

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate
September 8, 2008, 4:00, McCormick Room

Senators Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Kristine Bartanen, Terry Beck, Douglas Cannon (chair), Robin Foster, Sue Hannaford, Suzanne Holland, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Lisa Johnson, Hans Ostrom, Amy Ryken, Mike Segawa, Stacey Weiss, Yusuf Word

Visitors: Randy Bentson

I. Arrange for minutes

Standard alphabetical order: Anderson-Connolly begins.

Chair reminded the Senators to submit the minutes as soon as possible to him. The chair reserved the right to make some minor changes before bringing to the full body. After approval the minutes are to be sent to Jimmy McMichael both via email and as signed paper copy.

II. Approval of minutes of May 12, 2008

MSP with minor corrections.

III. Special Orders

Ostrom moved to continue special orders as a regular agenda item for the year. Senators are permitted to speak for up to one minute on some university-related topic.

Seconded and passed.

IV. Announcements

George Tomlin was elected chair of PSC.

Chair announced assignments of committee liaisons.

Liaisons should read the minutes and update the Senate on committee happenings. Regular meeting attendance is not required.

V. Plans for faculty meeting of Sept. 29

Foster expressed concerns that our topic from the retreat – a follow-up to the fall faculty conversation – would not attract a large crowd. She suggested instead a discussion regarding faculty benefits.

Ostrom added that the writing center planned to follow-up on the fall faculty conversation.

Holland agreed that we should do the benefits topic but wondered whether Rosabeth Gibson would be ready. Additionally it would be good to talk about the core. Issues of rigor would fit here as well.

The chair summarized some of the relevant discussion from the senate retreat. One goal was to increase attendance and interest in the full faculty meetings. Several ideas, including the fall faculty conversation, benefits, the core, and faculty evaluations, were suggested.

Kristin Johnson endorsed the faculty evaluations as a topic (not necessarily as an instrument). Foster suggested that we examine the data and bring a narrower focus to the meeting. It would be better at a later time.

Weiss asked Dean Bartanen about the assessment data on the new core. Bartanen: A lot of it is in the self-study.

Holland volunteered to organize the data by the first meeting. Foster agreed it could be done but preferred to come to the Senate first.

Hutchinson noted that most members of the faculty have not seen the full results. He added that the faculty did not have an opportunity to discuss academic intensity at the fall faculty conversation after the presenter.

Beck offered the idea that our topics should be chosen so that they help the Senate do work of value to the full faculty.

Foster agreed but wanted to return to the health benefits issue because it was brought to her by a colleague. This is a way to act as a representative. Beck supported bringing to the full faculty the topic of healthcare.

Ostrom suggested that we ask the faculty for areas they want us to consider.

Ryken noted that many important topics do not fit the responsibility of the Senate. This generates confusion.

Dean Bartanen shared that Rosa Beth Gibson would like to talk with the faculty about benefits. Furthermore the president and the dean have made arrangements for smaller meetings to follow-up on the fall faculty conversation.

Foster Moved: Propose a conversation about health and other benefits on the condition that Rosa Beth Gibson can attend and give a presentation.

Lisa Johnson: What is the purpose of this item? Will it lead to action or is it simply a discussion? Ostrom answered by noting that if we can't plug it into a standing committee then we can create an ad hoc committee.

Foster noted the importance of giving faculty voice on this topic.

Motion was seconded and passed.

The chair asked whether the body wants to change the venue of the meeting, as discussed at the retreat. Rotunda and the boardroom are the top choices.

Holland asked whether it would be possible to provide refreshments. Left as a task for the next meeting.

VI. Charges to Standing Committees

Academic Standards

Ostrom moved to add the following charge: Revisit the decision to require an academic advisor in the major. This has skewed the advising load in different departments. The committee should consider the imbalance in advising load more broadly.

Second part of motion: Move charge 4 up to charge 2 (in order to reflect its importance).

Charges as amended passed.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Academic Standard Committee are:

- 1. Continue work on creation of an honor code and/or honor pledge*
- 2. Committee self-assessment. This was originally requested of all standing committees during the 2006-2007 academic year, but the academic standards committee has not yet complied.*
- 3. Continue work on supplementing the academic honesty policy in the handbook with online material (e.g., discipline-specific examples and plagiarism quiz that are linked to the Academic Handbook text).*
- 4. Finalize rewording of withdrawal policy in the situation in which a student abandons a course*
- 5. Review the policy of requiring students to have drop codes during the automatic W period. Some petitions arise from students who wish to drop courses but cannot get drop codes from their professors in time. In light of this some committee members began questioning the reason for having drop codes at all during the W period. Perhaps it is worth reviewing this policy.*
- 6. Clarify the reading period policy and the status of informal review sessions.*
- 7. Revisit the decision to require an academic advisor in the major. This has skewed the advising load in different departments. The committee should consider the imbalance in advising load more broadly.*

Curriculum

M/S/P in original form.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Curriculum Committee are:

1. *Continue the discussion of the Connections core review, including discussions with all faculty, student input, and rubric guidelines (see review narrative).*
2. *Review departments and programs scheduled for 2008-2009: Asian Studies, Business and Leadership, Comparative Sociology, Economics, Humanities, International Political Economy, Music, Theatre Arts.*
3. *Core Reviews: Review the core curriculum as a whole including consideration of the foreign language requirement and requirement for three upper division courses outside the major.*
4. *Social Scientific Approaches core rubric: discuss possible change to the Social Scientific Approaches core rubric to clarify the use of empirical evidence (see minutes and attachments from 04/18/08).*

Faculty Advancement

Ostrom suggested that the FAC should elect a chair.

