

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

**March 25, 2013      McCormick Room**

Present – Kris Bartanen, Brad Dillman (Chair), Brian Ernst, Zaixin Hong, Judith Kay, Diane Kelley (Guest), Alisa Kessel, Danny Laesch (Guest), Brendan Lanctot, Amanda Mifflin, Ann Putnam, Elise Richman, Roy Robinson (Guest), Maria Sampen, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Amy Spivey, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese, and Peter Wimberger (Guest).

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

### **I. Announcements**

1. Kay reminded us of the American Voices Series on March 26 at 7 pm in Rasmussen Rotunda.
2. Kris reminded us of the Brown and Haley Lecture Series by Francis Fukuyama on April 2 and 3 at 7pm in Schneebeck Concert Hall.
3. Alisa reminded us to seek out nominees for the Excellence in Action award by April 5. Also, there is a call for donations for the Staff Senate Gift Basket Raffle. Donations are due on 15<sup>th</sup> of April

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

Zaixin emailed a list of upcoming conversations about Diversity in the Curriculum from the Committee on Diversity:

1. Governing Council, Student Diversity Center—Friday, March 29 from 4:00-5:00 p.m.
2. Wednesday at 4, CWTL—Wednesday, April 3 from 4:00-5:00 p.m.
3. Chairs, Deans, and Directors, Library 020—April 24 from 8-9 a.m.

### **III. Minutes of March 11, 2013**

M/S/P to approve the minutes from March 11, 2013, with minor revisions.

### **IV. Presentation by Roy Robinson on International Programs and study abroad application process**

Roy Robinson provided an overview of the study abroad process (past and present). The process did change this year. There has always been a fixed budget for SA, but previously we always allowed anyone to go. The new system was put in place in October. Students had to make an academic argument for why they should be approved to go abroad. The application was online, the deadline was changed to Feb 22, and essays were added to the requirements. In hindsight, the essay prompts were unclear to students, and the criteria used to review them were also unclear. Robinson stressed that while these issues need to be addressed, we still need to keep a format that allows us to say yes or no to students (keep it a competitive process and have the ability to deny some students if over budget). This year, we had to deny 10-12 students. The goal now is to make the process run more smoothly and make everyone aware of the new process so everyone is on the same page.

Peter Wimberger, a guest representative of the International Education Committee involved in developing the new application requirements, mentioned that the IEC polled people from a number of heavily involved departments/programs, reviewed how the process worked, and suggested revisions that would address the current dissatisfaction with process.

Mike Segawa asked about the number of total applications and the reasons why some were disapproved. Robinson and Bartanen responded that there was a total of about 230 applicants, and the reasons for declining were 1) not meeting program requirements, 2) requests for a 2<sup>nd</sup> location, and 3) freshman status. Kelley added that approval of an application for a 2<sup>nd</sup> location was possible, but this request was a lower priority unless it was a particularly compelling argument. Robinson added that the goal was to have the onus be on the students to make strong arguments for going.

Segawa asked if there was any consistency to the dissatisfaction expressed by students and faculty about the process. Wimberger said that the issues were mostly for foreign languages/programs that require SA. It appeared that students didn't take the essays seriously, as they thought it was a given to go if their major/program required study abroad. The committee is recommending to keep the essay component of the application, however, work is needed on the wording of the essays, and students in foreign language programs will only have to do one of two essays. Also, the faculty recommendation piece was an issue.

Nila Wiese mentioned that the timing of recommendation requests was problematic and wondered if it would be possible to make a deadline for requesting letters so faculty wouldn't be inundated with last-minute requests. Robinson responded that the reasoning behind the late recommendation notice was that they didn't want to ask for letters unless they knew the students were going to apply. Wimberger suggested that a simplified recommendation would be better, one that essentially asks if you have any concerns for student studying abroad. The letters coming in now are not very valuable (i.e., lots of students in top 5%). The letters are mainly only useful when they identify problems with students.

Amy Spivey asked for clarification on the budget for study abroad. Robinson explained that students pay tuition, fees, and government fees to UPS, regardless of whether the program costs more or less than UPS. UPS will meet the students' financial need to go abroad. One point of note is that merit aid dollars that go above the student's documented financial need don't transfer. Robinson also noted that there are currently about 145 approved programs, and IEC is looking to streamline the programs so that academic needs are matched, but we are not overloaded with options in one location (i.e., 12 programs in London).

