

Faculty Senate Meeting
Oct 22 2018

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

Guests: Sarah Comstock, Jake Nelko, Tiffany Davis

I. Call to order

II. Announcement

University counsel candidates visiting this week & next

III. Approval of minutes from Oct 8

approved unanimously without discussion

IV. Updates

ASUPS:

Initiating training for 7 new senators serving in campus housing, off-campus housing, and at large positions. Completing risk assessment for a potential spring cruise hosted by ASUPS Special Events.

Staff Senate

Revisiting policies with HR

V. Reports from Standing committees

Academic standards: they are re-considering pass/fail policy (which students are eligible, including "P" in GPA calculation)

VI. Student conduct code revision; shared with Senate from Division of Student Life

Draft of Student Integrity Code Procedures 10.18.18 --circulated prior to meeting

20 minutes powerpoint presentation by Comstock, Davis, and Nelko

Identifies members of committee, timeline & process. Overview / highlight of changes made between old code and new code. First revision in 20 years.

Presentation followed by Q&A

Question about the part of the process that allows appeal to provost: is this extra step to address students' feelings or is it possible at that point to change the sanctions? The response was that there is a finite number of reasons for this kind of appeal and if the provost upended it, the issue would go back to student conduct.

Questions about the process for disseminating this to students so that they would not see it for the first time when/if they got in trouble. One of the student representatives added that it helps to have it written more accessibly (compared to the previous code); also RAs are an important point of contact. Response from presenters was that next step is an implementation process to make sure that students are more aware.

Question about the change from 5 to 7 before expunging records. 7 years is typical for statute of limitations.

Discussion about how UPS3 (incident of student protest and disciplinary response) shaped discussion about revising the code. The code needed revision already and was slated for revision, but there were discussions among committee members about the UPS3 incident.

Additional set of questions about student activism & intentional disruption and how the policy addresses this issue.

Comstock noted that the discussion went back and forth; 1. Benchmarked how other schools address this question, 2. Developed distinctive language for the University of Puget Sound, 3. Questions about what these policies actually mean for campus activists. Not an easy discussion, but we came to current policy with attention to encouraging student activism and with attention to needs of other students (not impeding others' ability to learn). The effort was to make the process more clear while leaving room for interpretation that attends to the specific context.

Question about policy on freedom of expression, which includes language about protest. This is in development separately (and will be discussed publicly in the next month). Committee members expressed hope that this other policy will complement and mirror the conduct policy.

Point of clarification from the committee: students are allowed to protest.

Question about balancing "legalese" and clarity for students.

Question that returns to issue of student protest: worried about language of "disruption" and "disturbance" without modifiers. Discussion about how this document might refer to freedom of expression policy to clarify the boundaries of student protest.

Discussion about activism on campus vs. elsewhere.

Request not to distribute the policies at this point because it is a draft only.

Freeman : requested to change order of last two items of business. No objections

VII. Finalization of plans for staffing Provost search committee.

There was previous discussion about how many representatives would be appointed by faculty senate and how many would be appointed by president. New proposal adds another faculty person to the committee-- 7.

Questions for discussion: Do we accept that faculty has a slate of 7? That we do not have complete control over which faculty sit on the committee? Should they be selected by election or by appointment? If by election, how do we ensure a diverse slate of appointees?

President Crawford's stated concern is for balanced representation.

Discussion about concerns about the optics of the appointment process.

Feeling of the room is that faculty senate should appoint rather than hold an election.

Draft of call for nominations read & sent out to faculty.

Next steps: The next faculty senate meeting is Nov 5 and the president would like the slate of nominees before the end of the month. So, this will be finalized before the end of the month. Johnson will tabulate the nominees and self-nominees, and then senators will give feedback about that list via email. (to clarify: senators are not voting on the slate of nominees). Sara will work out details of appointment with Isaiah.

IX. Discussion of process for curriculum revision

Discussion of feedback from meeting with President Crawford last week.

Freeman: the next step is to appoint a committee or work group tasked with curriculum revision. The Committee needs to think about academic framework (grad & undergrad) and also issues of workload. There is strong feedback from faculty that the representatives to the committee should be elected. There is also worry that this is a big request to add to faculty service assignments and teaching.

Discussion of how the process will be structured-- there should be avenues for faculty input and proposals for new models. However, the committee/work group/ task force will need to distill and make recommendations.

Discussion of how large the committee should be, and whether there will be non-faculty (especially student representatives) on the the committee

Bartanen: has been charged & can co-chair. Reminder: there's a lot of work to do by May. We will have to be able to use faculty meetings this spring to test proposals.

Discussion of ways to incentivize faculty participation: a course release? (Bartanen: this would require equivalent of pulling 3 FTE out of the spring semester. Timing is difficult for spring semester). Other ways to compensate: Stipend and service release from committee.

Freeman: we will form a task force of 9 faculty (plus non-faculty members) to work on curriculum revision-- to include graduate and undergraduate and issues of faculty workload.

Discussion about process for election/appointment. There is a consistent call for this be elected, but there is also strong need for the committee to be representative. The suggestion was to organize the nomination process with attention to constituencies to be represented. The faculty will be elected (discussion about process). Send out call for nominations when the call for provost selection closes-- on Friday. However, it's more important to be right than fast.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather White