

Minutes for Senate Meeting, November 3rd, 2008

Senators in attendance: Holland, Ryken, Anderson-Connolly, Ostrom, Haltom, Weiss, L. Johnson, K. Johnson, Hannaford, Hutchinson, Beck, Word, Cannon, Segawa

Guests: Hanson, Bristow, Bentson, Moore

Senate Chair Cannon convened the meeting. The minutes from the Oct 6 meeting were approved.

Announcements:

Holland suggested the Senate have a discussion evaluating the previous Faculty Meeting.

Weiss gave an update on the Diversity Committee's revision of its bylaws. Judith Kay will soon be sharing the DC's revised definition of "underrepresented" with the Senate.

Holland announced the UEC has begun revising the Faculty Development Handbook.

Hutchinson announced that the LMIS committee is considering bringing more library training, including material on Library Research Skills, into the curriculum, possibly through the WR and SCI seminars.

Ostrom announced that the Staff Senate may pursue an ombudsman for staff related grievances (including faculty within the general term "staff").

Beck announced that the Senate website is almost up-to-date. Applause ensued!

Holland announced that, given the Faculty Meeting on benefits, a faculty member suggested that the Senate take up an evaluation of the benefits package independently of the Task Force organized by HR. Ostrom announced he had received a similar suggestion.

Cannon announced that Haltom had accepted the appointment to the Senate, and that a nomination to the position of Secretary of the Faculty had been accepted by Gwen Brown (Music Department). He attended (and filed a report to) the Board of Trustees meeting (report attached). He suggested that a follow up of the benefits discussion would be appropriate at a later meeting so that Gibson has time to address concerns previously raised.

Special Orders:

Holland proposed that the Senate hold a preliminary discussion of benefits without Gibson's lead. Ostram shared, on behalf of Priti Joshi, the suggestion that faculty members without children be able to identify children to whom the education benefit would be given.

Agenda Item #1: Procedures for Senate Elections

On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Elections assigned to review the procedures for Senate elections, Hanson shared the committee's conclusions thus far (report attached). He outlined four main issues, each given a section in the committee's report: 1) the clarification of the by laws regarding election procedures, 2) the production of an institutionalized document that would guide each new secretary concerning election procedures, to be approved prior to each election, 3) the implementation of electronic voting, and 4) the consideration of different voting schemes (i.e. ranked versus approval voting). Hanson described the changes made to the by laws regarding election procedures (**noted in bold**, with the committee's rationales, in the Report). The Senate had no questions.

Hanson described the reasoning behind the election procedure guide composed by the committee, and briefly reviewed its content (Section 2). He emphasized that the committee envisioned the document as a guide for each new secretary, to be approved prior to each election, rather than a set of procedures that would be set in stone. It should be a "working document" subject to review and revision by the Senate. The Senate had no questions.

Hanson described the committee's work on the issue of electronic voting (Section 3). Given that only 6 faculty responded to a faculty-wide survey regarding the issue, there seems to be satisfaction with electronic voting. However, the current system (UVOTE, developed by ASUPS) needs to be revised, and Bentson is investigating the various options (complexity versus simplicity, issues of safe-guards, etc.) Word pointed out that there have been problems with UVOTE during ASUPS election of senators, and that the director of Technology Services is working on the issue. Bentson added he has been in communication with TS and the system that is developed will probably be produced in cooperation with ASUPS.

As a member of the Committee, Anderson-Connolly explained Section 4, regarding different voting schemes. He offered that this issue is of secondary importance to getting an electronic system in place, and suggested it could be pursued at a later date. When asked why it was of secondary importance given its relevance in the face of concerns regarding proportional representation on the Senate, he replied that the new electronic voting system and procedures document should be implemented first, and then the Senate could proceed to "big system" changes (which would require changes to the By Laws). Holland suggested that the Senate could in fact work on the larger issue of voting schemes while the new system was being developed, rather than waiting until later.

In response to some potential problems with the specifics of the Procedures and Guidelines document noted by Beck (numerous elections resulting from serial resignations, for example), Hanson and Bristow emphasized that the advantage of the Procedures and Guidelines document was that it could be changed, providing an adjustable document to be used in conjunction with the Bylaws. Discussion ensued regarding whether the next step should involve simply the approval of the document or changes to the bylaws.

Holland moved that: **The Faculty Senate secretary bring a copy of the Procedures and Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Elections before the Faculty Senate for approval before the next election** (in the Spring). The motion carried.

Segawa thanked the committee for its hard work. The committee offered to place subsequent discussion in the hands of the senate, and Anderson-Connolly, Hanson and Bentson offered their expertise and advice on future matters.

Agenda Item #2: Instructor Evaluation forms.

Holland explained that the committee formed to study the Instructor Evaluation Survey administered in April recommends sending the report and the original survey to Faculty Coms with a note from the Senate Chair, in order to establish a basis for discussion at a future faculty forum. The Committee would also be proposing revisions to the form based on the survey. Committee member Moore noted that given that suggestions had been made regarding changing the form and changing how it was used, it would make sense to address each concern in turn.

Ostrom **moved and it was seconded that the Senate distribute a copy of the survey and report via Faculty Coms**, and Cannon asked for discussion. Anderson-Connolly shared a faculty member's suggestions that evaluation forms be administered well after the end of the course. Discussion ensued regarding the logistics of such a proposal, and included the point that some universities solicit comments from alums when evaluating instructors.

When queried regarding the next step following distribution of the report and survey to faculty, Holland explained that meanwhile the committee would revise the form, in order to bring a new draft to the faculty. Ryken suggested changes that would clarify where the report was summarizing written responses versus survey data. Cannon noted he would send the longer comments to the new senators. Consensus was expressed that the note accompanying the report and survey should contain an indication of future steps.

In response to concern regarding the burden on staff in departments where evaluations are used every semester to provide feedback rather than as a basis for evaluation, Haltom pointed out that the instructor is allowed in fact to administer unofficial evaluations in such cases.

