

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 6 June 2022
(Online Conference)**

Presiding Officer: Vicki Reitenauer

Secretary: Richard Beyler

Current senators present: Ajibade, Baccar, Borden, Carpenter, Caughman, Chorpenning, Clark, Clucas, Colligan, Cortez, Cruzan, De La Vega, Donlan, Duncan, Dusicka, Eastin, Emery, Farahmandpur, Feng (Wu-chang), Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Flores, Gamburd, Goforth, Gómez, Harris, Heryer, Hunt, Izumi, Jaén Portillo, Kelley, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Limbu, Lindsay, Loney, Luckett, Mudiamu, Rai, Reitenauer, Romaniuk, Sanchez, Thieman, Thorne, Tretheway, Watanabe, Webb, Wern, Wilkinson.

Alternates for current senators: Nathaniel Garrod for Raffo (also as newly elected senator).

Current senators absent: Eppley, Erev, Law, Oschwald, Smith, Taylor, Tuor.

Newly elected senators present: Anderson, Constable, Craven, Daescu, Dimond, Endicott-Popovsky, Garrod (also as alternate for current senator), Greenwood, Ingersoll, Knight, La Rosa, Lafrenz, Martin, Matlick, Perlmutter, Ruth, Zeisman-Pereyo.

Newly elected senators absent: Davidova, Hunte, Newsom.

Ex-officio members present: Beyler, Bowman, Burgess, Chabon, Chivers, Comer, Estes, Feng (Wu-chi), Ford, Herrera, Jeffords, Knepfle, Lambert, Mbock, Mulkerin, Podrabsky, Read, Recktenwald, Toppe, Wooster.

The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Roll call** *was effected using the participants list of the online meeting.*
2. Without objection, corrections were made to **Minutes of 2 May meeting:** under item D, DE LA VEGA should be listed as co-chair of the ad-hoc committee; senators EMERY and EASTIN should be listed as present.
3. **Procedural: Changes to agenda order – Consent Agenda**

*The following changes to the agenda order were made as part of the Consent Agenda:
Oral presentation of report G.3 was folded into discussion of motion E.5.*

Oral presentations of reports G.4 and G.5 were folded into discussion of motion E.6.

During the meeting, the Presiding Officer determined that, per the provision in Bylaws for an additional meeting if necessary to complete business at the end of the academic year, follow-up questions to Questions to Administrators (F.1-3), Provost's report (G.2), and debate and vote on motion E.6 would be postponed to a meeting on June 13th.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

REITENAUER felt, unexpectedly, more than eagerness for the year to be over a sense of melancholy at the prospect of change to working relationship she had enjoyed over the past year. The Presiding Officer [PO] had a unique opportunity to be in conversation with the Board of Trustees [BoT], administrators, and other faculty. She was worried about the

future for students, colleagues, and the institution as a whole. It was imperative to align professional roles, values, and practices for the changes we need for long-term survival.

REITENAUER reflected on a collection of studies on community-based learning projects, by Margaret Wheatley and Deborah Freeze, *Walk Out, Walk On*, which she had read with a group of UNST faculty. The projects proceeded from a shared belief that another world is possible through co-invention and collective action. No one [else] is coming to save us—all we have is each other. We have to be the ones we [ourselves] are waiting for. So in addition to melancholy, she felt grateful to people she had worked with as PO: Steering Committee and Secretary; technical support behind the scenes from David BURROW and Pei ZHANG; senators and ex-officio members of Senate, including the student and adjunct faculty representatives; chairs of constitutional committees; BoT members; and administrative and staff colleagues across the University.

REITENAUER mentioned the invitation that senators and ex-officio members should have received for a social gathering on June 9th.

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER reviewed the voting procedures and motions, as well as the corrections to the May 2nd Minutes as noted above [A.2].

NOMINATIONS FROM THE FLOOR FOR PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

CARPENTER assumed the Chair for officer nominations.

There were no nominations from the floor.

REITENAUER resumed the Chair.

3. Faculty reading room in the Library

EMERY announced that the Faculty Reading Room in the Library had been re-opened. Keys are available for checkout the circulation desk, for four hours at a time.

4. Introduction of new ASPSU President Kierra Wing

REITENAUER thanked Nya MBOCK for her work as ASPSU President during the past year. MBOCK, responding: it had been a rewarding experience to work with various campus partners. MBOCK introduced the incoming ASPSU President, Kierra WING, who had been much involved in student government, leading the Student Fee Committee for the past two years and having a positive impact on infrastructure. WING said she was graduating this spring, and coming back for a [graduate] certificate program in real estate investment and finance. She had the honor of serving as SFC Chair—for example, working on a proposal to improve Smith Student Union: fixing elevators, accessibility improvements, etc. She was excited by the opportunity to participate in Senate meetings and help make this a place for shared governance.

