

Faculty Senate  
McCormick Room, Collins Library  
Minutes of the October 23, 2017 meeting

**Present:**

Gwynne Brown, Anna Coy, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Jung Kim, Sunil Kukreja, Rachael Laitila, Lynda Livingston, Pierre Ly, Tiffany MacBain, Sarah Walling-Bell, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Paula Wilson

**Guests:** Bill Haltom

**1. The meeting was called to order at 12:00pm**

Kessel thanked members for reviewing the minutes.

**2. Announcements** none

**3. M/S/P to approve the minutes of October 2, 2017 (as amended)**

There was brief discussion about how the minutes should reflect the Senate's will about students' taking minutes in meetings of standing committees. There was unanimous agreement that *students should not take minutes*. The minutes of 10/2/17 were amended to reflect this agreement, now reading: "Students who serve as representatives for standing committees should neither be asked nor permitted to take minutes at faculty-designated meetings."

**4. Updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate**

**ASUPS:**

Walling-Bell reported that ASUPS has had elections, and now has five new senators. Most of these new senators are freshmen who appear very interested in their new roles. The newly revised ASUPS team will be planning a retreat soon.

ASUPS members also recently talked to Sarah Comstock about student integrity code revisions. This code has not been revised for over 20 years. Participants expect that the revision process will take about two years.

Walling-Bell reported the following upcoming events:

- 1) Alok Vaid-Menon on November 4th [facebook event](#).
- 2) Peyton Head lecture "Moving America Forward in the Age of Trump" [facebook event](#).

**Staff Senate:**

Anna Coy reported that the staff senate is "keeping on keeping on."

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

Jacobson reported that the Curriculum Committee now requires all proposals for new core and KNOW courses to include the core objectives in the syllabus. These objectives could either be integrated into the course objectives or copied verbatim from the core language. The CC has not indicated how or if this will

impact courses already approved as core and KNOW. Jacobson stressed that the CC sees students as the audience for this change.

Kessel reported that she has had several colleagues opine that the application for junior sabbaticals is much more onerous than that for tenured sabbaticals, requiring multiple letters of recommendation and therefore significant amounts of department chairs' time, and that she had sent an email to Derek Buescher, the chair of UEC, to ask whether the UEC also thought this was a problem. Kukreja noted that the dean's office reviews sabbatical applications (as well as those for Lantz fellowships, Lantz enhancements, and summer funding), so the UEC cannot address sabbatical application revisions. Kessel offered to follow up with the dean's office about these concerns and but would also encourage the UEC to consider streamlining any internal applications processes, if it deems such streamlining appropriate.

### **6. Discussion of proposed revision to standing charges for IRB**

Ramakrishnan shared a proposed revision to the standing charges for the Institutional Review Board. The revision removes responsibility for ethical decisions for animals from IRB, since the IRB is organized to deal with research on humans. (There is another federally regulated committee, the IACUC, that is responsible for overseeing the ethical treatment of animals.)

There will be a first reading of the revisions at the November 1, 2017 faculty meeting. Wilson noted that there was still a mention of animals in section 2.1; this was removed.

### **7. Discussion of options for items #6 and #7 of proposed educational goals**

Kessel opened a discussion of options for revision of the university's educational goals. She had previously sent senators an e-mail detailing the feedback she received after our last faculty meeting, which informed our discussion. (Commenting on the feedback, she reported being heartened by the faculty's active engagement: "wordsmithing means people care.")

Faculty feedback involved goal #6 and a newly conceived item #7. The Senate curated input from faculty regarding these goals, in order to create a list of alternatives from which faculty may choose. The Senate worked to develop an efficacious procedure for managing the upcoming faculty discussion.

Kessel asserted that "this is one of those moments when procedure is important to facilitate conversation." She and the right majestic parliamentarian, William Haltom (on hand to consult) consequently reviewed some parliamentary considerations:

- ◆ There is currently no motion on the floor to continue discussing as it was tabled.
- ◆ The faculty can make a motion to talk about same language we had before, or
- ◆ The faculty can make a motion to affirm the seemingly popular approach of having both a #6 and a #7.

Kessell reminded us that the following option is on the floor:

**a personal concept of justice and a commitment to live in accordance with that concept,**

a #7 variant. She also noted that the only option for which anyone has advocated (with the exception of one person who liked a #6/#7 hybrid: Informed awareness of self and others, and a commitment to make a positive impact on the world) is

**an informed, personal concept of justice and a commitment to ethical social action.**

With this background in hand, we first considered the big picture: the educational goals describe what we want students to be exposed to over the course of their Puget Sound educations. No single department is expected to fulfill all of the educational goals. Revisiting the goals is a valuable exercise. Thoughtful revision may improve people's perceptions of their own interactions with the core curriculum, and may help inform our curriculum assessments.