Motion carried.

Cannon requested input on how the submission of the Survey Report to faculty coms should be framed. Hannaford pointed out that the committee thought it was important to provide a timely response, given that there seems to be a lot of anxiety regarding the form, both in its use for feedback and as evaluation. The committee strongly felt a conversation is certainly needed, but that the conversation should be focused. Moore offered that the committee hoped to take care of some of the more simple issues of concern that people want changed; this revised draft-form could then serve as a point of departure for discussion. Cannon clarified whether the committee would like comments to be solicited from the faculty in the e-mail, and they replied yes.

Ryken asked for clarification regarding who actually has the authority to enact a change on evaluation forms, and discussion ensued ultimately concluding – in the absence of specific language in the Faculty Code regarding authority over evaluation forms - that the PSC, under the authority of the Senate, would be the appropriate body to enact such changes.

Miscellaneous

Holland requested that the previous Faculty Meeting be discussed, noting that some faculty members expressed dissatisfaction with both the venue and the fact the administration spoke until 5:05. L. Johnson shared another faculty member's impression that it did not feel like a faculty meeting. Ostrom offered that the latter may have been due to a tactical error on our part, in asking HR to make a presentation. A follow up meeting to continue the discussion would help alleviate this problem. Discussion ensued regarding increasing attendance, with suggestions including a move to the Rotunda, and emphasis on interesting topics, and wine and cheese.

Cannon responded to the issue (raised earlier) of having a meeting without administrators to discuss the benefits package. He pointed out that since the agenda is published, the meeting is open, and the Senate is not meant to just represent faculty, this would be difficult. He also wondered if a discussion of benefits should be formally placed on the agenda for the next Senate meeting, prior to the discussion of the Diversity Committee. Holland suggested a benefits discussion take place in an executive session, and expressed skepticism that a discussion of benefits led predominantly by the administration would adequately reflect the urgency of the faculty's needs. Cannon pointed out that given 1) that the Senate is meant to serve the faculty, staff, and administration, and 2) such anxieties hint at a difference of interest, the Senate needs to be involved in facilitating discussion. He emphasized that the point in inviting Gibson to the discussion would be so she could address some questions for which she had previously been unable to provide answers. Haltom pointed out it would be useful to have her expertise, and that the discussion could be useful to her. Hutchinson pointed out we are inviting her to answer questions when they come up. Holland urged that in any case the benefits issue is something the Senate needs to take up, perhaps via a committee, but that it should be separate from an HR task force with faculty folded in. Weiss added that in that sense it is beneficial to have Gibson here.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Kristin Johnson

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

to the

Board of Trustees of the University of Puget Sound

October 6, 2008

As I write, rainy weather confirms that fall indeed is upon us. Carrying forward last spring's attention to diversity issues, the Senate will take up a reorganization proposal from the faculty Committee on Diversity. The idea is for separate committees of faculty and staff to be coordinated by an administrative Diversity Advisory Council, with the guidance of the Chief Diversity Officer in particular. The Faculty Senate's part in this restructuring will be to bring to the faculty a detailed revision of the relevant section of the Faculty Bylaws. Such revision of course would subsequently come to the Board for its approval.

There are no other pending proposals for changes to the Faculty Code or Bylaws, so the Senate sees the way clear to address new topics. One involves assessment of the core curriculum, which has now been in place for five years. When the time comes, Senate deliberation will draw on the review of the core as a whole, which the Curriculum Committee has been charged to conduct, and also on the assessment sections of the reaccreditation self-study.

Another large topic is the process of faculty evaluation, which has had no fundamental examination for many years. Such examination could potentially lead to significant changes in the Faculty Code. Beginnings include a Senate request that the Professional Standards Committee craft language for a Faculty Code revision, to provide that standards for those wishing to be considered for early tenure or promotion be the same as for those coming up at the usual times. Also the Senate conducted a survey of faculty on the instructor evaluation form currently filled out by students. The results of that survey are being digested, but initially there seem to be more issues arising out of the use made of those evaluations than about the design of the form itself.

A looming background issue is the efficiency of our system of evaluation in the sense of achieving the objectives of faculty evaluation within a reasonable allocation of valuable faculty time and energy. An effective evaluation process is essential for securing a highly capable and professionally distinguished body of faculty who will provide the excellent instruction that our institution is known for. Further, it serves to motivate those whose membership on the faculty is

more or less assured. For over thirty years that our process has been in place, these objectives have been achieved to a remarkable degree. Even so, faculty and administrative resources devoted to them have been ever increasing and promise to continue to increase in an era of higher faculty turnover. It will be a challenge for the Senate, the faculty as a whole, and ultimately the administration and Board, to settle on an optimal balance.

Reflecting widespread faculty concern, the Senate has asked for a full faculty forum on employee benefits, which will occur on October 28. We have requested information from the director of Human Resources, who plans a presentation on which discussion will be based. She will focus on health care benefits and educational benefits. Faculty have particularly expressed concern about the high cost of health insurance for employees with dependents, this having sometimes been a deterrent in hiring. And the limitation of educational benefits to dependents as defined by the Internal Revenue Service has already been the topic of a preliminary discussion in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas F. Cannon
Professor of Philosophy
Chair of the Faculty Senate

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Elections
Richard Anderson-Connolly, Terry Beck, Randy Bentson,
Nancy Bristow, John Hanson (Chair)
October 30, 2008

At its September 10, 2007 meeting the Faculty Senate approved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to "discuss and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections". (The full text of the motion, along with specific charges to the committee, are included in Appendix 1.) The motion was a response to issues identified by John Hanson, who, in his role as Faculty Senate secretary, was charged with running faculty elections the previous academic year. (A document drafted by John Hanson immediately after the Spring 2006 elections that describes some of his concerns is provided in Appendix 2.)

