

Report to Board of Trustees on Administrative Leadership

Faculty Senate Steering Committee
June 2020

Isabel Jaén Portillo, Presiding Officer
Michele Gamburd, Presiding Officer Elect • Thomas Luckett, Past Presiding Officer
Elected Members: Rowanna Carpenter • Jill Emery • Jon Holt • Michael Lupro
Ex-Officio: Richard Beyler, Secretary to the Faculty • Rowanna Carpenter, Senior IFS Rep.
Karen Karvanic & Susan Lindsay, Co-Chairs, Committee on Committees
Yves Labissiere, Faculty Member of Board of Trustees

Context: Shared Governance and Higher Education in the United States

The notion of shared governance, as officially stated, is almost a century old in the United States. The American Association for University Professors wrote its first statement on shared governance in 1920: “emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies.” Their efforts culminated in the development of the 1966 [*Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*](#). This seminal statement, which was jointly formulated with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, highlighted the fact that “A college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.”

Awareness of this interdependence and need for joint effort is now in 2020 more important than ever. The organizations that conceived the 1966 report, which remains central to shared governance discussions, have been proactive in helping higher education institutions to improve their shared governance conditions by conducting surveys, publishing reports with recommendations, and issuing tools to assist universities in determining the levels of effectiveness of their shared governance mechanisms. An example of these tools is the AAUP [*“Evaluation of Shared Governance”*](#) survey, based on Keetje Ramo’s monograph *Assessing The Faculty’s Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards* (1998), in which seven areas/key indicators of the state of shared governance at institutions of higher education are identified: 1. Climate for Governance, 2. Institutional Communication, 3. Board’s Role, 4. President’s Role, 5. Faculty’s Role, 6. Joint Decision Making, 7. Assessing Structural Arrangements for Governance.

There seems to be in U.S. universities a generalized perception, reflected on surveys conducted by the universities as well as publications in outlets such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, that shared governance mechanisms can be significantly enhanced and that there are a number of obstacles that impede their optimal functioning, such as (to name a few culprits) lack of transparency, reliance on inadequate corporate models and practices, lack of faculty participation in decision-making, lack of sufficient understanding by the different constituents of each other’s roles, and need for additional effective communication and work channels necessary to carry out the joint effort of governance. In addition to these obstacles, we often find a distorted or

fragmented view of shared governance. This idea is illustrated by Steven Bahls in his *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*, where he describes the three traditional ways of looking at shared governance (as equal rights, as consultation, and as rules of engagement). These limited views of shared governance can be paired with a lack of recognition of the centrality of the Faculty's role, emanating from the centrality of teaching and research, the *raison d'être* of the University. The AAUP statement [On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom](#) (1994) stresses this idea, reminding us of its connection to academic freedom:

Teaching and research are the very purpose of an academic institution and the reason why the public values and supports it. This means that the Faculty, who are responsible for carrying out those central tasks, should be viewed as having a special status within the institution. The Association has taken this view from its earliest days. Its first statement, the 1915 *Declaration of Principles*, declares that members of a Faculty "are the appointees, but not in any proper sense the employees," of the trustees; they are partners with the trustees, and, as the 1915 *Declaration* states, the office of faculty member should be—indeed, it is in the public interest that the office of faculty member should be—"one both of dignity and of independence." Allocation of authority to the faculty in the areas of its responsibility is a necessary condition for the faculty's possessing that dignity and exercising that independence.

Public institutions such as PSU must address any obstacles and misconceptions about shared governance and optimize their processes in order to carry out the quality teaching and research work needed to serve our students and the community. In fulfilling the University's mission, the university administration supports and partners with faculty and trustees.

Both the American Association of American Professors and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges express deep interest in strengthening the processes of shared governance. A recent AGB report entitled "Shared Governance: Is OK Good Enough?" (2016) echoes the perception that shared governance in higher education in the United States can be improved. This report includes the results of surveys conducted among two groups (presidents/chancellors and governing boards), concluding that "Most presidents and board members from both public and independent institutions believe that shared governance is working adequately but could be more effective" (2), while highlighting its importance during "a time of serious challenges to higher education—among them declines in enrollment and funding, shifting demographics, and public critiques of value" (1). A year later, in 2017, the AGB issued a statement that further stressed the essential role of shared governance in these terms:

In higher education's volatile environment, shared governance is essential. It adds substantial value to institutional progress and innovation. In fact, responsibility and accountability for addressing colleges' and universities' thorniest challenges often rest with multiple parties. Effective shared governance is about more than who is responsible for what. At its best, shared governance is about how key constituents in institutional communities—traditionally faculty, administrators, and board members—engage in achieving a commonly supported mission. For example, these groups customarily participate in strategic planning, institutional budgeting, and discussion of critical issues such as campus climate and student learning outcomes. (2)

