

Faculty Senate  
McCormick Room, Collins Library  
Minutes of the September 26, 2016 meeting

**Senators Present:**

Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Bill Haltom, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Noah Lumbantobing, Brendan Lanctot, Pierre Ly, Emelie Peine, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Peter Wimberger.

**Chair Kessel called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.**

**1. Announcements**

Bartanen shared a handout about High Impact practices, as referenced by President Crawford in the last Senate meeting.

Wimberger announced Night at the (Slater) Museum, this Thursday night, which has the theme of "Back to School Night."

**2. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Senate meeting on September 12 were passed following final corrections.

**3. Liaison Reports**

Johnson noted that the Student Life Committee is having a de-briefing with CHWS on Friday, September 30.

Brown announced that the Committee on Diversity will have its first meeting this week.

There was no ASUPS President update as President Lumbantobing was not yet present.

Skeel reported on the first Staff Senate meeting, mentioning in particular the formation of a special committee to explore ways to improve spaces for nursing mothers on campus. There is currently a space in the basement of Howarth Hall, and the committee will work to make that space more functional, and also to spread word of its existence. There is also a Best Cookie Bakeoff scheduled for October 28, 12-1.

#### **4. Discussion of the Common Period**

The Senate turned its attention to consideration of the Common Period, continuing the conversation initiated at the Faculty Meeting. Kessel explained why the conversation was continuing in the Senate, explaining that the Senate is the Executive Committee of the faculty, and members are empowered to fulfill this role by the Faculty Bylaws. She also noted the impending deadline for the Scheduling Guidelines, which were scheduled to go out the same day as this meeting, but were delayed by one day by the Registrar, Brad Tomhave. Kessel reminded Senators that the guidelines would go out as approved by the Senate last year unless the Senate acted to make a change. Kessel then reviewed the three options she had laid out for the Senate in her email—the Senate could leave the guidelines as passed last year, could amend those guidelines for a “soft implementation,” or the Senate could withdraw the revised guidelines that were passed last year. She also noted the efforts made by Music and OT to retool their schedules, and the willingness of both Chemistry and Biology to make the Common Period proposal work, noting that these conversations had also included discussion suggesting that some of these departments needed the Common Period dates not used for Faculty Meetings for their own department meetings. She told the Senate, as well, that while the Physical Therapy program continues to see the Common Period as neither useful nor viable, faculty in that program plan to remain engaged with faculty governance even if the faculty goes forward with it.

The Senate then engaged in lengthy discussion of the merits of different options, and of other possible paths forward. Johnson suggested support for soft implementation as a gesture of goodwill, but also hoped that while conformity to the new Scheduling Guidelines would not be required in this case, that the Senate would encourage departments to see the importance of participating so that we might have a real test of how these new guidelines work. Ramakrishnan asked if we did this as a soft implementation, whether that would leave the question of a Common Period open, and require the topic to be revisited again next year. What, in other words, would the outcome of the soft implementation be? Lanctot asked whether, if things remained as they are, there would be any obstacle to departments doing what they need to do in terms of scheduling? Would inserting the language about soft implementation have any actual impact? What are the consequences, in other words, of doing this through the Scheduling Guidelines? In answer, Kessel explained that the language passed last spring by the Senate would go in effect unless the Senate acted, and this amendment to the guidelines uses the language of “should.” In fact, the reason the Scheduling Guidelines were chosen as the route for creating a Common Period was the reality that this would leave flexibility for those departments that absolutely could not adapt to a Common Period. Lanctot noted that last year’s Senate developed and voted on the language, and so it seemed strange to go back and change the language, but he also acknowledged that if this is being seen as an onerous imposition, that also needs to be respected by the Senate. He wondered if, having had the conversation in the faculty meeting, people would be ready to go ahead with the Common Period, or would there still be opposition, or a sense that this was pushed through.

Kessel noted other questions that are still being debated beyond simply whether there should be a Common Period, for instance whether faculty meetings should be 60 or 90 minutes in length in this new system, and how the other meeting days this plan would produce could be used. Jacobson asked if we needed to consider making the question about 50 versus 80-minute meetings. She also suggested that writing in the modifications would give us a final version that did not have to be re-circulated every year. Kessel returned to the question of “hard” vs. “soft” options. Brown asked about the 1:30-2:00 space, and whether we were creating dead space. Kessel noted that Biology had suggested the department might begin to schedule labs at 1:30.

