

## **Senate Meeting: December 3, 2012**

### **Present:**

Elise Richman, Amy Spivey, Nila Wiese, Kristine Bartanen, Amy Odegard, Kelli Delaney, Kathryn Ginsberg, Alisa Kessel, Zaixin Hong, Brad Dillman, Ross Singleton, Brendan Lanctot, Maria Sampen, Kriszta Kotsis; **visitors:** Liz Collins, Jess Yarborough, David Oksner, Marta Palmquist Cady, Amy Ryken.

### **Call to order:**

Chairman Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

### **Announcements:**

Kessel reminded those present that the end of the semester party at the Faculty Club will take place on December 7, 4-7 p.m. She urged members to bring non-member faculty or staff colleagues with them and noted that non-members can attend as Kessel's guests.

Bartanen reminded the Senate that those who have attended the presentations by the candidates for the position of Chief Diversity Officer should provide their feedback by Thursday, December 6, 2012.

Kotsis announced that several projects with the participation of Puget Sound faculty have been funded through the NW5C Collaborative Inquiry Projects fund; these include the Visual Culture Colloquium (with UPS Art faculty participating); Environmental Science Workshop (with Kena Fox-Dobbs); Gender Studies Faculty Consortium; Neuroscience and Behavior Group; Sustainable NW Food Systems Summer Program (with Emelie Peine); Writing and Learning Peer Tutor Colloquium (with Julie Nelson-Christoph).

Bartanen noted that more information will be forthcoming about the funded projects to the faculty.

Chair Dillman thanked Singleton, who will be retiring as of January, 2013, for his services to the Faculty Senate and to Puget Sound and characterized him as a "voice of reason."

### **Approval of minutes 11/19/2012:**

M/S/P to accept the minutes with some minor revisions.

### **Updates from liaisons:**

Sampen reported that the UEC discussed the promotion of UEC awards; chair of the UEC contacted Julie Nelson-Christoph to include UEC award recipients in the end of the year celebration of faculty authors. UEC has also been in contact with Sarah Stall and Barbara Weist to identify ways to make UEC news more visible to the campus community. The UEC will present Dean Bartanen a proposal authored by Ben Tromly and already approved by the committee for a new Faculty Scholarship Award (one for junior and one for senior faculty) that would recognize faculty scholarship, and the committee will recommend that the terms "faculty scholarship" should be used in the name of this award. Odegard wondered whether this was a monetary award or just recognition. Dean Bartanen noted that she has not yet received the proposal therefore she is not able to answer questions about it.

Hong reported that Amy Ryken, chair of the Diversity Committee had sent him an e-mail regarding the proposal about trans-gender health benefits, which he will present when we discuss this agenda item.

Lanctot reported that the Academic Standards Committee received a survey conducted amongst chairs and program directors about the possible changes to the course schedule. The most important findings include: 25 see the potential changing of the schedule as positive, while 13 see it as not positive; the survey indicates that there is a need for more two-day-a-week times slots; there is a general sense that courses are sufficiently spread out throughout the week and that there are enough three-day-a-week and four-day-a-week courses. There are different views on whether there is a problem with courses overlapping with co-curricular activities. The survey indicates that the teaching schedules do not result in faculty members not being on campus enough during the week. Faculty members experience difficulties in finding the right classrooms for their teaching needs at the right time slots. The ASC is also discussing the bereavement policy and Chair Johnson requested input about it from the Senate.

Spivey reported that the Curriculum Committee has discussed new policies for the freshman seminars and has approved most of these policies; Spivey provided a copy of the new policies (see Appendix I). She highlighted some of the policy changes. E.g. no. 10: currently transfer students can only take transfer freshman seminars in the fall, but the new policy allows transfer students to take any freshman seminar in the fall. Transfer students had limited choices in fall freshman seminars and were segregated from the rest of the community by having to take transfer seminars; the new policy addresses these concerns. No. 4 suggests that students must pass SSI1 before they can take SSI2. No. 2 indicates that most SSI1s will be offered in the fall and most SSI2s will be offered in the spring (with a few offered out of sequence each semester.) Discussion of no. 17 was tabled but will be taken up again; this policy stipulates that more experienced faculty (e.g. tenure line, not visiting faculty) should teach off-cycle (or out of sequence) seminars because these seminars have the potential of including "a group of more challenging students."

