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Portland State University Faculty Senate
In accordance with the Constitution of the PSU Faculty, Senate Agendas are calendared for delivery ten working days before Senate meetings, so that members of the senate will have sufficient notice of curricular proposals, and time to review and research all action items. If there are questions or concerns about Agenda items, please consult the appropriate parties and make every attempt to resolve them before the meeting, so as not to delay the business of the PSU Faculty Senate.

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:** According to a motion passed by the PSU Faculty Senate, Curricular proposals will be approved through a Consent Calendar process for a period of one year, commencing in January 2008. The Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will forward proposals as usual, and these proposals will be listed on the senate’s agenda under New Business, “Curriculum Consent Agenda.” At any time after the agenda has been announced concluding with the Announcement period of the meeting in question, a member of the senate may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda, for individual discussion. When there are no more items to be removed, the presiding officer will confirm the remaining items for the consent agenda, and name the items moved to the regular agenda.
TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate  
FR: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier, Secretary to the Faculty

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on **February 4, 2008**, at 3:00 p.m. in room 53 CH.

**AGENDA**

A. Roll  
B. *Approval of the Minutes of the January 7, 2008, Meeting*  
C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor  
   - Provost’s Report  
   - Vice President’s Report  
D. Unfinished Business  
E. New Business  
   *1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda*  
   a. Graduate Council Course and Program Proposals – Ostlund  
   b. GC and UCC Join Course and Program Proposals – Ostlund and Gould  
   c. University Curriculum Committee Course and Program Proposals – Gould  
   2. Study of Faculty Satisfaction and Empowerment – Liebman and Hines  
F. Question Period  
   1. Questions for Administrators  
   2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair  
G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees  
   1. Report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Meeting of 7/8 December at OHSU – Carter  
      [http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html](http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ifs/ifs.html)  
   2. Faculty Development Committee Semi-Annual Report – Ketcheson  
H. Adjournment  

*The following documents are included with this mailing:*  
B Minutes of the Meeting of January 7, 2008  
E-1a Graduate Council Curricular Proposals  
E-1b Joint Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council Curricular Proposals  
E-1c Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Curricular Proposals  

*The following documents are being distributed electronically:*  
E-2 Study of Faculty Satisfaction and Empowerment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Department</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences (40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agorsah, Kofi</td>
<td>BST</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balshem, Martha</td>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Kimberly</td>
<td>LING</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, Scott</td>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hines, Maude (Weasel)</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Greg</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapoor, Priya</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medovoi, Le remot</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reder, Stephen</td>
<td>LING</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe, Suwako</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetzel, Patricia</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Works, Martha</td>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arante, Jacqueline</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blazak, Randy</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodegom, Eric</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr, Grant</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison, Tim</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiao, Jun</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey, Martha</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebman, Robert</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pertmutter, Jennifer (Miller-Jones)</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Reese, Susan</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rhee, Ma-Ji (T. Dillon)</td>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stovall, Dennis</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Zelick, Randy</td>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames, Kenneth</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleiler, Steven</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Fountain, Robert</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller, Steven</td>
<td>PLL</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Weingrad, Michael (Johnson)</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, David</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalili, Aslam</td>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafferre, Gerado</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Robert</td>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussey, Ann</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padin, Jose</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palminter, Jeanette</td>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth, Jennifer</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Walton, Linda</td>
<td>HST</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Instructional (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower, Michael</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labissiere, Yves</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Fallon, Ann</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhaj, Sukhwant</td>
<td>UNST</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrell, Victoria</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers, Laurie</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot, Maria</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinhold, Jana</td>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahab, Stephanie</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson-Nathe, Benjamin</td>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Daniel</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban and Public Affairs (9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clucas, Richard</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farquhar, Stephanie</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wollner, Craig (Rose)</td>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Brodowicz, Gary</td>
<td>PHE</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messer, Barry</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussman, Gerry</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill, Jennifer</td>
<td>USP</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelmon, Sherril</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Neal</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*K Member of Committee on Committees
*Interim appointments
Proposal for the Initiation of a New Instructional Program
Leading to the Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies Minor in Women’s Studies

Portland State University
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Women’s Studies

Description of Proposed Program

1. Program Overview

a. Proposed CIP number: 050299

b. Over the past two decades, a new field of scholarship has emerged which examines sexual desire, sexual practice, gendered behavior, gender identity, and the sexed body as more than products of biology, but rather as socially organized, even socially produced phenomena located within specific social contexts and subject to social and historical change. Programs of study related to this research are beginning to form in universities across the nation under a variety of names such as Sexuality Studies, Gender Studies, Queer Studies, and LGBTQ Studies. The scholarship is interdisciplinary, emerging from such fields as sociology, feminist studies, history, anthropology, literature, ethnic studies, biology, and art history. As a field, it revisits foundational scholarship related to gender identity and sexual expression, opens new questions for contemporary research, and provides new theoretical frameworks for studying gender and sexuality within the academy.

