

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 13 June 2022  
(Online Conference)**

**Presiding Officer:** Vicki Reitenauer

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Baccar, Carpenter, Chorpenning, Clark, Cortez, Cruzan, Donlan, Duncan, Eastin, Emery, Eppley, Farahmandpur, Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Gamburd, Goforth, Heryer, Hunt, Jaén Portillo, Kelley, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Limbu, Lindsay, Luckett, Mudiamu, Oschwald, Rai, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Thieman, Watanabe, Webb, Wilkinson.

**Alternates present:** Moti Hara for De La Vega, Shayna Snyder for Harris, Claire Wheeler for Izumi, Nathaniel Garrod for Raffo, Sam Peters for Romaniuk, Sarah Dougher for Taylor.

**Senators absent:** Borden, Caughman, Clucas, Colligan, Dusicka, Eppley, Erev, Feng (Wu-chang), Flores, Gómez, Hunt, Kennedy, Law, Loney, Smith, Thorne, Tretheway, Tuor, Wern.

**Ex-officio members present:** Beyler, Bowman, Burgess, Bynum, Chabon, Chivers, Comer, Cunliffe, Duh, Estes, Feng (Wu-chi), Ford, Jeffords, Knepfle, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Reynolds, Voegele, 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. **Procedural: Changes to agenda order – Consent Agenda**

*Questions to Administrators (item F) and Provost’s report (item G.2) were moved to follow announcements, then followed by Unfinished Business (item D.1).*

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

REITENAUER appreciated members attending this important meeting during a very busy time at the end of the academic year. Several people had reached out to her expressing appreciation that she sometimes began the meeting with a poem or quotation of some kind. She wished to do this again in her last meeting as Presiding Officer with a poem by Naomi Shihab Nye, “Cross That Line”:

Paul Robeson stood  
on the northern border  
of the USA  
and sang into Canada  
where a vast audience  
sat on folding chairs  
waiting to hear him.  
  
He sang into Canada.  
His voice left the USA  
when his body was

not allowed to cross  
that line.  
  
Remind us again,  
brave friend.  
What countries may we  
sing into?  
What lines should we all  
be crossing?  
What songs travel toward us  
from far away  
to deepen our days?

These words, REITENAUER commented, invite us into a space where maybe we can imagine working in ways that make possible what we think might not be possible.

REITENAUER gave an overview of the structure of the meeting. She was glad to have had the opportunity to meet people in person at the gathering at the park last Thursday.

## 2. Announcement from Secretary

BEYLER reminded attendees of the protocols for using the chat function.

## 3. Announcement from Presiding Officer Elect

CARPENTER reminded senators that the first meeting of the upcoming academic year would be on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. This first meeting would be, again, an online (Zoom) conference. With so much still unknown, she would be in consultation with Steering Committee about the modality for subsequent meetings.

\*\*\*\*\*

### *Change to agenda order:*

*Question Period (follow-up discussion) and Provost's Report moved here.*

## F. QUESTION PERIOD – follow-up discussion

*Questions were presented to and answered the President and Provost at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Per the Bylaws, opportunity was here allowed for follow-up questions from Senate members. The original questions and President's and Provost's responses are included in the June 6<sup>th</sup> Minutes.*

PERCY gave an update regarding the search for Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. After conversation with the search committee and search firm, he had decided to continue with the search but slow down the pace so that finalists for the position can be reviewed after the new President has been selected by the Board of Trustees.

REITENAUER indicated that follow-up to the next two questions, to the President and Provost, would be handled together, as the questions were closely connected. KELLY, the senator who submitted the questions, had the first opportunity for follow-up. KELLY said she would defer for now. But she invited the Provost to do the right thing.

