

University of Puget Sound

Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Senate

April 19, 2010

4:00 pm Misner Room

Senators Present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Kelli Delaney, Douglas Cannon (chair), Fred Hamel, Suzanne Holland, Zaixin Hong, Rob Hutchinson, Lisa Johnson, Dan Miller, Steven Neshyba, Marc Phillips, Mike Segawa, Keith Ward, Seth Weinberger

Guests Present: Bob Boyles, Bill Haltom, Jane Carlin, Alyce DeMarais, Ross Singleton

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM.

Approval of the minutes of April 5, 2010: The April 5, 2010 minutes were approved.

Announcements: Miller announced that a student concerns meeting will be held on April 28 at 6 pm in the Rotunda. A panel will be there to answer questions. Anyone interested should come. Cannon asked if there were special concerns. Miller replied that there were none. This was just an open forum. Miller said that Mike Segawa and Dean Bartanen will be there.

Anderson-Connolly provided an update on the election. Anderson-Connolly had to unilaterally stop the election, because a name was inadvertently left off of the ballot. The name was reinserted, and the election was restarted. The run-off election will be started on Thursday.

Special Orders: Hamel stated a concern that there is no proxy voting for faculty members who are unable to attend faculty meetings due to concurrent university obligations (teaching a class, etc.). He wondered if others share this concern and whether addressing the issue would involve adjusting the bylaws. The issue arises when a faculty member has other university business, and therefore cannot attend a faculty meeting, and wants to vote on something.

Cannon said that there is no provision in the bylaws for voting in absentia or by proxy. However, there is a line in the bylaws concerning Senate elections that notes that each member shall have one vote and that there shall not be voting by proxy. However, Cannon pointed out, under the section concerning organization of the faculty, there is language suggestive of balloting by mail, but there is no direction about how such a thing should be decided.

Cannon said that we should find a better meeting time for faculty meetings. A new faculty member mentioned to him that she did not know that she could or should come to faculty meetings. At this faculty member's former university, a dedicated time (noon) was reserved for faculty meetings.

Ward returned to the special order raised by Hamel. Ward wondered whether the mailing language was a remnant of when the faculty used to do things by campus mail. Cannon clarified that the issue is not

whether balloting can be done by mail, but rather whether the language contains an implicit sense of proxy voting.

Reports of Committee Liaisons: Weinberger reported that the ASC has become aware of online study sites, such as www.coursehero.com, where students upload assignments and lecture notes from actual classes. These items cannot be viewed without payment. The ASC would like input from the faculty. Holland asked who places the materials online. Weinberger replied that students upload it, because it is a note sharing site. He said that there may be some copyright infringement issues if students are uploading class notes. Johnson said that if students are uploading their own notes, then there should not be a copyright infringement issue. Weinberger reasserted that some information may be copyrighted.

Ward, liaison to PSC, said that the PSC has addressed a personnel issue brought to them for action, has met with one academic department regarding revision of its departmental evaluation guidelines, and that subcommittees continue to work on departmental guidelines. Barry wants to know whether there is any word on student evaluations and how they might create any problems. There is no information on this yet.

Extra-Departmental Resources for Faculty Being Evaluated: The motion on the floor:

That a roster of former members of the Faculty Advancement Committee, subject to their consent, be maintained and publicized by the chair of the Faculty Senate, and that those listed be available to meet with faculty being evaluated under the Faculty Code.

Neshyba spoke in favor of the motion, but he said that we do not need a Senate motion on this because the Senate Chair could just do it himself.

Anderson-Connolly said that making the list available is fine, and the Senate could not move to block this.

Johnson said that Cathy Hale received a release unit to work with junior faculty members at the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching. Hale works with junior faculty on third-year files, personal statements, and other evaluation concerns. Bartanen clarified that Hale was given a release unit to work with students and to coordinate faculty development, though Hale may certainly do the type of thing that we are discussing, too.

