seems to be an inefficient method of delivering curriculum that employs a high level of adjunct instructors. A successful process will evaluate the entire delivery of the curriculum and consider a radical, far reaching solution. If university studies does not work for ALL units on campus it should be redesigned or eliminated.

An obvious and self-serving issue is continued employment. Creatively adapting to, and even creating, new work-research-teaching-learning institutions would help to insure our viability as knowledge professionals.

Maintain enough staff to continue successful academic and research programs. Do not redistribute workload from staff cuts to existing workers - people are over-burdened already. Too many years of "do more with less" - we can't keep doing that.

A reasonable budget allocation that supports quality academic programs and scrutinizes the size of our administration and non-academic units; we should avoid more of the same--trimming budgets at the margins or across the board--and avoid letting the administration drive the process.

Program stability and quality

Ditto.

I do not know the possible types of actions that could occur. I am not in favor of eliminating entire departments or cutting faculty.

Becoming a business school, even outside the school of business, should be avoided. Only programs with a long history of revenue loss or unproductively low enrollment should be cut. We should uphold our rigor and status as an R2-to-R1 leaning institution, many of us faculty came because of that.

Avoid "competition" across programs/departments. Avoid creating "winners" and "looser."

Actual application of equity lens. If we need to renegotiate the worst of PERS, let's do it.

Reorganization over mere elimination.

I want to avoid doing nothing. Success is making a change.

There is no success in eliminating people's livelihood! To put it mildly, this is a wrong question.

To enable our institution to emerge from a period of fiscal challenge academically stronger, not weaker; and, if possible, to realize a financial savings that could be applied to the state's substantial and continuing budget cuts for higher education.

A university that serves its students better in 10 years or 20 years is what the faculty want. What faculty do not want is a spreadsheet approach that sees the functioning of the university in neoliberal zero sum ways that seen some units and departments as failing because of the profit motive and others as "good" because they are profitable. The labeling of some units as "Zero Rev Units" is common and downright wrong.

We shouldn't even be undertaking this step without a sober and PUBLIC analysis of the university budget. Instruction and research are the core mission here and should be last on the chopping block, not first. Even as a former DI athlete, perhaps athletics should be something we should look at, as well as myriad other ways that the administration has prioritized various moneypots, decisions we have had no hand in, or even knowledge about. I am again reminded of the decision to arm campus police, a move that I can find no fixed dollar amount for, and which doesn't seem to be in the conversation as a cost saving measure. I find all this premature.

Achieve a university that will survive and is able to identify what we do well and what we might not need to continue to do. Avoid seeing the administration as the enemy and see this as collaborative.

I think success would look like restructuring so that more faculty are sharing administrator roles and reducing class sizes, so that we come out of this actually raising the quality of education instead of cutting programs.

Avoid holding on to programs that are bloated. Success constitutes a re-sizing of programs commensurate with the actual needs of the program based on a trend of steady or increasing success.

For me, success in an APRG plan would be the creation of synergy among the faculty, students, and administration. Another positive outcome would be for the administration to better understand colleges and departments. Both outcomes would ensure that the mission of the university is strengthened. We have an opportunity to rethink the role of upper administration and to be a leader in higher education in making changes that would likely benefit many universities.

To be avoided: further fragmentation and increasing hierarchical organization through the professionalization of administration.

Achieve: Create a strong sense of support and community, a sense of shared pride in our University and the University experience for our students. Avoid: loss of valuable departments and faculty.

Success would be rational decision-making, arrived at by faculty in a transparent process. What should be avoided is administrators being allowed to make decisions without consultation or justification, for their own convenience, taking advantage of mere "targets of opportunity".

We need to get to a point where we're not constantly being told that we have to cut our budgets.

Success would be to trim those structures that don't directly serve the educational mission of the university and a rebalancing of resources between units that are currently able to grow from units that are shrinking. We shouldn't just cut programs that are underperforming, but reimagine how they can be served by remaking how they are run and function. It's also about a rebalancing of staff and capital resources between units and a reimagining of general education that supports academic programs as opposed to our current UNST structure that feeds itself and does not



support, for instance, CLAS programs. It's also about identifying those units that are working very well -- the Honors College is the only unit up for fall 2020 as far as I know, and reproducing not only their management actions, but their management styles. Success would also be in persuading units that have decided to shrink to stay within their means, because they have not been given the resources they need to grow or even meet current demand, that they will be supported in the future. So much of success would be in identifying talented, successful faculty managers and reproducing their approaches across campus. Success would also be marked by a wildly better up and down structure of communication throughout the university and addressing the persistent problem of marginalizing poc and women by elevating them to leadership positions within colleges. What to avoid? Don't let senate kill any changes, which it may try to do because it often functions as a conjoined twin to PSU—AAUP, which advocates more so for job security for its members than in making difficult choices to benefit the educational institution.

Meeting goals with as little pain as possible

An intelligent strategy for making reductions at PSU based on a thoughtful, detailed assessment similar to methods used for program self-assessment and external reviews, with data on educational success factors, revenue vs. cost, scholarly productivity, curriculum development, innovation, community connections, broader impact, etc.

I think I have answered this question, but to summarize and state it a bit differently, to me, success will mean that we are creative, visionary, and inclusive as we make changes to the university. Let's make stronger connections and collaborations within our institution. What I want to avoid is fear-based, short-sided decisions that undermine the mission and vision of our institution--a mission and vision that I think are largely shared across the university.

avoid cutting programs that serve students and that are our core values; avoid making cuts that do not use an equity lens in decision making

I want to avoid ripping apart the fabric of our community.

*Draft Faculty Senate Resolution*

WHEREAS Educational Policy Committee, in its memorandum to Steering Committee dated April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020, outlines Faculty concerns about the impact of potential budget cuts on academic programs and on the quality of education that we offer our students,

be it RESOLVED that Faculty Senate, as stated in this memorandum:

- 1) Calls on OAA to proactively communicate to all Portland State faculty, before spring term ends and nine-month faculty go off contract, how it intends to make programmatic restructuring decisions;
- 2) Expects that the principles proposed there will govern decision making around educational policy at PSU;
- 3) Maintains that making decisions affecting programs over the summer would violate PSU's shared governance values and is not reflective of PSU's stated mission.

\*\*\*\*\*

**To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee**

From: Education Policy Committee

Date: April 16, 2020 [submitted May 14, 2020]

**RE: Budget Cuts and Education Policy**

Faculty are deeply concerned not only about the impact of budget cuts on programs and on the quality of education that we offer our students and on how these decisions are being made. Budget decisions are education policy decisions – they cannot be made independently of considerations about our ability to deliver high quality programs. Faculty need to be actively involved in all stages of the decision-making process.

While much of the current fiscal uncertainty results from factors beyond anyone's control, we have a choice as an institution as to how we will respond to it. The lack of transparency and dialogue regarding the steps and procedures that the administration is using for decision-making is an additional, avoidable source of anxiety. For this reason, we ask OAA to proactively communicate to all Portland State faculty, before spring term ends and nine-month faculty go off contract, how it intends to make programmatic restructuring decisions.

This includes scenarios for both reorganization and for possible cuts.

Art. 22 Section 3(e) of the contract states:

In reaching a decision whether to declare a condition of financial exigency or a condition requiring departmental reduction or elimination, the President will consider, among other matters, institutional guidelines concerning the mission and educational development of the institution; departmental effectiveness and productivity; enrollment historical, current and projected; the state of development of departments; the balance between academic

personnel and other elements of the budget; the dependence of other departments in the University on the department proposed for reduction or elimination; and the availability of similar programs and services elsewhere in the community.

The EPC also proposes the following principles to guide decision making surrounding Education Policy at Portland State:

- 1) Faculty want to be actively involved in shaping the future of PSU. Decisions to eliminate or to alter units or programs must be made according to principles of shared governance, with the understanding that faculty are often best positioned to understand our programs and the needs of our students.
- 2) Decisions responding to short-term needs should not be allowed to undermine the long-term viability of our institution. In particular, not hiring faculty to vacated positions is not a strategy for balancing budgets, but rather a choice to not make decisions strategically.
- 3) Diversity and inclusion are at the core of Portland State University's Mission and Values. We cannot allow decisions – or the failure to make decisions – to undermine our ability to exemplify these values through our programs, teaching, and research.
- 4) We need to recognize how not providing resources to retain people, fund graduate student, maintain library materials and databases, support labs, etc., often results in not being able to effectively achieve our academic mission as a University.
- 5) Decisions should be made in accordance with Faculty Senate Budget Committee [FY 18 Budget Principles](#).

Finally, we ask that the administration engage faculty proactively and in a timely manner during spring term in decisions affecting programs so that shared governance principles are honored. Making decisions affecting programs over the summer would violate PSU's shared governance values and is not reflective of PSU's stated mission.

*Draft Faculty Senate Resolution:*

WHEREAS Educational Policy Committee has reported to Faculty Senate Steering Committee in a memorandum dated April 16th, 2020, on the renewal of the contract of the Confucius Institute at PSU, be it RESOLVED:

- 1) That at the next contract renewal, the Office of International Affairs (OIA) will notify Hanban before the deadline that it intends to renegotiate the contract so it will not renew automatically;
- 2) OIA will notify the Faculty Senate of when it begins negotiations and will actively involve the Faculty Senate and/or appropriate Faculty committees such as EPC;
- 3) PSU will monitor CI in the meanwhile and will provide opportunities for faculty to submit concerns before the next renewal.

\*\*\*\*\*

**To: Faculty Senate Steering Committee**

From: Education Policy Committee

Date: April 16, 2020

RE: OAA/OIA response to Confucius Institute Memo

The Education Policy Committee would like to thank Executive Director of OIA Ron Witczak and Provost Jeffords for addressing the concerns raised by our February 6, 2020 memo on the Agreement between the Confucius Institute Headquarters of the People's Republic of China and Portland State University (PSU #694208).

The EPC appreciates the opportunity to review and to discuss the Statement for the Confucius Institute Headquarters, affirming that the English version of the Agreement is the official version, and the responses to our memo from General Counsel Cindy Starke.

After reviewing these responses, the EPC asks that they, along with our memo and the signed Agreement, be brought to the floor of the Faculty Senate for discussion.

Sincerely,

Arthur Hendrix

Alex Sager

Co-Chairs, Faculty Senate Education Policy Committee

TO: Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
FROM: EPC  
DATE: February 6, 2020  
RE: Confucius Institute Contract and Faculty Governance

The Faculty Senate Education Policy Committee (EPC) is dismayed that the Administration has moved forward and signed the **Agreement between Confucius Institute Headquarters of the People's Republic of China and Portland State University PSU #694208** (henceforth **the Agreement**) without EPC or Faculty Senate review. The continued partnership between Portland State University and the Confucius Institute raises significant issues of shared governance, of educational policy, and of academic freedom.

The EPC has reviewed the signed version of the Confucius Institute contract and wishes to raise a number of issues concerning shared governance, the content of the contract, and academic freedom.

1. The **June 4, 2018 PSU Faculty Senate Resolution on the Renewal of PSU Confucius Institute** noted that the Confucius Institute never went through EPC review and stated in clause 4 that: "That there will be appropriate review by EPC and the Senate prior to signing and execution of the renewal agreement."

The contract was signed on December 2, 2019, but the EPC did not see the revised contract until December 3. The signature of the CI contract prior to review by EPC is a violation of shared governance.

2. Article 5 - Organization of **the Agreement** states:

"7. The Institute at PSU's activities must be in accordance with the Constitution and By-laws, respect cultural custom, and shall not be contrary to applicable laws and regulations, both in the United States and China. In the event of conflict between the laws of the United States and the laws of China, the laws of the United States shall apply."

First, the EPC has serious concerns about the identification of two jurisdictions for the contract -- the United States and China. Institute activities carried out at Portland State University should not be bound by applicable laws and regulations of China.

From a legal perspective, we are comfortable that US law takes precedence. US law includes state and federal statutes and regulations, as well as the United States Constitution, as interpreted by US Courts. I believe this final sentence was added at PSU's request.

Second, the article does not state the applicable laws and regulations, so it is unclear what is meant.

The phrase “applicable laws and regulations” is common, even routine, in legal agreements, as it’s generally impossible to predict all of the relevant laws that might come into play in running an organization or institution, and it would be next to impossible to list them all. This would include employment laws, privacy laws, intellectual property, and many others. Critically, in all cases, US law takes precedence.

We also note that we assume that “Constitution” refers to the “Constitution of the Portland State University Faculty” and “By-laws” refer to Portland State University Faculty Senate By-laws. If so, this should be stated explicitly in the contract.

I agree with this – the language is ambiguous. I understand this provision was carried over from the prior contract. I’m not sure this merits an amendment, but it should be cleaned up if this agreement is ever renewed.

The reference to “cultural custom” is also troublingly vague and capacious.

I agree it is vague, but for that reason I don’t find it troubling because that vagueness makes it virtually unenforceable.

3. Article 8 - Revision of **the Agreement** states:

“With the consent of both parties, this Agreement may be revised during its implementation and any revisions will be made in a written amendment to this Agreement, both in English and Chinese. Such amendment will take effect when signed by authorized representatives of both parties. Each party shall have a version in each language. Each version shall be of equal legal weight and authority as the other.”

Article 13 of **the Agreement** states:

“This Agreement is written in Chinese and in English. Each party shall keep one copy in Chinese and one copy in English of the signed Agreement. The Agreement, in both languages, shall have the same effectiveness.”

The EPC is troubled that there are two versions of the contract, one in English and one in Chinese, which are each intended to have equal legal weight and authority. Standard practice is to designate the language for the contract and to provide a certified translation to ensure that both parties share a common understanding of its content.

Furthermore, the EPC has not been able to review the Chinese version of the contract, so we have not ascertained whether its content is similar to the English language version.

I believe this concern has been addressed by the letter Ron obtained from the CI

Headquarters Chief Executive acknowledging that the English language version of the agreement is the official version.

4. The **June 4, 2018 PSU Faculty Senate resolution** stipulates that

“Portland State University has unilateral control, consistent with the principles of AAUP’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, over all academic matters, including the recruitment of teachers, determination and oversight of curriculum and choice of texts...”

The EPC finds that the signed version of the contract does not meet this stipulation in the following sections.

9. Article 5 - Organization of **the Agreement** states:

“8. The Headquarters acknowledges that PSU and its faculty have the right to determine the content of the curriculum, the manner of instruction, and the choice of texts for all accredited and approved academic programs administered by PSU. PSU acknowledges that the Confucius Institute at PSU is not an accredited and approved academic program of PSU. PSU will afford all Confucius Institute

teachers with the same First Amendment rights and academic freedom rights as it affords to its own faculty.”

First, the EPC considers the statement that the Confucius Institute “is not an accredited and approved academic program of PSU” irrelevant to the core issues at stake, namely, the hiring of instructors and the offering of courses. The stipulation that PSU and its faculty have authority over “all accredited and approved academic programs” avoids the key issue: the Faculty Senate’s insistence that curriculum and instruction offered at Portland State University -- accredited and approved or not -- undergo scrutiny through appropriate procedures of shared governance.

Second, the June 4, 2018 PSU Faculty Senate resolution stipulates that “Portland State University affords Confucius Institute teachers First Amendment rights; the same academic freedom rights and the same collectively bargained protections afforded regular faculty members at Portland State University.”

