

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Monday, December 5, 2011**  
**Misner Room, Collins Library**

Senators present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Alisa Kessel, Amy Spivey, Kris Bartanen, Kriszta Kotsis, Keith Ward, Gareth Barkin, Bill Barry, Sue Hannaford, Fred Hamel, Leslie Saucedo, Ross Singleton, Mike Segawa, Steven Neshyba (Chair)

Guests present:

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of November 21, 2011 were approved with minor changes.

Announcements

None

Special Orders

- I. Following up on Singleton's question of 11-21-11, Bartanen announced that photos will be a part of the "People Soft" system introduced via the Optimize Puget Sound component of the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project, so there will be no amendments to Cascade. The 2-year rollout process has started.

Liaison Reports

- I. Spivey indicated that the Committee on Diversity is moving through its charges. Neshyba said he would follow up on appointing instructors to the committee. Bartanen will send the names to Neshyba.
- II. Hamel had a conversation with Barbara Warren from the Curriculum Committee and reviewed the minutes, which, as of 12-5-11, have not been posted since early October. Hamel reports that the committee has continued the discussion about the discrepancy of the length of the semesters; has changed some language in the calendar-setting guidelines with regard to the big question of when fall semester grades should be due; and has a goal of getting the new freshman writing and rhetoric rubric into effect in Fall 2013. The committee members have discussed guidelines for reviewing special interdisciplinary majors and are considering how to go about reviewing these. There is a group that is considering that issue, Working Group 5. The Curriculum Committee also had a discussion about 5-year departmental reviews and has opened the question about the reasons for that cycle. Finally, the committee has formed a joint subcommittee on the issue of summer credit introduced to the Senate by Lisa Ferrari on 11-21-11.

- a. Neshyba raised the issue of the “30-day clock” and whether or not it began ticking on the issue of summer credit on October 7, 2011, the date on which the Curriculum Committee addressed it.
  - i. Barry asked if the expectation around the issue of summer units will be exploratory, and, if so, when would it come back to the Senate for a charge, or would it not? Hamel answered that it will come back to the Senate after the subcommittee formulates options and ideas.
  
- III. Saucedo reported that the Professional Standards Committee has approved some sort of tailored course evaluations for the Music Department. The English Department has revised its procedures document, which the committee has discussed but not yet decided upon. The committee is starting to review the use of course assistants and is collecting data from department chairs on that issue right now.
  
- IV. Barry said that the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) has been discussing the (in)ability of staff to bring accusations of academic dishonesty against students. Nothing has been decided yet by the committee, but the discussion seems to be moving toward having one of the associate deans not typically associated with hearing boards stand in as a surrogate for the faculty member who would ordinarily bring a complaint. The staff member could go to an associate dean and move forward with the complaint in that fashion. This system would keep intact faculty’s right/responsibility to grade students and is the route that the ASC will probably follow.
  - a. Asked Luther: “Will it become a part of the student’s record as it would if reported in the usual way?” Barry answered that he suspects that if there is a complaint brought by a staff person to an associate dean, and if the associate dean believes that a violation has occurred, a report will be filed in the “first offense file” but won’t go to a hearing board. If it goes to a hearing board, it will be a sanction.
  - b. Saucedo asked what would happen if a student were to see another student cheating. Barry said that he doesn’t think that there’s any provision for such a situation in the handbook. Luther said that there is a student conduct system, and that students may report violations online. As a point of clarification, Bartanen said that what the ASC is trying to address are situations in which academic dishonesty occurs but there is no faculty member to go through, for example, if someone supplies a false diploma to the Office of the Registrar. Barry said that the big problem arises if a staff member sees academic dishonesty while proctoring an exam and the professor doesn’t want to get involved. Luther said he has always been curious as to why the university never created a proctoring policy.
  