Early in October of 2007 the committee solicited input from members of the faculty by distributing an email questionnaire. (The full text of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix 3.) Probably the most telling result from this questionnaire was the low response rate; only 6 faculty members responded, and most of these did not indicate significant concerns. (The responses from faculty are provided in Appendix 4.) This suggests that the faculty as a whole do not have strong concerns about the election process.

After reviewing the election process, and the charges from the Faculty Senate, the subcommittee makes the following recommendations:

1. Amend the Faculty Bylaws to clarify procedures for elections;
2. Create and maintain a document describing procedures and guidelines for conducting faculty elections;
3. Implement a reasonably secure system for electronic voting;
4. Discuss whether different voting schemes or representation structures are desirable.

1. Proposed Changes to the Faculty Bylaws

Below are a series of changes to the Faculty Bylaws, proposed by the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Elections. (Appendix 5 contains sections of the current Faculty Bylaws dealing with elections.) In the changes proposed below the committee has attempted to clarify the procedures for elections. This has involved, in some cases, the creation of new policies around election procedures. Given this, the committee wanted to explain the purposes of each proposed change, as well as to clarify the reasoning behind those changes. What follows, then, is a point-by-point explanation of our logic and purposes.

A. The Faculty Bylaws (IV, 6, D) state that the Faculty Senate Secretary shall distribute nomination ballots, collect names of nominees, and make available ballots for elections. Given the central role of the Secretary in the election process, we recommend adding the phrase "to conduct elections for Senate Chairperson, Senators, and Faculty Advancement

Committee members, following the procedures outlined in IV, 6 and V, 6, C" to the list of duties of the Secretary described in IV, 3, A, c.

The revised section would then read (new language in bold):

c. A secretary to keep minutes of all Faculty Senate actions and at the end of each May to deposit a complete collection of those minutes and supporting documents in the University library archives and with the office of the Dean of the University; at the beginning of each academic year to distribute to convenors of committees the end-of-the-year reports submitted by the respective committees to the Faculty Senate during the previous May; **to conduct elections for Senate Chairperson, Senators, and Faculty Advancement Committee members, following the procedures outlined in IV, 6 and V, 6, C;** and to perform such other duties as may be assigned.

B. Article IV, Section 3, B is titled "Election of Senate Officers", but the first subsection contains only the cryptic "The Chairperson (III, 1, c)." Although III, 1, c does state that "The Faculty shall elect for a two-year term from among its instructional staff, a Senate Chairperson..." it does not explicitly state the method for electing the chairperson, although this is presumably the same as that used for electing Senators. We recommend revising IV, 3, b, a, to read:

a. The Chairperson (III, 1, C) **shall be elected for a two-year term as described in IV, 6. Eligibility shall correspond to that outlined in IV, 6, A for members of the Senate.**

We also recommend that the title for IV, 6 be changed from "Procedures for Election of Senators" to "Procedures for Election of Senators **and Senate Chairperson**".

C. Article IV, Section 6, B, b states that "The terms shall be staggered so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the elected Senate positions open each year." However, in the current method for filling resignations and vacancies described in IV, C Senators who resign are simply replaced until the next election, and their spot is then filled in the regular election with a new 3-year term, potentially causing a drift away from having one-third of the positions opening each year. We recommend new language for IV, C, a (shown below) that will ensure that Senators' terms stay on the same three year cycle, even if they resign and are replaced.

Further, there is currently no provision for what should occur if the Senate Chairperson should resign or be unable to complete his or her term of office. Thus we recommend including the Senate Chairperson in this section.

Finally, if a Senator should resign before starting his or her term of office then it seems reasonable to simply have the next runner-up in the election take his or her place. This might occur, for example, if a person was running for both a Senate seat and Chairperson of the Senate and was elected to both. In the current language a temporary replacement would be appointed until the next election.

Current language of IV, 6, B, a:

a. If a Senator resigns or is unable to complete his or her term of service, the resulting

vacancy shall be filled in the next regular election. The new Senator shall serve a three-year term. If the vacancy occurs prior to the end of the academic year, the Faculty Senate may appoint a temporary replacement to serve until the next election.

The revised section IV, 6, B, a would then read:

a. If a Senator **or the Senate Chairperson** resigns or is unable to complete his or her term of service, **and if the remaining length in the term of office is one year or less**, the Faculty Senate may appoint a temporary replacement to serve until the next election. **In the case where a Senator resigns before starting his or her term of office, the next runner-up in the election will replace him or her. In all other cases, including resignation of the Senate Chair, a special election shall be held to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term of office.**

D. Article IV, section 6, D, e states "Nominees for a final election, if needed, shall be those with the highest number of votes but not to exceed twice the number of positions to be filled." This wording introduces ambiguity, since it doesn't specify exactly how many nominees should be listed. In addition, the "not to exceed twice the number of positions" could lead to some bizarre situations, especially in the case of an election with only one position to be filled and a tie in the primary.

We recommend that IV, 6, D, e be changed to read:

e. Nominees for a final election, if needed, shall be those candidates who received the highest number of votes in the primary election, and shall normally be twice the number of positions to be filled. When a tie in the primary votes prevents this outcome, those involved in the tie shall all be included in the final election.

E. John Hanson, who served as Secretary of the Senate for two years (2006-2008), has noted the absence of any guidelines for the detailed process of the elections. On his advice the committee chose to create a new document, "Elections Procedures and Guidelines," and to institutionalize this document through this reference in the Bylaws. While the specifics of the process do not need to be detailed in the Bylaws, the committee believes that the Senate should revisit this document regularly, hence the requirement that this document be approved before each election.

We recommend the insertion of the following new section IV, 6, D, i:

i. The Senate Secretary shall present to the Faculty Senate an Elections Procedures and Guidelines document for review, amendment and approval prior to the annual spring election of Senators.

