

## Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 5 December 2022

**Presiding Officer:** Rowanna Carpenter

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Anderson, Baccar, Carpenter, Chorpenning, Clark, Clucas, Constable, Cortez, Craven, Cruzan, Daescu, De La Vega, Dimond, Donlan, Dusicka, Eastin, Emery, Endicott-Popovsky, Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Garrod, Goforth, Greenwood, Hanson, Heilmair, Heryer, Hunt, Hunte, Ingersoll, Jaén Portillo, Kelley, Knight, La Rosa, Lafrenz, Lindsay, Martin, Matlick, Mudiamu, Newsom, Raffo, Rai, Romaniuk, Ruth, Sterling, Taylor, Tretheway, Tuor, Watanabe, Webb, Wern, Wilkinson.

**Alternates present:** Caroline Miller for Colligan, Tetyana Sydorenko for Davidova, Brad Wipfli for Izumi, Karen Kennedy for Perlmutter, Mindy Chappell for Thieman, Crystal Tenty for Zeisman-Pereyo.

**Senator absent:** Hunte.

**Ex-officio members present:** Adler, Allen (Jennifer), Beyler, Bowman, Bull, Chabon, Chaillé, Chivers, Collenberg-Gonzalez, Comer, Estes, Ford, Harris, Herrera, Holt, Jeffords, Knepfle, Labissiere, Lambert, Limbu, Lubitow, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Thorne, 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. **Minutes of 5 November meeting** were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
3. **OAA response to November Senate actions** was **received** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.
4. **Procedural: Presiding Officer may move any item** – *Consent Agenda*

*Item G.3, Campus budget planning overview from Budget Committee, moved to the start of reports. Item G.4, Monthly report from AHC-APRCA, moved to precede item E.3.*

### B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### 1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

CARPENTER acknowledged that it had been a busy, stressful term. We will talk about implications of lower than expected enrollment and revenue; we've seen colleagues leave, and the current hiring pause will have an impact; the Program Review and Reduction process is continuing. It has been hard to get into an imaginative place, but it is important to be imaginative together.

CARPENTER announced that the next meeting will be on January 9<sup>th</sup>. The Presidential search closed on December 2<sup>nd</sup>. Ben BERRY will give an update at the January meeting.

#### 2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER reminded senators to first state their name when speaking.

### 3. Jason Erik Washington Memorial Committee

CARPENTER introduced Patricia SCHECHTER, Chair of the Jason Erik Washington Memorial Committee, to give an overview of their final report. [For slides, see **November Agenda Attachment B.3.**] SCHECHTER stated that PERCY convened the committee a year ago to fulfill a clause in the settlement between the University and the Washington family regarding the death of Jason WASHINGTON at the hands of campus police on June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018. This clause stipulated that an art piece in memory of Mr. WASHINGTON be created. SCHECHTER signed up for this work, interested in part because of her work as a public historian who teaches about and works with students on exhibits, public memory, maps, and commemorative projects in the community.

Since last year, SCHECHTER said, in consultation with the WASHINGTON family, and with support of the President's office, the committee has worked towards a couple of things. One is installation of what they are for now calling an artisanal accountability marker on SW College Street, that will hopefully be in place by June 2023. The second thing is that an artist-in-residence will be invited to join our campus next fall, via a RFP [request for proposals], to work on a biographical and fine arts piece by which to remember WASHINGTON, likely to be installed probably in [SMSU] by the end of AY 2023-24. The committee's report to the President gives specifics.

The next phase, SCHECHTER said, is assembling and communicating information about all the various artworks and markers of memorialization around campus—connecting the dots between these pieces. The purpose is to be intentional about the meaning of these projects. One possibility is to have the biographical piece move around campus, after an initial installation in SMSU, with units' teaching and programming organized around these moves. Another idea is a space dedicated to collecting, telling, and archiving stories that intersect with the death of Jason WASHINGTON: racial justice, police bias, gun violence, etc., and thus add to our knowledge base and intellectual capital.

SCHECHTER wished to thank in particular: Kayla WASHINGTON, Jason's eldest daughter, who had been a gracious member of the committee; President PERCY who had committed to seeing this work through; Maryanna RAMIREZ of the Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art, for her expertise; Ed WASHINGTON of GDI for useful guidance; and Vicki REITENAUER for her inspiration on issues of public safety on campus. SCHECHTER solicited input from senators and faculty, and attendance at listening sessions to take place next year.