5. Update on LOA on Teaching Professor ranks

KINSELLA reported on progress [discussion by AAUP-PSU and OAA] defining the new Teaching Professor ranks that Senate approved in March of year and on the process for moving existing non-tenure-track faculty into those ranks if they meet those definitions. They have created two pathways. The first is the retitled pathway, available to non-

tenure-track faculty in the Professor ranks, generally hired before 2014, and to Senior Instructor II's. The second is the promotion pathway, which is more like the normal promotion process, available to faculty who are either not eligible for re-titling or who decline to do so. The two pathways are sequenced, so that the re-titling process is now underway and projected to conclude by this coming September. All non-tenure-track faculty in the Professor ranks should have been notified about their edibility for re-titling. The promotion pathway will then commence in September.

What still needs to be done, KINSELLA said, is figuring out the process and expectations for promotion through the Teaching Professor ranks when departments revise their P&T guidelines in academic year 2022-23. He thanked Shelly CHABON and her team in OAA as well as Jennifer KERNS, who led the effort to establish these new ranks.

6. Announcement from Board of Trustees on presidential search

REITENAUER introduced Benjamin BERRY, BoT Vice Chair and Chair of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. BERRY referred to Steve PERCY's campus announcement that he intended to retire at the end of his contract in June 2023. On May 16th the BoT voted on a resolution to initiate the search for the next PSU President, which BoT Chair Greg HINCKLEY shared in a message to the campus community, as well as the Board's gratitude to PERCY for his dedication during a time of unprecedented difficulties as President. HINCKLEY issued invitations to committee members, and appointed BERRY as chair. He [BERRY] had been in listening sessions with deans and other campus leaders, and further listening sessions would be scheduled for the fall.

BERRY related some of his background: he had been on the BoT since March 2019. He is Executive Vice President for Information Technology and CIO at the Bonneville Power Administration. His undergraduate college was the University of Portland; he also attended PSU for three summers. He has a MBA from UCLA. He and his wife have four children who have attended Oregon State, University of Oregon, University of Portland, and Ohio State. He was served two other universities' school of business and operations and technology management, and has been involved in six [industrial firms], including in Belize and Saudi Arabia. He owns a company called Airship Technologies Group, in design and manufacturing of drones. He serves on the BoT because he believes in the promise of a PSU degree for the knowledge and economic advancement of its students. PSU helped him in his career, and it continues to do so for its students.

BERRY reported that HINCKLEY sent invitations to committee members; two are still outstanding. The committee will have 16 people. An RFP for a search firm is out, and they hope to identify one by June 14th. Over the summer they will be preparing the search advisory committee on best practices. He is personally committed to have regular updates for Faculty Senate. He anticipates there will be listening sessions for the campus community in early fall term. Invitations for committee membership include representatives of the unions, Faculty Senate, and ASPSU, and past presiding officers where possible.

DE LA ROSA: Will the committee include people from science and technology? BERRY did not know the specific names of the sixteen members so far, but for him science and technology are key to the search, particularly for the research at PSU, so he will be looking into that. BERRY added that he wants to better understand some of the ongoing

dynamics of the University, especially around Program Review and Reimagine initiatives. This will be important for recruitment of and interviews with candidates.

REITENAUER thanked BERRY for the information. She noted that she had been asked and agreed to serve on the search committee, and would do everything she could to create a space where faculty can weigh in about this choice proactively.

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT

CARPENTER chaired this section of the meeting.

CARPENTER announced that there had been one nomination made in advance of the meeting for Lindsey WILKINSON [for information slide, see **Appendix 1**].

Lindsey WILKINSON was elected Presiding Officer Elect for 2022-23.

NOMINATIONS FROM THE FLOOR FOR STEERING COMMITTEE

Sybil KELLEY was nominated.

There was a query [via the chat function] how many positions needed nominees. CARPENTER stated that the decision had been made to not use nominations as the decision process, and therefore not to disclose in advance the number of nominations made [in writing] prior to the meeting.

REITENAUER resumed the Chair.

C. DISCUSSION – *none*

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – *none*

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Curricular proposals (GC, UCC) – Consent Agenda

The new courses, changes to courses, dropped courses, and changes to programs listed in **June 6th Agenda Attachment E.1** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of announcements.

The order of presentation of the following two items was inadvertently reversed during the meeting; however, the numbering and sequence of the original agenda is here retained.

2. New program: Grad. Cert. in Affordable Housing Development (GC)

RAI / AJIBADE **moved** approval of the Graduate Certificate in Affordable Housing Development, a new program in CUPA, as summarized in **June 13th Agenda Attachment E.2** and proposed in full in the [Online Curriculum Management System \[OCMS\]](#).

The new program Graduate Certificate in Affordable Housing Development, summarized in **Attachment E.2**, was **approved** (45 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

3. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Indigenous Traditional Ecological & Cultural Knowledge (UCC)

EMERY / CORTEZ **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Indigenous Traditional Ecological and Traditional Knowledge, a new program in CLAS, as summarized in **June 6th Agenda Attachment E.3** and proposed in full in [OCMS](#).

The new program Undergraduate Certificate in Indigenous Traditional Ecological and Traditional Knowledge, summarized in **Attachment E.3**, was **approved** (46 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

4. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Comparative Literary & Cultural Studies (UCC)

WATANABE / RAI **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Comparative Literary and Cultural Studies, a new program in CLAS, as summarized in **June 6th Agenda Attachment E.4** and proposed in full in [OCMS](#).