Sampen reported that the UEC is examining the participation of students in the evaluation of faculty grants and the selection of the Register Lecturer. The committee agreed that students should not serve in these capacities because of issues of confidentiality and that this guideline should be recommended to future UECs. Kessel reminded the senate that we have discussed this topic before and concluded that the Register materials were not confidential. Sampen noted that the committee was concerned about the fact that the Register materials may include FAC letters and that this may not be appropriate for students to review. Sampen will follow up with the UEC about this topic. Dillman wondered whether this guideline was approved as a motion or was just part of a discussion. Sampen indicated that the issue around student participation appears to have been discussed via e-mail by members of the committee but she was unsure what we can conclude about the nature of the discussion. Dillman and Kessel reminded members of the Senate that when we discussed this topic earlier in the semester (when we were drafting charges to the UEC), the senate concluded that it was not appropriate to exclude students from the evaluation of faculty grants and from the selection of the Register Lecturer. Sampen noted that the question of student participation in these processes came up as an item in the UEC's Year End Report; the senate deliberated on this topic and decided not to charge the committee with this item; she further suggested that the senate may need to step in here and provide clarification

to the committee. Dillman noted that the 30-day clock is now ticking with regard to this item and that the senate will need to take up discussion of this topic at the first meeting. As the UEC minutes containing discussion of this topic date to November 26, we need to keep this in mind for the 30 day clock. Bartanen reminded the senate that the 30-day clock only includes working days when classes are in session therefore the senate should have adequate time to respond to this.

Singleton asked Spivey regarding her report about the Curriculum Committee's new policies. He wondered about no. 13, which addresses sequencing. Spivey noted that the intent of this policy is to make it clear how two versions of the same seminar differ in content and approach based on whether they are taught in the spring or fall, since there are different learning objectives for the fall and spring seminars. She noted that some instructors could submit two courses which have the same content and only differ in assignments that emphasize the different learning objectives of the fall and spring versions of the rubric; or instructors could cover the same topic in a continuing sequence in the two seminars where the second course builds on the first; or someone could propose two completely different seminars for fall and spring. Bartanen emphasized that the intent of this policy is to ask instructors to identify how the first semester and second semester versions of a seminar address the learning objectives of the rubric and therefore it makes sense to ask instructors to address this in a single document.

Kotsis reported that the LMIS committee has been discussing the new Intellectual Property Policy of the university. This policy differs from the previous policy in that the previous policy covered everyone (faculty, students, and staff) as employees of the university; the problem with this is that when someone is covered as an employee, the university may automatically own the work. The new policy no longer considers faculty members as employees. The committee discussed ways in which the new policy should be brought to the attention of the faculty and talked about making sure that the policy is easily available on the website. The committee also discussed streamlining already existing documents on the website to make sure that they do not contradict the new policy. The committee discussed topics they will address in the spring: FERPA, special collections and archives of the library, the role of the library in helping with first year seminars, and examining the possibility of moving to an online administration of course evaluation surveys.

#### **Honorary degree recommendations:**

In closed session the senate deliberated about the candidates for honorary degree and commencement speakers. Dean Bartanen presented the candidates after briefly outlining the make-up of the committee on honorary degrees and commencement speaker, which includes members from all constituencies of the university (2 faculty members, 2 alumni, 2 trustees, 2 students, the Dean of the University, and a representative from the president's office). She presented six candidates for the endorsement of the senate which the senate approved unanimously.

