

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2010

1. Call to order

President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. At 4:15 there were 49 faculty, staff, and students in attendance.

2. Approval of minutes of February 22, 2010 meeting

The minutes for the faculty meeting of February 22, 2010 were approved as posted.

3. Announcements

Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen reminded faculty of the reception for retiring faculty and staff to be held on Thursday at 3:30.

4. President's Report

Admissions: President Thomas announced that the application period was closed and that the number of applications was up 14% from the previous year. There were over 6,000 applications. Test scores and diversity numbers were higher than past years, too. Deposits are also ahead from last year. The admissions committee has been able to be more selective this year, and yield events have been well attended.

Fundraising: The annual fund is +8% over last year, though -3% from the record year of 2008. Giving by alumni is up 14%, +6% by parents, though "friends" are giving at a slightly lower rate.

Other news: The Board of Trustees approved groundbreaking on May 13, 2010 for the Center for Health Sciences. The fundraising goal of \$15.5 million has been exceeded and increased to \$17.6 million to more fully cover building costs.

5. Academic Vice-President's Report

Evaluation: Dean Bartanen reminded faculty that not all letters regarding promotion, tenure and review have been sent yet. These cases are addressed group by group (i.e. , All 3rd year reviews at once).

Commencement: Participate, please!

Follow-up on Faculty Teaching Load: The Academic VP has been gathering data as to how many faculty currently teach a full 3/3 load (83 or 46%) and, not counting sabbatical leaves (96 or 54%). More information to come.

6. Report of the Faculty Senate Chair

Prof. Doug Cannon reminded colleagues of the call for nominations to the Faculty

Senate, where three seats are open. Also open is the position of Senate Chair and seats on to the Faculty Salary Committee.

Questions arose in the most recent meeting regarding the 1st reading of a revised amendment to the Faculty Bylaws, as there is no provision in the bylaws for repealing an amendment in the event of there not being an outright rejection of said amendment by the Board of Trustees. Prof. Cannon stated that the Senate's responsibility is to interpret the bylaws, and its interpretation of the above question is, in effect, that before an amendment is approved by the board, a superseding amendment approved by $\frac{3}{4}$ of the faculty would have the effect of withdrawing the previous version, provided this intention was made explicit in the motion.

7. Revised amendment to the Bylaws on the Committee on Diversity—[see attached]

M/S/F Prof. Richard Anderson-Connolly moved to delay the reading of this amendment on the grounds that items 8 and 9 were of pressing importance. The motion was rejected.

Prof. Owen read the revised amendment and moved to withdraw the earlier version of the amendment; Prof. Wiese seconded the motion.

M/S To adopt the revised (right column) amendment to the Bylaws on the Committee on Diversity and thereby withdraw the faculty action of April 6, 2009, in which an earlier version (middle column) of the amendment was adopted.

Prof. Bill Haltom proposed to revise section H.b.8 to include at its end "by the Faculty Senate." Profs. Owen and Wiese accepted the revised wording without objection.

Discussion:

Professor Anderson-Connolly read a critique of the motion. He cited the notion of "increasing social diversity" as a problematic general principle of the amendment, arguing that it would cause the exclusion of certain groups. The conditional mood of "could cause systematic exclusion" he found particularly troubling. He also expressed concern with what he considered a vagueness with regards to "celebration" v. "equal opportunity." Thirdly, he took issue with the notion of "identity," a "middle level identity" of race that he rejects in favor of "individual" or "human." Lastly, he found the implicit biological definition of race to be troubling. He then ventured a possible rebuttal: the notion that race is a cultural concept, which he rejected as well.

From this general critique, Prof. Anderson-Connolly offered detailed criticisms of specific points of the language of the revised amendment:

b.2 What would the role of the Diversity Committee (DC) be?

b.5 Would defining this notion of identity be the DC's role?

b.6 Regarding the Bias-Hate Education Response Team (henceforth “BERT”), he found the idea of “aggregating” such a small number of data points reporting bias and hate crimes to be problematic. If the events are isolated, he speculated, how can we speak of trends? Who would be responsible for gathering and evaluating data collected by various campus groups (maintenance, security, etc.) He also worried about the potential bias of individual members of BERT. Would members be selected at random?