The new program Undergraduate Certificate in Comparative Literary and Cultural Studies, summarized in **Attachment E.4**, was **approved** (36 yes, 3 no, 5 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

5. Courses for Race & Ethnic Studies Requirement (RESRC)

Per procedural item A.3, background to this motion included oral presentation of report G.3.

REITENAUER invited HERRERA, Chair of RESRC, to give an overview of their annual report [**June 6th Agenda Attachment G.3**] prior to introduction and consideration of the motion itself. HERRERA thanked members of the committee, Sri CRAVEN, Priya KAPOOR, Jungmin KWON, Marc RODRIGUEZ, A. P. SPOTH, Alma TRINIDAD, Ted VAN ALST; Angela CANTON of the CLAS Dean's office for administrative support; HARRIS, IZUMI, and LABISSIERE for further committee support.

HERRERA: The committee did an unprecedented type of work to ensure that this curricular innovation at PSU, the most important in over a decade, was conducted with professionalism, integrity, transparency, and respect. She thanked the committee members for their commitment and hours of work. The committee represented a balance and breath of expertise [in this area]. They are today presenting approximately 80 courses [for Senate consideration]. The committee approved a majority of proposals received.

HERRERA said that the committee's discussion was robust and transparent, and the voting procedure and, she believed, fair and equitable. Proposals that had split votes were marked for discussion by the group; she was pleased with the type of questions raised about pedagogy, readings, etc.

They met recently, HERRERA said, with Lisa WEASEL (WGSS) who is helping to coordinate the summer workshop. About ten faculty are eligible for the summer workshop; these are faculty whose courses were not approved [but could use further work] or had tentative approval.

The committee was given a very clear charge, HERRERA said, which was to establish guidelines for review of RESR courses and approve courses to meet this requirement. She believed the committee had fulfilled its charge, and are here presenting a diverse set of courses that will serve students for the first year of implementation. By and large, there is a balance between courses with a domestic and an international focus. She anticipates even more submissions next year, reflecting the dynamism of PSU faculty.

HARRIS / THORNE **moved** approval of the courses for the undergraduate Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement [RESR] listed in **June 6th Agenda Attachment E.5**.

BEYLER said that subsequent to receipt of the course list, they had received information that one course, INTL 211, Introduction to African Studies, would no longer be offered, so without objection that particular course would be regarded as stricken from the list with the others remaining intact.

TRETHEWAY asked if there was at least one course on the list from every University Studies [junior] cluster. HERRERA did not know if every cluster was represented, but a fair share of them. She had received a message from some academic advisors about this question. She would check. TRETHEWAY asked because the students he advises are generally in certain specific clusters; he was curious if students could fulfill this requirement without taking additional courses. HERRERA: Hopefully they will not have to take too many additional classes. They can double count. She believed the committee would work on this issue more, because they will have the entire academic year. TRETHEWAY hoped his students, in specific clusters, didn't have to double up.

The RESR courses listed in **Attachment E.5** were **approved** (44 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF STEERING COMMITTEE

CARPENTER took the Chair again for the election of officers.

BEYLER: a couple of candidates submitted information slides in advance, which he would now show in random order [see **Appendices 2-3**]: Sybil KELLEY, Pronoy RAI.

There were also candidates who didn't have an opportunity to submit slides, so they would have a minute or two to say a few words, again in random order.

Matt CHORPENNING: teach in SSW as an assistant professor practice. I have been affiliated with PSU in some way or another since 2011—as a graduate student, student activist, research fellow, adjunct faculty, fixed-term faculty, and now non-tenure-track faculty. I have been in Faculty Senate for the last few years and am now interested in serving on Steering to deepen my commitment to organizational equity, which is where social work practice is rooted in communities, organizations, and macro systems change. I feel that continuing my commitment to Faculty Senate by working on Steering is to help further the mission and some of the work we've been doing since I've joined.

Kate CONSTABLE: I have been at PSU for 11 years as an academic professional, first in SSW and now as a [gateway] director in Academic and Career Services. In that role, I serve departments across three schools and colleges: CoE, CLAS, and SSW. It has been a professional joy to work on the systems at PSU to best serve students. I like to tell colleagues we have the best students in the state, and I would look forward to continuing this work on Steering Committee.

BEYLER indicated that several people had been nominated [during the meeting through the chat function]; he was not clear whether or not they wished to accept the nomination and so gave them that chance.

[Two of those so nominated, David RAFFO and Evguenia DAVIDOVA, did not respond and one, Susan LINDSAY, respectfully declined the nomination. BEYLER circulated a ballot by e-mail. At this point Parliamentarian CLARK raised a point

of order regarding the two nominees who had not responded. The ballot was therefore withdrawn and the election postponed until BEYLER and CLARK could consult with each other to resolve this issue.]

REITENAUER resumed the chair.

6. Resolution on guiding principles and priorities for program review

(Steering, AHC-APRCA)

Per procedural item A.3, background to this motion included oral presentation of reports G.3 and G.4.

REITENAUER [per A.3] indicated that while the election issue was being sorted out, the meeting would proceed with two committee reports relevant as background to the next agenda item. She also proposed that if they could maintain a quorum after 5:00, Senate would continue business in hope of avoiding a second meeting next week, which would be her preference, but if necessary Senate would meet on the 13th to complete business.

