

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate Meeting, 8 June 2020
(On-Line Conference)**

Presiding Officer: Isabel Jaén Portillo

Secretary: Richard Beyler

Senators present: Ajibade, Anderson, Baccar, Broussard, Bryson, Chaillé, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Dillard, Dimond, Duncan, Eastin, Emery, Faaleava, Farahmandpur, Feng, Fiorillo, Flores, Fountain, Gamburd, George, Greco, Hansen, Harris, Henderson, Holt, Hsu, Ingersoll, Izumi, James, Jedynek, Karavanic, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Lafrenz, Limbu, Lindsay, Loney, Lupro, Magaldi, Matlick, Mosier, Newlands, Oschwald, Palmiter, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Sugimoto, Thanheiser, Thieman, Thorne, Tinkler, Watanabe.

Alternates present: Karen Curtin for Dolidon, Mitchell Cruzan for Eppley.

Senators absent: Fritz, May, Meyer.

Attendance of ex-officio members was not taken.

A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA. The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

1. Roll call.
2. Modification of procedure to allow the Presiding Officer to move any agenda items was **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Announcements from Presiding Officer

JAÉN PORTILLO thanked senators for participating in this second June meeting, necessary because of the complex agenda and need to get to certain items before summer.

JAÉN called attention to a new agenda item, introduced under the authority of the Presiding Officer under the Bylaws to add items under extraordinary circumstances: a proposed resolution to ask our administration to help us in diversity, equity, and inclusion issues, and in making our university a safe, inclusive, and supportive environment for everyone. The statement, proposed by Steering Committee, had been circulated by email [**June 8th Agenda Attachment E.2**]. The document echoes a number of statements already circulating on campus. We have invited senators to share any of those statements with us so we can create a unified wider response.

JAÉN clarified that the organs of Faculty governance ordinarily do not operate during the summer, since many faculty are on nine-month contracts. However, the presiding officer team—the incoming PO, PO Elect, and herself as Past PO—will be available during the summer for consultation with the administration. A June 2019 resolution said the administration should not make any permanent decisions when the Senate is not in session. This is, however, an extraordinary year, and we need to be prepared for the administration needing to consult with Senate on any emergency issue. We would probably have to call a special meeting which, apparently, had never been done, but which is contemplated in the Constitution and Bylaws.

2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER reviewed the voting procedures.

C. DISCUSSION – *none***D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** (*all items postponed from June 1st meeting*)**1. New program: Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management** (SB via UCC)

WATANABE/SANCHEZ **moved** approval of the Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management, a new program in SB, as summarized in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.1** and given in full in the [Online Curriculum Management System \[OCMS\]](#). The **Business Minor in Real Estate Property Management**, summarized in **Attachment D.1**, was **approved** (48 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

2. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Real Estate Property Management (SB via UCC)

EMERY/GAMBURD **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management, a new program in SB, as summarized in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.2** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Real Estate Property Management**, summarized in **Attachment D.2**, was **approved** (49 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

3. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Transformative Messaging (CLAS via UCC)

GAMBURD/WATANABE **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging, a new program in CLAS, as summarized in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.3** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Transformative Messaging**, summarized in **Attachment D.3**, was **approved** (41 yes, 3 no, 5 abstain, recorded by online survey).

4. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Women's Leadership (CUPA via UCC)

CHAILLÉ/GRECO **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership, a new program in CUPA, as summarized in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.4** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership**, summarized in **Attachment D.4**, was **approved** (52 yes, 0 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

5. New program: Undergrad. Cert. in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign (CUPA via UCC)

CHAILLÉ/KINSELLA **moved** approval of the Undergraduate Certificate in Campaigning to Win a U.S. Political Campaign, as summarized in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.5** and given in full in [OCMS](#). The **Undergraduate Certificate in Women's Leadership**, summarized in **Attachment D.5**, was **approved** (43 yes, 2 no, 7 abstain, recorded by online survey).

6. Gen. ed. requirement for students transferring with over 135 credits (USC)

THORNE/LINDSAY **moved** approval of the change to the general education requirement for students transferring with over 135 credits, as stated in the University Studies Council [USC] memorandum of 7 May 2020 (p. 2), **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.6**.