In closing Prof. Anderson-Connolly expressed his fear that the amendment, if passed, would pose a threat to free speech and lead to ad hominem attacks, as it suffered from a lack of conceptual clarity and an uncertainty as to how its agenda would be enacted.

In the ensuing discussion, Prof. Derek Buescher observed that Prof. Anderson-Connolly’s critique was based largely on a reading of the University’s strategic plan, not the specific language of the revised amendment and was therefore, largely conjectural. He also stressed that “celebration” and “support” were two discrete components, the latter being explicitly stated in the amendment in question.

Prof. Nancy Bristow argued that an ad-hoc committee would be – and has been – insufficient to address issues of hate and bias, and that it was our imperative as educators to deal with them on a systematic level. Moreover, she emphasized that the effects of such incidents are not solitary events, but have lasting repercussions in the campus community.

Prof. Judith Kay reminded the faculty that BERT exists regardless. The real issue in question is to ensure faculty control of it.

Prof. Carolyn Weisz found Prof. Anderson-Connolly’s argument based on a scary idea, which would result in another form of suppressing speech. She remarked that the putative color-blindness v. multiculturalism split “feels like a holocaust denial” and that it ignored the importance of the question of history in an academic debate.

Several faculty members, including Prof. Terry Beck and Prof. Dexter Gordon repudiated the notion of color-blindness, drawing on both academic studies and personal experience. Prof. Gordon pointed out that discrimination was not something simply “brought” to campus, but experienced here, and bears directly on the question of the retention of minority students.

Associate Dean Lisa Ferrari remarked that the debate at this point consisted largely of Prof. Anderson-Connolly talking to the faculty and wondered if other opinions or positions were being lost in the lopsided discussion.

Following a discussion regarding the implications of the phrase “emerging trends of hate and bias” (H.b.6), Prof. Stephen Neshyba made a motion to change the phrase in question to “incidents of bias and hate”. Ultimately, following debate “patterns” was suggested in place of “emerging trends.”

M/S/P that provision H.b.6 read: To activate annual a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about ~~emerging trends~~ **patterns** of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.

Prof. Cannon reminded faculty that the present setting was legislative and that the principal purpose of the discussion was to discuss the practical aspects of the amendment in question. He reiterated the notion that the adoption of the amendment would fulfill the faculty's educational responsibilities.

Dean of Students Mike Segawa stressed the frequency of bias issues on campus and emphasized that Student Affairs could not adequately address these issues on its own.

Prof. Michel Rocchi, echoing Dean Ferrari's earlier comment, called for other dissenting opinions to be voiced.

Prof. Zaixin Hong wondered what the opinion of legal experts would be regarding the language of the revised amendment.

Dean Bartanen noted that, though the document had not been sent to the university counsel, the group of trustees who had volunteered to be consulted on the bylaw language included an attorney with relevant expertise and that the trustees were prepared to support the revised language.

Prof. Neshyba asked whether the allocation of 7 faculty members to this committee work might not be detrimental to the other committee duties of faculty. He moved to amend the number to 5 faculty members.

In the pursuant discussion, several faculty members emphasized the importance of such committee work and stressed the importance of having a variety of identities and opinions on such a committee.

M/S/F that provision H.a. read: The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex officio); no fewer than ~~seven~~ **five** appointed faculty member, and one student.

A call was made to close discussion and vote on the revised diversity bylaw, incorporating the two amendments. The motion carried and a move to vote made. A call was made for paper ballots.

M/S/P To adopt the revised (right column) amendment to the Bylaws on the Committee on Diversity, as amended to replace "emerging issues" with "patterns" and add "by the Faculty Senate," and thereby withdraw the faculty action of April 6, 2009, in which an earlier version (middle column) of the amendment was adopted.

The motion passed with 44 of 51 present voting in favor (86%).

8. Amendment to the Bylaws on the Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee—discussion and potential vote (Doug Cannon) [see attached]

M/S/P At this point Prof. Cannon moved to move item 9 forward and save item 8 for the next meeting.

9. Motion to delay pass/fail policy [Bill Haltom]

Prof. Haltom induced faculty to delay 2 motions from the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) with regards to the Pass/Fail policy for 1st and 2nd year students and within major (w/ all major requirements completed). The purpose of the delay would be so that the faculty could discuss what the ASC and Senate had already had a chance to discuss.

Prof. Cannon gave a bit of background: the ASC adopted these changed in November. To evade the 30-day implementation limit, the Senate asked to discuss them but took no action, noting that any member of the faculty could call for further discussion.

Prof. Bill Breitenbach asked that the minutes from the November 4 and November 18, 2009 ASC meetings be reposted, as they were no longer available on the University web site.

M/S/P The motion to delay was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30

Respectfully submitted,
Brendan Lanctot
Assistant Professor of Hispanic Studies

Current language, Article V, Section 6.H.	Proposed language 4/6/09 approved	Proposed language 2/4/10
<p>H. The Committee on Diversity.</p> <p>a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Dean of Students (ex-officio); the Dean of Admission (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than five appointed faculty members; a maximum of three members of the staff, to be selected by the Staff Senate; and four students.</p> <p>b. The duties of the Committee shall be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To promote the involvement of all sectors of the campus community in the implementation of the University's intent to develop an increasingly diverse community. "Diversity" shall include areas such as race/ethnicity, gender, national origin, religion, socio-economic class, sexual orientation, and physical ability. 2. To assist the Dean of Admission and the Dean of Students in the University's ongoing program of recruiting, retaining, and graduating a diverse student body. 3. To assist the Vice President for University Relations in securing funding for scholarships and programs to enhance diversity. 4. To assist the President, the Dean of the University, and the Affirmative Action Officer in the ongoing program to increase the diversity of faculty, staff, administration, and university boards. 5. To foster an environment on campus that supports diversity through curricular and co-curricular programs. 6. To report annually to the Faculty the University's efforts and results achieved in recruiting and retaining members of ethnic and minority groups on campus. The report shall be presented and published as the Committee deems appropriate. 7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it. 	<p>H. The Committee on Diversity</p> <p>a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than seven appointed faculty members, and one student.</p> <p>b. The duties of the Committee shall be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus.</i> 2. <i>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.</i> 3. <i>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.</i> 4. <i>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.</i> 5. <i>To work with colleagues to maintain an inclusive classroom environment; to promote academic freedom and freedom of expression, as needed.</i> 6. <i>To activate, collaborate with, and oversee a group, focused on education, that will address, as needed, manifestations of prejudice or bigotry within the campus community through activities that include the promotion of academic freedom and freedom of expression; to include the activities of this group specifically in the annual report to the Faculty Senate.</i> 7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it. 	<p>H. The Committee on Diversity</p> <p>a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Chief Diversity Officer (ex-officio); no fewer than seven appointed faculty members, and one student.</p> <p>b. The duties of the Committee shall be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus. 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. <i>To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</i> 6. <i>To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about emerging trends of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</i> 7. <i>To report annually to the faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</i> 8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Proposed Revision of the Faculty Bylaws – Committee on Diversity

(prepared by the Diversity Committee, Professor Judith Kay, Chair, for the Spring 2009 faculty consideration of the Bylaw amendment)

Changes in Column 2 above approved by the Faculty on April 6, 2009 by a vote of 42 – 13 (76.36%).

The existing bylaws are judged inadequate for several reasons.

Inappropriate Structure

President Philip M. Phibbs first appointed an ad hoc University Committee on Diversity in academic year 1990-91. This Committee reported directly to the president, was composed of faculty, staff, administrators, and students, and produced a comprehensive report. One recommendation of the report was to create a standing committee of the Faculty Senate known as the Diversity Committee, the description of which (in the bylaws) is now almost 20 years old. The bylaws reflect a committee structure substantially different from that of other standing committees insofar as it includes three vice presidents and four staff members.

Insufficiently Attentive to Faculty Concerns, Authority, and Accountability

The existing bylaws use faculty mainly as advisors to vice presidents to assist their efforts. Those bylaws neither promote faculty diversity-related interests effectively nor create faculty accountability for diversity efforts or outcomes. Current and past members of the faculty Diversity Committee have suggested that the charges to the Committee are appropriate to faculty but not productively shared by staff and administrators. The Committee appreciates the time, effort, and goodwill offered by staff and administrative members, but regards the Committee's mission as more appropriately expressed through membership typical of faculty committees.

