

## **Senate Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2007**

Senators present: Bartanen, Beck, Bristow, Cannon (Chair), Foster, Hanson, Holland, McGruder, O'Neil, Ostrom, Ryken, Singleton, Weiss

Visitors present: Jack Roundy

Chair Cannon called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

### **I. Approval of Minutes of November 26, 2007**

The minutes of the November 26, 2007 meeting were approved as distributed.

### **II. Announcements**

Cannon reminded senators about the retirement celebration in honor of Carrie Washburn on Friday, December 14, 2007 from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in Trimble Forum.

Bartanen noted that she investigated the concern raised at the last meeting about faculty members being asked to use department travel funds for recruitment trips. She noted that some faculty do have recruiting responsibilities and do combine professional work trips with recruitment efforts. UEC monies have not been used for recruiting trips. Sarah Moore is investigating whether or not departmental travel funds have been used for recruitment trips.

### **III. Special Orders**

Foster shared that she had been approached by a faculty member who suggested that the University consider requesting an official transcript to document educational experiences and degrees earned as a part of the faculty hiring process.

Holland asked if the topic of faculty evaluation forms could be put on the Senate agenda for the first meeting of the spring semester. Foster suggested that the Senate complete business related to the PSC before taking on a new topic. Holland suggested that it could still be put on the agenda, even it wasn't taken up right away.

Holland shared that a junior faculty member has suggested that the Senate conduct an anonymous survey about faculty meeting attendance. Faculty members could be asked about why they do or do not attend faculty meetings and what they would like to see occur at faculty meetings. Perhaps the Senate might discuss this, and talk with Randy Nelson about it.

McGruder wondered if something the Senate had asked for had been done. Did the FAC appoint a chair? Bartanen noted that the FAC did not appoint a chair, but did spend time discussing the topic and plan to return to the topic.

### **IV. Reports of Committee Liaisons**

Bristow brought forward two issues from the Academic Standards Committee—scheduling and the honors policy. Scheduling: The ASC had two questions; 1) How soon did the Senate want us to address the schedule issue? and 2) What exactly does the Senate hope the ASC will do with this? Ostrom reminded the Senate that the ASC is done with the scheduling charge because the Senate took that charge back from the ACS. Honors: The ASC has voted on a new honors policy

that combines a grade point average with a minimum of 16 units taken at Puget Sound, but has not voted to apply the new policy retroactively. Bristow noted that if the Senate feels that retroactive application is important that concern needs to be communicated to the ASC. Bartanen asked senators to consider the implications of retroactive applications of policy and asked, How much do we want to go down a slippery slope with retroactive policy change? How far back? Cannon will consult with Senators who have been vocal on this issue to decide whether or not to pursue it.

Weiss shared that the Diversity Committee is continuing to think about possible bylaws changes. She reported that the committee has identified a couple of trajectories for itself—all of which are still in the brainstorming stage. Some trajectories involve removing the Diversity Committee from the standing committees of the Senate. The Diversity Committee would like to get preliminary feedback regarding the Senate's thoughts concerning this possibility. Ostrom expressed concern, but general discussion of the topic was delayed.

Holland shared that the graduate sub-committee of the UEC had met and funded all submitted proposals.

#### **V. Continued Discussion of Principles on which to base the Schedule of Classes**

Ostrom reviewed the changes to the schedule document (Appendix A) including: adding a rationale for setting principles, removing the protected hour, having teaching begin at 8 a.m., and expressing the desire for increased flexibility in the 4-6 time slot. Holland noted that it seemed odd to remove the common hour when in fact 4-6 effectively function as common hours because those hours are protected from classes being scheduled. Bristow highlighted that the language in the document was a compromise and that for the 450 athletes on campus afternoon class timing was a big issue. Ostrom emphasized that the principles seek to articulate the continuum of faculty beliefs articulated at the October 30, 2007 faculty meeting from allowing no classes in the 4-6 hour time slot to adding many more classes in those hours. He highlighted the importance of taking an experimental approach and treading lightly.