This recognition of the key role of shared governance, as well as of the fact that “Boards, working with key administrators and faculty leaders, hold responsibility for ensuring that the practice of shared governance embodies and advances institutional values,” lead the AGB to present a number of recommended questions in their [2017 statement](#) (p. 11):

Questions for Boards to Ask

- How are new board members, faculty, and senior staff oriented to shared governance?
- How does the board learn about faculty work? How does the faculty learn about the board’s role and responsibilities?
- How can the the board contribute to an institutional culture of appropriate engagement and inclusion in decision making?
- What are the roles of students and staff in shared governance at our institution? Is the board satisfied with their engagement?
- What can the board chair do to demonstrate the board’s commitment to shared governance? What does the president do?
- When did the institution last assess the state of its shared governance? What was the result? What has changed based on that assessment?
- How does the board engage with faculty on matters of consequence?
- Are the priorities of the board, president, and faculty currently aligned on critical mission-related matters? Is there agreement on the strategic priorities of the institution? Which are important topics or questions for collaboration?
- How well would shared governance work at this institution in a crisis?

In addition to the initiatives and publications by relevant higher education organizations and groups, a body of literature on shared governance and leadership has emerged during the last few years that stresses the importance of important pillars such as communication, collaboration, and evaluation. In this vein, Sharon Cramer’s edited collection (2 volumes) *Shared Governance in Higher Education* (2017) includes multiple voices and discusses, among other themes, faculty-student partnerships, shared accountability, and broad-based shared governance as well as best practices to improve its practice. In addition to this literature on shared governance, an increasing number of publications deal with the notion of shared leadership (see, among others, Kezar & Holcombe 2017 and the work of our own PSU Trustee and former President, Judith Ramaley and her team: Ramaley, Kezar, Holcombe & Elrod, in preparation). Shared leadership is characterized by collaboration and the inclusion of multiple perspectives and expertise, as well as interchangeable leader-follower roles, and constitutes an alternative to counterproductive top-down leadership styles in dealing with current higher education challenges.

Shared Governance and Leadership at PSU

During the past year, multiple and productive conversations have taken place at PSU regarding shared governance and leadership, which have evidenced a positive change of direction towards a more dialogic, transparent, and collaborative leadership landscape. This shift has significantly restored the trust eroded by the events of the previous year surrounding the Presidency. Sources of the positive change include a new higher administration team with a highly collaborative approach, as well as the willingness from our Board of Trustees to reach out and establish a close dialogic relation with the Faculty.

That being said, significant concerns (gathered in Part 3 of this report) still remain. Addressing these concerns will enhance shared governance and shared leadership at PSU.

Background

In Spring 2019, in the context of the controversies regarding the PSU presidency, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee issued a [Report to the Portland State Faculty Senate and the University on Administrative Leadership and Shared Governance](#). This report highlighted some of the issues that had impeded an adequate functioning of shared governance at our university, including “the tendency of administrative leadership to make far-reaching structural decisions without adequate consultation” and stressed that “consultation, far from a weakness, is one of the hallmarks of great leadership. Consultation is all the more necessary in higher education, and critical to shared governance.” The report further emphasized that “PSU possesses a rich array of administrative and faculty governance bodies whose wisdom, expertise, professional experience, and institutional memory are constantly available to guide the institution.”

The 2019 Faculty Senate Steering Committee report also called upon the University to:

- Cease the practice of issuing major and permanent decisions during the months of June through September, when the organs of shared governance are not available to participate in the decision.
- Draw (whenever feasible) on the expertise of the faculty and staff, rather than contract with outside consultants.
- Not contract with external for-profit education providers to provide PSU curriculum, except with the approval of the faculty of the concerned academic unit and of the Senate.
- Adhere to our existing policies on alteration or transfer of an academic unit, which are available on the website of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The report also expressed concerns about this pattern of non-consultative decision-making being replicated during summer 2019, particularly regarding “The selection of an interim president of the University and the selection of a search process for the president of the University, the significant changes that had been suggested in the Intensive English Language Program (IELP), including its proposed transfer to the Office of International Affairs, and its proposed partnership with Shorelight Education, and the renewal of Portland State’s contract with the Confucius Institute, the full contract language having only recently been submitted to the Educational Policy Committee for review.”

