

**Minutes of the Portland State University Faculty Senate, 4 April 2022  
(Online Conference)**

**Presiding Officer:** Vicki Reitenauer

**Secretary:** Richard Beyler

**Senators present:** Ajibade, Borden, Carpenter, Caughman, Chorpenning, Clark, Clucas, Colligan, Cortez, Cruzan, De La Vega, Donlan, Duncan, Dusicka, Eppley, Farahmandpur, Feng (Wu-chang), Ferbel-Azcarate, Finn, Flores, Gamburd, Goforth, Harris, Heryer, Hunt, Izumi, Jaén Portillo, Kelley, Kennedy, Kinsella, Labissiere, Lafferriere, Law, Limbu, Lindsay, Luckett, Mikulski, Mudiamu, Oschwald, Rai, Reitenauer, Romaniuk, Sanchez, Smith, Taylor, Thieman, Thorne, Tretheway, Tuor, Watanabe, Webb, Wern, Wilkinson.

**Alternates present:** Nick Matlick for Baccar, Antares Boyle for Heilmair, Nathaniel Garrod for Raffo.

**Senators absent:** Eastin, Erev, Gómez, Loney.

**Ex-officio members present:** Beyler, Bowman, Burgess, Bynum, Chabon, Chaillé, Chivers, Comer, Duh, Emery, Estes, Feng (Wu-chi), Ford, Herrera, Jeffords, Mulkerin, Percy, Podrabsky, Read, Recktenwald, Voegelé, Wooster.

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

**A. ROLL CALL AND CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **Roll call** was effected using the participants list of the online meeting.
2. **Minutes of 7 March meeting**, with two mechanical corrections noted by the Secretary [see below], were **approved** as part of the *Consent Agenda*.

**B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**1. Announcements from Presiding Officer**

REITENAUER, reflecting on two years of dealing with the pandemic in our personal and professional lives, thought of an interview in which poet Carolyn Forché said that the poems she intended to write just wouldn't get written because other happenings impinged on her ideas of what the poems were supposed to be. What was taking the place of her work had become her work. REITENAUER believed this also applied to many of us. What has taken the place of our work over the past couple of years is different from our work before. So, for example, she thought she was meeting with a student about putting together an annotated bibliography, but ended up talking with the student about mental health resources. In Senate the work we thought we would have been impacted by the context for this year. She encouraged faculty to reflect on how to do the work at hand with integrity and on the qualities we want to bring to our collaborations.

REITENAUER invited senators to consider becoming a candidate for Presiding Officer Elect for next academic year. In the next meeting we would be taking nominations and self-nominations. [They can also be submitted to the Secretary in writing.] Thinking about when she had said yes to this invitation, she had not regretted it at all. It had been a honor to serve the institution and work with colleagues in this way. She or other previous

Presiding Officers would, she was sure, be willing to talk with anyone who is interested. Elections for POE, as well as for Steering Committee, would take place in June.

REITENAUER noted that the search for Vice Provost for Student Success were nearing a conclusion with campus open sessions. She had valued being on the search committee, chaired by TOPPE and LABISSIERE. She encouraged everyone to with the candidates.

## **2. Announcements from Secretary**

BEYLER conveyed two corrections to the draft March Minutes: on p. 53, ‘campus’ should be replaced by ‘climate’; Gwen SHUSTERMAN should be listed as alternate for GOFORTH. [The changes were accepted without objection.]

The opt-in survey for Faculty Senate, Advisory Council, and IFS elections was in circulation; BEYLER asked senators to encourage their colleagues to consider becoming candidates. For him, in addition to a chance to serve the institution, Senate had been enormously educational in getting a sense of what’s happening across the University.

BEYLER alerted senators to the possibility of an extra meeting as we come to the end of the academic year. If necessary, it would be scheduled for a Monday at 3:00.

REITENAUER added that there was some interest in also having an in-person celebratory gathering at the end of the year.

## **3. Race & Ethnic Studies Requirement - update**

Before giving the floor to Cristina HERRERA, Chair of the Race and Ethnic Studies Requirement Committee for an update on that committee’s work, REITENAUER reviewed the background. RESRC was formed last year as part of the development of a race and ethnic studies for undergraduates. Attention was given to not add credits to students’ plates, but to give them an opportunity to engage in this important subject matter through a variety of pedagogies, to enhance their experience and understanding of the world and the challenges in it. There were several conversations in Senate over draft versions of the requirement. After the requirement itself passed, we approved the constitutional amendment to create the RESRC.

REITENAUER noted that some decisions last year about organizing the Committee on Committees had unanticipated consequences for this process. CoC was not constituted until the beginning of the academic year, which meant in turn that RESRC was not fully formed until the year was underway—in retrospect, not the most fruitful start. She thanked HERRERA and other committee members to take up this important.

REITENAUER noted that HERRERA was new to PSU this year, having come from California State-Fresno to serve as Chair of Chicano-Latino Studies.