Outdated in Light of New Circumstances

After broad consultation with the campus community, President Thomas unveiled a University Diversity Strategic Plan and created the position of Chief Diversity Officer. These changes provide a timely opportunity to revisit the structure and function of the Diversity Committee in light of the entire strategic plan.

In light of these concerns, in fall 2008 the Faculty Senate charged the Diversity Committee with revising its bylaws. Important features of the revisions are brought to your attention.

Change the Structure

The Committee recommends that its membership resemble other faculty committees; ASUPS and the Staff Senate are urged to each form its own diversity committee.

Tailor Committee to Address Faculty Concerns

The revisions create a committee that can actively identify, contribute to, and be accountable for diversity activities and concerns within traditional areas of faculty interest and responsibility:

- recruitment and retention of excellent faculty
- production of knowledge
- maintenance of currency in our fields and in pedagogy
- protection of academic freedom and freedom of speech
- respect for diverse faculty perspectives on diversity
- education and advising of students inside and outside the classroom.

The new bylaws do not give the Committee any enforcement role; it has no accusatory or adjudicatory duties. Rather, the Committee will have authority through established faculty channels to recommend new approaches and promote discussion of these matters.

As faculty, we protect academic freedom in part by maintaining a degree of autonomy from the university administration. Although the proposed bylaws affirm faculty partnership with the administration, which does so much to support academic endeavors, the bylaws also maintain faculty freedom to dissent from administrative initiatives. The Diversity Committee looks forward to working closely with the new Chief Diversity Officer and her advisory council, including the task forces on which faculty serve. Nonetheless, we believe that the Diversity Committee should maintain a direct line of accountability to the faculty through the Senate.

Summary of Consideration of the Bylaw Amendment by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees

May 2009:

Dean Bartanen opened discussion, noting that the proposed amendment was approved by the faculty on April 6, 2009 by 76% vote; its purpose is to focus the work of the Committee on Diversity on areas of interest and responsibility of the faculty and to provide clearer charges for the committee.

Trustee concerns:

- A formally constituted university committee could sanction a member of the faculty for his or her expression. In response to explanations by Cannon, Bartanen, and Dean Segawa regarding the educational (rather than adjudicatory) objectives entailed in 6.H.b.6, there was still concern that simply having some group decide that an incident or comment was a “manifestation of prejudice or bigotry” that needed response could be a form of sanction.
- Other discussion raised questions about the vagueness or lack of clarity of the language in 6.H.b.6. Ultimately, the proposal was tabled for further discussion in October 2009 in order to allow time for the Committee to address other agenda items.

October 2009:

Dean Bartanen reintroduced the proposed changes to the Faculty Bylaws, explaining the Diversity Committee’s interest – now that the Diversity Strategic Plan, Diversity Advisory Council, and Chief Diversity Officer are in place – to narrow its membership into closer alignment with other Faculty Senate committees and to focus its attention on diversity priorities of the faculty. Professor Nancy Bristow offered remarks about the proposed changes, specifically commenting on Article V, Section 6.H.b.6. She offered examples of recent campus events that indicated the need for a response group to relieve hurt students of the burden to educate the campus about the hurtfulness of such situations. Chief Diversity Officer Kim Bobby then followed with remarks that reinforced how alone some students feel in this kind of circumstance, and the need for a body to illuminate the issues. This volunteer group, composed of persons from a variety of campus constituencies, comes together to share information, identify what trends are happening on campus, and create a proactive dialogue about identified issues in hopes of preventing further incidents from occurring in the future.

