

**Faculty Senate**  
**McCormick Room, Collins Library**  
**Minutes of the October 24, 2016 meeting**

Attendance: Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, William Haltom, Robin Jacobson, Alisa Kessel, Brendan Lanctot, Pierre Ly, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Peter Wimberger

Guests: Todd Badham, Sarah Comstock

- 1. Call to order at 4:02.**
- 2. Approval of the minutes of October 3, 2016**

M/S/P unanimous

**3. Updates from liaisons to standing committees**

Kessel reported that the ad hoc committee for Title IX compliance, approved at the last Senate meeting, has been staffed: Megan Gessel (Student Life Committee), Poppy Fry (Sexual and Gender Violence Committee), Amanda Mifflin (Professional Standards Committee).

Kessel said that Casey O'Brien will no longer be one of the ASUPS student representatives to the Faculty Senate. Lumbantobing will help locate a replacement.

Bristow reported that the Professional Standards Committee has approved PT continuing to use electronic course evaluations, and OT beginning to do so. The PSC has been in conversation with the Committee on Diversity about collaborating on the charge to educate students about bias in course evaluations. Senate will be receiving information from PSC soon about the plan for an 8-year review cycle for departmental standards.

Wimberger reported that the International Education Committee wants to revise one of their charges. Kessel noted that such a change requires Senate approval.

**4. Updates from the ASUPS President and the Staff Senate representative**

No update from ASUPS.

Skeel reported that the Staff Senate discussed the draft campus animal control policy. There was a resolution to approve the policy but no vote has been held yet. There is continuing discussion about merit pay policy, and HR is continuing to work on defining "exceeding expectations" and on developing training. HR has prepared an updated sexual misconduct policy and procedures for staff, and a draft is ready to go to the Staff Senate for consideration.

## 5. Discussion of draft Campus Animal Control Policy

Comstock said that she and Badham are here representing the Accessibility Work Group (AWG) and have been gathering feedback on the draft. The impetus for the policy is that there have been some dangerous incidents with dogs, so the policy is meant to ensure that service animals and owners are as safe as possible. Safety is an ADA concern. Additionally, we need to comply with Tacoma municipal code, which stipulates that dogs outside of houses must be leashed. A lower order of concern than safety and accessibility, but still important, is management of grounds and buildings. Comstock and Badham seek Faculty Senate endorsement of the policy.

Badham said there have been three incidents in the last two years where off-leash dogs have bitten people or other dogs. Security frequently receives notes of concern—even just today—about a dog-on-dog aggression on campus, sometimes resulting in high veterinarian bills. The draft policy has been seen by the Cabinet. Badham encouraged comments and questions from the Faculty Senate.

Wimberger asked whether those who drafted the policy looked at other, less restrictive policies at other colleges. Comstock said that the policy was created based on needs specific to our campus, as well as concerns about accessibility and safety. Badham said that other schools' policies are fairly similar in terms of requiring leashes and restricting the presence of animals in buildings, although some are looser on the latter point than the proposed Puget Sound policy. He said that county and municipal ordinances, as well as Health Department rules (i.e., no animals in buildings where food is served), are also a factor. Additionally, a simple policy that applies to every building is easier to understand and enforce.

Wimberger voiced support for Puget Sound creating an animal policy, acknowledging that there are problems when dogs are unruly and owners irresponsible, and that allergies are a genuine concern. He noted that while many negative anecdotes are being highlighted in the discussion, there are many positive sides to the presence of animals on campus, including the improvement of workplace morale, decrease in stress and anxiety, and the fostering of a welcoming environment. The presence of dogs in Puget Sound's faculty offices and on our campus has been viewed positively by prospective students and faculty hires. Students and colleagues have voiced to Wimberger their support for a less restrictive policy than the one under discussion. Some faculty mention their dog ownership in their syllabi for students with allergies or cynophobia, but faculty with dogs in their offices report more students coming to their offices as a result, sometimes specifically to interact with the dog (e.g. before a test or when feeling anxious). There is a Dogs at Puget Sound site on Instagram. Dogs outside of the SUB help students relax during finals period. Dogs and cats help reduce feelings of social exclusion. Erin Colbert-White and her students are doing research on this.

Wimberger volunteered to help draft a less restrictive policy, and distributed a handout, "References for benefits of animals with a focus on dogs" (see Appendix).

Comstock said that similar points had been brought up by ASUPS, which nonetheless fully endorsed the draft policy. She said students recognize the benefits of dogs on campus, including the alleviation of homesickness. Students did note that while dogs may benefit some people, they threaten or harm others. Not every student with cynophobia will be comfortable sharing that with a faculty member

despite encouragement in a syllabus, and should not be put in the position of having to do so. In the past, some students and staff have been asked to walk faculty members' dogs, which is problematic. Also, if faculty are permitted to have dogs in their offices, this is unequitable because staff with offices in Wheelock (where animals are not permitted) cannot bring pets. Comstock acknowledged that the negatives of pets on campus have been highlighted in the policy discussion, but that is because negative experiences, particularly those of students and those with service animals, are what have given rise to the need for a policy.