- V. Kotsis read the minutes from the meetings of the Library and Media Information Systems Committee (LMIS) and talked with Jane Carlin. Currently, LMIS members are working on the print management system and as a result are also looking into hiring a copyright clearance center to blanket license for copyright permission. One problem they have encountered is that this service is the same

that funds lawsuits to restrict fair use. Committee members are also assessing Turnitin—is it useful? Is it getting used? Carlin called Kotsis to get clarification on the Senate charge regarding electronic reading devices, and Kotsis provided clarification; Carlin was encouraged. Carlin indicated that she is also trying to get a sense of who is in charge of copyright information here at the university, and where this information is available on the website. She wonders if it would be a good idea to have someone in charge of copyright, for copyright laws and practices are becoming more and more important on campus as we move toward a print management system.

- a. Bartanen said that LMIS is where it lives. Kotsis said she finds it surprising that there isn't one consolidated place and plans to encourage LMIS to consolidate. Ward suggested that Mott Greene could be an important person to involve in that conversation.
- b. Barkin asked if Carlin wants feedback from the Senate on e-readers. Kotsis said no, just clarification.

#### Discussion of Report on AAUW Shared Governance Conference and Workshops

- I. Kessel announced that she would give the report because MacBain would be typing the minutes. (See **Attachment A** for a full outline of Kessel and MacBain's introductory statement. ) Kessel stated the guiding principles of the report. (See **Attachment B** for the statement of guiding principles and for the report in its entirety.)
- II. Kessel and MacBain opened the discussion to questions relevant to the Faculty Senate's consideration of the items in the report.
  - a. Barkin asked if the distribution of items reflects the information MacBain and Kessel received at the conference. Kessel replied that the distribution is a function of the conference, which was focused on what faculty can do to facilitate shared governance.
  - b. Spivey asked how the conference was organized. Kessel explained that certain sessions were workshops, and MacBain said that many of the ideas contained in the report originated not from presenters but from participants. Neither Kessel nor MacBain knew what was involved in the conference organizers' process of selection of presenters.
  - c. Saucedo voiced a question about item 6 under "Faculty Senate," to which Kessel replied that everyone at the conference who spoke about a Senate had representation. Some of them have a member from every department, some from academic divisions, etc. She said that on our campus we could think of this issue in any number of ways and added that on the panel on "openness" that she attended, a junior faculty member said that having a clear pathway for presenting ideas was very important, and it took her a few years to feel out who to talk to. Said Kessel, the idea is that we all know who we can go to—to give people a clear pathway; the model would be something like the U.S. House of Representatives or the U.S. Congress.

- d. Barkin asked about item 7 under “Faculty Senate”: it seems perfectly reasonable to him, but he wonders if it is an issue we face on this campus. MacBain reiterated the report’s introductory caveat that the list is comprehensive; when we begin talking about implementation, items are sure to drop off the list.
  - e. Barry asked where Kessel and MacBain sense that Puget Sound is, as compared to other institutions. Kessel said that in terms of efficacy of faculty we’re probably low; in terms of the structure of governance, we’re in good shape. The structure exists, but the perception on campus may not be that it’s in place. It is certainly the case that faculty are involved in budgeting. At other places, faculty members feel a stronger sense of their involvement in issues.
- III. M (Kessel)/S/P to collectively discuss and prioritize the practices in the “Faculty Senate” section of the document.
- a. Referencing the second paragraph of the report, Singleton asked if Kessel and MacBain could say more about their perception of “a need—and desire—to attend to the health of [the] system” of shared governance at Puget Sound, in order that he might understand whether these proposals are going to address those issues. Kessel replied that when she and MacBain generated the proposal to go to the conference, they noted a few particulars, one of which was a conversation on the faculty governance listserv regarding the question about whether the 3/2 issue should even go to the Senate. MacBain added that, as Faculty Senate Secretary, she has observed that it is difficult to generate interest among faculty in running for certain elected positions. MacBain also cited Bartanen’s decision early in Fall semester to mandate attendance at Faculty Meetings, and President Thomas’s recent remarks about trust at a Faculty Meeting.
  - b. Barry said that he thinks the real substance of this discussion will be around what our priorities are, so he is in favor of moving on so that we can begin to discuss and prioritize. Spivey agreed.
  - c. The motion passed.
- IV. M (Spivey)/S/P that Item 7 be put at the bottom of the list.
- a. Speaking in support of the motion, Spivey observed that since there aren’t that many adjuncts on faculty, requiring adjuncts to serve is problematic.
  - b. Barry made a friendly amendment to drop the item, for putting it on the bottom of the list suggests that it is still a priority.
  - c. Spivey said for the record that she likes the idea that adjuncts can serve on standing committees.
  - d. The motion passed as amended. 1 opposed (Kotsis); 1 abstained (MacBain).
  - e. Barkin said that he is intrigued that Kessel and MacBain had not agreed with each other (as voiced earlier) that some of these strategies were a good fit for the institution. He asked if Kessel and MacBain would share that conversation with the group. MacBain said that she would feel more comfortable not influencing the discussion of the Senate in that way.