Trustee concerns:

- Continuing concern with the language, specifically that a judgment is being made that a “manifestation of prejudice and bigotry” has occurred and in response to which the group is activated. The proposed language outlines no due process for colleagues to respond to an allegation of an act of prejudice and bigotry. While trustees agreed with the need for skilled facilitators to respond to the behaviors described by Professors Bristow and Bobby, the proposed language is overly broad and could prove problematic (even a sight for litigation) down the road.
- Question about the consistency of this response team with the structure of other faculty committees, which led to clarification that the Diversity Committee is consonant with other Faculty Senate committees and that it is the response group that has broader membership from across campus.
- Question about where adjudication of complaints rests. Deans Segawa and Bartanen noted the processes of the Student Integrity Code, Faculty Code, and Staff Policies and Procedures, and Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, and that these codes and policies are designed to respond to complaints brought forward by individuals when an alleged respondent can be identified, but do not address broader campus incidents or education of the campus community regarding broader concerns. Student Representative Katie Rader spoke in favor of the response group.
- Suggestion that 6.H.b.6 be dropped. Professor Cannon stated that, if Section 6.H.b.6 was dropped from the proposed bylaw change, the faculty would then not have any authority or accountability for the group described in this section. It would fall to the administration to oversee such activity, contrary to faculty wishes.
- Question about whether 6.H.b.5 would affect classroom teaching. Professor Cannon noted that faculty members had not expressed concern for this change having an impact on faculty teaching practices.

Trustees deferred action on the proposed bylaws change until the March 2010 meeting in order to allow faculty to revise language. Three trustees volunteered to be available for consultation. Professors Susan Owen and Nila Wiese, in consultation with colleagues, have forwarded revised language. The three trustee volunteers and the ASA Chair on Monday, February 8, affirmed their support of the revisions and their intention to recommend the language in committee at the upcoming March Board meeting. Pending faculty approval after a first and second reading, the amendment would move forward to the full Board in May 2010.

On the current revisions

Some of the questions and concerns RE: 6.H.b.6 considered by Nila Wiese and Susan Owen, in consultation with various faculty members and members of the Diversity Committee:

- (1) Does B.E.R.T. have adjudicatory power? (No)
- (2) Who has adjudicatory power? (See Faculty Code; See HR rules; See rules governing student behavior).
- (3) What does B.E.R.T. actually do? (Review aggregate data/propose educational opportunities).
- (4) By what authority? [See Diversity/Purposes & Goals/Education + Tracking and Awareness]
- (5) Who gathers the data, and how? [Security; Maintenance; Student Affairs; others]

Item 6.H.b.6 has been revised to more closely reflect the language that was proposed and approved by the Faculty Senate when BERT was created (see below). In addition, item 6.H.b.5 has been revised to increase clarity and item 6.H.b.7 has been added.

Purpose & Goals of BERT

(taken from the 'Diversity at Puget Sound' webpage)

Purpose

While there are formal channels to address complaints of bias or hate, our campus community at large is not aware of the extent to which these kinds of incidents may occur. The Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BERT) aims to create a greater awareness of how these incidents may be shaping our community. BERT creates a space for proactive dialogue related to emerging trends of bias or hate incidents.

Goals

Education

BERT will create an educational space for reflection and dialogue regarding incidents of bias or hate. This will positively augment existing formal vehicles for reporting these incidents. BERT will be represented by a cadre of faculty, staff, and students who will take an active role in addressing the trends of hate or bias incidents, create opportunities to confront these issues, and encourage dialogue for change.

BERT will promote community discourse where public incidents require dialogue, reflection, and understanding of how these incidents shape our collective identity on campus, even if we are not directly involved. This collective, thoughtful response by members of the Puget Sound campus community can lift the burden that is placed on individual students, faculty, and staff or on student organizations to address these incidents.

Tracking and Awareness

In collaboration with the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research, BERT will review aggregate data on incidents of hate or bias so that we may be proactive in addressing trends and increasing awareness on campus. Hate and bias behaviors may seem isolated, but when aggregated these incidents tell us a story about what is happening in our community.

BERT also may develop accessible, less formal approaches to tracking hate and bias incidents.

Faculty Bylaws (Revised Edition July 2009)

Proposed revisions to Article V, Sec. 6:

G. The Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee.

a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Director of the Library (ex-officio), the ~~Chief Technology Officer~~ (ex-officio), ~~the Director of Educational Technology~~, no fewer than five appointed members of the Faculty, and one student.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: Associate Vice President for Information Systems

b. The duties of the Committee shall be:

1. To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director and the ~~Chief Technology Officer~~.

Deleted: Associate Vice President for Information Systems

2. To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.

3. To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.

4. To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.

5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it [by the Faculty Senate](#).