F. The Bylaws are silent on the issue of recusal. Imagining worst-case scenarios the committee decided to include language here to require recusal.

k. Recusal of the Secretary of the Senate from conducting elections shall occur when s/he is standing for a position to be decided in the election and the Senate shall appoint a replacement to conduct the election from those members not standing for election.

2. Procedures and Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Elections

The Faculty Bylaws describe the election of Faculty Senate members and officers as well as some other faculty positions, e.g., members of the Faculty Advancement Committee. (Appendix 5 contains sections of the Faculty Bylaws dealing with elections.) However, there are many election details that are not described in the Faculty Bylaws. For example, Article IV.3.D.h states that "The Faculty Senate shall establish a system of voting that is reasonably secure against fraud and ensures a secret ballot." The purpose of this document is to provide detailed information about the process to be used in faculty elections. This document should be maintained by the Faculty Senate Secretary and should be updated, reviewed, and approved by the Faculty Senate prior to each election.

As a courtesy, the Faculty Senate Secretary has upon request run elections for other faculty groups (i.e., the Faculty Salary Committee) during the regular Senate elections.

I. Eligibility for Voting

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.A.b) state that those eligible to vote in the election of Senators are (by reference to Article II.1) "the President of the University, the Academic Deans, the Dean of Students, and members of the instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and full-time visiting faculty."

The Faculty Senate Secretary will prepare a list of those eligible to vote and publish this list on the University website at the same time that a call for nominations is distributed to eligible faculty. The call for nominations will also include a description of how to access the list of eligible voters.

The Academic Dean's office and OIS are two resources that the Secretary can use to compile the necessary list. OIS has generated a process that can be accessed via a web browser to get an eligible list of faculty:

http://cascade.ups.edu/cascade/faculty.voting_list

When this method was constructed (Spring 2007) the following description was provided:

Voting eligibility is validated against the full-time faculty list that is maintained by the Academic Dean's office. To determine eligibility, we look for faculty members with an active contract for the current year in the Academic Dean's office database, which includes tenure-track, not tenure-track, visiting and retired positions. It does not include adjunct faculty or research-only positions.

If this list is not accurate, consult with OIS via the helpdesk.

The Senate Secretary should also check to be sure that whatever method is being used for distributing ballots uses the same voting list.

Any member of the faculty may challenge the presence or absence of an individual on the voting list by notifying the Faculty Senate Secretary. If the Secretary finds that the presence or absence of an individual is the result of a clerical error, the Secretary may add or delete that individual from the roll as appropriate. If however, there is uncertainty or disagreement about whether or not an individual is an eligible voter, the matter will be brought before the Faculty Senate to decide the issue.

II. Nomination Procedures and Eligibility for Election

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.a) state "At a time no later than one month before the last scheduled class day, or at a time designated by the Chairperson when an election to fill a vacancy is needed, the Secretary shall distribute a nomination ballot to each member of the instructional staff eligible to vote."

This nomination ballot will be distributed via an email solicitation using the facultycoms@ups.edu email server. Appendix 6 includes a sample nomination e-mail that may be used as a template.

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.b) state "Names of nominees for Senate Chairperson, Senators, or the Faculty Advancement Committee are to be submitted to the Secretary within one week. The consent of the nominee to be a candidate is to be secured by the Senate Chairperson."

Nominations may be made via email to the Faculty Senate Secretary, or by sending a note via campus mail.

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.A.a) states "Eligible to be elected to the Senate are full-time members of the non-retired instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor."

As nominations are made, the Faculty Senate Secretary will determine if the nominee is eligible for election as described in Article IV.6.A.a. If the Faculty Senate Secretary believes that a nominee is not eligible for election, and the identity of the nominator is known, the Secretary will contact the nominator and explain why the nominee is not eligible. If the nominator agrees with the Secretary the nominee will be dropped. If the nominator disagrees with the Secretary, he or she may appeal the decision to the Faculty Senate. If the nominator is not known, the Secretary will consult with the Faculty Senate Chairperson. If both agree that the nominee is not eligible, the nominee will be dropped. If the Secretary and Chairperson do not agree, or if there is some doubt as to the eligibility of the nominee, the matter will be decided by the Faculty Senate.

Since the consent of the nominee must be secured by the Senate Chairperson, the Faculty Senate Secretary should regularly send lists of nominees to the Senate Chairperson. The

Chairperson will then contact the nominees to secure their consent. The Chairperson will then send a list of those nominees who have agreed to stand for election to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

III. Balloting Procedure

See the Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c-i).

Information about the voting system that will be used should be inserted here.

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c) "one week shall be allowed for the return of the ballots", which is interpreted to mean that Faculty should be able to vote for one week.

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c) "The Secretary shall list all the nominees in alphabetical order" and "Nominees and ongoing members of the Senate shall be identified by name and academic department on the election ballot".

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.f) "Each person may vote for as many nominees as there are positions to be filled; however a person may not cast cumulative votes for a single candidate."

If the number of candidates is more than twice the number of positions to be filled, then the first vote is a primary and those receiving the highest number of votes in the primary (but not to exceed twice the number of positions to be filled) will be listed on the final election ballot.

The Faculty bylaws specify (Article IV.6.D.g) that "The nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes shall be elected. Tie votes shall be decided by a coin toss." If a coin toss is necessary, the Faculty Senate Secretary, the President of the Faculty Senate, and the two candidates (or their representatives) will meet to select the winner. In the event that one of the candidates or a representative fails to attend an agreed upon meeting, the coin toss shall proceed as scheduled. The secretary will have one candidate call the toss and then flip the coin.

The balloting system will be overseen by the Faculty Senate Secretary and one other person selected by the Faculty Senate. This person should not be a candidate in the election and will provide an independent validation of the election results.

The vote count will not normally be published, but the Faculty Senate Secretary will provide the vote count to any member of the faculty eligible to vote upon request.