- V. M (Ward)/S/P to delete Item #3.
- a. In support of the motion, Ward said that he sees a meeting between the Senate Executive Committee and the chairs of standing committees to be superfluous. He does not see the parallel to a cabinet structure.
  - b. Speaking against the motion, Hannaford said that the way most faculty are involved in governance is through standing committees, that what we do (as our contribution) is to go to our standing committee meetings week after week after week. She thinks that there could be a benefit to getting representatives of those groups in a room together. Speaking as a former committee chair, she is not sure that she shares the assumption that the chair of a standing committee has any particular insight and can see why an annual meeting might be a good idea.
  - c. Speaking in favor of the motion, Hamel said that the idea is appealing on the surface, but he is not clear on what the conversation becomes between the chairs of various committees.
  - d. Speaking in favor of the motion, Kessel said that she thinks it's redundant if we have a strong system of liaisons.
  - e. Saucedo offered the idea that we could ask our liaisons for a midyear report on how the charges are coming along.
  - f. The motion passed.
- VI. M (Barkin)/S/P to give high priority to item 1, concerning the Senate handbook.
- a. Speaking in support of the motion, Barkin said that it's not entirely clear right now what's required and what's expected of senators. A lot of these ideas could be hashed out in the course of creating a handbook. He added that the creation of a handbook would involve a subcommittee.
  - b. Ward said he sees the buff document as a useful comparison. In that regard, he thinks a handbook would be good. He wants to caution that the handbook ought not to reinvent the wheel: we currently have by-laws. MacBain offered as a point of clarification that the handbook would not circulate every fall as the buff document does but would exist in paper and/or online as a resource for senators, prospective senators, and faculty.
  - c. The motion passed. 1 abstention (Hamel).
- VII. Ward introduced a point of information on Item #2 under "Faculty Senate": like mowing a lawn, maintaining a webpage never goes away. He asked that we consider where the webpage would reside and who would be responsible for maintaining it.
- VIII. M (Barry)/S/P to assign a high priority to #11.
- a. In support of the motion, Barry said that he is mainly interested in the efficacy issue—items 1-6 in the "Faculty" section—but this one item in the first ("Senate") category also interests him.
  - b. Kessel offered a friendly amendment, to incorporate #11 into #1. In support of the friendly amendment Kessel said that the handbook would likely designate the different kinds of responsibilities. As long as we agree that it's a good idea to have the kind of "report back" (by the Senate Chair to the

Senate) provided for by #11, it's a good idea to have the practice delineated in the handbook. Friendly amendment accepted.

