

## **Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

**March 11, 2013**

**McCormick Room**

Present – Kris Bartanen, Brad Dillman (chair), Kathryn Ginsberg (student member), Judith Kay, Alisa Kessel, Brendan Lanctot, Amanda Mifflin, Anne Putnam, Maria Sampen, Shirley Skeel (Staff Senate liaison), Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert, and Nila Wiese.

Chair Dillman brought the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

### **I. Announcements**

1. Kris Bartanen announced that two working groups have been formed in order to prepare some materials for presentation to the Board of Trustees. One working group is the “Teaching and Technology Working Group”, and the other is the “Big Ideas Group”. There is more information on the faculty conversations Soundnet site (<https://soundnet.pugetsound.edu/sites/Team/WorkTeams/Dean/SitePages/Home.aspx>).

2. Brad Dillman announced that he and Alisa Kessel would be taking turns as the faculty representative to the ASUPS Senate for the rest of this academic year.

3. Chair Dillman thanked Brian Ernst (in absentia) for his good year of service as ASUPS president and noted that ASUPS elections are currently being held for next year’s officers.

### **II. Minutes of February 25, 2013**

M/S/P to approve the minutes from February 25, with minor revisions.

### **III. Updates from standing committee liaisons**

1. Judith Kay announced that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) recently passed an interpretation of the Faculty Code regarding consensual sexual relationships between staff or faculty members. The main idea is that people need to disclose their relationships when there is a power differential and potential conflict of interest, such as in the case of performance reviews. This interpretation appeared in the posted PSC minutes of February 18 and is included as Appendix A in these minutes.

Some discussion of the “30-day clock” for Senate response to committee action ensued with regard to the PSC’s Code interpretation. Bartanen clarified that once the PSC’s interpretation of the Code is published in the minutes of the Faculty Senate, faculty members have 10 days to appeal the interpretation.

2. Ariela Tubert announced that the Library, Media, and Information Systems committee (LMIS) is behind in posting their minutes to the Web, and that she was working with the committee to address the delay. At a recent meeting, the LMIS heard a report on the PeopleSoft transition project. They also got some numbers regarding PrintGreen that indicated that printing seems to have been reduced since the introduction of PrintGreen, as was hoped. The printing numbers for users with low printing numbers are pretty consistent with what they were before the implementation of PrintGreen, and the users with previously high printing numbers seemed to be doing less printing than before the PrintGreen implementation.

In addition to the above activities, the LMIS committee recently formed a working group related to the university archives. There is a summer research project available for a student to work in the archives, and students are currently applying for that. LMIS has also been discussing possible avenues for library staff to be involved in faculty development efforts related to information literacy (in Prelude, for example). They had two proposals, one of which considered funding for a possible workshop for faculty on information literacy and one to encourage department chairs to schedule meetings related to information literacy once each term.

3. Anne Putnam announced that she had received a note from Institutional Review Board (IRB) chair Garrett Milam about possible upcoming changes in that committee's structure.

4. Amanda Mifflin shared that the Student Life Committee (SLC) is continuing to discuss the results of the Campus Climate Survey.

5. Brendan Lanctot updated the Senate on recent activities of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). The ASC continues to work on a bereavement policy for students and a credit hour policy, which was forwarded to the Senate (see Appendix B).

6. Judith Kay also announced that the PSC is considering questions related to faculty research misconduct and whether sanctions for faculty research misconduct should be different in cases where the research is federally funded versus non-federally funded research.

#### V. The Senate considered the **Credit Hour Policy** forwarded by the ASC (see Appendix B)

Kay commented that some weeks our students do a lot more than 10 hours of work per class, and 10 hours per week seems like a minimum amount.

Lanctot asked about the part of the document that lists the class blocks and whether that would need to be changed if the campus were to decide on a common hour where no classes were scheduled. Bartenen said that yes, the class block schedule would have to be changed.

M (Kessel) / S (Kay) / P to affirm the policy as forwarded from the ASC.

#### VI. **Discussion of upcoming Senate elections**

Nila Wiese, the Senate Secretary, announced that the time for faculty elections is quickly approaching. (The Senate handbook gives a timeline for the election that she is following.) Once we know exactly how many positions need to be filled, we can email the faculty to solicit nominations (probably just after the spring break). The ballot would go out around April 3, and elections would close on April 9. All election issues should be resolved by the final meetings of the Senate in early May.

Brad Dillman, as chair, will secure confirmation form the nominees that they are willing to run for the Senate. Brad encouraged everyone to nominate colleagues for the elections. Wiese and Dillman will check to see how many people are rotating off of the Senate and how many positions need to be filled for next year.

Kay asked about replacement senators for people who will be on leave, and Dillman said that they will be selected from the list of nominees, as per usual.

Shirley Skeel talked a little bit about how the Staff Senate members are elected. In particular, the Staff Senate is more representative than the Faculty Senate, in that senators are elected from different areas of campus.

## VII. Update on and discussion of activities of the **Ad Hoc Professional Development Committee of the Senate**

Alisa Kessel, who is chairing this ad hoc committee, gave an update on their recent activities. Elisa Richman, Brendan Lanctot, Ariela Tubert, and Kessel comprise the committee. Recently, Richman sent an email to the faculty governance listserv to solicit ideas from faculty about no-cost ways to support faculty scholarship. The coordinating committee for the Wednesday at Four sessions and other groups have also contributed ideas. The ad hoc committee is working with the University Enrichment Committee (UEC) on awards related to faculty scholarship. They also heard several recommendations for promoting and displaying faculty work in new ways.

Kessel continued her report and said that the ad hoc committee has been working on ideas for forming working groups or support groups for faculty members related to scholarship. Eric Orlin from the CWLT met with Alisa to discuss a brown bag luncheon talk series with informal talks from faculty members about projects on which they are working. It may take place every Friday, for example. Lanctot also suggested the idea of faculty reading groups.

Thirdly, Kessel said, the ad hoc committee has been working on ideas for improving the environment on campus for faculty to conduct scholarly work. For example, the issue of having heat in campus buildings over the winter holidays has been resolved. Alisa found out that Facilities Services staff heated all of the buildings over this past winter break (after new, more efficient, boilers were installed recently), found it cost-effective to heat the buildings, and will continue to do so in the future. There was also talk about hosting a conversation for junior faculty regarding tenure and promotion standards, providing course releases for faculty members with external grants, and allowing faculty members to keep their offices while on sabbatical. Kessel will be looking into the issue of faculty members keeping their offices. Also, she is interested in the idea of getting faculty members who are on sabbatical connected with each other.

Other members of the Senate responded to Kessel's report, as follows:

- Skeel commented that the brown bag lunch would be a good place for the Communications Department to learn about what scholarly work faculty members are doing.
- Kay mentioned that the brown bag lunch could include talks about teaching methods, as well.
- Sampen asked whether a facilitator would be needed for the brown bag lunch. For example, the facilitator could "interview" the speaker, asking a few questions about their work to which the speaker could respond. That might relieve the speaker of the need to prepare so much in advance.
- Spivey remarked that someone would need to coordinate the speaker schedule as well as communications and logistics.
- Putnam said that she would want to come and have people discuss and ask questions at the brown bag lunch, and not do any preparation.
- Kessel commented that a lot will depend on how the leader sets it up and what he tells the speakers about what they should expect.
- Putnam remarked that a free-floating, flexible template would be good.
- Kay said that she was there when the idea of the brown bag lunch came up. At another institution, they do this and insist that the speakers talk in layman's terms. The job of the planner is to get the speaker's title and make sure it's generic enough and comprehensible. The leader of

the brown bag lunch would want to carefully choose the first six to eight speakers to ensure that they were folks who could do a good job and set the stage.

- Kessel pointed out the brown bag lunch should be beneficial primarily for the speakers.
- Regarding the idea of informational sessions for junior faculty about tenure and promotion standards, Spivey commented that the Faculty Advancement Committee has hosted information sessions for junior faculty in the past and more recently.
- Tubert commented that some of the discussion had to do with having a campus-wide set of guidelines for tenure and promotion, because there is wide variation in departmental standards.
- Kessel commented that this might constitute a potential charge to the Professional Standards Committee.
- Wiese asked if the Senate could make of list of these ideas and sort out which might be future charges to specific committees, which could be handled with a simple phone call or conversation with specific individuals across campus, and which things the Senate should take up and discuss further?
- Kessel said that we should add faculty borrowing privileges at Collins Library to the list of things to consider.
- Kessel said that she would communicate the Senate's comments regarding the brown bag lunch idea to Eric Orlin.
- Dillman commented that some of the ideas definitely sound like charges for committees for next year.
- Sampen said that the UEC has sent a proposal for a new faculty award to Dean Bartanen.
- Tubert announced that the Faculty Advancement Committee had received the proposal for the new award from the UEC and needed more input from the UEC regarding criteria for the new award.
- Kessel said that she would present some of these ideas at the next full faculty meeting and solicit more ideas from the faculty.
- Dillman asked if the brown bag luncheon would be open to staff and students.
- Kay answered that the group discussing the brown bag luncheon was leaning toward including only staff and faculty, and not students.
- Lanctot commented that Spanish has a colloquium for faculty and students, and that it is a valuable experience for the students to participate.
- Kay and Kessel commented that the brown bag luncheon was intended to serve a different need than departmental seminars serve.

## VII. Other business

1. Chair Dillman reminded the Senate that we had committed to giving an overview of faculty governance at a faculty meeting this spring, presumably at the April 15 meeting. It needs to get on the agenda for that meeting. He suggested discussing that at the next Senate meeting in order to decide who will do it and what should be discussed. The next Senate meeting is March 25.

2. Dillman also brought up the fact that Senate decides each year who should receive the Walter Lowry service award, and that nominations should be requested from the faculty soon.

Some discussion ensued over the details related to nominations and the criteria for the Walter Lowry award.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Amy Spivey.

**Appendix A – Excerpted from the minutes of the Professional Standards Committee  
for February 18, 2013**

**Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 3, Chapter 1, Part D, Section 2 (e), and  
Chapter I, Part D, Section 4. Professional Ethics of Faculty and Relationships of a  
Consensual Sexual Nature.**

It is in the best interest of the university and all individuals associated with the university that there be no real or perceived bias in situations where one individual exerts influence over another colleague or staff member. Situations of direct supervision or when one has the ability to advance, promote, recommend, or in any other way directly influence the academic or work status of the colleague are the times when transparency is required.

The existence of a consensual sexual relationship constitutes a conflict of interest, and can create a real or perceived bias. Therefore, it is the policy of the university that such relationships should be disclosed when there is any possibility of a supervisory or career influencing role between the parties. When faculty or staff members enter into a consensual sexual relationship where one party has supervisory or career influence over the other, each party is required to promptly disclose the relationship to his/her superior(s) so that reassignment, alternative supervision processes, or other arrangements can be facilitated and documented.

The following scenarios are presented as examples where a faculty member must disclose the existence of a consensual sexual relationship. They are not intended to be exclusive, and faculty members should exercise judgment when faced with a similar situation.

- The evaluation process is clearly a career-influencing relationship. No faculty member should participate in the evaluation of another faculty member with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations.
- Hiring decisions are also understood to involve the exercise of judgment and may result in a work- or career-influencing relationship. No faculty member should participate in the search or hiring process when a person with whom he or she is involved in a consensual sexual relationship is an applicant and all faculty members, including head officers, are expected to recuse themselves from such situations.
- The responsibilities of serving as department chair or program director may also, at times, require supervising or making decisions about the academic or work status of other departmental members. Departmental chairs should be aware of when their duties place them in a career-influencing relationship to a colleague with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship. If and when such situations should arise, chairs should take care to put alternative processes in place to avoid conflicts of interest or other improprieties.

This policy aligns with the university's conflict of interest provisions in the Code of Conduct as well as Section II, Part E ("Consensual Sexual Relationship") of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct.

If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Section 4 of the Faculty Code (“Professional Ethics”), and/or speak with your Department Chair or the Dean.

## **Appendix B – Details related to the Credit Hour Policy sent to the Senate by the Academic Standards Committee**

From the Academic Standards Committee:

### Credit Hour Policy

Courses offered under the early semester calendar at the University of Puget Sound are computed in units of credit. In order to receive the baccalaureate degree from University of Puget Sound, a student must earn a minimum of 32 units. For purposes of transferring credit, one unit is equivalent to six quarter hours or four semester hours. Courses are approved by the faculty Curriculum Committee on the basis of a unit offered over a 15 week semester.

Guidelines for course scheduling define time frames within the 15 week semester:

1. For three day per week courses: Monday-Wednesday-Friday courses generally begin on the hour and end 10 minutes before the next hour.
2. For two day per week courses:
  - a. Tuesday-Thursday courses begin and end in 80-minute blocks.
  - b. Monday-Wednesday or Monday-Friday or Wednesday-Friday at 2:00-3:20 is also available for 80-minute classes. Although there will be no 80-minute classes at 3:00-4:20, 4:00-5:20 is available for courses with multiple sections.
3. For four day or five day per week courses:
  - a. The Tuesday and/or Thursday sessions that accompany Monday and/or Wednesday and/or Friday sessions at 9:00, 12:00, or 3:00 are shifted by thirty minutes to fit within one of the 80-minute Tuesday/Thursday time blocks that begin at 8:00, 9:30, 11:00, 12:30, 2:00 or 3:00.
  - b. Tuesday and/or Thursday sessions that are part of four or five-day-per-week classes may, at the instructor's request, be assigned the entire 80-minute time period.
4. One-day-per-week, three-hour classes are limited to 300- and 400-level courses and graduate courses.
  - a. Although a particular three-hour time slot has not been designated for seminar courses, starting times are available at the 3:00, 4:00, 5:00 and 6:00 time slots, provided that the course is not a single section of a required course.
  - b. A department may wish to schedule a three-hour class on Tuesdays or Wednesdays. In addition to having only one non-teaching day per semester, scheduling on Tuesdays or Wednesdays allows the seminar to meet during the week of Reading Period.

Faculty expectations are that students will devote a minimum of 10 hours per week to a one-unit course, inclusive of time in class and outside of class, for each week of the 15-week semester. Examples of activities considered in the calculation of out-of-class time include, but are not limited to, time spent reading, studying, preparing for class, attending



performances, lectures, or presentations related to the course, attending laboratory, studio, or rehearsal sessions, discussing the material with other students, or completing course-related assignments.

The Curriculum Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, reviews curriculum on a five-year cycle inclusive of new or revised course offerings. Course Proposal Forms include affirmation of anticipated course hour expectations, Course Revision Forms include a check on in-class and out-of-class hours per week, and the Department and Program Curriculum Review self-study questions ask for affirmation of course hour expectations and explanation of any departures from this policy.