Singleton noted that there are many good reasons to protect the 4-6 hours from regularly scheduled classes. He suggested that the level of student engagement in co-curricular activities is a distinctive feature of a Puget Sound education. He emphasized that classes in the 4-6 hour will require some students to tradeoff co-curricular activities for class participation. He emphasized that scheduling classes in the 4-6 hour could discourage participation in dance groups, music groups, theater groups, athletics, intramural sports, department colloquia, student government, and many other student initiated club and volunteer activities. He noted that there is much more to the college experience than attending classes all day long. Puget Sound students show initiative when creating and participating in co-curricular activities and should be encouraged in this regard. Ostrom noted that he agreed with Singleton about involvement in co-curricular activities and the character of the university, but he did not agree that classes in the 4-6 hour would send a discouraging message. He observed that Wyatt Hall faculty see empty classrooms in the late afternoon and wonder why they can't teach then, and that this has become something of a morale issue in Wyatt. Weiss observed that science students seem to be very involved in athletics and co-curricular experiences and also have one to two afternoon lab sessions each semester. Holland noted that the practice of allowing afternoon classes for the

sciences, and disallowing classes (even 3-hour classes) in the same time slot seems discriminatory to faculty in the humanities. Singleton and Bristow observed that labs are once a week and that arriving late to practice or rehearsal to accommodate a three day per week class would be much more complicated. Ostrom reminded Senators that the principles exclude required courses from the 4-6 time slot. Weiss wondered if there was an estimate on how many faculty members would want to teach in the 4-6 hour. Ostrom re-emphasized the need to experiment. Bartanen highlighted that that students are engaged with co-curricular experiences well into the evening, not simply between 4 and 6 p.m.

Holland asked what happened to Bill Breitenbach's proposed schedule of classes. Cannon shared that the academic deans and registrar were taking the plan seriously; that proposal opens up more classes by taking greater advantage of Friday afternoons. Ostrom wondered how that plan might impact the 50-minute course offerings as those courses are far and away the most popular. O'Neil noted that they are simply the most frequently offered. She noted that studies have been done to demonstrate that shorter class sessions are beneficial in some subject areas. Bristow noted that the compromise language was used to resolve a pedagogical conflict as there is such a wide range of preferences by department and faculty members. Bristow asked if the Breitenbach schedule fit within the scheduling principles. Beck noted that it should as the principles call for an optimal combination of 50 and 80 minute classes. Jack Roundy shared that he, Sarah Moore, and Brad Tomhave are seriously discussing the promising Breitenbach schedule. He noted that the devil is in the details and they are currently focused on the how of it. Ostrom suggested that it might be productive for the Senate to have a conversation with Sarah Moore, Brad Tomhave and Jack Roundy.

**Action (M/S/P; 8 ayes, 1 no, 1 abstention). Senate Resolution: Expressing a sense of the senate, on behalf of the faculty, the senate adopts the scheduling principles dated November 2007 and commends them to the Registrar for guidance in creating the class schedule.**

## **VI. Continued Discussion of Faculty Grievance and Evaluation Processes**

Weiss reviewed the proposed Code revisions (Appendix B) made in response to issues raised at the November 26, 2007 senate meeting, including replacing the word university with Dean (Chapter 1, part D, Section 4) and adding clarifying language (Chapter 3, Section 4). Singleton noted that he was still unclear about how the results of a grievance would factor into the evaluation process. Cannon read language suggested by Hanson to create a number (3) in Chapter 3, Section 4, "If the outcome of the grievance process has bearing on the evaluation the Dean may add information to the evaluation file." Singleton wondered what would happen if the file was still at the departmental level.

Beck asked if the focus was an evaluation issue or a disciplinary issue. Bartanen highlighted that Beck's question was the gist behind the proposed changes. She noted that the intent is to not have evaluators in the position of adjudicating professional ethics. Bristow agreed and emphasized that the grievance process is equipped to deal with issues of professional ethics. Singleton noted that he felt Hanson's suggested addition was important to add. Bristow agreed noting that the goal of the revisions was to make things as predictable as possible.

Bartanen questioned where the addition best fit—in the section on evaluation of faculty as number 3 in Chapter 3, Section 4 or in the section on grievances in Chapter 4, Section 5. Singleton suggested that for the sake of clarity the addition best fit in the evaluation section. McGruder expressed concern about the vast number of possible outcomes of a grievance and whether or not we could specify all of them. Beck noted that Section 5 is titled President’s Action so the addition did not seem to fit there. Bristow noted that the two are not mutually exclusive and spoke on behalf of more direction.