- c. Hamel asked Bartanen how often she meets with department chairs, to which Bartanen replied, "Monthly." Neshyba said that, as Senate Chair, he has sporadically attended the Dean's meetings with department chairs, but he has never understood what the role of the Senate Chair should be in (and after) those meetings: If the chairs are there, why would the Senate Chair need to disseminate information? Do the department chairs not do so on the departmental level? Spivey responded that she could imagine a couple of roles, for instance, chairs could ask questions of the Senate Chair. She added that she doesn't know how much consistency there is in disseminating information to the departments, and others concurred that this practice may not be widespread.
  - d. The motion passed, as amended.
- IX. M (Saucedo)/S/F to drop Item 5.
- a. Speaking in support of the motion, Saucedo said that she likes the idea but worries that there are sometimes major changes to the minutes, and the day-after summary would not account for those. She also thinks that the Senate meets frequently enough that people don't have to wait long to read the minutes.
  - b. Ward said he worries that the Senate will find themselves in trouble over this, that these updates will begin to be read as the minutes. Because the minutes can be revised, and sometimes substantially, they must remain the only mode of communication about the activities of the Senate.
  - c. Speaking against the motion, MacBain said that the paragraph would not be an exhaustive recounting of Senate conversations but rather a brief summary of the business at hand. She added that there is a substantial lag between a meeting and the posting of the minutes: under the best circumstances, minutes are posted between 2 and 3 weeks after a meeting (given the need for senators to approve the minutes of one meeting at the subsequent meeting; the time allowed for the Secretary to revise and submit the minutes to facultycoms; and the time allowed for facultycoms to approve and distribute the minutes).
  - d. Speaking against the motion, Kessel said that the Senate is regarded at least by some as an ineffectual body and that the Senate should consider doing a little PR. These summaries could remind people that we are doing work. She finds this step to be very important in terms of cultivating an ethos of service on campus. She pointed out that this practice was a recommendation at the conference, but even on another board on which she serves (the docents of the Tacoma Museum of Glass), such blurbs have made a huge difference in people's perceptions of the docents and the work they do.
  - e. Speaking against the motion, Luther said that the ASUPS Senate has begun sending out these summaries; they do it online on a blog. It gets about 100 views a week. ASUPS has found that it increases intrigue. Luther said that

ASUPS provides a case study for the practice working: it's easy and it's really effective.

- f. Barry said that if this were to pass, it would be a good idea not to include senators' names because each person's contribution is part of what we monitor when we review the minutes.
  - g. Neshyba noted that there is nothing to stop anyone from sending out summaries now. What we're really talking about is a normalization of a practice that is already allowed.
  - h. Speaking against the motion, Spivey said that she likes Luther's idea that one could post the minutes AND this little blurb in the same place—so people could have both of these pieces of information in the same location.
  - i. Speaking against the motion, Singleton said that he sees this practice as being in the same vein as the sometime-practice of the Faculty Chair to frame issues for the Faculty Meetings. He added that when one reads the minutes it's sometimes hard to see the forest for the trees.
  - j. The motion failed. 1 supporting vote (Ward). 1 abstention (Saucedo).
- X. M (Barry)/S/P to put #5 on the list of priorities.
- a. The motion passed.
- XI. M (Kessel)/S/Carried over to give Item 12 second priority on the list.
- a. Speaking in favor of the motion, Kessel said that she realizes that there are many complicating factors in the item as it's listed. The question is whether to move forward. It's very important given that there are arrangements in place that allow faculty to participate in these processes. It's centrally important to governance for us to participate in discussions and decision-making about budgeting and expenditure.
  - b. Barry said that he is getting concerned that we're going to be doing a lot of bureaucratic work in the Senate. If we're thinking about efficiency, we should think carefully about this particular one.
  - c. Kessel replied that if there is an area in which we allow ourselves to be overburdened, it's budgeting and expenditure. The distrust that can be felt on our campus is due in part to a perception of a lack of transparency about these items. She believes it's our responsibility as a Senate to make sure that these processes are clear and think that there are other places on the list where we might cut the bureaucratic burden.
  - d. Ward said that it has been the practice that appointments to the Budget Task Force are usually made during the summer. As he understands the issue at hand, there is a desire to formalize a process of representation. He doesn't see this as a transparency issue.
  - e. Kessel explained that the Budget and Benefits Task Forces provide for the flow of information. MacBain said that the issue is one not only of trust but also of flow of information and access to information. Bartanen noted that all of these reports are available online.