Ryken moved that the committee review the faculty members scheduled for this year. Bartanen noted that this is in the code already, thus was unnecessary.

Motion passed 8-4.

Ostrom moved that we charge the FAC with appointing a chair. The chair asked to defer this issue to a later meeting when we can invite other members of the FAC. Ostrom withdrew the motion.

The Senate charge to the 2008-09 Faculty Advancement Committee is:

Review the faculty members scheduled for 2008-09.

University Enrichment

M/S/P in original form.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 University Enrichment Committee are:

1. *Discuss the Phibbs award selection process to determine if the current process is fair and is consistent with the donor's intentions in the Memorandum of Understanding.*
2. *Review Professional Development application procedures, forms, and documents for UEC-funded awards. In particular, the current committee thought that it would be useful to make sure that all UEC selected proposals have a paragraph at the outset that summarizes the research methods, clearly indicates why the research is important, and indicates what will be done with the requested funds. In addition the proposal that six, rather than nine, copies of proposals be submitted should be considered.*
3. *Revise sections of the Professional Development Handbook.*

Professional Standards

Ostrom suggested that we consider items 9 and 10 at a later Senate meeting. He moved to charge with 1-8.

Foster suggested that we could send back an item that was discussed at a previous PSC meeting. To quote from the PSC minutes of February 22, 2008:

The PSC considered the possibility of assessing consistency of expectation for faculty professional development across departments as part of a regular 5-year review of department standards. However, the PSC concluded that its role is to ensure that department guidelines don't contravene the Code, and not to consider consistency across departments. If the Senate believes that the particular circumstances that prompted this query do involve a Code issue, the PSC would welcome a presentation of the issue at a future PSC meeting and would be glad to reconsider its decision.

Ostrom offered that we could consider this item later along with 9 and 10.

Holland offered an additional item for later consideration: There is considerable variation among non-tenure line faculty with regards to university service. Question: do they even need to participate in this service?

Motion (items 1-8) passed.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Professional Standards Committee are:

- 1. Draft a Code amendment to clarify the definition of "tenure-line faculty" (Chapter I, Part B, Section 1). Some progress was made this spring toward the item. (Charge #7 in AY0708).*
- 2. Draft a Code amendment revising and clarifying the process to be followed when an evaluatee makes informal and formal challenges to the evaluation conducted by a department, program, or school (Chapter IV, Section 4 b. (4)). Some progress was made this spring. (Charge #8 in AY0708)*
- 3. Revisit the issue of criteria for early tenure and promotion. A PSC interpretation of the existing Code was decided upon last year on February 12, 2007, was delivered to the Senate on April 23, 2007, and has not yet been formally taken to the Board. The discussions of members of the Board of Trustees and of the Faculty Senate seem to have led the thinking into a realm where a Code amendment would be required. (Charge #23 in AY0708) [See #8 below.]*
- 4. Draft a Code amendment specifying the "constitutional" standing of formal Code Interpretations issued by the PSC: how they are displayed in the Code itself, how to alter their status as they become obsolete, and how to reconcile Code amendment processes with issuing new interpretations that supersede old interpretations. Discussion of this topic by the PSC has ensued this year in the wake of faculty*

deliberations over the proposed Code housekeeping amendments. (Charge #22 in AY0708)

5. *Issue a Code Interpretation or draft a revision to the buff document or the green faculty hiring guide covering interdisciplinary faculty appointments, so as to ensure that the appointment letter specifies the procedure for later evaluation of that faculty member. The PSC has discussed this issue extensively this year. (Charge #18 in AY0708)*
6. *Review the “Research Misconduct Policy” document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct. (Charge #25 in AY0708)*
7. *Complete the drafting of examples of evaluation file text for university service for the buff document. (from Charge #15 in AY0708)*
8. *[Specific charge from the 2007-2008 Senate meeting of March 10] Craft language to change the faculty code so that it allows people to come up for early tenure without a standard above and beyond that normally required for promotion and tenure and also to check throughout the Code for any inconsistencies related to this issue and suggest corrections.*

Student Life

Ostrom suggested addition to item 13: Solicit the advice of the chief diversity officer regarding this issue.

Ryken offered an amendment to item 2: Replace “changes” with “consider changing.”