A senator requested recognition of Alissa HARTIG (LING): the Provost highlighted in her answer the dashboards as primary evidence of transparency. Based on communications from OAA, the role of these dashboards was primarily to identify departments for scrutiny in Phase Two. However, departments were told that Phase Two narrative would allow them to provide additional context and qualitative data. This led to a three-part question. First, what criteria for evaluation were applied to this additional information? Second, what measures were taken that these criteria were applied systematically and consistently to all eighteen units; for example, was a rubric used? Third, why weren't these evaluation criteria provided to the units? JEFFORDS agreed that she referred the dashboards as one indication of transparency. There was probably a difference, however, in views of the intentions behind the dashboards. Neither she nor members of the working group thought that purpose of the dashboards was to enable scrutiny, but rather to create opportunities to think across all of our units in relation to values and outcomes that matter to us all: student success, graduation rates, retention rates, presence and performance of BIPOC students and faculty. She believed we would all agree that these are things to pay attention to. In Phase Two they looked at how

units were performing in relation to the shared metrics. They then asked a group of units to help us understand how their performance on those metrics different from other units across the institution. This was intended not pejoratively, but informatively. For example, how might unit history affect the way they offered their curriculum, or the numbers of faculty? Several units talked about national enrollment declines, and what they were doing in response to these national trends. There was extraordinary innovative and intentional work being done across the institution—e.g., building partnerships with community colleges; or revising curriculum to welcome different student populations, such as offering a non-thesis master's degree option. Several units said they'd already begun to see rises in enrollment or completion rates. The dashboards themselves don't show the richness of this work.

JEFFORDS added that she had discussions with AHC-APRCA and with some faculty from those units saying that it was inadvisable to fully publish these reports, because it might be perceived as placing them under additional pressure. Simultaneously, she also heard from others not in those units that they wanted to see what was happening. A compromise has been to create summaries, along with the responses from OAA and deans.

To answer more specifically, JEFFORDS said there was not a [single] rubric. They were trying to be respectful of each unit's culture, history, and ongoing work. It was also important for the deans to be engaged in these conversations to reflect colleges' larger strategic goals. It seemed inappropriate to have one template as though these units were all the same.

KINSELLA: For Phase Three the five units are asked to indicate whether they can fulfill their goals within current budgets. If these units can make do within their current budgets, is it safe to say that the retrenchment process per Article 22 [of the CBA] is off the table for the remainder of PRRP? JEFFORDS knew that her answer would not make people happy, but it would be premature for her to say now that Article 22 is off the table. If units show that they can function within current budgets, that is a conversation that needs to include their deans and college budget officers. It would be premature for her to say that if they come up with a plan, everything else is off the table. She could not predetermine decisions and outcomes.

RAI requested recognition of Polo RODRIGUEZ (IGS): There is incorrect information in the dashboard for his department. He raised this issue and a townhall meeting in spring of last year, when he was department chair. He was told to raise with the dean; he also discussed it with Matt CARLSON who was in charge of some of the data. But they were never changed. It's in reference to SCH generated by their unit. [It appeared that courses with] UNST prefix had been accounted to University Studies even when taught by their faculty. It makes a big difference for their RCAT values. They are now going into Phase Three with faulty data. JEFFORDS said that he was not the only one to raise this issue. She would not use the adjective faulty. There was an agreed upon process about how to count SCH and assign it to units. That had been determined long before she ever got to PSU, and is the way in which RCAT data is calculated. Several units have said, our faculty are teaching in another unit, and not getting credit for that SCH. She believed that SCH is calculated by the course prefix and not by the faculty and unit paying for the faculty. There is a legitimate debate to be had about how we want to count faculty teaching in other units. She would welcome the chance to have that debate, but it should be consistent across all units. Every change that is in favor of one unit would be potentially in disfavor of others; therefore, we need the process to be inclusive if we are going to rethink this. She recognized that this is an area that needs further attention; it cannot be managed at the individual unit level.

KELLEY requested recognition of Nike ARNOLD (LING): the five Phase Three units have yet to receive clear guidance on how their narratives will be evaluated, beyond broad requests to demonstrate viability. That raises questions of what exactly is viability, what are some measurable criteria? For more than a month after having been notified, they have not received guidance. JEFFORDS noted that the deadline has been adjusted to December 1<sup>st</sup> [*in the meanwhile, to January 15<sup>th</sup>*]. She said that the guidance for each of these units has to take place in conversation with the [respective] deans. The deans have met with each of these units for conversations about plans. She believed that the deans really need to be involved and that is not up to her to come up with a single template, because each unit is distinct.