#### **Discussion of trans-gender health benefits (part I, this discussion transpired before Chair Ryken was able to join the senate):**

Chair Dillman noted that we have received documents addressing the topic of trans-gender benefits from Chair Ryken of the Committee on Diversity (see Appendix 2, 3); these documents included the pricing for the benefit (dated Nov. 26, '12) and the action of the committee (dated Nov. 19, '12) regarding the proposal about transition service which states: "In support of the Diversity Strategic Plan, the University of Puget Sound will include health care benefits for employees covering treatment related to gender identity disorder and gender dysphoria. These benefits will include sexual reassignment surgery, hormone treatments, and related counseling services." The Committee on Diversity discussed the proposal on November 19, 2012 and endorsed it with 8 ayes and 1 abstention. After endorsing the proposal, the Committee on Diversity received the actual pricing on the benefit, which was much higher than initial estimates suggested (see Chair Ryken's note about this to Chair Dillman and Liaison Hong dated November 29, as Appendix 3).

Chair Ryken sent a message to Liaison Hong prior to the senate meeting asking Liaison Hong to present it to the senate. Hong read the message: "I'm writing to share with you my perspective on this. My hope would be that the Senate would support the idea of including the benefit in principle--asking that each year when HR negotiates for our health benefits that they inquire about the costs and possible tradeoffs of adding the benefit. I'm acutely aware that the cost constraints the university is facing are substantial and that the estimated cost by Premera is very high (which is a big disappointment; based on the estimates we had been given). The goal is to make this issue part of the yearly conversation, so that it is always considered among all the other coverage that HR explores."

Dillman asked whether we were asked to endorse a specific proposal or the general idea. Bartanen noted that we can endorse a recommendation but the Board of Trustees will make the final decision about the benefit. She noted that Ryken's message sounds like that even if we are frightened away by the projection of costs, we should still endorse the proposal in principle. This would mean that we would ask that the trans-gender benefit coverage would be explored in the benefits negotiation process. Spivey asked whether the cost projection would impact everyone covered by the health benefits across campus, to which the answer was yes. Singleton suggested that Ryken may not want us to vote on the proposal since the cost analysis was received after the proposal had been passed and therefore the committee may not want to present the current proposal which was voted on when all information was not yet available. He further suggested that we could ask the Committee on Diversity to deliberate on the new information as it impacts their proposal and send us a new proposal. Wiese noted that it is possible that the committee wishes us not to endorse the specific prices suggested in the pricing document but rather to endorse the proposal that the trans-gender benefit would be considered as part of our benefits package. Singleton suggested that the Committee on Diversity should define more clearly what it is that they wish the senate to endorse. Spivey suggested the possibility of tabling the discussion until a representative of the committee is able to come and talk to the senate. Kessel noted that we could endorse the proposal in principle but ask the committee to rework the proposal based on the new pricing information since it is clear that members of the committee were shocked to see the actual pricing; she also underscored that the timeline is significant to consider: the committee voted on the proposal before the final pricing was received. Spivey also noted that it is important to consider that the committee did not have a chance to consider the new pricing as it related to the proposal. Dillman suggested that we should table this discussion given the lack of clarity. Kessel suggested that we should invite the committee to send a new proposal that is more complete. Lanctot noted that there appear to be two issues with regard to the proposal on trans-gender health benefit, namely 1) a financial issue that has to do with the actual, surprisingly high cost of the benefit (which would impact everyone on campus) and 2) the philosophical commitment to support the benefit (e.g. supporting in principle). Sampen suggested that we could perhaps endorse that the trans-gender benefit would be included in

the negotiation about health benefits, but also thought that it is important to find out more about the specific details of the issue. Bartanen noted that we need to find out what the impact of the senate's endorsement would be; how would this impact the benefit as a whole. Lanctot asked a procedural question: if the senate endorses the proposal, where would it go from there? Kessel said that we could send the endorsement to HR. Bartanen clarified that benefit decisions go from HR to Budget Task Force to President to Board of Trustees. Dillman noted that our endorsement would not be binding for any of these entities. Hong noted that discussing the issue would be important because it would keep it alive, which would make an impact. Singleton suggested that we should send the proposal back to the committee and have them re-consider it under the changed circumstances; he suggested that we should not vote on this with the information that we have right now.