"The regular election of Senators shall be completed by the last Senate meeting of the spring semester."

IV. Conflicts of Interest

Given the central role of the Faculty Senate Secretary in the election process, he or she should not be a candidate in the election. (An individual who expects to be a candidate in the next Senate election should not accept a nomination to run for Faculty Senate Secretary.) If the Secretary does decide to stand for election, he or she is automatically recused from his or her roles in running the election and the Faculty Senate will select a member of the Senate to serve in his or her place. Any faculty member may raise a question of conflict of interest. The Faculty Senate will decide the issue.

V. Resolution of Disputes

If any challenge to the election procedure or results is raised, the Faculty Senate will meet and decide the issue. Any members of the Faculty Senate who are running in the election are automatically recused from this process.

3. The Future of Electronic Voting

We recommend continuing the use of electronic voting. However, the current "uvote" system is not under control of the Faculty Senate and consequently should be replaced by a new system. Randy Bentson is investigating the possibility of either constructing or adapting an electronic voting system for use by the faculty. We recommend that Randy work with the Faculty Senate Secretary to implement a new voting system. Details regarding this system should be included in the "Procedures and Guidelines for Faculty Elections" document.

4. Alternative Election Schemes

Two types of changes to the system of Faculty Senate elections are possible. The first is to change from multimember at-large to single-member district representation. The second is to change from plurality to ranked choice voting or approval voting.

Single-Member Districts vs. Multimember At-Large Seats

In a multimember at-large election candidates run in the same race for several open seats to represent the entire political or organizational body. The entire electorate can vote and the candidates with the most support are elected. Our current system is at-large: In a typical year the faculty elect three new members from the entire faculty and the elected senators represent the entire faculty.

An alternative is to change to a system with districts, particularly single-member districts, using some characteristic to separate the faculty. Three open seats could be divided into three distinct races according to rank: Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. One assistant professor would be elected by only assistant professors and so on. Alternatively

districts could be based upon some disciplinary grouping: sciences, humanities, etc. In a sense a senator would represent a particular “constituency.”

Plurality vs. Ranked Choice or Approval Voting

In a plurality election a voter has a number of votes equal to the number of positions to be filled and the candidate with the most votes wins. Most elections in the US are single-member plurality; each voter has one vote for each office. For the Faculty Senate, when three positions are open, each voter has three votes.

Ranked choice voting (RCV) and approval voting are two alternatives to plurality voting.* Under RCV voters are permitted to rank the candidates on the ballot. The votes are tabulated such that in each round a vote on a ballot counts toward the highest ranked candidate still in the running. In a single-member district race, if a candidate has a majority of first choice votes then that candidate wins. Otherwise the candidate with the fewest first choices is eliminated and the highest ranked candidate on each ballots is counted as a vote in the second round. The process may take several rounds to produce a majority winner. In a multi-member race, the threshold for victory is no longer 50% and votes are transferred both from eliminated candidates and from surpluses of already elected candidates. In a multi-member election RCV is considered to be one type of proportional representation.

With approval voting the voters can cast as many or as few ballots as they wish. The voter will vote for those candidates that s/he “approves.” In a race with 10 candidates for 3 open seats, a voter may approve of as few as 0 or as many as 10. The three candidates receiving the most votes are elected. Multi-member approval voting is also considered to be a type of proportional voting.

The primary election, which we currently use when the number of candidates exceeds twice the number of positions, would no longer be necessary under RCV or approval voting.

The Problem with the Current System

The Faculty Senate is currently elected by a plurality at-large system. This system has a serious structural flaw and can lead to the election of a set of candidates who do not represent the diversity of the electorate. This system allows a majority of the electorate, or possibly even the largest minority, to win all the seats. Assume that the largest group of faculty are full professors and that faculty tend to vote for others in the same rank (perhaps not out of any attempt to promote their own interests but simply because they know them better). Full professors would be able to elect only full professors to the Senate. The possibility is not restricted to rank. Faculty might sort themselves according to political views or attitudes about the administration. The largest group, according to any dimension, might obtain a disproportionately large percentage of Senate seats.*

* There are other alternatives in addition to RCV and approval voting. The version of RCV considered here is called the single transferable vote.

* Until 1842 many states elected their US representatives by plurality at-large. This allowed the majority party to win all the congressional seats for the state. Plurality at-large has also been used to minimize the

Recommendation

Retain the at-large structure instead of representation by district.

Change to either ranked choice voting or approval voting in order to achieve a more accurate representation of the entire faculty.

representation of racial minorities. These are not problems faced by the Faculty Senate but rather illustrate the nature of the flaw with this voting system.

APPENDIX 1: Formation of and Charges to the Ad Hoc Committee on Elections

The following motion was approved at the Sept. 10, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

I move that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. The membership of the committee will consist of John Hanson (Chair), Richard Anderson-Connolly, Randy Bentson, Nancy Bristow, and Terrence Beck.

The committee is charged to investigate the issues discussed below, as well as other issues related to elections that it identifies during its deliberations.

How should votes be cast? Should electronic voting be used, and if so what system should be implemented? What safeguards are necessary for ensuring secure and accurate elections? For the past two years we have used electronic voting using the ASUPS uvote system. While electronic voting seems to be popular among many faculty members, others have voiced concerns about the security and validity of electronic voting, especially using a system that we do not control and that we have not validated.

Who runs the election and who certifies the results? The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is currently charged with distributing and collecting ballots for the election. But there is no indication as to who should be involved in certifying the election that the Secretary ran. This is a potential weak point in the process, especially since the Bylaws don't provide any provision for what should happen if the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is also running for a position!

Should the procedures used for electing the Faculty Senate Chair be the same as for Faculty Senate members? There are currently no procedures outlined in the bylaws for the election of the Faculty Senate Chair. For example, if there are three candidates should the winner of the election be declared the new Faculty Senate Chair, or should there be a runoff, as is stipulated for the election of Faculty Senate members.

