

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 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.[†]

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

[†] 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?