### **Discussion of senate handbook and priorities for next semester:**

Dillman brought the discussion to the topic of developing the senate handbook and priorities for next semester. Kessel noted that in the minutes from our last meeting there is a list of priorities already about some of the topics to be included in the handbook: e.g. specifications to committee chairs about the format of the final report; detailed information about timelines; more information about the Board of Trustees for faculty representatives. Kessel also noted that we may want to address questions about faculty-trustee relations. Wiese suggested that we have three topics to consider here: 1) procedural issues, 2) trustee related questions, 3) spring elections and committee assignments. Odegard asked what the procedure was last year for working on the handbook. Kotsis and Delaney said that it was divided up into sections, e.g. junior senators worked on the (in)frequently asked questions, others were asked to contribute brief descriptions about specific roles (e.g. staff representative, ex-officio members). Kotsis noted that with the exception of a few notable areas the coverage of the handbook seems fairly complete (additional information is needed for the calendar, the role of student representatives, list of abbreviations, and Jimmy McMichael's office should be specified). Wiese suggested that we should update the handbook to have continuity in the process so that next year there will be a clear sense of how to continue with it in case the senate wishes to add more information to it. Kotsis noted that another area that could be fleshed out is the relations with the trustees since the senate chair makes a report to the trustees. Sampen noted that she did not have much information the first time she served as faculty representative to the Board of Trustees meeting and would have appreciated more information to prepare; it would have been helpful to have information about who the trustees are; what is expected of a faculty representative; how would the faculty representative report back to the faculty. Dillman suggested that he and Sampen will discuss the issue of faculty-trustee relations and will develop ideas to include in the handbook. Singleton noted that under the section entitled "Purpose and Composition of the Faculty Senate" it would be helpful to have a brief discussion of the role of the senate especially as it pertains to its relationship with faculty committees, with particular emphasis on the senate's role of charging and overseeing the faculty committees and the importance of the 30-day clock (which defines the amount of time the senate has to take actions regarding decisions made by the committees.) This led to a general discussion about how to interpret the 30-day clock; the handbook states that "the 30-day clock is interpreted to being (sic) [probably meaning: begin] on the date of any action as recorded in the published minutes of the committee." It was noted that it is not possible to identify when the notes for minutes were published because the minutes usually reflect the date of the meeting but not the publication of the meeting minutes, yet the 30-day clock begins to tick at the point of publication. Dillman noted that we need to work out a process that ensures that the publication date of minutes is included on the published documents. The liaisons should inform the committees when they convene the committees at the beginning of the year that the minutes' publication dates need to be included on the documents; this is also a topic that can be addressed in the handbook.

Ginsberg and Ernst will work on a description of the role of student representatives on the senate with the guidance of Dillman.

Wiese expressed concern that we need to make sure that we have all necessary information to run the spring elections.

Kessel had questions about the Faculty Salary Committee, which is an elected group of faculty members yet is not a committee that is under the oversight of the senate. She wondered why the Faculty Salary Committee does not report to the senate. Does the senate have any role in relation to this committee? Where does this committee fit into our faculty governance? Singleton noted that it is not clear that the Faculty Salary Committee should be a component of faculty governance and suggested that this committee has a mandate that covers different issues than what he believes belong under the umbrella of faculty governance. Kessel wondered whether we should try to codify a relationship with the FSC and establish mutual communication with it. Dillman noted that the Faculty Salary Committee is under the BTF and that the BTF will come and talk to the senate. Delaney noted that the Faculty Salary Committee has already reached its decisions and made its report to the BTF this year, just like the Staff Salary Committee has. However, she noted that the Staff Salary Committee asked for feedback from the Staff Senate regarding their decisions and after the Staff Salary Committee finalized its proposal to the BTF they reported back to the Staff Senate. Spivey wondered whether the Faculty Salary Committee is a sub-committee of the BTF or whether it has an advisory role. Kessel noted that budget issues are important and should be discussed by the senate more extensively; she noted that the senate should facilitate discussion about the budgetary decisions of the university and wondered whether there is a way to do this in a more systematic way than it had been done in the past. Dillman suggested that after we hear from the BTF we can have a more extended discussion of this topic.