Hamel spoke against the motion, saying that he found the proposed role of the ex-FAC members, as indicated by the language “be available to meet with,” to be fundamentally ambiguous. He asked what might happen if a faculty member going for tenure asks an ex-FAC member about “biases” of the existing FAC, or if such a faculty member asks the ex-FAC member to read over his/her statement.

Ward spoke against the motion. Ward said that if he were a member of such a panel, that he would limit his comments to procedural matters and not to substance.

Moved (Neshyba) and seconded: **That a roster of former members of the Faculty Advancement Committee, subject to their consent, be maintained and publicized by the chair of the Faculty Senate, and that those listed be available to meet with faculty being evaluated under the Faculty Code.**

Motion carried after Chair called for a division.

Holland moved (seconded by Anderson-Connolly): **Move agenda item VII forward, ahead of item VI.**
Motion passed.

Annual reporting from the Sustainability Advisory Committee: Neshyba moved (Anderson-Connolly seconded): **The Senate requests that the SAC present the Senate with an annual report, to begin next academic year.** Weinberger wants to know why this isn't already done. Neshyba reported that the SAC was not originally a standing committee, because it was created by the President in 2005 or so. Neshyba said that we want to reemphasize that the SAC counts as service to the university. This is a way to legitimize the SAC. Bartanen said that the SAC jointly reports to the CFO and to the Academic VP. Bartanen said that faculty serve in many ways that are not standing committees, and they are credited for that service. Neshyba and Bartanen both stated that they did not mean to contradict each other. Neshyba said that there is a faculty and a staff co-chair of SAC. This motion would help place the SAC into the operations of the university.

Barry said that since the SAC was constituted by the President, the clause, "with the consent of the President," should be inserted into the motion. Neshyba asked whether this would be one time permission or ongoing permission. Barry clarified that the permission would be required only once. Neshyba agreed to the amendment, but Anderson-Connolly, who was the seconder, had left the room. Haltom noted that we can proceed forward without a second, providing that there is not a point of order objection. Barry moved to amend. Neshyba seconded. The motion is:

The Senate requests that the SAC, with the consent of the President, present the Senate with an annual report, to begin next academic year.

There was no discussion on the motion to amend. Vote on motion to amend. Motion carried.

There was no further discussion on the motion. Vote on the motion. The motion carried.

Interim report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Benefits: Cannon reminded the Senators that the Senate asked for the ad hoc committee on this issue. An ad hoc Committee was formed, constituted entirely of faculty. In the meantime, HR appointed a task force, consisting of faculty and staff, to provide support to HR. This task force appointed Neshyba, Ross Singleton, and Jill Nealey-Moore to their task force. This report is given by Neshyba in his capacity as a member of our own ad hoc Committee.

Neshyba presented a slide show. His presentation reviewed the Benefit Task Force Charges, the members of the task force, the members of the ad hoc committee, and the activities of the ad hoc committee during September and October 2009, and January, February, March, and April 2010.

The ad hoc committee released a survey in March. Institutional Research tabulated the data from the survey. There will be three sessions on April 27 and 28 for interested campus members. The survey

results will be discussed at those sessions. The numerical survey results are on the ad hoc committee's website. They hope to make recommendations to Sherry Mondou by August 2010.

Neshyba said that the medical plan is our priority. We need to increase funds for medical coverage, or we will have less medical coverage. From the survey, it is apparent that funding should not be reduced to the retirement plan. If we are discussing reallocation, the survey indicates that we should leave the retirement plan alone. There is no clear consensus on whether we should take money out of the educational benefit.

The ad hoc committee is going to look at restructuring the health care package. Neshyba discussed health savings accounts. If we had a health savings account, we would use it to satisfy a deductible, which would be much larger than our current deductible. However, the account would roll over from year to year. This is not a huge savings, but it is something like a 20% savings, which is better than what we can do now. The ad hoc committee is evaluating what we might want to do. Notably, with the health savings account, there is an educational component to it. In other words, people really need to understand how it works in order to use it. That means that there is an educational mission ahead of us, if we use the health savings account.