Who decides on election questions not addressed in the Faculty Code or Bylaws? (For example, should vote counts be announced?) What mechanism should be used to inform the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and others charged with overseeing the election, about the answers to these types of questions, as well as providing practical information about running the election?

Should the structure of elections be changed? For example, should instant runoff voting be implemented? Are there ways of structuring the elections such that the Faculty Senate is more representative of the faculty as a whole?

APPENDIX 2:
Reflections on Faculty Elections

April 30, 2007

John Hanson, Faculty Senate Secretary

While preparing for and running the faculty elections this year I encountered a number of issues that I think should be discussed (see below). I recommend that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss these (and related) issues and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. I recommend that this committee be chaired by the next Secretary of the Faculty Senate and that it include two additional members of the Faculty Senate and two members from the faculty.

One fundamental question that needs to be addressed is the type of voting procedure we should use. For the past two years we have tried using electronic voting using the ASUPS uvote system. While electronic voting seems to be popular among many faculty members, others have voiced concerns about the security and validity of electronic voting. I myself am concerned about using a system that we do not control and that we have not validated. I recommend that the Ad Hoc Committee discuss the relative merits of various voting procedures and make a recommendation to the Senate.

The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is charged with distributing and collecting ballots for the election. But there is no indication as to who should be involved in certifying the election that the Secretary ran. This is a potential weak point in the process. Especially since the Bylaws don't provide any provision for what should happen if the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is also running for a position! Presumably we don't want a candidate being the sole person running an election.

There are currently no procedures outlined in the bylaws for the election of the Faculty Senate Chair. (Article IV, Section 3.B.a. states "The Chairperson (III, 1, c)" For example, if there are three candidates should the winner of the election be declared the new Faculty Senate chair, or should there be a runoff, as is stipulated for the election of Faculty Senate members. I assume that the intention was that the same system used for electing senators would be used for electing the chair, but it doesn't actually state this.

Who decides on particulars of the voting system? As it reads now it looks like the Secretary of the Faculty Senate gets to do whatever he or she wants, as long as it doesn't violate anything in the bylaws. But there are lots of procedures that aren't stipulated in the bylaws. For example, should vote counts be announced? Again the bylaws are silent. It seems reasonable to make the Faculty Senate be the decision making body regarding elections, but I recommend that this be stated explicitly in the bylaws.

Given that there will be numerous voting procedures that are not (and probably should not) be outlined in the bylaws, there needs to be a document that the Faculty Senate Secretary can refer to that details the decisions made by the Senate (or whoever is anointed the governing body for elections). I recommend that a document outlining the voting procedures be created and posted on the Senate website. Each year, prior to the election, the Senate can approve this document. If new issues arise that need to be incorporated into the election procedures the Senate can vote to amend the document. This will provide some continuity from election to election and ensure Senate oversight.

One question that the Faculty Senate secretary needs to address is validating the list of those eligible to vote. Especially with electronic elections, the Secretary needs to look at

the list of voters that the computer is accessing when it decides who may vote and who may not. This list should be checked against a list maintained in by the Dean of the University. I recommend that this list be published on the web and freely accessible to any faculty member. That way any faculty member can check the list, to make sure that they are on it if eligible, and so that they can challenge any names that they believe should not be on it.

APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire sent to faculty.

Dear Colleague,

The Faculty Senate recently created the Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss and make recommendations regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. (The full text of the committee's charges is included at the end of this email.) The committee consists of John Hanson (Chair), Richard Anderson-Connolly, Randy Bentson, Nancy Bristow, and Terence Beck. We are writing to solicit your input on the faculty election process, and would appreciate it if you could take a few moments to answer the questions posed below, and add any other comments/concerns/suggestions that you might have. All replies should be sent to John Hanson (hanson@ups.edu), preferably within one week. Names of those responding will be removed before the comments are compiled or distributed.

1. For the past two years we have been using an electronic voting system for Faculty Senate elections. What did you like about electronic voting? What additional features do you think would be useful to include in an electronic voting system?
2. What didn't you like about electronic voting? What safeguards need to be included in an electronic voting system to make you feel comfortable using it?
3. Do you think that the current system for faculty elections, in which faculty are nominated and run in plurality at-large elections, results in adequate representation for various faculty constituencies? If not, what concerns do you have and what changes would you suggest?
4. Please provide any other comments/suggestions/concerns about our election process.

Thanks,
The Ad Hoc Committee on Elections

Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections

I move that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. The membership of the committee will consist of John Hanson (Chair), Richard Anderson-Connolly, Randy Bentson, Nancy Bristow, and Terrence Beck.

The committee is charged to investigate the issues discussed below, as well as other issues related to elections that it identifies during its deliberations.

How should votes be cast? Should electronic voting be used, and if so what system should be implemented? What safeguards are necessary for ensuring secure and accurate elections? For the past two years we have used electronic voting using the ASUPS uvote system. While electronic voting seems to be popular among many faculty members,

others have voiced concerns about the security and validity of electronic voting, especially using a system that we do not control and that we have not validated.

Who runs the election and who certifies the results? The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is currently charged with distributing and collecting ballots for the election. But there is no indication as to who should be involved in certifying the election that the Secretary ran. This is a potential weak point in the process, especially since the Bylaws don't provide any provision for what should happen if the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is also running for a position!

Should the procedures used for electing the Faculty Senate Chair be the same as for Faculty Senate members? There are currently no procedures outlined in the bylaws for the election of the Faculty Senate Chair. For example, if there are three candidates should the winner of the election be declared the new Faculty Senate Chair, or should there be a runoff, as is stipulated for the election of Faculty Senate members.

Who decides on election questions not addressed in the Faculty Code or Bylaws? (For example, should vote counts be announced?) What mechanism should be used to inform the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and others charged with overseeing the election, about the answers to these types of questions, as well as providing practical information about running the election?