SPENCER said that this represented a bottom-up reform. Requirements for transfer students haven't been reviewed for a long time. With the recent closure of several higher

education institutions in the Portland area, we have had a wave of transfers coming in at the senior level. They are then asked to take a Capstone, which is a crown jewel of our general education requirements, and also twelve hours of junior cluster credits. This creates some frustration for students who are already ready to finish their education. We have heard from registration and advising that many students have chosen not to come to PSU for that reason. UNST Executive Director GEORGE and Dean CHABON also believed it was time to work on this issue. With COVID there will probably be more students transferring to PSU rather than fewer, and sadly more closures of higher ed institutions. This provision is a way to make PSU a safe landing place for these students who are already facing upset and uncertainty. It applies only for those with the equivalent of senior standing, so most transfer students continue with the current requirements.

The policy change for students transferring with more than 135 credits stated in **Attachment D.6** was **approved** (44 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

7. **Non-COTA courses used for Fine & Performing Arts credit (ARC)**

KARAVANIC/THORNE **moved** the proposal from the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC), **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.7**, to allow certain designated film courses outside of COTA to count towards the fine and performing arts (FPA) distribution requirement for undergraduate degrees.

DUH stated that ARC had been working with COTA see whether some non-COTA courses could be counted towards the FPA credits required for the BA and some other degrees. Mostly the FPA credits come from that college—architecture, art and design, music and theater, and film—but there are also film courses in several other departments. The list is given in **Attachment D.7**. ARC has been receiving a number of student petitions asking for these courses to count towards the FPA requirement; this proposal would cover such petitions going forward.

HOLT saw one of his classes on the list. If there is another one that he would like to propose for inclusion, how should he do that? DUH: contact COTA, who had been working with ARC on this issue, to see about submitting the course for inclusion.

The change to the list of courses usable toward the FPA distribution credit for undergraduate degree requirements, as proposed in **Attachment D.7**, was **approved** (46 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain, recorded by online survey).

8. **Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization (Steering)**

AJIBADE/GAMBURD moved the proposal to create an Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization, with membership and charge defined in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.8**. JAÉN adverted to the discussion at the Faculty Forum in May about the examination of programs. This proposal is for a committee to do exploratory work during the summer—framing a set of guidelines, looking at models in other universities, gathering evidence and data, thinking about how to shape the work in the next year. This committee is just taking preliminary steps; another committee will be formed in the fall. There will be eight to ten members chosen by the Committee on Committees; chairs of the main constitutional committees; and a diversity, equity, and inclusion advocate. The committee will work with administration

members proposed by the Provost. It will present a report in the fall, with the purpose of informing next steps. JAÉN stressed that the work will be exploratory, information gathering—no decisions on PSU programs can be made during the summer.

JEDYNAK: will Faculty Senate be involved in deciding or suggesting which programs to cut? JAÉN: we don't really know yet how the process is going to be shaped. That's why we are conducting this exploratory work.

WATANABE: the title is "summer research committee" and refers to "academic program and reorganization." What is the structure of this committee that has several topics to work on? JAÉN: the organization is given in the charge. Basically they will look at models elsewhere, and frame some guidelines based on our situation and applying the diversity lens. This work has to tie into data. As for its composition: part of the committee will be chairs of key constitutional committees, and part will be other Faculty members. They will, of course, be working with the administration. WATANABE: it's only during the summer? JAÉN: yes, that is why this group is only doing exploratory work and not reaching any decisions.

GAMBURD's vision of what we're trying to do is to set up a process, or find examples from other universities that have gone through similar experiences. What have been the pros and cons of those processes? The exercise is to take a holistic look at our curriculum, which we haven't done for a while. Departments and programs do that in their own assessment; in this project we do it together. We are not being asked to figure out what to cut. It's broader and hopefully more generative. We are figuring out what we want our future curriculum to look like, so that as the University and Provost make difficult decisions we are not shooting ourselves in the foot by reorganizing or cutting something critical to our academic mission. It's an opportunity for Faculty as a whole to consider where we are and where we want to be in ten years, for the Provost to consider as she weighs decisions on how to move forward during the present crisis.