**ACTION: (M/S/P, unanimous) Forward proposed faculty code revisions dated 12/05/07 to the full faculty with the addition of the sentence, “If the outcome of the grievance process has bearing on the evaluation the Dean may add information to the evaluation file.” as number 3 to Chapter 3, Section 4.**

## **VII. Faculty Role in Achieving Diversity Objectives**

Not discussed due to lack of time.

### **VII1. Appointment of Temporary Replacement Senators**

Cannon noted that four members of the senate need replacing for the spring semester. Anderson-Connolly, Ryken, and Weiss have sabbatical leaves and McGruder is retiring. Ostrom read a proclamation (Appendix C), which passed by enthusiastic clapping, and presented a box of chocolates to McGruder. True to her commitment to social justice McGruder opened the chocolates and shared them with her senate comrades. Cannon reviewed the provision in the bylaws that runners up in recent senate elections can serve as temporary replacements.

**ACTION: (M/S/P) Appoint Jim McCullough and Alva Butcher to the Senate for Spring 2008.**

Cannon noted that the senate could draw the other two replacements from previous elections or from past senate members.

**ACTION: (M/S/P) Executive Committee will appoint the two other senators.**

Weiss noted that committee liaison duties would need to be assigned to replacement senators. Senators expressed well wishes and bon voyage to the departing senators.

## **IX. Senate Meeting Schedule**

Cannon announced that the Spring meeting schedule had not yet been set, but that he hoped to begin meetings the first Monday after Martin Luther King Day.

## **X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Submitted by Amy E. Ryken

## Appendix A

November 2007

### Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes

1. The schedule of classes serves the diverse needs of students, faculty members, department-chairs, and program directors. It necessarily reflects the resources and limitations with which the administration, academic advising, the staff, and facilities-services must work, including the physical spaces available for teaching and learning. The process of scheduling is complex and dynamic. By articulating some principles, the faculty intends to contribute productively to this process, but relatively broad principles cannot address all circumstances. Consequently, good communication among students, faculty members, department-chairs, program-directors, staff members, and the administration remains essential. Some issues connected to scheduling may be addressed by articulating principles; others are best addressed individually, with flexibility, cooperation, and practicality in mind.
2. The university's primary mission is to educate the whole student; therefore, in addition to providing an academic education, the university continues to value students' participation in athletics; in the performing, visual, and literary arts; in media; in the ASUPS; and so on. Consequently, those involved with scheduling need to take these elements of academic education into account. At the same time, the core-curriculum, majors, minors, graduate programs, and interdisciplinary curricula form the basis of a Puget Sound education. Departments should avoid scheduling required classes for the majors, *of which classes there are not multiple sections or alternatives*, after 4:00 p.m. Legitimate exceptions to this guideline may arise, and there are different kinds of "required classes," but in general, departments should include this guideline in the several considerations that go into scheduling classes. By the same token, some courses (in the core curriculum and in majors, minors, and graduate programs), to which students may readily find alternatives, may be scheduled after 4:00 p.m. Such courses can serve the needs of many students and faculty-members without undermining athletics, arts, and media.
3. The schedule should reflect an optimal use of the classrooms available, of the five working-days available per week, and of the hours from 8:00 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. It is understood, of course, that there are other teaching-spaces besides actual classrooms, such as laboratories, practice-rooms, and studios. "Classrooms" here is used in a broad sense, therefore. The principles articulated in this document acknowledge the diversity of educational venues and methods at the university.
4. In academia, the 50-minute and 80/90-minute periods remain effective and venerable. It is understood that, for sound pedagogical reasons, some colleagues prefer the former, some the latter, and some a combination of both. It is understood that neither period is inherently better pedagogically even if individual professors strongly prefer one to the other. Personal preference does not reflect an inherent pedagogical value of either time-slot. Therefore, the schedule should reflect an optimal combination of the 50-minute and 80-minute time-slots for classes.

5. No classes should begin before 8:00 a.m., and no classes should end later than 9:50 p.m. Moreover, as has been the custom at the university, individuals, departments, the staff, and the administration should attempt to accommodate reasonable preferences for a class-schedule. The main scheduling-custom now seems to involve good communication among individuals, departments, associate deans, the advising office, and the Registrar. There appears to be no reason to change this customary practice of reasonable negotiation and accommodation.
  