HERRERA stated that the committee started meeting in January and that they were now reviewing submissions for courses that might be part of the requirement. She encouraged faculty to submit course proposals. So far there had been a wide breadth of content and great classes, including some from CUPA, Film, Sociology, Philosophy, History, and even some units that we might not ordinarily think about like Environmental Science and Math. The point is that this is a campus-wide initiative. There are faculty throughout the University who are already addressing race and systemic oppression in their classes.

The committee, HERRERA said, had approved a set of guidelines to assess alignment with the requirements. This is given on the webpage linked from the CLAS website: a step-by-step process on how to submit a proposal, and an overview of the committee's rubric: Does the course justification adequately explain how the course content satisfies the RESR? Does the course cover race, ethnicity, and systemic oppression throughout the term? Does it provide multiple ways for students to engage with the content: assignments, readings, etc.? Does the course utilize the scholarship of the community being discussed in the course? And does the course align learning goals with disciplinary requirements? They intended a broad rubric to be inclusive of the breath of content that faculty might submit. Different disciplines would take different approaches, use different lenses.

HERRERA urged colleagues to consider submitting a course. Many faculty already doing this work; it doesn't mean reinventing the wheel, but possibly just modifying a syllabus to address the rubric more clearly. Student like to have different options. It's a way for faculty all across campus to participate in this important, meaningful requirement. They aim to have a list of courses for Senate to approve at upcoming meetings.

LUCKETT recalled from the discussion last spring the possibility of summer training workshops. Was this happening? HERRERA: yes, they are planning a workshop this summer. There is funding for three summers. Details are being ironed out. After the committee has reviewed proposals, some faculty will be invited to participate. She recognized Lisa WEASEL to give some further information. WEASEL said that her experience with previous workshops for faculty and high school teachers had been pleasurable and collegial experiences. There had been some preliminary conversations about the kinds of panels or activities. It will probably be informal—a chance to learn from each other, and work on a syllabus in the company of others with experiences to share. In this area we can be taking the lead as an institution, build expertise and collegiality, and develop strong courses that our students will be able to be engaged in.

WATANABE asked if the application process would be a one-time thing, or an open process similar to University Studies [cluster courses]. HERRERA: since this is a kind of curriculum committee, it will be operating on an ongoing basis. The deadline this year was short, but starting in fall 2022 we will have more time to review materials—the entire academic year. The committee would [in this respect] be similar to UNST Council.

CORTEZ asked if they could submit courses offered in Spanish. Many of the Spanish courses have readings on topics of race and ethnicity in the context of the Americas. HERRERA: absolutely yes, as long as it fulfills the requirement by looking at Latin American literature in the field—for example, a course on Latin America and colonialism, that drew on Latin American literature.

RAI: is the intention to provide comments for proposals that aren't supported this year—a kind of revise and resubmit procedure. HERRERA: yes, the process allows the committee members to provide feedback which can be passed on if a proposal is not approved. Also, participating in the summer workshops will give feedback.

HERRERA thanked senators for their questions, and invited anyone with further questions about RESR to contact her.

### **C. DISCUSSION – none**

**D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – *none***E. NEW BUSINESS****1. Curricular proposals** (GC, UCC, USC) – *Consent Agenda*

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

**F. QUESTION PERIOD****1. Question to Provost**

REITENAUER read the question for the Provost (**April Agenda Attachment F.1**):

Two of the guiding principles as expressed by the Academic Program Review and Curricular Adjustments committee and featured on the Program Review and Reduction website explicitly name the importance of wide participation in this process. Up to this point, opportunities for input and participation have been uneven across campus and among the departments identified in Phase II. Please provide specific examples of the ways in which you and the deans plan to enact these principles as the process moves through Phase III.

**Guiding Principle 1:** Equitable and Meaningful Engagement of All Stakeholders An equitable process includes instructional, research, and academic professional faculty of all contract types, undergraduate and graduate students, administrators, staff, and community partners to ensure voices are diverse and fully representative. Equitably accessible participation of diverse voices will generate visionary and sustainable solutions in the design and implementation process.

**Guiding Principle 5:** Seek Feedback Prior to Decision Making Everyone should have the opportunity to participate throughout the process. Details of proposals and their possible impacts will be communicated to the PSU community throughout the process for discussion and should include multiple mechanisms for timely, formative feedback.

JEFFORDS acknowledged that this was an issue on many people's minds. She would have more to say about the timeline in her report. Specifically to this question: she queried deans about how they have been engaging colleagues in the development of unit proposals. The forms of engagement differ across colleges, reflecting varying cultures. She could provide a complete report, but now could give a few examples. In the School of Business, there were multiple meetings with all of the faculty and administrators in the unit had been asked to write a report, looking at data, options, partners, etc. In each college there was commitment to engaging members of the units asked to write reports, but different approaches to how the reports were put together. In some cases, a committee worked collectively; in some cases, the chair took the lead role; in other cases, another faculty member took the lead. OAA didn't wish to dictate how the reports would be written. In CLAS, faculty actively engaged with chairs to develop the program narratives, and there was feedback and data from the dean's office when requested.