After much consideration, faculty and students involved in planning the minor at PSU decided that Sexuality, Gender, and Queer Studies would best represent the proposed curriculum and learning goals. This minor enables students to examine sexual expression, gender systems, and the relationship between these two phenomena using queer theory as a tool of analysis. While the diverse experiences of LGBTQ identified peoples will be represented in many of the courses in this minor, this program is not an “identity studies” program. As you will see from the list of courses, the minor approaches a broad spectrum of topics within the field from pornography, to masculinities, to lesbian history, to global health issues. We hope the name captures the complexity and breadth of this field of scholarship and the related possibilities for teaching and learning.

c. The minor will be available to students as soon as it is approved by the Faculty Senate.

2. Purpose and Relationship of Proposed Program to the Institution’s Mission and Strategic Plan

a. Program objectives:
   • Provide interdisciplinary studies of all types of sexual expression and gendered experiences.
   • Diversify current studies of gender and sexuality.
   • Institutionalize outreach to Portland and Oregon’s growing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer communities.
   • Attract undergraduate and graduate students to Portland State University.
   • Encourage innovative research on the topics related to sexuality and gender.

b. The minor in Sexuality, Gender, and Queer Studies meets PSU’s mission in numerous ways. The program addresses the internationalization initiative through its curricular examinations of sexual and gender expression in a variety of global, regional and historical contexts. Second, the program will support faculty engagement with local sexual minority and transgender communities and encourage university-community partnerships in this arena. Finally, the minor will encourage student awareness of diversity, not only related to sexuality and gender expression, but also the matrix of connections between race/ethnicity, class, nation, gender and sexuality.

c. Since the recent passage of a non-discrimination law by the state of Oregon, this program proposal for a minor in Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies is very timely. The minor will increase student awareness of and social responsibility toward all citizens regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Moreover, Portland is a queer-friendly city, home to large populations of transsexual, lesbian,
gay, genderqueer, and queer identified residents, making Portland State University a perfect place for Oregon's first academic program of this kind. The program will make students literate in the public discourse surrounding sexual orientation and gender identity and give them basic skills for becoming allies to Oregon's queer populations.

3. Course of Study

a. **Core Course Requirements (16 credits).** Students must take all four of the core courses listed below. [See attached documentation of departmental approvals for inclusion of their courses listed below.]

- UNST Sexualities SINV 4 cr.
- WS 370U History of Sexualities 4 cr.
- WS 332U Race/Class/Gender/Sexuality 4 cr.
- WS 360U Intro to Queer Studies 4 cr.

**Electives (16 credits).** Students must take 16 credits from the list of courses below. The faculty advisor for the minor may approve other courses to fulfill the elective credit requirements where appropriate.

- ANTH 103 Intro to Cultural Anthropology 4 cr.
- ANTH 432/532 Gender in Cross-Cultural Perspective 4 cr.
- BST 342 Black Feminism/Womanism 4 cr.
- CFS 490U Sex and the Family 4 cr.
- ENG 494 Feminist Film Theory 4 cr.
- ENG 494/594 Queer Theory 4 cr.
- ENG 447 Harlem Renaissance 4 cr.
- ENG 441/541 Same-Sex Desire in the English Renaissance 4 cr.
- PHE 335 Human Sexuality 4 cr.
- PHE 453/553 Women's Reproductive Health 4 cr.
- PHE 410 Sex Education in America 4 cr.
- PHE 410 Worldview of Sexual Health 4 cr.
- PSY 410 Human Sexualities 4 cr.
- PSY 431/531 Psychology of Men and Masculinities 4 cr.
- SOC 344U Gender and Sexualities 4 cr.
- SP 410 Sex and the Media 4 cr.
- SP 452/552 Gender and Race in the Media 4 cr.
- SPAN 410 Transgenderism in South American Literature 4 cr.
- SPAN 436/536 Disease and Literature in the Americas 4 cr.
- WS/ENG 308U Lesbian Literature 4 cr.
- WS/ENG 308U Gay and Lesbian Fiction 4 cr.
- WS 399U Sex and the State 4 cr.

b. No new courses at this time.

c. No nontraditional learning modes at this time.

d. Learning outcomes achieved by completion of the Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies minor are as follows:

- Understanding of the distinctions between the sexed body, gender presentation, gender identity, sexual identity, sexual orientation, and sexual expression.
- Critical knowledge of the ways cultures construct normal and abnormal in terms of sexuality and gender.
- Familiarity with diverse sexual and gender expressions in local and transnational contexts.
- Understanding of social construction as an analytical concept and its applicability to various aspects of sexual and gender expression and representation.

1 Should Sophomore Inquiry courses be eliminated from the curriculum, Women's Studies will continue to teach this course which is an interdisciplinary introductory course to sexuality studies. Five sections of the Sexualities SINV are currently being taught annually, four sections by faculty with appointments in Women's Studies and funded by the Women's Studies budget. Thus, both the faculty and some of the budgetary resources will remain even if UNST is reorganized to eliminate Sophomore Inquiry as a general education requirement.
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• Critical knowledge of the relationships between sexuality and power formations, particularly gender, race, class, nation and ability.
• Ability to use learned knowledge about sexuality and gender for self-reflection.

4. Recruitment and Admission Requirements

a. The Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies minor is intended to expand program options for students who are already enrolled at PSU and to draw students who would not otherwise come to the institution.

b. No additional requirements for admission

c. No enrollment limitations

5. Accreditation of the Program

a. Not applicable

b. Not applicable

C. Not applicable

6. Evidence of Need

a. Formation of the minor in Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies is a logical outgrowth of student demand, growing faculty engagement in this emerging field of scholarship, existing courses relevant to the field at PSU, national trends in the academy, and the local social climate.