### 4. Library update on Elsevier negotiations

EMERY, speaking on behalf of the Library Committee, gave an update on negotiations with Elsevier. [For slides, see **December Agenda Attachment B.4.**] For a number of years, PSU negotiated a contract along with University of Oregon and Oregon State University; this was a way to leverage spending. Unfortunately they have been unable to come to an agreement for the next cycle for Elsevier journals.

EMERY said we will retain online access to past content of around 150 journals we subscribed to from 1997 to 2022. From a deal negotiated in 2008, we will have full backfile access to three collections: agricultural and biological titles; engineering, power, and energy titles; and neuroscience titles. Any content published by open access by other

institutions and authors will be available. We will be able to obtain articles through our interlibrary loan, usually within 48 hours. The Library has also created a guide to alternative access modes to authors' accepted manuscripts in various repositories.

However, EMERY said, we will lose current access to Elsevier titles starting in January, until a new agreement is reached. They are taking a break from negotiations, but the three campuses hope to get back on track with negotiations in 2023. EMERY noted that the University of Washington has also declared that they are unable to come to an agreement for a package of journals from Elsevier and that they are selectively adding single titles to their collection.

The money saved, EMERY said, will be used variously: in part to pick up titles elsewhere and purchase some backfiles, reference materials, and specific books the campus is in need of. They are also helping cover costs for article publishing by faculty on campus. They are entering into a transformative deal for open access publishing with Wiley, which they hope to have in place in January, and another open access arrangement with Taylor & Francis. They will be supporting the Public Library of Science journals that allow for publication without any article fees to the individual author. 25% of what was cut from Elsevier has gone to cover inflation from other journal providers.

EASTIN asked if and how it is possible request access to a journal on an a la carte basis. EMERY advised contacting the subject liaison librarian.

CLARK: do journals have exclusive agreements with Elsevier? EMERY: some do, but some have moved to other providers. CLARK: Is Elsevier owned by a larger corporation? EMERY: They are owned by RELX, which also includes Lexis-Nexis and Westlaw. They consider themselves a data broker now, rather than a scholarly publisher. They provide information to ICE and other agencies, which makes them slightly dangerous.

RAI: asked about specifics about open access deals that were mentioned. EMERY said the deal with Wiley will be for open access as well as hybrid journals, and the same for Taylor & Francis and Routledge.

FORD acknowledged the work EMERY had been doing on this, which was not necessarily visible from the surface—countless hours looking at spreadsheets. It was a heavy lift, and she wanted to publicly express appreciation for this important service to the campus—students and faculty.

### **C. DISCUSSION** – *none*

### **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – *none*

### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

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

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

#### **2. Graduate academic forgiveness policy (GC)**

LUBITOW stated that the Graduate School [GS] had brought this issue to Graduate Council. The proposal is for a clean slate approach for PSU graduate students who are

entering a different graduate program. While there were some minor questions, GC approved the proposal unanimously. They were happy to see us proactively solving ongoing issues for students trying to start a new graduate program.

HANSON said that Kelly DOHERTY, Director of Graduate Admissions, brought this issue to the attention of GS leadership. If a student has nine or more graduate credits when applying to a graduate program, the GPA for those credits is used for the admission decision, rather than undergraduate GPA. If the graduate GPA is below 3.0, they are ineligible for admission, except through a special approval process if the department advocates for the applicant. Students who earned those grades at a school other than PSU are in a different situation; it is not a level playing field. For undergraduates, transfer credits figure in the cumulative GPA. That doesn't happen for graduate students, even if students officially transfer courses—they go into DARS, but not into Banner. Students who earn poor grades at another school and then enter via special approval come in with no GPA baggage. A PSU student with previous poor grades might also be admitted by special approval, but those previous PSU grades remain part of their cumulative GPA. This policy aims to rectify this discrepancy. It is particularly relevant for students from underrepresented groups, first-generation students, etc.

Other universities, HANSON said, had models to borrow from. When approved for academic forgiveness, the courses and their grades will still appear on the transcript, with a notation that they are excluded from the GPA calculation. Students can request academic forgiveness when beginning a new program after an absence of over three years. It is term based, not course-by-course. There is an upper limit of three terms. A student previously on academic program or disqualification is not eligible for academic forgiveness; the policy shouldn't be used to circumvent another policy, namely, academic standing. There are other processes for problems there. If a student applies and meets the specified criteria, they will have academic forgiveness [within these parameters]—it's not a discretionary decision. The policy will be effective, if approved, in fall 2023.

RAI/RUTH **moved** the proposal for a graduate academic forgiveness policy as specified in **December Agenda Attachment E.2**.