Following acknowledgement of the big picture, a lengthy discussion of the details ensued. Some of the ideas discussed during examination of our options included:

- ◆ The KNOW creators thought a lot about this type of work.
- ◆ We may not have asked students to share their thoughts. Our student representatives promised to consider the issues and give us any feedback they may have.
- ◆ The “personal conception” language is a philosophical construction.
  - OPTION C: A personal conception of justice and a commitment to live in accordance to it.
  - OPTION D: A personal conception of justice and a commitment to make a positive impact on the world.
- ◆ Is the “personal” adjective (in options C and D) necessary?
- ◆ “Conception” and “concept” are two different things.
- ◆ Should we distinguish between collective and individual ethical action?
- ◆ Is “commitment” language too prescriptive? Should we have an option that does not include “commitment”?
  - Alternatives: “responsibility”; “respect” (sense of what thoughtful action should be); “appreciation”
- ◆ If we separate #6 and #7, our list contains items that are “short and sweet.” The combined #6/#7 leads to a long sentence, and might muddle the power-dynamics focus of #6 with the justice focus of #7.
- ◆ Should we remove “sustainable living” from option G?
  - OPTION G: Informed awareness of one's agency in the world and a commitment to self-reflection, sustainable living, and ethical behavior.
- ◆ Option G is very “self-oriented.”
- ◆ How can we deal with a call to promote an “aesthetic sense”?

Ultimately, the four options below garnered the most support among Senate members:

#7

- an informed and thoughtful sense of justice and an appreciation for ethical action**
- an informed, personal conception of justice and a commitment to ethical action**

**Combo of 6 AND 7:**

- informed awareness of self, others, justice, and influence in the world;**
- informed awareness of the agency of oneself and others in the world and a commitment to reflection and ethical action.**

Having exhaustively considered many of the best words, we turned our attention to the process before us. Senate members would like to have a straw poll of faculty, to gauge response to the options we have

chosen. Parliamentarian Haltom informed us that we cannot have a straw poll/nonbinding vote in a faculty meeting. However, we can do one electronically. We will therefore do an electronic straw poll asking faculty to rank-order their choices to the four alternatives above. If this results in an overwhelming favorite, then we will take that to the faculty. If two emerge as strong contenders, we will take them both. If possible, we will also use an instant run-off to provide fuller information about the aggregate preference of faculty.

### **8. Other business**

Brown reported that the strategic planning group received about 60 responses from faculty to their survey. In addition, about 20 people came to the related Friday-night dinner. Major themes from the survey included affordability, campus diversity and inclusion, the relationship of liberal arts and career-oriented education, and the desire for the strategic plan to focus more on the education we provide and less on appearances. Much of the discussion at the dinner revolved around ways in which Puget Sound can be made a better place to teach (e.g. support for faculty initiative, work/life balance, teaching load, etc.).

Kessel reported that, given that we are entering the period of budgetary stress engendered by our current low enrollment, faculty have expressed interest in a conversation about budgeting philosophy. One faculty member requested, as an agenda item for faculty meetings, that President Crawford address faculty concerns and to clarify what “shared sacrifice” looks like in Crawford era. Having President Crawford address faculty questions could both inform us of his perspective and reduce some faculty members’ sense of budget-process opacity. Kessel asked the Faculty Senate whether it would be a good idea to have another meeting in November to discuss this (since President Crawford cannot come to the remaining fall semester meeting, or the February meeting, which would push the conversation to March at the earliest)? Would people come? If so, should we talk about enrollment or the budget, or both?

Anna Coy noted that 11/8 is the staff senate meeting. The benefits fair is also that day (from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m.) Kessel thus proposed 11/15 for the added faculty meeting, promising no prepared presentations.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm

Minutes prepared by Lynda Livingston

Respectfully submitted,  
Pierre Ly  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendices:  
IRB proposed amendment to standing charges  
Educational goals options