The Senate then worked to revise the amendment to the guidelines passed by the Senate in spring 2016. Discussion focused on emphasizing the need to protect especially the 12:00-1:00 period. Senators also worked through the reasons for the revisions they were enacting, and determined the need for guidance for instances where a department simply cannot protect the Common Period. Senators also discussed how to instruct the Registrar in terms of the publication of the guidelines. Kessel will follow up with Brad Tomhave and with the full faculty. The following motion then M/S/P unanimously for addition to the Scheduling Guidelines:

Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.

If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30, they should only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.

## **5. Committee Charges**

**Curriculum Committee.** Jacobson moved to approve the following:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Curriculum Committee to:

1) Investigate and report on potential impacts and opportunities of options A

and B identified by the Curriculum Committee last year to equalize teaching days in Fall and Spring semester.

2) Create guidelines for unit limits for majors to fit existing practices, core curriculum, and educational goals.

Jacobson explained the background for the second charge, noting that this one has repeatedly surfaced from the Curriculum Committee, as they review departments and programs and discover that almost all exceed the 9-unit limit for majors. The CC is never certain how to handle this. Bristow argued in favor of this second charge, noting the guidance and clarity it would give to the committee. Motion passed.

**International Education Committee.** Wimberger moved the proposed charges for the International Education Committee. Senators discussed whether charge 3 needs a lead individual, and Wimberger agreed to oversee this, and Johnson agreed to inform the Student Life Committee. Following a friendly amendment, the motion passed:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the International Education Committee to:

Charge 1: With respect to the issue of sexual violence:

- a: Continue the review of sexual violence policies at study abroad programs used by Puget Sound students.
- b: Finalize and distribute the sexual violence crisis response documents drafted last year.
- c: Develop sexual violence prevention and response training for Puget Sound faculty and staff involved in Puget Sound study abroad programs.

Charge 2a. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g. language, discipline, or geography) or are expensive.

2b: Develop language that clearly incorporates this charge into the standing charge that deals with program review.

Charge 3: In collaboration with the Committee on Diversity and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students.

Charge 4: Work with the Office of Institutional Research to gather and analyze study abroad participation rate data for students of color and first-generation students and, based on those findings, make recommendations to address any disparities in participation rates.

**Professional Standards Committee.** Bristow moved the proposed charges:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Professional Standards Committee to:

1. Recommend to the Senate specific, concrete changes to the evaluation process to mitigate well-documented bias in student evaluations during the evaluation process.
2. Develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

Johnson asked about the issue of educating students on this issue. Kessel noted that a related new charge to the Committee on Diversity would be part of Other Business. Motion passed.

## **6. Other Business**

**Additional Charge to the Committee on Diversity.** Brown moved an additional charge for the Committee on Diversity:

Develop and implement a strategy to educate students about bias in course evaluations.

This is understood as the flipside of the PSC charge, which will likely involve some consideration of the evaluation process, but not outreach and education for students. This seemed to be more logically sent to the COD, rather than the PSC. Jacobson was concerned about whether there is a tension between these two charges. Might some be inclined to eliminate structural change around evaluations, if student education is offered as an apparent solution? Peine noted that her first response was that we absolutely need to be doing the student education. While we can make progress on the structural, we also need to be working on the education of those who do the evaluating. Wimberger suggested, too, that some changes in the evaluation form will help with the educational process. Bristow urged, though, that unconscious bias will continue to be an issue. Lanctot asked why the COD instead of the SLC was being charged, and Kessel noted the bylaws of the COD include a charge to work on faculty retention. Motion passed.

**Strategic Planning.** Kessel then turned to a discussion of how to move forward with feedback for the Strategic Planning Process. President Crawford has twice mentioned his interest in having the Senate's help in thinking about how to collect faculty feedback about the process for the creation of the new Strategic Plan. Kessel asked what we should do to collect feedback for the president, and to ensure faculty voices are engaged in planning the process. She hoped that there would be a way to create a process that would build on higher order thinking, rather than our usual, day-to-day, particular concerns. Bartanen asked if this was to reach beyond the listening sessions that are being planned. Kessel suggested a particular interest in ensuring a breadth of voices. Haltom asked if it would make sense for the Senate, or

someone else, to have minimal information about what the Strategic Plan is and what goes into it. Bartanen ensured this would happen. Wimberger wondered what the parameters are for the process, and how it might vary. Others agreed that they knew little about this aspect. Kessel suggested that we certainly want to invite participation in the planned events, and to think about those who could be unwilling or uncomfortable speaking in those, depending on the shape they take. She agreed we would return to this in a few meetings.

**Adjournment.** The Senate adjourned at 5:20.

Minutes prepared by Nancy Bristow.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pierre Ly  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate