

## **Faculty Senate Minutes**

### **24 September 2007**

Senators Present: Anderson-Connolly, Bartanen, Boland, Bristow, Bryant, Cannon, Foster, Hanson, Holland, McGruder, O'Neil, Ostrom, Racine, Ryken, Segawa, Singleton, Weiss

Visitors Present: DeMarais, Droge, McCullough

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:00.

Cannon introduced the new student representatives. Because the ASUPS president, Hart Edmundson, has a conflict for some Senate meetings, Cannon recommended that he appoint additional students to attend. Edmundson will come when he can, and because meetings are open to the UPS community, there is no problem with numbers. The only issue has to do with voting, when the students will have two votes to cast. The new student representatives, joining Ana O'Neil, are Rebecca Bryant and Reilly Boland.

#### **1. Approval of Minutes of 10 September 2007**

The minutes were approved with corrections. Ryken then raised a question about whether the former practice of emailing suggestions for corrections to the minute-taker would continue. Discussion ensued. Cannon determined that the circulated version would come to floor, and changes would be made in the Senate meeting. Cannon then asked how the Senate would like to take care of the posting of minutes, and senators agreed that the minute-taker would send the minutes to Jimmy McMichael (facultycoms) for posting on the web and would also send along a signed hard copy.

#### **2. Announcements**

Cannon noted that the senate minutes of 7 May 2007 had suggested that Jim McCullough would be appointed to fill a vacancy on the Senate, but this was an error. Because there was no vacancy, McCullough was not appointed. He will, however, be the first to be considered if a vacancy opens up, which is expected in the spring, if not sooner.

Bartanen noted that one of the things that came forward from Diversity Committee last year and was received by the Senate was the formation of the BHERT, the Bias and Hate Education Response Team. BHERT is currently in the process of being constituted, and it is to include a Senate representative. The Senate will need to choose that appointee.

#### **3. Special Orders**

Anderson-Connolly raised the issue of the selection of Honorary Degree recipients, noting that in three of the last four years someone with a military background of some sort has been honored. Anderson-Connolly suggested that he would find it inappropriate if this happened again in the context of an illegal occupation in its fourth year. Anderson-Connolly wondered if the Senate would take this up as a philosophical discussion of the guidelines for the selection of Honorary Degree recipients. Holland agreed, and suggested it would be even more interesting to discuss this issue at a faculty meeting. McGruder agreed as well, and reminded senators of the protest

against one of the military recipients by students. She would approve a “pre-emptive strike,” avoiding having this category of names coming forward. Bartanen clarified that nominations come from faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

Holland brought senators’ attention back to the issue of how the university could make medical benefits available to faculty who come in full-time for a full semester but not an entire year and so are currently ineligible for benefits.

#### **4. Reports of Committee Liaisons**

Hanson reported that he had convened the Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee and noted that Bill Dasher was elected chair. Ryken reported that she had convened the Curriculum Committee and that Mary Rose Lamb was selected chair. Ryken also praised the committee’s impressive thoughtfulness in their first meeting. Weiss reported on convening the University Enrichment Committee and noted that Mark Reinitz was selected as chair. She noted that the committee had had some question on the fifth charge related to streamlining the process for applying for conference funding. Singleton reported on convening the Interim Study Abroad Committee, and reported that the only tenured member of faculty on the committee, David Balaam, was selected chair though he was not in attendance. This committee still awaits charges. Bristow reported on convening the Academic Standards Committee. Mike Spivey has been elected chair. She also noted the committee’s difficulty in finding a meeting time because of its size and suggested that the committee discussed this issue. Cannon convened the Diversity Committee, and reported that Nila Wiese and Mike Valentine have agreed to serve as co-chairs.

