

Subject: Re: Opinion Meeting- informal and voluntary

From: "Melody E. Valdini" <mev@pdx.edu>

Date: 4/15/20, 9:29 AM

To: "Lindsay J. Benstead" <benstead@pdx.edu>, Richard Clucas <hprc@pdx.edu>, Stephanie Erev <erev@pdx.edu>, David Kinsella <kinsella@pdx.edu>, Chris Shortell <shortell@pdx.edu>, Kim Williams <kmw3@pdx.edu>, Birol Yesilada <yesilada@pdx.edu>, Jack Miller <jack35@pdx.edu>, Joshua Eastin <jeastin@pdx.edu>

Hi all,

Alrighty- it looks like 9am tomorrow (Thursday, April 16) is the time that works for everyone who responded to the poll. I will not be putting this on your calendars, so please make a note of it.

And here is the zoom link that we will use: <https://pdx.zoom.us/j/97833738101>

This is such a difficult situation- I sincerely appreciate your willingness to talk through options and express opinions, and I look forward to speaking with you all tomorrow.

All my best,

Melody

On 4/13/20 5:01 PM, Melody E. Valdini wrote:

-CONFIDENTIAL-

Hi all,

Words cannot express how much I wish that we didn't have to deal with this right now, but unfortunately I cannot delay this any longer- we need to talk about next steps regarding Bruce. His most recent opinion piece is self-published via his new policy consulting firm (you can find it here: http://www.web.pdx.edu/~gilleyb/HiddenCostsofShutdown_PFA.pdf) and, while this is not too extreme (relative to his usual stuff), it does signal me that he is ramping up and will probably become more prolific as he tries to establish his new business as a policy consultant. Thus, it is time to make some decisions.

As you may remember, I convened a sub-committee in January, and asked them to provide me with guidance. The members of that sub-committee, David Kinsella and Kim Williams, produced an excellent report, and I cannot thank them enough for their time and thoughtful approach. I am not distributing the report to faculty at this point (and I am happy to explain why in person or via zoom... and I spoke with Kinsella about this, and he supports this decision). That being said, I would like to share the 5 main recommendations of the subcommittee with you all, and then convene a discussion to get your thoughts (recommendations are below my signature). I am particularly interested to hear how you feel about each recommendation, and also if you think that implementing all 5 would be an adequate response from the dept. From my perspective, I see a lot of division in the faculty regarding appropriate next steps, so I think the healthy approach here is to voice our opinions and get a sense of where we are on this.

That being said, I know that some of you are deeply uncomfortable engaging on this topic,

so I want to emphasize that this discussion is totally voluntary. This is not a faculty meeting, and there is nothing official here– this is simply an informal opportunity to voice an opinion (if you want). Also, needless to say, this discussion will be confidential, and Bruce will not be present.

I have proposed a few times for this Thursday and Friday– please fill out the poll regarding your availability (and this will be via Zoom): xoyondo.com/dp/sx7x7CPGFzsiGj6

Please continue to keep all of this confidential.

All my best,

Melody

Here are the 5 recommendations from the subcommittee:

(1) Faculty whose scholarship or community engagement generates controversy should, upon request from the Department Chair, begin explicitly stating that their views are not those of the Department or PSU when they write or speak in extramural settings.

(2) When faculty are aware that particular extramural speeches or writing are likely to generate negative reactions, and certainly when they court such reactions, they should inform the Department Chair.

(3) The Department should reserve public censure for cases of clear misconduct in research or teaching. It is not appropriate in cases where the only concern is the content of a faculty member's writings or speech. In exceptional cases of misconduct, such a statement should require genuinely unanimous support from the faculty, and in ascertaining the degree of support, the Chair should exercise the utmost discretion.

(4) When the Department Chair believes that course reassignment or blanket student opt-out permissions are warranted, s/he should consult with the chair of the Curriculum Committee and/or the chair of the Graduate Committee prior to making a final determination. These decisions generally should not be treated as matters for public consumption on or off campus. Opportunities to opt-out of required courses can be communicated to students through their academic advisors.

5) In cases of censure, the Department Chair should give the faculty member an opportunity to commence a Faculty Grievance Procedure and allow that procedure to run its course before making the statement public.