BACCAR asked if this will be applied automatically, or can students say they don't want to do it? HANSON anticipated that they would present this to students as an option, but no one will be forced to do it—students will have to make the request if they so choose.

The graduate academic forgiveness policy given in Attachment **E.2** was **approved** (46 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, vote recorded by online survey and paper ballot).

*Change to agenda order: item G.4, monthly report of AHC-APRCA, moved here to precede E.3.*

#### **G.4. Monthly report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment**

REITENAUER, co-chair of AHC-APRCA along with ESTES, reviewed their monthly report [**December Agenda Attachment G.4**]. This year the committee includes several new members, including herself. They turned to returning members to help understand what the experience and existential reality of AHC-APRCA has been. Conversations revealed there was not a clear sense of that. Thus they have been trying to figure out the committee's role in Phase III of the Program Review and Reduction Process [PRRP].

The committee was founded in 2020, REITENAUER pointed out, to help co-create the context and conditions under which faculty could have a collaborative [role in the process]. At the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, Senate passed an amended version of a resolution brought by AHC-APRCA, asking the administration for an accounting of the collaborative approach we had been looking for all along. AHC-APRCA, along with Steering Committee, sat with the Provost's report [called for in the resolution]; it's fair to say they didn't see much new there. What we have been seeking for the better part of two years, REITENAUER said, is to understand the strategic vision behind how [PRRP] has been going forward, and the cuts and adjustments across the University.

In their report, REITENAUER said, committee reviewed their charge and the guiding principles and priorities, [articulating which] was one of their first actions. The membership includes ten faculty, some of whom are appointed by Committee on Committees and some by other committees. There are four OAA representatives serving as consultants, but not voting members. As related in November, the committee met with representatives of the five scrutinized units, and debriefed this at their November 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. At the second November meeting, they considered the request from Steering to co-sponsor the resolution under consideration. AHC-APRCA talked about what they see as a lack of an overarching vision, and about curricular adjustments being pursued in ways not aligned with the original concept. Of the ten voting members, eight voted for co-sponsoring the resolution, and one abstained. There was thus strong agreement that we need to take a stronger tack, and to say we really mean it.

REITENAUER pointed out that the committee's charge says that AHC-APRCA is to focus holistically on PSU's collective future and ensure faculty participation in meaningful, inclusive, and formative discussion of curricular adjustments related to budget reduction. It's fair to say that AHC-APRCA feels that these two elements of the charge have not been met. One member put it this way at the November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting: For a long time PSU grew without a vision, and now we're cutting without a vision.

Turning to the proposed resolution itself, REITENAUER called attention to the 2022 budget context. Faculty are concerned about the seeming lack of connection among budget-related efforts—the ones being entertained already. Budget decisions, including administrative, structural, and organizational changes, have curricular and research implications, because those decisions affect the resources available to carry out core functions. Moving forward without coordination risks undermining core purposes of education and research, and hinders efforts towards institutional priorities. We can't talk about any of these and not also talk about curriculum. Faculty have a responsibility to insist they be at the table when those decisions are being made.

REITENAUER reviewed the specific elements of the resolution. It calls on the administration to engage in a budget process that looks beyond the current cycle and aligns resources with strategic priorities by, namely: providing a summary of the overall budget situation—not just OAA—over the last five years, with projections for the next several years; sharing the range of strategies and reorganizations being considered, including timelines, implementation costs, anticipated savings or revenue generation, and impacts on core functions of education and research, as well as on strategic priorities of racial justice and equity, student success, and community engagement; and finally, by

convening campus for an intentional, participatory, facilitated process based on the information requested above.

*Return to regular agenda order.*

**3. Responding to the Provost’s Program Review and Reduction Process Phase III Report and calling for a strategic budget process (Steering, AHC-APRCA)**

KELLY/EMERY **moved** the resolution responding to the Provost’s PRRP Phase III Report and calling for a strategic budget process, as given in **December Agenda Attachment E.3**.

JAÉN PORTILLO: When we started these conversations in 2020, when she was Presiding Officer, there was a forum to discuss possible initiatives with the whole faculty. We agreed that this was going to be a collective vision and effort, coordinated between administration and faculty, centered on educational principles. We need to honor the core principles that AHC-APRCA created for this purpose. The resolution calls for that.

SYDORENKO: for the five units affected in Phase III, the strategic vision is something they are asking for calling for. She therefore very much supported the resolution.

DE LA VEGA thanked the committee for diving deep into words that were said [previously]. The resolution is grounded in what’s important for our students, in our vision for racial justice and equity, and in community service. We do have a unified vision. She applauded the grounding of the resolution’s elements in those priorities.

RUTH: the resolution comes back to the home base of shared governance. She was struck by REITENAUER’s comment about [growing and cutting] both without vision. It’s demoralizing. We are isolating different groups who have to carry the burden, and then not engaging other people—there is no obligation from the rest of campus to be involved. How do we get more voices, so that it’s not just falling on [a few]?

The resolution responding to the Provost’s PRRP report and calling for a strategic budget process, as stated in Attachment **E.3** was **approved** (40 yes, 5 no, 5 abstain, vote recorded by online survey and paper ballot).

**F. QUESTION PERIOD** – *none*

**G. REPORTS**

*Change to agenda order: item G.3, update from BC, moved here to precede G.1.*

**3. Campus budget planning overview from Budget Committee**

Budget Committee Co-Chair EMERY noted that this report [for slides, see **December Agenda Attachment G.3**] followed upon the meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee of the Board of Trustees [BoT] and the President’s financial sustainability town halls. It is apparent, EMERY said, that PSU faces financial difficulties in forthcoming years due to declining enrollments. Meanwhile, we’ve had a commitment to maintaining our reserves at a specific amount of funding.

The committee, EMERY said, grounded discussion in the committed values and vision of University of the campus finance and administration group, as well as the guiding principles they were given for budget projections. She also wanted to remind ourselves of

the goals outlined in the Time to Act strategic plan. This is basically the active strategic plan for the University. Additionally, EMERY highlighted the guiding principles provided by AHC-APRCA in May 2021, which Faculty Senate also endorsed.

EMERY indicated that while BC is welcome to attend the majority of budgetary conversations, they are rarely invited to the table as participants. BC's main sphere of influence resides in advising, acting as a sounding board to the budgetary processes of OAA, and considering the budgetary implications of curricular programming.

EMERY said that from the financial town halls BC noted the following main points: PSU has managed [so far] to get through declining enrollments without significant drawdown of reserves. We have now reached the point of needing to make significant changes or else spending down reserves within a few years. BoT is committed to a having plan where resources more closely equal expenditures. A \$20 million deficit is seen as unsustainable. Our reserves, however, have grown beyond the percentage goal put in place by BoT. All that said, what does 'right-sizing' PSU, one of the things they are calling for, mean? It doesn't necessarily mean ongoing loss, but perhaps a new direction of intent. There has been attrition at all staffing levels, accelerated by the pandemic. Need for change is recognized. But we are struggling with where those changes need to occur. The conversations are difficult across campus. Within those hard conversations we need to find areas of agreement.

The current process, EMERY continued, tends to isolate our budgeting year-by-year. Should we use a greater scale, a four-year plan perhaps? Or would a longer timeframe put us in a more vulnerable position vis-à-vis adverse circumstances such as another health crisis, climate catastrophe, or coup d'état? All those things could happen.

Budget Committee is following several themes within their standard work, EMERY said: effects of the hiring freeze, PRRP, enrollment trends, and whether aspects of the Presidential strategic initiative plan will be curtailed or paused. There are areas of concern. How can we be a University that provides opportunity for all, when curtailing what opportunities are available? There has been previous centralization of services, such as the [department research administrators] and student advising; in both cases, there have been strong criticisms of how the centralizations played out—whether they were seen as successful or not. Before enacting more centralization, EMERY suggested, it makes sense to evaluate previous efforts. Lastly, we need to determine how to work in a less siloed manner to solve budgetary problems. If faculty cannot agree amongst ourselves about a long-term vision for the University, are we open to such a vision being brought to us by senior leadership? Given the frustrations with SCH data in evaluating programs, what other data should units and OAA use? What are the qualitative attributes used to evaluate programs? How do these attributes address the guiding principles articulated by AHC-APRCA and the Time to Act criteria? These questions remain unanswered. BC is willing to advocate for other data and qualitative analysis, but is not hearing cohesively what those should be. We need to find a way to work across silos, in both the short and the long term, to achieve a more balanced budget.

CARPENTER: if faculty have responses to any of these questions—if they are not rhetorical—what should they do? EMERY: contact any member of BC.

