

Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate Meeting, 7 October 2019

Presiding Officer: Isabel Jaén Portillo

Secretary: Richard Beyler

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

Senators absent: Hansen, Kennedy, Sugimoto, Thieman

Ex-officio members present: Adler, Beyler, Bielavitz, Burgess, Carpenter, Chabon, Duh, Gibson, Jaén Portillo, Kneple, Loikith, Luckett, Lynn, Percy, Toppe, Webb, Wooster, Zonoozy

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was **called to order** at 3:02 p.m.

1. **Minutes of the 3 June 2019 meeting** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
2. **OAA response to Notice of Senate Actions for June** was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

JAÉN PORTILLO welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the year. She thanked senators for their trust, recognized newly elected senators, and valued contributions of colleagues on the Steering Committee. LUCKETT had agreed to be parliamentarian. She appreciated PERCY's stepping into the role of President. She thanked other members of the administration, and recognized hard work of the bargaining team. JAÉN saw the work of Senate, and shared governance generally, to revolve around academic quality for the benefit our students and our communities. This was particularly important as we face financial challenges. In this climate, faculty, administrators, and trustees must work together to ensure that resources are distributed flexibly and fairly, that the quality of education we provide does not suffer, and that our University will continue to serve our community.

JAÉN continued: long-term goals are essential, beyond short-term crisis-fixing solutions. Two examples: striving to preserve, strengthen, and balance programs in all components of higher education, instead of shrinking them or making them disappear; and supporting faculty so that student can access the quality of education that they deserve. Faculty and students are the backbone of any university; the administration's role and purpose is then to support strategies for academic quality and student success. She hoped this year to engage faculty, staff, trustees, and students in a series of conversations about how we can move our University forward through shared governance.

JAÉN called attention to the upcoming town halls being held by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Advancement for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on October 9th and 10th.

JAÉN displayed a message that had been circulated by the Board of Trustees on postponing launching a presidential search [sent by e-mail to University community on 2 October; see **Appendix B.1**]. She greatly appreciated this statement of respect for shared governance, but noted that Steering Committee did not intend to conduct a formal review but rather to initiate a series of conversations, starting today and then continuing in a meeting of the Faculty in November.

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER made procedural announcements about distribution of the monthly packet, formation of the Faculty Senate districts for the year, and determination of voting procedures (use of secret ballot follows upon request by five or more senators).

BEYLER reviewed rules for placing items on the Senate agenda. Usually this was through referral by a constitutional committee (including Steering). Extraordinarily, the Presiding Officer can unilaterally place items on the agenda. A petition by Faculty members can also place an item on the agenda. Finally, a senator supported by two others “in open meeting” can place on the next month’s Senate agenda. He emphasized this because of questions in previous years, and because of something that came up during the summer. If a senator—perhaps at behest of constituents—is dissatisfied with the action or inaction of Senate or of a committee, this is a way to address the problem. Three senators acting together can say: “We want Faculty Senate to consider this issue.”

3. New SLATE admissions system

WOOSTER announced plans to upgrade admissions systems. In consultation with the Office of Information Technology, deans, the Registrar, Financial Aid Office, and other stakeholders, Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions had decided to implement the SLATE system. This represented, WOOSTER said, an improvement in students’ experience with the application process. It will provide real-time reporting and modelling for stakeholders. It will be supported by OIT and integrated with Banner. At the graduate level, the goal is to open SLATE for reviewing applicants on April 1st, and to complete processing of any CollegeNet applications by the end of June. She then introduced Chuck KNEPFLE, Vice President for Enrollment Management.

KNEPFLE characterized SLATE as customer relations management software tailored for new students. The undergraduate side won’t affect faculty as much as the graduate side. It modernizes a system that is currently, in his view, on the primitive side. Undergraduate applications will go live in August 2020. KNEPFLE added that SLATE will enable more efficient and targeted recruiting.

FARAHMANDPUR asked about predictability: what does this program allow us to do? KNEPFLE said that [recruiting capabilities] are more on the communications side; it allows us to send targeted information to students, and is an interface for students to see where they are in the process. It will collect more data that will allow us to better predict who will enroll. FARAHMANDPUR asked about privacy issues: who exactly is collecting the data? KNEPFLE’s understanding was that data is provided by students in the application. As many other universities do, we also purchase names of students from testing services. International data privacy rules may have an impact; he was also aware of some pending legislation in California.