HANSEN's understanding is that during the summer the [committee] will not make recommendations [on its own]; the product will be recommendations to the Faculty Senate as to the process for considering changes to programs throughout campus—to ensure it will be fair and equitable. We then apply that process to a holistic view of our curriculum and programs. Decisions would still have to go through the process of reviews by the relevant committees (EPC, BC, GC, UCC) and Faculty Senate, which will have a yea or nay on whatever recommendations come out of the committee. JAÉN agreed that the report will not make any set-in-stone decisions.

GRECO asked about compensation for people on the committee who are on nine-month contracts, and about who will appoint the DEI advocate. JAÉN: there will be compensation for faculty on nine-month contracts; they have already talked with the Provost about that. The Committee on Committees will decide the best process for staffing the committee. It doesn't have to be only current senators.

JAÉN reiterated that the work will be exploratory, and no decision making will happen over the summer.

ZONOOZY urged that any committee or ad-hoc committee that participates in decision making for the future recognize the contribution of adjunct faculty to the quality of education at PSU, and the efforts to achieve equity with other faculty members.

The Ad-Hoc Summer Research Committee on Academic Program Examination / Reorganization, with composition and charge as given in **Attachment D.8**, was **approved** (44 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

9. EPC memo on budget cuts and education policy

KARAVANIC/WATANABE moved the **resolution** calling for adherence to the principles on budget cuts and education policy set forth in the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) memorandum of 16 April 2020, **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.9**.

SAGER said this a follow-up to the work EPC did on elimination and suspension of programs [May meeting]. It responds to faculty members' expressed anxiety about potential cuts or talk of reorganization, while not knowing what the administration sees as the range of scenarios or the prioritization of the values guiding decisions. EPC's position is that faculty voices are absolutely crucial. We also need some statement from senior leadership about how they see the situation. EPC here suggests some key principles. There is a great deal of worry that important decisions will be made over the summer, and we want to state strongly that that shouldn't be the case. Faculty need to be present, on contract, to provide input. This is necessary for the quality of decisions, and if Faculty voices are absent the University will be the poorer for it.

The **resolution** endorsing the principles stated in **Attachment D.9** was approved (41 yes, 3 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

10. EPC memorandum and OAA/OIA response on Confucius Institute contract

SAGER summarized the next item: EPC's memo [**June 8th Packet Attachment D.10**] following up on Faculty Senate resolutions about the renewal of the contract for the Confucius Institute (CI) at PSU, and Faculty concerns about a number of matters, including academic freedom. Since the time the previous memo was released, we learned that the contract had in fact been signed. EPC had a very useful dialogue with Ron WITCZAK (Director, Office of International Affairs), Susan JEFFORDS, and the Office of General Counsel to clarify several questions: about the jurisdiction and about the language the contract was written in. It seemed that there were two contracts, one in Chinese and one in English. The appendices to the memo show the exchange. We arrived at a point where we thought the legal questions had been answered, but that the response did not fully address broader concerns such as academic freedom, salient to PSU faculty. One call is for discussion to be brought to Senate so faculty could provide input.

GAMBURD/THORNE **moved the resolution** given in **Attachment D.10** regarding steps to be taken at the next renewal of the contract of the CI at PSU.

GAMBURD asked what happens next. It seems that we are taking steps so that things don't get lost over the summer, and that we have clarified that the English version of the contract is the one we are moving forward with. It seems that we should also make sure to have on somebody's watch list that we need to have a conversation about the renewal of this contract when it comes up again.

SAGER: when this comes up for renewal we will know in advance and know that it should be brought to the Senate and EPC. He would very much like to see a conversation with Senate so as to incorporate feedback from faculty.

HOLT said he had asked his colleague Steve WADLEY to compare the Chinese and English versions. No translation is perfect; we need to have everything in one language to know what is being discussed. He [WADLEY] had pointed out a couple of questionable places [in the translation]. HOLT therefore supported what EPC is doing, and wanted to remind the administration that we need to be careful—can't be of two different minds for these processes at PSU. JAÉN agreed that it is crucial to have a process that respects shared governance. It appears that previously there was not an efficient way to share resolutions with our administration so that everybody is clear about the next steps to be taken. PERCY has been working on that, she said.

