

## **Faculty Senate Minutes December 1, 2008**

Senators present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Terence Beck, Douglas Cannon, William Haltom, Sue Hannaford, Suzanne Holland, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Hans Ostrom, Jada Pelger, Amy Ryken, Mike Segawa, Stacey Weiss, Jenny Wrobel, Yusuf Word

Visitors present: Nancy Bristow, Alyce DeMarais, Lisa Ferrari, Judith Kay, Justin Tiehen, Nila Wiese

Chair Cannon called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

### **I. Announcements**

Cannon noted that while there is the possibility of a December 15 meeting, this is most likely the last Senate meeting of this semester.

Regarding spring semester, Cannon told senators to be prepared to meet on Monday, January 26, then every other week thereafter. He expressed the wish to have the new Senate of 2009-2010 meet earlier than last year, which would require earlier elections and end-of-year reports.

Amy Ryken thanked the generosity of those who helped raise \$240 for three students at the Tacoma Business Academy.

### **II. Special Orders**

None.

### **III. Reports of Committee Liaisons**

Sue Hannaford reported that the International Education Committee is feeling tension while working on cutting back Study Abroad programs. Chairs John Lear and Peter Wimberger have reservations about a memo that Dean Bartanen will take to the President's Cabinet on January 12. There is concern that the cabinet's recommendations are ones that the faculty wouldn't approve of. Lisa Ferrari said that Lear and Wimberger are concerned that without a specific charge, the Senate can't take action, and that the IEC may be asked to overstep its bounds with deep cuts and changes in managing Study Abroad programs. Lear and Wimberger had possibly wanted Senate involvement.

Bill Haltom reported that he ran a proposed amendment regarding early tenure past the Professional Standards Committee. He noted that the PSC prefers not to make policy, so Haltom has brought the proposed changes to the Senate to approve and send on to the PSC. Additionally, Haltom wanted the following in the minutes: "When the first SOB starts to do framers' intent, I will slam down my first and say, 'I am the...framer!'" Cannon mentioned that Haltom's proposal will be placed on an agenda.

Suzanne Holland noted that the University Enrichment Committee is continuing to revise the Professional Development Handbook.

Kristin Johnson said that the Academic Standards Committee has completed its self assessment and everyone looks happy. She noted that the ASC found that the division of labor between the ASC and the Curriculum Committee isn't always clear. Cannon said he will distribute the ASC self assessment to the senators.

#### **IV. Academic Honesty in guidelines for first-year seminars**

Last spring, the Curriculum Committee completed revision of Writing and Rhetoric and Scholarly and Creative Inquiry rubrics to include discussion of academic honesty. These revisions are attached at the end of these minutes as an appendix. The Curriculum Committee sent this to the Senate to place on the agenda of the next Faculty Meeting. Cannon placed it on the agenda but asked if anyone felt this required action before next week's Faculty meeting; no one did.

#### **V. Revision of Bylaws concerned the standing Committee on Diversity**

The Senate's charge to the Diversity Committee was, "Continue working with the Faculty Senate to reconstitute the Faculty Diversity Committee, revising the bylaws for this committee and facilitating approval of such charges in a timely fashion." Ostrom asked if there is going to be a Faculty Diversity Committee and a Staff Diversity Committee. Judith Kay, chair of the Diversity Committee, proceeded to walk through the "Proposed revisions to the by-laws of the Diversity Committee" (attached to these minutes as an appendix). In part b.1. of the proposed revision, it is stated that the duties of the committee shall be "To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus as defined in the university's Diversity Strategic Plan." Kay observed that this is open to the changing dynamics of society and evolving forms of discrimination, and that it is easier to change the definition of diversity in the strategic plan than it is in the bylaws. Part b.2. of the revision deals with issues of recruiting and retention of faculty "from historically under-represented populations." Kay noted that this has a backward looking focus that complements the forward looking definition in the strategic plan, and that this entails a look at historical representation in each discipline. She noted that inclusion of faculty from different social locations can enlarge our disciplines, which will likely bring up issues not commonly brought up. An example she gave was the issue of bias in Martin Luther and Kant. Kay said, by recruiting a diverse faculty, more diverse students may attend and this may expand the intellectual depth and cultural sophistication of our students. Regarding part b.3., Kay noted that while the Diversity Committee is to work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer, the Diversity Committee reports through the Senate, not to the Administration. Kay addressed b.5. ("To work with colleagues to maintain an inclusive classroom environment") by stating that it is important not to target students and make them feel like victims. Part b.6. of the revision concerned the activation of BERT, the Bias-Hate Education Response Team. Kay said that BERT identifies trends before they become problems. BERT responds not just to speech, but graffiti and other types of physical acts (disfiguring of posters, for example). Kay said that, while we at the university respect freedom of speech, we feel some things should be pointed out as morally repugnant. Hateful speech communicates that certain voices are not welcome at the table. Kay said that it is important to honor differences, and that one has to take responsibility for one's utterances.