Enrollments in the core courses for the minor have consistently been between 35-45 students over the last four years. Students fill five sections of the Sexualities SINQ and more than ten junior cluster courses offered each year. Student demand is also evidenced by the support of various student groups, notably Queers and Allies, the Queer Resource Center, and leaders in the Student Senate. Additionally, students have been represented in large numbers at the planning meetings for the minor program in the last year and a half.

Sexuality and gender have been major topics in Women's Studies courses since the program's inception in the 1970s. But courses with a primary focus on sexuality and gender began to appear with much more frequency in PSU's curriculum only in the mid 1990s. All of the courses listed above as either core courses or electives for the minor have been added to the curriculum since 1996, all of them designed and taught by faculty who are new to PSU since the mid-nineties. What this indicates is a strong interest by newer faculty in the field of sexuality studies, gender studies, and queer studies. This rising interest at PSU parallels what is happening nationally. Many research universities have formed some version of a sexuality, gender or queer studies program, all established within the last 5-10 years, including the University of Wisconsin, San Francisco State University, University of Minnesota, University of Chicago, and University of California, Berkeley. This proposed minor establishes a place for PSU in this new field.

b. The Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies minor will fulfill regional employment needs for personnel in health sciences, human resources, education, media, social services, need-based non-profits, and similar human service institutions to have knowledgeable and culturally literate employees in the Portland metro area as the number of transgender, transsexual, genderqueer bisexual, gay and lesbian populations increase and gain more visibility both locally and nationally.

c. The minor will serve students who are currently using the Sexualities cluster to fulfill their UNST requirements and who want to pursue their interests in the field even further. Over two hundred students take the Sexualities SINQ each year and, of those, conservatively, one quarter will continue with the corresponding junior cluster. Of those fifty students, we estimate that ten students will want to continue with the minor. The minor will also attract Women's Studies majors who, while interested in the topic, choose not to pursue the Sexualities cluster because too many of the courses are Women's Studies courses and thus ineligible as cluster courses. This may add another three students to the minor each year. Finally, the minor will attract majors from other departments who did not choose the Sexualities cluster, but have an interest in the topic, adding another three students. Attracting sixteen students to the minor each year will most likely yield thirty-five to forty graduates by the end of the
d. The Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies minor will attract more undergraduate and graduate students to Portland State University, regardless of their academic interests. The availability of curricular offerings and queer student organizations signal a notably open, safe, and progressive campus climate to many students shopping for a university.

e. The Portland Area Business Association (PABA), a local business network for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender business owners supports the new minor. The Q Center, Portland's new Queer Community Center which houses the Transgender Resource Library, also supports our efforts. The Gay and Lesbian Archives of the Pacific Northwest, which develops and supports the archival collections of LGBTQ history locally, backs the minor. Finally, Equity Foundation, a local philanthropic organization focused on eliminating the "prejudices toward the sexual and gender communities of Oregon," also endorses this proposal. [Please see attached documentation.]

f. Some of the courses are already being offered as evening courses. Where two or more sections of the same course are offered in a year, Women's Studies will make every effort to schedule one of these in the evening. Finally, an increasing number of faculty are offering hybrid web courses, including some of the faculty teaching courses in the minor. The program advisor will encourage faculty to consider developing entirely web-based courses.

Outcomes

7. Program Evaluation

a. The program advisor in conjunction with the Chair of Women's Studies and/or the Women's Studies Curriculum Committee, will review the courses offered each year to ensure that a wide variety of disciplines are represented in the curriculum, that program objectives and learning goals are being addressed, and that relevant new courses are added to the electives. The program advisor will track enrollments in minor courses. Program objectives and learning goals will be distributed to all faculty teaching courses in the program to encourage their understanding and incorporation of these goals, with special note given to the importance of diversity in their courses. Course evaluations will be administered at the end of each course for student feedback on learning goals. Faculty will be encouraged to form community partnerships and provided with community resources for speakers and panels. The program advisor will keep records on each advisee and how they came to the program.

b. Course evaluations will be shared with faculty. One yearly faculty meeting will be held for the purpose of reviewing curriculum, discussing learning goals, developing community partnerships, fostering research networks or addressing other topics related to the viability and vibrancy of the minor.

8. Assessment of Student Learning

a. Assessment will be accomplished with course evaluations throughout the curriculum. In addition, assignments in the core courses will be developed around specific learning goals and then assessed using a grading matrix developed by the core faculty. Eventually, the assessment tools developed in the core courses will be gradually applied to the elective courses.

b. The program advisor will conduct exit interviews with a cross-section of graduating minors.

c. There is no licensure examination associated with this field of study.
Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, January 7, 2008
Presiding Officer: Richard Clucas
Secretary: Sarah E. Andrews-Collier


Alternates Present: Nishishiba for Gelmon, Kindle for Hoffman, Shearer for Khalil, Kim, Knights, VanDyck for Luther, Clark for Toppe.


A. ROLL
B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2007 MEETING

The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
p.12, E.1, para. 7, line 2, correct to read, “GOULD asserted that the English Department Chair signed the course proposal, and CEPPI responded that she did not.”
p. 13, E.3., para. 5 and 6 (between), add “THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.”