Finally, in PSU's context of a presidential crisis, the report urged the PSU community to "examine whether the office of the presidency in its current form is necessary to our mission, and even whether a better system of administration might be designed without a president. A quarter century ago PSU gained national recognition for boldly reimagining general education when we founded the University Studies Program. Today we find ourselves at the convergence of multiple crises of university leadership, at a time when our national democracy is also in crisis. We call upon the Faculty to consider whether it is now time to reimagine governance. Instead of a president, we could consider an executive council of vice president-level administrators promoted from the Faculty for limited terms, and a more collaborative relationship with the Board of Trustees, but all such details are open to discussion and reinvention. The first advantage of elimination of the presidency would be to save the cost of the presidential compensation package, funds that we could invest instead in faculty excellence and student success. Along with the Faculty and the larger Oregon Community, the Steering Committee has been alarmed to learn of the escalating size of presidential compensation packages, and the extraordinarily large severance package granted to the outgoing president, at the very time when we are forced to undertake severe budgetary cuts to programs and an unusually large tuition increase."

In order to initiate a constructive and meaningful discussion on administrative leadership and shared governance at PSU, the Steering Committee proposed to convene a Meeting of the Faculty, as described by the [Faculty Constitution](#) (Art. 4, Sec. 3), in the form of a Fall Symposium. This meeting, presided over by Interim President Stephen Percy and held on November 6, 2019, provided the PSU Faculty and staff with an opportunity to discuss fundamental issues pertaining to present and future of PSU's leadership, such as the state of research and interdisciplinarity; the structure of the administration; equity, diversity, and inclusion; budget and curriculum; shared governance; compensation; and appointments and continuity. The [minutes of this forum](#) are available at the PSU Faculty Senate website.

Participants at the meeting considered the following questions on administrative leadership and shared governance:

- What, primarily, do we look to administrative leadership to provide to the University? Can we imagine a different administrative structure for PSU—different from both our past practice and from the conventional practice at other institutions—that might work more effectively for us?
- Are the principal administrative officers best recruited internally or through national searches? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each approach?
- Given the rapid turnover in our highest administrative ranks, how can we achieve greater continuity of leadership and institutional memory in the University's administration?
- What is the proper role of shared governance in the administration of the University, and how can we assure that best practices of shared governance will be followed?

During the academic year 2019-20, the conversations continued as part of the Faculty Senate discussions and in other spaces, such as the joint forum organized by AAUP and the Faculty Senate steering committee, the winter symposium and, most recently, the May 18th 2020 Faculty Forum, where the Faculty had a chance to dialogue with the Administration about the current challenges brought by COVID-19, express their concerns about budget issues, and consider strategic ways to plan for PSU's future, such as academic programs examination. A form to

gather additional faculty input was also distributed in connection with this forum. This form included a section on Academic leadership, where the Faculty offered additional and extensive comments that inform the present report, along with the comments that the Steering Committee has been receiving from diverse constituents during the last year through the multiple conversations maintained with faculty, staff, students, administration, board members, and union leaders.

The form was divided into the following sections: Administrative Searches, Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Administration and Faculty, Revisioning Structures, and Conducting Regular Evaluation of Administrators. In each of these sections, faculty commented on a number of themes. The next part of this report includes a summary of the ideas voiced throughout the year, including those expressed on the actual form. Details on these themes follow below:

I. ADMINISTRATIVE SEARCHES

Themes: Use and role of search firms, faculty participation and input during the search process, consideration of internal/external candidates for administrative positions, onboarding of administrative hires, institutional commitment vs. churn, compensation (salary and other) for higher administrators, practice of keeping administrator's salaries when they return to Faculty roles, other.

In this area, the faculty identified and expressed the following issues and concerns:

1. DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION

The need to apply consistently a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion lens in our searches. DEI is one of the main pillars of our strategic plan and is fundamental for the health of our institution. Upon identification of areas that needed attention, including the lack of and loss of underrepresented faculty and staff, the PSU Faculty Senate approved in a [resolution on PSU's diversity, equity and inclusion issues](#), calling on our administration to:

- a) In partnership with the relevant constituents, develop and present to the Faculty as soon as possible an updated plan with short- and long-term strategies to support underrepresented Faculty and staff and remedy PSU's diversity, equity, and inclusion problem to adequately serve our students, Faculty, staff, and communities, including a protocol for its implementation.
- b) Take urgent action regarding the unsustainable situation and needs of the departments and programs of the School of Gender, Race and Nations.

Additionally, the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty, worked throughout the year on a report, formulated recommendations/expectations to address our PSU Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion problems. The main recommendations were: conducting exit interviews, including DEI advocate in searches, verifying the participation in the inclusive hiring workshop required for search committee members, requiring a DEI statement from search candidates, and the use of data to assess the progress of our administration in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty.

2. COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY

Faculty noted that over the past ten years, the ratio of average administrative to Faculty salaries has increased and that there is a lack of **transparency regarding elements of administrative compensation** such as benefits, “golden parachutes”, travel, etc. They worry about the application of corporate models on how we look for “talent” and what seems to be an engagement in the “CEO salary arms race,” as well as about compensation for higher administrators being out of line with the university. While Faculty acknowledge that compensation for administrators needs to be enough to provide incentive for good candidates, they feel that it should not be as high as to attract the wrong kind of candidates. They feel that the wage gap between faculty and administrators is too great for a public university committed to serving our students and our community. Administrative salaries and Faculty salaries should be much closer and administrative salaries in general should return to upper Faculty levels.

The most commented issue in this category was **the practice of administrators returning to Faculty positions at their full administrative salaries**. This has been a long-standing concern of the Faculty, who submitted a question for the President to answer during the June 2019 Senate meeting. The question noted that “Paying full salaries to administrators after they return to schools and colleges reduces funds available for other Faculty lines and increases salary inequities that PSU has sought to reduce in recent AAUP-PSU contracts” and enquired about whether the practice was under review. The Faculty is still uncertain and seeks transparency about the current status of this practice, which is regarded as not only as being unsuitable in a change of role and as producing great inequities but also as a source of incredible strain on the Schools and Departments to cover the salaries, whose budgets are not adjusted to meet the increased salary needs.

3. USE OF SEARCH FIRMS

Faculty expressed disappointment about the process and results of **searches conducted via search firms**, which they viewed as draining resources and having a poor track of recruiting suitable candidates. A Faculty member commented, “Let the institutional knowledge serve the campus and the community better by being more proactive in selecting the leadership of the administration rather than a detached outside search firm wasting huge sums of money needlessly.” Faculty doubted the ability of search firms to attract civil servant educators rather than careerists. The last presidential search was not anomalous, but rather a result of extant policies; therefore, hiring policies need reconsideration.

Faculty also expressed concern that these search firms attract candidates who do not fully understand PSU’s mission and culture and do not stay but rather move laterally between institutions, creating a problem of **administrative churn that erodes institutional continuity**.

On the pros and cons of **employing search firms vs internal expertise**, comments noted, “The search firm that was used for the VP-GDI brought an excellent set of finalists to campus. But that was a specialized firm. The firm that we usually use continues to bring weak finalists to campus. We spend a lot of money. The firm protects everyone’s privacy to the point of erasing any real or useful feedback, and the excessive filtering of feedback obscures all weaknesses that are noticed and signaled by the university community.” “I am not sure why there isn’t a course release for search teams to be developed. I am not impressed by what has been brought to us through search firms. Why are we supporting this industry? I don’t always think we have the right people here but there must be ways we can research that for ourselves.”

4. EXTERNAL VS. INTERNAL CANDIDATES

The PSU Faculty desires a balance of internal and external applicants for administrative jobs and **recommends more attention to internal Faculty expertise**. They regret that, currently, few units are strongly led in ways that seek to develop Faculty for administrative roles. For instance, one comment favors national searches but recommends to “expand the parameters so firms are not headhunting other administrators, but are identifying directors, chairs, Faculty, talented staff that could and should move to administration. Essentially, we need a mentor structure so that faculty become deans, etc.” Other, related comments state, “It would be better to have mostly internal candidates who are acculturated into the institutional idiosyncrasies”; “keep a good balance on those who have the institutional memory and those who can bring in new ideas”; “We need individuals who believe in the current mission of our institution and make a long-term commitment to the institution. I would like to see more focus on supporting and training leadership from within”; “talk to senior and mid-career Faculty about what PSU needs, as opposed to being wonderstruck by star power, or what other institutions are doing”; “I want to see president, provost, and deans teach classes to really be part of PSU.”

5. PROCESS

The Faculty also mentions the need to review the PSU hiring/recruitment process to address whether the best candidate is being recruited: “If in any search the first choice is not recruited, this should be examined. If the pool is not what we hoped then why did PSU not achieve a better applicant pool? These need to be more open, transparent, and include Faculty.” **Faculty believe that they should have a leading role in administrative searches**. Currently they offer recommendations but have no authority to make the hiring decision, which they see as a flaw in the process. Faculty also recommend that search committees include multiple and diverse voices from within PSU.

II. RECRUITING AND RETAINING A DIVERSE ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY

Need for and role of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) advocates in searches, monitoring mandatory inclusive hiring training, diversity of committees and candidate pools, exit interviews to compile data about why Faculty choose to leave the institution, using data to track our institution’s success in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty, requesting a DEI statement from candidates, need to have dedicated staff be available to all units to support and monitor progress in diversity, assessment of administrators based on their progress in recruiting and retaining diverse Faculty, other.

Comments from the Faculty echo the recommendations of the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty (see previous section on administrative searches).

1. RAISING AWARENESS

The Faculty calls for attention to the PSU **existing reports on the situation of underrepresented students**, Faculty, and staff, as well as other available tools and resources (including the expertise of the Faculty conducting research on DEI) to raise awareness of the need for more support for these groups. In the case of faculty and staff, for instance, their extra labor supporting students of color brings no additional compensation or acknowledgement of how that effort affects them in the tenure process.

2. MONITORING TRAINING

The faculty highlight the need for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion **training and attention to biases**. For instance, a comment reads, “Without specific attention being paid to diversity, equity, and inclusion, our implicit biases take over and we (as an organization) find ourselves touting that we value DEI but not actually showing that in our faculty/staff.” The Faculty also acknowledges the need for training beyond the search environment, for current faculty, staff, and administrators on a regular basis. One comment notes, “an online training program one time upon hire is not enough. If you want DEI to be part of the culture, it needs to be more visible to ALL, not just among those who consider themselves diverse.” The Faculty comments also suggest the monitoring of mandatory inclusive hiring training, to make sure that faculty participating in searches receive adequate preparation.

3. DIVERSITY OF COMMITTEES AND POOLS

The **both search committees and candidate pools need to be more diverse**. The Faculty stresses the need to include **DEI advocates** in all searches on campus to maintain PSU’s expectations and obligation for diversity and representation. Other key improvements suggested for the employment process include requesting a DEI statement from candidates and conducting exit interviews with people who leave the institution so that we can identify and address retention issues. In these interviews, privacy must be protected so people feel open to being honest about their reasons for leaving. An enthusiastic comment reads “Yes! Let’s figure out why people choose to leave PSU and let’s hear from the upper administration about their experiences and their ideas for recruitment and retention of under-represented Faculty” while another regrets, “I have watched minority Faculty come to PSU and leave as soon as possible.”

4. ENCOURAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY: MUCH MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE

The Faculty encouraged both the Administration and departments and units to **take diversity seriously when hiring and requested that diversity benchmarks be set in place**. Further suggested initiatives include cluster hires of Faculty of color, faculty diversity affinity groups, and active mentorship. Faculty of color should be encouraged to run for chair, and underrepresented Faculty and staff should be considered for Assistant and Associate Dean positions as well as Vice Presidential ones. A comment denounces that, “PSU has almost no faculty of color, and nearly no domestic minority faculty who feel they could start here on tenure track and maybe someday become a Chair or Dean.” A number of comments voice the Faculty’s disappointment and feeling that we are failing at supporting our underrepresented minorities. For example, one comment notes, “A good part of it might be to listen and be proactive toward Faculty of color when they make requests for protection and change. Evidence of this is clear: we have not done a good job with this in any way at PSU”; “This is an extremely important topic. I have been impressed with the hiring of diverse faculty in my years at the institution, but I don’t think we have done a great job of making non-white (and to a lesser extent, non-male) Faculty feel welcomed and supporting them to be successful. Far too many have left”; “we need to change our search committees and process, we need to address campus climate issues, and we need to do difficult and brutally honest self-study. We are failing in this area, despite our discourse. It feels hypocritical”; “we need A LOT OF HELP in this area. And not just in searching but in retaining.” These are some of the comments that point to the need to act urgently to address these problems. Another commenter notes, “This is a matter of culture, the awareness and understanding of culture and how that comes across in language and interaction. Higher

education tends to treat this as an issue of checking boxes rather than checking ourselves”, while the link between student success and DEI success is also emphasized: “I think this goes hand in hand with student success, as having diverse faculty who represent the diversity of our student body is part of making students feel welcome and seen.”

It is clear from the conversations that have taken place this year on campus, as well as the initiatives (including the [Senate March 2020 resolution](#)) and reports (including the [DAC report](#)) put forth by the different committees and groups, among them our [Strategic Planning Equity Lens](#) (p. 11) that a majority of the Faculty feel that we need quick and robust action in the area of DEI and, particularly of recruiting and retention of color and underrepresented faculty.

III. REVISIONING STRUCTURES

Establishing channels of collaboration/communication among Faculty, Administration, and Board of Trustees, adding more Faculty members to the Board of Trustees, shared governance vs shared leadership, expanding Board of Trustees’ awareness of Faculty’s concerns, Faculty mentoring for Board of Trustee members, assessing our administrative structures and their effectiveness, achieving continuity in a context of a high rate of administrative turnover, promoting transparency and trust, other.

