

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 6, 2020
Minutes

Senators Present: Heather Bailey, Bill Beardsley, Laura Behling, Sara Freeman (Chair), Megan Gessel (Vice Chair), Alison Tracy Hale, Mushawn Knowles (ASUPS), Jairo Hoyos, Chris Kendall (Secretary), Jung Kim, Julia Looper, Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Sarah Moore, Heather White.

Visitors Present: Jennifer Hastings, David Andresen, Greg Johnson, Suzanne Holland, Kontogeorgopoulos, Uchenna Baker, Kristen Strehle, Mark Martin, Alyce DeMarais, Stuart Smithers

Faculty Senate Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Announcements
- III. Approval of Minutes from the March 23, 2020 Meeting
- IV. Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees
- V. Discussion of Report from *Ad Hoc* Committee on Non–Tenure-Track Faculty
- VI. Review of Code: Senate’s Rights and Responsibilities in the Case of Financial Exigency
- VII. Discussion of Code Motion for Timeline of Changes Related to Promotion Language
- VII. Other Business
- VIII. Adjournment

I. Call to Order:

Freeman called the Senate to order at 12:01 pm. This “virtual” meeting was conducted on the “Google Meet” platform.

II. Announcements

No announcements

III. Approval of Minutes from the March 23, 2020 Meeting

M/S/P the minutes of 04/06/2020 as amended.

IV. Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees

IEC	Monaco: no updates
IRB	Moore sent an update to clarify that IRB is leaving it to individual researchers to review their protocols; IRB is not reviewing protocols one at a time to see if they should be revised or halted. (Appendix 1)
COD	Tracy Hale: no updates
CC	Looper sent an email (Appendix 2) Freeman updated about (Email, March 25, 26, 27) the move toward creating an online common period for the MPH program proposal (2 week), shared a message of the public health proposal, and proposed a video conference that will have the MPH working group speak to the faculty at large.
FAC	Gessel: update by email (Appendix 3)
ASC	MacBain: updated about the language on academic standing and sanctions. The ASC approved the permanent change. ASC also voted on a temporary change of sanctions for Spring and Summer 2020: no new academic sanctions for any student at the Puget Sound. After the ASC posted their minutes, the 30-day clock for the Senate will begin. These changes of the ASC were included in a document that was shared with the Senate by Chris Kendall (Appendix 4)
SLC	Kendall: no updates
LMIS	Freeman update by email (Appendix 5)
CTF	Kim: update on discussions about Spring and Summer work schedule.
UEC	Hoyos: no updates
PSC	Beardsley: no updates

Elections Update: Chris updated on the election of Senators, FAC members, FSC members, Secretary, and Senate Chair.

V. Discussion of Report from *Ad Hoc* Committee on Non–Tenure-Track Faculty

Freeman asked the Senate for an endorsement to send the Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Non–Tenure-Track Faculty to Provost Behling. Gessel stated endorsement, but also voiced a concern regarding the need to review the “Buff Document” and Department evaluation guidelines regarding service and advising when evaluating Term Position Faculty. Senators Beardsley and Freeman discussed the best timing to submit this report to the Provost. Provost Behling reiterated the historical commitment of the University towards resisting the casualization of faculty labor. But, due to the current Covid 19 scenario, the Provost also affirmed that the report needed careful evaluation, and inquired which committee would be the proper one to ask for any necessary clarifications on the content of the report. Because the Office of the Provost is

unable to review promptly the report, due to the current pandemic, Freeman stated that the Senate could follow up on the Provost's response in the next academic year.

MacBain added that the Senate endorsement of this report would signal support to contingent faculty members that will be affected by the revision of this policy. Tracy Hale continued by stating that the passing of this report to the Provost could possibly add value, especially during the difficult financial decisions that the University will have to make in the following months. Gessel stated a possible conflict between new hires and the contract renewals of current non-tenure line Faculty. White stated that the discussion of the report must recognize not only the time non-tenured faculty members have worked at this university, but also the lack of job protection they face in a scenario of Financial Exigency. DeMarais, Gessel, White, and Johnson stated the importance of moving the report forward to the Provost. The Senate and the *ad hoc* committee agreed on the importance of having the input of this committee when the Provost reviews the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.

MacBain and Monaco: Motion to endorse and forward the Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty to the Provost Behling. Gessel: Second the motion.