Should the structure of elections be changed? For example, should instant runoff voting be implemented? Are there ways of structuring the elections such that the Faculty Senate is more representative of the faculty as a whole?

**APPENDIX 4:
Faculty Input on Elections
Replies from the October 18, 2007 Solicitation**

I have one immediate thought on the issue of electronic voting for faculty elections and it is this: In judging the security and accuracy of any electronic system, we should avoid comparison to some ideal of 100% secure and 100% accurate in favor of comparison to the system we are replacing. As an example of this, consider the issue of securing against an individual voting more than once. Our old system had essentially no security against this. The old system required each person to return a paper ballot in a sealed envelope signed across the sealed flap. From my experience as Faculty Senate Secretary, I can tell you that a substantial proportion of the signatures were illegible. Thus, it was not feasible to keep track of who had submitted a ballot. After checking with my predecessors that this was the tradition, I made no effort to do so. Anyone with access to a copy machine and willingness to scratch out illegible signatures could have voted repeatedly. Of course, the old system could have been modified to be more secure and more accurate. (For example, to deal with the illegible signature issue, we could require a printed name to also be included on the seal.) So, perhaps the real comparison to be made is between an electronic system and a feasible modification of the old system. The main point is to not throw out an electronic system solely because it fails to meet some ideal standard.

1. For the past two years we have been using an electronic voting system for Faculty Senate elections. What did you like about electronic voting? What additional features do you think would be useful to include in an electronic voting system?

I like electronic voting because of its convenience. It seems to be working well.

2. What didn't you like about electronic voting? What safeguards need to be included in an electronic voting system to make you feel comfortable using it?

I'm comfortable with it. It's important to ensure that each faculty member votes only once, through I'd prefer to think that I can trust my colleagues to do right.

3. Do you think that the current system for faculty elections, in which faculty are nominated and run in plurality at-large elections, results in adequate representation for various faculty constituencies? If not, what concerns do you have and what changes would you suggest?

The current system is fine. Faculty members can decide for themselves if a group appears underrepresented.

4. Please provide any other comments/suggestions/concerns about our election process.

1. For the past two years we have been using an electronic voting system for Faculty

Senate elections. What did you like about electronic voting? What additional features do you think would be useful to include in an electronic voting system?

It has improved the facilitation of elections substantially. Additionally, it enabled me to participate in elections while on sabbatical on a different continent. Without the electronic elections I probably would not have been able to participate, at least in any way that is allowed by our by-laws

2. What didn't you like about electronic voting? What safeguards need to be included in an electronic voting system to make you feel comfortable using it?

Easy, uncomplicated, and secure. I am comfortable with the present safeguards.

3. Do you think that the current system for faculty elections, in which faculty are nominated and run in plurality at-large elections, results in adequate representation for various faculty constituencies? If not, what concerns do you have and what changes would you suggest?

This is a tough question to answer, since it cannot address the natural inclination or disinclination of individual faculty to participate in governance. There have been certain factions within the faculty that have managed to dominate the agenda, but they do so because they choose to be involved. Would we be better served with the addition of a nominating committee? Perhaps. Related to this topic, I do like the system of run-offs.

4. Please provide any other comments/suggestions/concerns about our election process.
None.

1. For the past two years we have been using an electronic voting system for Faculty Senate elections. What did you like about electronic voting? What additional features do you think would be useful to include in an electronic voting system? **Electronic voting has been convenient, easy to understand and it works into my normal working routine.**

2. What didn't you like about electronic voting? What safeguards need to be included in an electronic voting system to make you feel comfortable using it? **I have had no trouble with the voting--I'm currently comfortable using it.**

3. Do you think that the current system for faculty elections, in which faculty are nominated and run in plurality at-large elections, results in adequate representation for various faculty constituencies? If not, what concerns do you have and what changes would you suggest? **I haven't had any concerns about representation of various constituencies.**

4. Please provide any other comments/suggestions/concerns about our election process.
I like electronic voting--please continue it.

I have been pleased with the electronic voting system. It is quick and easy to use. I cannot think of any other safeguards that need to be implemented. I also think that the current system provides adequate representation for the various constituencies.

1. What did you like about electronic voting? What additional features do you think would be useful to include in an electronic voting system?

Convenient and saves paper (and all those envelopes). It is a very efficient system.

2. What didn't you like about electronic voting? What safeguards need to be included in an electronic voting system to make you feel comfortable using it?

I'm comfortable with electronic formats and tend to trust the system more than distrust it. After the election I was surprised to get an email that listed who I had voted for. I would prefer to get an email confirmation stating simply, "You successfully voted in the UPS Faculty elections. If you have questions contact _____."

3. Do you think that the current system for faculty elections, in which faculty are nominated and run in plurality at-large elections, results in adequate representation for various faculty constituencies? If not, what concerns do you have and what changes would you suggest?

No. I've been concerned about this since I arrived at Puget Sound. I'm particularly concerned about junior faculty having a voice. I'd be open to a system where Senate seats are distributed by proportional percentage (e.g. by % of professor, associate, and assistant professors). At a minimum I'd prefer to see at least three seats designated for junior faculty. I've also wondered if candidates should provide statements (could be linked to the ballot) so that we have more to base our decisions on than name recognition.

Appendix 5: Portions of the Faculty Bylaws Dealing with Elections

ARTICLE II: THE FACULTY

Sec. 1. **Membership**. The Faculty shall consist of the President of the University, the Academic Deans, the Dean of Students, and members of the instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and full-time visiting faculty.

Sec. 3. **Voting**. Each member shall have one vote and no voting by proxy shall be permitted in any deliberation of the Faculty.

ARTICLE III: ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY

Sec. 1. Officers and Duties.

C. The Faculty shall elect for a two-year term from among its instructional staff, a Senate Chairperson to:

- a. Call and preside over the meetings of the Faculty Senate.
- b. Serve as Faculty Representative to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.
- c. Jointly, with other members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Dean, and the President, appoint all Faculty standing committee members. (IV)

D. The Faculty shall elect for three year terms from among its instructional staff, eleven (11) Senators as members of the Faculty Senate. (IV)

Sec. 2. Meetings of the Faculty

C. At its first meeting of the academic year, the Faculty shall elect a Secretary to keep minutes of all Faculty actions; distribute those minutes to the Faculty; and at the conclusion of the academic year deposit a complete collection of the minutes and supporting documents in the University library archives and with the office of the Dean of the University.

E. Voting shall be by voice or, at the call of two (2) members of the Faculty, by a written ballot, or by mail when a majority of those present at the meeting approve such a ballot by voice or written ballot prior to a vote being taken on a substantive motion. In the case of voting by mail, the process for the distribution and collection of ballots shall correspond to the process for the election of Senators (IV, 6, D).

ARTICLE IV: THE FACULTY SENATE

Sec. 3. Officers and Executive Committee.

B. Election of Senate Officers.

- a. The Chairperson (III, 1, c).
- b. The Vice-Chairperson and the Secretary shall be elected for one-year terms from among and by the elected Senators as soon as possible after the election of Senators (IV, 6, C).

Sec. 6. **Procedures for Election of Senators.**

A. Eligibility for election of and voting for Senators.

- a. Eligible to be elected to the Senate are full-time members of the non-retired instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor.
- b. Eligible for voting in the election of Senators are the members of the instructional staff as defined in Article II, Section 1.

B. Terms.

- a. The term of office shall be three years.
- b. The terms shall be staggered so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the elected Senate positions open each year.
- c. The terms of office for the Senate Chairperson and all Senators shall begin on June 1 and end on May 31.

C. Resignations and Vacancies.

- a. If a Senator resigns or is unable to complete his or her term of service, the resulting vacancy shall be filled in the next regular election. The new Senator shall serve a three-year term. If the vacancy occurs prior to the end of the academic year, the Faculty Senate may appoint a temporary replacement to serve until the next election.
- b. When a Senator is unable to serve for a period that does not exceed an academic semester, the Faculty Senate may appoint a member of the Faculty to serve as a temporary replacement during the Senator's absence; however, a Senator, who is unable to serve for more than a semester must resign.
- c. If an incumbent Senator is elected Chairperson, the resulting vacancy shall be handled as a resignation.
- d. Whenever possible, temporary replacements should be drawn from a list of alternates composed of runners-up from the previous regular election.

D. Nomination and Balloting Procedure.

- a. At a time no later than one month before the last scheduled class day, or at a time designated by the Chairperson when an election to fill a vacancy is needed, the Secretary shall distribute a nomination ballot to each member of the instructional staff eligible to vote.
- b. Names of nominees for Senate Chairperson, Senators, or the Faculty Advancement Committee are to be submitted to the Secretary within one week. The consent of the nominee to be a candidate is to be secured by the Senate Chairperson.
- c. The Secretary shall list all nominees in alphabetical order and make available a ballot to each member of the instructional staff eligible to vote. One week shall be allowed for the return of the ballots. Nominees and ongoing members of the Senate shall be identified by name and academic department on the election ballots.
- d. If the number of candidates is more than twice the number of positions to be filled, a primary vote shall be taken.
- e. Nominees for a final election, if needed, shall be those with the highest number of votes but not to exceed twice the number of positions to be filled.
- f. Each person may vote for as many nominees as there are positions to be filled; however, a person may not cast cumulative votes for a single candidate.
- g. The nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes shall be elected. Tie votes shall be decided by a coin toss.

h. The Faculty Senate shall establish a system of voting that is reasonably secure against fraud and ensures a secret ballot.

i. The regular election of Senators shall be completed by the last Senate meeting of the spring semester.

ARTICLE V: STANDING COMMITTEES

Sec. 6. Standing Committees

C. The Faculty Advancement Committee.

a. **Membership.** The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio) and five tenure-line Faculty members.

A slate of nominees will be selected by the Faculty using the method specified for the election of Senators. In order to stand for election, a nominee must agree to serve a minimum of two consecutive years. The slate of nominees will number three if there is one position to be filled. If there are two or more positions to be filled, the slate will number two persons for each position open. The Dean normally will select from the nominees in such a way as to avoid the appointment of two members of the same department or school to serve on the Committee at the same time.

c. **Vacancies and Resignations.** Replacement of members due to vacancies and resignations shall be handled by the procedures described above. New members shall serve full terms.

Appendix 6: Sample Nomination E-mail

Faculty Colleagues,

This is a call for nominations for the following faculty governance positions:

- Chair of the Faculty Senate
- Two (2) members of the Faculty Senate
- One (1) member of the Faculty Advancement Committee
- Three (3) members of the Faculty Salary Committee

A list of the continuing members of these bodies can be found at the bottom of this message.

You may submit nominations for these positions using any of the following methods:

- Email the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, John Hanson (hanson@ups.edu)
- Send a note to John Hanson via Campus Mail (CMB 1015)

Be sure to indicate which position(s) you are nominating someone for. The deadline for nominations is Wednesday, March 28, 2007.

Thank you,

John Hanson
Faculty Senate Secretary

Continuing Members of the Faculty Senate:

- Terry Beck (Education)
- Robin Foster (Psychology)
- Priti Joshi (English)
- Julie McGruder (OT)
- Hans Ostrom (English)
- Amy Ryken (Education)
- Nancy Bristow (History)
- John Hanson (Chemistry)
- Ross Singleton (Economics)

Continuing Members of the FAC:

- Peter Greenfield (English)
- Sunil Kukreja (Comparative Sociology)
- Kate Stirling (Economics)

Keith Ward (Music)

Continuing Members of the Faculty Salary Committee:

Lynda Livingston (Business)

John Woodward (Education)