6. One-day-per-week, three-hour classes should be limited to 300- and 400-level courses and graduate courses. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no professor should teach more than one of these classes per term. Currently, such classes are rarely scheduled; therefore, debate about the drawbacks and merits of such courses is probably unnecessary and wasteful. However, three-hour slots beginning at 3:00, 4:00, 5:00, and 6:00 should be available to teach in, *as long as scheduling such a class reflects guidelines expressed in item #2 above.*

Appendix B

Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

1

**UNIVERSITY 1 OF PUGET SOUND**

**2 FACULTY CODE**

3

**4 CHAPTER I**

5

**6 GENERAL POLICIES**

7

8

**9 PART D - PROFESSIONAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

10

**11 Section 4 - Professional Ethics**

12

13 Professors are bound to observe acceptable standards of professional ethics. In general, a  
14 professor should not compromise the interests of the university or of one's students in  
15 favor of one's own. **Questions related to violations of professional ethics should be**  
16 **handled in the following manner:**

17

18 **a. First notify the faculty member of suspected misconduct on his or her**  
19 **part. There may be an explanation that resolves the matter satisfactorily.**

20

21 **b. Failing to receive an explanation that is satisfactory, or not wishing to**  
22 **deal directly with the person suspected of misconduct, one should take**  
23 **the matter to the Chair of that person's department. (If the Chair is the**  
24 **person suspected of misconduct one should take the matter to the Dean.)**  
25 **The Chair may resolve the matter to everyone's satisfaction.**

26

27 **c. If these steps do not resolve the problem, the matter should normally be**  
28 **referred to the Dean and handled through the grievance process as**  
29 **provided in Chapter VI, with the Dean responsible for filing the**  
30 **grievance. In the event that the Dean does not file a grievance, faculty**  
31 **members retain the right to do so.** If questions of professional ethical import  
32 arise which cannot be resolved, the party or parties may refer the issue to the  
33 Professional Standards Committee for recommendation to the parties.

34

**35 PART E - ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

36

**37 Section 3 - Enforcement**

38

39 **If a faculty member's rights regarding academic freedom, as provided in this part of**  
40 **the faculty code, have been denied, that faculty member may initiate a grievance**  
41 **action as provided in Chapter VI.** If a faculty member's rights as provided by  
42 Chapter 1, Part D (p.4) of the faculty code have been denied, that faculty member may  
43 initiate a grievance action as provided in Chapter VI hereof. In case of a dismissal, the

44 faculty member may request a hearing board to review the case as provided in Chapter V  
45 of this code.

46

47

Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

2

1 CHAPTER III

2

3 EVALUATION OF FACULTY

4

5

6 Section 4 - Evaluation Procedure

7

8

9 **f. Process for dealing with questions of professional ethics that arise during an**  
10 **evaluation.**

11

12 **(1) If, during an evaluation, a member of the faculty raises a question or a**  
13 **concern regarding the professional ethical behavior of an evaluatee, the**  
14 **faculty member shall initiate a grievance process as described in Chapter I,**  
15 **Part D, Section 4, and the evaluation -- whether at the department,**  
16 **program, school, or Faculty Advancement Committee level -- shall be**  
17 **suspended until the grievance process concludes.**

18

19 **(2) If, during an evaluation, a member of the faculty raises a question or a**  
20 **concern regarding the professional ethical behavior of an evaluator (related**  
21 **to this person's role as an evaluator), the faculty member shall initiate a**  
22 **grievance process as described in Chapter I, Part D, Section 4, and the**  
23 **evaluation -- whether at the department, program, school, or Faculty**  
24 **Advancement Committee level -- shall be suspended until the grievance**  
25 **process concludes.**

26

27

Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

3

1 CHAPTER VI

2

3 GRIEVANCES

4

5

6 Section 1 - When Used in this Chapter

7

8 a. The term "grievance" includes a faculty originated complaint or a university  
9 originated complaint.

10

11 b. The term "faculty originated complaint" is a complaint by a faculty member that the

12 university, an officer including another faculty member, or an official body thereof  
13 has, by act or omission, violated obligations accorded that faculty member by the  
14 contract of employment or by provisions of this faculty code; provided, that a faculty  
15 originated complaint does not include obligations conferred by Chapter I, Part F, and  
16 Chapters III, IV, and V of this code. Those chapters provide for appeal of the alleged  
17 violations.

18

19 c. The term "university administration originated complaint" is a complaint by the  
20 university alleging that a faculty member has by act or omission violated obligations  
21 conferred by contract of employment with the university or by provisions of this  
22 code.

23

24 d. The term "grievant" refers to the originator of the complaint.

