Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, April 2, 2012
McCormack Room, Collins Library

Senators Present: Steven Neshyba (Chair), Gareth Barkin, Leslie Saucedo, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Keith Ward, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Kelli Delaney, Kriszta Kotsis, Ross Singleton, Elise Richman, Mike Segawa.

Guests Present: None.

I. Minutes of 3-5-12 and 3-19-12 adopted w/minor changes.

II. Announcements:

> Saucedo asked that Steven send a reminder about the Lowrie Award nominees.
>
> MacBain announced that elections will begin tomorrow, April 3, and will close on the following Monday night. She acknowledged the important contributions of Neshyba and Emily Mullins (in OIR) in helping her to facilitate the elections.
>
> Neshyba announced that he has received responses from six standing committees and offered tentative dates for their presentations of year-end reports to the Senate. Agendas for the final three Senate meetings of the year will indicate the dates of presentation for each committee.
>
> Also before the last Senate meeting of this year, the 2012-13 Senate will need to have a straw poll to determine the new officers. At an upcoming meeting we will finish our business at 5:00 and then have the new Senate meet so that they can complete this business.

III. Special Orders: None.

IV. Liaison reports:

> Saucedo: The Professional Standards Committee (PSC) is working on an interpretation of the Faculty Code, chapter III, section iv, for the term "colleague" as used specific to evaluations is unclear. The PSC wants to clarify who is to be considered a "colleague" in these situations.
>
> Barry: The Academic Standards Committee is still working on language for the policy about students whose 1st-semester freshman GPA is below 1.0.

V. Faculty Governance Procedure:

> Kotsis distributed a draft of the "Infrequently Asked Questions" portion of the Senate handbook. (Kotsis, Barkin, Richman, and Saucedo created the document.) Kotsis suggested that the document also be "boiled down" for new faculty members attending Orientation. Such boiling down should be relatively easy, for, as Barkin said, those who drafted the document erred on the side of inclusion. A few edits

were suggested during the meeting. Barkin will put this document into the shared doc on SoundNet, where everyone can access and edit the (In)FAQs.

Ward said that by the end of the term we will have a working document that the new Senate can discuss at the Fall retreat and continue to build upon thereafter.

Neshyba reviewed the Kessel/MacBain document (see Attachment 1) and determined that the only outstanding issues under the "Faculty Senate" category are #s 6, 9, and 12.

M (Barry)/S/W to drop #9. Speaking against the motion, MacBain said that one impetus behind #9 was to give voice to faculty's experiences with admitted students in the classroom. Also speaking against the motion, Ward said that he would like to have the chance to discuss the issue. He can imagine having some informal liaising between Admissions and faculty. Barry withdrew the motion because there was some interest in discussing Item 9.

Barkin asked about #6: What was the intent behind it? MacBain explained that #6 speaks to former senator Lisa Johnson's observation that the Faculty Senate does not function as a true senate, for "senators" are not representatives of particular constituencies. MacBain also drew upon remarks made by Alisa Kessel when she introduced the report at the senate meeting of 12-5-11, namely that "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)." Bartanen said that undertaking Item #6 would require an amendment to the By-Laws.

Ward said that because these three topic are substantial, he does not see the current senate taking them on this year.

Neshyba presented the senate with 3 options: to toss up the issues to Faculty, to create a senate ad hoc committee to consider them, or to "kick" the items to the next Senate.

M/(MacBain)/S/P to pass along these three items to the next Senate as items of interest. Speaking in support of the motion, MacBain suggested that these are issues to begin rather than to end a term with; she added that it seems premature to bring the issues to the full faculty. Singleton concurred. Barry said that we could form ad hoc committees right now. Speaking against the motion, Saucedo said that perhaps we could deal with #12 before the end of the year because the Faculty has been talking about these issues. Barry said he was concerned that each of the three items is really big and will require a lot of labor. He said that if we could create structural momentum through ad hoc committees, it might begin the move forward in dealing with the three items. The work could be lost if we simply recommend in the minutes that the next Senate take it up. Bartanen said that to reconstitute the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) as suggested in #12 would require the FSC to meet

with the Senate: the Senate cannot take singular action with respect to the FSC because the FSC is not a committee of the Senate. Singleton said that it seems likely that Neshyba would meet with the new senate chair and convey to him what the issues are that are being discussed and why. Singleton was not as concerned as Barry was about this project getting lost. The motion passed.

M (Ward)/S/W: A parliamentarian should be appointed or elected from the faculty.

Ward said that this is the motion that was approved (as amended) by the faculty. The faculty does have an interest in our developing a parliamentarian for faculty meetings and to assist faculty in preparing items for faculty meetings. Bartanen added that at the faculty meeting, the discussion surrounding the motion was a discussion of concept.

Ward said that he, Hamel, and MacBain indicated that before the senate discussed the idea further, the senate wanted to find out if the faculty are interested in considering what would be involved in appointing or electing a parliamentarian. Barry asked if we are to work out a mechanism. Ward said that we need to define the parliamentarian's role and to decide whether or not the person should be elected or appointed. Bartanen added that it seems that we need an implementation motion: something like, that a subcommittee of the Senate be formed to prepare a proposal to the Faculty. Neshyba requested another motion.

Barry suggested that a way to organize the discussion is around "appointment" or "election." Ward said that the other would be how we define the parliamentarian. Singleton said he thinks we need to talk about what process we're going to use to arrive at the proposal. Barry said he thinks we should appoint rather than elect because the person has to have a certain level of expertise to do the job. MacBain said she thinks it would make sense to discuss the job description, what Singleton had earlier called "the role as conceived") of the parliamentarian before we discuss how a parliamentarian should be elected or appointed. Ward said that according to Sturgis, the parliamentarian is someone who consults, not someone who rules.

M (Barry)/S/P: that Ward draft formal language for a subsequent meeting, to define the position along the two main lines: to help package ideas for faculty preparing material to present at faculty meetings and to consult regarding points of order. The motion passed.

M (Saucedo)/S/P: During the usual process of service appointments, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the deans should appoint the parliamentarian. Speaking in support of the motion, Saucedo said that the SEC and the deans would be in the best position to know which faculty member would be a good fit for the position. Singleton said that it seems to be important to clarify the length of the term and also the place this fits in within the category of service. Neshyba said that the normal appointment to a standing committee is 3 years. Barry offered that it might be better for the Senate to make the appointment, for it would balance out the fact that an administrator (the Academic Dean) runs the summer meeting.   Kotsis

asked if we would solicit people to nominate themselves. Ward said that, having participated in these meetings for 3 summers, he has observed that they really flow but that sometimes it's a challenge akin to putting together a jigsaw puzzle. He doesn't get a sense of administrative influence: it's a very open and conciliatory discussion, and there's a desire to find consensus. Speaking in support of the motion, MacBain said that it would make sense to keep the appointment in the hands of the SEC and deans because of the organizational challenge presented by the committee appointments process: How would the Senate know whom to pull from which committee and how that shift would affect committee structures and numbers? Speaking in support of the motion, Singleton suggested that when we all fill out our service forms, we could have on it "parliamentarian," which would assist in that process. In response to Ward's comment, Barry reminded the Senate that we must consider not this administration's leadership of "open and conciliatory discussion" but rather any given administration and what it might do. In response to MacBain's point, Barry said that we are talking about appointing only one person, a manageable number, and that the Faculty Senate could also make this appointment in consultation with the administration. This solution would still allow the faculty to be the driving force behind the appointment. The motion carried with 6 for, 3 against, and 2 abstaining.

Bartanen said that she and the Senate Chair are about to send out the solicitation for committee preferences and wondered if the parliamentarian position should be mentioned on the solicitation. Neshyba said that we should hold off on mentioning the parliamentarian until the faculty weighs in.

VI. The meeting adjourned at 5:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachment 1

Report on the 2011 AAUP Shared Governance Conference and Workshops
Alisa Kessel and Tiffany Aldrich MacBain

Submitted to the Faculty Senate, 21 November 2011

From November 12-14, 2011 we 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 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. <u>We (MacBain and Kessel) would like to emphasize that our aim is to present, not to endorse, these practices, in the interest of sharing the information we obtained at the conference</u>.

<u>Faculty Senate</u>
- ▪ 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.

- o   Reassert the significance of the secretarial positions on standing committees (emphasizing the importance of keeping thorough minutes).
- ⬚   Maintain a web page that includes goals, current charges for standing committees, Senate meeting agendas, and the handbook.
  - o   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."
- ⬚   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.
- ⬚   Designate a parliamentarian for Senate meetings.
- ⬚   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.
- ⬚   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.
- ⬚   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 <u>and to hold positions on faculty senates</u>" (emphasis added).)
- ⬚   Create a Senate Election Committee to administer and track elections.
- ⬚   Specify a formal relation between the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate.

Faculty

- ⬚   Require that faculty meetings be led or co-chaired by an elected officer of the faculty.
- ⬚   Require a quorum at faculty meetings, or utilize online voting on key measures.
- ⬚   Designate a parliamentarian for faculty meetings.
- ⬚   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.
- ⬚   Exercise the right and responsibility to participate in shared governance.
- ⬚   Form an AAUP chapter on campus.

Administration

- ⬚   Identify 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.
- ⬚   Broaden faculty awareness of and participation in processes of budgeting and expenditure.
  - o   Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed faculty representation on the Benefits Task Force.
  - o   Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed faculty representation on the Budget Task Force (or formalize the system of presidential appointment of faculty members to the Budget Task Force).

- 	Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed faculty representation in the President's Cabinet. (Such a person would join other cabinet members in offering counsel and recommendations to the President.)
- 	Create a standing committee on Admissions.
- 	Generate "good faith" efforts to respond to faculty concerns about increasing bureaucratic demands.

Trustees
- 	Request faculty-elected or Senate-appointed faculty representation on the Board of Trustees.
- 	Expand the presence of faculty and faculty emeriti on the Board of Trustees, particularly faculty and faculty emeriti of the University of Puget Sound.
- 	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)