Motion passed as amended.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Student Life Committee are:

1. *Revise Article V, Section 6f(b) of the Faculty Bylaws (Student Life Committee duties) to provide permanent reminders of the repeated duties of the SLC.*
2. *Request that ASUPS consider changing its bylaws to require (or at least recommend) that a member of the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee serve as one of the three students representatives on the Student Life Committee.*
3. *Review the progress of the Residential Seminar program and provide recommendations for its future.*
4. *Provide input to the Dean of Students on how to best structure the process of self-studies, or reviews, for departments within Student Affairs.*
5. *Analyze data from the Summer/Fall 2008 study abroad pre-departure survey, and revise the survey as needed.*

6. *Design a post-arrival study abroad survey to be given to students approximately six months after arriving back at UPS from studying abroad.*
7. *Ask the staff of the Office of International Programs to set up a system whereby faculty members receive, each semester, a list of students who have just returned from studying abroad. Draft a note to faculty receiving this message (and list) from International Programs on ways in which they may utilize the list.*
8. *Ensure that the Excel spreadsheet which lists returned study abroad students is posted, by September 1st, as a link on the International Programs website.*
9. *Communicate on a regular basis with the new International Education Committee (approved by the faculty at its April 22nd faculty meeting) about survey data being collected by the Student Life Committee from the pre-departure and (eventually) post-arrival surveys.*
10. *Establish regular correspondence between members of the Student Life Committee and campus committees that address issues related to student life.*
11. *In consultation with the Community Involvement and Action Center (CIAC), discuss the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program.*
12. *Review and provide recommendations for the development of a Leadership Development program that spans all four years of a student's Puget Sound experience. As part of this process, the Dean of Students shall appoint a faculty member of the Student Life Committee to serve on the "4-Year Leadership Development Curriculum Plan."*
13. *Explore the desirability of Multicultural Student Services devoting more attention to the support of individual students and their overall success rather than the primary mission now of program and event delivery. Solicit the advice of the Chief Diversity Officer regarding this issue.*
14. *Participate in finding options for comprehensively addressing drug education.*

MSP to reorganize the agenda to consider diversity before LMIS.

Diversity

Word asked whether the training referenced in item 2 would be mandatory. Hutchinson responded that the current training is not mandatory.

Foster added the Senate would probably not make that decision.

Holland asked Word whether he thought it should be mandatory. Word stated that he originally favored mandatory training but more recently has come to believe that it would not be beneficial if forced.

The chair noted that faculty generally do not like being trained.

Holland moved to amend charge # 2 as follows: Continue to develop and implement a program for including diversity issues as a permanent element of on-campus faculty development.

Motion passed.

Word asked whether the committee should examine retention of students of color. Some discussion ensued regarding the duties of the committee, the Senate, and the three proposed diversity committees.

M/S/P three charges.

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Diversity Committee are:

- 1. Continue working with the Faculty Senate to reconstitute the Faculty Diversity Committee, revising the bylaws for this committee and facilitating approval of such changes in a timely fashion. [A draft of a proposed revision of the bylaws, including Committee duties is included in the 2007-2008 year-end report.]*
- 2. Continue to develop and implement a program for including diversity issues as a permanent element of on-campus faculty development.*
- 3. Examine the language of the University's Diversity Statement in light of suggested changes from the Coalition Against Injustice and Racism. [The language of the 2007-2008 Senate resolution of April 22 was, "The Faculty Senate endorses the request to reexamine the university's Diversity Statement. The Senate refers this matter to the Diversity Committee and forwards the following language suggested by CAIR for their timely consideration."]*

Holland moved to adopt as written the charges for the remaining committees (Library, Media, and Information Systems, Institutional Review Board, International Education).

Amendment by Weiss, accepted as friendly, to add charge 9 from student life, with appropriate changes, to international education.

Library, Media, and Information Systems

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee are:

- 1. Meet with OIS and Library representatives at the beginning of each term to learn about upcoming decisions and changes relevant to LMIS.*
- 2. Continue discussion regarding multiple-format journal subscriptions.*
- 3. Continue implementing a copyright policy (in support of the TEACH act).*

4. *Continue discussion of faculty intellectual property.*
5. *Assist OIS with the implementation of Moodle as our Learning Management System.*

Institutional Review Board

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 Institutional Review Board are:

1. *Initiate and implement a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research regarding IRB oversight of OIR work. [Recommended by Randy Nelson.]*
2. *Modify the current system of departmental IRB designates to include a designate for protocols originating outside of academic departments.*

International Education

The Senate charges to the 2008-09 International Education Committee are:

1. *Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty.*
2. *Continue the comprehensive review of all study abroad programs offered through the university and revise the list based on geographical location and academic coverage.*
3. *Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.*
4. *Review and ratify the study abroad mission statement.*
5. *Review the Study Abroad Working Group recommendations and determine if they should be endorsed.*
6. *Communicate on a regular basis with the Student Life Committee about survey data being collected by the Student Life Committee from the pre-departure and post-arrival surveys.*

8. Adjournment: Meeting concluded just slightly behind schedule.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Anderson-Connolly