The EPC is concerned that the Agreement does not provide any provisions for the meaningful enforcement of academic freedom rights and collectively bargained protections for Confucius Institute teachers.

This language represents a compromise between the requests made by Faculty Senate, what was within our legal authority, and what was acceptable by CI Headquarters. Ron worked hard to negotiate this concession with CI Headquarters. PSU does not have any legal authority to interfere with the employment relationship between CI and its employees.

5. **Article 6. 4. Responsibility of Parties, Responsibilities of Headquarters** states:

“5. To send Chinese instructors based on the requirements of teaching and pay for their international airfares, salaries, and other expenses. Individuals recommended by Headquarters shall have academic credentials acceptable to PSU.”

**Article 6. 4. Responsibility of Parties, Responsibilities of the Institute at PSU** states:

“7. Invite one Chinese Program Manager from China and one or more visiting faculty from the People’s Republic of China to perform educational services necessary to its mission and to the educational mission of PSU. Individuals recommended by Headquarters shall have academic credentials acceptable to PSU. PSU shall use its own personnel for programmatic and administrative support.”

The EPC notes that these articles allow Headquarters to unilaterally appoint faculty to



the Confucius Institute, subject only to meeting academic credentials acceptable to PSU. The EPC holds in contrast that faculty should instead be hired by the PSU Confucius Institute Director in accordance with PSU university regulations and procedures.

Given these concerns about **the Agreement**, the EPC makes the following recommendations:

- 1) We ask for Interim President Stephen Percy's signature be rescinded and that the Agreement not be enforced until items 2 through 4 are satisfactorily resolved.
- 2) That this memo and **the Agreement** are brought to the floor of the Faculty Senate for presentation and discussion.
- 3) That the administration establish transparent protocols to ensure that shared governance requirements are met, including signatures from relevant Faculty Senate committee chairs.
- 4) That the Chinese version of the contract be translated into English by a certified translator so that the EPC and the Faculty Senate can review it.



**AGREEMENT BETWEEN CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE HEADQUARTERS  
OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND PORTLAND STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**PSU #694208**

In accordance with a desire to continue to promote cooperation in areas of mutual interest for the benefit of both institutions, Portland State University ("PSU") and the Confucius Institute Headquarters ("Headquarters") of the People's Republic of China (individually the "Party" and collectively the "Parties") hereby enter into this Agreement (the "Agreement") for continuing the operations of the Confucius Institute at PSU.

**WHEREAS**, the Headquarters, an initiative of the People's Republic of China, that seeks to support and foster teaching of Chinese language and culture internationally through affiliated Confucius Institutes, has undertaken to establish Confucius Institute in various locations through the U.S.; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Office of International Affairs ("OIA") at PSU shares with Headquarters a desire to promote educational exchange and cooperation between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China; and

**WHEREAS**, PSU strives to advance the global literacy of its students and of the community at large; and,

**WHEREAS**, in keeping with these purposes and with support from Headquarters pursuant to an agreement between the Parties, PSU established a Confucius Institute ("Confucius Institute at PSU" or "The Institute at PSU") in 2007, which participates in China's Confucius Institute initiative; and,

**WHEREAS**, the original agreement for the establishment and operation of The Institute at PSU was established January 19, 2007 with subsequent renewal negotiations starting in February 2014 and February 2019; and,

**WHEREAS**, PSU and Headquarters desire to enter into a new agreement for continuing the operation of The Institute at PSU.

**NOW THEREFORE**, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, Headquarters and PSU agree as follows:

**Article 1 - Purpose**

The purpose of this Agreement is to identify the rights and responsibilities of Headquarters and PSU in the development and management of The Institute at PSU.

**Article 2 -Character**

The Institute at PSU shall be a non-profit educational institution.

**Article 3 - Executive Institution**

PSU will cooperate with Soochow University (Soochow) in China, as the Chinese executive institution. Soochow will collaborate with the Confucius Institute at PSU.

**Article 4 - Scope of Activities**

The Institute at PSU shall provide the following activities:

1. Teaching Chinese language and providing Chinese language teaching resources;
2. Training Chinese language instructors;
3. Holding the HSK examination (Chinese Proficiency Test) and tests for the Certification of the Chinese Language Teachers;
4. Providing information and consultative services concerning China's education and culture;
5. Conducting language and cultural exchange activities;
6. Other activities as approved and funded by the Parties and set out in an amendment to this Agreement that is signed by both parties.
7. PSU, in conjunction with The Institute at PSU, will coordinate the payments to the affiliated Confucius Classrooms (CC) and shall submit budget proposals for each CC to Headquarters. After receiving budget proposals from PSU for each CC, Headquarters shall approve funding of up to \$10,000.00 per year per CC for each CC to use for their Chinese language programs and related activities and events. Headquarters will transfer approved funding to PSU. PSU agrees to set up an agency account to fund the CC's. All rules and regulations of PSU will be adhered to with respect to handling of such funds.
8. The Parties understand that the funds received from the Headquarters for Confucius Institute are subject to the mandatory PSU overhead charge. PSU shall notify Headquarters of the overhead charge rate on an annual basis.

## 9. Article 5 - Organization

1. The Institute at PSU shall have a Board of Directors (“The CIPSU Board of Directors”), which shall serve as the decision-making body regarding programming of events that seek Headquarters funding. The CIPSU Board of Directors will serve as an advisory board to the Executive Director of OIA regarding the directorship of The Institute at PSU. The Board shall consist of 6-10 members who will be representatives of PSU, local educational, community, and business groups with strong interests in China and shall be appointed for terms of two (2) years. The CIPSU Board of Directors shall provide input on the following:

- formulating development plans for The Institute at PSU;
- significant issues including teaching, research and management;
- fund raising;
- appointing and dismissing the director of The Institute at PSU;
- examining and approving the budget proposal and final financial accounts of The Institute at PSU; and,
- reporting to the Parties on the management status and other significant issues.

2. Upon receiving recommendations from The CIPSU Board of Directors, PSU shall adopt a Director Responsibility System, which will set forth guidelines relevant to the directorship of The Institute at PSU. Subject to applicable PSU policies, PSU will hire a director of The Institute at PSU (the “Director”) who shall be based at PSU and shall undertake the day-by-day academic, financial, personnel, facilities and support administration of The Institute at PSU. The Director shall be a PSU employee and be appointed by PSU for a term of 3 years (renewable). The performance of The Institute at PSU Director shall be reviewed annually by the Executive Director of the OIA.

3. The Confucius Institute at PSU shall be located within OIA. It shall have the status of a non-credit entity and be operated in accordance with policies and procedures applicable to institutes and centers at PSU generally. Overall authority for management and operation of The Institute at PSU shall be the responsibility of the Executive Director of OIA.

4. PSU shall maintain the funds and expenditure records for The Institute in a university account that is separate from all of its other accounts. The Institute at PSU will independently establish annual budget proposals and prepare final financial accounts. The Institute at PSU will be in charge of its daily operations and management. It shall assume the sole responsibility for its profits or losses and shall balance its accounts by charging fees for language courses and other programs.

5. The Chinese partner university (Soochow University) shall appoint multiple members to the Board of Directors. In addition, a Joint Management Committee (JMC) exists and consist of two members from PSU (typically these are the two Directors at the PSU Confucius Institute, or higher level administrators, such as the Provost and Executive Director of the Office of

International Affairs) and two members from Soochow University. The JMC will endeavor to meet at least once a year to work on strategy, programming ideas, budget and other high leveler administrative issues.

6. The Institute at PSU shall allow Headquarters to evaluate/assess the quality of teaching at The Institute at PSU.

7. The Institute at PSU's activities must be in accordance with the Constitution and By-laws, respect cultural custom, and shall not be contrary to applicable laws and regulations, both in the United States and China. In the event of conflict between the laws of the United States and the laws of China, the laws of the United States shall apply.

8. The Headquarters acknowledges that PSU and its faculty have the right to determine the content of the curriculum, the manner of instruction, and the choice of texts for all accredited and approved academic programs administered by PSU. PSU acknowledges that the Confucius Institute at PSU is not an accredited and approved academic program of PSU. PSU will afford all Confucius Institute teachers with the same First Amendment rights and academic freedom rights as it affords to its own faculty.

#### **Article 6 -Responsibilities of the Parties**

##### Responsibilities of Headquarters:

1.To authorize The Institute at PSU to continue the use of the title "The Institute", as well as its logos and institute emblems.

2.Recommend teaching materials, courseware, and other books according to the needs of the CI and authorize the use of online courses.

3.To provide a set amount of annual funds determined by the Headquarters Division in charge of US Confucius Institute affairs, the Headquarters' Finance Division and also determined by Headquarters' assessment of each event and activity The Institute at PSU holds.

4.To send Chinese instructors based on the requirements of teaching and pay for their international airfares, salaries, and other expenses. Individuals recommended by Headquarters shall have academic credentials acceptable to PSU.

##### Responsibilities of PSU:

1. To provide a fixed office place and appropriate sites for teaching and other activities of The Institute at PSU; equipped with office and teaching facilities, and with responsibility for the setting, management and maintenance.

2.To provide administrative personnel (full time or part-time).

3.To assist Headquarters with the necessary visa documentation needed to bring in visiting Chinese instructors to assist the work of The Institute at PSU. All expenses for the visiting Chinese instructor shall be the responsibility of Headquarters and/or the incoming instructor.

4.To provide in-kind support, which should have a value not less than the amount provided by Headquarters.

#### Responsibilities of the Institute of PSU

During the term of this Agreement, The Institute at PSU will provide the following educational resources and services:

1. Events and outreach (in cooperation with other civic organizations as appropriate) on Chinese language, culture, history, politics, economics, sociology, philosophy and allied areas of scholarship and interest.

2. Outreach to Portland Public Schools, to include:

- a. short-term training programs for primary and secondary teachers;
- b. advice and support for local Chinese language teachers;
- c. making available Chinese language teaching materials for teachers and students of Chinese in the Portland region;

3. Development of Chinese language and culture studies at PSU;

4. Chinese language and culture courses;

5. Hosting the Chinese Language Level Test (HSK, YCT, BCT).

6. In conjunction with OIA, developing and promoting curricula for study abroad programs in China.

7. Invite one Chinese Program Manager from China and one or more visiting faculty from the People's Republic of China to perform educational services necessary to its mission and to the educational mission of PSU. Individuals recommended by Headquarters shall have academic credentials acceptable to PSU. PSU shall use its own personnel for programmatic and administrative support.

#### Responsibilities of the Office of International Affairs

1. During the term of this Agreement, OIA shall contribute to the operation and support of The Institute at PSU by providing the following:

- Necessary office and classroom facilities;
- Necessary teaching equipment;

- Customary operating supplies;
- Customary administrative services, including clerical support;
- Appointment and payment for local part time instructors at such time as the success of The Institute at PSU's teaching and training programs warrant additional faculty, and subject to further written agreement between the Parties;
- Assist the visiting scholar described in Headquarters' responsibilities described above, to obtain necessary non-immigrant visa for entry into the United States.

2. The Institute at PSU, through OIA, shall be authorized by PSU to charge fees at a PSU-approved self-support rate for non-credit courses. Any funds generated will be earmarked for programs that advance knowledge in the region of Chinese cultures and that meet the overall education mission of PSU.

3. The evaluation of The Institute at PSU shall be conducted by OIA on an annual basis and the results shall be shared with Headquarters.

#### **Article 7 - Intellectual Property**

Headquarters exclusively owns the title of "The Confucius Institute", its related logo, and emblem as its exclusive intellectual property. PSU cannot use, apply or transfer the title, logo, and emblem in any form, either directly or indirectly, after this Agreement has been terminated.

Each Party shall retain all right, title and interest in any and all of its Intellectual Property used in Confucius Institute activities. If Intellectual Property is jointly developed by the Parties, such Intellectual Property shall be jointly owned by the Parties unless otherwise agreed in writing. The respective interests of the Parties and the Parties' employees in intellectual property resulting from the activities of The Institute at PSU shall be determined by PSU Intellectual Property Policies and Guidelines.

#### **Article 8 - Revision**

With the consent of both parties, this Agreement may be revised during its implementation and any revisions will be made in a written amendment to this Agreement, both in English and Chinese. Such amendment will take effect when signed by authorized representatives of both Parties. Each party shall have a version in each language. Each version shall be of equal legal weight and authority as the other.

#### **Article 9 - Term**

The Agreement shall be in effect on the date when both Parties have signed below. The Agreement shall have a period of 5-year validity. Either party, if it wishes to terminate the



Agreement must notify the other in writing 90 (ninety) days prior to the end of the Agreement, otherwise it will automatically be extended for another 5 years.

#### **Article 10 - Force Majeure**

Parties hereto will be released from their obligations under this Agreement in the event of a national emergency, war, prohibitive government regulations or any other cause beyond the control of the parties hereto that renders the performance of this Agreement impossible. In the event of such circumstance, the party under the situation shall inform the other party in writing that the program may be delayed or terminate, and duly take the effective measures to mitigate the loss of the other party.

Neither Party shall be responsible for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation imposed upon it hereunder nor shall such failure or delay be deemed to be a breach of this Agreement if such failure or delay is due to circumstances of any nature whatsoever which are not within its immediate control and are not preventable by reasonable diligence on its part.

#### **Article 11 - Termination**

This Agreement may be terminated in one or more of the following cases:

1. Either party intends to terminate this Agreement upon giving a written notice at least six months in advance of their intention to terminate.
2. The two parties have no intent to continue the collaboration upon expiration of the initial term or ensuing terms.
3. The two parties agree that the intent of the Agreement cannot be fulfilled. If the actions or negligence of one party of the Agreement is determined by one or both parties to have severely harmed the image and reputation of The Institute at PSU.
4. The Agreement must be terminated due to force majeure with an unforeseeable conclusion.

The termination of the Agreement shall not affect any other agreements, contracts and/or programs between the Parties.

Before the Agreement is terminated, the Parties shall endeavor to make appropriate arrangements for the enrolled program students and other works so as not to interrupt or delay any students' program completion and/or delay or dismantle other works of The Institute at PSU.

#### **Article 12 - Dispute Settlement**

Should any disputed arise, the two parties shall work together to resolve the issue(s) through friendly and cooperative negotiations.

#### **Article 13 - Agreement Language**

This Agreement is written in Chinese and in English. Each party shall keep one copy in Chinese and one copy in English of the signed Agreement. The Agreement, in both languages, shall have the same effectiveness.

#### **Article 14 -Confidentiality of Agreement**

The parties to this Agreement will treat this Agreement as confidential and will not, without prior written consent, publish, release or disclose or permit publication, release or disclosure without the written permission of both parties as a result of this Agreement. Except insofar as such publication, release or disclosure is necessary to enable each party to fulfill their obligations under this Agreement. The above notwithstanding, PSU's obligations under this Agreement are at all times subject to the limitations and conditions of the Oregon Public Records Law ORS 192.410 – 192.505.

#### **Article 15 - PSU Standard Terms and Conditions**

##### **1. Confidentiality of Student Records**

Subject to Oregon Public Records Law and any other Oregon or United States federal laws, PSU agrees that it will make reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of any Confidential Information received from the Headquarters and shall not use such Confidential Information except in performing its obligations pursuant to the Agreement.

Subject to the laws of the Peoples Republic of China, Headquarters agrees that it will make reasonable efforts to maintain the confidentiality of any Confidential Information received from PSU and shall not use such Confidential Information except in performing its obligations pursuant to the Agreement.

Under State and U.S. federal laws protecting the privacy of student education records, PSU may not, in most instances, disclose education records of students enrolled at PSU to Headquarters without the student's written permission. Any request for education records of students enrolled at PSU from Headquarters shall be directed to PSU officials in OIA who can determine if records can be disclosed.

Headquarters acknowledges that student records are protected by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, 20 USC 1232g ("FERPA"). Headquarters is a "school official" as defined in PSU's Student Records Policy and Headquarters's handling of student information will comply with FERPA and with the PSU's Student Records Policy.

Headquarters is aware of and will comply with the limitations on the use and re-disclosure of personally identifiable information from education records as set forth in FERPA (34 CFR 99.33(a)(2)). Contractor agrees to hold education records in strict confidence. Headquarters will not use or disclose information from student records received from or on behalf of PSU except as permitted or required by this Agreement, as required by law, or as otherwise authorized in

writing by PSU. Headquarters agrees not to use information from education records for any purpose other than the purpose for which disclosure was made.

Headquarters shall comply with the Information Safeguards Rule (the "Safeguards Rule") as set forth in 16 CFR Part 314 – Standards for Safeguarding Customer Information of the federal regulations implementing the Gramm Leach Bliley Act ("GLBA"). Headquarters shall develop, implement, maintain and use appropriate administrative, technical and physical safeguards to preserve the confidentiality, integrity and availability of all customer information (as defined in the Safeguards Rule) regarding PSU's students, which is disclosed to or accessed, maintained, or transmitted by Headquarters.

Headquarters will, within one day of discovery, report to PSU any use or disclosure of education records or customer information relating to PSU students not authorized by this Agreement or in writing by PSU. Such notice shall identify: (1) the nature of the unauthorized use or disclosure, (2) the information that was used or disclosed, (3) who made the unauthorized use or received the unauthorized disclosure, (4) what Headquarters has done or will do to mitigate any deleterious effect of the unauthorized use or disclosure, and (5) what corrective action Headquarters has taken will undertake to prevent future similar unauthorized use or disclosure. Headquarters shall provide such other information, including a written report, as reasonably required by PSU.

## 2. Merger Clause

This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties. There are no understandings, agreements, or representations, oral or written, not specified herein regarding this Agreement. Headquarters and PSU, by the signature of their authorized representatives hereby acknowledge that they have read this Agreement, understand it, and agree to be bound by its terms and conditions.

## 3. Waiver

No waiver, consent, modification, or change of terms of this Agreement shall bind either party unless in writing and signed by both Parties. Such waiver, consent, modification, or change if made shall be effective only in the specific instance and for the specific purpose given. The failure of PSU or Headquarters to enforce any provision of this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver by PSU or Headquarters of that or any other provision.

## 4. Severability

The parties agree that if any term or provision of this Agreement is declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal or in conflict with any law, the validity of the remaining terms and provisions shall not be affected, and the rights and obligations of the parties shall be

construed and enforced as if this Agreement did not contain the particular term or provision held to be invalid.

5. Compliance with Law

The Parties shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, codes, regulations, and ordinances applicable to this Agreement.

6. No Third Party Beneficiaries

Headquarters and PSU are the only Parties to this Agreement and are the only Parties entitled to enforce its terms. Nothing in this Agreement gives, is intended to give, or shall be construed to give or provide any benefit or right, whether directly, indirectly or otherwise, to third persons unless such third persons are individually identified by name herein and expressly described as intended beneficiaries of the terms of this Agreement.

**Article 16 - Effective Date**


This Agreement shall be effective on February 13, 2019.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE  
HEADQUARTERS

INTERIM PRESIDENT

DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STEPHEN PERCY

Date: 12-2-19

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MA JIANFEI

Date: 2019.11.18

DIRECTOR, CONTRACTING AND  
PROCUREMENT SERVICES

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KAREN THOMSON

Date: 11.18.19

## Proposal

### Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews

#### Context and Rationale:

Portland State has recently seen a movement towards a more communicative and collaborative relationship between the faculty and the other key constituents of the campus community, including the Board of Trustees. We are walking an increasingly constructive and effective path in shared governance and shared leadership, where transparency and trust are being valued and emphasized and which provides us with optimal conditions to continue to envision and strategically design processes to further strengthen our institution. Such strategic thinking to project us into the kind of university that we want, need, and can be in the future in accordance with our mission and values is particularly important in the present moment, as we face multiple challenges caused or aggravated by the COVID-19.

An essential component of a healthy and highly functional university is the ability to establish and implement methods of self-assessment and adjustment not only in its instructional dimension but also in its administrative one. As such, it is important to design and maintain regular review processes, in order to provide our administrators with the opportunity to receive constructive feedback from the campus community on their progress and effectiveness as leaders, for their personal development as well as the development and enhancement of the institution. The faculty play an essential role and hold a great responsibility in this assessment process, both as reviewers and reviewees. As the report by the American Association of University Professors on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators states, "their [faculty] expertise is both an indelible part of a full and fair evaluation and a positive service to relevant administrators and to the institution's governing board". The report further explains that "the most desirable, as well as the most effective, system is one that rests on sound institutional policy, healthy relationships among the parties, and scrupulously fair practice. Indeed, such a system at its best will involve not only evaluation, but also constructive mentoring, as is the case with the best systems of faculty evaluation."<sup>1</sup>

While some elements of administrative review are currently in place at PSU, we still lack a Faculty Senate-centered, comprehensive and consistent mechanism for effectively utilizing faculty expertise in assessing and enhancing PSU's leadership on aspects such as progress in advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion; promoting shared governance, communication, and collaboration among university constituents and involving them in decision-making; ability to embrace innovation and ensure that PSU

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.aaup.org/report/faculty-evaluation-administrators#2>

effectively serves students, the city, and the global community; alignment with our mission and strategic goals; impact on institutional priorities, and other important leadership components. The need for the PSU faculty to examine our current procedures and practices, identify gaps and establish a solid administrative review process became evident during the conversations on PSU's leadership and administration that took place in Fall 2019 as part of the Special Meeting of the Faculty on November 6th and continued in connection to the Faculty Forum on May 18th, 2020, where faculty members provided extensive feedback on this subject, prompting the steering committee to present this proposal.

**Motion Recommended by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee:**

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommends the creation of an exploratory Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews to

- Examine the mechanisms already in place at PSU for the review of Chairs, Directors, Deans, Associate Deans, Provost, Vice-Provosts, and other members of our administration, identifying areas of need and improvement.
- Explore models of administrative review being successfully implemented at other public universities comparable to PSU, reflecting on best practices that could be adapted to the specific needs of our institution.
- Make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for the creation/implementation of an administrative review process consistent with the context and rationale stated in this proposal, including a timeline and specific steps to collaborate with the administration and relevant constituents in setting this process (e.g., creation of a permanent administrative review committee)

This committee shall consist of 6 to 8 members chosen by the Committee on Committees from among nominations and self-nominations by faculty. It will present a report with its recommendations to Faculty Senate by the end of the academic year 2020-2021.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIVERSITY ACTION COUNCIL'S COMMITTEE ON THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF DIVERSE FACULTY

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate passed a resolution on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at PSU on April 6, 2020; and

WHEREAS the Annual Report of the DAC Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty makes many of the same recommendations as that Faculty Senate resolution;

The Faculty Senate, as the representative of the Faculty, RESOLVES to endorse the Annual Report of the DAC Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty and supports implementation of the report's recommendations.

**TO:** President Steve Percy  
**FROM:** DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty  
 Gina Greco, Chair; Jola Ajibade, Shelly Chabon, Jeff Conn, Deanna Cor, Chloe Hammond-Bradley, Isabel Jaén-Portillo, Debra Lindberg, Larry Martinez, Aria Ramus, Eva Thanheiser, Michael Walsh, Lisa Weasel, Jennifer Cie Williams  
**DATE:** June, 2020  
**RE:** Annual Report, Action Item, Recommendations

This year, the committee had a short period to meet, due to the late start for all DAC committees, the resignation of one of the committee's Co-Chairs before our first meeting, and then the disruption caused by Covid-19. But we did have robust conversations when we were able to meet, and our large committee reached consensus on one action and a number of recommendations. Our discussion included recurring conversations, triggered by the Co-Chair's resignation letter, about the committee's role and potential effectiveness. Members expressed collective impatience with the status quo, desire to see progress, and disinterest in serving an empty or symbolic role.

#### **Action:**

The committee has chosen to apply for an NSF ADVANCE Catalyst Grant to support the recruitment and retention of diverse STEM faculty. A small subcommittee will work with a grant writer to prepare the proposal, which will be submitted on behalf of the committee. Successful practices that are developed through grant funding will then be implemented across campus to advance the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty in all disciplines. We appreciate that Interim President Steve Percy has accepted to join the committee as a co-PI for the grant, and we also recognize the support offered by Provost Susan Jeffords and Interim Vice-President Julie Caron. We are especially grateful to Julie and the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion for providing the funding needed to hire a grant writer.

#### Initial workplan:

- speak to PSU faculty and administrators who are involved in the PSU EXITO grant
- speak to Provost Jeffords about her experience with an ADVANCE grant on a different campus
- read successful ADVANCE proposals/reports
- refine our ideas for a PSU project and identify a grant writer

#### **Recommendations:**

We want to preface this section with the statement that, while we call these recommendations, we see them more as expectations. We believe strongly that all of these items should already



exist on campus, and recognize that, in some cases, these items do exist in name, or existed in the past. We realize that the problem in many instances is one of inadequate staffing. We therefore call for funding to be restored to units such as OGD I so that they can reactivate processes that have been discontinued. In some cases, the problem is one of compliance with existing mandates or programs. People are busy—we understand—so when there are competing demands on a person’s attention, we need to find ways of making our demands regarding diversity rise above other priorities. As explained below, we suggest the use of tracking, data, and a system of accountability.

It goes without saying, but we shall nonetheless point out, that a commitment to (1) improving faculty searches so that they attract a more diverse candidate pool and lead to greater diversity in hiring, and (2) creating a campus climate and support structures that allow diverse faculty to thrive on our campus so that we can retain a more diverse faculty, is both a legal obligation and a moral imperative. But the obligation extends beyond considerations of our commitments as an equal opportunity employer, and includes our responsibility to meet the needs of our increasingly diverse student body. As ***The Portland State University Task Force on Asian-American, Asian and Pacific Islander Student Success Final Report, June 20, 2017*** points out:

“Studies have shown that cultural representation among faculty and staff on college campuses is needed to prevent and reduce the negative effects caused by the model minority myth and to increase sense of belonging among AAAP I students (Yeh, 2004; Poon et al., 2016). Meaningful relationship and interactions with faculty, for example, has been shown to be a predictor of academic success (Lundberg & Schreiner) and to be associated with a broad range of positive outcomes, including above average college GPA, social and civic ability, academic satisfaction, and political engagement (Kim, Chang & Park, 2009). When compared to students from other racial/ethnic groups, however, AAAP I students tend to have lower rates of interaction and were less likely to have high-quality relationships with faculty (Kim, Chang & Park, 2009). Language barriers and lack of cultural connection have been cited in the literature as reasons for low student-faculty interaction among AAAP I college students.” (p. 10)

## 1. Exit Interviews.

The committee understands that HR is interested in conducting exit interviews of faculty who leave the university, but that they are not yet able to reach all faculty. We feel strongly that exit interviews must be a priority for our institution. To that end, we recommend that Interim President Percy direct HR to implement a system for contacting faculty in a timely manner, and encouraging them to participate in an exit interview. The focus should be on reaching faculty who leave the university prior to retirement, so that we can compile data about why people leave. That data should inform our work on developing and implementing retention strategies.

We note that Initiative 2.1 of the Strategic Plan's Goal "Expand Our Commitment to Equity," reads: "Adopt best practices for recruitment, retention and advancement of diverse faculty, staff and administrators to better reflect the diversity of the student body." One proposed strategy to achieve this goal is: "Hiring staff in the Office of Human Resources with specific expertise in the recruitment, transition, and retention of employees from diverse backgrounds." We encourage HR to work with their staff who possess this expertise to design and conduct the exit interviews so that the data collection is done professionally and thoroughly. We also encourage a system of accountability to ensure that this practice, once established, continues moving forward.

We also note that the *PSU President's African American, African, and Black Student Success Task Force Report, 2017* reaches the same conclusion:

"Finally, PSU needs to collect qualitative data on why people leave their positions. Given data showing that 28 Black identified employees left PSU from 2015 to 2016--over 20% of the Black employees at PSU--it is critical to understand why retention is not occurring. All of this data is critical to understanding how the university can be recruit, retain, and support Black faculty and staff." (p. 38)

## 2. Search Committee : DEI Search Advocates.

The committee recognizes that PSU had begun to train campus members to serve as DEI search advocates, but that the effort stalled due to insufficient staffing in OGD I to administer the program and a lack of incentives for potential advocates. We understand the need to respect employees' workload, and so call for a priority hire in OGD I so that the search advocate program can be implemented as designed. The ultimate goal should be that every search committee for fulltime faculty members and administrators will include a DEI search advocate who serves on the committee solely in that role. Ideally, the advocate should come from a different department or unit from the one conducting the search.

We note that Initiative 2.1 of the Strategic Plan's Goal "Expand Our Commitment to Equity," reads: "Adopt best practices for recruitment, retention and advancement of diverse faculty, staff and administrators to better reflect the diversity of the student body." One proposed strategy to achieve this goal is: "Modernizing the university's search and hiring practices to better reflect the unique strengths offered by faculty and staff from non-dominant backgrounds." Campuses across the state, region, and nation have adopted the system of search advocates, and so should we modernize and align our procedures with best practices.

- A. The committee recommends that no search at the level of Associate Dean, Vice-Provost, Vice-President, or above be conducted without a designated DEI search

advocate. This recommendation should be implemented immediately and without exception.

- B. The committee recommends that OGD I draw up a 5-year plan so that, at the end of 5 years, every single search for a fulltime faculty member includes a DEI search advocate on the search committee.

Finally, we feel it is important to state that there is no reason to reinvent the wheel on this front. OSU has a search advocate program that is nationally recognized. One of the original developers of the OSU program is now in PSU's Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion. With a dedicated hire in OGD I, PSU could implement a successful program.

We note that the ***PSU President's African American, African, and Black Student Success Task Force Report, 2017*** reaches the same conclusion:

“Other institutions across the nation address these issues by providing an “equity representative” on the hiring committee who has no stakes in the position being filled and whose role it to make sure that the process and deliberations are equitable, consistent for each candidate, and in partnership with the committee Chair, discriminatory acts are called out and dealt with immediately.” (p. 39)

That same report also focuses on the same categories of searches that we highlight as needing particular attention:

“Two particular hiring procedures need to be called out for particular attention: hiring for tenure-track faculty by faculty search committees; and hires of high-level administrators that have search firm support.” (p.39)

### **3. Inclusive Hiring Workshop.**

The committee notes that, despite stated requirements for all members of search committees to participate in an inclusive hiring workshop, this expectation is not monitored and is not consistently applied across campus. We recommend that participants receive a certificate at the end of the workshop, that HR, OAA, or OGD I track the names of persons awarded a certificate, and that OAA not approve a search unless all members of the search committee have been verified to have completed a mandatory inclusive hiring workshop.