25

26 e. The term "respondent" refers to the person(s) complained against.

27

28 f. The term "parties" refers to the grievant, the respondent, and the university.

29

30 g. The term "committee" refers to the Professional Standards Committee.

31

32 Section 2 - Prehearing Settlement Conference

33

34 a. Within thirty (30) working days of the alleged violation, the grievant shall give  
35 written notice thereof to the respondent; provided, that the notice may be served on  
36 the dean if the grievant is without knowledge of the identify of the respondent.

37

38 A grievance notice presented after thirty working days of the alleged violation will be  
39 considered only if the grievant demonstrates that he or she did not know, **or could not**  
40 **have known**, about the alleged violation until a later time. In such an instance, the  
41 grievance notice must be given within thirty working days of the date upon which the  
42 grievant gained knowledge of the alleged violation.

43

44 b. The notice shall state the relevant facts with reasonable particularity, cite those  
45 portions of the appointment contract or the faculty code alleged to be violated, and  
46 include proposed remedies.

47

48 c. Within five (5) working days of notice the respondent shall conduct formal  
49 discussions with the grievant and other appropriate persons with the intent of reaching  
50 a satisfactory settlement of the grievance, and which, if found, shall terminate the  
51 grievance process. Any party may terminate the prehearing settlement conference if  
52 they feel that further discussions will be unsuccessful.

53

54 Section 3 - Grievance Hearing

Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

4

1

2 a. If the prehearing settlement conference is terminated without settlement of the  
3 grievance, then within five working days of said termination the grievant may serve  
4 the written notice required in Section 2 (p.26) to the dean. Included with said notice  
5 shall be identification of the individuals who attended the conference and a demand  
6 for a grievance hearing.

7

8 b. The dean shall, within five (5) days of the service of said notice, forward the notice  
9 and all attendant materials to the committee.

10

11 Section 4 - Grievance Procedure

12

13 a. **Upon receipt of the grievance from the dean, the committee shall schedule a**  
14 **hearing to begin within fifteen (15) working days and give the dean, the grievant,**  
15 **and respondent at least five working days notice thereof.** Upon receipt of the  
16 grievance the committee shall fix a time, not later than fifteen (15) days of receipt for  
17 a hearing and shall give the dean, the grievant, and respondent five days notice  
18 thereof.

19

20 **b. In grievances brought before the committee, the individuals involved or any**  
21 **committee member may raise the issue of a conflict of interest concerning a**  
22 **member of the committee. If the conflict of interest is disputed, those members**  
23 **of the committee who are not involved in the alleged conflict of interest shall**  
24 **conduct a confidential, written vote to determine if a conflict of interest may**  
25 **exist. If it is determined that a member of the committee may have a conflict of**  
26 **interest, that member shall be recused from deliberating and voting. If a**  
27 **member of the committee is recused because of an apparent conflict of interest,**  
28 **the committee, at its discretion, may appoint a substitute to participate in the**  
29 **case. Parties to the grievance are automatically recused from serving on the**  
30 **grievance committee.**

31

32 **bc.** The function of the hearing committee shall be to determine whether there have  
33 been violations of the code **or contract of employment**, as alleged by the grievant,  
34 and to recommend what sanctions, if any, should be imposed upon the respondent(s).

35

36 **cd.** Procedures

37

38 (1) Presiding Officer. The committee chairperson shall preside, handle  
39 administrative duties, and rule on matters of procedure and evidence; provided  
40 that decisions by the chairperson are subject to being overruled by a majority of  
41 the committee.

42

43 (2) Representation. The university shall be represented by person(s) designated by  
44 the dean. The grievant and respondent may attend all hearings in person and be  
45 acted for by lawyer or non-lawyer counsel chosen by the grievant/respondent.

46

47 (3) Closed Hearings. Hearings shall not be open to the public, and the only persons

48 present shall be those whose presence is allowed by this chapter. However, at  
49 the request of either party, and with the concurrence of the committee, a  
50 representative of an educational association or other appropriate association  
51 shall be allowed to observe hearings.

52

53 (4) Records. In all cases, the university shall **provide make** an electronic verbatim  
54 record **of the hearing, and provide to either party, upon their request, a**  
Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

5

**copy of that verbatim recording or a verbatim transcript 1 paid for by the**  
2 **requesting party. , and if requested by either party, a verbatim transcript of the**  
3 **proceedings paid for by the requesting party.** Records made of the hearing  
4 shall be retained by the university for six years after the committee makes its  
5 report.