LUCKETT noted that the current system archives the previous applications, so that information on previously admitted students is available, e.g., transcripts. Will that information go away? WOOSTER thought that there is similar storage of data in SLATE. LUCKETT: but will we lose access to the old data? WOOSTER thought not, but could double-check with the implementation team. She mentioned that a chart showing the implementation process is on the OIT website.

CHRZANOWSKA-JESKE asked how much of the student data is collected voluntarily, and how much is required? KNEPFLE responded that the admission application indicates required and optional fields. We need certain information to make admissions decisions; we also have information we're required to collect for the state, that we may or may not use in the admissions process. The current plan is to eliminate about thirty items from the application: to collect the minimum amount of information necessary to make an admissions decision and to report accurately as required by government. She hoped that we are requiring students to submit more information that necessary. KNEPFLE said that part of the project is to slim down to only necessary items.

C. DISCUSSION: upcoming Faculty meeting on University leadership and governance

LUCKETT reviewed background: last spring Steering Committee, following a Senate resolution, wrote a report on concerns with the administration and shared governance at PSU [see **June Agenda Attachment E.2**]. Circulating at the same time was a petition to convene a special meeting of the Faculty in the fall to discuss the administrative and governance structures at PSU. It seemed a particularly opportune time to have such a discussion, when much of our administration is interim and many questions about the future are open.

LUCKETT pointed out that the Faculty is a body defined in the Constitution [of the PSU Faculty]. Article IV, Section 3 contains provisions to call a special meeting of the Faculty. We aren't aware of any such meeting in the last fifty years. Originally this was how faculty governance worked; in the 1960s it was decided to create a Senate to meet regularly, but retain a provision to convene the whole Faculty. There are also regular meetings of the Faculty, such as Convocation. When it meets, assuming there is a quorum, its authority is superior to that of the Senate; we could hypothetically vote on a resolution which would take precedence over resolutions of the Senate. He did not expect that to happen, but it is a possibility. Such a meeting is presided over by the President of the University.

The petition gave the Steering Committee the task of scheduling such a meeting. We have reserved the Smith [SMSU] Ballroom for Wednesday, November 6th (but have not yet pinned down the hours), for a meeting of probably not more than three hours. It's envisioned that this will be something like the Winter Symposium. LUCKETT hoped that this would be one of a series of conversations; they may be meetings of other stakeholders. At this time, as JAÉN had remarked, the Steering Committee had no plans to issue a review as such.

Today LUCKETT hoped to get input on what questions to discuss on the 6th. Based on previous discussions, he introduced five possibilities [see **Appendix C**]. 360-degree reviews of administrators are used at some other institutions; should we do so and what would we want to learn? As has emerged in several instances: what are pros and cons of internal vs. national searches? What are the fundamental functions of administrative leadership, and could we imagine alternative structures that could perform these functions? Given rapid

turnover in administrative ranks, how can we maintain continuity and institutional memory? What's the proper role of shared governance in general?

GRECO: how do we attract the best candidates, whether internal or external, through our compensation packages? What elements of compensation attract the wrong candidates?

KARAVANIC: coming out of this meeting, what would cause you to feel it was a success?

GAMBURD wanted to consider the composition of the Faculty. The academic freedom that comes from tenure is significant. She wondered how the move towards contingent faculty affects the nature of shared governance, and changes what people feel free to say and do. If the work of the Senate is confined to appointees with more than 0.5 FTE, and more and more teaching is done by people with less secure academic positions, how does that affect the participation in shared governance by those with a long-term investment in the institution?

LUCKETT said a survey will be circulated soon. BEYLER confirmed this, but given "survey fatigue" he urged senators to contact faculty directly to find out their views. The petition received 188 signatures—well above the 7.5% required—within a short span of time. After about a week and a half, we stopped collecting names. So in June, there was a considerable energy around this question. Time moves on; we all are busy; is that energy still there? Beyond a survey, personal contact may be a better way of tapping into that.

JEDYNAK wondered if there will be a resolution to vote on. LUCKETT: once the discussion is open, members of the assembly could make and second a motion, which would then be voted on. He didn't anticipate that Steering Committee would recommend a resolution; mostly he expected a discussion. But nothing would prevent a motion.