We note that the ***PSU President's African American, African, and Black Student Success Task Force Report, 2017*** reaches the same conclusion about the importance of training, and goes further to argue that training should be extended to all members of a department hiring tenure-track faculty :

“Search committees may receive training, but other faculty also need to be reminded of equity and inclusion considerations as well as basic legalities around equal employment opportunity so that candidates are treated fairly and deliberations do not consider statuses that are illegal to include. All faculty who are involved in searches, not just committees, need this information.” (p.39)

#### 4. DEI Candidate Statement.

- A. We recommend that a DEI statement be made mandatory for candidates in all academic searches.

We note that some PSU schools/colleges require candidates for faculty positions to submit a diversity statement, as do some PSU departments that are in schools/colleges that do not require such statements. We consider the requirement of candidate DEI statements as an example of modernizing the university’s search and hiring practices, a strategy cited above to help meet Initiative 2.1 of the Strategic Plan’s Goal “Expand Our Commitment to Equity.”

We note that the *PSU President’s African American, African, and Black Student Success Task Force Report, 2017* similarly emphasizes the importance of evaluating a candidate’s DEI skills:

“Currently, PSU job descriptions include boilerplate language on cultural competency and diversity skills, but they are not tailored to the position nor considered very seriously as linked to candidate evaluation and eventually to job performance evaluation. PSU HR partners should work with hiring managers/committees to develop seriously these concepts in job descriptions, and help to develop evaluation metrics for discerning DEI skills in a candidate’s resume, statements, and at the interview.” (p. 38)

And also:

“For faculty hiring, particularly faculty who will play a teaching role, the DEI skills related to teaching must be seriously included and evaluated in order to ensure that diverse candidates are fully considered and that all instructors will be able to teach Black and other POC students.” (p.39)

- B. We recommend that search committee members assess candidate DEI statements using a common rubric.

This is another example where implementation can be swift if we do not feel compelled to reinvent the wheel. UC Berkeley has developed a rubric for assessing

candidate contributions to DEI, and other campuses have adopted their rubric. We suggest that PSU do likewise. The rubric can be found here:

[https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/rubric\\_to\\_assess\\_candidate\\_contributions\\_to\\_diversity\\_equity\\_and\\_inclusion.pdf](https://ofew.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/rubric_to_assess_candidate_contributions_to_diversity_equity_and_inclusion.pdf)

## 5. DATA.

The committee requested data in a desire to track which units were successful in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, and which units were falling behind. It became apparent that the way the university collects data, for a variety of reasons including federal requirements, did not allow for a clear picture of what was happening in faculty ranks.

Why are data so important to us? First, if there are units that are having success on our campus, we want to be able to share their strategies and encourage other units to adopt them. Second, if there are units with particularly weak records, we need to ask why, and see what could be done to improve the performance.

We had a good conversation with HR, and are developing a definition for faculty, and STEM faculty, so that analysis of the last 5 years of faculty data can be made available. We recommend that HR continue to track the numbers of faculty for future DAC Committees on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty. Once the dataset has been defined, future tracking should be easy, and it will allow the committee to see where progress has been made, and where progress (and even, perhaps, intervention) is needed. It should be noted that we are emphasizing faculty who have meaningful contact with students, as our priority is for students to benefit from faculty diversity.

We note that the ***PSU President's African American, African, and Black Student Success Task Force Report, 2017*** shares our concerns about data collection and analysis:

“Currently the institution is unable to accurately and consistently track the numbers of Black identified staff that go through our employment application process. Better tracking is necessary from time of application, through the entire hiring process, including once candidates are offered or denied employment. For example, we need data to track the number of Black candidates that apply for positions, their percentage in that overall pool, the number invited for interviews, the number offered positions, and the number who accept PSU job offers. Taking this disaggregated job tracking further, we need to begin tracking how long Black employees stay in their positions and rates of promotion within the university. Lastly, PSU needs to collect qualitative data on why people leave their positions. Given data showing that 28 Black identified employees left PSU from 2015 to 2016--over 20% of the Black employees at PSU--it is critical to

understand why retention is not occurring. All of this data is critical to understanding how the university can be recruit, retain, and support Black faculty and staff.” (p.38)

## **6. Data-based Leadership and Assessment.**

We recommend that the university President assess the Provost annually on the basis of these data, and that the provost assess the deans annually on their progress in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. Our sense is that adequate progress will not be made across all units of campus if diversity remains “a nice thing to do” and an abstract goal. Unless deans are held accountable in some way for progress in the area of diversity, it will not rise to the top of what they expect from chairs and departments. If equity, diversity, and inclusion are indeed principle values of our institution, we must track our achievements and hold campus leaders accountable.

## **7. Institutional Support.**

We recognize that it is not fair to hold people accountable for results when we do not provide them with adequate tools. The committee has noticed that some schools/colleges have a Diversity Coordinator of some kind, while others do not. We recommend that dedicated staff be available to all units and at the college level to support and monitor progress in diversity. We acknowledge that the campus will soon welcome a new VP of Diversity who will come with her own thoughts and strategies about organizing, and might have preferences for either college/school-specific appointments, or a more centralized approach. The committee’s concern is that there be appropriate levels of support and an expectation of progress.

## Temporary P/NP Policy Changes Proposal/Discussion for Fall 2020

**Current Situation for Spring/Summer 2020:** In April the Faculty Senate approved a temporary change to various P/NP grading policies, in response to the COVID pandemic and the resulting transition to fully remote course delivery in spring and summer terms. At the time, they also extended the changes to fall 2020, should we remain fully remote.

The full policy can be found here: [Spring/Summer 2020 Temporary P/NP Policy Changes](#)

The key elements of the policy are summarized as follows:

1. **Graded Only Courses** - Allows colleges/departments to offer Graded Only courses as P/NP Optional. (Some colleges made college-wide decisions to offer all Graded Only courses with the P/NP Option.)
2. **Relaxation of Academic Restrictions** -
  - a. Allows any Pass grades earned in spring/summer to be used without restriction towards major/program requirements,
  - b. Pass grades earned spring/summer will not count against degree limitations,
  - c. Allows Pass grades earned in spring/summer in prerequisite courses to be used for entry into the subsequent courses.
3. **Extended Deadline for Students to Change their Grading Option** - To give students more time to evaluate how they are managing in the remote environment, the Grade Option change deadline was moved from Week 7 to Week 10.
4. **Transcript Notation** - To help downstream consumers of the transcript (i.e. medical and graduate schools, employers, etc.) understand the context for the use of P/NP grading during this period, a transcript notation will be added that says: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic PSU allowed increased use of the Pass/No-Pass grading option.

### Fall 2020 Instructional Planning Scenarios

There is a good chance that fall instructional delivery will not be fully Remote, but will include some measure of return to in-person, face-to-face courses, along with continued Remote offerings. The two planning scenarios under consideration include:

- Scenario #1: Primarily Remote w/Limited F2F is a continuation of Remote, with very restricted/limited F2F for labs/studio-type courses where hands on activity and access to specialized equipment and space is required.
- Scenario #2: Variety of Delivery Types would provide a more balanced combination/variety, with a significant number of F2F courses and a significant number of Remote courses.

### **P/NP Policy Question for Fall 2020:**

If PSU is able to move from Fully Remote in fall 2020, to either Scenario 1 or 2 described above, do we want to extend the Temporary P/NP Policy to fall or revert back to the standard policy?

Options to consider:

- A. Revert back to the standard, pre-COVID P/NP Policy if either Scenario 1 or 2 is adopted.
- B. Maintain the current Temporary P/NP Policy during fall term, under both Scenario 1 and 2.

**Competing Rationale** to consider in weighing decision:

- **Remote No Longer a Surprise:** Either way, students should be expecting remote learning in fall and it is no longer a 'surprise' that needs to be mitigated by the policy exception.
- **COVID Stress & Disruption Continues** - the pandemic will still be generating stress and disruption for students beyond the novelty of remote learning (i.e. child care, tending to impacted family members, etc.). The continuation of the policy will mitigate the stressors in some measure.
- **UG and GR Policies Should Align** - having separate policies will be messy and introduce confusion. The Temporary P/NP Policy already allows colleges/units to decide whether they want to offer a Graded Only course as P/NP Optional. This should provide sufficient flexibility for GR programs that do not want to expand the P/NP Option.

**By the Numbers:**

**Spring 2019:** End of term

786 sections offered optional grading (695 UG and 91 GR)



858 = The number of individual course registrations where students selected the P/NP Option (excludes P/NP Only courses)

**Spring 2020:**

1,742 sections offered optional grading (1,261 UG and 481 GR)

April 16th snapshot = 1,039 course registrations taken P/NP (excluding P/NP Only)

June 2nd snapshot = 7,254 course registrations taken P/NP (excluding P/NP Only)

\*\* There was a steady increase each week, with a surge in Weeks 8 & 9, as students took advantage of the 2 week deadline extension.

Those 7,254 courses were taken by 4,148 individual students broken down as follows:

UG - 3,556 students

GR - 455 students

PB - 111 students

NA - 26 students

**How many GR courses that were Graded Only by design chose to offer P/NP Option in Spring?**

While we do not have an accurate accounting of this, a gross estimate is that 60-70% converted to P/NP Optional.

Some colleges/academic units made a college wide decision to change ALL GR & UG Graded Only to P/NP Optional.

Others chose to keep GR Graded Only courses as Graded Only.

**Statement and Resolution Against Racism and Discrimination  
and in Support of Underrepresented Faculty, Students, and Staff**  
Faculty Senate Steering Committee

**Statement**

As we stand in shock and mourn the death of George Floyd, being reminded of the death of Jason Washington on our campus in 2018 and of the many black lives unjustly lost at the hands of the police; as we learn of the higher impact of COVID-19 in communities of color, due to systemic inequities; and as we continue to witness the discrimination and violence perpetrated daily against people of color, women, transgender people, and other targeted groups in the US and at its borders, it is imperative that we ourselves break our silence and help to stop the inertia that have allowed these human abuses to continue for so long. It is our moral responsibility and our obligation to care for and ensure the safety and inclusion of communities of color and underrepresented individuals. We must make a conscious effort to go beyond words and good intentions and not only demand change but also enact change amongst ourselves.

In our higher education environment, we have the chance to implement policies that can make a difference in our university and our communities: through our curriculum, we can educate our students on the history and current patterns of dominance and oppression--the suffering and deaths that this has caused and the people who have bravely fought it in different time periods, in the US and around the world. We can help our students to acquire the knowledge and skills that they need to be empathic and ethical human beings. We can also implement hiring and retention practices to ensure that faculty, staff, and students of color come and stay at PSU and that they feel represented and supported. We can create a safe environment where no one feels harassed or threatened, or lives in fear. These are only a few examples of the many ways we could redress these long-standing issues.

To succeed at taking vigorous and effective steps to end these inequalities and prevent future deaths and violence, we all must stand in solidarity and acknowledgement that racism and discrimination are systemic problems. We must then take immediate action through the means and channels available to us and we must recruit the help of our administrations, boards, and legislators. We encourage our administration, Board of Trustees, and the PSU community as a whole to pay close attention to the PSU student, faculty, and staff voices and statements underscoring the diversity, equity, and inclusion problems that we currently face and providing recommendations. We also ask them to partner with us in making the necessary changes to resolve these problems as soon as possible, so PSU can be regarded as a safe, inclusive, and supportive university for us all. The following resolution is specifically directed to our administration with the purpose of requesting their assistance in these efforts.

**Resolution**

**Faculty Senate, as the representative of the Faculty, RESOLVES that the PSU administration:**

- 1) Work together with the Faculty to take immediate action regarding the recommendations of the resolutions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been approved by the Faculty Senate during academic years 2018-20.
- 2) Present by October 15th 2020 to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee a plan of action, to be discussed and approved by the Faculty Senate in Fall 2020, aimed at effectively addressing and resolving PSU's diversity, equity, and inclusion problems in a sustained manner and, once the action plan is approved, to provide quarterly reports to the Faculty Senate detailing the actions taken, their immediate impact, and expected long-term outcomes.

## **Faculty Senate Budget Committee Annual Report May 22, 2020**

**Members:** Tina Anctil (COE), Candace Avalos (AO-SALP), Michael Bowman (LIB), Steven Boyce (CLAS-Sci, MTH, Co-Chair), Mitchell Cruzan (CLAS-Sci, BIO, Co-Chair), David Hansen (SBA), Erik Geschke (COTA, ART&D), Sam Gioia (SSW), Brenda Glascott (OI, HON), Arthur Hendricks (EPC co-chair, ex-officio), Chia Yin Hsu (CLAS-SS, HST), Martin Lafrenze (CLAS-Sci, GGR), Janice Lee (CLAS-AL, ENG), Derek Tretheway (MCECS, ME), Melody Valadini (CUPA, PS), Stephen Walton (CLAS-AL, WLL), Mitchell West (student), Bradley Wipfli (SPH, HSMP).

**Consultants:** David Burgess (OIRP), Susan Jeffords (OAA), Andria Johnson (BO), Kathi Ketcheson (OIRP), David Maddox (OAA), Kevin Reynolds (FADM).

### **Committee Charge and Roles**

The Budget Committee has a multipart charge:

- 1) Consult with the President and his or her designee(s) and make recommendations for the preparation of the annual and biennial budgets.
- 2) Consult with academic leaders of colleges/schools, Intensive English Language Program, and University Studies, and make recommendations for the preparations of their annual budgets and enrollment plans. Each Budget Committee member from one of the above listed units shall serve as liaison to his/her unit for this purpose, with other members assigned as liaisons as needed.
- 3) Recommend budgetary priorities.
- 4) Analyze budgetary implications of new academic programs or program changes through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the program, and report this to the Senate.
- 5) Analyze budgetary implications of the establishment, abolition, or major alteration of the structure or educational function of departments, schools, colleges, or other significant academic entities through the review of a business plan that anticipates and provides for the long-term financial viability of the unit, and report this to the Senate.
- 6) Consult regarding changes from budgets as prepared.
- 7) Review expenditures of public and grant funding as requested by the Faculty Senate.
- 8) Recommend to the President and to the Senate policies to be followed in implementing any declaration of financial exigency.
- 9) Report to the Senate at least once each year.

## Budget Principles

Several years ago, the Committee developed guiding principles that were shared with OAA and the University Budget Team to be considered in prioritization of budgetary decisions. The document has evolved and has been updated over the years. In Fall 2017, the Committee developed statements that address equity issues in budgetary decisions. This budget principles document has continued to be shared among deans and fiscal officers, in addition to the OAA budget team. This document is available at

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Dfdi2ziCcL7G4883yYDTQ\\_9gEAO-6rrinJVILezKqW4/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Dfdi2ziCcL7G4883yYDTQ_9gEAO-6rrinJVILezKqW4/edit)

## FY21 OAA Budget Process

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) follows a budget process called Integrated Planning of Enrollment and Budget (IPEB). This budget process has the revenue generating units develop two plans, the enrollment plan and the strategic investment plan. Enrollment plans detail the student enrollment outlook. These are accompanied by enrollment narratives that explain the impact on students via persistence, recruitment, degree completion, and program management strategies. Strategic investment plans detail proposed budget changes and are based on new initiatives plans while meeting OAA directives. This year, due to lower overall enrollment in Summer and Fall 2020 than had been projected for FY2020, units in OAA were directed to prepare strategic plans for FY2021 that were flat from the FY2020 budget, with restricted spending of reserves, with limited opportunities for investments beyond meeting the service level in FY2020. Members of the Budget Committee participated in the November Faculty Budget Forums led by Susan Jeffords and Dave Maddox.