Anticipating a possible further question about the role of the college faculty as a whole, JEFFORDS said that this phase was principally an activity at the unit level. Moving forward with outcomes, clearly we would want to engage broader constituencies across schools and colleges—a larger engagement of a broader group of stakeholders.

REITENAUER: what would a campus-wide set of conversations would look like? Faculty recognized the imperative of figuring out how to really organize what we do and how, to meet the current and future needs of our students. To bring our best insights together, the expertise each of us have, we have to be brought into conversation with each other, breaking outside of separate units. What would be possible ways for Senate and Senate committees to be places for that discussion in the next academic year?

JEFFORDS would seek [REITENAUER's] advice, but could say some things here. She expressed appreciation to all those who participated in developing the unit reports. They are thoughtful, generative, and innovative documents. She recognized that the process of developing them was stressful, and that there is anxiety about next steps. Their quality, integrity, and seriousness was representative of what we would expect from PSU.

We are on track with the timelines posted on the website, JEFFORDS said. She had committed to report back to the units by April 21<sup>st</sup>. This would allow individual meetings with each of the deans and also, per a recommendation from AHC-APRCA, time for the deans to meet collectively for a conversation across colleges. There was concern that a decision taken in one college could impact another, and without shared information this could lead to negative outcomes. She had moved up the meeting with deans for this Wednesday [the 6<sup>th</sup>], and with this accelerated timeline she might be able to communicate back to the units before the 21<sup>st</sup>.

JEFFORDS planned to share reflections on key themes which had emerged with AHC-APRCA and hearing that committee's thoughts. One concern which came forward as the need to access services like marketing, recruitment, and communications. Another strong theme was continued concerns about assessing units only by student credit hours. They have been working on a revised allocation model with a richer representation of how units operate; this is a conversation that should continue. Another frequent theme was a question about small departments; the mathematics meant that small units would not look as good on the dashboards; could we think about a more complex way to assess the data? Another thing was a strong commitment, as also Faculty Senate, to cross-disciplinary collaboration. Here we can learn from the report submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Research. This is pertinent to how we operate across academic units, and how we will move conversations forward in the next step of the process. We want to respond to the requests and innovative ideas put forward. At this point, she wanted to be deeply respectful of the integrity of the units and the work they put in. The Reimagine Fellows might be another forum for conversations.

JEFFORDS mentioned also that as the IPEB [annual budgeting] process goes forward, they would be talking with the units about the relationship between program review and reduction and the IPEB process. We don't want preclude or predetermine an outcome from PRRP by incorporating something into IPEB where a decision had not yet been made. [PRRP] conversations would be incorporated into next year's IPEB process. Budget Committee would be engaged in reviewing that information.

REITENAUER commented that the Vice Provost for Student Success, the search for which is the final stages, will be a key conversation partner. An argument for changes to create conditions for student success, to meet our responsibilities to our students. She indicated also that some questions from the discussion last month, which, in the Provost's absence, had not been readily answered, had been shared with the Provost.

## G. REPORTS

### 1. President's Report

PERCY said that he had received a preliminary briefing, but not the final report from the Huron consulting study of student services, support services, and administration, done parallel to the program review and reduction process. Once he has received the final report and had a chance to review it, it would be shared with Budget Committee and Faculty Senate. We would not automatically undertake any recommendations, but would seek input and consider them.

PERCY earlier announced to the campus community the opening of a search for Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. When that position became open, Jason PODRABSKY stepped forward and done an amazing job on an interim basis. Going forward with recruitment at that time, when we had gone remote, seemed problematic. He had now decided to move ahead with a search. JEFFORDS will chair the committee.

PERCY announced further that John JOHNSON would be joining PSU as Athletic Director on May 1<sup>st</sup>. He had served in a variety of settings and institutions which enabled him to understand our unique mission as an urban research institution. In this first year they would be working together on a strategic plan for financial sustainability.

Jennifer ALLEN, Todd ROSENSTIEL, and others, PERCY said, were working on an invitation for inclusive participation to take on climate action as a signature program of our institution. This would be the focus for the spring symposium in May.

### 2. Provost's Report

JEFFORDS provided an update on the search for the Vice Provost for Student Success: the four finalists had made presentations, and she would be meeting soon with the search committee to review their thoughts. Simultaneously, the search for the Dean of MCECS had reached the finalist stage, with campus visits coming soon. She announced further that with the recent resignation of David BANGSBERG as Dean of SPH, effective this summer, a search for that position will commence in the fall.

JEFFORDS thanked AAUP for continued conversations about the retirement transition program. They hope to expand it to non-tenure-track faculty and academic professionals.

Before adjournment BEYLER added a reminder that the Faculty Committee Preference Survey would be circulated soon; senators should encourage their colleagues to sign up.

### 3. Monthly report of AHC-APCA – *received as part of the* Consent Agenda

H. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was **adjourned** at 4:25 p.m.