Stacey Weiss thanked the Diversity Committee for working on this revision and made a **Motion: That the Senate endorse the Diversity Committee revision of the bylaws concerning the Diversity Committee and that the Senate move this forward to the full faculty for approval.** Terry Beck seconded the motion. It was noted that a bylaws change requires approval by 75% of faculty present.

Discussion: Rich Anderson-Connolly said that giving BERT a formal existence concerns him. He felt that if the way to fight speech is with speech, we shouldn't have a team of faculty and staff going to talk to people. He feels that is heavy handed.

Terry Beck disagreed emphatically. He pointed out that the purpose of BERT is not to gang up on individuals. He noted the blackface incident on campus and that it fell to the Black Student Union to talk to those responsible for the incident. Beck said that he felt it wasn't the BSU's responsibility. Also, he noted that the blackface was not done out of malice but out of a lack of awareness. Beck pointed out that people are not being lectured about this, nor are they being singled out. Rather, issues are being talked about. Without BERT, Beck noted, we don't have a place to go where people who are victimized can gain an equal footing.

Nila Wiese, who was on the Diversity Committee, said that there have been many meetings where BERT has created awareness about events. She said they had found that religion was a more active and hurtful topic on campus. She said that BERT is finding issues that need to be addressed.

Nancy Bristow said that it had been on the victims' shoulders to create an educational event. BERT removes that. BERT does not engage in punitive actions; those are handled through Integrity Code Boards and Honor Court.

Judith Kay noted that campus responses have been very slow in the past. BERT can respond more quickly. She noted that the view presented isn't always dogmatic.

Yusuf Word asked what BERT's role is. He said that BERT stepped in with a "thug life" incident, but he wanted to know what BERT is, how it works, and what it does. He brought up an issue in the Trail's Combat Zone section. He was under the impression that BERT would address this but it didn't. He said the students that had been hurt didn't get the chance to respond.

Kay said that having faculty oversight of BERT helps with the speed and scope of the response.

Suzanne Holland asked if changing the name would address Anderson-Connolly's concern. Anderson-Connolly said that calling speech an assault or attack is not accurate. He said that stifling speech is a greater issue than someone feeling hurt by speech, and that he doesn't think hurtful speech is like an assault. Holland responded by noting that she's on the board of the ACLU for Washington state and that it is recognized legally that there is such as thing as hate speech. She said that hate speech can lead to physical assault. Anderson-Connolly responded that assault is physical and that words are not assault.

Jenny Wrobel noted that BERT establishes faculty support, which is comforting to students and therefore is valuable.

Kay noted that this discussion occurring in the Senate is the kind of discussion we want to have on campus. She said that there are disagreements and there should be discussion and it should be educational. She also noted that the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized that speech can be regulated in time, place, and manner.

Hans Ostrom said that there has been a hostile environment created in dorms with graffiti, and that this is a form of speech that can make the environment intolerable. He sees a sense of fatigue with our African American students having to find a place to go to generate a response. BERT is a place to start.

Kay noted that the BERT procedures contain steps and questions.

Holland noted that it is possible that BERT could have a chilling effect on speech. It could shut down white students who are afraid to say something for fear of being reported to BERT. And, she thinks the name is problematic because “bias” and “hate” implies to people that they have done something wrong. Bristow agreed with Holland, noting that we want to avoid the situation where everyone is silenced. But there are students from under-represented groups who feel chilling effect on their speech all the time. BERT opens things up, is educational, and does not silence speech.