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

- There will be no President’s Report.
- The Second Edition of the 0708 Governance Guide will be available on the OAA webpage after 15 January.
- Added to the agenda: F.1. Question to Administrators, Question #2
Changes in Senate and Committee memberships since November 5, 2007: Dan Johnson has resigned from the Senate, to coincide with his retirement this month. His replacement is Richard Weingrad, Judaic Studies.

Provost’s Report

KOCH reported that the State Board approved the Turkish Studies program this month. Also, with respect to the Board, Koch described several other items. At their December retreat, they identified four items that will require campus responses, and six major board directions. Of the four items, sustainability, PreK-12 education, program review, and learning outcomes, PSU is already engaged in two. Of the six items, three are largely administrative and three have program implications for PSU, they being addressing barriers to student participation and success, state funding for graduate education and research, and the Portland higher education initiative. There will be more to come on these issues.

KOCH continued, regarding our proposal for academic investments, aka hiring new faculty, $3.4 Million in proposals have been received from the deans for building capacity. We have received $1.9 Million in proposals, less current UNST contributions, for building University Studies positions. We will try to respond to those proposals starting next week. Regarding sustainability positions, the ad hoc faculty group is concluding their work on criteria.

D. Unfinished Business

None

E. New Business

1. Curricular Proposals Consent Agenda

FLOWER/BURNS MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the curricular Consent Agenda as listed in “E-1.”

THE MOTION PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

2. Scholastic Standards Comm. Proposal to Change Enrollment Deadlines

GOUGH presented the proposal for the Committee.

LAFFERRIÈRE/REESE MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE the four motions contained in “E-2”, with general discussion followed by a separate vote on each.

KOCH asked if these changes would have any negative impact with respect to Financial Aid. GOUGH stated no. HICKEY asked if the proposal provides any financial incentives. GOUGH yielded to Phillip Rodgers, Dir. of Financial Aid. He stated that the largest benefit is that by moving up the date, fewer students will have incurred debt after they drop a class. HANSEN asked how this would affect
the deadline appeals process. GOUGH stated that it is anticipated that petitions will increase in the short run but will diminish once knowledge of the policy becomes widespread.

CRESS asked if this would include dissertation credits, as those students are notorious for registering late. GOUGH noted this is an issue with By Arrangement courses in general, but offered that appeals from those students could be short-tracked. CRESS asked if there could be exceptions to the policy for internships and practica, which are mostly at the graduate level. BACCAR stated that if deadlines are not published, they should be handled administratively. LAFFERRIÈRE reminded that appeals are permitted.

FARR asked if these changes are being made largely to accommodate Financial Aid. GOUGH stated no, the change in Financial Aid only was only an incentive to review other policies. LAFFERRIÈRE noted that the general feeling of those involved was that students need to commit to their programs, as the quarter is only 10 weeks long. BARHAM added that we have been making changes piecemeal for a long time, which, in its own way, has been very difficult for students.

TALBOTT asked if the committee considered moving the Grade Option deadline forward. GOUGH stated that it just went from 5 to 7 weeks last year.

ACCETTA noted that as a member of Student Affairs he supports the motions, and queried if student government was consulted. GOUGH yielded to Phillip Rodgers who stated, yes, they met with ASPSU President Rudy Soto. TOLMACH asked if the International Student office was consulted. stated yes, that Cindy Baccar and Christina Luther are in conversations about this.

WATTENBERG queried why it is that students are allowed to enroll without faculty permission after classes begin. Once you have met the class, certain issues kick in and it is problematic, whether at the end of the 1st or 3rd week when I suddenly find out students have added who have missed the first week of class. What is the logic here? GOUGH noted that until last year, the enrollment period was a lot longer. LAFFERRIÈRE noted that students have some time to see if they can handle the class under the current system. WATTENBERG noted he agreed with that principle, but urged that the faculty do the admitting. HINES noted also that Wattenberg has an important point, it is not whether students can add but that faculty have to approve the addition, so that it is clear what work the students have missed, etc. REESE concurred, adding that this issue affects the ultimate class headcount and compounds the campus space problem. HINES added that she feels personally, she would feel more generous about adding people at the first meeting, if she knew other people weren’t simultaneously adding online.

CRESS noted she remained uncomfortable with this change, especially with respect to graduate students and urged that they have an exception, not necessarily
noted in the catalog. The dissertation students in Education frequently miss deadlines. BACCAR stated that deadlines needs to be public for the students.

**THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.**

MOTION #1 PASSED by unanimous voice vote.

CRESS/BLEILER MOVED TO TABLE MOTION #2.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 42 in favor, 16 against, 7 abstentions.

MOTION #3 PASSED by majority voice vote.

MOTION #4 PASSED by majority voice vote.

3. **Motions Relating to Balance of Tenure and Non-tenure Faculty**

RUTH/RUETHER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #1 as listed in “E-3”(attached).

WATTENBERG queried if this proposed ratio isn’t a one-size-fits-all concept, and doesn’t serve the faculty well. RUTH stated she feels no, the task could be enormous, but we have gotten out of whack between tenure versus non-tenure faculty, and it’s not good. Passing this motion would put Senate weight behind a remedy for this issue.