- f. Neshyba called the question of whether we want to close discussion of this issue. The vote was not to close discussion. Neshyba said that we will pick up here next time.
- XII. M/S/P to adjourn.
  - a. Meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain  
Faculty Senate Secretary



## Attachment A: Introductory Statement

Faculty Senate

5 December 2011

Report on the Shared Governance Conference and Workshops (AAUP) November 13-15, 2011

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain and Alisa Kessel

### Process for writing the report:

- compiled a list of practices adopted by various institutions--public and private
- consulted with Steven, Keith, and Kris to:
  - provide factual clarification about institutional arrangements
- revised the report to adapt the practices to the Puget Sound model

### Process for discussing the report:

- we'll present the guiding principles (thematic areas) that we have used
- we'll take questions about points of information on the different parts of the document
- as Steven suggested, we'll move to discuss, prioritize, implement, or discard practices in the Faculty Senate section (in particular)

### Rationale for this reporting procedure:

- this is a list of possibilities, not a list of endorsements, and we present all that we heard, in the interest of open dialogue
- that said, neither of us believes everything on this list is a good idea
  - our aim with this discussion is to explain the rationale for all of them--as it was explained to us--separate from a discussion about the merits of each of the practices. (Later we will join you in advocating for what we want and not for what we don't)

### Guiding principles (thematic areas):

#### ***•"Closing the loop" to improve communication and fulfill the promise of representation:***

- Many of the institutional arrangements on campus reflect a commitment to shared governance, but may not exercised by the faculty as effectively as they could be;
- the recommendations here suggest ways to improve pathways for communication between these bodies and the faculty
  - Ex: formal mechanisms for reporting to the faculty and for facilitating faculty participation in decision-making processes before final recommendations are made.

#### ***•Increasing the efficacy of shared governance:***

- Broadly, this report suggests that the goal of revisions to Puget Sound's system of shared governance should aim to improve mechanisms for decision-making and to facilitate information flow across the various governing constituencies on campus (such as between the faculty and the Senate).

#### ***•Building trust:***

- As the report indicates, effective shared governance depends upon the cultivation of mutual trust between the three bodies charged with upholding the core academic mission of Puget Sound: faculty, administration, and trustees

- Ex: creating more opportunities for conversation between trustees and faculty members.
- Trust is cultivated when four principles are upheld: openness, reliability, competence, and benevolence.
- The report assumes the fitness of these principles to guide all that we do in our efforts to improve faculty governance on campus.

## Attachment B: Report

### **Report on the 2011 AAUP Shared Governance Conference and Workshops**

**Alisa Kessel and Tiffany Aldrich MacBain**

Submitted to the Faculty Senate, 2 December 2011

From November 12-14, 2011 we (Kessel and MacBain) attended the American Association for University Professors (AAUP) Shared Governance Conference and Workshops (SGCW) to consider new strategies for improving the quality and increasing the efficacy of shared governance at the University of Puget Sound.

Puget Sound enjoys a collegial and collaborative atmosphere, one that must continue to be cultivated through open, informed, and engaged conversation within and between the three bodies charged with university governance: faculty, administration, and trustees. Yet recent events at Puget Sound indicate a need—and desire—to attend to the health of this system, for any developing distrust among constituencies and “drift” of faculty away from governance can corrupt the system of engagement and collaboration foundational to our community’s shared commitment to liberal arts education. The SGCW confirmed our (MacBain and Kessel’s) impression that a collegial atmosphere can erode, particularly as a college or university struggles to make and manage difficult choices to maintain its core academic mission in times of political and economic austerity.

One panelist at the SGCW aptly attributed the maintenance of **trust** to partners’ cultivation of a mutual sense of **openness, competence, reliability, and benevolence** as they work cooperatively toward shared goals. The emphasis on mutuality strikes us (MacBain and Kessel) as being crucial to maintaining like core values at the University of Puget Sound, for the university’s mission relies upon “a community of learning” to “liberate each person’s fullest intellectual and human potential.” In order to achieve the core academic mission of the university, governance must be shared, and the system of shared governance must be nurtured; as we perform this work, the qualities of openness, competence, reliability, and benevolence might well serve as touchstones for us all.

In service to the Puget Sound mission and its resonance even beyond this campus, we share with you a collection of practices instituted at other universities and colleges (both private and public) to improve communication, transparency, collaboration, and efficacy within and between governing bodies in an institution of higher learning. We (Kessel and MacBain) would like to emphasize that our aim is to present, not to endorse, these practices. We present this report in the interest of sharing the information we obtained at the conference.

