

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 7 June 2021  
(Online Conference)**

**Presiding Officer:** Michele Gamburd

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Anderson, Berrettini, Borden, Carpenter, Chorpenning, Chrzanowska-Jeske, Clark, Clucas, Cortez, Cruzan, Duncan, Dusicka, Eppley, Farahmandpur, Feng, Flores, Fountain, Fritz, Gamburd, Goforth, Gómez, Greco, Hansen, Harris, Holt, Heilmair, Hunt, Ingersoll, Izumi, Jedynek, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Law, Limbu, Loney, Lupro, Matlick, May, Meyer, Mikulski, Newlands, Oschwald, Padín, Reitenauer, Sanchez, Smith, Sugimoto, Thanheiser, Thorne, Tinkler.

**Alternates present:** Megan Oprook for Broussard, Jack Miller for Erev, Rich Wattenberg for Magaldi, Tanya Romaniuk for Law (also as newly elected senator).

**Senators absent:** Guzman, Ito, Kelley, Raffo.

**Newly elected senators present:** Baccar, Caughman, Colligan, De La Vega, Donlan, Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Hotton, Jaén Portillo (also as ex-officio member), Lindsay, Luckett, Mudiamu, Rai, Romaniuk (also as alternate), Thieman, Tretheway, Tuor, Watanabe (also as ex-officio member), Webb (also as ex-officio member), Wern, Wilkinson.

**Ex-officio members present:** Beyler, Boyce, Chabon, Emery, Ginley, Jaén Portillo (also as newly elected senator), Jeffords, Knepfle, Lambert, Loikith, Lynn, Mbock, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Rosenstiel, Sager, Spencer, Toppe, Watanabe (also as newly elected senator), Webb (also as newly elected senator), Wooster, Zonoozy.

The meeting was **called to order** at 3:00 p.m.

**A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **Roll call** was effected using the participants list of the online meeting.
2. **Minutes** of the 3 May meeting were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

GAMBURD announced that there would be a **second June meeting on Monday, June 14<sup>th</sup> at 3:00**. She welcomed newly elected senators, and also thanked current senators for their contributions to Faculty governance. In a change from previous practice, divisional caucuses to choose Committee on Committee members would be deferred until the start of the new academic year.

GAMBURD announced that University policy now officially recognized the teaching professor rank series approved in May. Next steps would be revision of department-level promotion and tenure guidelines, as well as bargaining on salaries and, presumably, crosswalk policies for colleagues currently in instructor ranks.

GAMBURD reminded senators of the Article 22 process for the Intensive English Language Program, open through the 10<sup>th</sup>. A Steering Committee report would be included in the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting packet.

## 2. Announcements from Secretary

BEYLER clarified that the meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> would be for current senators. He called attention to the committee reports included in the packets, some of which included recommendations for action items for next academic year.

## 3. Announcements from ASPSU

GAMBURD introduced Nya MBOCK, the new President of ASPSU. MBOCK welcomed the opportunity to work with Faculty Senate. She is a Communications major, a Student Ambassador, and a peer mentor for international students. She looked forward to bringing students' perspectives to the important issues coming before Senate.

### ELECTION OF SENATE OFFICERS FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2021-22

GAMBURD turned the chair over to REITENAUER.

**NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT FOR 2021-22.** BEYLER announced that Rowanna CARPENTER had been nominated prior to the meeting. There were no further nominations from the floor.

**ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER ELECT FOR 2021-22.** CARPENTER was **elected** Presiding Officer Elect (recorded by online survey).

**NOMINATIONS FOR STEERING COMMITTEE.** BEYLER stated that there were three positions open: two regular two-year terms (2021-23) and one interim one-year term (2021-22). Nominations had been received prior to the meeting for Bishopal LIMBU, Susan LINDSAY, and Becky SANCHEZ.

**ELECTION OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS.** LIMBU, LINDSAY, and SANCHEZ were **elected** members of Steering Committee (recorded by online survey). *(By prior agreement with the candidate, LINDSAY will take the interim position.)*

GAMBURD resumed the chair.