Sampen asked if the policy about scholarships not transferring over was a new development. She thought that it used to be that everything transferred. Robinson clarified that the change in policy occurred about 3 years ago. His office is working to make that point clear to students. Sampen also inquired about how the Tuition Exchange program applied to study abroad. Bartanen confirmed that they carry it with them.

Kay wondered where study abroad falls within our institutional goals, as some schools encourage a majority of their junior class to go abroad. She also wondered how this relates to our cost concerns. Robinson stated that about 44% of our junior/senior classes participate in study abroad. Robinson stated that although it seems like study abroad should be a cash cow due to less expensive programs, these savings are more than offset by other costs. He suggested that more faculty-led programs and increasing summer options can be a cost-effective way to increase study abroad opportunities for students, and would also help meet the needs of student athletes, for example.

Dillman inquired whether there was any priority of full-year over semester programs. Robinson responded that there was not unless the student is in a department that requires it or is in a language immersion program. The highest priority goes to our own programs, then majors that require study abroad/immersion programs. Dillman asked what percentage of students participate in full year programs. Bartanen responded that 10 applied for full-year programs this year. Robinson added that there are few programs that are full-year.

Dillman also wondered whether there was any feedback from students in terms of expectations when coming to UPS. They are paying thousands of dollars and then may be told they can't go abroad. He asked how we were to explain that study abroad is not a right. Robinson agreed that that is something that we want to make clear as we move forward. Students still have the idea that if you want to go abroad, you can go. We need to make the reality more transparent. Bartanen added that in the past, students were still rejected if they didn't meet requirements. Segawa concluded that out of 12 students declined, we only had 4 that could have gone under the previous regulations. Wimberger added that some of the declined students petitioned and were subsequently allowed to go. Bartanen confirmed that out of the 12 declined, 7 didn't meet requirements, 2 were freshmen, and 3 didn't get approved for participation in a second program. One of the students requesting a second program petitioned and was approved. Robinson added that we are sure to be under budget this year as there is some "melt" between the number who apply and those who ultimately go (we have already had a number of students decide not to go).

Maria offered a comment in favor of the application process and that her students were very excited that they were accepted. She said they felt like they were getting an "A".

Robinson added that some programs are not as rigorous as others. His goal is to make students really think about the academics of the study abroad program to which they are applying. Segawa clarified that we want to continue to up the perception of rigor in study abroad. Spivey added that there are not many programs that offer options for science majors (students often take a semester off from science classes to study abroad). Robinson asked to be informed if faculty know of good programs for the sciences. Wimberger stated that there is a good Math program that works well, and reiterated that it will be helpful if we let faculty know of programs that work well for their specific disciplines. Mifflin added that there are some domestic programs, such as the Semester in Environmental Science program in Woods Hole, MA, that were rigorous programs for biology/ecology/chemistry students.

Richman suggested that something needs to happen on a departmental level in figuring out ways to facilitate making the process clearer. Perhaps working to integrate study abroad into the curriculum, as there are different experiential learning needs for different departments. Bartanen asked for a clarification as to whether Richman was suggesting that departments should require study abroad. Richman responded that she would like to be able to make more targeted recommendations to students. For example, one student found a program that offered an opportunity to study tantric painting with a guru, which is notable and just one example of the rich study abroad experiences that could be more systematically documented. If faculty know of such programs, then we can recommend them to students who express a need or fit well with a program. Spivey added that a list that advisors could use would be helpful. Richman agreed that it would be nice to compile a list of programs or possible experiences that students could have. Lanctot suggested that something searchable for keywords would be helpful. Robinson and Wimberger pointed out that there is a list of programs and what they satisfy for electives, etc. compiled by Kathleen Campbell. Lanctot thought it would be helpful to make them accessible to faculty to help in advising students. Robinson suggested that a form could be put together to plan

ahead (i.e., students in chemistry should do this program in spring because it covers such and such class). He added that the study abroad experience could add value to discussions and involvement back on campus. Tubert added that she knows of one program that's good for philosophy, but not everyone wants to go to Edinburgh. It would be nice to have information to assist students that want alternatives. Robinson suggested talking to Kathleen to see what she has available so we can compile something that will be helpful.

## **V. Student Bereavement Policy**

Dillman informed us that Sarah Moore sent along a student bereavement policy that was passed by ASC. Once the Senate is informed, we have 30 days to modify or reject the policy. The history of the policy is that ASUPS Senate sent a letter to ASC requesting the implementation of a student bereavement policy. ASC in turn put together a comparative report of policies at other institutions, resulting in the passing of a student bereavement policy that is now under our consideration.