AJIBADE requested recognition of Andres LA ROSA (PHY): Is it right to assume that benchmarks or criteria will be spelled out, so units will know what is needed to get a green light? JEFFORDS: as previously indicated, specifics need to be worked out with the deans.

KELLEY requested recognition of Tetyana SYDORENKO (LING), who had a comment in the spirit of looking for more clarity on how units were evaluated and will be evaluated. The Provost mentioned that deans were involved in discussions of the narrative reports and communications with the units. Their dean was unable to explain the criteria for evaluation of Phase Two narratives, so they have little confidence in the role that deans will continue to play in this process. JEFFORDS appreciated the feedback. She would immediately reach out to all of the deans and have a conversation about clarifying criteria.

DONLON requested recognition of Jennifer RUTH (FILM): Tying in with the question from RODRIGEZ, it appeared that the Provost did not want to go into detail about the information on RCAT and service to other departments, which might favor one department and disfavor another. It is a level of intensive work that we haven't done, but there is a lot at stake, obviously. She echoed KELLY saying, do the right thing. The right thing would mean doing that level of intensive work and making sure those numbers are correct. RUTH was concerned, having read through the materials for this meeting, about the issues around transparency that many people have shared. She was concerned about how [the Provost] continued to reiterate that [the review] has been done in consultation with Senate and AHC-APRCA. The intention seemed to be if they do take action, [to be able to assert that] they had not violated academic freedom. But many faculty are saying the work has not actually been in concert with faculty. That's a problem. RUTH's specific question had to do with RCAT. She was disturbed to learn that the original metric was total SCH divided by FTE. She was then not surprised to see programs on the chopping block who have a history and a reputation of making sure there are sustainable jobs with job security—they don't exploit a high number of adjuncts. Departments that have a reputation of having an army of adjunct labor without good job security and without good pay were not on the list, as far as she could tell. Was equity and sustainability as a value metric taken into consideration, looking at jobs where people can mentor students, have office hours, etc. She was concerned that the disaster capitalism that's going on across the country—where tenured and full-time non-tenure-track faculty are laid off, and then rehired as adjuncts in some cases—doesn't happen here. JEFFORDS appreciated these observations. At the more immediate level around RCAT, she reiterated that the determination has been used for years. If we think those are not the correct practices we should revisit them, but we have to do it as a community, across the board. RUTH was raising a larger issue around faculty status. We would need to look at this unit by unit. There are a lot of units who are teaching a lot of students, who are still doing everything

they can to maintain commitments to faculty and faculty workloads. She wouldn't subscribe to a blanket statement that every unit that is doing well on enrollment is therefore not doing well by faculty. There are many units who would disagree with such an assertion.

SANCHEZ requested recognition of Priya KAPOOR (IGS): The notion of values is really important. Is it the case that the Working Group, who developed the driver and value metrics, barely consisted of any faculty and didn't receive adequate campus input on these metrics? The value metrics as described did not reflect academic values as we understand them collectively at PSU. She referred to past initiatives of civic engagement and service learning, due [e.g.] to past President Judith RAMALEY. Those values became a credo at PSU. Community-based learning and leadership were brought to the forefront in scholarship and teaching for a large cohort of faculty. Will we receive similar outcomes from the values stated in the Phase Two metrics? JEFFORDS: The Working Group consisted of members from each school and college. She would defer to co-chairs WOOSTER or CARLSON about detailed questions about their operations. They did present in numerous public fora and met with department chairs to get feedback. They did everything they could to ensure accuracy of information in the dashboards. As to the value metrics, she would again defer to the committee, but they had robust discussions. They recognized that PSU has values not reflected in these original metrics. How do we measure those? Can we develop ways to see how they are executed, and compile [that data] and think it through? Absolutely we should have that conversation. But the Working Group was constrained in some ways by existing data sources. Should we expand our data sources? Absolutely. We should have robust conversations about how the work that we do can reflect our values.