Votes Results in Chatlog:

William Beardsley: aye

Professor White: Y

Jung Kim: aye

Julia Looper: yea

Sarah Moore: aye

Alison Tracy Hale: yea

Andrew Monaco: Yea

Tiffany MacBain: yea

Mushawn Knowles: yay

Megan Gessel: Yay!

Heather Bailey: yea

Jairo Hoyos Galvis: yes

Laura Behling: abstain

Uchenna Baker: A

Prof. Kendall: abstain

The Senate approved via Chat box to endorse and forward the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty to Provost Behling.

VI. Review of Code: Senate's Rights and Responsibilities in the Case of Financial Exigency

Freeman asked Senators: Are there any aspects of the code itself that we would like to discuss in order to better understand? Megan asked for clarification on Chapter 5, Section 2c, Numeral 6 of the code: "If the university dismisses faculty for financial exigency, it shall not at the same time renew non-tenured appointments or make new appointments except in extraordinary circumstances where serious distortion of the academic program would otherwise result." Freeman stated that the code establishes procedures, but the code also gives space for negotiation. Tracy Hale asked for clarification on the request of President Crawford towards the Senate. Provost Behling clarified that President Crawford is requesting for principles that would inform the budget processes of the University.

Some values that emerged in the Senate meeting were:

- Access to Proper Information/Transparency: Tracy Hale, Hoyos
- Commitment to offering a curriculum that represents our full liberal arts values, across disciplines: Tracy Hale
- Preservation of the Senate integrity: Beardsley, Kendall, Freeman
- Preservation of Faculty governance: Beardsley, Kendall
- Shared Sacrifice/ the problem with uneven burden: Moore, Freeman

Following Jacobson's proposal at the last Faculty Meeting, the Senate discussed the creation of a faculty-centered committee to collaborate on budget and operational decisions. Gessel and Monaco examined the possible relationship between the BTF, the FSC, and this faculty-centered committee. Tracy Hale suggested that this committee should not be constrained to 'stay in its lane', and should not be excluded from budgeting specific procedures. Senators emphasized that the new committee should consult with the Budget Task Force, the Faculty Salary Committee (particularly, regarding Faculty Compensation Philosophy Policies), and the Senate. However, this Committee should not be part of any of these committees or the Senate.

Regarding "Financial Exigency", Provost Behling explained that "Financial Exigency" is defined by AAUP as an: "imminent financial crisis which threatens the survival of the institution as a whole," and is an option that educational institutions have when dealing with extreme financial crises. However, "tough financial" periods do not fall under Financial Exigency. As clarified by Provost Behling, Financial Exigency is a severe option that could have negative ramifications for the University, since Institutions that declare Financial Exigency are perceived as non-viable. Provost Behling also stated that the code establishes: 1) how to declare Financial Exigency, 2) who is involved in the process, and 3) what would happen if tenured faculty are dismissed because of Financial Exigency. Provost explained that Financial Exigency is not the same

process regularly followed by the BTF. Hoyos asked about the situation of tenure-track faculty. Freeman clarified that the protections set by the code during Financial Exigency only apply to tenured faculty. The Financial Exigency code follows the hierarchical structure of the University in its policy-making process. Finally, Strehle requested that the Senate or the University should be more proactive in reaching out to non-tenured faculty and more direct in discussing their participation in the University's response towards the current financial situation.

Finally, Freeman will send a response to President Crawford about the Dual Track Budget Planning and the Guiding Values for the Budgeting Process. (**Appendix 6**)

VII. Discussion of Code Motion for Timeline of Changes Related to Promotion Language

The Senate agreed to withdraw the motion for promotion language code change implementation from the full faculty meeting agenda and stop the motion passed on Jan. 22 from going to the Board, thereby, as executive body of the Faculty, stopping any change of the code this year, and clearing the slate. The Senate agreed to wait for parliamentary advice on what the Senate needed to do procedurally about that to make it final. A vote will be taken on April 27. Future Senates may take up changes to code language about promotion anew when they are able.

VII. Other Business

The Senate discussed the procedures for reviewing End of the Year reports by the Standing Committee.

Knowles communicated that the 20-21 ASUPS Executive team will be inaugurated on April 17th. They will introduce the new president of ASUPS Nicole Carino in the April 27th Senate meeting.

The Faculty Senate congratulated Mushawn Knowles for their service as ASUPS President.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 1:30

Sincerely,
Jairo Hoyos
Virtual note-taker

Appendix 1

Edited for clarity (removing signature lines, etc.)