1. FACULTY PARTICIPATION AND COLLABORATION WITH OTHER LEADERSHIP TEAMS

This year’s conversations highlighted the need for Faculty participation in shared governance. The omission of collaboration with Faculty, and Faculty Senate, or Senate Constitutional Committees on the [Portland State University Organizational Chart](#) symbolizes the need to strengthen those channels.

Comments and conversations also expressed a desire to **create direct channels of collaboration between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate leadership, to have more faculty participation in the Board** (beyond just a Faculty board member), and to **have BoT representation in the Faculty Senate**. Including more members with academic experience in the Board would expand the Board’s awareness of the Faculty’s concerns and their work as well as the Faculty’s knowledge of the work and concerns of the Board. A synchrony between these two groups would benefit our academic institution. Creating channels for communication and collaboration would contribute to fulfilling recommendations from documents such as the Association of Governing Boards’ “Shared Governance: Is OK Good enough?,” which calls for more orientation of Board members regarding Faculty work. This document warns that “With little information about Faculty work, board members beginning their service are unprepared to support effective shared governance over time.” The same need applies to Faculty orientation, which could include more information about the Board’s role and work.

The Faculty also believes in further **strengthening the communication and collaboration with the Administration** as a key endeavor for shared governance. Under the prior PSU President, Faculty grew to mistrust an administration that devalued shared governance. The following observations were made during the Nov 6th Faculty Forum: “Many Faculty and academic professionals have had the experience of being on committees whose work ends up being inconsequential—put on the shelf—or who become the audience for a presentation of a *fait accompli*. If shared governance is only lip service, it becomes devalued. Another devaluation occurs when members of minority groups are repeatedly tapped to be on committees, workgroups, etc.—a form of hidden labor that’s not rewarded. Similarly, for academic

professionals, participation in shared governance often means an overload. We seem to have problems of accountability, continuity, inclusivity. If we value shared governance, it needs to be meaningfully integrated into our work: identified in letters of appointment, rewarded at times of review or promotion, and not just symbolically. There has to be authority for Faculty in these roles.”

Recently, **the situation has begun to change for the better, thanks to the collaborative and inclusive approach promoted by the new leadership team** integrated by Provost Susan Jeffords and President Stephen Percy. We are beginning to move from a consultative model of faculty participation to a model in which faculty’s input is included in the decision-making process. That being said, we still have a long path in front of us, as **we are still facing challenges regarding representation and collaboration.**

Faculty feel that their voices are not sufficiently included in the decision-making processes of their departments or colleges, at a granular or micro-level in addition to Faculty Senate representation. A comment states that “The Faculty (departments and programs) are not engaged in decision making. Sometimes, there are discipline specific considerations that are never tapped or assessed because the Administration relies on a college wide representative who doesn’t have discipline-specific knowledge.”

There is an understanding that **diverse stakeholders are an integral part of shared governance and leadership and that students are central to shared governance conversations.** A deliberate effort from the Faculty Senate and the Student Government to reach out and collaborate with each other has been further made this year. The need to **further include part-time (adjunct) Faculty in governance** is also voiced.

A desire to **move from top-down governance models to co-governance and shared leadership models** is expressed, to move away from corporate models that have been failing us and to embrace cooperative models that are more suitable for a higher education institution.

2. ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY

Faculty call for enhanced transparency in many venues. For instance, Faculty would welcome more **information regarding budgetary decisions that impact academics**, and call for including more Faculty economic expertise in preparing budget information. Faculty were also curious about how the totality of administrative positions and salaries at PSU compares to that at other institutions.

Many Faculty do not know much about the **structure and working of the higher administration.** Rapid restructuring and administrative turn-over makes acquiring such knowledge even more challenging. Filling administrative positions by rotation among Faculty would increase mutual knowledge and respect. Faculty also request a detailed list of administrative committees and their tasks (similar to the list of committees outlined in the Faculty Constitution). Among the questions for which the Faculty would welcome a response are the following (from the November 6th, 2019 meeting minutes): Which administrators are also faculty, and how is this decided? Do they return to the Faculty at the end of their term? Are there other institutions that place more emphasis on internal hires or rotation? Because the Board of Trustees is relatively new, faculty should learn more about the members, the appointment process, and requirements (if any) for experience in higher education.

Finally, the Faculty has also pointed to the need to evaluate the administrative structures and

services, particularly in our current circumstances, looking for ways that they can be reorganized to work more effectively, in an effort parallel to the examination of our programs.

IV. CONDUCTING REGULAR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Who should review Chairs, Deans, Provost, President, and other administrators, role of the Faculty in administrators reviews, kinds of questions that should be considered when assessing our administrators, frequency of reviews, procedure, should reviews of administrators be made public? Models to consider from other institutions.