Anderson-Connolly asked if the health savings account is the only big idea on the table, or whether we were waiting for other ideas, give the new legislation regarding the health care system.

Neshyba said that there are also some other things, but that he had just presented one idea as an example.

Holland inquired about the formation of a health care collective comprised of various universities. She mentioned that we were once told about a Washington law that prohibited us from doing it. Bartanen responded that there is some rule in State of Washington prohibiting group formation for the purpose of getting health insurance. Rosa Beth Gibson did try to accomplish it, but other institutions did not want to do it, because it would be to their disadvantage, since we have a history of high costs. Holland wondered whether we should try again, since that was probably seven or eight years ago. Bartanen said that Rosa Beth does look into this regularly. It is an ongoing effort. Singleton added that Rosa Beth has tried to do this within the last couple of years. The problem is basically insurmountable given the regulatory hurdles in conjunction with the compatibility hurdles.

Cannon said that the Senate should remind the ad hoc committee about other things that we were interested in, too. Singleton said that there is a whole range of things that the committee was investigating. People have made a number of suggestions, and the ad hoc committee will address each of those in the final recommendations.

Anderson-Connolly asked whether recruitment, retention, and productivity of faculty are comparative with other institutions. If it is bad everywhere, then maybe it's just a wash. Singleton reported that the Ad Hoc committee had looked at this, specifically at how our university stacks up against other schools. We are below par in medical contributions, but significantly above par in retirement contributions. We are on average with educational benefits. Anderson-Connolly wondered whether there is a differential impact regarding age with respect to who we can attract and keep. Anderson-Connolly speculated that younger folks may want health care for kids, while older folks may want retirement contributions.

Holland inquired about the status of health care Flex Cards, which our plan administrator offers, and which would allow users to skip the process of submitting receipts and the paperwork involved in getting reimbursed, in favor of an automatic account deduction card that can be used at pharmacies, and so on. She said that she had asked our Benefits department why we couldn't have these since our plan offers it, and she was told the university decided it was not in our best interest. Holland wants to know how this was decided, and whether we could have an explanation for the decision. Singleton said that there is some reason why we don't do it. Neshyba said that the debit cards are not universally accepted, so Rosa Beth said it would be just as problematic as our current method. Holland said that she had used such a card while teaching at Colgate and that it was not universally accepted but it was accepted at several drug stores and it was very easy to use. She also suggested that if one of the principles that guides our benefits is increased productivity, having such a debit card would increase productivity by getting rid of hours spent on receipts and paperwork. Neshyba said that he will follow up on this.

Neshyba said that in his capacity as Vice Chair of the Senate, he sits on the Enterprise Risk Management committee. Issues of productivity are very high on that committee's list of concerns. Failure to engage faculty might include not enough work/life balance. This issue is being addressed in different parts of the university.

Singleton reported that the issue with on-campus child care would be a benefit, but that there are legal and financial constraints.

Year-end report of Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee:

Bob Boyles reported on the transition from Blackboard to Moodle, and on print management.

Anderson-Connolly mentioned that the LMIS report is very good. Anderson-Connolly asked whether the point of purchase system should be a charge for next year. Boyles replied that the issue was a sub-point of print management.

Anderson-Connolly asked how a point of purchase system would work. Boyles described it. DeMarais pointed out that students will not have to pay for class materials. Miller said that a 250 page limit is not very much. Boyles said that at this point, the number is completely arbitrary.

Holland wants to know whether we will save money by moving to Moodle and away from Blackboard. Boyles replied that we do save money, because Moodle is free. Bartanen noted that faculty could place more materials in course packs, because this would result in fewer items being printed. DeMarais said that readers are a good idea, and they help with copyright issues. Additionally, they allow the students to preview the readings. Holland reported that faculty were once asked to use Blackboard instead of course readers, and she asked whether we were now being asked to go back to course readers instead of electronic documents. DeMarais and Boyles both replied that course readers were options.

Phillips noted that large amounts of paper are being wasted under the current system. He said that a possible solution would be for professors to give a code to students, so that they could print what they needed to print.