The Budget Committee liaisons met with the Deans in December and January to have a preliminary conversation about their plans before units completed enrollment plans for FY21. The Committee was able to review the submitted enrollment plans and strategic planning narratives during the Winter term. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, follow-up meetings with units were delayed but were completed by the end of the Spring term. At least a pair of FSCB members reviewed each unit's enrollment plan, budget reduction scenarios, strategic investment plan, and strategic planning narratives, and provided feedback to OAA about our observations, including common and unique strategies suggested by units (see Appendix).

## University Budget

The committee received periodic updates on the university budget by Andria Johnson and Kevin Reynolds. The first presentation in October by Andria Johnson included a recap from FY19 and an update on FY20. This presentation also focused on the university budget process for new and returning committee members. The second presentation led by Kevin Reynolds in February focused on FY21, including budget context, enrollment projections, cost drivers, forecasts, and tuition.

As part of the tuition setting process, FADM established the [Tuition Review Advisory Committee \(TRAC\)](#). The main charge of this committee is to provide recommendations to the President about tuition policy. The committee aims to involve students in the tuition setting process and a number of ASPSU representatives are involved in the committee. Budget Committee co-chairs have been invited to serve on this committee and provide the committee's perspective on the topic. The co-chairs have gathered members' input on what the university should consider when setting tuition policy and shared the faculty feedback with TRAC. In response to TRAC meetings outcomes, the Budget Committee prepared a statement regarding the proposed tuition increase for the April Faculty Senate meeting.

The third university budget update, led by Kevin Reynolds, was on May 4. This update focused on the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on PSU's budget and discussions about how the Budget Committee could be involved with budgeting decisions for FY21 taking place over the summer, as there is currently great uncertainty regarding state funding and enrollment projections.

### **Budget Model Working Group**

Beginning in the 2018-2019 AY, Associate Provost Dave Maddox convened an ad-hoc committee and Working Group to explore models and recommend a new model for budgeting at PSU. The Budget Committee had a member on this committee and provided feedback on preliminary recommendations in November. We expect the Budget Model Working Group recommendations to be included in discussions of a process for academic program reorganization initiated by Provost Jeffords and Faculty Senate Steering in Spring 2020.

### **PSU Board of Trustees**

The co-chairs have been invited to participate in the Board's Finance & Administration Committee meetings and one of the co-chairs has attended each meeting thus far. The committee meeting minutes including Kevin Reynold's presentations and budget updates can be found at: [Board F&A Committee](#).

### **Curricular Proposal Reviews**

The committee has reviewed 65 proposals for new programs, program changes, or program elimination. The proposals are reviewed by two-person or three-person review panels which report their recommendations (no significant impact/modest impact/significant impact) to the committee via an online google document. This system enables other committee members to review and comment on proposals not assigned to them. Major proposals such as those for completely new programs are discussed in committee meetings. The final recommendation is posted in the curriculum proposal system. This year we switched to corresponding with Andreen Morris directly through google docs ( curricular proposal reviews were previously sent via separate email once complete) which made this process more efficient.

## Appendix: Summary of IPEB Document Review

The following table and statements are based on FY 2021 IPEB documents submitted by each unit at PSU. At least a pair of FSCB members reviewed each unit's enrollment plan, strategic planning narratives, budget reduction scenarios, and strategic investment plans. The findings and recommendations were discussed at FSBC meetings.

	<b>Common strategies</b>	<b>Unique strategies</b>
<b>Enrollment Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly agree with the OIRP projections</li> <li>• Adjustments upward for anticipated growth in new programs</li> <li>• Adjustments downward due to anticipated need to reduce expenditures next year.</li> <li>• Great deal of uncertainty due to COVID-19</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enrollment forecast limited by current capacity/resources (COTA, Honors)</li> <li>• Increase over OIRP's forecast in some programs (MCECS/COE)</li> <li>Investment in Recruiting Staff (HON, SPH)</li> </ul>
<b>Reduction Scenarios</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holding faculty and administrative lines vacant</li> <li>• Reducing course offerings</li> <li>• Reserve spending</li> <li>• Investment of faculty resources in FY21 to prepare to offer new programs in FY22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural reorganization within units, such as merging operations, changing admin/staff mix (UNST, COE, IELP).</li> <li>• Requiring more research supports to be funded externally (MCECS)</li> <li>• Potential enrollment cap changes due to COVID (MCECS)</li> <li>Differential tuition increases to counter budget restrictions (SSW)</li> </ul>
<b>Strategic Investment Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic investment plans were not funded due to OAA budget reductions</li> </ul>	
<b>Strategic Planning Narratives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted marketing/recruitment/retention efforts are valued/needed</li> <li>• Increase faculty involvement in advising</li> <li>• Create new degree programs (both between units and within units)</li> <li>• Writing/tutoring centers in individual units to support student success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New/growing programs in Data/Computer Science/Analytics (SB, MCECS, CLAS) but require investment in marketing, recruitment and retention to be successful</li> </ul>

## Observations/Suggestions

1. Previous practices of not filling TT faculty lines and cutting GA positions are at a point where further cuts' negative impact on revenue outweigh cost savings. Continuing to hold faculty positions vacant is likely to continue to affect retention and recruitment of junior faculty. It has the potential to jeopardize accreditation and the ability to deliver quality educational experiences to students.
2. There are promising collaborations in areas of data science, data analytics, and computer science that have been projected to increase enrollment, but these will require marketing, recruitment, and retention investments to be successful.
3. Strategic narratives' descriptions of recruitment, marketing, and fundraising efforts suggest wide variation in units' activities in these areas; we suggest analysis of the return on investment (and loss from lack of investment) in comparison with centralized efforts.
4. Some units have been internally funding academic student support centers, such as writing or tutoring centers, which may be better to house centrally.
5. Some units expressed concerns about the impact of the new centralized advising system on student success and SCH; evaluation of the levels of support students and faculty are receiving in comparison with the previous advising models is recommended.
6. COVID-19 has led to increased uncertainty regarding enrollment projections. It is important that reserves are maintained so that units can be afforded the flexibility and resources to respond swiftly to fluctuations in demand and modality.
7. The steep level of cuts proposed to IELP's 2021 budget are correlated with declines in international student enrollment. There is concern that enacting the proposed cuts could accelerate these declines by requiring substantial staffing reductions that further reduce PSU's ability to attract and retain international students. Opportunities for growth in programs for international non-degree students and unclear status of international partnerships also point to a need for analyses of costs and benefits of international partnerships.

## Appendix: Questions to VP FADM and Responses, Faculty Senate, 6/8/20

Questions to consider for future budgeting and enrollment.

1. Governor Brown ordered (on Monday, April 27) that state agencies prepare budget reductions of 8.5% for the biennium (this would correspond to 17% in the upcoming academic year because funds have already been spent for the first half of the fiscal year). Because the state allocation to PSU in FY20 was approximately \$105 million, this would correspond to an unanticipated cut in FY21 of approximately \$17 million dollars. This 8.5% revenue reduction represents 5.2% of the total E&G revenue for FY20. Additionally, it represents 3.1% of the All Funds revenue, including Auxiliary Services. How is the university responding?

*As you can imagine, the target set for HECC by the state to plan for a 17% reduction in state funding across the biennium is daunting. The Governor's Office has asked the Higher Education Coordinating Committee to coordinate responses for higher education. The university has examined possible scenarios for responding to budget reductions and provided to the HECC an estimation of what this level of reduction would mean in terms of tuition increases, or in reductions. As the majority of our E&G costs are personnel, we have provided estimations of what these reductions would mean in terms of layoffs or compensation decreases.*

*The HECC summary can be found here*

*<https://www.oregon.gov/highered/about/Documents/News-Updates/HECC-DAS-CFO-Agency-Reduction-OptionsGF-Final-5-11-20.pdf>*

*While we are required to undertake planning and provide estimates for a possible 8.5% reduction in each year of this biennium (17% across the two-year biennium), it has not yet been determined that this is the actual budget we will receive. We will not know this until the state legislature makes budget decisions*

2. Last Sunday, April 26th, KATU News reported:

Despite so many uncertainties, like when campus will reopen, Knepfle believes that PSU will have a full class this fall and for years to come. 'From looking at enrollment trends during times of recession nationwide, schools like Portland State tend to attract more students during periods of uncertainty,' he explained. 'Students want to stay closer to home and students want to go somewhere where there is less financial burden on them.'

<https://katu.com/news/coronavirus/changes-made-to-recruit-students-during-pandemic-may-continue-after-coronavirus>

Given this development and contradicting data about enrollments correlating with previous economic factors, what are the new enrollment projections for FY21? What are the corresponding revenue projections for FY21?

*The question that the reporter asked, and that the story was focused on, was new student enrollments. Knepfle explained in all budget forums, and when he met with the FSBC, that a significant event, like an economic downturn, could have positive impacts on PSU's **new student** enrollment.*



*We are doing all we can to assess several factors that may impinge about student enrollment, both for incoming freshman and transfer students and returning PSU students. Multiple factors likely will influence enrollment decisions including the economic recession, (will we experience the traditional counter cyclical pattern of enrollment growth during economic downturn), safety concerns about in-person classes and campus life, experiences with and preferences for remote and on-line learning, concerns of parents, and the situation of students whose lives have changed due to employment, home and family care, transportation and other factors. We are working diligently to clarify our fall plans for instruction and campus life. We are also engaged in outreach and recruitment that may attract students in the greater Portland area who are enrolled at other universities to consider enrollment at PSU in the fall.*

*All of this said, we must be cognizant of the multi-year, persistent decline in student enrollment at PSU. Like most other universities, we face the pressure of demographics (fewer students graduating from high school), student financial pressures, variable interests in courses of study, and other factors. **Overall** enrollment decline at PSU is as much (and potentially more so) a function of the many years of new student declines, than in any projection of new student enrollments into the future. The overall enrollment at PSU is likely to continue to decline for 3-5 more years even if we have an uptick in new student enrollments—unless the pandemic creates major changes in student preferences for higher education.*

*Between the volatility of the current economic climate, and the uncertainty regarding whether PSU will be online, in-person, or some kind of hybrid in the fall, any attempt to project how those factors will impact our fall overall enrollments would be premature and extremely preliminary. We likely won't have a solid enrollment projection until well into September.*

3. Please provide an update on plans for reserve spending during the 2020-2021 academic year. How are budget cuts (based on expected CSLs) affecting units across the university? How are non-revenue generating units reducing spending? Are reductions targeted? Other than Auxiliary Services, and excluding vacant positions, will FY20 positions be eliminated from the FY21 budget? If so, how many positions? How many of these positions revenue producing positions?

*The current FY21 general fund budget is flat from FY20 and uses \$11 million of E&G reserves. 50% of that will be from Central reserves and the other from unit management reserves. \$8.1 million of the proposed OAA FY21 \$211 million General Fund budget will be provided by \$4.05 million central and \$4.05 million OAA reserves. This material has been provided to the FSBC and can be found in the FSBC google shared drive [here](#). Any significant additional spending of E&G reserves would exceed the direction of \$11-13 million use of reserves provided by the F&A committee of the Board of Trustees in January and would not be financially prudent. Preliminary FY21 management reserve plans have been submitted and are currently being reviewed. On March 5, 2020 the Interim President announced a Strategic Hiring Freeze for positions funded by E&G funds first, as the result of larger than expected enrollment decline and then, augmented given anticipated revenue*

losses associated with the pandemic. The freeze currently includes an exemption process. Budget cuts for FY21 thus far have mostly impacted the ability to hire for new or vacant positions in both revenue generating and non-revenue generating units. In many cases individuals have been taking on additional work and some non essential work is being delayed.

4. Please provide an update on how operations costs have declined (in dollars, and as a percentage) due to the closure of the University.

*Our current forecasts for FY20 are for a \$15 million loss in revenue (all funds basis) through the end of the fiscal year and for \$4.5 million in savings. A more detailed summary has been provided to the FSBC and can be found in the FSBC shared drive [here](#). The impacts to FY21 depend on multiple factors and is it too early to make a forecast given the uncertainties about when and the extent to which campus operations return to more normal conditions.*

5. Please discuss the impact of the current COVID-19 crisis on the budgets of Auxiliary Services including Student Housing, Parking Services, University Place, and dining services on campus including businesses that would normally pay rent, but are currently shuttered (e.g., stores on the first floor of the Broadway Building).

- a. How are these units absorbing expected funding shortages?

*Housing (including dining services) is estimating a net loss of \$3.9 million, Parking \$2.3 million and University Place \$700 thousand. The financial impact on each of these and other areas of the university is provided in the [COVID-19 LossTracking for Spring](#) which was provided to the FSBC. Most of these units are absorbing funding shortages in the short term by accessing their available Working Capital reserves in addition to placing a number of PSU employees on Leave Without Pay with Extended Benefits. Chartwells has also reduced the number of employees.*

- b. Does Auxiliary Services maintain management reserves? If so, what was the reserve level at the beginning of FY20? What was this reserve level as a percentage of the Auxiliary Services FY20 budget?

*Auxiliary and self-support units do not maintain management reserves but are required to have Working Capital, Capital Reserves and Treasury Reserves per the Board of Trustees Reserves Management Policy (found at the following link): <https://www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/Reserves%20Management%20Policy.pdf>.)*

*Auxiliaries should maintain Working Capital equal to 3 months of annual operating expenses as required by Reserves Management Policy, the definition of these funds and the amounts in each are reported annually to the university through the Financial Dashboard (see pages 22-24 for reserves detail).*

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/165zLxztYldkC-OZRanxGx582CyNWHz60/view>

- c. To what extent is the General Fund revenue (in dollars, and as a percentage) used to support Auxiliary Services?

*With the exception of Athletics, general fund revenue is not used to support the operations of Auxiliary Services. The general fund does provide for \$5.58 million in debt support to Auxiliary Services annually. However this debt support is for Auxiliary buildings or spaces that have been transitioned to, or built in part for, education and general purposes. For example, when the Housing Department constructed the Broadway Building, the design incorporated general purpose classrooms, study space and a computer lab. The general fund provides support for the debt housing incurred to construct this space. So the \$5.58M is for general fund space*

6. Under what circumstances would the university declare exigency? What are the plans for including faculty in the decision-making process to implement cost-saving measures in the case of exigency? What would be the criteria for removing programs from the university?

*Exigency is likely a last resort response to a financial crisis. At the current time, we are doing extensive planning around possible contingencies and are taking multiple efforts to reduce costs. It is premature to consider exigency, though we cannot rule this out pending further information about the state's budget circumstances. Faculty involvement is clearly articulated in Article 22 of the current PSU AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement and campus leadership will fully comply with all elements outlined in Article 22 to include faculty engagement should exigency be considered.*

7. What will be the impact of CARES Act funding on the 2020-2021 budget? How will decisions be made on how these funds are spent? What provisions are being made to ensure faculty input on the decision-making process?

*These funds have not yet been received and we are continuing to clarify restrictions on their use. The \$8.4 million in institutional CARES Act funding is less than the \$15 million of lost revenue estimated for FY20, which will certainly grow in FY21. Many institutions plan to use these funds to help cover the loss in housing revenue associated with permitting students to cancel their contracts. PSU will solicit input on the use of these funds from the FSBC.*

8. PSU has been subjected to budget cuts (not meeting CSL) for a number of consecutive years, and this has reduced our ability to make structural changes that avoid negative impacts on our ability to adequately serve students. While some projections predict some enrollment increase in the fall of 2020, the state is already planning for funding cuts, so we can expect our state appropriation will be smaller in the 2021-2022 cycle. In addition, our expenses will increase substantially in the next biennium due to the increased cost of the retirement system.

- a. When, or under what conditions, will the hiring freezes in OAA and across the university be lifted?

*The necessity to review hiring decisions will continue until the university budget has stabilized and significant budget reductions are no longer required to balance the budget.*

- b. Given these conditions and other possible stresses on finances, what are the long-term plans for ensuring that PSU will continue to offer diverse and high-quality curricula to our students?

*Given the changes that PSU faces - demographic shifts, economic changes, changing patterns of student enrollment and degree-seeking, and now COVID-19 - it behooves us to engage in longer-term discussions about how the university can adapt to these varying disruptions. We expect that the Faculty Senate will be an important partner in these discussions.*

*Any of these discussions will take as their foundation the core values and mission of the university and the commitment to offering students a diverse and*

*high-quality curriculum. As we have been developing our budgets under tight constraints, the Office of the Provost has worked very closely with the schools and colleges to make sure that we are able to offer the full array of courses and sections necessary for students to meet their educational goals. This has involved a variety of staffing and funding solutions. We are committed to sustaining our long-term commitment to the Students First initiative and to advance our achievement of student success metrics.*

9. Please discuss the reasoning for the merger between the Intensive English Language Program (IELP) and the Office of International Affairs (OIA). What staff and faculty reductions are expected? How will the potential faculty reductions affect the ability of IELP to offer a curriculum that will adequately serve PSU students?

*The merger between IELP and OIA, which was voted on by the IELP faculty, brings together two units whose core mission is serving international students. This shared commitment means that there are opportunities for sharing support and operational services that can benefit both units. Because of the significant decline in enrollment of international students, IELP will need to respond to how it can continue to serve students while reviewing its offerings so as to decrease the significant budget shortfall in that unit. At this time, it is premature to specify faculty and staff reductions.*

# Report to Board of Trustees on Administrative Leadership

Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
June 2020

## Context: Shared Governance and Higher Education in the United States

The notion of shared governance, as officially stated, is almost a century old in the United States. The American Association for University Professors wrote its first statement on shared governance in 1920: "emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies." Their efforts culminated in the development of the [1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#). This seminal statement, which was jointly formulated with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, highlighted the fact that "A college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems."

Awareness of this interdependence and need for joint effort is now in 2020 more important than ever. The organizations that conceived the 1966 report, which remains central to shared governance discussions, have been proactive in helping higher education institutions to improve their shared governance conditions by conducting surveys, publishing reports with recommendations, and issuing tools to assist universities in determining the levels of effectiveness of their shared governance mechanisms. An example of these tools is the AAUP Evaluation of Shared Governance survey, based on Keetje Ramo's monograph [Assessing The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards](#) (1998), in which seven areas/key indicators of the state of shared governance at institutions of higher education are identified: 1. Climate for Governance, 2. Institutional Communication, 3. Board's Role, 4. President's Role, 5. Faculty's Role, 6. Joint Decision Making, 7. Assessing Structural Arrangements for Governance.

There seems to be in U.S. universities a generalized perception, reflected on surveys conducted by the universities as well as publications in outlets such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, that shared governance mechanisms can be significantly enhanced and that there are a number of obstacles that impede their optimal functioning, such as (to name a few culprits) lack of transparency, reliance on inadequate corporate models and practices, lack of faculty participation in decision-making, lack of sufficient understanding by the different constituents of each other's roles, and need for additional effective communication and work channels necessary to carry out the joint effort of governance. In addition to these obstacles, we often find a distorted or fragmented view of shared governance. This idea is illustrated by Steven Bahls in his *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*, where he describes the three traditional ways of looking at shared governance (as equal rights, as consultation, and as rules of engagement). These limited views of shared governance can be paired with a lack of recognition of the centrality of the Faculty's role, emanating from the centrality of teaching and research, the *raison d'être* of the University. The AAUP statement [On the](#)

[Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom](#) (1994) stresses this idea, reminding us of its connection to academic freedom:

Teaching and research are the very purpose of an academic institution and the reason why the public values and supports it. This means that the Faculty, who are responsible for carrying out those central tasks, should be viewed as having a special status within the institution. The Association has taken this view from its earliest days. Its first statement, the 1915 *Declaration of Principles*, declares that members of a Faculty “are the appointees, but not in any proper sense the employees,” of the trustees; they are partners with the trustees, and, as the 1915 *Declaration* states, the office of faculty member should be—indeed, it is in the public interest that the office of faculty member should be—“one both of dignity and of independence.” Allocation of authority to the faculty in the areas of its responsibility is a necessary condition for the faculty’s possessing that dignity and exercising that independence.

(<https://www.aaup.org/report/relationship-faculty-governance-academic-freedom>)

Public institutions such as PSU must address any obstacles and misconceptions about shared governance and optimize their processes in order to carry out the quality teaching and research work needed to serve our students and the community. In fulfilling the University's mission, the university administration supports and partners with faculty and trustees.

Both the American Association of American Professors and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges express deep interest in strengthening the processes of shared governance. A recent AGB report entitled "Shared Governance: Is OK Good Enough?" (2016) echoes the perception that shared governance in higher education in the United States can be improved. This report includes the results of surveys conducted among two groups (presidents/chancellors and governing boards), concluding that "Most presidents and board members from both public and independent institutions believe that shared governance is working adequately but could be more effective" (2), while highlighting its importance during "a time of serious challenges to higher education—among them declines in enrollment and funding, shifting demographics, and public critiques of value" (1). A year later, in 2017, the AGB issued a statement that further stressed the essential role of shared governance in these terms:

In higher education’s volatile environment, shared governance is essential. It adds substantial value to institutional progress and innovation. In fact, responsibility and accountability for addressing colleges’ and universities’ thorniest challenges often rest with multiple parties. Effective shared governance is about more than who is responsible for what. At its best, shared governance is about how key constituents in institutional communities—traditionally faculty, administrators, and board members—engage in achieving a commonly supported mission. For example, these groups customarily participate in strategic planning, institutional budgeting, and discussion of critical issues such as campus climate and student learning outcomes. (2)

This recognition of the key role of shared governance, as well as of the fact that "Boards, working with key administrators and faculty leaders, hold responsibility for ensuring that the practice of shared



governance embodies and advances institutional values," lead the AGB to present a number of recommended questions in their 2017 statement (p. 11):

## Questions for Boards to Ask

---

- How are new board members, faculty, and senior staff oriented to shared governance?
- How does the board learn about faculty work? How does the faculty learn about the board's role and responsibilities?
- How can the board contribute to an institutional culture of appropriate engagement and inclusion in decision making?
- What are the roles of students and staff in shared governance at our institution? Is the board satisfied with their engagement?
- What can the board chair do to demonstrate the board's commitment to shared governance? What does the president do?
- When did the institution last assess the state of its shared governance? What was the result? What has changed based on that assessment?
- How does the board engage with the faculty on matters of consequence?
- Are the priorities of the board, president, and faculty currently aligned on critical mission-related matters? Is there agreement on the strategic priorities of the institution? Which are important topics or questions for collaboration?
- How well would shared governance work at this institution in a crisis?

In addition to the initiatives and publications by relevant higher education organizations and groups, a body of literature on shared governance and leadership has emerged during the last few years that stresses the importance of important pillars such as communication, collaboration, and evaluation. In this vein, Sharon Cramer's edited collection (2 volumes) *Shared Governance in Higher Education* (SUNY Press, 2017) includes multiple voices and discusses, among other themes, faculty-student partnerships, shared accountability, and broad-based shared governance as well as best practices to improve its practice. In addition to this literature on shared governance, an increasing number of publications deal with the notion of shared leadership (see, among others, Kezar & Holcombe 2017 and the work of our own PSU Trustee and former President, Judith Ramaley and her team: Ramaley, Kezar & Elrod, in preparation). Shared leadership is characterized by collaboration and the inclusion of multiple perspectives and expertise, as well as interchangeable leader-follower roles, and constitutes an alternative to counterproductive top-down leadership styles in dealing with current higher education challenges.

## Shared Governance and Leadership at PSU

During the past year, multiple and productive conversations have taken place at PSU regarding shared governance and leadership, which have evidenced a positive change of direction towards a more dialogic, transparent, and collaborative leadership landscape. This shift has significantly restored the trust eroded by the events of the previous year surrounding the Presidency. Sources of the positive change include a new higher administration team with a highly collaborative approach, as well as the willingness from our Board of Trustees to reach out and establish a close dialogic relation with the Faculty.

That being said, significant concerns (gathered in Part 3 of this report) still remain. Addressing these concerns will enhance shared governance and shared leadership at PSU.

### Background

In Spring 2019, in the context of the controversies regarding the PSU presidency, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee issued a report to the Portland State Faculty Senate and the University on Administrative Leadership and Shared Governance (June 2019 Senate packet). This report highlighted some of the issues that had impeded an adequate functioning of shared governance at our university, including "the tendency of administrative leadership to make far-reaching structural decisions without adequate consultation" and stressed that "consultation, far from a weakness, is one of the hallmarks of great leadership. Consultation is all the more necessary in higher education, and critical to shared governance." The report further emphasized that "PSU possesses a rich array of administrative and faculty governance bodies whose wisdom, expertise, professional experience, and institutional memory are constantly available to guide the institution."

The 2019 Faculty Senate Steering Committee report also called upon the University to:

- Cease the practice of issuing major and permanent decisions during the months of June through September, when the organs of shared governance are not available to participate in the decision.
- Draw (whenever feasible) on the expertise of the faculty and staff, rather than contract with outside consultants.
- Not contract with external for-profit education providers to provide PSU curriculum, except with the approval of the faculty of the concerned academic unit and of the Senate.
- Adhere to our existing policies on alteration or transfer of an academic unit, which are available on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs ([www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/academic-units](http://www.pdx.edu/academic-affairs/academic-units)).

The report also expressed concerns about this pattern of non-consultative decision-making being replicated during summer 2019, particularly regarding "The selection of an interim president of the University and the selection of a search process for the president of the University, the significant changes that had been suggested in the Intensive English Language Program (IELP), including its proposed transfer to the Office of International Affairs, and its proposed partnership with Shorelight Education, and the renewal of Portland State's contract with the Confucius Institute, the full contract language having only recently been submitted to the Educational Policy Committee for review."



Finally, in PSU's context of a presidential crisis, the report urged the PSU community to "examine whether the office of the presidency in its current form is necessary to our mission, and even whether a better system of administration might be designed without a president. A quarter century ago PSU gained national recognition for boldly reimagining general education when we founded the University Studies Program. Today we find ourselves at the convergence of multiple crises of university leadership, at a time when our national democracy is also in crisis. We call upon the Faculty to consider whether it is now time to reimagine governance. Instead of a president, we could consider an executive council of vice president-level administrators promoted from the Faculty for limited terms, and a more collaborative relationship with the Board of Trustees, but all such details are open to discussion and reinvention. The first advantage of elimination of the presidency would be to save the cost of the presidential compensation package, funds that we could invest instead in faculty excellence and student success. Along with the Faculty and the larger Oregon Community, the Steering Committee has been alarmed to learn of the escalating size of presidential compensation packages, and the extraordinarily large severance package granted to the outgoing president, at the very time when we are forced to undertake severe budgetary cuts to programs and an unusually large tuition increase."

In order to initiate a constructive and meaningful discussion on administrative leadership and shared governance at PSU, the Steering Committee proposed to convene a Meeting of the Faculty, as described by the Faculty Constitution (Art. 4, Sec. 3), in the form of a Fall Symposium. This meeting, presided by Interim President Stephen Percy and celebrated on November 6, 2019, provided the PSU Faculty and staff with an opportunity to discuss fundamental issues pertaining to present and future of PSU's leadership, such as the state of research and interdisciplinarity; the structure of the administration; equity, diversity, and inclusion; budget and curriculum; shared governance; compensation; and appointments and continuity. The minutes of this forum are available at the PSU Faculty Senate website [https://www.pdx.edu/Facultysenate/sites/www.pdx.edu.Facultysenate/files/Minutes191106Special\\_Faculty\\_Meeting.pdf](https://www.pdx.edu/Facultysenate/sites/www.pdx.edu.Facultysenate/files/Minutes191106Special_Faculty_Meeting.pdf)

Participants at the meeting considered the following questions on administrative leadership and shared governance:

- What, primarily, do we look to administrative leadership to provide to the University? Can we imagine a different administrative structure for PSU—different from both our past practice and from the conventional practice at other institutions—that might work more effectively for us?
- Are the principal administrative officers best recruited internally or through national searches? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each approach?
- Given the rapid turnover in our highest administrative ranks, how can we achieve greater continuity of leadership and institutional memory in the University's administration?
- What is the proper role of shared governance in the administration of the University, and how can we assure that best practices of shared governance will be followed?

During the academic year 2019-20, the conversations continued as part of the Faculty Senate discussions and in other spaces, such as the joint forum organized by AAUP and the Faculty Senate steering committee, the winter symposium and, most recently, the May 18th 2020 Faculty Forum, where the Faculty had a chance to dialogue with the Administration about the current challenges brought by

COVID-19, express their concerns about budget issues, and consider strategic ways to plan for PSU's future, such as academic programs examination. A form to gather additional faculty input was also distributed in connection with this forum. This form included a section on Academic leadership, where the Faculty offered additional and extensive comments that inform the present report, along with the comments that the Steering Committee has been receiving from diverse constituents during the last year through the multiple conversations maintained with faculty, staff, students, administration, board members, and union leaders.

The form was divided into the following sections: Administrative Searches, Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Administration and Faculty, Revisioning Structures, and Conducting Regular Evaluation of Administrators. In each of these sections, faculty commented on a number of themes. The next part of this report includes a summary of the ideas voiced throughout the year, including those expressed on the actual form. Details on these themes follow below:

## **I. ADMINISTRATIVE SEARCHES**

*Themes: Use and role of search firms, faculty participation and input during the search process, consideration of internal/external candidates for administrative positions, onboarding of administrative hires, institutional commitment vs. churn, compensation (salary and other) for higher administrators, practice of keeping administrator's salaries when they return to Faculty roles, other.*

In this area, the faculty identified and expressed the following issues and concerns:

### **1. DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION**

**The need to apply consistently a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion lens in our searches.** DEI is one of the main pillars of our strategic plan and is fundamental for the health of our institution. Upon identification of areas that needed attention, including the lack of and loss of underrepresented faculty and staff, the PSU Faculty Senate approved in a resolution on Regarding PSU's diversity, equity and inclusion issues, calling on our administration to:

- a) In partnership with the relevant constituents, develop and present to the Faculty as soon as possible an updated plan with short- and long-term strategies to support underrepresented Faculty and staff and remedy PSU's diversity, equity, and inclusion problem to adequately serve our students, Faculty, staff, and communities, including a protocol for its implementation.
- b) Take urgent action regarding the unsustainable situation and needs of the departments and programs of the School of Gender, Race and Nations.

Additionally, the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty, worked throughout the year on a report, formulated recommendations/expectations to address our PSU Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion problems. The main recommendations were: conducting exit interviews, including DEI advocate in searches, verifying the participation in the inclusive hiring workshop required for search committee members, requiring a DEI statement from search candidates, and the use of data to assess the progress of our administration in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty.