JAÉN PORTILLO: what are the immediate steps we can take towards true collaboration? Co-Chair J. ALLEN, responding, was glad to see various committees focused on particular problems sharing information. Set the table so that all voices are invited

RAI asked for elaboration on the mismatch between vision and action. Our enrollment is not increasing, our financial resources are not the same. We have to be strategic about using limited resources. EMERY: Yes, especially as we are on the cusp of hiring a new president. How can we hire someone who is supposed to be a both a bad guy and a good guy? Many decisions are being deferred to this new leadership role. They are supposed to be supportive of us, but we are not giving much of a direct vision to work from.

CLARK: In these difficult discussion, what are the two things where there is most accord, and what are the two things about which there is most difference? EMERY: There is agreement that there needs to be change; no one is saying, we don't want to change. There are difference voices as to what that change should be. ALLEN observed that the student credit hour [as measure] creates perverse incentives. If we want to do interdisciplinary work, we need to figure out this challenge. We still have systems that disincentivize it. Similarly around the equity vision, there is agreement that there are opportunities, but when you get to the unit level and deal with reducing resources—that does not help get us there. The misalignment is not disagreement about values, but the lack of a framework for value-aligned decisions.

*Return to regular agenda order.*

### **1. President's report**

PERCY acknowledged that the fall term has not been easy, but it has been effective. The campus has been more vital, and we've received appreciation from the community.

PERCY appreciated the concerns raised in the previous conversation. There are many moving pieces. He will meet with BC in January, and will try to follow through to get the requested information as soon as possible. The steady-state has never been very steady. We thought a couple of years ago we had some new initiatives—tried some new things in enrollment management. We had some gains. Then we fell down a little this year for new students, our persistence dropped, and our financial situation become more complex than anticipated. We need to work on these things together, PERCY said. New ideas are coming forward, and he would do everything to encourage them. How do we collaborate? How do we break down silos? How do we align curriculum across units? There have been some initiatives coming from the units that were part of Phase II of PRRP for new programs, new enrollment, etc. There are many opportunities, but we need to have more chance to hear the voice of faculty. He promised he would not leave his position [as president] without resolving the student credit hour [allocation issue].

We do a lot of work to inform the new president, PERCY said. Faculty Senate was thinking of dialogues in winter or spring term—maybe those could be a way to identify key issues. If faculty wanted administrators to come in and bring other people in, they would be glad to do that at the right time. He heard what was being said, [that the issue] was bigger than AHC-APRCA.

PERCY didn't agree that there's been no strategy. Maybe it has not been clear enough, and maybe the strategies aren't perfect. He pledged to show the guiding principles for all the things they are going; then we can see whether or not they are aligned.

On a more celebratory note, PERCY invited all to the upcoming Celebrate the Season event, and wished everyone a happy, peaceful, regenerative holiday season.

## 2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS joined PERCY in thanking senators for the rich and productive discussion. She was grateful to BC for cogent advice and input, and to AHC-APRCA and Steering for the work that went into the resolution. She looked forward for opportunities to have dialogue about these important times for the University.

JEFFORDS announced that they would be posting and sharing the work that the units in PRRP Phase II have been doing: extraordinary, innovative contributions. UCOMM will be featuring stories about the good work that's been done by those units. She met with the deans last week, and they are engaging in conversations with the units that are preparing Phase III reports. She wished to assure everyone that they are actively engaging with those units, and she believed we are on a path to some really constructive outcomes.

JEFFORDS said there was a process for how OAA would proceed with the hiring freeze, recently announced by PERCY. She had shared this with the deans and other managers, and it would be posted to the OAA website.

JEFFORDS shared also that they were moving forward with conversations that came out of the support services review and the report on federated service centers. She planned to shared publicly more on this in January, and begin to engage stakeholders. A team in CLAS had already developed and submitted a proposal for a federated service center there. She heard the theme that many would like to see how these various processes are linked together. She took seriously the challenge to make the connections more evident.

KELLEY suspected there would be no love lost if the [Phase III] units did not finish their reports right before the holidays.

LA ROSA said that his department, Physics, had [as a group] become old. As people retire, those positions are being held vacant according to the report from the President and Provost. Are they part of the strategy of where PSU is going [financially]?

JEFFORDS said that the vacant positions list consists of those that are currently vacant; it doesn't include positions of individuals anticipating retirement.

The PO recognized Jenny MITTELSTAEDT (LING): Let's consider highlighting the innovative and collaborative work that the five units [in PRRP Phase III] have been doing. JEFFORDS didn't want to be premature, because the reports have not been completed. But she was profoundly impressed by the truly innovative work that these units have undertaken and was happy to acknowledge that.

## 4. Monthly report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustment – *moved above, to follow E.2*

**H. ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:48 p.m.