Boyles said that faculty could just make reading packets.

Weinberger inquired about the status of backup for faculty hard drives, such as Carbonite.

Neshyba moved to receive the report of LMIS and to commend it for its quality and thoroughness. Cannon pointed out that the report would be simply appended to the current minutes. Actions have been heard by the Senate, so the thirty day clock as begun.

There was no discussion on the motion. The motion carried to accept the report of LMIS with a commendation for its quality and thoroughness.

Response from the Professional Standards Committee on the effect of opening tenure files:

Haltom reported that he is responding to the query made to the PSC concerning what effect there has been on open files at tenure time. The PSC consulted with the FAC. Has the change had an effect?

Haltom distributed copies of the following statement to the Senators, and then he read the statement to the Senate.

In response to a charge from the Faculty Senate to consult with those who served on the Faculty Advancement Committee since 2005 about the impact of the 2005 decision by faculty to allow open tenure files, the Professional Standards Committee consulted with seven members of the FAC. In writing or in person, the PSC heard from all members of the FAC in 2008 or 2009, when the FAC's year-end reports raised concerns about open files. Dean Bartanen, member of the FACs as well as the PSC and Faculty Senate, participated in discussions among members of the PSC but did not participate in face-to-face consultations with four erstwhile members of the FAC(s).

The PSC asked consulting members from the FAC to characterize tenure cases because those alone could have been changed by the 2005 shift [and, in tenure cases in which evaluatees selected a closed file, even tenure files may have been unchanged after 2005]. The veterans of the FAC volunteered that calling post-2005 letters "more guarded" was perhaps ill-advised because only the Dean and one member of the FAC had served prior to the change in 2005. The FAC veterans candidly admitted that they could not assay degrees of changes after 2005. However, the members reiterated that one or more letter-writers overlooked or downplayed serious issues in one or two tenure cases per year. On one or a few occasions when the FAC invited letter-writers to consult with the FAC, letter-writers seemed to some FAC members more forthcoming in person than they had been in letters.

Those who were on the FAC when either or both statements of concern were in the FAC's annual report to the Faculty Senate insisted that the FAC aimed to make faculty aware of the guarded letters so that the faculty might reflect on the changes effected in 2005.

The issues discussed struck the PSC as worthy of the attention and discussion of the faculty.

The consultations disclosed no confidential information, so anything that the PSC heard might be aired before the Faculty Senate or the full faculty.

Respectfully,

Bill Haltom

Chair, PSC

Anderson-Connolly commented that the method used has low power. Anderson-Connolly said that the methodology itself is so limiting, that we cannot learn anything from it. There is an absence of evidence.

Haltom said that the report said that the letters to the FAC had become more guarded. This seems to the PSC that the FAC was trying to get a discussion going about this issue.

A discussion ensued.

Haltom reported that the PSC is only reporting what was heard during the consultation. The PSC did not discuss the substance of the issues. They were just trying to clarify what the issues were.

Holland asked whether the PSC ever had a question regarding whether the department can receive in an open file the letter that the candidate receives from the FAC.

Cannon said that the next meeting would be devoted to year end reports.

Cannon said that we do have a meeting on May 10th. We also have a faculty meeting on May 3.

Hamel moved to adjourn. Holland seconded. The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Johnson
Scribe of the Meeting

Richard Anderson-Connolly
Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A : 2010 Report of Library, Media and Information Systems (LMIS) Committee

Year End Report

Library, Media and Information Systems (LMIS) Committee

15 April 2010

Committee Members: Jennifer Neighbors (Chair, Fall semester), Bob Boyles (Chair, Spring semester), Mark Cain (through January), Jane Carlin, Alyce DeMarais, Joe Granville (student; fall semester), Pierre Ly, William Morse (from February), Mark Reinitz, Wayne Rickoll, Jeff Tepper; Cindy Riche attended.