## C. DISCUSSION: Race and ethnic studies in the PSU curriculum

Steering Committee, GAMBURD said, felt that it would be useful to have a broader discussion of the issues surrounding the RESR proposal and give senators the chance to ask questions without feeling pressured by parliamentary apparatus. She wished to clarify how and why the material was postponed at the May meeting. The discussion had already gone on for some considerable time, and other business needed attention. The impression might have been given that the working group had not done their homework; GAMBURD stated, however, that they had diligently consulted stakeholders. She did not want anyone to be left with a contrary impression. GAMBURD also wished to clarify Budget Committee's role in curricular proposals. For programs that go through GC or UCC, this is usually done via OCMS [Online Curriculum Management System]. Degree requirement changes go through ARC; BC's role there is less clear. BC did provide feedback on the BA/BS changes earlier this year, and to the UNST curriculum revisions appearing on the June 14<sup>th</sup>. Steering intends to clarify BC's role in the process for these types of changes.

IZUMI, as Presidential Fellow on Asian-American and Pacific Islander [AAPI] Student Success, commented on the anticipated amendments. *[Note from Secretary: the proposed*

*amendments appeared in the packet as D.1.2-3, but were not actually introduced in that form; see below.] One expresses a desire for more courses on Asian, Pacific Islander, and Middle Eastern populations, but singles out students so as to undermine efforts to dismantle white supremacy. It places faculty in the position of profiling students in ways that perhaps violate their privacy rights. One mechanism of white supremacy is to create different racial groups and pit them against each other through varying relationships to white cultural norms.*

Another potential amendment, IZUMI said, seeks to waive the requirement for international students of color. According to an Oregon State engineering professor, requirements such as that being proposed benefit students from countries where social norms may vary greatly from the experience of people of color in the US. Such courses will broaden their cultural education, and give them a way to process their experiences in relation to others.

IZUMI noted a concern about a lack of courses focusing on AAPI students. She had been involved since last fall on a cross-campus effort to create an AAPI Studies Department; the group had recently received a \$120,000 anti-racism grant from the OHSU/PSU School of Public Health. Curriculum could potentially be cross-listed in SGRN and lay the foundation for an AAPI Studies Department. In her studies of health and nutrition inequities, being of Asian descent or being a health equity scholar doesn't make her an expert on race or racism; she was grateful to lean on SGRN for scholarly expertise and analysis of these topics.

IZUMI noted that PSU is the higher education institution in Oregon with the most racially and ethnically diverse student body; our students want and need these courses.

TINKLER understood from her department that PSU does not like cross-listing courses; therefore, the suggestion that [RESR] courses would be cross-listed was confusing.

GAMBURD recognized Registrar Cindy BACCAR to respond: she was unaware of any changing policies on cross-listing. Senate had set few rules. A cross-listed course needs to go through the regular curricular process, and cross-listing is not approved just for advertising purposes. The two units need to collaborate on the curriculum and each have faculty that can teach the course. TINKLER: Women in the Economy used to be cross-listed with [WGSS]. She thought now that there was no one in that department who has an interest in also teaching it; therefore, it could not be cross-listed? BACCAR: that is the rule set by Senate. Both units have to contribute to the curriculum and commit to teaching the course. GINLEY: faculty from both departments have to be involved in the proposal. CRUZAN wished for clarification of whether cross-listing will be required. SAGER: the committee would simply determine whether courses meet the RESR requirement; cross-listing was an issue for UCC. The proposed committee does not have jurisdiction over broader curricular issues. Though cross-listing is not required, they expect that some faculty will want to pursue this.

PADÍN: our budgeting system turns some educational proposals into a zero-sum game between units. We need to fix that; we shouldn't have departments competing for every last credit, when there is a proposal that is educationally defensible and desirable.