FORD appreciated this discussion of shared values. That was what we need to be working on. What was scary for many folks is the cloud of retrenchment hanging over their heads. Would you [the Provost] commit to doing away with the idea of retrenchment for these five units right now? JEFFORDS said she can't do that. She knew that would be the easiest thing for her to say and that it would make a lot of people happy. But in trying to fulfill her responsibility as chief academic officer, she couldn't pre-commit to that. She has said throughout the process that nothing is predetermined. In the same sense, to those who have said that she already knows what she wants to cut: that is absolutely not true. There were not predetermined decisions; they were not targeting somebody and trying to create a narrative that would yield that target. They were listening to units to hear about the work that they're doing. In that spirit, she didn't feel that she could say as a predetermined outcome that they are going to rule something out or in. As she intended to address in her remarks later, [PRRP] is only one component of progress on closing the gap. We still need to close what had been an \$11 million gap, and is now \$7 million. The good news is that we are making progress. She had not determined some component from [PRRP] that would go towards budget reduction. Even if they were to say they are committing to no [retrenchment], there is still this budget gap to close.

FARAHMANDPUR had spent countless hours trying to figure out the RCAT model. The value metrics state that we value BIPOC faculty and students. When he looked that the IGS faculty and staff, who are mostly faculty of color, he did not understand how the decisions made by the administration are consistent with the value metrics (a term, by the way, which comes from the business world). He thought there is an inconsistency and contradiction between academic values the application of business models to higher education, particular

for a University that boasts of serving BIPOC students. If equity, diversity, and inclusion are key to our identity, why cut programs where there are many faculty of color? JEFFORDS: We have not cut anything, so again let's not predetermine outcomes. There are units that have done very well on a number of the value metrics. We have to keep in mind that no one single metric was used, but rather a combination of them. We have to look at a balance.

RODRIGUEZ reiterated that many IGS faculty and students identify as BIPOC, and it is important to appreciate how this relates to the stated strategic goals of the University. He was happy to hear that something is being done about the SCH assignment issue; however, if Phase Three moves forward the data being used does not reflect the viability of the programs, while we are told that viability will determine whether those programs survive.

## G. REPORTS

### 2. Provost's Report – *moved here, per A.3*

JEFFORDS thanked the faculty, staff, and academic professionals for everything they had done during the past year, which continued to present challenges to us. We continued to adapt as the pandemic changes; nonetheless, we continued to serve students. That almost 6000 students graduated this past weekend is evidence of the extraordinary work of faculty, staff and APs. It was heartwarming to participate in the graduation ceremonies and see the joy and pride of our students, but even more so, of their family members and friends. It made her extraordinarily proud to participate, and she know that the outcomes are due to the work of faculty and staff throughout the institution.

JEFFORDS thanked Presiding Officer REITENAUER for her compassionate leadership this past year, with a vision and true understanding of the students we serve and the communities in which we participate; and for being a wonderful collaborator as partner. She appreciated all the members of the Steering Committee, with whom she met several times, for their critical wisdom and guidance.

JEFFORDS congratulated all the faculty who were promoted in this past year. She had a chance to read all of the portfolios and to see the high quality of work being done every day at this institution. She was pleased that we could recognize the achievements of so many faculty through promotions.

JEFFORDS shared the news that Joseph BULL has been appointed the new Dean of the Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science. starting August 15<sup>th</sup>. His appointment is the result of a robust and rigorous national search. She thanked all members of the search committee but in particular chair Cliff ALLEN. Dr. BULL received his PhD in mechanical engineering at Northwestern in 2000. He currently serves as Associate Dean for Research in the School of Science and Engineering at Tulane University, where he holds an endowed chair. He has been appointed a fellow of the American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering, and among other honors was named a Sequoia Fellow of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society. In a robust research career, he has had over \$35 million in grants, focusing on bio-fluid mechanics and ultrasound, with results that directly impact health outcomes of people around the country. He is an enrolled member of the Delaware Tribe of Indians. He was also a first-generation college student. He identifies with the students at PSU, which is what drew him to apply for this position, and has a long history of working to improve

racial equity and diversity. JEFFORDS expressed gratitude to Wu-chi FENG for his leadership as interim dean this past year.

JEFFORDS announced the appointment of Erica WAGNER as Vice Provost for Student Success. As Associate Dean of the School of Business, she led numerous initiatives that have improved student success outcomes, particularly for BIPOC students. She will formally start this September.