Daniel Laesch (ASC student member, Senator-at-Large for ASUPS) provided the Senate with a summary of why a student bereavement policy is being requested. Last semester, a student experienced the death of a grandfather, requiring him to miss class Friday-Monday. Most of the faculty involved were accommodating, but one of his professors did not feel it was fair to offer a make-up for an exam that would be missed. For the instructor, it was an issue of ethics: there was no way to equitably allow him to retake exam when she wouldn't allow others to do so. The exam was 30% of his grade, so the policy would have a significant effect on the student's grade. There is currently no mechanism for the student to fall back on in a situation like this. Sarah Moore had a conversation with the faculty member, and it was clear that the faculty member was looking for way to allow him to retake the exam so she did not feel she was being unfair to other students, but it was proving difficult. ASC and ASUPS felt issue was worth addressing and developed a student bereavement policy.

Spivey commented that 3 days of excused absences makes sense, but was concerned that official documentation would constrain faculty members from being more generous than the policy. She gave an example that in the case of a student that missed a week for brother's funeral, she calculated his grade as if a missed lab wasn't there. She was concerned that the language "the student remains responsible for missed academic work" would preclude her from such practice in the future. Bartanen suggested that this issue would be addressed by the next sentence where students are instructed to talk to faculty members to explore their options for missed coursework.

Laesch acknowledged that it would be a very rare occurrence when this policy will be needed. For the most part, students feel supported by faculty. He emphasized that this policy is not designed to constrain faculty members, but to allow for guidance. Faculty can be more generous than the policy allows, and the policy merely serves as a catchall.

Sampen agreed that the policy sounds good, but wondered how would students would find out about it. Laesch responded that the policy would go into the student handbook and that there is suggested language offered in the policy that would go into a syllabus. The students are directed to the Dean of Students' office.

Kessel agreed that there was no problem with having a bereavement policy, but wondered about the burden on the Dean of Students office and suggested conversations with faculty

members should happen early on. She argued that pushing for more faculty involvement earlier is almost always better. Spivey offered that she usually hears about these situations from the Dean of Students. Segawa added that if a student comes to the Dean of Students office first, they would take responsibility for contacting faculty. In such circumstances, a student is likely not available to take care of these things before leaving. The office tries to alert students to the issues they will need to address upon their return to campus. Segawa stated that Student Affairs continues to identify ways to make this easier for the faculty and students involved.

Dillman wondered about bereavement for non-family deaths, which was not addressed in the policy. Segawa responded that a student would petition for the policy to apply to them. It has been done previously, and it's pretty clear when this should apply. It takes the burden off of the faculty member. Laesch added that there is a fair amount of discussion about the term "family", and that there were concerns that it would be taken advantage of. The policy allows for discretion in such situations.

Bartanen moved that student bereavement policy be approved. Brief discussion followed regarding the manner in which faculty are informed of students that are affected by a death. Segawa clarified that the Dean of Students office will alert faculty if a student alerts them. Otherwise, faculty can send an alert when they become aware.

Tubert asked if there was a way to excuse the student if alerted after the fact. Bartanen suggested that if it were in your syllabus, students would be more likely to let you know. Segawa added that DOS would call a student in to have a conversation, and they will provide faculty with advisement after the conversation. A bereavement policy would not necessarily become retroactive, but would put things into perspective for faculty. Laesch added that the policy was meant to allow for attendance of a funeral. Actual bereavement continues for a length of time. He asked if the policy would be retroactive for informing after the funeral. Segawa suggested that it would be apparent that a student had a loss, and if they have not gotten up to speed as they thought they would, it could be taken this into account.

M/S/P to approve the student bereavement policy.

## **VI. Process for Lowrie Nominations**

Dillman surveyed the Senate to determine if we wanted to adopt the same policy as last year for Lowrie Award nominations. Written nominations of 500 words or less were solicited by a facultycom email. There was no public announcement of nominees, and nominees were individually notified that they were nominated. The winner of the award was chosen at the last meeting of year.

Wiese wondered about notifying all nominees, and Kessel asked if we were getting a reasonable number of nominees. Segawa responded that last year we had three nominations, and the year before we were scrambling for more.