In further discussion, the following points were raised:

- The negative situations that prompted the creation of a campus animal control policy were not caused by the presence of dogs in faculty offices. It would be possible to have a policy that controlled but allowed the presence of pets in offices. For example, a faculty member could register their dog, commit in writing to doing their own office cleaning, etc. Some faculty wouldn't bring pets to campus if they had to do their own clean-up; others have expressed willingness to vacuum their own offices.
- A good policy needs to be enforceable; a moderate policy can raise enforcement problems. For example, what happens if a student doesn't want to come to a faculty office because of cynophobia?
- Ideally we create a strong policy that doesn't have to be endlessly tinkered with as circumstances change.
- Might a small area of campus (e.g. a segment of President's Woods) be designated for pets?
- Reed College has off-leash areas on campus; pets may not be left unattended for more than 10 minutes. At larger California institutions, animal control policies are enforced by mid-level supervisors rather than centrally, which allows for more flexibility as needed.
- Since we have a policy for members of the campus community who bring cars to campus, we could probably come up with a similar structure for faculty who bring dogs to campus.
- Emotional support animals are not recognized under the ADA, but current students are permitted to have them (with various restrictions), and faculty who wish to have them can arrange it through HR.
- From the Tacoma Municipal Code (17.02.050): "If any dog is off the premises of its owner or custodian such dog, while away from such premises, must be controlled by a leash or chain not more than eight feet in length, such control to be exercised by such owner or custodian or other competent and authorized person. Failure to control a dog in this manner is a violation."
- Presumably this doesn't apply to private buildings. And since the city has off-leash areas, there must be more leeway than this would suggest.
- If someone would like to see further tweaks to the draft policy, this should go through AWG, rather than spin off into a new ad hoc committee, particularly since AWG has already worked on this for a year and half.

The Senate was not prepared as a body to endorse the draft policy. Comstock emphasized the AWG's commitment to the creation of an animal control policy in response to safety concerns and for maximum clarity about what is and isn't okay.

Segawa noted that the policy is being shared and discussed with different governing bodies (staff, student, faculty), and while feedback is important, it's the cabinet that set the sharing/feedback process in motion and will make a determination. There is clear consensus from the discussion that dogs on campus must be leashed, and Badham needs to be able to enforce this policy. Also, it's a given that animals cannot be in buildings where food is served. Currently the biggest area of discussion is around office space, particularly faculty offices.

Comstock said that she can invite senators to the next AWG meeting.

The Senate expressed its gratitude to Comstock and Badham.

#### **6. Closed Session: Presentation of candidates for honorary degrees**

Alyce DeMarais, Liz Collins, and Kyle Chong joined the Senate to discuss the slate of nominated honorary degree candidates.

#### **7. Discussion of implementation of the common period in 2017-8**

Kessel stated that at the Faculty Meeting, a motion for a 60-minute common period was introduced and failed, so the 90-minute Wednesday period with the three added criteria, as passed by the Senate on 9/26/16, stands.

Kessel noted that after the October 10 Faculty Meeting, some colleagues expressed their hope that the issues raised during that meeting (scheduling, impact on course schedule and course availability, how the time is used, whether meetings operate efficiently) would be taken up by the Senate.

Kessel asked what we might want to schedule during the Common Period besides faculty meetings, in the interests of making the Common Period as successful as possible. Every 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of the month for Faculty Meetings seems reasonable (and this is at the discretion of the Senate Chair). Should we try to schedule a campus-wide event once per semester? A Swope or Pierce lecture? Something else? It would be good to have a sense of what the Common Period will look like next year, so faculty can anticipate using the period for meetings, course schedule, etc.

Additionally, Kessel noted that it's likely that Monday and Friday 12-1:30 will be relatively open, which might mean that other meetings (including Faculty Senate) could conceivably happen then rather than at the start or end of the workday.

Kessel raised the question of how the effectiveness/desirability of the Common Period will be evaluated after it has gone into effect. If the 60-minute resolution had passed, next on the docket was a resolution to call for a review to occur in Spring 2018. Kessel asked whether this seemed like the right time.

In discussion, the following topics came up:

- Between full faculty meetings (3 per semester), campus-wide events (1 per semester), and departmental meetings, there may not be much room left during the Wednesday CP for standing committee meetings. However, Monday and Friday middays may be more open than they were.