JEFFORDS shared that there will be a summer bridge program again this year, for students coming directly out of high school to better prepare for enrolling as freshmen. We are enrolling almost 400 students in the program this summer. The focus is on students with a high school GPA below 3.0. We want to give them an opportunity to form bonds with peers and key faculty, and to establish a sense of belonging at PSU. The State of Oregon fully funded the program last summer and this summer; they have indicated that they would continue to fund it for another two years. She particularly wanted to recognize CARPENTER who has been engaged to do an assessment of the program.

Earlier this year, JEFFORDS related, she and VP-FADM REYNOLDS chaired a committee to make recommendations about the future of the PSU Bookstore. We have seen the pattern of students buying their books elsewhere. We wanted to make sure the bookstore is serving our students effectively, with a high priority on affordability. Based on the work of this committee, we have moved the bookstore contract from the Bookstore Board directly to PSU. We appointed a Bookstore Oversight Committee, that includes two faculty members recommended by the Senate Steering Committee: LIMBU and THORNE. She thanked members of the Bookstore Board for their dedicated service.

JEFFORDS noted that many faculty had engaged in a new course modality called 'attend anywhere,' where students can attend either in person or remotely. We heard from faculty of various challenges. As a result, we want to look at how we can most effectively support faculty in this modality. Interim Chief Information Officer Ryan BASS is developing a pilot, starting this fall, to outfit several classrooms with different kinds of technology, and have faculty test those technologies as to which are most effective.

JEFFORDS had heard many inquiries about how to use the information we've gained about students' participation in various course modalities. Over the summer, and in conversation with the Presiding Officer Elect, we want to start planning for faculty development opportunities around data-informed pedagogy, around how to use this data to continue to improve pedagogy in ways that recognize the students who are at PSU.

In a memo earlier today, JEFFORDS reported on progress on closing the [budget] gap. Two years ago, she laid out an approach to addressing the \$11 million shortfall in the OAA budget. We were using reserve funds, but needed to have a balanced and sustainable budget over the long term. What had been and \$11 million shortfall is now down to \$7 million. She had said it would take us three years, so that means we are on track. The strategy included stabilizing and increasing enrollments, through targeted investments with a financial impact of almost \$3 million. The retirement transition program—she thanked AAUP for their cooperation and support—had budget savings of almost \$2 million. We also had savings through attrition and vacancies of almost \$700,000. We are doing everything we can to achieve a sustainable budget. We all would like to get to a place where budget reductions are not a subject of constant conversation.

We continue to use Reimagine funds for faculty to develop ideas that will improve their units or work collaboratively across units: 10 projects in the first round, and an additional 23 this last academic year. Retention and graduate rates keep going up—a tribute to our faculty and staff. While it is great news for our students, it's also great for our budget.

JEFFORDS recognized OAI and their partners for transitioning to a new teaching and learning platform, Canvas. She knew this was not easy work, but the new system will enable us to do a great deal to support students and reduce workload for many faculty.

JEFFORDS gave an update about the online fee, an issue of great importance to students and to many faculty. We reduced the fee to \$22 beginning this fall, but also agreed to take up a conversation about how best to cover costs for digital learning infrastructure, engaging the Faculty Budget Committee, student government, and other stakeholders.

While it seems that the conversation is always about budgets, JEFFORDS wished to express gratitude to the many people who are enabling amazing things to happen every day at PSU, and remember why we are proud to be part of this community.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Return to regular agenda order.*

**C. DISCUSSION** – *none*

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**– *none*

**1. Resolution: foregrounding the APRCA guiding principles for program review/reduction process** (Steering, AHC-APRCA) – *postponed from 22.06.06 E.6*

GAMBURD / KINSELLA **moved the resolution** calling for foregrounding the AHC-APRCA Guiding Principles in the Program Review / Reduction Process, as given in **June 13<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.1**.

REITENAUER called on AHC-APRCA Co-Chair GAMBURD to give some context: The number of guests attending the meeting indicated how important these issues are to the campus community, not solely the units facing the Phase Three plan. She thanked the Presiding Officer and Steering Committee for sticking to this issue throughout the year, and to the Provost for the report she had just given and answers to questions. The information on closing the budget gap shed light on the financial issues that are part of the driving force. GAMBURD also appreciated the information about Reimagine projects. AHC-APRCA very much hoped to bring those projects more fully to the faculty, so that everyone can learn about the work that's being done.

AHC-APRCA and Steering, GAMBURD continued, deeply considered the requests they had received about how to shape upcoming conversations around PRRP. AHC-APRCA in particular felt it would be useful to foreground the guiding principles and priorities [they previously developed]. The Provost's Program Reduction Working Group came up with driver metrics and value metrics in February 2021, and at the same time the Provost asked the APRCA committee to craft guiding principles and priorities to be a complement to these metrics:

- ensure equitable and meaningful engagement of all stakeholders
- focus on student success and quality learning experiences for students
- understand that our work will change, we hope for the better



- make decisions informed by research and data
- engage with feedback before decisions are made
- devote resources to the reimagine process
- make the process transparent and engage in open communication with all stakeholders.

GAMBURD continued: Concerns were raised as AHC-APRCA met with the five units [involved with Phase Three] about goals and methods for analysis and evaluation. Chairs of the five units, members of AHC-APRCA, and members of Steering Committee felt that the later phases of PRRP lacked some of the clarity and transparency around criteria for analysis and evaluation called for in the guiding principles.

The proposed resolution, GAMBURD said, has three elements. First, Senate endorses the AHC-APRCA guiding principles and priorities. Second, Senate requests a written response from OAA by the start of the 2022-23 academic year with a detailed plan for how the guiding principles and priorities will be upheld during Phase Three of PRRP. Third, Senate urges the deans for foreground these principles and practices during Phase Three to maximize consultation, participation, communication, and transparency.

KELLEY / DONLON **moved to amend** the resolution to replace subpoint 3) with:

3) to pause PRRP until AHC-APRCA and Steering Committee review and the Faculty Senate approves the plan provided by OAA for phase III

*Consideration of amendment*

BURGESS was concerned about the wording of stopping the process, because it has been going on and causing stress for many departments. There are a few departments now being looked at in Phase Three. He wanted to caution about how much time, effort, stress, and [impact on] productivity of everyone involved might result if we stopped the process and asked the administration to start over.

JAÉN PORTILLO: When we say stop, do we mean to say pause until we receive and evaluate that written report, so that the process then somehow continues afterwards if we, the Faculty, are satisfied with how the process is being re-aligned?

KELLEY said perhaps the wording need to be finessed; however, she had concerns about the process outlined in the motion—that it has not followed the APRCA principles. There’s been little communication and transparency, points that were outlined in the letter from the five units. If it’s a flawed process, slowing it down and then restarting seemed insufficient to her. We’ve had an unfortunately missed opportunity. We came to the process with a lot of collaboration and humility; we knew things need to change. It seems [instead] that there has been a double-down on “This is what we’re doing.” It hasn’t aligned with the spirit of shared governance. Comments today showed that [the Provost] knows the hardships of the year. Just pausing the process seemed insufficient.

SYDORENKO, borrowing words of a colleague, suggested an analogy: if a student comes to us and asks, “How come a I got a D on this paper, because I worked on it for two or three weeks,” the answer they get is, “You haven’t addressed all the requirements of this rubric.” If we say we say we don’t want to stop this process because it’s been going on for a long time and took a lot of resources, it has [still] not been a transparent process, as we’ve seen with the comments and questions today.

The principles and priorities state that institutional redesign must strengthen and align with our curricular priorities and stated values of access, community engagement, equity and inclusion. However, [quoting from the Minutes] at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting the Provost “recognized that the strategic direction of the University was an issue brought forward by AHC-APRCA from the beginning. She understood the value of a conversation about the overall vision of the University. That was [however] not the framing within which we began this discussion. We started this discussion, JEFFORDS said, as part of an effort to get to a place where the institution could be in a healthier budget situation, [so that] we would not have to constantly have to talk about cutting budgets.”

