

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, August 27, 2018
Minutes

Present: Heather Bailey, Uchenna Baker, Kris Bartanen, Nick Brody, Gwynne Brown, Sara Freeman, Andrew Gardner, Megan Gessel, Alison Tracy Hale, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Chris Kendall, Andrew Monaco, Collin Noble, Sarah Shives, Heather White, Peter Wimberger,

1) Chair Freeman called the meeting to order.

2) Announcements: Jacobson announced that a staged reading of “Building the Wall” will occur Friday at 7:30pm.

3) Confirmation of Vice Chair and Secretary of Senate
M/S/P to confirm Gwynne Brown as Vice Chair and Kristin Johnson as Secretary of Senate

4) **M/S/P** approval of the minutes of May 7, 2018.

5) Updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate: Noble shared that ASUPS continued work on the Student Emergency Fund, planning for orientation, LogJam, and relationship-building this summer. Sarah Shives will be the staff representative for Fall; Heather Bailey will serve in that role for Spring. No other updates from Staff Senate.

6) Discussion of Charges for Standing Committees 2018-2019

During discussion of draft charges for the IEC (International Education Committee) (included below for reference), Brown noted that some of the IEC’s upcoming work warrants collaborating with the Committee on Diversity.

M/S/P following charges (in addition to standing charges) for the IEC:

Charge 1: Complete work from AY 2017-2018, including:

- Finalize the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Brochure and finalizing evaluation criteria for reviewing sexual assault response.
- Develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students. Work with the appropriate offices and groups to implement these changes.

Charge 2: Develop guidelines for faculty who wish to incorporate short-term study abroad programs into their courses.

Charge 3: Continue to examine the causes of the disparity in first-generation and historically underrepresented student participation in study abroad. Review and implement recommendations (2017 IEC Final Report) to reduce that disparity.

Charge 4: Establish criteria for distribution of funds for faculty development of programs and student support (to defray costs of these programs, which do not permit the application of financial aid).

Charge 5: Examine a potential proposal for how study abroad application criteria could apply to Running Start students. (time permitting)

Charge 6: Examine the potential use of Digication e-portfolio software amongst students studying abroad. (time permitting)

During discussion of the draft charges for the IRB (Institutional Review Board) (included below for reference, but not yet passed), Gardner requested clarification regarding first, what problems the IRB has in mind concerning interviewing faculty and staff to date, especially given the challenges students face in going off campus to do research (IRB liaison Gessel noted three main concerns: use of online tools, overusing faculty, repeating work available through the office of institutional research) and second, what are the IRB's concerns regarding online research. Gardner noted these policies apply to federally funded research, yet we use those guidelines for all student research. With respect to charge #4, Noble noted that faculty of color are already overutilized and we need to be mindful of that fact.

IRB DRAFT CHARGES

Charge 1: To formulate a policy on how staff and faculty are recruited and used for sources and interviews (concern regarding overuse of faculty and staff for studies)

Charge 2: develop a policy for online research, including online data collection

Charge 3: make any necessary updates to the Common Rule, the federal policy regarding the protection of human subjects and vulnerable populations

Charge 4: to make sure our IRB are meeting federal guidelines for a representative board

M/S/P the following charges to the CC (Curriculum Committee):

Charge 1: Develop formal guidelines for distinguishing between activity credits and academic credits.

Charge 2: Propose mechanisms for programs and faculty to provide the curriculum committee with feedback to completed core area reviews so as to improve the curriculum.

Charge 3: Consider the Curriculum Committee's role in reviewing course and program proposals, and develop mechanisms for engaging faculty and programs proactively early in the design process.

Charge 4: Complete the review of the standard workflow of the Curriculum Committee to consider how to streamline course approval and fulfill other standing charges related to the review of courses and programs while providing necessary vetting and faculty control of curriculum.

Discussion ensued regarding future potential work in the CC with respect to the Strategic

Plan, the need for attention to admissions cycles in curriculum review work, and (with respect to Charge 3), the benefits of involving the CC earlier in the process of course proposal and development, rather than just as a gate keeper.

7) Vote on Charge to the SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) Task Force

M/S/P to charge the SET Committee with the following tasks:

- * to identify what the faculty values and learns from student feedback about courses.**
- * to recommend an approach to feedback about courses that minimizes bias, corresponds to what we value, and that supports faculty development and advancement.**

Timeline:

Interim report to Faculty Senate by December 2018 with a preliminary recommendation about timelines for achieving committee objectives (with the understanding that the committee will not have completed this work, but will have been able to assess the workload and make recommendations about how long they expect the work to take).

If advised by the SET Committee, the Faculty Senate may request outside consultative support for the committee. The Committee will also require research support from the Office of Institutional Research.

Discussion included the distribution of faculty in this committee while at the same time considering the need to populate Curricular working group for the Strategic Plan, both requiring help from IR: how do we attend well to faculty time & workload, and avoid sending overlapping or redundant tasks sent to IR (Institutional Research)? Note was made that the first phase of some of this work came from the subcommittee of the PSC. We also need to attend how subcommittees like these might be drawn from and then refolded back into standing committees. We also discussed whether the role of SET in professional evaluation needed to be more explicit in the charges, or whether a more open-ended 'what to do' with student feedback is better.

8) Concluding discussion focused on the status of the motion to change the *Faculty Code* to allow phased implementation, for which a second reading is scheduled at the next faculty meeting.

9) Continued discussion of next steps with Strategic Plan:

Chair Freeman outlined the following potential plan for supporting faculty conversations and engagement with the 'Author Your Future' proposal in the Strategic Plan:

1. Conversation with President on Sept. 5, and describe the plan

2. Conversation on faculty governance list, open space for conversation at University Club, conversation at the October 3 Faculty Meeting
3. Simultaneous with item 2: Set up google docs site for faculty visions/descriptions sharing
4. Then, form a working group; have them look at models and create models
5. Then host focus groups of 20, modeled on the Educational Goals focus group process
6. Report out

Discussion ensued regarding whether we can identify who will be on the Working Group so they can be attentive to these events prior to starting their work. 'Is Pathways a done deal' seems to be a recurring question among faculty, as is 'Is the Strategic Plan a mandate or a process?' Assuming the latter, faculty need more information on what that process is.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Johnson
Secretary of the Faculty Senate