#### Faculty Senate

- 1) Create a Senate handbook detailing responsibilities of senators, the executive committee, and liaisons to standing committees; a timeline that indicates the standing business of the Senate (e.g., the period devoted to issuing charges to standing committees; the period devoted to administering elections); a statement of purpose, goals, or guiding principles of the Senate; a statement of best practices for conveying Senate business to the Board of Trustees.
  - Reassert the significance of the secretarial positions on standing committees (emphasizing the importance of keeping thorough minutes).
- 2) Maintain a web page that includes goals, current charges for standing committees, Senate meeting agendas, and the handbook.
  - Request modest (short-term) administrative staff support for the Senate to develop a more comprehensive web page and to scan old reports onto a shared site for a comprehensive history of “case law.”
- 3) Hold “cabinet” meetings (once or twice a year) that include the Senate Executive Committee and the chairs of the standing committees in order to follow up on charges.
- 4) Designate a parliamentarian for Senate meetings.
- 5) Distribute (on facultycoms) one- to two-paragraph summaries of Senate meetings the day after each meeting so that faculty may be informed of progress on agenda items in advance of the posting of the minutes.

- 6) Adopt a scheme of representation whereby some senators have (and are elected by) specific constituencies (e.g., departments, divisions, buildings) and others are elected at-large.
- 7) Include contingent faculty on the Senate. (The November 17, 2011 issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that the AAUP has issued a call “for adjuncts to be allowed to vote for faculty leaders and to hold positions on faculty senates” (emphasis added).)
- 8) Create a Senate Election Committee to administer and track elections.
- 9) Create a standing committee on Admissions.
- 10) Specify a formal relation between the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate.
- 11) Designate a Faculty Senate officer (e.g., the Chair) to represent the Faculty Senate at meetings between the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Department Chairs in order to gather a more comprehensive understanding of administrative concerns and policies and to report these back to the Senate.
- 12) Broaden faculty awareness of and participation in processes of budgeting and expenditure.
  - Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed faculty representation on all relevant ad hoc task forces, such as the Benefits Task Force, and ensure that such representatives report regularly to the Senate or faculty.
  - Pursue avenues for faculty representatives on the Budget Task Force to confer with the Senate or faculty (for feedback and recommendations) throughout the budgeting process.
  - Re-organize the Faculty Salary Committee as a standing committee of the Senate; consider changing the scope of the committee to address compensation, broadly conceived.

#### Faculty

- 1) Require that faculty meetings be led or co-chaired by an elected officer of the faculty.
- 2) Require a quorum at faculty meetings, or utilize online voting on key measures.
- 3) Designate a parliamentarian for faculty meetings.
- 4) Consider ways to cultivate an ethos of service, a shift that may require the reduction of responsibilities in other areas and an increase in the value of certain types of service in the formal evaluation process.
- 5) Exercise the right and responsibility to participate in shared governance.
- 6) Form an AAUP chapter on campus.

#### Administration

- 1) Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed (non-administrative) faculty counsel to the President’s Cabinet in order to broaden avenues for mutual communication between the President, the Cabinet, and the faculty.
- 2) Generate “good faith” efforts to respond to faculty concerns about increasing bureaucratic demands.

#### Trustees

- 1) Require that Senate-appointed faculty members on the Board of Trustees regularly report to the Senate or faculty after each Board meeting.
- 2) Expand the presence of faculty and faculty emeriti on the Board of Trustees, particularly faculty and faculty emeriti of the University of Puget Sound.
- 3) Expand opportunities for faculty and trustees to understand one another’s work and to build relationships.

#### Panels attended

Opening Plenary (Kessel and MacBain)

1A: Making Senates Effective (Kessel and MacBain)

2A: The Role of Faculty Handbooks in Shared Governance (Kessel)

2B: Corporatization v. Shared Governance (MacBain)

3A: Collective Bargaining and Governance (Kessel)

3B: Case Studies in Governance (MacBain)

4C: Case Studies in Governance (MacBain)

5C: Case Studies in Governance (Kessel)

6B: Getting Faculty Involved in Governance (Kessel and MacBain)

7A: What Senates Need to Know about Budgets (Kessel and MacBain)

Closing Plenary (Kessel and MacBain)