In other words, SYDORENKO continued, AHC-APRCA was created to ensure shared governance, yet the committee’s guiding principles were not followed. So how did this qualify as shared governance? How could the process continue if it did not follow the principles to ensure that shared governance takes place?

LUCKETT raised a point of order: According to Robert’s Rules of Order, an amendment to a motion cannot turn the motion to its opposite. It seemed to him that the motion is to continue the process with certain safeguards in place, while the amendment is the opposite, to stop the process. REITENAUER asked for an opinion from Parliamentarian CLARK, who said that the question was whether LUCKETT’s interpretation of the rhetoric of the change is agreed upon by the group. The way to answer that would be to call for a vote.

GAMBURD appreciated all the comments made about the guiding principles and priorities. There had been quite a bit of consultation from the Provost and the Program Reduction Working Group with the APRCA committee and the Faculty Budget Committee. The role of these committee is not just to convey faculty’s desires and concerns to the administration, but also to convey what we’ve learned from the administration to the faculty. Speaking as a member of one of the eighteen units asked to write Phase Two narratives, she felt there had been consultation, quite a bit of openness of many aspects of the process. Some of the concerns raised today were around rubrics and how they are used. The Provost said that the units are unique and the concerns for each are unique, and would be the subject of discussions between the units and the deans moving forward. As a senator she supported the motion as currently written, prior to the amendment, to keep a focus on transparency in communication. There have been many good things coming out of the statements already made by the eighteen units, that are moving forward in positive directions. She would be sad to see those pieces of progress abandoned.

*[There was discussion among the mover, seconder, PO, and Secretary about the exact wording of the amendment, settling on the wording given above.]*

CHORPENNING observed that there seemed to be broad agreement that there hasn’t been the level of transparency promised; however, if we stop PRRP, does that then give the administration carte blanche to make changes and cuts with an even less transparent process? Do we want to amend the amendment to say that we want to initiate some new process based on the APRCA guidelines? Or are we just going to stop it and take our chances?

FARAHMANDPUR agreed we needed to have an amendment to the amendment. We can use Federal recovery funds—we have about \$25 million—to backfill the gap until we restart the process in a more equitable, transparent manner. REITENAUER asked if he had specific language to propose. FARAHMANDPUR said this was more of an idea. He knew the \$25 million was one-time money, but it would enable us to address the gap until we can go back and do this in a more equitable manner.

FORD wanted clarification on what the Provost has purview to do or not. There are two processes in play: one is in the CBA, and one is through Faculty Senate. CHORPENNING: his question was, if we stop this process, do we end up with a worse one? FORD: if we stop this process, retrenchment can still happen.

KELLEY said her original idea had been to stop the current process and being a new one that follows the APRCA principles next fall. BEYLER noted that there was a specific amendment on the floor, and that any other proposed amendments had to have specific language to vote on.

GAMBURD wanted to get back to the original impetus for AHC-APRCA. We were working at the intersection of the faculty's authority over curriculum and the administration's authority over budget. There are spots where these two things affect each other; in particular, if we lose a unit or program, we can't offer that curriculum. That's why we have a process that is trying both to respect faculty principles and priorities and the driver metrics that are about budget. She thought the Provost had been very careful to reiterate that curriculum is the purview of faculty, and we should be equally careful to say that budget is the purview of the administration. We should be careful not to overstep our authority by telling the administration how to do their jobs. However, we do have this difficult and intense overlap right now.

LINDSAY: Having gone through the retrenchment process last year, she understood the intent and the concern [of the amendment]. The retrenchment process gives the administration enormous latitude to move forward independently. In this situation, she liked more the clarification around the role of AHC-APRCA and the commitment of the administration for more transparency and working with the guiding principles rather than completely stopping the process. As GAMBURD said, budget is the purview of the administration and we can't dictate to them how that rolls out.

JAÉN PORTILLO: In view of the concerns expressed, it would be wise to parse things and make sure that we have alignment. We didn't want to stop the process altogether; we want to align it with our course values and our mission, and to make it more transparent and clear. The idea would be to pause the process until APRCA and Steering have a chance to review the plan provided by OAA for Phase III.