## 2. COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY

Faculty noted that over the past ten years, the ratio of average administrative to Faculty salaries has increased and that there is a lack of **transparency regarding elements of administrative compensation** such as benefits, "golden parachutes", travel, etc. They worry about the application of corporate models on how we look for "talent" and what seems to be an engagement in the "CEO salary arms race," as well as about compensation for higher administrators being out of line with the university. While Faculty acknowledge that compensation for administrators needs to be enough to provide incentive for good candidates, they feel that it should not be as high as to attract the wrong kind of candidates. They feel that the wage gap between faculty and administrators is too great for a public university committed to serving our students and our community. Administrative salaries and Faculty salaries should be much closer and administrative salaries in general should return to upper Faculty levels.

The most commented issue in this category was **the practice of administrators returning to Faculty positions at their full administrative salaries**. This has been a long-standing concern of the Faculty, who submitted a question for the President to answer during the June 2019 Senate meeting. The question noted that "Paying full salaries to administrators after they return to schools and colleges reduces funds available for other Faculty lines and increases salary inequities that PSU has sought to reduce in recent AAUP-PSU contracts" and enquired about whether the practice was under review. The Faculty is still uncertain and seeks transparency about the current status of this practice, which is regarded as not only as being unsuitable in a change of role and as producing great inequities but also as a source of incredible strain on the Schools and Departments to cover the salaries, whose budgets are not adjusted to meet the increased salary needs.

## 3. USE OF SEARCH FIRMS

Faculty expressed disappointment about the process and results of **searches conducted via search firms**, which they viewed as draining resources and having a poor track of recruiting suitable candidates. A Faculty member commented, "Let the institutional knowledge serve the campus and the community better by being more proactive in selecting the leadership of the administration rather than a detached outside search firm wasting huge sums of money needlessly." Faculty doubted the ability of search firms to attract civil servant educators rather than careerists. The last presidential search was not anomalous, but rather a result of extant policies; therefore, hiring policies need reconsideration.

Faculty also expressed concern that these search firms attract candidates who do not fully understand PSU's mission and culture and do not stay but rather move laterally between institutions, creating a problem of **administrative churn that erodes institutional continuity**.

On the pros and cons of **employing search firms vs internal expertise**, comments noted, "The search firm that was used for the VP-GDI brought an excellent set of finalists to campus. But that was a specialized firm. The firm that we usually use continues to bring weak finalists to campus. We spend a lot of money. The firm protects everyone's privacy to the point of erasing any real or useful feedback, and the excessive filtering of feedback obscures all weaknesses that are noticed and signaled by the university community." "I am not sure why there isn't a course release for search teams to be developed. I am not impressed by what has been brought to us through search firms. Why are we supporting this

industry? I don't always think we have the right people here but there must be ways we can research that for ourselves.”

#### 4. EXTERNAL VS. INTERNAL CANDIDATES

The PSU Faculty desires a balance of internal and external applicants for administrative jobs and **recommends more attention to internal Faculty expertise**. They regret that, currently, few units are strongly led in ways that seek to develop Faculty for administrative roles. For instance, one comment favors national searches but recommends to "expand the parameters so firms are not headhunting other administrators, but are identifying directors, chairs, Faculty, talented staff that could and should move to administration. Essentially, we need a mentor structure so that faculty become deans, etc." Other, related comments state, "It would be better to have mostly internal candidates who are acculturated into the institutional idiosyncrasies"; "keep a good balance on those who have the institutional memory and those who can bring in new ideas"; "We need individuals who believe in the current mission of our institution and make a long-term commitment to the institution. I would like to see more focus on supporting and training leadership from within"; "talk to senior and mid-career Faculty about what PSU needs, as opposed to being wonderstruck by star power, or what other institutions are doing"; "I want to see president, provost, and deans teach classes to really be part of PSU."

#### 5. PROCESS

The Faculty also mentions the need to review the PSU hiring/recruitment process to address whether the best candidate is being recruited: "If in any search the first choice is not recruited, this should be examined. If the pool is not what we hoped then why did PSU not achieve a better applicant pool? These need to be more open, transparent, and include Faculty." **Faculty believe that they should have a leading role in administrative searches**. Currently they offer recommendations but have no authority to make the hiring decision, which they see as a flaw in the process. Faculty also recommend that search committees include multiple and diverse voices from within PSU.

## II. RECRUITING AND RETAINING A DIVERSE ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

*Need for and role of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) advocates in searches, monitoring mandatory inclusive hiring training, diversity of committees and candidate pools, exit interviews to compile data about why Faculty choose to leave the institution, using data to track our institution's success in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty, requesting a DEI statement from candidates, need to have dedicated staff be available to all units to support and monitor progress in diversity, assessment of administrators based on their progress in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty, other.*

Comments from the Faculty echo the recommendations of the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty (see previous section on administrative searches).

#### 1. RAISING AWARENESS

The Faculty calls for attention to the PSU **existing reports on the situation of underrepresented students**, Faculty, and staff, as well as other available tools and resources (including the expertise of the Faculty conducting research on DEI) to raise awareness of the need for more support for these groups. In

the case of faculty and staff, for instance, their extra labor supporting students of color brings no additional compensation or acknowledgement of how that effort affects them in the tenure process.

## 2. MONITORING TRAINING

The faculty highlight the need for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion **training and attention to biases**. For instance, a comment reads, "Without specific attention being paid to diversity, equity, and inclusion, our implicit biases take over and we (as an organization) find ourselves touting that we value DEI but not actually showing that in our faculty/staff." The Faculty also acknowledges the need for training beyond the search environment, for current faculty, staff, and administrators on a regular basis. One comment notes, "an online training program one time upon hire is not enough. If you want DEI to be part of the culture, it needs to be more visible to ALL, not just among those who consider themselves diverse." The Faculty comments also suggest the monitoring of mandatory inclusive hiring training, to make sure that faculty participating in searches receive adequate preparation.

## 3. DIVERSITY OF COMMITTEES AND POOLS

The **both search committees and candidate pools need to be more diverse**. The Faculty stresses the need to include **DEI advocates** in all searches on campus to maintain PSU's expectations and obligation for diversity and representation. Other key improvements suggested for the employment process include requesting a DEI statement from candidates and conducting exit interviews with people who leave the institution so that we can identify and address retention issues. In these interviews, privacy must be protected so people feel open to being honest about their reasons for leaving. An enthusiastic comment reads "Yes! Let's figure out why people choose to leave PSU and let's hear from the upper administration about their experiences and their ideas for recruitment and retention of under-represented Faculty" while another regrets, "I have watched minority Faculty come to PSU and leave as soon as possible."

## 4. ENCOURAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY: MUCH MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE

The Faculty encouraged both the Administration and departments and units to **take diversity seriously when hiring and requested that diversity benchmarks be set in place**. Further suggested initiatives include cluster hires of Faculty of color, faculty diversity affinity groups, and active mentorship. Faculty of color should be encouraged to run for chair, and underrepresented Faculty and staff should be considered for Assistant and Associate Dean positions as well as Vice Presidential ones. A comment denounces that, "PSU has almost no faculty of color, and nearly no domestic minority faculty who feel they could start here on tenure track and maybe someday become a Chair or Dean." A number of comments voice the Faculty's disappointment and feeling that we are failing at supporting our underrepresented minorities. For example, one comment notes, "A good part of it might be to listen and be proactive toward Faculty of color when they make requests for protection and change. Evidence of this is clear: we have not done a good job with this in any way at PSU"; "This is an extremely important topic. I have been impressed with the hiring of diverse faculty in my years at the institution, but I don't think we have done a great job of making non-white (and to a lesser extent, non-male) Faculty feel welcomed and supporting them to be successful. Far too many have left"; "we need to change our search committees and process, we need to address campus climate issues, and we need to do difficult and brutally honest self-study. We are failing in this area, despite our discourse. It feels hypocritical"; "we

need A LOT OF HELP in this area. And not just in searching but in retaining." These are some of the comments that point to the need to act urgently to address these problems. Another commenter notes, "This is a matter of culture, the awareness and understanding of culture and how that comes across in language and interaction. Higher education tends to treat this as an issue of checking boxes rather than checking ourselves", while the link between student success and DEI success is also emphasized: "I think this goes hand in hand with student success, as having diverse faculty who represent the diversity of our student body is part of making students feel welcome and seen."

It is clear from the conversations that have taken place this year on campus, as well as the initiatives (including the Senate March 2020 resolution) and reports (including the DAC report) put forth by the different committees and groups (among them our Strategic Planning Equity Lens, that a majority of the Faculty feel that we need quick and robust action in the area of DEI and, particularly of recruiting and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups.

### III. REVISIONING STRUCTURES

*Establishing channels of collaboration/communication among Faculty, Administration, and Board of Trustees, adding more Faculty members to the Board of Trustees, shared governance vs shared leadership, expanding Board of Trustees' awareness of Faculty's concerns, Faculty mentoring for Board of Trustee members, assessing our administrative structures and their effectiveness, achieving continuity in a context of a high rate of administrative turnover, promoting transparency and trust, other.*

#### 1. FACULTY PARTICIPATION AND COLLABORATION WITH OTHER LEADERSHIP TEAMS

This year's conversations highlighted the need for Faculty participation in shared governance. The omission of collaboration with Faculty, and Faculty Senate, or Senate Constitutional Committees on the Portland State University Organizational Chart symbolizes the need to strengthen those channels.

Comments and conversations also expressed a desire to **create direct channels of collaboration between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate leadership, to have more faculty participation in the Board** (beyond just a Faculty board member), and to **have BoT representation in the Faculty Senate**. Including more members with academic experience in the Board would expand the Board's awareness of the Faculty's concerns and their work as well as the Faculty's knowledge of the work and concerns of the Board. A synchrony between these two groups would benefit our academic institution. Creating channels for communication and collaboration would contribute to fulfilling recommendations from documents such as the Association of Governing Boards' "Shared Governance: Is OK Good enough?," which calls for more orientation of Board members regarding Faculty work. This document warns that "With little information about Faculty work, board members beginning their service are unprepared to support effective shared governance over time." The same need applies to Faculty orientation, which could include more information about the Board's role and work.

The Faculty also believes in further **strengthening the communication and collaboration with the Administration** as a key endeavor for shared governance. Under the prior PSU President, Faculty grew to mistrust an administration that devalued shared governance. The following observations were made during the Nov 6th Faculty Forum: "Many Faculty and academic professionals have had the experience of being on committees whose work ends up being inconsequential—put on the shelf—or who become the audience for a presentation of a *fait accompli*. If shared governance is only lip service, it becomes

devalued. Another devaluation occurs when members of minority groups are repeatedly tapped to be on committees, workgroups, etc.—a form of hidden labor that's not rewarded. Similarly, for academic professionals, participation in shared governance often means an overload. We seem to have problems of accountability, continuity, inclusivity. If we value shared governance, it needs to be meaningfully integrated into our work: identified in letters of appointment, rewarded at times of review or promotion, and not just symbolically. There has to be authority for Faculty in these roles."

Recently, **the situation has begun to change for the better, thanks to the collaborative and inclusive approach promoted by the new leadership team** integrated by Provost Susan Jeffords and President Stephen Percy. We are beginning to move from a consultative model of faculty participation to a model in which faculty's input is included in the decision-making process. That being said, we still have a long path in front of us, as **we are still facing challenges regarding representation and collaboration**. Faculty feel that their voices are not sufficiently included in the decision-making processes of their departments or colleges, at a granular or micro-level in addition to Faculty Senate representation. A comment states that "The Faculty (departments and programs) are not engaged in decision making. Sometimes, there are discipline specific considerations that are never tapped or assessed because the Administration relies on a college wide representative who doesn't have discipline-specific knowledge."

There is an understanding that **diverse stakeholders are an integral part of shared governance and leadership and that students are central to shared governance conversations**. A deliberate effort from the Faculty Senate and the Student Government to reach out and collaborate with each other has been further made this year. The need to **further include part-time (adjunct) Faculty in governance** is also voiced.

A desire to **move from top-down governance models to co-governance and shared leadership models** is expressed, to move away from corporate models that have been failing us and to embrace cooperative models that are more suitable for a higher education institution.

## 2. ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY

Faculty call for enhanced transparency in many venues. For instance, Faculty would welcome more **information regarding budgetary decisions that impact academics**, and call for including more Faculty economic expertise in preparing budget information. Faculty were also curious about how the totality of administrative positions and salaries at PSU compares to that at other institutions.

Many Faculty do not know much about the **structure and working of the higher administration**. Rapid restructuring and administrative turn-over makes acquiring such knowledge even more challenging. Filling administrative positions by rotation among Faculty would increase mutual knowledge and respect. Faculty also request a detailed list of administrative committees and their tasks (similar to the list of committees outlined in the Faculty Constitution). Among the questions for which the Faculty would welcome a response are the following (from the November 6th, 2019 meeting minutes): Which administrators are also faculty, and how is this decided? Do they return to the Faculty at the end of their term? Are there other institutions that place more emphasis on internal hires or rotation? Because the Board of Trustees is relatively new, faculty should learn more about the members, the appointment process, and requirements (if any) for experience in higher education.

Finally, the Faculty has also pointed to the need to evaluate the administrative structures and services, particularly in our current circumstances, looking for ways that they can be reorganized to work more effectively, in an effort parallel to the examination of our programs.

#### IV. CONDUCTING REGULAR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

*Who should review Chairs, Deans, Provost, President, and other administrators, role of the Faculty in administrators reviews, kinds of questions that should be considered when assessing our administrators, frequency of reviews, procedure, should reviews of administrators be made public? Models to consider from other institutions.*

As mentioned above, a more communicative and collaborative relationship has recently emerged between the Faculty and the other key constituents of the campus community, including the Board of Trustees. We are walking an increasingly constructive and effective path in shared governance. University leaders among both the Administration and the Faculty value transparency and trust. This emerging partnership will position us well to **strengthen and transform our institution while remaining true to our mission and values** and is particularly important now, as we face multiple challenges caused or aggravated by the COVID-19 and social unrest.

**An essential component of a healthy and highly functional university is the ability to establish and implement methods of self-assessment and adjustment.** Such assessment should take place not only in the Faculty ranks and instructional dimensions but also within the administration. We recommend that PSU design and maintain a regular review process to provide our administrators with the opportunity to receive constructive feedback from the campus community on their progress and effectiveness as leaders, for their personal development as well as the improvement and enhancement of the institution. The Faculty can play an essential role and hold a great responsibility in this assessment process, both as reviewers and reviewees. As the report by the American Association of University Professors on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators states, "Their [Faculty] expertise is both an indelible part of a full and fair evaluation and a positive service to relevant administrators and to the institution's governing board." The report further explains that "the most desirable, as well as the most effective, system is one that rests on sound institutional policy, healthy relationships among the parties, and scrupulously fair practice. Indeed, such a system at its best will involve not only evaluation, but also constructive mentoring, as is the case with the best systems of Faculty evaluation."