BROWN questioned the use of the term “regulative” in “(B).” RUTH replied that this refers to setting a goal, or regulative ideal, something we should be working for, but not dictated.

OSTLUND stated that she understands why the Graduate Council is included for participation in this committee, but they are too busy, especially during winter term, and she assumes that University Curriculum Committee would have the same response. RUETER acknowledged that that is an issue. OSTLUND suggested broadening the motion to include anyone who has served on Graduate Council.

asked how this motion relates to financial realities. RUETER stated that that is a good question, and this motion doesn’t relate to that. It introduces the problem and it would be a good challenge for this committee to develop this issue.

KOCH noted that there is no distinction made in “(A)” between fixed-term and adjunct faculty, and requested clarification. RUTH stated that it is inappropriate regarding certain issues, but her goal is to address the ratio of SCH generated by non-tenure related faculty. RUETER stated that the intent is an inflammatory charge to the committee to get them sparked.
FARR stated he also objects to the word “regulative” in “(B)” and to the subsequent implication of “negative” only consequences. What is the most bothersome is language in the second sentence in “(B)” which denies that we already have hiring and review policies. You must mean something different than that, because there are guidelines and policies. RUETER urged that the point of the motion is to establish a task force. FARR stated that the Senate is passing words, not just a concept, and the second paragraph is contradictory. RUTH stated that __________ “regulative” can be dropped, and that with respect to hiring and reviewing of adjunct faculty, whatever the rules, she feels that the common practice around here is that the chair has total discretion in hiring. She would like to see Senate get involved if the union hasn’t been effective in enforcing more rigorous kinds of reviews. FARR stated a lot of the items being brought into question have been previously negotiated in collective bargaining, including a goal for the ratio. FLOWER urged that even if policies are in place, new fact-finding and discussions might lead to the modification of such guidelines.

CEPPI noted that whether or not people have concerns about what the recommendations might be, we should still recommend establishing a task force because it can come up with data and actual facts about procedures, so that when we have a discussion about the recommendations, we have more than anecdotal evidence or common wisdom. Perhaps AFT should be included as well.

DILL and RUETER described hiring variations in their departments. HANSEN noted that adjuncts and fixed terms are under two distinct unions.

WETZEL stated she didn’t think we could ask the task force to hone these and determine what the agenda is. What we would want the task force to do is answer some very specific questions that we have, for example, what is the historical trajectory of the use of tenure versus non-tenure lines at PSU. This could be worded better and she would volunteer to assist in that project.

WETZEL/FARR MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION.

THE MOTION TO TABLE PASSED by 40 in favor, 22 against, 5 abstentions.

RUTH/RUETER MOVED THE SENATE APPROVE motion #2 as listed in “E-3.”

OSTLUND stated that the Graduate Council already does this, so this is redundant. Additionally, she urged that a blanket policy is not possible. RUTH stated that she understood that there is a policy, and that it allows for exception. OSTLUND stated she disagreed. RUETER noted that after a course is approved, there is no oversight of faculty by the Graduate Council.

ARANTE asked for a clarification between motion #1 and #2, as they are vastly different issues. RUETER stated that motion #2 is about who is currently teaching the courses. UCC doesn’t track who is teaching a course after it is approved. It isn’t the competency issue; he trusts his colleagues with those hires, however,
there is overall fiscal pressure to hire the least expensive contingent labor, for example, some courses are being taught be grad students.

JHAJ asked if the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee employs criteria for evaluating a course based on who is teaching it. MUSSEY stated that it has happened, citing a set of courses in Womens Studies.

BROWN asked if Rueter and Ruth envision the committee going through and actually reviewing who is teaching the courses, or do they trust chairs to hire competent faculty. What would one be looking for? RUETER stated he trusts individuals to make good decisions but not organizations this large, so his worry is that there is too much pressure. Who are these people that are actually teaching our courses in the catalog? FARR queried that if it isn’t competency, then what is it. RUETER stated there is a credential issue that can be looked at without judging an individual’s competency.

WATTENBERG stated that this is another one-size-fits-all proposal. This proposal sounds like the institution will make a rule that all individuals have to have such and such. I take issue with that because various departments have various criteria for competencies and degrees required for different types of teaching. RUTH stated the motivation is to prod the senate to take authority over our jurisdiction, which is the quality of the education that we are offering here. WATTENBERG continued that the motion is worded in a way that suggests that there are certain department-specific issues, while at the same time suggesting that there is an absolute standard to fit every department.

SMALLMAN asked if Rueter talked to the University Curriculum Committee to see if they are willing to take this on. RUETER stated, no, he didn’t, but that is a senate committee and he feels that the senate needs to take responsibility for this. The UCC has new staffing and is moving forward with approvals, which should make this possible. LAFFERRÈRE. RUTH noted she is more interested in this issue with respect to undergraduate education.

ARANTE noted that the differing departmental cultures at PSU made it difficult to negotiate Article 18, and she feels many of the guidelines therein have fallen by the wayside. We have an increasingly large number of contingent faculty because decisions are put in the hands of individuals. Chairs all over campus have hired competent people, but cheaply, and the number of these appointments keep creeping up. A large number of faculty will never have tenure nor academic freedom and they are teaching huge undergraduate courses. Wages are more competitive in some areas but the people are still contingent faculty. These are employment issues that should be negotiated through AAUP. The spirit of these motions seems to be a valiant attempt on your part to involve the Senate in what AAUP has always tried to do. Regarding motion #2, I have watched the senate pass curriculum for six years without asking the question “who pays for this.”