Before moving on to the rest of the agenda, Cannon noted that he wants consultation in setting the Senate agenda, and explained that this is especially relevant in the context of Standing Orders comments that emerge. He recognized that prioritizing Senate business will be important, and that Old Business will continue to take precedence over New. He also reminded the Senate that Old Business does remain from last year, including the two Ad Hoc Committee reports. The Senate confirmed that Hanson, Ostrom, Weiss, and Anderson-Connolly constitute the new committee to review those reports. When they are ready, they will appear on the Senate agenda in advance of any New Business.

M/S/P a change in the agenda order, allowing agenda item 8A to come first, and to limit the discussion of that item to fifteen minutes. Cannon then explained that the October 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Meeting has only one agenda item at the moment, an agenda item that likely would not sustain a full meeting. Cannon asked if Senators would like to add something to that agenda. He raised this in the context of Senate discussions about the need for various fora to discuss issues before the faculty. Cannon asked if this was the time for one of those discussions, suggesting he would happily frame the issue for the faculty if the Senate decided in favor of adding an agenda item. Ostrom asked about Item 7 on the Senate’s agenda, the issue of the Early Tenure and Promotion policy. Ostrom suggested that this issue is one about which Senators know little, and argued that it would be useful to get a range of opinions before the Senate takes this up. Holland agreed, and noted the faculty might also consider the issue of Honorary Degrees that Anderson-Connolly had raised earlier. Droge reminded Senators that today is really the deadline for the agenda, and that if this meeting is cancelled, the next is scheduled for October 30th. Items for that meeting’s

agenda would need to be received by October 16<sup>th</sup>. Holland also suggested the possibility of a discussion about the evaluation form. Bristow asked about whether information could be circulated quickly enough to make for a productive discussion, or whether information was necessary. Holland was not sure anything could be distributed, but suggested a productive conversation would be possible anyway. McGruder went back to the previous suggestion by Anderson-Connolly, and asked if the Senate could put that issue on the agenda, asking faculty to think about who they would like to see on the dais at the end of the year. She noted the irony of the past pairing of a peace activist and a military figure at the same graduation. She also raised the issue of the chronic problem of low attendance at faculty meetings and wondered whether more faculty would attend if the agenda included an issue such as this one that would engage people's politics.

Cannon reminded the Senate that whatever value would be achieved by a faculty forum is only accomplished with good attendance, and with Senators in place to explain the issues. Hanson wondered about whether we should be putting suggestions on the agenda if the Senate has not talked about them yet. Droge noted that one of the reasons for having a published agenda is so that business at a meeting would be available for discussion ahead of time. He suggested in this case, though, the Senate might be imagining an informal open discussion, in which case the discussion might be put under an umbrella title such as "Senate Concerns." The downside of such an approach, he explained, is that faculty are busy, and they want faculty meetings to consider questions of importance and such a framing might not communicate that. Ostrom noted we are going to take up #7 on our agenda (Early Tenure and Promotion policy), so there is a clear purpose to bringing it up at the faculty meeting, particularly since it is assumed this will return to the Senate. Bartanen noted that we have an Early Tenure and Promotion policy, and the agenda item refers to a request that the Senate clarify the policy only. She informed the Senate that the PSC wrote an interpretation of the policy, but that the interpretation has not yet gone forward to the Board. Joshi explained that she was the one who put it on the Senate agenda last year, and noted that though we have the interpretation from the PSC, her suggestion was that the Senate look into the policy itself, not just the PSC interpretation.

Singleton moved to cancel the October 1<sup>st</sup> faculty meeting, due to concerns expressed by Droge, reiterating that the Senate should bring to the faculty concrete ideas for their consideration and discussion. The motion died for lack of a second, and senators considered whether they actually have the power to make such a determination. It was moved and seconded that the Senate not forward any items for the upcoming Faculty Meeting. Holland then wondered why it had to be a Senate item that was added to the Faculty Meeting agenda. Hanson noted that any person can add something. Cannon clarified that if Senate moved to have something added to the agenda, he was ready to go forward. Alternatively, any individual can also approach Droge with an agenda item. Anderson-Connolly argued that this still leaves open the issue of who cancels Faculty Meetings. Cannon noted Droge does so. Droge explained that if agenda items are brought forward, he would likely add them to the agenda. The motion passed. Cannon noted that items that were raised can be added to the agenda of future Senate or Faculty Meetings.