GAMBURD wondered what it meant to pause the process. It has been proposed for the five units [in question] to receive funding over the summer and receive guidance from MULKERIN and information from OIRP. Does this mean pausing that work? JAÉN's idea was to pause pending a review of the OAA plan, but she was not sure about the timeline. GAMBURD thought the Provost had provided much clarity during this meeting. [With a pause] the units would then have less time to come up with their reports. It becomes complicated, but maybe it could be worked out.

TRETHERWAY, reverting to LUCKETT'S intervention, thought that the amendments contradicted the original intention of part two of the motion, which seems to imply that Phase Three will happen. Are we changing the actual [intent of the original motion]? JAÉN wished to allow Senate opportunity to review and approve the plan provided by OAA, to make sure the process and the principles are aligned. This is not stopping the process, but rather asking to see and approve the plan.

JAÉN PORTILLO / DONLAN **moved to amend the amendment** by replacing the proposed language with:

3) to pause PRRP until AHC-APRCA and Steering Committee review and the Faculty Senate approves the plan provided by OAA for Phase III.

*Consideration of amendment to the amendment.*

The **amendment to the amendment** was **approved** (21 yes, 13 no, 3 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

*Return to consideration of initial amendment as amended.*

PERCY thought that during the summer there would be planning efforts and financial support for faculty to work on this. If there is a pause, would that prevent us from using those funds? He would appreciate clarification. REITENAUER thought the intent was to pick up [the process] in the fall when faculty are back on contract; she didn't know whether or not funds could be distributed in the meanwhile.

HARTIG: Pausing everything, including the funding, until we know what we are preparing for, would be useful, if we don't know what the criteria for evaluation are.

JAÉN PORTILLO thought that some exploration could continue during the summer, but the actual process of Faculty [governance bodies] having opportunity to review the plan, and have concerns answered, would wait till the fall. The [OAA] plan will be produced during the summer and other factors can continue to operate. This is a question of whether we believe speed is more important than having the faculty understand the process and have it aligned with our priorities and values.

SYDORENKO would like the process stopped during the summer because most faculty are not working, and even with the funds it is difficult to find the time to work on it, [the more so] until we know what we're working towards. FARAHMANDPUR: Part of the answer to the President's question is that faculty need more time to review and provide more feedback.

JEFFORDS echoed GAMBURD's comments asking for clarity in terms of what pausing means. Her understanding from several of the deans is that some of the five units wish to discuss potential initiatives. Are faculty who wish to have those conversations not allowed to have them until Senate has reviewed a report she will give to Senate in the fall? Were we preventing faculty from engaging in conversations they may wish to have on their own? REITENAUER did not imagine that Senate was interested in policing conversations that colleagues might have with each other. Faculty in these five units may be exhausted, having additional levels of expectation, stress, and anxiety; they may not want to be on the hook to do work unless they choose to be engaged with each other. [However,] she would certainly hope that

Senate would not prevent colleagues from being in conversation with each other. JAÉN agreed that conversations could and should continue, since this is a joint effort between the faculty and administration. Senate is not meeting in the summer, but this shouldn't preclude the development of plans.

The **amendment as amended** was **approved** (25 yes, 10 no, 1 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

*Return to consideration of main motion as re-amended.*

GAMBURD wished to be clear about the summer parameters. She understood that if units wanted to move forward with consultation and wanted access to summer funding they could go ahead, but [they might wish] not to engage till fall. REITENAUER interpreted the motion as now amended to allow units this freedom. HARTIG thought it would be tricky if some units move forward with conversations while others wait.

Resolution **D.1 as re-amended** was **approved** (26 yes, 9 no, 0 abstain, vote recorded by online survey).

**E. NEW BUSINESS** – *none*

**F. QUESTION PERIOD** – *moved above, per A.3.*

**G. REPORTS**

**1. President's Report** – *none, as the President reported at the June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

**2. Provost's Report** – *moved above, per A.3.*

*The following reports were **received** as part of the Consent Agenda. See the respective Attachments to the June 13<sup>th</sup> Agenda.*

**3. Annual Report of Academic Quality Committee**

**4. Annual Report of Academic Requirements Committee**

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

**H. ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:30 p.m.