From: Wendell M Nakamura <wnakamura@pugetsound.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 1:18 PM
To: Sarah Moore <smoore@pugetsound.edu>
Cc: Mike B Pohl <mpohl@pugetsound.edu>
Subject: Re: IRB question from Senate

Hi Sarah,

Yes, in an effort to not overwhelm the IRB members' workload, the email was sent to all researchers whose protocols have been approved during this academic year, regardless of their approach to data collection. It's up to the individual researchers to contact the IRB for changes to their protocol. We trust that they comply with university restrictions.

Vyer best,
Wendell

From: Sarah Moore
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 1:14 PM
To: Wendell M Nakamura
Subject: RE: IRB question from Senate

Hi Wendell,

Thanks for the clarification. During the Senate meeting Laura said something about asking the IRB to review all of the individual protocols, but perhaps I've misunderstood her comments?

In any event, can you affirm that you've simply notified all researchers and have left it to them to contact the IRB, as needed, via the process you've explained below?

Best,
Sarah

From: Wendell M Nakamura <wnakamura@pugetsound.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 1:11 PM
To: Sarah Moore <smoore@pugetsound.edu>; Mike B Pohl <mpohl@pugetsound.edu>

Subject: Re: IRB question from Senate

Hi Sarah,

Thank you for asking about the temporary change in our procedures for already approved protocols. Student researchers and their faculty advisors (as well as faculty researchers) have all been notified by email and it's also posted to the IRB [website](#). If researchers can and want to change how they collect data (shifting from in-person to virtual), they need to submit a modification form outlining their new methods. If they want to postpone their data collection until restrictions are lifted, but doing so is hampered by the 1-year approval, they can submit a renewal form. If their postponement is unhampered by the 1-year approval, they don't have to do anything. If they cannot modify their data collection and cannot postpone, they will have to terminate their research. All of this is spelled out in the email and on the IRB webpage. We feel that it's incumbent on researchers to determine the best approach for their circumstance. All changes will be reviewed by the Board member who initially reviewed their protocol. The review procedure will continue to follow our standard three-day response for review.

Please let us know if you have additional concerns.

Very best,

Wendell

From: Sarah Moore
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Wendell M Nakamura; Mike B Pohl
Cc: Sarah Moore
Subject: IRB question from Senate

Hi Wendell and Mike,

I hope you both are during this very strange and uncertain time.

Regarding the IRB email that went out to faculty and students, Laura Behling mentioned that she spoke to you about going through all of the individual protocols to see which studies might, in fact, be okay to continue (since they were, for example, collecting data virtually).

I wondered, if people wanted to modify their procedures so that they could convert from in-person to virtual data collection (it might be possible with some studies, for example, survey

data collection), are you planning to offer some advice or stream-lined way to approve these changes?

Happy to discuss any ideas/ thoughts you have on how to move forward.

Best,

Sarah

Appendix 2

Update from the CC: The CC continues to meet. I have heard from them specifically about clarification on their charge to develop a rubric and learning objectives for the language requirement as well as on their charge to evaluate possible new language, that was proposed last year, for question number 6 of the departmental self-study. This is the question about engaging diversity. In the case of the language requirement, the chair was seeking to understand if the learning objectives should be related to language or cultural competence. After input from Sara Freeman and Julie Christoph, outlining the previous discussions about this charge, the expectation about what the CC was asked to do has been clarified. In the case of question number 6, the working group was asking for context to this charge. That was provided and the charge was brought back to the full committee for consideration.

Appendix 3

FAC liaison notes-Megan Gessel

I attended the Feb 26th meeting of the FAC. The FAC discussed the reasons why the committee would like a liaison and brought up an assortment of other things that have come up that the FAC would perhaps like some senate action on.