## **D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **1. Adding race/ethnic studies requirement to the undergraduate University requirements (*postponed from May*)**

GAMBURD brought to the floor the proposal for an undergraduate Race/Ethnic Studies Requirement, postponed from May, contained in **June 7<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.1.**

JEDYNAK/CRUZAN **moved to amend** the motion with the text specified in **June 7<sup>th</sup> Attachment D.1.1**, which would change the requirement for transfer students with 60 or more credits to take one RESR designated course.

*Consideration of Amendment D.1.1*

CRUZAN indicated that the amendment represents a compromise in regard to transfer students. Students entering as freshmen or sophomores would be required to take two RESR courses; transfers coming with 60 or more credits would be required to take only one, and not in a particular department. The motivation was to provide some equity in terms of the time students spend at PSU. There was concern that students in some majors would have difficulty incorporating this requirement into their curriculum. Especially since we are competing for transfer students with other Oregon universities, we wish to have a scaled requirement for transfers.

SPENCER: similar concerns, along with anticipated effects of RESR, were behind the proposals about UNST clusters which would appear before Senate next week.

FENG / AJIBADE **moved to amend the amendment** by adding the underlined text [*referred to hereinafter as D.1.4*]:

taken within SGRN, within the International Studies program in CUPA, or be cross-listed with one of the SGRN units.

*Consideration of Amendment D.1.4 to Amendment D.1.1*

FENG's concern was representation of Asian and Middle Eastern ethnicities. They are currently not represented very well in the curriculum, but realizing that there is some representation in CUPA, he was proposing now a simplification of the two potential amendments in the packet [D.1.2-3].

PADÍN questioned whether this is not a separate issue than that raised by Amendment D.1.1; it's about the pool of available courses, rather than the transfer requirement. GAMBURD agreed that the question was a bit blurry, but proposed to deal first with the amendment to the amendment, and then return to D.1.1.

IZUMI: RESR aims to help students understand the history, culture, and lived experiences of African-Americans, Latino Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans—courses where SGRN has expertise. Including other academic units under this blanket may not help us fulfill this goal.

JAÉN PORTILLO: the motion has been carefully crafted through multiple conversations with faculty in relevant units. The current wording [of the main motion] is intended to bridge BIPOC experience at both domestic and international levels. The ideas motivating the modification have already been considered in the crafting of the main motion.

AJIBADE voiced concerns about the requirements for transfer students. Many of our students have talked about the gaps they experience in not having access to ethnic studies in depth. She hoped we could find ways to address making this available to transfer students. PADÍN thereupon reiterated his question about the relationship of the two amendments; the previous comments seemed to relate to the first amendment rather than the amendment to the amendment.

*Upon a procedural question from HANSEN, and discussion of parliamentary issues by GAMBURD, CLARK (Parliamentarian), and BEYLER, it was determined to first vote on D.1.4, and then return to D.1.1.*

**Amendment D.1.4** to amendment D.1.1 was **not approved** (13 yes, 30 no, 7 abstain, recorded by online survey).

*Return to consideration of Amendment D.1.1*

CRUZAN emphasized that the amendment would not eliminate the requirement for transfer students, but only reduce it and remove the stipulation that it be taken within SGRN. JEDYNAK: this met the concerns expressed by AJIBADE.

GRECO wished to hear from the working group. There was already potential to have overlap between RESR and UNST clusters. Therefore she wished to know if the amendment was really coming from everyone [involved in the proposal]. SAGER: it was product of discussion among various constituencies. They recognized a concern that some juniors, particularly in STEM, might have difficulty to meet the two-course requirement. They didn't wish to place undue barriers to graduation. It was an acceptable compromise. SPENCER noted that the RESR working group talked with UNST Council about cluster overlap; another outcome was the motions that would appear on the next agenda. Probably some cluster courses would be of interest for RESR, but he did not want to pre-empt the auditing work to determine what would engage in race and ethnic studies in a sufficiently sustained way.

GAMBURD recognized Lisa WEASEL (chair of WGSS and member of the working group): after these conversations, they made a spreadsheet with all the clusters to identify courses that look like good candidates [for RESR], and conversely clusters that could use additional course development—the aim of the summer workshops. The amendment [D.1.1] was motivated by data showing very little room in, e.g., engineering degrees, where professional certification is also an issue. It balanced concerns of different constituencies, while not burdening students with extra costs or difficulties in graduating. She noted that departments might require students to take such courses [as part of their majors]; some, such as PSY, have already done so.

BACCAR asked if the requirement had to be fulfilled by PSU courses, or whether transfer courses could be used. WEASEL: it would depend on equivalency or articulation agreements, though they did not delve into this in detail.

FENG: the state mandates a cultural literacy requirement, without adding credits, for community college transfers (SB 2998). That's another reason why the reduction helps transfer students. In the computer science transfer map, e.g., we must accept community college cultural literacy courses as part of the academic program.

LUPRO wondered about the 60-credit threshold; why not have it match the threshold for transferring into the junior cluster requirement at 75 to 89 credits? CRUZAN: if this needed to be changed, it could be.

**Without objection, the amendment was modified** to change “60 credits” to “90 credits,” as consonant with the intent of the proposal and clearer for students.

**Amendment D.1.1.**, with the modification of the threshold to 90 credits, was **approved** (43 yes, 8 no, 1 abstain, recorded by online survey).

*Return to consideration of main motion D.1 as amended*

The proposal for an undergraduate Race/Ethnic Studies Requirement as given in **June 7<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.1**, as **amended** in **Attachment D.1.1**, and modified to change 60 credits to 90 credits, was **approved** (45 yes, 5 no, 2 abstain, recorded by online survey).

**2. Introduction (first reading) of proposed amendment to Faculty Constitution: RESR Committee** (*postponed from May*)

GAMBURD reviewed the procedure: the proposal in **June 7<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachment D.2** to add a RESR Committee to the Faculty Constitution would be open to potential modification today, but the final version would not be voted upon until the next meeting. BEYLER clarified that, due to an editing error, the term ‘ex-officio’ should be struck from the text circulated in the packet; this was in accord with the intent of the proposers.

INGERSOLL observed that since we also offer BFA degrees, references to ‘BA/BS degrees’ should probably be changed to ‘bachelor’s degrees.’

CORTEZ: only one course will be required from SGRN, but there will be a majority on the committee. There are other departments that would like to be represented.

GAMBURD reverted to INGERSOLL’s suggestion the term should be ‘bachelor’s degrees.’ This change was made **without objection**, as expressing the actual intent.

CORTEZ, continuing, wished to consider the number of members and distribution of members on the committee. GAMBURD recognized Ethan JOHNSON (chair of BST and member of the working group) to respond: it is as matter of relevant expertise. While many people have an interest in these questions, the entire teaching and research focus of SGRN faculty, such as himself, is on these questions of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. The proposal is led by SGRN faculty because this is the work that they do, and this is recognized in the composition of the committee.

JAÉN: as we trust Math Department colleagues with the math requirement, and WLL colleagues with the language requirement, so we should trust these colleagues with this requirement. The committee does include members from other departments; their expertise also forms part of the community. The committee is meant to work collaboratively. There is, furthermore, evaluation of new courses by the regular curricular process through UCC and Senate. Campus input can occur at a variety of stages.

HANSEN observed that the term ‘relevant expertise’ may prove problematic for CoC. It can be no small task to get people to step up to serve, and without further guidance it may be difficult for CoC to determine what counts as relevant expertise.

BORDEN suggested adding something more specific to the charge about teaching that engages critical race theory, ethnic studies, cultural competency, etc. She also wondered about the process CoC would use to staff the committee with faculty from SGRN.

PADÍN said these two questions were connected. The aim is to safeguard the integrity of the requirement. The four SGRN faculty, as area experts, don’t need special vetting. We can be more fluid about the other three, without having to spell out onerous guidelines.

SAGER: the selection was placed in the hands of CoC because they wanted to mirror the process for writing or math requirements, while maintaining integrity, as PADÍN said. The requirement should not get watered down in a rush to include as many courses as possible. There should be scrutiny embedded in scholarship.

GAMBURD recognized Pedro FERBEL-AZCARATE (BST, newly elected senator): if CoC wants a conversation with SGRN about selection criteria, that would be a fantastic opportunity. SGRN is itself interdisciplinary. The more conversations, the better, to get us out of silos and understand what goes on in our different disciplines.

GAMBURD recognized Eli ROACH (ASPSU), who pointed out the [FAQ document](#) circulated earlier from SGRN, which addressed this issue of majority representation.

MEYER observed that not long ago, SGRN was marginalized. In the meanwhile, they conducted several rigorous searches and started this initiative. She felt that they had earned a majority in this committee.

JEDYNAK wondered about situations of disagreement about a course. FERBEL-AZCARATE suggested that the committee would follow models of other curricular committees, for example how UNST evaluates capstones for community engagement.

BORDEN/GRECO **moved to amend** the proposed constitutional amendment by adding:

The four SGRN faculty, shall be chosen by a majority vote of the faculty of SGRN which shall notify the Committee on Committees of their elected committee members each year by June 1.

*Consideration of the amendment to the proposed constitutional amendment*

REITENAUER: governance in SGRN operates through a consensus model, so calling for a majority vote may unnecessary, or in fact run counter to the school's methods.

GRECO, following upon BORDEN: there is ambiguity about who is responsible for choosing the SGRN members. She agreed with the notion of the school selecting the appropriate people, but what if the school doesn't want or take that responsibility?

WEASEL suggested changing 'majority vote' to the text offered by BORDEN in the chat: 'vote within the processes of SGRN.' JOHNSON: it would be easy for the [SRRN] director to appoint four members from faculty from those who volunteered.

HANSEN said that these changes would require other constitutional changes, since CoC is charged with appointing members of all constitutional committees. There needs to be internal consistency within the Constitution. BEYLER observed, however, that there are in fact some constitutional committees that have members other than CoC appointees—for example, Intercollegiate Athletics Board—if Faculty Senate stipulates that in the committee's charter.

**Without objection, the amendment to the amendment was modified to:**

The four SGRN faculty, shall be chosen by a vote within the governance model of SGRN of the faculty of SGRN, which shall notify the Committee on Committees of their elected committee members each year by June 1.

The **amendment to the proposed constitutional amendment** was approved (26 yes, 9 no, 3 abstain, recorded by online survey).

## E. NEW BUSINESS

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

The changes to programs, new courses, and changes to courses listed in **June 7th Agenda Attachment E.1** were approved as part of the *Consent Agenda*, there having been no objection before the end of announcements.

### 2. Notification of elimination of programs (BC, UCC) – *Consent Agenda*

Senate **received** from Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Committee notification of the elimination of the following academic programs, as specified in **June 7th Agenda Attachment E.2**: MA/MS in Health Studies; MAT/MST in Arts & Letters; MAT/MST in Science; MAT/MST in Social Science; Minor in Religious Studies.

## F. QUESTION PERIOD – *none*

## G. REPORTS

1. **President's report** – *fell out due to time*
2. **Provost's report** – *fell out due to time*

*The following reports were received as part of the Consent Agenda (see the respective June 7<sup>th</sup> Agenda Attachments):*

3. **Annual Report of Budget Committee**
4. **Annual Report of General Educational Policy Committee**
5. **Annual Report of Student Affairs Committee**
6. **Annual Report of Graduate Council**
7. **Annual Report of Honors Council**
8. **Annual Report of Institutional Assessment Council**
9. **Annual Report of Library Committee**
10. **Annual Report of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
11. **Annual Report of University Studies Council**
12. **Annual Report of University Writing Council**
13. **Annual Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Program Reduction and Curricular Adjustments**
14. **Final Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Administrative Reviews**
15. **Interim Report of Ad-Hoc Committee on Definitions of Faculty, Program, and Department in the Faculty Constitution**

## H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was **adjourned** at 5:40 p.m.