REDER noted that Senate can maintain quality not just with course and program approval, but also with program review authority, which both Graduate and
Undergraduate curriculum groups have discussed. We could get the ball rolling here in the senate. HINES noted that motion #2 could have the effect of supporting department chairs by giving them more rigorous guidelines to work with.

JAGODNIK stated she is on UCC and it is the rare occasion that they look at a faculty member’s credentials. They are too busy and couldn’t take this on unless they knew staffing was in place. She also noted, that she sees a contradiction in stating that we don’t trust individuals and that we don’t trust institutions at the same time. If department chairs aren’t making appropriate decisions, then the deans should be held accountable.

BROWN queried if what are we talking about here is program review. RUETER responded that Brown’s area has it, and continued that Hines’s point is that in his area he doesn’t have the choice to hire the best person and/or for a full load. BROWN stated this doesn’t seem to be directed at programs, but at hiring. RUETER stated it is directed at UCC and Grad Council. WETZEL stated she supports this effort, but this motion seems like this is an audit. The best audits are external and most folks would welcome external review. She suggested that we have more opportunities for program review, rather than have colleagues evaluate colleagues. RUETER stated he didn’t like Wetzel twisting the word; this is not an audit.

BLELER noted he is very concerned with the language of the motion, in particular, “who is qualified to teach at this level” and stated that it explicitly asks the committees under this charge to perform a “checklist” for criteria for which they have no expertise. RUETER responded that the committee could do this. WALTON stated and she knows people in the institution teaching 300-level courses with master’s degrees. She objected to tabling the first motion and RUETER stated he agreed. OSTLUND stated she agreed in terms of what the Graduate Council does in the proposal process, but this is a separate charge to go back and police whether individual departments are doing what they said they were going to do. This is too huge a charge, and Graduate Council is not the body to do that.

BLEILER noted that designating these committees to examine this issue is one way, but the Senate could decide other ways. The important thing is quality, whether it is program review or whatever, and we need to own responsibility for the quality of our instruction. HINES reminded that the language indicates the committees “consider ways to determine . . .”

THE QUESTION WAS CALLED.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE MOTION #2 PASSED by 37 in favor, 16 against, and 6 abstentions.

F. Question Period
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1. Questions for the Administration

Questions for Provost Koch

*Note: There is no transcription of the meeting from this point.*

*Provost Koch has provided his notes for these minutes.*

Question #1. For the 2007-09 biennium, PSU received $1.5 Million to improve the student/faculty ratio, $0.5 Million for the first year and $1.0 Million for the 2nd year. The continuing funding for these positions is $1.0 Million per year. We have allocated $1.0 Million to the initiative to build capacity for student success and to expand innovative research, which directly addresses the objectives of the state board. The strategy here is to increase the numbers of tenure line faculty with a particular focus on those units that generate significant numbers of SCH either for their majors, as a “service” department or through UNST, and have low numbers of tenure line faculty. Unfortunately, this last criterion is not very useful in discriminating between departments at PSU since many have low numbers of tenure line faculty. We have precisely met the intention of the OUS Board and the legislature. We intend to insure that the $1 Million we have allocated to build faculty capacity in Sustainability will further address the issue of student-faculty ratios and building the tenure line faculty. Although the funding has been targeted there are many (in fact most) programs that directly address issues of sustainability that have low number of tenure line faculty.

Question #2. We have not one but three priorities, improving student success, expanding innovative scholarship, and enhancing opportunity for higher education in the metropolitan region. They are a small number in order to focus our attention on all of them, and they are not prioritized. With regard to the student success priority, we have always been committed to it. It is now made more explicit and we ask everyone to consider whether what he or she are doing in this regard and how they are doing it is effective in advancing this priority. We will evaluate progress and allocate resources accordingly. This is one of the reasons for the plan to increase the numbers of tenure-line faculty. Expanding innovative scholarship is another priority and is largely the responsibility of the tenure-line faculty. To my knowledge, OAA is not telling new hires that all that matters is that they publish. I am candid in discussing the fact that our expectations for scholarship are growing with the stature and aspirations of the institution and that new faculty need to be aware of this. We are also careful to point out that scholarship is the distinctive (but not the only) expectation for tenure so they need to pay sufficient attention to this aspect of their portfolio in order to achieve tenure. We also indicate that there is a clear expectation (it goes without saying) that they will provide effective instruction and related student support, in particular mentoring and advising. We make them aware of the support available through CAE in this regard. From the interactions I have had with new tenure-line faculty, it is clear to me that they come with a clear scholarly expectation of their own and none of this is a surprise to them.
Finally, as a comprehensive, doctoral granting institution, we have both instructional and scholarly responsibilities for tenure-line faculty like all other similar institutions. Historically, these expectations have been found to support each other and to enhance the educational experience of the students. At PSU, the P&T guidelines explicitly identify student mentoring and advising as part of the instructional responsibilities of tenure-line faculty and so this expectation is clear. We are also not alone in assuming that departments or programs will exhibit a balanced portfolio of faculty contributions that allow them, collectively, to address issues of student success (principally through effective instruction and advising) and contribute to scholarship. The contributions of individual faculty typically vary throughout the career but scholarship is an ongoing part of the expectation. There is no evidence that faculty scholarship needs to be counterproductive to either effective instruction or student success. To the contrary, where faculty are leaders in their fields as a result of their scholarship and students are engaged with faculty in scholarly activities, the students have been observed to be more successful. So I don’t believe that we need to revise the P&T guidelines for tenure line faculty as a result of an explicit priority on student success.

Question #3. This is the purview of the Faculty Senate, and he would be happy to work with the Senate leadership on this if it becomes an issue of funding.

Questions for the Administration (added to the agenda 12/31/07)

A number of PSU students had hold placed on registration for Winter due to changes in our account receivable polices and practices. For example, last year a registration hold was only placed for Winter if a student had past due of more than $100 from Summer and/or $1000 from Fall. This Winter a registration hold was placed if a student had a past overdue of $100 from any term. This is a significant shift but I am not aware of any discussion of this issue in faculty senate.

I have the following question(s) for administration:

As a result of a change in PSU’s account receivable policies all students with a prior term past due of over $100 were placed on registration hold for Winter.

1. Please explain the change in policy to the faculty senate.
2. Provide the number of students who were placed on registration hold as a result of this policy. Provide the number of students who were not able to register for classes as a result of this change.
3. Explain the impact of this change on student success and student retention.
4. Explain how this policy serves PSU’s mission and our commitment to provide access to learning.

Sukhwant Jhaj

Vice President Desrochers has provided notes prepared by Eric Blumenthal for these minutes:

1. Please explain the change in policy to the faculty senate.

There was no change in Portland State University registration hold policy. The policy of placing a financial hold on a student account is as follows:

1. Student owes a prior term balance greater than $100,
2. Student owes a current term balance for resident greater than $1,000, for non-resident greater than $2,500, or
3. An account that has a written off amount greater than or equal to $25, or
4. An account that is currently at an outside collection agency, or
5. An account that has an unsettled return check or stop payment check.

The change at the end of fall term was that for the first time Business Affairs strictly adhered to policy which does not allow students to carry more than a $100 balance over from a prior term. The placement of additional holds did not occur until after the end of the fall term on December 10. Prior to the placement of these holds, letters were sent to all students outlining policy with an additional explanatory letter sent to students in danger of having a financial hold placed on their student account after the end of the fall term. For practical purposes, we did not place holds for prior balances less than $300 to account for unbilled or late charges, miscellaneous fees, etc.

2. Provide the number of students who were placed on registration hold as a result of this policy. Provide the number of students who were not able to register for classes as a result of this change.

The number of financial holds placed on accounts on December 10 was 2,555 students. By January 1, the number of "December 10" holds was down to 1,097 students. As of the end of business on Friday, January 4, 2008 the number of "December 10" holds was down to 975 with an additional 1,803 holds remaining from November. Students who did not have a hold placed on their account in November had the opportunity to continue to register for the winter term up until holds were placed on December 10.

3. Explain the impact of this change on student success and student retention.

The adherence to policy will allow for stronger fiscal control and reduce accounts receivables for the University. Additional detail is provided below on significant increases to receivables over the past three years. (see table) The adherence to policy will serve students better since it will not needlessly prolong lingering financial and financial aid issues and additionally prevents student debt from spiraling out of control and forcing students to leave the institution. In this way, students can be counseled early on financial aid options as well as payment plan options.

4. Explain how this policy serves PSU's mission and our commitment to provide access to learning.

The policy is not seen as an impediment to the institution's mission or PSU's commitment to access, rather prudent fiscal policy that allows parents and students to appropriately pay for their education in a timely manner without needlessly getting into dire financial circumstances. The goal is to work with students and their families early on so educational expenses are planned for and well managed so students can concentrate on learning and persist.
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The following table shows a significant 36% increase in accounts receivable over the past two years. Currently, accounts receivable balances (excluding 0-30 days and any winter term assessments) stands at $16,400,000.

Portland State University
Accounts Receivable Aging Comparison
August 2007, 2006, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total AR</td>
<td>$20,663,512</td>
<td>$18,290,592</td>
<td>$13,299,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Body Headcount</td>
<td>25,013</td>
<td>24,284</td>
<td>24,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R as percentage of student body</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real dollar increase</td>
<td>$2,372,919</td>
<td>$4,991,113</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Body Headcount source: 2007 Estimated Fall

2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair

None.

G. Reports from Officers of the Administration and Committees

1. Report of the IFS Meeting of December 7-8 at OHSU

The report was tabled until the next meeting.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:48.
January 9, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: DeLys Ostlund, Chair
      Graduate Council

RE: Submission of New Graduate Council Items for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate. Course descriptions will be supplied by Steve Harmon.

School of Business Administration

New Courses
E.l.a.1

- BA 548  Special Topics in Business, 4 credits
  The courses offered under this number cover a range of specialized topics in business such as Product Design and Stewardship for Global corporations, Sustainability Metrics in Business, Cross-Sector Partnerships for Sustainable Enterprise, Global Marketing Research, Marketing in Asia, Global Marketing, Global Human Resource Management, etc. Only open to graduate students of the School of Business Administration. May be repeated with different topics; maximum of 12 credits may be applied to the master’s degree.