- The FAC has missed M/S/P changes that the PSC has enacted (similar to the issues we've seen with the ASC). In using the buff document for its work, the FAC has found that some of the interpretations are contradictory with other parts of the buff document or problematic in other ways. Moreover, in addition to the already existing issues, the FAC also suspects that the lack of communication may likely lead to problems in the future.
 - The FAC hopes that the new liaison and the senate can help facilitate better communication between the groups.
 - There was also an interest in having the Senate look at the FAC end-of-the year when writing PSC charges.
- With regard to the buff document, the FAC thought that the buff document would benefit with a regularly scheduled review (e.g. every four years). This would serve to help in clarifying language and improving its organization. The FAC also would appreciate that any changes in the document to be dated, so that it would know when the new language came into effect. The FAC is aware that these changes are in the minutes, but they don't know where to look.
- The members of the FAC feel uncomfortable sharing their opinions at some faculty meetings when topics related to evaluation are being discussed (like the language for promotion to full). The members don't want other faculty members to feel that the FAC members' comments reflect issues with files under review. However, they clearly have a valuable opinion that is informed by their work evaluating. One potential role of a faculty senate representative would be to help share the FAC viewpoint through a somewhat indirect voice, so that the opinions of those serving on the FAC could be shared.
 - Related to this, there was a strong feeling that the newly crafted language does not actually help clarify what distinguished service means. For example, if a professor does their assigned service work and nothing more, is that significant? If they simply chair their assigned committee is that significant? What about service roles that include a release unit? Since those assignments have less teaching responsibilities, are they actually significant? What does the university want to consider as significant service? Supposedly, when distinguished service was added to the promotion language, it was at a time of regional to national transition and service was highlighted as a way to show that faculty were invested in Puget

Sound. Overall, the FAC was hoping for a little bit more clarity, both for the evaluators and also for candidates who are going through the process of promotion.

- There was also a question about the promotion process, in general. Overall, the FAC would like to see the senate to convene a discussion about the principle of promotion at Puget Sound. Perhaps if the senate could have this discussion among themselves as elected representatives of the faculty, then the Senate could report on the results of their discussion to help frame the discussion among the larger faculty. Is promotion something that one earns or is it a box to check on the way up the pay scale? There is no clear language or sense of what the purpose of promotion is. How do we want our system of promotion to advance the University? How do we incentivize it?
- There is also a question of what it means to be a distinguished professor. There is currently no language to guide the committee in this decision. The FAC generally understand it to be distinguished in scholarly work.
- There was great concern about the lack of nominees for the FAC. In the last year, we had the minimum number of nominees. The FAC would like the Senate to perhaps help identify and encourage nominees to the FAC. This year they need 4 names.
- The FAC expressed some concern with the training of head officers. The FAC would like to remind head officers to read the promotion language and the 3rd year letters ahead of evaluation. I suggested that perhaps there could be a spring workshop for all head officers. Head officers could read the 3rd year letters and promotion language ahead of time. Then the workshop could be two parts: the first part with just the head officers and the FAC and then the candidates could join them for discussion. This idea was very well received.

Appendix 4

Academic Standing and Sanctions for Undergraduate Students

Good Academic Standing is defined as a 2.00 minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) for undergraduate students. Academic standing and sanctions for graduate students are included in the Graduate Programs and Degrees section of the Bulletin. The Academic Standards Committee reviews the record for each student eligible for a sanction based on the requirements below. A student's cumulative and term GPA includes grades earned at Puget Sound.

First Semester Students

These sanctions will apply only at the end of an incoming student's first term at Puget Sound

End of current term GPA is below 2.00 but 1.00 or higher	Probation
End of current term GPA is below 1.00	1-semester suspension

For Continuing Students

End of current term GPA is below 2.00 but cumulative is 2.00 or above	Probation
Cumulative GPA is below 2.00 but current term GPA is 2.00 or above	Probation
End of current term GPA is below 2.00 AND cumulative GPA is below 2.00	1-semester suspension
End of current term GPA is below 2.00 AND previous term GPA is below 2.00 but cumulative GPA is 2.00 or above	1-semester suspension
End of current term GPA is below 2.00 AND previous term GPA is below 2.00 AND cumulative GPA is below 2.00	1-year suspension

Academic Probation

When placed on Academic Probation, a student is expected to develop a plan for academic improvement with their academic advisor. Academic Probation is not recorded on the student's academic transcript.

Academic Suspension

A student is required to petition the academic standards committee for reinstatement after the end of the suspension period. The petition must include a reasonable plan for academic improvement if reinstated.

Students eligible for a 1-semester suspension may petition for immediate reinstatement. Students eligible for a 1-year suspension may petition for reinstatement after one semester. In both cases, the petition must include a compelling argument and plan for academic improvement in order to be considered by the Academic Standards Committee.

An Academic Suspension is recorded on a student's academic transcript.

Appendix 5

Update on LMIS, late spring 2020

From Janet Marcavage;

The next thing that had been on the LMIS agenda was a presentation by Peggy Burge regarding Digital Initiatives in the library. We are handling this in an asynchronous manner now. Jane Carlin has graciously put together a presentation on library digital collections which is in our LMIS google share drive. I've added a google doc where committee members can add comments and questions about library digital collections. Next to come is a review of the year's work and LMIS Report to the Senate.