As mentioned above, a more communicative and collaborative relationship has recently emerged between the Faculty and the other key constituents of the campus community, including the Board of Trustees. We are walking an increasingly constructive and effective path in shared governance.

University leaders among both the Administration and the Faculty value transparency and trust. This emerging partnership will position us well to **strengthen and transform our institution while remaining true to our mission and values** and is particularly important now, as we face multiple challenges caused or aggravated by the COVID-19 and social unrest.

An essential component of a healthy and highly functional university is the ability to establish and implement methods of self-assessment and adjustment. Such assessment should take place not only in the Faculty ranks and instructional dimensions but also within the administration. We recommend that PSU design and maintain a regular review process to provide our administrators with the opportunity to receive constructive feedback from the campus community on their progress and effectiveness as leaders, for their personal development as well as the improvement and enhancement of the institution. The Faculty can play an essential role and hold a great responsibility in this assessment process, both as reviewers and reviewees. As the report by the American Association of University Professors on Faculty Evaluation of Administrators states, “Their [Faculty] expertise is both an indelible part of a full and fair evaluation and a positive service to relevant administrators and to the institution’s governing board.” The report further explains that “the most desirable, as well as the most effective, system is one that rests on sound institutional policy, healthy relationships among the parties, and scrupulously fair practice. Indeed, such a system at its best will involve not only evaluation, but also constructive mentoring, as is the case with the best systems of Faculty evaluation.”

While some elements of administrative review are currently in place at PSU, we still lack a Faculty Senate-centered, comprehensive and consistent mechanism for effectively **utilizing Faculty expertise in assessing and enhancing PSU’s leadership on aspects such as progress in advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion; promoting shared governance, communication, and collaboration among university constituents and involving them in decision-making; ability to embrace innovation and ensure that PSU effectively serves students, the city, and the global community; alignment with our mission and strategic goals; impact on institutional priorities, and other important leadership components.** The need for the PSU Faculty to examine our current procedures and practices, identify gaps and establish a solid administrative review process became evident during the conversations on PSU’s leadership and administration that took place in Fall 2019 as part of the Special Meeting of the Faculty on November 6th and continued in connection to the Faculty Forum on May 18th, 2020, where Faculty members provided extensive feedback on this subject, prompting the steering committee to present this proposal.

The Steering Committee recommended in Spring 2020 the creation of an exploratory Ad- Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews to **examine the administrative review mechanisms already in place at PSU, explore models of administrative review being successfully implemented at other public universities comparable to PSU, reflecting on best practices that could be adapted to the specific needs of our institution**, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for the creation/implementation of an administrative review process consistent with the context and rationale stated in this proposal, including a timeline and specific steps to collaborate with the Administration and relevant constituents (including our Board of Trustees) in setting this process (see [Faculty Senate resolution, 8 June 2020](#)).

Among the themes highlighted by the Faculty regarding this topic, we find the centrality of a **diversity, equity, and inclusion lens, the desire to work with our Board of Trustees**, as well as the recommendations to set a **regular and comprehensive process**. On the advantages and need of establishing this process, we received comments such as “Evaluation and feedback can be immensely useful for professional development. Why would we deny administrators access to this critical professional development resources?” and “Though I generally deeply value assessment, I would like better to see accountability and a way to support our deans, chairs etc. Questions to ask about accountability? Do those you lead feel rewarded, ignored or punished for trying to meet desired outcomes.”

Focusing on constructive feedback and highlighting best practices and models (both externally and internally) pointing to the values and practices that are central to PSU are also key to this endeavor. A comment read: “Models to consider? The best Deans and Presidents that I have had the pleasure of knowing had a strong and positive vision for the school and were there for 20+ years to make it happen. If I am not mistaken, they both rose internally and excelled at bringing the campus together. They were connected with the students (taught, personally attended student activities and club meetings, regular face in Faculty meetings), everyone (students Faculty) knew exactly what the goals were, strategies were cohesive though flexible. Benefits for reaching the goals were clear and felt by all.”

Recommended Actions

Below are some of the actions that we can and need to take together to ensure that PSU reaches its full potential:

- Address the lack of and loss of underrepresented faculty and staff. Take immediate action following the recommendations of the Faculty Senate resolutions on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and on recruitment and retention of diverse faculty (approved in [March 2020](#) and [June 2020](#), respectively).
- Enhance efforts to hire and retain diverse faculty and staff by including DEI advocate(s) in searches, verifying the participation in the inclusive hiring workshop required for search committee members, requiring a DEI statement from search candidates, conducting exit interviews, and using data and assessment tools to evaluate the progress of our administration in recruiting *and* retaining diverse faculty.