School of Social Work

New Courses
E.l.a.2

- SW 568  Community Mental Health Seminar, 3 credits
  Seminar on interdisciplinary relationships among social work, psychiatry, and nursing; and on a variety of clinical, and policy topics. For students in community mental health placements and those working with individuals with severe and persistent mental illness. Jointly offered with OHSU’s Department of Public Psychiatry. Enrollment is limited to six students per term and requires instructor approval.

College of Urban Studies and Planning

New Courses
E.l.a.3

- USP 529  Green Buildings I, 3 credits
  Reviews development of new real estate properties and communities with attention to environmental sustainability, reduced operating costs, and enhanced residential and working environmental conditions. Topics include green building standards and techniques for assessing project success.
January 9, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Gould  
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  

DeLys Ostlund  
Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Submission of Graduate Council for Faculty Senate

The following proposals have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate. Course descriptions will be provided by Steve Harmon.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New Courses**

E.1.b.1

- ESR 480/580 Coastal Marine Ecology, 4 credits  

E.1.b.2

- ESR 485/585 Ecology and Management of Bio-Invasions, 4 credits  
Overview of invasive species biology, ecology and management with a strong focus on aquatic invasive species and invasive species in Portland. Builds upon the basic fundamentals of ecology and also addresses economics, ethics, policy, and management practices. Recommended prerequisite: ESR 321.
January 14, 2008

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Rob Gould
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: Submission of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

The following proposals have been approved by the UCC, and are recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate.

Maseeh College of Engineering and Computer Science

Changes in existing courses:
E.1.c.1 CS 311 Computational Structures – change course description.

School of Fine and Performing Arts

Changes in existing programs:
E.1.c.2 BM in Composition – Changes number of required credits in Mus 474 or 475 Midi Applications from 4 to 2 and adds 2 required credits in Mus 476 Computer Music Composition.

E.1.c.3 BM in Music Education - The 6-credit sequence of MuEd 422, 423 Instrumental Literature and Rehearsal Techniques (3,3), which had previously been a 2-term course of 3 credits each has been split into a 3-term course MuEd 422, 423, 424 Instrumental Literature and Rehearsal Techniques (2,2,2) of 2 credits each. This change has been made to allow the missing component of Marching Band Techniques to be included and studied at more intense level.

Changes in existing courses:
E.1.c.4 Art 312 Art in the elementary School (4) – change course description and credit hours.

New courses:
E.1.c.5 Arch 384 Architectural Design Focus Studio 1 (3)
Studio investigations of architectural designs based on supporting human activities, structure and theory. Includes individual criticism, lectures and seminars.

E.1.c.6 Arch 385 Architectural Design Focus Studio 2 (3)
Studio investigations of architectural designs based on supporting human activities, structure and theory. Includes individual criticism, lectures and seminars.

E.1.c.7 Mus 476 Computer Music Composition (2)
Introduces concepts, applications, and projects in sound synthesis, sampling, and digital signal processing. Students learn to create real time compositions using a graphical programming environment and studio pieces using various sound editing applications.

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences**

**New program:**
E.1.c.8  Sexuality, Gender and Queer Studies Minor in Women's Studies. – See attachment.

**New courses:**

**E.1.c.10**  ASL 201, 202, 203 Second Year American Sign Language (4,4,4)
Expansion and refinement of first-year comprehension and production skills; expansion of grammatical and lexical repertoires through task-based instruction in transactions such as asking/giving directions, making plans, describing and identifying people, places and things, giving simple instructions, and telling what happened. Prerequisite: ASL 103.

**E.1.c.13**  Eng 331 Introduction to Rhetoric and Composition Studies (4)
Introduction to contemporary issues in rhetoric and composition studies by way of the rhetorical tradition of Greece, the rise of composition in the modern North American university, and their relation to the process-oriented approach to composition which has dominated composition instruction since the 1960's. Focuses are on such perennial issues as the relationship between writing and the self, the link between writing and "content," the relationship of writing to speech and reading, the political dimensions of writing, and the role of the audience in composing.

**E.1.c.15**  Span 301, 302, 303 Third year Spanish (4, 4, 4) [ADDING 303]
Continued work on the Spanish language at intermediate-advanced level. Prepares student for upper division classes. Intensive grammar review. SPAN 301 emphasizes listening comprehension and speaking. Recommended: Span 203. SPAN 302 emphasizes reading and writing. Highly recommended: 301. SPAN 303 emphasizes oral and written skills in order to prepare student for literary analysis and critical writing. Highly recommended: 301 and 302.

**E.1.c.16**  Swah 330 Topics in East African Culture and Civilization (4)
A study of literary forms, theories, and analysis of texts in their socio-cultural contexts. Topics include: Oral literature, folklore, short stories, traditions and modernity, and biographies. Conducted in English.

**Changes to existing courses:**

**E.1.c.18**  Geog 331 Geography of Globalization (4) – change in course title and description.

**E.1.c.19**  Geog 348 Cultural and Political Ecology (4) – change in course title and description.

**E.1.c.20**  Wr 300 Topics in Rhetoric and Composition (4) – change in course title and description.