Wiese pointed out that names of individuals are not attached to BERT’s responses, unless it rises to the need for an ICB (Integrity Code Board). Wiese said that BERT merely identifies trends and issues that are troubling people and should be addressed.

Bill Haltom noted that he teaches a class called “Civil Liberties,” and wished to make three points regarding this discussion. First, at a faculty meeting on these bylaw changes, some advocates need to bring a statement of the range of activities to be expected of BERT. Second, there will be a discussion of the limits to what BERT is going to be doing. Third, he has a concern that b.6. (regarding BERT) is over specific. He asked if there is a way to frame this. He gave further advice to the committee, asking if they are willing to try for six out of these seven items. A more general statement, he said, might be, “Among the duties of the Diversity Committee will be the responsibility to respond to campus events...” etc. Ostrom said that he felt the faculty will have a clear choice in that circumstance, because otherwise faculty would be giving up oversight of these issues. Weiss agreed.

Anderson-Connolly said there is another alternative: to get rid of BERT. He said we could let things come up and deal with them then. He would rather have that than a bureaucratic response. He feels that informal discourse can be more powerful than response brought by bureaucrats.

Holland asked Word about the Trail problem, and if there was an assumption as to who would handle it. Jenny Wrobel said that there is a lack of understanding about where to go to

get a public forum. She worries that there are already a lot of bureaucratic responses on campus. She said that there is not a fair space to address these things at this point. Holland noted that with a Chief Diversity Officer, a Diversity Committee, and BERT, it can get confusing figuring out where to go. Haltom said we can have everyone involved—meaning the Senate, the Diversity Committee, and BERT—or, by eliminating b.6., we can all become bystanders. Kay said that the Diversity Committee wants something that has accountability up through the Senate through to the faculty. She said that the group most committed to freedom of speech is the faculty and that is why we need faculty oversight of BERT. BERT exists in the administration. The Diversity Committee wants to activate it and report on it to the faculty. Wiese said that the Senate charged the Diversity Committee to create BERT and the next year they were charged with activating it. Space was needed to house it so the Dean of Students took it over. This is why it appears to be under the umbrella of the administration. Holland asked Haltom if he was aware of that; he said it might help if faculty were aware of the fact that the Diversity Committee created BERT. Holland noted that BERT creates yet another committee for faculty to serve on and we ask a great deal of faculty in terms of service.

Anderson-Connolly said that what will concern faculty is freedom of speech, and the Trail is the press. We shouldn't be in control of threatening the Trail editor. We should move away from the BERT route we are going.

Beck said that he doesn't see BERT as a duplication of effort. He said that it is about education. BERT was created because things weren't getting addressed.

Ostrom responded to Anderson-Connolly by noting that the Trail faced a forum, and that is good for them to face. He noted that the editor wasn't fired and that the Trail wasn't shut down.

Wrobel noted that faculty were supportive of her during the Port of Tacoma protests. Faculty were supportive in helping to create a activity-credit discussion group on the Iraq War. There are students desiring an educational response. She understands that the name contains hot-button words and posed "Faculty for Educational Response" as an alternative. Word agreed that the educational component of BERT is great. He said that "thug life" things keep happening and he hopes BERT can become more proactive. He said he would like to see statistics on how things change on campus. He noted that there was racist material in the "Hey You" section of the Trail last year, but that they couldn't get contrary voices heard.

Mike Segawa said that if BERT became a dogmatic "speech stifler" we would disable it. He said that the point of BERT is to give a voice to *both* sides. He noted that sometimes people don't know how to have a conversation about difficult topics.

Chair Cannon said that we need to think about where to go from here. He said that this discussion in the Senate is valuable prior to a full faculty meeting. He said that he saw three alternatives: 1) to adjourn, meaning discussion begins with the next meeting, 2) to postpone action on the floor to a future date, or 3) postpone discussion to December 15, which means

we would have another meeting of the Senate this semester. Weiss made a **motion to postpone further discussion until the 26<sup>th</sup> of January**. Holland seconded. **Motion carried.**

Cannon said that sometimes it is beneficial to have people here who can answer questions, as it was during our discussion of benefits with Rosa Beth Gibson present. Holland asked if anyone knows why we don't have a book in common about issues like these that everyone reads? Lisa Ferrari noted that the suggestion of a common reading comes up with some regularity when talking about Orientation. She said that the research on student orientations suggests that students don't tend to read the common reading in preparation for such events.

Beck made a motion to adjourn. Weiss seconded. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Hutchinson

Date: May 1, 2008  
To: Faculty Senate  
From: Mary Rose Lamb

2007-8 Curriculum Committee Final Report  
This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2007-8 academic year.

.....

### **III. Addition of Consideration of Academic Honesty in the First Year Seminars**

The Faculty Senate and Academic Standards Committee charged the Curriculum Committee to “consider adding discussion of academic honesty and integrity to first year seminars.” We began with a discussion as a committee of the whole. In our deliberation we considered the need for such discussions and the best place for those discussions. We saw that writing courses were a good place to incorporate honesty issues into assignments. We considered the possible negative impact on student evaluations of young faculty if students saw discussions of academic integrity as being “policed” by the professor. We talked about the “growing culture of academic dishonesty” on campus and the need for an honor code. Finally, we asked the working group that reviewed proposals for the First Year Seminars to take on the task of crafting language to be added to the seminar rubrics and guidelines. The guidelines were accepted by the Curriculum Committee on 4/18/08 and are appended to the report (Appendix A). We trust that the Senate will bring this discussion to the full faculty next fall.

.....

## Appendix A.

# Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric Rubric

## Learning Objectives

In each Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, students encounter the two central aspects of the humanistic tradition of rhetorical education: argumentation and effective oral and written expression. Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively, **and with integrity**, for academic and civic purposes.

## Guidelines

- I. Through their introduction to argumentation, these seminars address:
  - A. the value of pro/con reasoning and the need to approach a controversy from multiple perspectives;
  - B. issues and questions that organize a particular controversy;
  - C. standard argument forms and other persuasive strategies (for example, traditional and contemporary models of reasoning, narrative); and
  - D. methods of evaluating arguments (including evidence evaluation and identification of logical fallacies).
- II. Through their introduction to effective expression, these seminars address:
  - A. important elements and conventions of standard written English;
  - B. the range of lexical and stylistic resources available to speakers and writers (for example, appropriateness, audience, tone, voice, and other aspects of a message's verbal texture); and
  - C. various oral and written composition strategies, including approaching composition as a process (including purposeful drafting, revising, and editing).
- III. These seminars address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**
- IV. These seminars may be organized around topics, themes, or texts; in each seminar the material must be appropriate and accessible for meaningful work by first-year students.



# Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Rubric

## Learning Objectives

The purpose of this core area is to introduce students to the processes of scholarly and creative inquiry through direct participation in that inquiry. Students in a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar gain a degree of mastery that comes with deep exposure to a focused seminar topic. They increase their ability to frame and explore questions, to support claims, and to respond to others' questions and differing opinions. Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects, **employing good practices of academic integrity.**

## Guidelines

- I. Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminars examine a focused scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme.
- II. Since seminars in this category are taken in the student's freshman year, they are designed to be accessible and appropriate for the accomplishment of meaningful work by students without previous preparation in the course's field. This requirement informs the choice of topic or theme of the course, the choice of texts or materials to be treated in the course, and the design of assignments for the course.
- III. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry require substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects and include significant intellectual exchange both between the instructor and the students and among the students. Careful, sustained, and recurrent examination of ideas and sources (broadly defined to include data, texts, media, and/or other visual, aural, or graphic material) play a central role in the course. Pedagogical methods take advantage of the opportunities provided by a seminar setting.
- IV. **Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**

**Proposed revisions to the by-laws of the Diversity Committee  
Approved the Diversity Committee on 11/25/08**

The Committee on Diversity

- a. The Committee shall consist of Dean of the University or designee (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than seven appointed faculty members, and one student.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be
  1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus as defined in the university's Diversity Strategic Plan.
  2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.
  3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.
  4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.
  5. To work with colleagues to maintain an inclusive classroom environment.
  6. To activate the Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BERT) annually, collaborate with it as needed, and make an annual report to the Faculty Senate of its activities.
  7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.