- In matters of compensation, rely on higher education models rather than corporate ones to close the current wage gap between administration and faculty, too large for a public university committed to the mission of serving students and the community.
- End the practice of administrators returning to faculty positions at their full administrative salaries, a long-standing concern of the Faculty that creates inequity and is a source of incredible financial strain on the schools and departments.
- In administrative searches, evaluate carefully the need for an external firm, given the concerns regarding transparency, preselection of candidates, results, and cost.
- Ensure that faculty have a leading role in administrative searches and include multiple and diverse voices from within PSU in search committees.
- Strike a balance of internal and external candidates for administrative jobs and pay more attention to internal faculty expertise and talent.
- Prepare PSU faculty for administrative roles: they understand the mission and culture of the campus and are committed to the institution; including more PSU faculty in the administration helps prevent administrative churn.
- Pay attention to PSU's existing reports as well as other available tools and resources (including the expertise of the faculty conducting research on DEI) to raise awareness of the need for more support for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.
- Promote DEI training on a regular basis for current faculty, staff, and administrators and pay attention to biases occurring in the context of searches and beyond.
- Diversify search committees and candidate pools.
- Ensure that diversity is taken seriously and request that diversity benchmarks be set in place.
- Promote cluster-hiring of underrepresented faculty, faculty diversity affinity groups, and active mentorship.
- Encourage underrepresented faculty to run for administrative positions at all levels and ensure that they are considered for these positions.
- Make students and faculty of color and other underrepresented students and faculty feel welcome, seen, safe, and supported by listening and acting when they make requests for protection and change.
- Help raise awareness of the direct correlation between a diverse faculty and staff and student success.
- Integrate the governance roles of the Faculty, Faculty Senate, or Senate Constitutional Committees into the [Portland State University Organizational Chart](#), to provide a full view of PSU's organization.
- Further strengthen the communication and collaboration between the Administration the Faculty.
- Create direct channels of collaboration between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate leadership.

- Include more faculty representation in the Board of Trustees and also include Board of Trustees representation in the Faculty Senate.
- Ensure that diverse stakeholders form an integral part of shared governance and leadership and place students at the core of shared governance conversations. Increase inclusion of part-time (adjunct) faculty in governance.
- Continue to move from a consultative model of faculty participation to a model in which faculty input is included in the decision-making process.
- Continue to develop co-governance and shared leadership models. Move away from corporate top-down models, which have been failing us, in favor of co-operative models that are more suitable for a higher education institution.
- Enhance transparency in aspects such as: information regarding budgetary decisions that impact academics, administrative committees and their tasks, and how administrative positions and salaries at PSU compare to those at other institutions.
- Maintain a regular review process to provide our administrators with the opportunity to receive constructive feedback from the campus community on their progress and effectiveness as leaders, for their personal development as well as the improvement and enhancement of the institution.
- Utilize faculty expertise in assessing and enhancing PSU's leadership on aspects such as the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion; the promotion of shared governance, communication, and collaboration among university constituents and their involvement in decision-making processes; the ability to embrace innovation and ensure that PSU effectively serves students, the city, and the global community; the alignment between our mission and strategic goals; the impact on institutional priorities, and other important leadership components.

Works Cited

American Association of University Professors. "Evaluation of Shared Governance." *AAUP*, [https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Evaluation of Shared Governance.pdf](https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Evaluation%20of%20Shared%20Governance.pdf), 2016.

American Association of University Professors. "On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom." *Academe*, vol. 80, no. 4, Jul.- Aug. 1994, pp. 47-49. <https://www.aaup.org/report/relationship-faculty-governance-academic-freedom>

American Association of University Professors; Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges; and American Council on Education. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." *AAUP Bulletin*, vol. 52, no. 4, Dec. 1966, pp. 375-79. <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. AGB, "AGB Board of Directors' Statement on Shared Governance," https://agb.org/sites/default/files/u27335/2017_statement_sharedgovernance.pdf, 2017.

- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. "Shared Governance: Is OK Good Enough?" AGB, https://agb.org/sites/default/files/survey_2016_shared_governance.pdf, 2016.
- Bahls, Steven C. *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*. Washington: AGB Press, 2014.
- Cramer, Sharon F., ed. *Shared Governance in Higher Education*. 2 vols. Albany: SUNY Press, 2017.
- Kezar, Adrianna J., and Elizabeth M. Holcombe. "Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Important Lessons from Research and Practice." *American Council on Education*, <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Shared-Leadership-in-Higher-Education.pdf>, 2017.
- Ramaley, Judith, Adrianna J. Kezar, Elizabeth M. Holcombe, and Susan L. Elrod. *Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Responding to a Changing World*. (In preparation.)
- Ramo, Keetje J. *Assessing the Faculty's Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards*. Washington: American Association of University Professors, 1997.