THORNE did not know of a non-hierarchical model. Shared governance confronts a hierarchical difference between faculty and administrative leadership. Are there heterarchical or rhizomatic structures that can still get work done and serve various functions, rather than a hierarchical arrangement? Though they might be out there, he didn't know of good models. It would be helpful to build from, or be informed about, alternative models of academic leadership. His anxiety about the upcoming meeting is that we don't know what were talking about, yet we continue talking. It would helpful if someone could say: here's a university that does this, with these virtues and these problems.

EPPLEY, similarly: we should look at best practices—what is working in other universities.

GAMBURD wished for background about what administrative leadership does for PSU. There are assumptions, for example about administrative bloat: is there contextualizing data? She wanted us to work from evidence before we start talking about alternatives.

FARAHMANDPUR: more data would be helpful: about turnover, administrative bloat, the state funding of higher education in Oregon and in the nation, projections of declining enrollment. This is important context.

JAÉN said that planning for the meeting would continue over the next few weeks, incorporating ideas expressed today and the ones we already have. We have to look at what is happening at our own institution, but also models beyond our institution, and then find our own way that works for our academic culture. She was not sure what the outcome can be, but we will build on the conversation to figure out the right path for us.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – none

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals – *Consent Agenda*

The new courses listed in **October Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of Roll Call.

2. New courses – **School of Public Health retroactive curricular review** (SPH via GC)

JAÉN reminded senators of the discussion last academic year [June Minutes, p. 96].

KARAVANIC/EMERY moved **approval** of the new courses summarized in **October Agenda Attachment E.2** and proposed in full in [OCMS](#).

LOIKITH reviewed the situation: last year it came to the attention of Graduate Council [GC] that some courses in the SPH curriculum, and that had been functioning successfully at OHSU, had never received explicit approval from [PSU] Faculty Senate in the process of starting the joint program. GC fast-tracked the review, looking particularly at potential overlap with existing PSU courses. Around fifty such courses appeared before Senate last year; there are still some coming through with the requested overlap statements from PSU departments and programs.

The **new courses** summarized in **Attachment E.2** were **approved** (43 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, by show of hands).

F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

G. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

1. President's report

PERCY welcomed senators at the start of the academic year. Since 1971 he had been on a college campus at the beginning of fall, in different roles, and felt this excitement. He had a chance to meet students moving in, on the first day of classes, and at the party in the Park Blocks. He was impressed with the diversity of students: the countries, places, ethnic and racial backgrounds represented. He welcomed the new Presiding Officer and the new ASPSU President [Gibson]—other new leadership, of which there is a lot now.

PERCY related that over the summer, PSU received a high ranking in social mobility from *US News and World Report*. This is based on the number of Pell Grant recipients who graduate. We are ranked highest in Oregon, and high throughout the Northwest. We should celebrate this hard work with our students. Some exciting NSF awards were received: a major math-science award, and one to study earthquake resilience in Nepal. He can't cover all the research grants; they represent a growth of about 8%-10% from a year ago. There is also great scholarship and creative expression going on that is not measured in metrics tied to external grant funding: books, plays, essays, etc.

PERCY reviewed the presentation at Convocation about student success. JEFFORDS had spent a year developing plans for coordinated, innovative thinking about student success. We want to triple down on that this year. We have always cared about student success, PERCY said, but we want to dig deeper and coordinate better, using innovation and data. We don't expect faculty to take on a new job, but rather in curriculum, advising, etc., keep in mind how to support our students. Some central initiatives include

creating hardship funds—many students are one unexpected financial crisis away from having to drop out—and developing integrated systems to address mental health needs.

A physical manifestation of this commitment, PERCY said, is the renovated and newly reopened Fariborz Maseeh Hall. In one place there is the financial wellness center, advisors, career services, registrar, OIT help desk; over the skybridge are various other support services, multicultural centers, etc. There are also several departments housed there. He was excited about the new Transfer and Returning Student Resource Center. His aspiration is that we become a national leader in student success innovations.