Other brief items to note:

- The Best Practices document currently sits on the desk of legal counsel.
- We have adjusted the language (in accord with our charges) regarding committee membership, so that with the Senate, it can be brought as a motion to the faculty meeting floor.
- More to come in our report about Elsevier and journal bundling, the cost of textbooks for students, digital streaming and costs, etc.

Appendix 6

Dear Isiaah

After discussion with the Senate at our April 6 meeting, consideration of conversation on the Faculty Governance list, and my own reflection, I am providing this input. I have shared a draft of this with Senate, and Senators have generously helped me shape these points.

The most important point to emerge from Senate discussion **is a call to create a faculty-centered campus wide committee** to collaborate in the off-cycle budget and operational decisions that may need to be made so we can think holistically (though rapidly) about our programs and their future after the worst of physical distancing ends. There was strong interest in this committee being separate from but in consultation with the Budget Task Force, the Faculty Salary Committee, and the Senate. This because there is a desire for a committee that will not be constrained to ‘stay in its lane’ and speak only to one aspect of our functioning so that creative solutions can emerge that might cross the usual lines within our labor structures, such as job sharing, temporary redistributions, or other type of work re-imaginings that would allow us to come together to protect the liberal arts nature of the institution, as well as the livelihood of as many people in our community as possible.

A separate committee also makes a bit of space for the Senate to preserve its integrity related to its role (as outlined in the Code) when or if tough decisions are made that may have a negative impact on some of our colleagues. The Senate must retain its role of speaking against the decisions if needed and giving voice to any colleagues who feel they have been harmed.

In response to your two questions in your original email:

Question: From the faculty/staff perspective, would you recommend any revisions, additions or removals from the summary of guiding principles as we consider dual-track planning and any necessary budget reductions in this very challenging and uncertain environment? Would you prioritize certain principles over others?

Among the principles listed, I would put absolute and maximum importance on the first two (“Maintain centrality to mission and adherence to Puget Sound’s core values” and “Preserve quality of educational experience for students”). I see already in your leadership that these are the lodestars.

I would put next emphasis on “encourage the innovative deployment of resources.” I urge us to “balance the budget with long-term benefits in mind” and I would like to encourage that in adhering to that value we might deemphasize or temporarily take of the list some of the other values. In this situation being too responsive to economic and market conditions may cause us to cut off our nose to spite our face and focusing too much on competitiveness in the higher education market in the short term might cause us to do undue damage to our liberal arts model. Likewise, the forward movement of the strategic plan may need to have a longer timeline and not drive some of the off cycle budget decisions.

As I look at the University’s Core Values, I would rank **Courage**, **Respect** and **Inclusion** as the top three for us to follow while we engage in dual-track planning around the Covid-19 crisis. **Creativity** would come next, alongside **Justice**, especially as regards our treatment of contingent faculty and staff during this period. **Shared sacrifice** comes up as an important value to faculty and this whole community, but with the note that many have felt at previous times when that value has been invoked, such as during the 2008 financial crisis, the sacrifice was not truly shared. It is important that the choices we make are equitable, which means attending to the way the impact of some types of budget decisions do not fall equally on all members of our community.

In the Senate meeting on April 6, the other values to emerge were:

- Transparency
- Access to Proper Information
- Commitment to offering a curriculum that represents our full liberal arts values, across disciplines.

Question: What do you see as the key areas of input needed from faculty and staff leadership to inform our decision-making?

Key areas where input is needed:

- The duration of remote operations and the date for return to in-person operations
- Policies regarding work from home and technical access and support
- Changes to any aspect of compensation
- Actions related to the employment of contingent faculty
- Actions related to the retention or layoff of staff members
- The development of any new initiatives or consolidation of existing programs in light of the crisis

There is also strong support among Senate for student input to inform decision-making.

Finally, I will highlight the adaptive, forward-thinking ideas that faculty are putting forth on the Faculty Governance list, especially from Gwynne Brown, Lisa Woods, and David Sousa. There is ample evidence that faculty are ready and willing to help address the impacts of the crisis for

our operations in creative, mutually supportive ways. This strengthens the call for a consultative committee.

Thank you for your partnership and focus during this truly upending public health crisis.

Sara