While some elements of administrative review are currently in place at PSU, we still lack a Faculty Senate-centered, comprehensive and consistent mechanism for effectively **utilizing Faculty expertise in assessing and enhancing PSU's leadership on aspects such as progress in advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion; promoting shared governance, communication, and collaboration among university constituents and involving them in decision-making; ability to embrace innovation and ensure that PSU effectively serves students, the city, and the global community; alignment with our mission and strategic goals; impact on institutional priorities, and other important leadership components.** The need for the PSU Faculty to examine our current procedures and practices, identify gaps and establish a solid administrative review process became evident during the conversations on PSU's leadership and administration that took place in Fall 2019 as part of the Special Meeting of the Faculty on November 6th and continued in connection to the Faculty Forum on May 18th, 2020, where



Faculty members provided extensive feedback on this subject, prompting the steering committee to present this proposal.

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee recommended in Spring 2020 the creation of an exploratory Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews to **examine the administrative review mechanisms already in place at PSU, explore models of administrative review being successfully implemented at other public universities comparable to PSU, reflecting on best practices that could be adapted to the specific needs of our institution, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for the creation/implementation of an administrative review process consistent with the context and rationale stated in this proposal, including a timeline and specific steps to collaborate with the Administration and relevant constituents (including our Board of Trustees) in setting this process (see Faculty Senate Resolution in 8 June Packet)**

Among the themes highlighted by the Faculty regarding this topic, we find the centrality of a **diversity, equity, and inclusion lens, the desire to work with our Board of Trustees, as well as the recommendations to set a regular and comprehensive process. On the advantages and need of establishing this process, we received comments such as "Evaluation and feedback can be immensely useful for professional development. Why would we deny administrators access to this critical professional development resources?" and "Though I generally deeply value assessment, I would like better to see accountability and a way to support our deans, chairs etc. Questions to ask about accountability? Do those you lead feel rewarded, ignored or punished for trying to meet desired outcomes."**

**Focusing on constructive feedback and highlighting best practices and models (both externally and internally) pointing to the values and practices that are central to PSU are also key to this endeavor. A comment read: "Models to consider? The best Deans and Presidents that I have had the pleasure of knowing had a strong and positive vision for the school and were there for 20+ years to make it happen. If I am not mistaken, they both rose internally and excelled at bringing the campus together. They were connected with the students (taught, personally attended student activities and club meetings, regular face in Faculty meetings), everyone (students Faculty) knew exactly what the goals were, strategies were cohesive though flexible. Benefits for reaching the goals were clear and felt by all."**

# General Student Affairs Committee 2019-2020 Report

**Chair:** Josh Epstein, Dept. of English ([jepstein@pdx.edu](mailto:jepstein@pdx.edu))

**Committee Members:** Emma Britton, SBA; Melinda Holtzman, MCECS; Heather Petzold, UNST; Christopher Skinner, Admissions; Wyatt Isaacs, ASPSU; Tricia Oleson, ASPSU

**In Attendance:** Michele Toppe, Vice Provost for Student Affairs; Alex Miller, Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs

## Committee Charge (from Faculty Constitution)

The Committee shall:

1. Serve in an advisory capacity to administrative officers on matters of student affairs, educational activities, budgets, and student discipline.
2. Have specific responsibility to review and make recommendations regarding policies related to student services, programs, and long-range planning, e.g., student employment, educational activities, counseling, health service and extracurricular programming
3. Nominate the recipients of the Presidential Community Service Awards.
4. Report to the Senate at least once a year.

## Report

The work of the General Student Affairs Committee was truncated by the COVID-19 crisis and transition to remote operations. We intend in 2020-2021 to pick up on much of the work left behind during this academic year. At present, we do not have much to report.

- At the beginning of the academic year, we proposed revised language for the committee charge to Richard Beyler, and hope to continue working with him to make sure the charge reflects the work of the committee. We are eager to hear from the Senate about how we might be of further service.
- During the fall quarter, we met with Michele Toppe to discuss the role that GSAC might play in supporting the recent Student Success Initiatives. The committee believes it can continue to support university efforts to improve persistence and student experience.
- During the winter quarter, we worked with Michele Toppe on the Student Resources Website (<https://sites.google.com/pdx.edu/studentliferesources/home>). Vice Provost Toppe solicited the committee's input on improving this website and making it more accessible to students—and to members of the PSU community (including faculty, advisors, staff, and academic professionals) often charged with referring those students to our campus resources, which are numerous but often obscure or hard to locate for the students who need them most.
- In consultation with Vice Provost Toppe, the committee tabled the President's Awards. We had considered doing so even before the COVID crisis, given the consistently low number of applications in recent years, and the perceived lack of interest from students, departments, and administrators. We intended, instead, to look into student academic and non-academic awards that already exist at departmental and college levels, so that we could refashion the President's Awards so that they yield more enthusiasm and

“buy-in” from students and nominating faculty. Having received feedback from faculty and staff expressing interest in restoring the Awards, we intend to revisit this next year.

- We were in the early stages of speaking with Vice Provost Toppe about an expanded Fall Convocation for new students. That work was tabled (perhaps just as well, given the uncertain status of the Fall 2020 term), but we hope to revisit it next year. We believe it could play a vital role in enhancing the student experience, especially if tied in with University Studies and other curricular programs.
- GSAC remains committed to working with the Vice Provost’s office on supporting students during, and in the wake of, the coronavirus pandemic. Anyone who has worked with students (or been one!) during the past quarter understands the wide range of pressures—personal, psychological, medical, financial, and academic—that have accompanied the pandemic. These matters require ongoing action and attention: many of these problems exist even under ordinary circumstances and are exacerbated during crises like COVID, and similar emergencies for which we will want to prepare in the future.

## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Annual Report 2019–2020

According to the Faculty Governance Guide, the Library Committee should be comprised of at least two members each from Arts & Humanities, Science & Engineering, and Social Science.

Committee Chair: Léa Millay, UNST

Committee Members:

Katrine Barber, CLAS-SS  
Micki Caskey, COE  
Carrie Collenberg-Gonzalez, CLAS-AL  
Karin Magaldi, COTA  
Gerald Recktenwald, MCECS  
Jelena Schiff, COTA

Consultants:

Tom Bielavitz, Dean, LIB  
Michael Bowman, LIB  
Cris Paschild, LIB  
Jill Emery, LIB

Library Committee meetings were held on October 17, 2019; January 31, 2020; and May 28, 2020.

The focus of our meetings for the 2019–2020 academic year has been on the Library Budget; Library Services (Spring 2020); Strategic Planning Committee; Provost's Student Success Initiative and the Library's Role; Open Access for Faculty Publications; Archives, Records Management, and Special Collections; Library Building Security; Personnel; and Senate Resolution – Spring 2019 (follow-up).

### **Budget:**

#### 1. Funds Received:

University general fund and management reserves; Sales and Services; OAI online fee funding and flexible degree funding.

#### 2. Funds Spent on Library Resources:

Collections building and budgeting  
Subject liaisons that work with departments on campus

General collections value statement:

Scholar-led to find valuable and accessible resources  
Recognize that departments work differently  
Commitment to purchasing works authored by PSU faculty

Avoid digital rights management restrictions, which means online materials that are limited in access or usability  
Limit restrictions to members of the community using library materials  
Support diversity  
Mission driven – align with the “Student First” initiative  
Maintain sustainable collections

Budget model for collections – fund collections at the macro level as opposed to the micro level

Majority of funding spent on electronic journals and electronic books

Leverage consortia purchasing

Licensing principles – make sure that resources are fully accessible to all authorized users

Insure transparency

Balance collections across campus (ongoing subscription breakdowns)

Journal packages:

Arts and Humanities (Cambridge University Press Journals)  
Monograph Breakdowns

Collection Reductions Considerations:

Look at cost per use over a three-year trend to see declining usage  
Work with department liaisons  
Identify Open Access availability

## **Library Services – Spring 2020**

[Library Services](#)

## **Strategic Planning Committee**

In a changing environment, how do we embrace and create opportunities?  
How do we continue to positively engage and effectively support the communities we serve?  
How do we develop and maintain a positive library culture?  
Since Covid 19 the Library is in Phase 1 of strategic planning to increase services to the community.

## **Provost's Student Success Initiative and the Library's Role**

Four areas (see PSU webpage on Student Experience/Student Success)

## **Open Access for Faculty Publications**

Tom presented before the Faculty Senate  
Benefits for faculty using PDX Scholar

Library will ask faculty to work with publishers  
Library will take a version of a faculty publication and put it in PDX Scholar An about-to-be-published version will go into the PDX Scholar archive Mostly journal articles go to PDX Scholar  
Opt-out policy – faculty can decide if they would rather not participate

### **Library Building Security**

Students completed a building security survey in which there was a diversity of responses to the question: What is the purpose of the Library building? (study, research, collaboration)

For increased security there will be key cards after 8 pm; an unarmed security officer will be present for closing; and Public Safety will have someone do a walk-through every two hours. Things are improving and there have been fewer disruptions and troubling incidents.

Since Covid 19 the Library has been mailing out equipment, shipping books, and offering scanning services for course reserves. Only the first floor of the Library is open for the computer lab, with 20 operating computers. Key card access is required.

The committee commends the Library for helping Spring 2020 doctoral students to print copies of their dissertations.

### **Personnel**

Since Covid 19 there has been a hiring freeze, which has especially impacted a search for the Head of Cataloging and Library Technician 3 positions.

### **Senate Resolution – Spring 2019**

At the final meeting of the PSU Faculty Senate for the academic year 2018/2019, the Library Committee offered a proposal for a re-evaluation of the fee structure for online resources that support online learning.

The Faculty Senate resolved that the University will strive to maintain adequate funding to support the collections development of the Library.

Tom has had discussions with the Provost about the resolution and will have further conversations with Johannes at OAI.

OAI funding now covers Kanopy costs.

\*Overall, the Library Committee meetings have provided an effective channel for communication among library staff and faculty members, as the committee continues to serve the Library with dedication and diligence. The Library in turn contributes to the health and prosperity of Portland State University in an ongoing and vital way

**University Studies Council 2019-2020  
Faculty Senate Report**

Prepared by Albert Spencer, Chair

Council Membership: Tim Anderson, Leslie Batchelder, Emma Britton, Lucas Clark, Jeff Conn, Aleksandar Jokic, Annie Knepler, Yves Labissiere, Amy Larson, Vicki Reitenauer, Amy Spring, Karen Strand, Rachel Webb, Kimberly Willson-St. Clair

Consultants: Rowanna Carpenter (University Studies Director of Assessment), Michael Lupro (Director of Sophomore Inquiry and Clusters), Óscar Fernandez (Univerisity Studies Diversity Coordinator), Linda George (Interim Executive Director of University Studies) Rick Lockwood (Awards Subcommittee Chair)

**I. Curriculum**

<b>Course No.</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Cluster</b>
ARH 333	Latin American Women Artists	Gender and Sexualities
ARH 355	Medieval Monsters	Popular Culture
ARH 379	Latin American Baroque Art and Architecture	Interpreting the Past
BA 332	Property, Management, and Society	Community Studies
BST 412U	Oregon African American History	American Identities
BST 484U	African American Community Development	American Identities
CFS 386	Youth Healthy Relationships and Sexuality Education	Families and Society
ENG 310	Children's Literature	Families and Society
ENG 325U	Postcolonial Literature	Gender and Sexualities
ENG 360	American Lit and Culture I	Interpreting the Past
ENG 369U	Asian American Literature	Gender and Sexualities
ENG/BST 351U	African American Lit	Gender and Sexualities
ENG/BST 352U	African American Lit II	Gender and Sexualities
FIN 301	Stock Market Investing	Design Thinking
INTL 349	Gender and Development	Gender and Sexualities
LING 332	"Do I Speak Wrong?": Language Myths in the USA	American Identities
LING 334	"You have the right to remain silent.": Language and the Law	Freedom Privacy Technology
PHL 312U	Feminist Philosophy	Knowledge Values Rationality
SCI 399	Green Roof Biomonitoring and Eco-design	Science in Social Context
WLL/ENG 383	Topics in Comparative Lit, Film, and Comics	Popular Culture
WLL/ENG 383	Topics in Comparative Lit, Film, and Comics	Global Perspectives

**Removals:**

<b>Course No.</b>	<b>Course Title</b>	<b>Cluster</b>
BST 420U	Caribbean Literature	Global Perspectives
BST 412U	Oregon African American History	American Identities
BST 484U	African American Community Development	American Identities

**II. Program**

A. The Council has continued to support assessment of the revised Diversity Equity and Social Justice Goal and the development of a rubric for the revised Ethics, Agency, and Community Goal.

B. At the end of AY 18-19, a new subcommittee was formed to revise UNST's Communication Goal. At our November 2019 meeting, the subcommittee recommended the division of the goal into two separate goals: one that focuses on UNST's writing expectations and an other than outlines our expectations with regards to quantative literacy. The subcommittees were on track to host symposiums with UNST instructors and other stakeholders in order to inform these revisions during the Spring term, which were unfortunately cancelled due to the pandemic. Since there is no urgent need for these revisions, the Council decided to postpone this revision until public discussion can safely resume. It will be among our agenda items for our first meeting in the Fall.

C. The Council has continued to recognize UNST instructors through our Awards for Teaching Excellence which will be presented at the UNST End of the Year Party this Thursday (6/4). We are proud of our member's work to maintain this tradition during challenging times and want to recognize all UNST and PSU faculty for making the rapid transition to distance learning. In particular, the Council Chair would like to recognize Richard Lockwood from the PSU School of Community Health. Richard was among the Council members who originally organized these awards and in order to maintain continuity Richard continued as an ex officio member of the Council in order to oversee the process.

D. The Council is enthusiastic with the results of Executive Director, Linda George, and Director of Assessment & Upper Division Clusters, Rowanna Carpenter, initiative to coordinate a review of UNST and outreach to publicize its high impact practices among the campus community. Tentatively titled the UNST Roadshow, the Council received a preview of their findings at our last in person meeting (February 14th). While they will not be able to begin the outreach phase of their project until normal operations resume, their review did highlight key areas of program success, such as high graduation rates for minority students who complete FRINQ and increased retention rates for all students who complete SINQ courses. Likewise, they diagnosed areas for improvement, such as the encouragement of more high impact practices at the Junior Cluster level and the need to better advise students on the role of Junior Cluster courses with the general education curriculum. Fortunately, they were able to present these findings to department chairs before the shutdown and they will be on the Council's agenda for our first meeting in AY 20-21.

E. The Council supported the Executive Director's recommendation to add Junior Cluster titles to student transcripts beginning next year (AY 20-21). This will hopefully increase our



graduates success on the job market by more clearly representing the knowledge and skills gained by that component of the general education curriculum.

F. The Council supported the Executive Director's recommendation to revise the UNST Requirements for Senior Transfer Students (Transfer students 135+ credits). While triggered by the spike in transfers due to multiple recent closures in the Portland area (Concordia '20, Oregon College of Art & Craft '19, Art Institute of Portland '18, and Marylhurst '18) and in anticipation of increased OUS transfers due to COVID-19, the requirements had not been reviewed in recent memory and did not make any significant distinctions between Juniors (transfers with 90+ credits) and Seniors (transfers with 135+ credits). This revision should alleviate the financial and curricular burdens of transfers already coping with a major disruption to their education and degree completion. By placing students first, PSU will continue to serve as a safe place to land during these complicated and uncertain times. Likewise, this policy revision will unburden the PSU Staff and Faculty who have been coping with this influx, such as the Registrar's Office, Advising & Career Services, and the Academic Requirement Committee all of whom notified the Council of this pressing need and support the revision of these requirements.