PERCY announced a Presidential Fellows program. Fellows will work on a specific issues suggested by the President. It is a way to engage faculty in innovation. This year, Theodore VAN ALST will explore how to grow relationships and collaborations with Native American Tribes, and to be more successful in educating Native American students; Shirley JACKSON will look at re-establishing an ombuds program; Laura NISSEN will continue her work on a futuristic approach to higher education, leading a team of about thirty people; Lisa HAWASH will work on something he believed we needed to get back to: the equity lens articulated in our Strategic Plan.

PERCY looked forward to working [with Faculty Senate] on questions of governance. He had similar questions about the change in the composition of the faculty and enrollment patterns, and would try to share some data. (Summer term was down about 8%, and regular term about 4%.) On administrative turnover they were also looking at data; there were several idiosyncratic things, but probably also some patterns. He would also like to look at the diversity of our leadership.

PERCY re-introduced Chuck KNEPFLE, the new Vice President for Enrollment Management and welcomed him to PSU. [Applause.]

2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS had asked CHABON to stand in for her today to introduce Brian SANDLIN, who is responsible in OAA for the University's accreditation and state authorization.

SANDLIN: the Provost had asked him to give an update on accreditation and the ad-report recently submitted to NWCCU. We are accredited, as we have been since 1965. There are many chances to improve before we risk losing accreditation. We are, however, “not in compliance.” That is based upon our year-seven report in 2015, which indicated two main problems. First, we did not publish all of our graduate-level student learning outcomes in easily accessible places for our students. Second, we were not actively assessing student learning in a comprehensive way across campus.

SANDLIN related what we are doing to address these problems. We published the graduate learning outcomes and are now in compliance. Assessment of student learning outcomes had been a different project. We created the annual assessment update to review programs' assessment activities: do you have an assessment plan, and are you doing it (provide an example)? Last year we reported that 36.5% of our academic programs were actively assessing student learning—a figure which brought us into non-compliance. In the ad-hoc report last month we reported that 58.4% programs were assessing student learning, an increase of 30 programs (17 graduate, 13 undergraduate). This shows success, but is not our final goal.

SANDLIN said that this improvement was in part due to the processes put in place—the annual update. Another reason is that the Provost has stressed in meetings with faculty, at Senate, etc., that assessment is a tool for improve our teaching. LUCKETT took initiative in his own department. WOOSTER had a leading role with graduate programs. SANDLIN also recognized the efforts of Janelle VOEGELE and Raiza DOTTIN in the Office of Academic Innovation; they are experts who can provide help. Kathi KETCHESON and colleagues in OIRP made improvements to the survey tool—repetition, analysis, archive. The dedication of deans, chair, directors, and faculty themselves was most important. They produce the evidence that we need.

Moving forward, does SANDLIN believe that the response to our ad-hoc report will be: nice job, your efforts are paying off, but keep going and provide another ad-hoc report in a year. We've committed to achieving 100% compliance.

SANDLIN noted that JEFFORDS had appointed several Faculty Fellows, two of whom will be helping with assessment and accreditation: G.L.A. HARRIS and Charles KLEIN.

WOOSTER shared that progress had been made at the graduate level towards the 100% compliance commitment. She had spoken with an external visitor from 2015; his impression was that we were not doing well at closing the loop. We may be doing good work, but need to show that we are using and responding to feedback. The Graduate School had appointed Mark WOODS as Graduate Education Leadership Fellow, and formed a team to collect and analyze data. They hope to visit with programs—ten this fall—to help them write learning outcomes, post them, and develop and assessment plan. This effort is tied to student success.

BEYLER called attention to the reports in the Packet, this month and most months; the committees are doing important work and their reports contain important information. He also urged senators to review the Minutes; in producing them, he frequently noticed thoughtful comments that had not really registered during the meeting itself.

PALMITER commented that she was pleased to see the appointment of Faculty Fellows by the President, Provost, and Graduate Dean. We are thereby drawing from faculty expertise, as opposed to spending money on outside consultants. Not only let knowledge serve the city, but also let knowledge serve the university.

*The following reports were **received** as part of the Consent Agenda. See **October Agenda Attachments G.3-4**.*

3. Report from Committee on Work-Life Balance

4. Progress report form Digital City Testbed Center

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:22 p.m.

After the meeting, **division caucuses** chose as members of Committee on Committees:

CLAS-Sci: Bruno JEDYNAK

COE: Ramin FARAHMANDPUR