## **5. Charges to Standing Committees**

**\*Academic Standards Committee (ASC)**

Cannon circulated a new draft of the charges to the ASC. Singleton and McGruder asked about #5 (*Review the WF policy that was implemented last year*), wondering about the purpose of the charge, and about the specifics of the WF change. Bartanen explained the new WF policy, and Hanson noted the addition, too, of extra paperwork. Singleton then raised his concerns about the WF grade. Earlier research he conducted shows that no other school uses such a thing, and he finds the WF punitive. He asked if the charge could ask the ASC to reconsider the policy. Ostrom supported Singleton, as did Holland. Bartanen asked whether, if something extraordinary happened in a student's life, whether faculty would want that student to receive only an F? Singleton responded that the proper response would be a W in that context. Singleton offered an addition to the charge, adding "and consider eliminating WF as a grade option" to the original charge. O'Neil asked if the ASC liaison would attend the meeting when the charges would be discussed and Bristow confirmed that she would attend this Wednesday. Ryken then asked if charge #7 could be revised with the addition of the term "documented" or "registered" and the elimination of the remainder of the charge after the word "disabilities." McGruder raised the issue that the charge then seemed too vague. Foster noted Ivey West could deal with this specificity. Cannon offered a rephrasing, adding "relevant documented" to the charge. McGruder argued that our view of learning disabilities is too static, and that it is not impossible for anyone to learn a foreign language, and that attempting to learn one may be just the thing a student with a learning disability needs. Motion to accept the charges with the proposed amendments M/S/P.

*The Senate charges to the 2007-08 Academic Standards Committee are:*

- 1. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including: review student performance, making decisions on probation and dismissal for unsatisfactory work; hear student petitions for waivers of academic policies.*
- 2. Discuss and pursue implementation of the "Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes," reported by a Senate Task-Force, April, 2007.*
- 3. Review the requirement of 28 graded units for eligibility for University Honors. Consider retroactive awards for recent graduates who qualify under any revised requirement.*
- 4. Revise student alert form to include behavioral issues.*
- 5. Review the WF policy that was implemented last year and consider eliminating WF as a grade option.*
- 6. Complete the update of the academic honesty section of the Logger begun last year, especially as it pertains to the internet.*
- 7. Review the foreign language requirement for students with relevant documented disabilities.*

**\*Student Life Committee (SLC)**

O'Neil asked if an additional charge could be added that would call for the SLC to assess the CHAWS facility, staff and services and to engage in a comparison to peer schools. She acknowledged the differences in state laws, and knows the SLC would need to take this into consideration in their investigations. Hanson suggested if this charge were added, it should be a separate item. O'Neil agreed. Ostrom supported the charge, noting a recent visit to another campus where two MDs were employed at the campus health center. Cannon noted that Beck, who was unable to attend today's meeting, is the liaison to the SLC, and turned to Segawa for guidance. Segawa explained that the SLC is comfortable with fairly vague charges. O'Neil asked about her recommended charge and how the SLC might respond. Segawa suggested that it would take up their whole year, and they might not be the group for this. He noted that if ASUPS is interested in this question, they could bring it to Dean of Students, or could ask that it be a part of BTF considerations. Segawa emphasized that he was not trying to squash such an exploration, but simply wanted to note the implications of such a charge. DeMarais noted that she had served on a review of CHWS about five years ago, and wondered whether another regular review was due soon. McGruder asked what the mechanism for that earlier review had been. DeMarais said it was a regular review of all components of Student Life, similar to departmental reviews on the academic side. Singleton noted that he would like to see the first three of the draft charges rewritten as a request rather than a description, and also questioned #4 as a charge, suggesting that the service of faculty on ad hoc committees is assumed. Holland moved, in the interest of moving the Senate discussion of charges forward, that the Senate "postpone consideration of charges until the next meeting when the liaison will have redrafted them in the form of charges in consultation with the committee." The motion was seconded. O'Neil suggested she would talk to Beck about her charge. Motion passed.