Charges from the Faculty Senate:

1. Recommend a point of purchase system for print management.
2. Review and implement policy regarding digital collections management.
3. Review and implement copyright policy.
4. Review and implement intellectual property policy.
5. Work in consultation with the Curriculum Committee to develop mechanisms to integrate information literacy programs throughout the curriculum.
6. Assist Technology Services in training and transitioning faculty to Moodle.
7. Evaluate the performance of the new Tech Help Line.

Print Management: The committee reaffirmed the objectives of implementing a print management system. The primary objective is to reduce excessive extraneous printing and therefore address the college's goal for sustainability. The secondary objective is to manage costs. These objectives will be achieved by implementing a print management system that will allow for a number of pages printed without charge (enough to cover student academic needs) followed by modest charges per page after the limit is achieved. It is estimated that the print management system will save the library alone hundreds of thousands of pages printed and at least \$5,000 annually. Technology Services is planning to implement a print server that will help track printing, and its associated costs, across campus.

Print management has been an ongoing issue the LMIS Committee has discussed throughout the year. A print management system, Pharos, was selected as the vendor by the print management task force; however, upon further review it has been decided to evaluate additional vendors due to the high cost of the Pharos system. At this point other vendors are being considered and proposals are due by the end of April. Vendor selection is expected this summer.

The questions remain of how, and when, to roll this out to the UPS community. The committee discussed a number of ideas for educating the campus community about printing, print management, and the new system. The Committee feels it is important to share information with faculty via Department Chairs. The Committee endorsed the development of a communication plan that emphasizes the idea of connecting the implementation of print management with our commitment towards sustainability, green environment, and reduction of waste. Cindy suggested that TS might be able to play a role with advertising and publicity and will follow-up with colleagues. A brief discussion concerning the amount of printing required in different disciplines took place. This is an important topic to address in publicity. We endorse the development of a “press release” providing a general overview and key concepts. Jane Carlin contributed a number of good ideas:

1. Create a “brand/logo” associated with the program. Perhaps we could go with PrintWise and use an image of an owl as a logo or try to associate the concept with already established university themes such as sustainability.
2. Create a central web page that would provide information on why we are doing this and emphasize the following: conserve resources, equalize print usage and set an acceptable standard. This is not an effort to add to student expenses, but rather a program to track printing and to encourage responsible printing, as well as to manage copy and print services to ensure better service
3. The web site and any publicity and outreach should include endorsement of this effort by key groups.
4. Initial correspondence should include the timeline of the project so that students and faculty understand we are working on a pilot project and monitoring use.
5. Create a weblog or input form to gather comments and concerns to help build the FAQ page. We need to send some community wide emails indicating print system is coming, where the pilot project will be etc....Need a contact staff member or email for the project or program:
printwise@pugetsound.edu

Initially, the plan was to begin piloting the service over the Spring and Summer semesters 2010. The idea was to have two dedicated printers monitoring usage and work out the kinks. This was to have a follow-on plan of implementing the print management program in the Fall of 2010 to the campus community. This will be on a trial basis with no fees incurred for printing by students. This trial period will help establish the page limit for printing without charge. It’s currently thought, based on other universities’ history, that the page limit will be around 250 pages per semester before fees kick in for the user. Planned full implementation was to be for Spring 2011.

In light of the recent decision to evaluate other products in addition to Pharos as the print management source, these timelines will be pushed further along by at least one semester and, more likely, by one year. This is contingent on establishing a print management source.

Digital Asset Management: Last year, Jane Carlin, Cindy Riche, David Tinsley, Alyce DeMarais and Peggy Firman reviewed existing policies and procedures associated with Digital Asset Management. This year

the following implementation plan has been put in place: Transfer of the ContentDM software program to the Library, establishment of an Institutional Repository through DSpace called *Sound Ideas* and the ongoing development of new image databases. *Sound Ideas* is a digital repository of historical and scholarly materials created by members of the Puget Sound community. Important works sponsored by or affiliated with the university are shared openly with students, faculty, lifelong learners and the broader world for non-commercial use and the preservation of scholarship for future generations. Projects under development include archiving of Arches magazine, OT theses, and summer research award reports. The Library has continued to move forward with maintaining the current digital collections web page, provide support to staff and faculty using this resource, as well as developed, with John Finney, a new digital database: *A Sound Past*. *A Sound Past* chronicles through historic photographs the people, buildings, events, athletics, and campus environment that make the University of Puget Sound such a unique place. *A Sound Past* includes a growing collection of photos selected from the University Archives.

