

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, February 20, 2012
McCormack Room, Collins Library

Senators Present: Fred Hamel, Marcus Luther, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Keith Ward, Kriszta Kotsis, Elise Richman, Ross Singleton, Gareth Barkin, Steven Neshyba, Bill Barry, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Sue Hannaford, Leslie Saucedo

Guests present: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

- I. Minutes of February 6, 2012 meeting were approved with edits submitted via email prior to today's meeting.
- II. Announcements
 - a. There is a Daedalus talk tonight.
- III. Special Orders
 - a. Hamel wondered if the Faculty Senate ad hoc benefits committee would want to issue a response to the work shared by the Benefits Task Force (BenTF). Neshyba said that the ad hoc committee does not yet wish to be dissolved. Bartanen reminded everyone that February 24th is the end of the comment period, so the ad committee would not be able to talk to the Senate before then. Barry asked if it's possible to get the comment period extended given the fact that if we do not invite the committee to the Senate, we might miss the opportunity to hear a recommendation or get feedback. Barry is concerned in particular with the "donut hole" group of students and believes it would be nice to see that issue redressed. Hamel wondered how informed people were of how significant a change to the benefits package the BenTF's recommendation constitutes. Neshyba noted that although the recommendation is due to President Thomas on March 1st, Cabinet won't be formulating their recommendation that soon. To Neshyba, the question was whether or not the ad hoc task force would want to influence the BenTF or the Cabinet; considering that we would be asking the BenTF to do the Senate a favor by allowing it to weigh in after February 24th, it was decided that the Senate would defer to the preferences of that committee. The Senate will meet on Monday, February 27th, to have a conversation with the Senate ad hoc benefits committee in order to get the members' perspective on the contents of the recent report.
- IV. Endorsement of Nominee for Honorary Degree. M (Hannaford)/S/P to endorse the nominee.
- V. Election Guidelines

- a. M (MacBain)/S/P to approve with minor changes the election guidelines document.
 - b. Neshyba brought up the issue of faculty leaves in order to establish that we will want at least nine people on the ballot for Senator so that we can have five elected people and four to slide in as substitutes for Hannaford (1 year), Saucedo (1 year), Singleton (spring), and Kotsis (spring).
- VI. Liaison reports
- a. Barkin has been talking to Amy Ryken, Chair of the Committee on Diversity (CoD). The committee wants to make sure that the campus community participates in the Climate Survey. They have asked that Senate members encourage their students and colleagues to participate. Also, they have been collecting faculty narratives related to diversity issues that arise in the classroom; they use these narratives at the New Faculty Orientation and other venues. They welcome contributions from senators. Barkin also relayed news of an issue the CoD is facing now: the senate charges asked the CoD to collaborate with the Curriculum Committee (CC) on introducing a diversity component into core graduation requirement. The CC does not have time to work on the project this year, but the CoD would like to pursue it. An area of uncertainty right now is how the CoD is to proceed if the CC will not be able to participate this year. The CoD also has a subcommittee working on gender issues on Cascade. People must choose “male” or “female” and sometimes select matching icons. The CoD is working with Students Services and Technology Services to add “Transgender” and “Unidentified” to the options.
 - b. Barry recently sent an email to senators about language for the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). As an update he said that the Senate might take up the matter and pass the new language rather than send it back to the ASC, depending on what the ASC wants to do. Hamel asked how communications between the Senate and the ASC have been, and Barry reported that he, Sarah Moore, and Paula Wilson agree that in this case it is advised for the ASC to approve the Senate-authored language rather than for the Senate to “send back for tinkering” ASC-authored language. Barry also informed the Senate about some recent ASC policy work: the ASC has been working with the Office of Institutional Research to consider a policy that would result in the automatic dismissal of students who earn a GPA lower than 1.0 in the first semester of their first year. These students experience a 100% failure rate, and Student Affairs is concerned about the energy expended on trying to “save” these students, when the result of these efforts is student failure. Under this policy, the student could return after a semester and could also petition, but the default assumption would be dismissal. This is a policy that hasn’t been passed but is coming. Segawa said that the policy started in the Retention Task Force (RTF). He said that about a dozen students on average each fall are in this category. He added that the policy would serve, too, to address the question of whether or not we allow a student and her/his family to invest more money in the Puget Sound experience when we know that the

student will not succeed. Neshyba asked if the policy would apply to transfer students. Barry replied that the ASC is currently analyzing the trend among transfers in order to see how broadly the policy would apply.

- c. Neshyba announced that the Senate still doesn't have a liaison for the Student Life Committee (SLC). Segawa reported that the SLC is doing well and agreed to perform the function of liaison for the rest of the academic year. Segawa said that this week the SLC will take up the charge regarding academic integrity.