CRUZAN, co-chair of Budget Committee gave an overview of their annual report [**June 6th Agenda Attachment G.4**]. The committee's primary role is to be a communication conduit between faculty and administration. BC reviews curricular proposals that come to Faculty Senate and provides comments on their budgetary implications. Every two weeks, BC meets with and receives reports from various administrative units, including the VP for Finance and Administration, the Provost and the VP for Enrollment Management. These are opportunities for frank discussion about the implications of budget challenges for the curriculum and the quality of education for our students, and to provide a faculty voice that can be heard by administrators.

Part of the annual process, CRUZAN continued, is the Integrated Planning, Enrollment, and Budget [IPEB] process. This includes BC representatives meeting with the deans or directors of each college and other academic units, to get feedback from them and summarize it for the administration. It's fair to say this had been very open process. The report includes a summary of the IPEB process.

CRUZAN noted that the curricular content can be negatively impacted when there is a loss of non-tenure-track faculty and graduate teaching assistants. Graduate TAs can be valuable mentors for undergraduates and help us achieve goals for persistence and success. Such changes in TA staffing change the workload for faculty, who then have less time to focus on teaching and research responsibilities.

BC sees a number of opportunities, CRUZAN said. One is the expansion of online curriculum, including hybrid and attend anywhere modes. There is a discussion across the University about which modes work best for different disciplines. Another opportunity that the administration has acted on is investment in programs that are limited not by student applications, but by available resources. These include the Honors College, Social Work, Computer Science and other programs that could improve our total enrollment.

Overall it has been a challenging year, CRUZAN said. We have seen bridge funding continue: last fiscal year around \$11 million, which is now down to around \$7 million. That is 5% of our budget last year, and we are looking at 3% bridge funding this year—that is, funding coming out of reserves. There is a difference between budget and actual expenditure, because, as in our own households, we make a budget and then at the end of

the year don't want to find you have overspent. Thus budgets are often conservative, which is why there is often a difference between what is budgeted and what is actually spent by the end of the year. Our administration faces problems in budgeting with many unknowns going into next year. We don't know what it's going to be like. For example, last year there was a shift in the [state allocation] model which benefited PSU, but then other things change over of the summer.

CRUZAN believed that BC members are comfortable with how the budget situation is being handled. It is their hope that things continue to turn around, and that we won't see such a large gap between the amount of money we bring in versus what we're spending.

CHORPENNING wished to clarify: did we use 5% in bridge funding this year and intend to use 3% next year, or was it 5% last year and 3% this year? CRUZAN: in fiscal year 2022, 5% is what BC was told this morning, and for fiscal year 2023 the budgeting is for about \$7 million [in bridge funding], about 3% of the total value.

BORDEN asked if there were specific recommendations BC had for the administration in the budgeting process. CRUZAN said they had been pushing for the last years for further investment in resource-limited programs. He was pleased to see that even in challenging conditions there had been investment in units such as Honors and SSW that received more applications they can handle. Co-chair EMERY: It has been a dialogue as they've worked through IPEB. She believed the information they gather through this process is listened to by the administration.

CARPENTER resumed the Chair for resumption of the vote for Steering Committee.

The adjusted ballot, including candidates Matt CHORPENNING, Kate CONSTABLE, Evguenia DAVIDOVA, Sybil KELLEY, David RAFFO, and Pronoy RAI (listed on the ballot forms in random order) was distributed. An additional vote was necessary to break a tie between two candidates.

*CHORPENNING and KELLEY were **elected** members of Steering Committee.*

*REITENAUER returned to the Chair for resumption of item **E.6**.*

The Presiding Officer [per A.3] announced that, in view of time, the current meeting would continue with presentation of the AHC-APRCA report (G.5) as background to E.6 and with the Questions to Administrations, but that consideration of the E.6. would be postponed until a second meeting on June 13th.

GAMBURD, co-chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment, gave an overview of their annual report [**June 6th Agenda Attachment G.5**; for presentation slides see **June 6th Minutes Appendix G.5**]. The committee, GAMBURD stated, exists to interface between budget, which is the responsibility of the administration, and curriculum, which is the responsibility of the Faculty. During budget reductions, we must deal with financial pressures which affect faculty jobs and the curriculum that faculty are able to offer. This is a difficult, fluid space, in which the committee has tried to have generative conversation. The Committee's charge is to ensure faculty participation in [determining] PSU's collective future; to recommend principles and priorities [for these decisions]; to plan and implement transparent communication with and feedback from all stakeholders; and, if needed, to plan and implement contractually mandated hearings for retrenchment and

Article 22 processes, as outlined in the PSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement. We want decision making to be informed by research and data, and feedback to be solicited prior to making decision. We want resources to be devoted to the reimagining process, and that we have a transparent process with open communication.

GAMBURD continued: As we have heard from CRUZAN (BC), there is a \$7 million gap between expenditures and revenues that OAA needs to bridge in the next two years. The Program Review and Reduction Process [PRRP] is one of several strategies. Others are the retirement transition option, a strategic hiring freeze, the hope that we will meet our enrollment targets, and information from the Huron Report on administrative services.