In addition, the Library and Educational Technology staff held a series of meetings with art history faculty to more fully explore issues associated with image management. The Library also worked with ARTstor to provide access to Puget Sound images via the ARTstor interface.

A new web interface for digital collections is in process and will be available fall semester 2010.

Faculty interested in developing digital collections or contributing to *Sound Ideas*, should contact Jane Carlin, Library Director

Copyright: Committee members associated with review of this policy include: William Morse, Cindy Riche, Jennifer Neighbors and Alyce DeMarais. In addition, Lori Ricigliano will join the review team as she has been involved in the copyright review effort on campus. The current policy is available at: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/academic-resources/collins-memorial-library/research-gateway/general-guides/copyright-at-puget-sound/>.

The subcommittee reports that Lori Ricigliano will be preparing a copyright tutorial for students during the summer 2010. Educational Technology staff are developing an internal protocol document for appropriate use of materials as well as a “user guide” for faculty on how to appropriately post materials to Moodle. The group also recommends tying an announcement to faculty regarding copyright and appropriate use of materials to the call for texts each semester (through the bookstore).

Intellectual Property: The subcommittee working on copyright also discussed intellectual property. Currently, the policy is embedded in the copyright policy. We need to develop a more succinct policy statement. William Morse has provided an example of an intellectual property policy that the committee can use as a guide.

Integration of Information Literacy: Jane Carlin updated LMIS on the efforts of last year’s Committee. A faculty senate resolution supporting the integration of information literacy within

the curriculum was passed last year. The reaccreditation reviewers also made the recommendation that Puget Sound continue to review this issue. Librarians have developed a series of online resources for faculty including Research 101, an online tutorial as well as an information portal for faculty and a new site on academic integrity. These resources can be found from the library's main web page. In addition, Jane shared this information on behalf of LMIS with the Curriculum Committee. The Library, along with CWLT and the Academic Vice President's office will host a workshop on the topic of information literacy in May.

Moodle transition from BlackBoard: Educational technology is about two thirds to its goal of moving users from BlackBoard to Moodle. EdTech has asked LMIS members to encourage colleagues to let them know that EdTech is ready and willing to help them move their classes to the new platform. All migration to Moodle will be completed by December 2010.

Tech Help Line: Based on their assessment data, Technology Services discontinued the use of the Tech Help service. Tech help is now housed on campus with the continuation of some of the new features such as direct transfer to Educational Technology staff for those in a class or event. Technology Services is continuing to refine tech help services.

Other LMIS Activities:

Backup for Faculty Computers: The proposal for external hard drives as a means for back up of faculty computer generated files was not approved for funding. However, the Associate Deans' Office, in conjunction with Educational Technology, is exploring ways to move forward with implementation of external hard drive computer backup for faculty for summer and fall 2010.

e-Portfolios: Bob Boyles and Cindy Riche attended a meeting to discuss the Mahara e-portfolio(mahara.org) plan and potential uses. This will be a cost-free service to our students, faculty and staff. TS will be implementing it over the summer, with a planned pilot phase in late summer. Training will be offered by EdTech staff beginning in late summer.

Faculty Bylaws Revision: The committee recommends the following changes to the Faculty Bylaws to better reflect the titles and membership of the committee. To date, the proposed revision has had one reading by the full faculty and awaits the second reading and vote by the full faculty.

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.

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.

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.

Charges for the 2010-2011 LMIS Committee:

1. Develop and implement print management educational materials.
2. Review copyright policy and protocols.
4. Revise intellectual property policy.
5. Assist Technology Services in training and transitioning faculty to Moodle.

Respectfully Submitted

Bob Boyles