## I. Institutional Review Board.

1. The Board shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio) and no fewer than four appointed members of the faculty. Members may be added or chosen so that the composition of the committee is in compliance with current federal regulations.
2. The duties of the Institutional Review Board shall be:
  1. To apply the University's policies on the protection of human and animal subjects to the board's review of faculty, student, and staff proposals for research involving human ~~and animal~~ subjects and to proposals from persons outside the University planning research involving University employees or students.
  2. To carry primary responsibility for ensuring that the University's policies and procedures and its *Protection of Human Subjects* ~~and *Protection of Animal Subjects*~~ documents are consistent with the will of the University and that they comply with regulatory requirements governing the protection of human ~~and animal~~ subjects in research.
  3. To establish definitions, procedures, and dates for the review of research involving human ~~or animal~~ subjects.
  4. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Dear colleagues,

I've heard back from several of you with ideas about how to revised the seventh educational goal. By way of review, here's where we were when we tabled discussion at the October faculty meeting:

*The faculty has selected the following goals to emphasize in the undergraduate curriculum:*

*A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to*

1. think critically;
2. communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
3. develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

*and will have developed*

4. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
5. solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing;
6. informed awareness of self, others, and influence in the world; and
7. a personal concept of justice and an understanding of ways to act on it.

At issue is #7. Or maybe #6 and #7.

After the meeting, I sent an email with these suggestions (generated during the faculty meeting), along with an invitation to share other ideas once you were able to give it some thought. (FYI: The one that is emboldened is the amendment that is on the floor.)

- "informed and thoughtful sense of justice"
- "a sense of one's responsibility for action"
- **"a personal concept of justice and a commitment to live in accordance with that concept"**
- "a commitment to ethical social action"
- "an informed, personal concept of justice and a commitment to ethical social action."

After my email to the faculty, some colleagues wrote to tell me that they liked this recommendation: "an informed, personal concept of justice and a commitment to ethical social action."

I received a few other alternatives.

FOR EDUCATIONAL GOAL #6

OPTION A: Informed appreciation of self and others in similar and different communities [proposed with option G]

OPTION B: An informed awareness of self, others, justice, and one's place in the world.

FOR EDUCATIONAL GOAL #7:

OPTION C: A personal conception of justice and a commitment to live in accordance to it.

OPTION D: A personal conception of justice and a commitment to make a positive impact on the world.

OPTION E: A sense of justice and a commitment to make a positive impact on the world.

OPTION F: A sense of justice and a commitment to ethical action.

OPTION G: Informed awareness of one's agency in the world and a commitment to self-reflection, sustainable living, and ethical behavior. [proposed with option A]

A COMBINATION OF 6 & 7:

OPTION H: Informed awareness of self and others, and a commitment to make a positive impact on the world.

I encourage us all to give this more thought and to share our thoughts with others (maybe over coffee with a colleague! maybe with one of your faculty senators! maybe via this listserv!). The Faculty Senate will consider these options (and any responses we receive) at our October 23 meeting. *You are—as always—welcome to attend the meeting and to participate in the discussion.* Our aim will be to narrow the list to 2 or 3 options. I'll share those recommendations at the November faculty meeting (remember, too, that we will not be limited to those options).

On a separate note—that is, unrelated to #6 or #7—one colleague wrote that he hoped we would also consider whether we should include in these goals some language about the role of promoting an aesthetic sense.

I apologize if I've missed an email from you (I got quite a few and am not sure I've tracked them all down!). If I have missed yours, please let me know and I'll be happy to distribute your ideas to the listserv if you'd rather not do so.

And thanks, all, for your continued engagement on this important question about our educational aspirations for our students.

Kind regards,

Alisa Kessel  
Faculty Senate Chair

#### Additional feedback since the posting on facultygovernance

- 1) I think it is important to consider that the student/or students who posted the social media content that Kris referred to at the beginning of last meeting. Could be said to have met this goal (even with the word still as “willingness”): a personal concept of justice and an understanding of ways to act on it. My point—it might not be a “personal concept” that is aspired to.
- 2) Here is a more general consideration about this process: Regardless of what language is finally adopted (and I'm not advocating for/against anything in particular here), it will have some bearing on how we are evaluated as a university by any outside evaluation process, as well as at the departmental and individual faculty review levels.....So, in other words (from Dr. Paranoia-Unintended Consequences) I would suggest that some thought be put into how this official public statement of our educational policy may be interpreted and acted on in the future.
- 3) Apologies if this has already been discussed, but it occurs to me that shouldn't there be something in here about critical reading (as well as critical thinking)? Or something about critical interpretation of data (if reading is too text-oriented)? Or all of his? "To think, read, and interpret data critically." I

just feel the need for more substance in the "think critically" part, or something more aimed at what we do here (we analyze data and texts).

- 4) I am currently in favor of this one: "an informed, personal concept of justice and a commitment to ethical social action."
- 5) Option H seems the most sensible to me.