GAMBURD reviewed the status of PRRP: in Phase One, the Provost's Program Reduction Working Group created driver and value metrics to identify eighteen units for further scrutiny, as AHC-APRCA created guiding principles and priorities for the review process. In Phase Two, the Provost identified eighteen units which were asked to write narratives [responding to the metrics]. In Phase Three, five units have been asked to write further plans: Applied Linguistics, Conflict Resolution, International and Global Studies, Theater, and Leadership in Sustainable Education.

In May, GAMBURD reported, AHC-APRCA met with the five units and also received a letter from the five units, addressed to the campus community, which is appended to the Committee's report. Concerns raised in that meeting and in the letter involve the lack of clarity about goals and criteria in PRRP; questions about the specific evaluation of metrics used to select the eighteen units in Phase Two; and unclarity about the goals and evaluation criteria for the Phase Three plans. This leads to a question whether there is distrust and exhaustion among the faculty of the five units. The prolonged and unclear process damages hope, drains self-esteem, and diminishes creativity. There has also been a lack of communication and some lack of clarity about how exactly any plans for reductions in these units would make a significant dent in that \$7 million budget gap. There is more detail in the letter from the five units.

Also in May, GAMBURD said, AHC-APRCA met with the Provost. Recently OAA sent letters to the five [Phase Three] units offering \$25,000 per unit of summer support. They were asked, in consideration of workload, to limit the plan texts to 10 pages; the deadline was extended to December 1st; and the units were offered consultation about their budgets with college financial officers and Amy MULKERIN (Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning). Additional clarity was given to the plans, which would to show how the unit can function within the current budget. The Provost has said that no decisions have yet been made, and that she envisions a serious dialogue about how we move forward within constrained resources.

LA ROSA asked whether AHC-APRCA represents the administration or the faculty. GAMBURD: it is a Faculty Senate committee, made up of representatives from Steering Committee, Budget Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Educational Policy Committee, as well as five faculty members appointed by the Committee on Committees. It does have consultants from OAA, but it is a Faculty committee. LA ROSA: For the [unit narratives], it was not clear to him what were the requirements. GAMBURD believed that the idea is that the department chairs and the respective deans would be in conversation, and that the departments received letters

[from the Provost] responding to the suggestions and innovations in their reports. The process ends with Phase Three. Her understanding is that deans will follow up with units about how to implement suggested innovations.

*As noted above, by determination of the Presiding Officer per the Bylaws pertaining to completion of business at the end of the academic year, further consideration of E.6 was **postponed** until an additional meeting on June 13th.*

F. QUESTION PERIOD

President PERCY was not present in person, as he was attending the Big Sky Conference meeting; however, he prepared a video responding to the two questions F.1 and F.2 and incorporating his regular report, G.1.

1. Question to President

A Faculty Senator addressed the following question to the President:

Given that you have announced your retirement, can you please comment on the rationale for pursuing a search for a new Vice President for Research?_This is a key position for the PSU research infrastructure that needs to be in good philosophical alignment with the President. Given the financial and other costs associated with pursuing the search, it seems that this search should be postponed so it can be handled by your successor.

2. Question to President

Senator KELLEY, on behalf of faculty colleagues in the departments of Applied Linguistics, Conflict Resolution, International and Global Studies, Theater, and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership, addressed the following question to the President:

We acknowledge the challenge facing administration in creating a balanced budget and acknowledge that adjusting the organizational structure and function of our institution is necessary. We recognize that the Program Review and Reduction Process (PRRP) was initiated and the Faculty Senate Academic Program Review and Curriculum Adjustment (APRCA) committee was created as a way for faculty and administrators to engage in shared governance around these challenges.

The PRRP process has not aligned with the [APRCA committee guiding principles](#) related to transparency, due process, and shared governance. Criteria for evaluation have not been shared and there has not been meaningful engagement or feedback around Phase II or Phase III narratives. Further, the process has reinforced siloes and does not support meaningful collaboration toward stated goals of interdisciplinary programming and research for climate resiliency and racial justice.

If the Provost refuses to stop the PRRP and start over with meaningful faculty engagement, will you intervene to do so?

*The video with PERCY's **answer** to questions F.1 and F.2, together with monthly report G.1, was played:*

The Huron Study on administrative structures, processes, and policies came out this week, and a message about this was sent to campus this past week. One notable finding is that PSU, compared to other universities, is heavily decentralized. PERCY believed this was a result decisions over our 75-year history about adding units, changing process, creating new specialties and operations; it's a system cobbled together over many years by well intentioned people trying to move the University forward. The study allows us to step back and see what we've learned from all this. Can we be more efficient, are there ways we can be more timely, can we reduce the amount of effort that goes into our transactions? This would make us a smoother operation—[able to more] rapidly respond to the needs of the institution as we move forward with our mission.

While no major actions will be taken over the summer, PERCY stated, there are two things that he thought were really promising, and he wanted to start thinking about them this summer. One thing to look at is federated service centers—the idea that we may be able to cluster administrative operations different ways, pulling things together, and bring more career mobility to people in those positions.

Second, PERCY wanted to look at student-facing services: can we align them in a more effective way? We've created a large number of new centers and units to support students in different ways. Can we align them better?