Wiese turned the discussion to the question of what constitutes service at the university. She wondered how service is defined. Kessel proposed that we need to be more equitable in distributing service which could entail changing the size of some committees. Richman acknowledged the importance of this topic and wondered whether we could generate a more comprehensive listing of all service work undertaken by faculty members which would reflect how faculty spend their time on service assignments (this list should be more comprehensive than the Faculty Service Assignment sheet, which does not reflect all service undertaken by faculty members.) She believes generating such a list could help us in making service more equitable across the faculty. Wiese said that the current service load seems unfair and it would be helpful to have more information when the Senate Executive Committee and the Dean make service assignments. Sampen noted that the topic of equitable service is likely to be difficult to address because departments have different types of service (e.g. Music has many extensive interdepartmental service requirements); she still believes this is an important topic and there is improvement to be made in making service more equitable. Kessel wondered how we could accomplish this; consolidating information would help; we should try to find out what service faculty members are doing and how much time they spend on service. She also noted that we could try to pair things down by trying to become more efficient. Kotsis also noted that collecting information could only be helpful in this

process. Lanctot warned, however, that if we collect this type of information we need to be aware of the fact that service assignments fluctuate. He also wondered where this information is readily available about individual faculty members' service. Sampen also wondered how this information could be collected and tracked, noting that Music committee work does not appear anywhere in documents outside the department. Dillman wondered if we collect information, should we limit this to standing committee service only. Lanctot cautioned that we will need to move beyond anecdotal evidence and wondered whether there is an assumption that there are some members of the faculty who consistently do less service than others. Kessel noted that as we collect data on service work, this could help with developing efficiencies in our processes by lightening the load and simplifying processes (e.g. cutting out unnecessary letters of recommendation for internal applications for students); she emphasized that the goal is not to make more work but to make it more efficient and more equitable.

**Discussion of trans-gender benefit (part II):**

After Committee on Diversity Chair Ryken joined the senate, the discussion returned to the trans-gender benefit. Hong told Ryken that we would like to send back the proposal to the committee because we felt that the proposal was based on insufficient information. Ryken said she would be happy to take it back to the committee for further discussion and expressed her disappointment about the quoted cost of the benefit. She also underscored that in the past this benefit has not been part of the yearly conversation/negotiation about health benefits conducted by HR; the Committee on Diversity would like to ensure that HR's discussion with Premera every year includes a discussion about the trans-gender benefit. She also said that the committee would like to educate the community about this topic and would like it to be discussed more broadly. She said that the committee could deliberate again and send back their proposal to the senate. Dillman noted that the senate would like clarification on what the committee would like the senate to endorse. Kessel noted that as Lanctot remarked earlier, there are two issues intertwined here: an issue of financial commitment and an issue of philosophical commitment. Ryken noted that in her view the 'in principle' endorsement is important because this is an issue that should be discussed every year regardless of the current cost estimate. She said "I don't want the cost to shut down the conversation." Ryken also brought up that the 'in principal' endorsement would be important to have sooner rather than later because HR will be negotiating the health benefits with Premera in January 2013 for 2014, and it would be helpful to have the senate's endorsement for that. The possibility was discussed that if the Committee on Diversity could deliberate on the proposal regarding trans-gender benefits before the term comes to end, the senate could vote about its endorsement via e-mail.

Respectfully submitted by Kriszta Kotsis