VII. Report from the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on Faculty Governance Practices

- a. Ward reported that the members of the SEC (Neshyba, Ward, and MacBain) imagine the Senate Handbook to combine both original and existing materials and to include at least six areas: 1) a calendar; 2) an explanation of what a senator does; 3) the roles and responsibilities of officers and liaisons; 4) the election guide; 5) policies and procedures (e.g., the 30-day clock; the vetting of charges); and 6) reports to trustees from the previous years as a way to provide context for incoming Senate Chairs. MacBain added that the SEC had talked about making the handbook accessible through an additional link on the University webpage devoted to committee membership and minutes. Ward said that we could also use the SoundNet site.
 - i. Singleton suggested that there be the item "What the Senate does" to define the role the Senate plays in faculty governance.
 - ii. Neshyba indicated that before composing the handbook, we should identify its audience: people standing for election? people who have been elected to the senate? Senators generally agreed that the imagined reader would be someone nominated for or elected to/serving on the Senate. It was generally agreed, too, that parts of the handbook (e.g., the calendar) would be updated each year, while others (e.g., roles and responsibilities) would not have to be. Because the handbook would not be considered a governing document, noted Luther, changes would not have to be approved. Neshyba suggested syncing the updates with the creation of the Dean's calendar, which Bartanen said is done in mid-August.
 - iii. Hamel wondered to what extent the handbook's authors will draw from the By-Laws. Ward said that they would draw from the By-Laws where they could and then add to the document operating assumptions not spelled out in the By-Laws or else simple practices of the Senate. For example, said Ward, last semester we talked about what to do when a committee creates its own charge.
 - iv. It was decided that the SEC would draft the handbook and then share it with the Senate for feedback.
- b. Another item the SEC discussed was the appointment of a Senate parliamentarian; members decided that a parliamentarian is not needed for the Senate but agreed that one may be needed at Faculty meetings. Neshyba explained that it's helpful for the Chair of the Faculty Senate to be familiar

with Sturgis. He suggested that we could establish a convention by which the outgoing chair of the Faculty Senate could be asked to pick up the job of the parliamentarian for the Faculty meetings. For this person will have already had to “bone up” on parliamentary procedure. Chances are good that the person would wish to stay active in the campus community, too. Neshyba agreed that the outgoing Vice Chair could also be asked and added that it would be up to the Faculty to decide whom to appoint, but the Senate would be performing a useful service for the faculty by putting up some names for consideration.

- i. Saucedo asked what the history is behind having a parliamentarian and using Sturgis. She asked if the By-Laws ordain these practices, and Senators confirmed that parliamentary procedure is mandated by the By-Laws. Bartanen suggested that the Senate handbook reflect that Sturgis’s rules are the rules followed by the Senate and include a one-page user’s guide to Sturgis. The suggestion met with general agreement.
- ii. Singleton spoke in support of the SEC’s thinking on the issue of a Senate parliamentarian because the Senate Chair should be operating according to and under the rules of parliamentary procedure. Neshyba added that the Senate is a small enough body that it has always been possible to deal with issues pertaining to procedure. Hamel said that it is incumbent upon Senators to be familiar enough with Sturgis to issue corrections should the Chair misstep. MacBain said that the job would mean a lot of work for the outgoing Senate Chair, who will also be serving on the Budget Task Force.
- iii. The Senate took up the subject of the Faculty parliamentarian, for the conversation would serve as a frame for a discussion of the full faculty. Hamel asked what the merits would be of having a more open nomination process; he was concerned that we were limiting the pool, and Barry shared his concern. Barry added that the position ought to count for service for some period of time—more than a year or two. Hannaford said that the Senate may not know what the Faculty want in a parliamentarian: someone to maintain order? someone to ensure equity? She said that when we ask people to nominate and vote for a parliamentarian, the Senate may be looking for someone familiar for procedure, but the Faculty may wish to ensure that they get heard. We ought not to formalize the procedure too much. Barry said that he sees the parliamentarian as someone who will adjudicate disputes that arise during a meeting, someone whom the faculty and administration trust to adjudicate. Bartanen said that a parliamentarian could also assist faculty members working to bring a motion before the Faculty. Neshyba thought the person could also allow people to issue comments in the proper order. Kotsis observed that the position sounded big and echoed a suggestion from a prior meeting that it be framed as a service position. Kotsis suggested a 3-year appointment. Though Ward and Barry preferred that the

position be held for 5 or 6 years, Neshyba felt that it was problematic to make the assignment more than 3 years because of the timetable of our current service system.

- iv. M (Ward)/S/P: The Senate recommends to the Faculty the establishment of a parliamentarian.
 - 1. It was generally agreed that the position would be a three-year appointment, with the possibility for reappointment.
 - 2. Barry asked if the position would be approved by the deans and the SEC according to the procedure of determining service appointments. Singleton noted that senators are not appointed, so the parliamentarian would not have to be, either. Neshyba expressed an interested in keeping this issue separate from the motion. Barry suggested that we could add a parenthetical, “(elected by or appointed by),” to this motion if we wanted to amend it. About the question of electing a parliamentarian, Barry opined that the one factor that would make an election problematic is that one needs to know Sturgis in order to be a parliamentarian (whereas in order to be elected Senator one does not).
 - 3. Bartanen observed that we were not all that far from having written a job description. She said it would be strong of the Senate to take this job description to the Faculty. It could suggest directly who might or might not be nominated—that is, what the expectations of the job would be. Hannaford said that the best person might actually be a consultant, someone not on the faculty at all. MacBain concurred, but Bartanen said that “it would be odd to go from ‘zero’ to having a hired person do this” and that she would feel “quite pressed” to hire a parliamentarian at this time.
 - 4. The motion passed.
- v. M (Bartanen)/S/P that the SEC draft a job description for the Faculty parliamentarian.
 - 1. Barry said that he wished to avoid a By-law change, to which Hamel replied and senators generally agreed that no change would be necessary.
 - 2. Bartanen said that to determine what a parliamentarian ought to do, we should read what Sturgis says a parliamentarian does.
 - 3. Hamel said that it would make sense for the Senate to come in on the issue of whether an election or appointment were preferable. Barkin added that the Senate could even present some “clean” options.
 - 4. Singleton reminded senators that we had not yet clarified by which channel the appointment would be made. Neshyba replied that it might be “putting the cart before the horse” to talk about implementation before the Faculty decide whether

or not they want a parliamentarian. Barry asked that as Neshyba introduces the motion to the full faculty he lay out two options—by election or by appointment—for discussion.

VIII. Adjournment

- a. The meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain

Secretary of the Faculty Senate