PERCY addressed Question **F.1**. He had announced that he will be stepping away from the position of President at the end of his three-year term, that is, at the end of the next academic year in summer 2023. Is this to time to have the challenge of recruiting a Vice President [for Research]? He understood the question, because he knew the importance of an effective leader to support and guide our research operations. He will talk to search committee, chaired by the Provost, and to the search firm to explore the question and timing and make sure that whatever we do is done in a timely, effective fashion.

PERCY then turned to Question **F.2** regarding PRRP. He recognized that this was very tough work. It is important to remember, PERCY said, that we are in a dynamic, disrupted period. We are dealing with increased enrollment competition from other universities. We have changing patters of students' interest in majors and careers. We are focused on student success and quickly doing all we can to advance student graduation. We are facing enrollment decline, which has cause a reduction in net tuition revenue and caused challenges of financial sustainability, which he as talked about before.

In this difficult context, PERCY said, we're trying to use multiple levers, including things other than PRRP, to reach financial sustainability and set up the University to be successful moving into he future, and allow best efforts in student success. The PRRP parallels the Huron Study; it was a way to look at our overall operations and improve our overall ability to meet our mission. Phase One of the process involved collecting data and organizing dashboards with a variety of different indicators for all the units of the University. Those dashboards were created with the help of AHC-APRCA, and reviewed by deans, the Provost, and others in the process. As a result of that we moved into Phase Two. Thirteen of the eighteen [identified] units have received feedback from the Provost, with appreciation for the plans and made and the ideas they've had looking for innovation. Some actions are already being taken, and some really interesting ideas have emerged, including new pedagogy, increasing online and hybrid learning options,

development of non-thesis [and] non-majors tracks, increasing applied components and outreach to professional communities, and increasing partnerships with community colleges. People have taken this opportunity to be creative and innovative; those thirteen units will now move forward to implement those plans.

Five units, PERCY continued, have received communications from the Provost and the respective deans asking them to create specific plans to move their units forward within the constraints of resources they're currently facing. There is a deadline [*in the meanwhile, extended until January 15th*] to submit a report of plans for their unit. Between now and then, those units are receiving grants and other supports, a chance to talk with deans, and other occasions to engage in the process to create those plans. When we have a resolution on those five academic units, the review process that we've been undertaking will be complete. We'll be able to move on to enact some of the innovative ideas and other elements of the projects to create greater financial sustainability.

To the direct question PERCY answered that, after deliberation, he would not step in to stop or re-start [PRRP]. He wished to explain why. No process is perfect, he said, especially ones that you've had to create without a lot of precedents behind them. He knew that the process has had its imperfections, but overall [he believed] it had stayed true to its objectives and mission. The last time we tried program review, the faculty-led process didn't come to fruition. We learned that the administration would need to lead this type of program review. That's what we have done this time around. But we stayed true to the idea of faculty involvement. AHC-APRCA embodied faculty involvement in planning and implementation. While it has been challenging, people are undertaking exciting new initiatives and projects which will advance those units and also, he believed, advance enrollment and net revenue. He believed the Provost and deans have worked diligently and put in tremendous effort, as have the faculty in those academic units. He thanked everybody who had put their full energy to do this work. He believed they have striven to adhere to key values of student success, innovation, and dialogue.

To start over, PERCY said, would be in his view tremendously disruptive, neglecting the important innovations that have been made. We have moved through almost all the process and are just finishing the last phase, so he felt it was not appropriate or correct to stop the process and start again. He hoped we could move through this process and learn from it, and move on to other things in our academic lives that we'd like to pursue.

PERCY again thanked all for helping us get through a tremendously disruptive year. He hoped there would be time for reflection and healing over the summer.

Follow-up questions were postponed until the additional meeting on June 13th.

3. Question to Provost

Senator KELLEY, on behalf of faculty colleagues in the departments of Applied Linguistics, Conflict Resolution, International and Global Studies, Theater, and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership, addressed the following question to the Provost:

We acknowledge the challenge facing administration in creating a balanced budget and acknowledge that adjusting the organizational structure and function of our institution is necessary. We recognize that

the Program Review and Reduction Process (PRRP) was initiated and the Faculty Senate Academic Program Review and Curriculum Adjustment (APRCA) committee was created as a way for faculty and administrators to engage in shared governance around these challenges.

The PRRP process has not aligned with the [APRCA committee guiding principles](#) related to transparency, due process, and shared governance. Criteria for evaluation have not been shared and there has not been meaningful engagement or feedback around Phase II or Phase III narratives. Further, the process has reinforced siloes and does not support meaningful collaboration toward stated goals of interdisciplinary programming and research for climate resiliency and racial justice.

Due to the lack of transparency, due process, and shared governance in the implementation of the PRRP, will you stop this process and start over with a renewed process that aligns with the guiding principles of the APRCA committee?

JEFFORDS responded: Obviously there are similarities to the question to the President. He clearly stated that he's not prepared to step in and pause the process.

JEFFORDS joined the President in believing that we should finish the process as we started it. She completely agreed, as the President said, that the process is difficult—some of the most difficult conversations that universities undertake. We see this all over the country where university after university is undergoing similar conversations. She had utmost respect for the units who have participated in this process, and incredible empathy for the stress it has presented to them and for the workload they have undertaken. She was appreciative to them for their continued engagement and positive processes they are undertaking to serve students and continue the mission of the University.

JEFFORDS wished to remind everyone that this was a conversation we began in partnership with Faculty Senate leadership. She wished to give thanks and gratitude and acknowledge the leadership of Michele GAMBURD, at that time as Presiding Officer and then on AHC-APRCA. She had engaged with AHC-APRCA on numerous occasions, and she was grateful to the committee for the time they had given to allow to attend their meetings and joins their conversations. In every instance when she participated in those conversations, shared ideas, and heard their feedback, she changed her approach in response to their input. She felt at least that she had been engaged with them in partnership. She had extended the deadline [for the Phase Three responses] until December 1st [*later extended to January 15th*] in response to the committee's request.

At the start of the process, JEFFORDS recalled, we established the Program Reduction Working Group to develop the dashboards that were used as the initiator for these conversations. This group had representatives from all colleges. They held multiple townhall meetings, presented to and sought feedback from department chairs and associate deans. They significantly changed the dashboards in response to that feedback. She felt that they conducted a inclusive, transparent, and engaged process that received and responded to faculty feedback.

JEFFORDS pointed out the website that includes all the information that's available throughout this process. They tried to be as inclusive and transparent with information.

They had meetings and at the college and school level, and posted answers in response to questions that came forward in the townhalls. They used direct emails and the PSU website to communicate details of the process. The deans have been constantly engaged with the units throughout, and continue to do so. She provided updates to Senate and AHC-APRCA, and remained open to hearing feedback and sharing information.

JEFFORDS did not feel it is in our best interest to start over. As the President stated, we are nearing the close of the process. It was never her intention that this would be an ongoing, permanent part of the institution; it would be one-time process that we would complete and then move forward.

JEFFORDS hoped that at the next meeting she could offer her regular report. She was grateful to Senator CRUZAN, who had summarized a bit of the conversation they had in the Budget Committee. She acknowledged that these conversations around budgets can feel exhausting, but she wanted to share the real progress we've made in one year to close the gap in our budget. She was confident we would continue to make progress.

G. REPORTS

1. President's Report

PERCY's report was folded into the video in which he responded to the Questions to Administrators F.1-2, above.

2. Provost's Report

*JEFFORDS's regular report was **postponed** until the additional meeting on June 13th.*

3. **Annual report of Race & Ethnic Studies Committee** – *Per procedural item A.3, oral presentation of this report was folded into discussion of item E.5, above.*
4. **Annual report of Budget Committee** – *Per procedural item A.3, oral presentation of this report was folded into discussion of item E.6, above.*
5. **Annual report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment** – *Per procedural item A.3, oral presentation of this report was folded into discussion of item E.6, above.*

*The following reports were **received** as part of the Consent Agenda. See the respective Attachments to the June 6th Agenda.*

6. **Annual report of Academic Appeals Board**
7. **Annual report of Educational Policy**
8. **Annual report of Faculty Development Committee**
9. **Annual report of Graduate Council**
10. **Annual report of Intercollegiate Athletics Board**
11. **Annual report of Library Committee**
12. **Annual report of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
13. **Annual report of University Research Committee**
14. **Annual report of University Writing Council**

H. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:33 p.m.

Lindsey Wilkinson (he/him; they/them)

University positions and service

- Associate professor (2008-present) and chair (2018-present), Sociology
- Shared-line faculty in Sociology/University Studies (2008-present)
- Human Subjects Research Review Committee member (2012-18) and chair (2016-18)
- Interdisciplinary Collaborative in Applied Social Science (I-CASS) member (2018-19)
- Statewide Major Transfer Map in Sociology committee member (2020-22)
- Faculty Senate (2021-present); Committee on Committees member (2021-present)

Research areas: sociology of education; health & well-being of gender and sexual minority youth; quantitative methods

Interest in POE

- Have worked closely with PO Reitenauer and POE Carpenter in the past – appreciate opportunity to work with this team, to provide continuity in the PO role, and to be mentored
- Appreciate opportunities to develop/hone skills and to develop relationships in service to PSU
- Value trust and relationship building among stakeholders across campus, transparency, opportunities for faculty engagement with leadership and faculty input into and oversight of decisions and processes affecting PSU

Sybil Kelley (she/her)

- At PSU since 1999
 - MS-Teaching-Center for Science Ed. (1999-2002)
 - PhD-Environmental Sciences & Management; Fellow with Center for Learning & Teaching--West (2002-2009)
 - Fixed term faculty in Center for Science Ed., University Studies, and Environmental Sciences (2009-2011)
 - TT in Leadership for Sustainability Education (COE) in 2011
- In Portland community for 30 years
- Uphold PSU's Motto: "Let Knowledge Serve the City" in all endeavors--that's why I'm here!
- Strong Relationships across campus and throughout Portland community
- Relationship-based approach to my work
- Systems thinker/Ecological design
- Teaching and research at intersection of STEM and Sustainability Education--Ecology, Outdoor, and Garden-based Education



If I serve on Steering Committee, I will strive to ensure that we engage all stakeholders in the change processes--starting from our shared values, building from relationships, and strengthening interconnections and interdisciplinary activities.

Pronoy Rai, Ph. D.

- Assistant Professor, International & Global Studies (IGS), CUPA
 - Affiliated Faculty, Earth, Environment, & Society Doctoral Program and Department of Geography (CLAS)
 - Associated Faculty/Fellow, Institute for Asian Studies, Institute for Sustainable Solutions
- **Ongoing University Service**
 - Senator, CUPA, 2021-24
 - Member, University Studies Council, 2020-
 - Member, UNST Executive Director Search Committee, 2022
 - Member, UNST Cluster Curriculum Committee, 2022
 - Chair, IGS Curriculum Committee, 2021-23
 - Chair, IGS Marketing & Outreach Committee, 2021-23
 - Member, CUPA Dean's Faculty Awards Advisory Committee, 2021-22
- **Ongoing Disciplinary/National Service**
 - Chair, Research Grants Committee, American Association of Geographers (AAG), 2022-23 (Member, 2020-23)
 - Director, Board of the Development Geographies Specialty Group, AAG, 2021-23
 - Delegate for Portland State University, American Institute of Indian Studies, 2019-

APRCA Committee

June 2022 Report to Faculty Senate

Interface between budget and curriculum

- The administration has the responsibility to budget for the university
- The faculty has responsibility for the curriculum
- During budget reductions, we must interact when financial decisions affect faculty jobs and the curriculum that faculty are able to offer



Committee membership

- From Constitutional committees (5)
 - Steering: Michele Gamburd
 - Budget: Mitch Cruzan
 - UCC: Peter Chaille
 - GC: Yangdong Pan
 - EPC: Joan Petit
- From Committee on Committees (5)
 - Rachel Cunliffe, Jones Estes, Candyce Reynolds, Kellie Gallagher, and Michelle Swinehart (diversity advocate)
- From OAA (4)
 - Sy Adler, Laura Hickman, Vanelda Hopes, and Amy Mulkerin.

Committee Charge

- Focus holistically on PSU's collective future
- Ensure faculty participation
- Recommend [principles and priorities](#)
- Plan and implement transparent communications,
- Solicit input, feedback, and involvement from faculty, Deans and Chairs/department heads, students, staff, and other stakeholders
- Plan and implement meetings and interactions
- Assist in contractually mandated retrenchment hearings as per [Article 22](#) of the [PSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement](#)

Guiding Principles and Priorities

1. Equitable and Meaningful Engagement of All Stakeholders
2. Focus on Student Access, Quality Learning Experiences, and Completion
3. Our Work Will Change; Let's Make it for the Better
4. Research and Data-Informed-Decision Making
5. Seek Feedback Prior to Decision Making
6. Devote Resources to the Reimagining Process
7. Transparent Process and Open Communication with All Stakeholders

Budget balancing strategies

- Goal: Close the \$7 million gap between expenditures and revenue that OAA needs to bridge in the next two years.
- PRRP is one of several strategies
- Other strategies include
 - Retirement transition option
 - Strategic hiring freeze
 - Meeting enrollment targets
 - Huron Report on support services

Program Review/ Reduction Process (PRRP)

- [Phase I](#) (last year)
 - Provost's Program Reduction Working Group created "driver" and "value" metrics used to identify 18 units for further scrutiny.
 - APRCA created [Guiding Principles and Priorities](#) to guide the program reduction process.
- [Phase II](#) (spring) The Provost asked the 18 units identified as falling below the median on driver metrics to write narratives.
 - Summaries (once approved by units) will be available on [PRRP website](#)
- [Phase III](#) (now thru December)
 - 13 units are implementing initiatives described in their narratives.
 - 5 units are writing Phase III plans.
 - Applied Linguistics (CLAS), Conflict Resolution (CLAS), International and Global Studies (CUPA), Theater (COTA), and the Leadership in Sustainability Education track in Educational Policy and Leadership (COE).

APRCA meeting with the 5 units on 5/5/2022, and 5 units' letter to APRCA 5/27/2022

- Lack of clarity about goals and criteria for the PRRP process
 - a) What evaluation was applied to the metrics to select the 18 units?
 - b) What criteria were applied to the Phase 2 narratives to select 5 units?
 - c) What are the goals and evaluation criteria of the Phase 3 plans?
- Morale: Mistrust and exhaustion. The prolonged and unclear process damages hope, drains self-esteem, and diminishes creativity.
- Lack of communication and consultation; lack of budget clarity
- Strategic planning: Scrap the PRRP and instead engage the entire campus in strategic thinking about the future of the university.

APRCA meeting with the Provost on 5/23 and OAA letters to the 5 units 5/27

- \$25,000 per unit of summer support
- Plan text limited to 10 pages of text; deadline extended to Dec 1
- Consultation about unit's budget with College SFO and Vice Provost for Academic Budget and Planning
- Task: Show how the unit can function with current budget or alter programs to fit current budget
- No decisions have been made yet; serious dialog about how the units will move forward with 'constrained resources'

Questions, conversation, and next steps