The **resolution** on steps to be taken upon the renewal of the CI contract, given in **Attachment D.10**, was approved (43 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

11. Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews (Steering)

JAÉN indicated that the next topic arose from conversations earlier in the year, in particular the meeting of the Faculty in November. One theme in the comments was the importance of establishing an effective process for review of our administrative mechanisms, taking stock of what is already in place and exploring models at other universities: what monitors would be efficient and work for our mission and values? A committee of six to eight members will study the issue and report back to Senate.

GRECO/KARAVANIC **moved** the proposal for an Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews, with composition and charge defined in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.11**.

PALMITER wondered what members of the administration the reviews would include, specifically department chairs. JAÉN believed that is the understanding. We have some mechanism for review [of department chairs] in place, and the idea would be to look also at other models and think about how to optimize our own mechanisms.

JEDYNAK: previously we discussed forming a group to look at the future of the University in terms of programs. This has to do with reviewing the future of the administration. Why does it not include things such as the size of the administration, a more global discussion of who the administration should be? Why does it focus only on current administrators? JAÉN replied that is an important question—slightly different from the one the committee will be working on, but related. It will likely be part of the conversations. She also pointed to the draft of report to be shared with the Board of Trustees [**June 8th Agenda Attachment G.4**] which addresses this issue. She asked for any comments senators had on the draft report. Ultimately, the question is how to optimize our ability to serve students.

CHABON observed, reverting to the earlier question, that chairs are identified in the proposal; the question of what members are included is still a good one. JAÉN said an early task for the committee will be to determine which members of the administration are in question. BEYLER: there are some mechanisms in place; the task of this group would not be to re-invent the wheel, but see what could be improved, changed, etc.

JAÉN: yes, thus this starts as exploratory work—to determine what we already have, and then what other universities are doing.

BACCAR asked if this is an evaluation of individuals in specific positions, or a review of their areas of responsibility JAÉN: that point that will have to be clarified through exploratory work. She thought the idea was to assess whether what is happening in a particular role is the work as we want it to happen—and as needed, to make adjustments.

ZONOOZY: a long and difficult year will soon be behind us; however, multi-faceted emerging challenges will continue to present us with challenges. Thank you to the capable leadership and accomplishments of our Presiding Officer. JAÉN expressed her thanks for the kind comment. She hoped for a continuation of these effective actions.

The motion to create the Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews, with composition and charge given in **Attachment D.11**, was **approved** (40 yes, 0 no, 4 abstain, recorded by online survey).

12. Recommendations from Diversity Action Council Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty

KARAVANIC/HOLT **moved** the resolution to endorse the recommendations of the Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty of the Diversity Action Council, contained in **June 8th Agenda Attachment D.12**.

GRECO (chair) said the report represented a year's work for the committee. Their charge was to look at how the University could do a better job recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. There are separate groups working on staff and on students. One of the big things needed is money, so a subgroup is going to apply for an NSF catalyst grant that's focused on data collection and analysis, and then a larger institutional transformation grant for diversity in STEM. The report also makes recommendations not connected to the grant; they are things that we think should be going on, period. In many cases they have already started, but flounder due to a lack of administrative support, or no one in charge, or failure to track outcomes. The University could be doing a better job; exit interviews are one example. The committee also thinks there need to be specified diversity advocates immediately on all searches for upper administration, and eventually on all searches. The University's current data is difficult to understand; that's one reason for the catalyst grant. proposal. Nearly all recommendation they found echoed in the words of our strategic plan and findings of earlier task forces. Bringing the statement before Faculty Senate and publishing it might give more momentum.

JAÉN thanked the committee for the report, and also for the grant application. She adverted to Senate's previous resolution [March meeting], and also to the report to the Board of Trustees. These pieces all agree on how important it is to support diversity, equity, and inclusion at our University.