Wiese asked if it was clear what the criteria were, and wondered if clarifying the criteria would help the nomination process. Bartanen confirmed that the criteria have been a moving target. The award was originally designed as a lifetime achievement award to Senate or Governance service, but has shifted over the years. Bartanen was in favor of clarity. Spivey offered that her memory was that a number of the winners have been on a lot of governance positions, but that Alan Thorndike (last year's winner), for example, was not active in

governance, but was involved in much of the construction of Thompson/Harned Hall, among other things. Sampen agreed that service comes in all shapes and sizes and should not be excluded. Wiese suggested that since we have teaching and research awards, it was appropriate that this award focused on service that was broadly defined.

Lanctot asked if the award was advertised outside of the Faculty dinner. Sampen suggested it would be nice to have a pop up on the website of a vignette on the winner. It was also noted that a barrier to receiving nominations may be the writing required. Kessel asked for suggestions on what we can do to get people to be more proactive in submitting nominations. Wiese offered that many winners have been close to retirement, so perhaps the Senate could be proactive in identifying potential nominees. Segawa reminded us that we have never had more than 4-5 people to consider. The challenge is in doing the nomination in less than 500 words. The way people get around this is to have multiple people send in 500 word letters of support.

Putnam wondered if we could have nominees roll over to next year's nominees. Sampen described that in Music, they take a few minutes at faculty meetings to make a nomination and someone is assigned to write the letter. It might help if the nomination process is scheduled into department meetings. Tubert mentioned that she knows people who are active in service, but hasn't been around long enough to know enough details to write a nomination. Segawa added that this is the reason we want nominations. Many senators don't know the candidates or what they did 15 years ago. Kessel suggested advertising at a faculty meeting. Lanctot mentioned that the letter that went to FAC for a colleague called attention that he should be nominated for such an award. Would it be possible to earmark reviews with those comments? Tubert added that we could get a list of names and then solicit departments for letters. Sampen warned that it would have to be a short agenda item for their department meeting. There may be no time to implement these ideas now, but maybe for next year. Kessel observed that Segawa's comments make it sound like we're getting enough nominations, so maybe this isn't a problem that we need a solution to.

Sampen moved to do the nominations this year in the same way that has been done in the past and postpone new proposals for next year.

Friendly amendments to Sampen's motion were offered as follows: (1) Eliminate notification to nominees (Kessel), (2) Clarify criteria for nomination (Sampen), and (3) provide a list of past winners (Spivey). The revised motion was seconded by Tubert.

Dillman added that he looked for additional criteria last fall, and there wasn't any. Wiese added that the only criterion is sustained service. Dillman clarified that it is the "Walter Lowrie Sustained Service Award." Bartanen suggested that we add a sentence that it is sustained service across the university, not just to the Senate. The buff document has an open definition of sustained service. The only documentation is a plaque. Dillman asked for a volunteer to write a clarifying sentence. Kessel and Wiese volunteered.

M/S/P to approve 1) eliminate notification to nominees, 2) clarify criteria for nomination, 3) provide a list of past winners.

Note that this was Sampen's first motion ever!

## **VII. Guidance on committee year-end reports**

Dillman reminded the Senate that it is time to schedule end of year reports with committees, and that they should be scheduled within the next week. Dillman will contact committee chairs. Kessel asked if it was possible to get a sample report, and Dillman responded that he would make sure they have access to previous year's reports (also online).

Wiese suggested that reports from some committees needed further explanation for why some charges were not completed and pushed off to the following year. She wanted additional clarifications so we can assess whether we are giving committees too many charges or an unreasonable timeframe for completing those charges. This would be helpful to the Senate in the discussion of charges next fall. Dillman agreed and offered to relate the usefulness of this information to the committee chairs.

## **VIII. Senate elections update**

The last full faculty meeting is on April 18<sup>th</sup>, where we will discuss the faculty governance structure. Dillman asked if Spivey could attend to help the discussion. Spivey agreed, but didn't feel she was an expert on the code, so she could use someone else. She asked Bartanen if she could send her the language they prepare to make sure they are not misleading. Bartanen agreed, but reminded us that she won't be at this meeting.

Dillman suggested that the discussion would be helpful for new faculty who are selecting committee assignments. Bartanen suggested that the item be forwarded to Alyce for the agenda to increase attendance. The next Faculty Meeting is Wednesday at 7:45 am. Gail McIntosh will be there to provide more info to faculty about branding. Also, the first reading on the code amendment that sets up the framework for a research misconduct policy will be made.

Wiese informed us that the call for nominations for senate elections is out and we should encourage people to submit nominations.

The meeting adjourned at 5:31p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Mifflin