**\*Library, Media and Information Services (LMIS)**

Hanson distributed a handout with redrafted charges. These emerged from Hanson's convening of the first meeting. There were some slight changes, including removal of one charge regarding wireless use, and one additional charge regarding "negative impacts on education...that new communication technologies...make possible." M/S acceptance of the charges as reframed. McGruder asked about materials forwarded from Greene, in particular the request that LMIS "investigate the efficacy of our SPAM filter." Conversation reflected the desperation of the faculty. McGruder's suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment, and the motion passed overwhelmingly and with enthusiasm.

*The Senate charges to the 2007-2008 Library, Media and Information Services Committee are:*

- 1. Meet with both OIS and library representatives early in the term about upcoming changes and plans for the term.*
- 2. Finalize statements to present to faculty, and the faculty senate, with regards to intellectual property ownership by faculty. This should be done early in the fall term, since potential changes to the faculty code might take substantial time.*
- 3. Review policies related to the Teach act and encourage a statement by the university so that we are in compliance with the Teach act.*

4. *Continue course management software evaluation.*
5. *Continue the review of paper versus electronic subscriptions by the library.*
6. *Participate in the technology budget cycle as laid out by the Technology Planning Group.*
7. *Be closely involved in the hiring of the new OIS CTO position and the OIS Head of Instructional Technology position.*
8. *Be closely involved in the hiring of the new director of the library.*
9. *Investigate options for backup of campus PCs.*
10. *Investigate the potential negative impacts on education (e.g., violations of honor code) that new communication technologies (cell phones, blackberries, etc.) make possible.*
11. *Investigate the efficacy of the SPAM filter.*

**\*Diversity Committee (DC)**

Cannon convened and attended the first meeting on behalf of Weiss, and noted that the committee expressed no dissatisfaction with their charges, and no desire to add charges. Cannon reiterated as well that the committee is anxious for the Senate to consider their self-study, and that they are in need of serious consideration and support from the Senate. Bartanen suggested a rewording for #5 to reflect the appointment of the new Chief Diversity Officer and the sunsetting of the Diversity Planning Task Force. Bartanen added two other charges, listed as numbers 6 and 7 below. Bristow supported with vehemence the charge to work on BHERT, given events of the past week. M/S/P acceptance of the charges with Bartanen's additions.

McGruder asked that word be carried back to Committee that the Senate will follow up on looking at the committee's self-assessment, and Weiss agreed to carry that word to the committee.

*The Senate charges to the 2007-2008 Diversity Committee are:*

1. *Continue working with the Office of Admission, the Office of Human Resources, and other appropriate offices and governing bodies in support of efforts to recruit and retain an increasingly talented and diverse faculty, staff, and student body.*
2. *Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education.*

*3. Provide liaisons between the faculty, staff, and student organizations related to diversity issues and continue working with the Student Diversity Center and the Office of Multicultural Student Services to support the work of the Student Diversity Center organizations, Diversity Theme Year, and other existing and emerging organizations and programs.*

*4. Work with appropriate University groups to promote language in University documents that encourages and rewards greater faculty involvement in creating and maintaining a welcoming and accepting climate for diverse students, staff and faculty.*

*5. Support the Chief Diversity Officer in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity Plan for the Puget Sound Campus.*

*6. In collaboration with the Chief Diversity Office and the Dean of Students, constitute the Bias and Hate Education Response Team (BHERT) and forward recommendations regarding its institutional home and the annual process for constituting its membership.*

*7. Consult with the Race and Pedagogy Initiative Task Force regarding its suggestions on the diversity work of the campus, including diversity training and advance planning of major diversity events.*