- Having a campus-wide event during the CP once per semester would be a lovely thing for faculty who aren't on campus in the evenings. This was a big reason why ASUPS supported the CP well, so we owe it to them to develop campus-wide events. We could create a new thing—not a Swope lecture but something else. It would be possible to partner Race & Pedagogy, ASUPS in development of campus-wide events. Need to be cognizant of facilities: the Fieldhouse is the only venue that can actually hold the whole campus community, so we need to communicate with Jeff Halstead (athletics) and staff who have to do the work to make an all-campus event go.
- Reviewing in Spring 2018 might be a bit soon to evaluate whether the meetings are good, the cultural shift, but not too soon to assess whether students' choices and schedules are being impacted negatively. This could be evaluated even after fall registration. To do so would reassure people that their concerns were taken seriously, and would allow any problems to be dealt with swiftly. Useful tools/sources of info include advising, wait lists, department chairs, and even PeopleSoft. Assessment both pre- and post-registration might be good.
- It would be neat to have a once-semesterly "Wednesday at NOON" for a bigger pedagogy conversation than what's possible at 4.
- At least two departments, biology and chemistry, plan to move their departmental meetings to the CP *every* week except for the ones with full faculty meetings. The School of Music also has many meetings that would likely be scheduled then.

Two committees were created to support implementation of the common period:

Review Committee: Pierre Ly, Peter Wimberger, Kena Fox-Dobbs, & Alisa Kessel with support from Kate Cohn and Brad Tomhave

Events Committee: Nancy Bristow, Shirley Skeel, Noah Lumbantobing, & Alisa Kessel

## 8. Other Business

Haltom noted that colleagues have expressed dissatisfaction with the procedures through which the CP was implemented. He invited consideration of how the Senate can make sure faculty are well informed about what we're up to so that no one is shocked when we do things.

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- The disgruntlement over the CP is not dissimilar to the reaction to the creation of the KNOW requirement.
- Digital technology might be used more effectively—not for voting, but for gathering and disseminating information.
- A lot of feedback, discussion, and dissemination of information actually happened leading up to the CP decision.
- The Faculty Senate report contains a wealth of useful information. The actions of standing committees could be listed at the top of this report, and projected at the start of faculty meetings.
- The portal is a good tool for the dissemination of information, aside from all the clicking required.

- Faculty are inundated with info—there’s actually too much.
- Senate liaisons to standing committees could make sure to announce to the Senate whenever a standing committee passes something so that it appears **BOLDLY** in the Senate minutes. Few read the standing committee minutes, but we could promote the value of reading the Senate minutes (perhaps by forbidding faculty to read them).
- We could do better in communicating about the *process* by which things are happening and can happen. Many faculty believed the CP needed a full faculty vote to be enacted, and it didn’t; this led to much of the unhappiness. Also, there was not widespread understanding that the Senate actually acted to create the CP *last spring*, and that this fall’s Senate acted to adjust the implementation.
- Part of the reason the CP decision went down as it did last fall—through a decisive act by the Senate that was then discussed—was that there was a perceived need for a CP, and if we started out with aimless discussion (“What should we do?”), nothing would actually happen. But this does lead some people to feel left out of the process.
- Senators could do more to keep their departments informed about what’s happening in faculty governance, and to get feedback. They could also go to one or two other departments’ meetings. Since all senators are at-large, there’s no formal representation (e.g. of particular departments). We could create connections, informally, between senators and particular areas.
- We may need to recalibrate what sorts of decisions are for the Senate and which ones should be for the full faculty.
- Consensus is an ideal, but as long as the Senate acted diligently and in good faith, we should be proud of our actions. Some will inevitably be unhappy.

9. Meeting adjourned at 5:30.

Minutes prepared by Gwynne Brown

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

**Appendix: References for benefits of animals with a focus on dogs**

## Appendix

### References for benefits of animals with a focus on dogs

#### **Dogs decrease perceived workplace stress and increase work satisfaction**

Barker et al. 2012. Preliminary investigation of employee's dog presence on stress and organizational perceptions. International Journal of Workplace Health Management. 5: 15 - 30  
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17538351211215366>

#### **Dogs reduce perceived test stress in students**

[https://news.vcu.edu/article/VCU\\_study\\_finds\\_college\\_students\\_feel\\_less\\_stress\\_prior\\_to\\_exams](https://news.vcu.edu/article/VCU_study_finds_college_students_feel_less_stress_prior_to_exams)

Original article: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08927936.2015.1069988>

#### **Dogs and cats reduce feelings of social exclusion**

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103111002411>

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/20414005.2015.1067958?src=recsys>

Currently Erin Colbert-White and students are doing research on this question.

#### **Dogs and other pets increase physical well-being**

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22866043> - a meta-analysis of 62 studies showing a constellation of positive effects

#### **Examples of policies at other colleges and universities:**

[https://reed.edu/academic/gbook/comm\\_pol/animals.html](https://reed.edu/academic/gbook/comm_pol/animals.html)

<http://www.stetson.edu/law/policies/home/media/guidelines-for-pets-on-campus-pdf.pdf>

<https://www.pomona.edu/administration/facilities-campus-services/policy-and-procedures>

<http://policies.csusb.edu/animals.htm>

<http://www.uchastings.edu/about/admin-offices/human-resources/the411/docs/PetPolicyOnCampus070114.pdf>

<http://www.moravian.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/DogFriendlyPolicy.pdf>

[https://www.amherst.edu/offices/human\\_resources/policies/petpolicy](https://www.amherst.edu/offices/human_resources/policies/petpolicy)