6

7 (5) Order of Presentation. The grievant shall make the initial presentation to the  
8 committee. At the conclusion of that presentation any party may request that  
9 the hearing be terminated for lack of any probable merit for the grievance. The  
10 committee shall then meet in executive session to approve or reject the request.  
11 If the request is approved by a majority of the committee then the grievance  
12 shall be dismissed and such dismissal is final. If the request is denied by a  
13 majority of the committee then the respondent shall go forward with the  
14 respondent's presentation.

15

16 (6) Evidence. Each party shall offer such evidence as the committee deems  
17 relevant, and each party may cross-examine the other's witnesses. Witnesses  
18 may be allowed to testify by affidavit if, in the committee's discretion, that is the  
19 most feasible way of presenting their evidence and if the opposing party is not  
20 substantially prejudiced by lack of cross examination. The committee shall  
21 have no duty to seek or to present evidence but may do so if, in its judgment,  
22 justice requires. In such a case, the committee shall have right of access to all  
23 pertinent materials, **regardless of classification.** The hearsay rule or other  
24 exclusionary rules of evidence used in courts of law shall not apply.

25

26 (7) Discovery. Insofar as practicable, each party shall assist the other in obtaining  
27 witnesses and evidence when the party's assistance is necessary or helpful.  
28 Each party shall make specifically requested and relevant documents or other  
29 tangible evidence in its possession available to the other for presentation to the  
30 committee.

31

32 (8) Public Statements. No person involved in the hearing's proceedings shall make  
33 public statements, directly or indirectly, about the matters in the hearings.

34

35 (9) Final Report. After completion of the hearing, the members of the committee  
36 shall meet in executive session to consider their decision on the matters before  
37 them. The committee may consider only evidence presented to it in hearing.

38 The decision of the majority shall be transmitted to the president as the  
39 committee's decision, but dissenting members may also transmit statements of  
40 their position. Said report(s) shall be delivered to the president within ten (10)  
41 working days of the termination of the hearing unless the committee extends the  
42 time. The committee shall send the president a copy of the grievant's notice of  
43 complaint, a summary of their hearings, and tangible items of evidence they  
44 received in their hearings. **The committee will send copies of its report(s),  
45 and other materials transmitted to the president, to the parties in the  
46 grievance at the same time that it sends them to the president.**

47

#### 48 Section 5 - President's Action

49

50 The president shall consider the report and materials submitted therewith. Within twenty  
51 (20) working days of receiving the committee's report, the president shall do the  
52 following:

53

Proposed Faculty Code Revisions: 12/5/07

6

a. finally determine what action, if any, the university shall 1 take in response to the  
2 grievance complaint;

3

4 b. transmit the final determination to the committee, to the grievant and to the  
5 university officer or employees whose actions gave rise to the grievance complaint;

6

7 c. **transmit to the committee and the other parties to the grievance, should the final  
8 determination be contrary to that reached by the committee, the reasons for the  
9 determination**transmit to the committee, should the final determination by contrary  
10 to that reached by the committee, the reasons for the determination;

11

12 d. direct appropriate university officers to take any required action.

13

#### 14 Section 6 - Respondent's Action

15

16 The respondent shall comply with the decision within thirty (30) working days or sooner.  
17 Failure to comply may be considered a violation of contract, and Chapter I, Part C of the  
18 faculty code.

19

## Appendix C

*Whereas* Professor Juli McGruder has given generously of her time, energy, idealism, and intelligence to the University of Puget Sound for nigh onto 30 years,

*And Whereas* this self-same Dr. McGruder has distinguished herself in Occupational Therapy, Anthropology, and allied disciplines,

*And Whereas* the very same Juli McGruder helped to found and has participated fully in African American Studies since its inception,

*And Whereas* Ms. McGruder has been a tireless, candid advocate for those disadvantaged, those downtrodden, and those discriminated against,

*And Whereas* Juli has participated fully in faculty governance in plenary meetings, in departmental and school meetings, and in this very Faculty Senate,

*We Resolve that* Juli McGruder - Professor and Doctor, Colleague and Advocate, Senator and Scholar - has earned the praise and congratulations of every member of the faculty of the University of Puget Sound

*and thus* The Faculty Senate extends soon-to-be Emerita McGruder our warmest valedictions upon her retirement.