#### **\*Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

Anderson-Connolly is the liaison to the IRB, and he reminded the Senate that it had raised the issue at the retreat of whether there is a way to streamline the IRB process and even eliminate certain kinds of reviews. Anderson-Connolly mentioned this issue to the IRB at their first meeting. Holland noted that new conversations nationwide make clear that many of those projects currently under IRB aegis at UPS do not need IRB approval, and that IRB approval is actually limited to that research operating under federal grants. Foster noted that other organizations may weigh in here, for instance the American Psychological Association, and suggested that the IRB should look at more than funding sources. Holland explained her own sense that national organizations such as the APA may need to reconsider their policies in the context of the new national conversation. McGruder agreed with Holland overall that many situations are low-level research that should not require IRB approval, and yet worried that if UPS followed the narrow guidelines Holland was outlining such guidelines would have stopped the infamous Tuskegee syphilis study, but not the Stanford prison experiment and others. Bartanen suggested that the Senate offer a charge that asks for a review of the IRB process at UPS in light of national discussions. Foster wanted to expand this. She used the example of the educational value of going through the IRB process, and explained that the Psychology Department has much latitude with the IRB and that many students are asked to complete the process, but their materials are handled internally in the department by the IRB representative in the department. Could this model be used in an effort to streamline some IRB processes, she asked. Bristow wondered whether the IRB should be asked to look at these issues with the specificity of the various disciplines in mind, though she worried about the IRB's workload. Anderson-Connolly agreed, noting that the IRB guidelines are written more obviously for medical research than for many other fields. He offered that perhaps the IRB could look at the

broad differences among areas of research, rather than every department. He offered to report the spirit of the Senate conversation to the committee. Foster noted that the IRB can ask departmental designates to report the disciplinary norms. The following wording was added as a sixth charge: "Consider the scope and mechanisms of IRB review in light of national professional and disciplinary standards." M/S/P the IRB charges.

*The Senate charges to the 2007-2008 Institutional Review Board are:*

- 1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.*
- 2. Post and monitor upgraded IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers.*
- 3. Work with the new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration and discuss administrative duties for the IRB liaison that ease the secretarial work of the Chair.*
- 4. Determine the possibility of an electronic IRB stamp for approved consent/assent forms.*
- 5. Explore the possibility to create web-space where IRB approved UPS research studies can post flyers for recruitment of human subjects.*
- 6. Consider the scope and mechanism of IRB review in light of national professional and disciplinary standards.*

**\*Interim Study Abroad Committee (ISAC)**

Singleton noted the shortage of time and expressed his belief that this committee's charges could not be taken care of in the remaining four minutes. He then noted that there is a great deal of uncertainty about the relationship between this committee and the new Study Abroad Working Group that was set up this summer. He is not clear on the recommendations of the Working Committee either. DeMarais reported that the Working Group was charged with looking into ways to maintain fiscally viable and academically responsible programs, and came up with seven recommendations to the President's cabinet. These recommendations have been approved to be investigated for their feasibility. The Working Group is continuing to look at their recommendations, collecting information for the cabinet, and DeMarais suggested that she imagines the two groups, the Working Group and ISAC, working in consultation. Singleton mentioned that one recommendation forwarded by the Working Group involves the radical restructuring of the study abroad program. All programs would be collapsed into one sort of program, similar to the Partners Program we currently have on the books. Approved programs would be eliminated, or folded into the Partners Program. DeMarais suggested this is what is to be investigated. Holland asked that the ISAC charges be deferred along with SLC charges to the Senate's next meeting.

Ostrom reminded Senators that Item 8B on the agenda having to do with an Open Hour needs to be dealt with soon, because scheduling for next year is nearly upon us. Cannon offered to carry to schedulers the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation, as something to be experimented with.

The meeting adjourned quite promptly at 5:30

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy K. Bristow  
Professor of History