JEDYNAK suggested that including a statistician in the composition of the committee and in writing the grant proposal might be useful. GRECO observed, first, that the committee is drawn from anyone who signs up to be one it. Second, regarding data analysis: first it's necessary to get the data, and so far we have three data sets each with a different number of faculty. We want to look at a variety of questions and will get someone who can help with statistical analysis. But just obtaining the data—finding the

right coding—is a time-consuming problem. Even looking what we do have, we can see that there’s a problem. She noted that it’s a subset of the committee working on the grant, including a colleague Larry MARTINEZ (PSY) who does this kind of workplace analysis. But they could use help, so feel free to sign up. JAÉN observed that the recommendations are not necessarily based on quantitative data, but on a combination of situation and experiences discussed throughout the year. Quantitative data is useful, but so is qualitative.

PALMITER called attention to a STEM strike being called for Wednesday, June 10th.

GRECO reiterated that the recommendations are separate from the grant application per se, and noted that diversity advocates are already a practice in, for example, MCECS.

The **resolution** endorsing the recommendations of the DAC Committee on Retention and Recruitment of Diversity Faculty given in **Attachment D.12** was **approved** (unanimously, recorded by online survey).

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. P/NP policy for fall term (Steering)

SANCHEZ/HOLT moved the continuation of the current modified pass/no-pass policy into fall term, as stated in **June 8th Agenda Attachment E.1**.

BACCAR said that the question is whether to extend into fall the temporary change we made for spring and summer. The motion [passed in April] granted an extension to fall if we will be fully remote; however, that is not the case for either of the scenarios discussed previously. They are each a blend. One line of reasoning is that whereas in spring the change was very quick, now students are familiar with remote learning. The other line of reasoning is that the modification was necessary not because of the suddenness of the change [to remote] but rather because of the impact on family life, travel, personal concerns, etc.; the suggestion is that this stress might continue into fall, regardless of the scenario. Data [given in **Attachment E.1**] showed how students have utilized the P/NP option. BACCAR also noted there have been requests to expand the option beyond week 10 because of students’ involvement with the marches, etc.

LAFRENZ observed that settling the policy in advance also helps faculty, to as they do grading that students have this option.

HOLT: keeping things in a certain groove from spring and summer into fall makes it easier for faculty and students. His question is whether there is worry if students have too many P grades and not enough letter grades, say for the major. BACCAR said they hadn’t thought in these terms, since if departments give students this option they are implicitly approving those courses. She noted that they are putting comments [about the policy] on transcripts. It would be hard for this to go on forever without some deep analysis, but we haven’t run into many issues like this so far.

IZUMI advocated that we think about it in terms of the students who are most impacted by COVID-19, and also by the racial injustices and protests. It would be most equitable to support this policy.

EPPLEY supported the policy, but questioned why we are doing it the day before grades [are due]. U of O is doing it after grades are due. She believed it was too fast for both

faculty and students, not to have the ability two days later. BACCAR: at first we were making decisions very fast, responding quickly. The idea of going into finals [week] was proposed by some faculty. But others pointed out it is not necessarily fair between, say, students who get their final on Monday and those who get it on Friday. What resulted was this compromise. If we let it go till after grades roll, systems break down; it is difficult to manage—degree clearance, etc. EPPLEY observed that U of O has a two-week window. BACCAR: we could think about that for the fall.

HANSEN wanted to make sure that students could elect letter grade—for example, because of requirements for a scholarship. BACCAR: yes, it is an individual choice as before. This is assuming the department as set up having this option for the course. The students still have to decide how they want to take it. HANSEN: are some units mandating pass/no-pass? BACCAR said we are talking about courses that are typically set up as letter-grade only. Some colleges or departments wanted all the graded courses set up as optional. This wasn't uniform. Some colleges set up courses with the option, and some stuck with graded courses because of the impact on licensure, etc.—where they thought it would not be in students' interest.

THIEMAN asked about the logistics for faculty—say there is the option, but the student has chosen a letter grade. The weekend after finals week, the faculty member posts a letter grade and then leaves—this is not uncommon. On the day that grades roll up, the faculty member might be no longer there. What happens if the student changes their mind after this point? BACCAR: the Registrar's office can look at this and flip the grade to pass, sending an email to the instructor. If the instructor says, if I had known they were taking P/NP, my evaluation might have different and I might have given a pass grade—they still can change it. These are little wrinkles; we are trying to find the best approach. THIEMAN, following up: in the COE graduate program, a pass is A or B, not C. JAÉN thanked BACCAR for dealing with this complexity.

The motion to extend the current temporary change in the pass/no-pass policy through the fall 2020 term, stated in **Attachment E.1**, was **approved** (43 yes, 8 no, 0 abstain).

2. **Statement and Resolution Against Racism and Discrimination and in Support of Underrepresented Faculty, Students, and Staff** (Steering)

This item was added to the agenda at the discretion the Presiding Officer pursuant to the Bylaws, section 'Agenda,' subpoint (a).

INGERSOLL/MOSIER **moved the resolution** contained in **June 8th Agenda Attachment E.2**, calling on the administration to take action on the resolutions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been approved by Faculty Senate during this academic year, and to present to the Steering Committee by October 15th an plan of action for discussion in Faculty Senate.

JAÉN reminded senators that we have a new Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion, Ame LAMBERT. This resolution is tied to the previous resolution passed in March. It encourages the administration to communicate with Senate more closely. There is a call for immediate action, and a request for a plan for further action by October.

PALMITER thought this was a good idea, and appreciated that it mentioned Jason WASHINGTON. She wished, however, that it included resolutions dating back to 2018

so as to include the conversations on the Margolis Healy report on campus policing. Could it be backdated? BEYLER stated that senators are free to propose amendments. JAÉN observed that the resolution pertains to prior motions, not simply conversations; also, it's understood that these motions are themselves product of more than a year of conversations. Point one is calling for action on an item that previously called for action, but now we feel it's a more urgent situation.

PALMITER/LINDSAY **moved to amend** the closing words of point one of the resolution to read "academic years 2018-20," thus:

- 1) Work together with the Faculty to take immediate action regarding the recommendations of the resolutions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been approved by the Faculty Senate during academic years 2018-20.

Discussion of amendment to E.2

LINDSAY felt strongly that the conversations we've had previously around arming the campus police should be noted in this document that we are putting out now.

MOSIER believed that there was a resolution already in 2014 against arming the police, voted on by two-thirds of the senators. She wondered if we should go back to look at that resolution—stretch the timeframe even further back and re-engage with that conversation. JAÉN observed that point one was written to support previous resolutions specifically on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

KARAVANIC supported passing the resolution as originally written: in the interest of time, we should vote on something now rather than delve into past discussions—the timely way to move forward.

LABISSIERE stated that there was lots of conversation [in Steering, around the crafting of the statement]. He appreciated that the motion is a commitment to look forward, to work together and sustain action. It's an accountability strategy.

JAÉN suggested looking at how conversations have developed in the last few days, but it's also important that we re-open the conversation in the fall. Clearly the faculty wants to revisit certain topics. If the statement focuses on resolutions passed this year, that doesn't foreclose debate on the other topics.

The **amendment** was **approved** (30 yes, 13 no, 2 abstain).

Return to main motion E.2 as amended

The **resolution** stated in **Attachment E.2, as amended**, was **approved** (47 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

G. REPORTS

1. President's report

Prior to the President's report, JAÉN thanked PERCY for stepping forward as Interim and expressed congratulations [on his appointment as President].

PERCY indicated that since last week there had been some planning about how people would come off the workshare plan, and he hoped to get information out about this soon. They are looking into the concern about people working on grant-funded research.

When he saw [E.2], PERCY said, he was heartened because we're on the right track. We need to step up. This time of sorrow, grief, reflection, protest causes us to look at what we've accomplished, but also how much more we need to do. It's a job for us at all levels. We are already taking steps. Presidential Fellows are updating the African-American students retention report. We are working on a plan to advance relationships with Native American tribes. We are working on how to apply the equity lens in our decision making and assessment. He thanked the DAC Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diversity Faculty for their work; he had the pleasure of co-chairing that committee before stepping into his current role. He is committed to try to do even better.

PERCY: words were lacking to express his appreciation for the work faculty did to go remote. We are all still experiencing the change and reflecting on its meaning. We kept the learning going; we kept serving students. He talked with students who appreciated what faculty did. PERCY gave heartfelt thanks for all faculty did alongside the unexpected distractions. It's a huge accomplishment. We overcame the initial crisis; now, there's a lot more to do and a lot to learn. We're not done.

LUPRO observed that there are many young, intelligent talents on the waterfront, downtown, and in Irving Park tonight, demanding that institutions do a better job representing our population. The sooner PSU takes the lead on putting our money where our mouth is, the sooner we are going to attract that top talent and reinvigorate our city. Money is tight, but it could be made up in recruitment and retention of students who are looking for an institution that's going to lead on this issue. We should act while the market is in our favor: find new, talented instructors and professors and bring them in, so we can tell students that we mean it and we've done something about it.

JEDYNAK: we have been discussing the two options [for fall]. How does he [PERCY] see this as it pertains to faculty work? Some might prefer to go back to their office; some might prefer to, say, go elsewhere or to be closer to family if they know they will be working online. PERCY: this period of disruption led to different models and new ways of doing things that we haven't used before; maybe we can learn more flexibility out of that—learn how to enhance the access of our students. The prime consideration is the safety and security of our students, but also to meet them where they are. There are areas where remote doesn't work very well, so we may try to do some face-to-face, on campus but with social distancing. There are many things to figure out, including faculty coming to their offices, or mundane things like organizing bathrooms so people have access to them but they don't become disease-spreading places. We'd like to be as flexible as we can, recognizing that public safety requirements could ease up and then change back.

BRYSON seconded LUPRO's comments, and urged action to disarm PSU. That would be a statement that we're actually trying to attract students and faculty of color.

2. Provost's report

JEFFORDS expressed gratitude to JAÉN for the leadership she has shown as Presiding Officer, the partnership and collaboration she has brought to all their conversations, and

her commitment to faculty and shared governance. She admired the way JAÉN had expressed this leadership and impacted the institution. She felt privileged to have worked closely with her. JAÉN: thanks for those kind words.

JEFFORDS said they continue to look at the implications of fall term scenarios. Over 600 faculty sent feedback; the large majority supported a principally remote environment with some face-to-face exceptions. So that is what they are exploring right now. She had been discussing with PERCY using CARES Act funding for stipends for faculty to participate in a series of workshops and meetings over the summer. The people who have already provided great service to the institution have enthusiasm for this idea, and they are putting together a full package of summer programming. In addition, they are looking into technology to outfit classrooms for remote delivery. We hope that by the fall we will have support for faculty in multiple ways by enhancing technology.

JEFFORDS thanked the Senate for extending the P/NP availability for students. They extended the deadline this term, which created some upheaval for faculty; nonetheless, they had received numerous emails of thanks from students. It is deeply appreciated by them; they feel that the institution is expressing support for what they are going through, and the work they are doing to improve our society and combat racism. JEFFORDS reiterated her thanks for this willingness to be flexible on behalf our students.

JAÉN thanked JEFFORDS and PERCY for their support of faculty. It had been a pleasure to work with them. The collaboration is an indication of good things to happen, and that we are on the same page about what our institution needs.

3. Budget Committee Annual Report and questions to FADM

JAÉN said that the questions in the report were the product of multiple conversations with the administration. Let the Budget Committee know if you have further questions that should be added. It is an ongoing conversation.

4. Report to Board of Trustees on administrative leadership

JAÉN summarized this piece as a report they have been building throughout the year for the Board of Trustees, to let them now our thoughts about administrative structure and leadership. The report is open this week for comments and suggestions. We have tried our best to capture ideas and comments we have received, and not leave anything out.

JAÉN thanked those who had sent statements relating to social justice; the idea there is to create a unified response and archive.

JAÉN said it had been a pleasure to work with Senate, Steering Committee, and administration. Despite all the challenges, she was pleased with how things have worked year. She thanked senators for their service, and wished all a wonderful summer.

*The following reports from committees were **received** as part of the consent agenda. See the respective **June 8th Packet Attachments G.5-7.***

5. Annual Report of General Student Affairs Committee

6. Annual Report of Library Committee (with appendix)

7. Annual Report of University Studies Council

H. ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:35 p.m.