

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
March 20, 2007

1. President Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Thirty-four voting members of the faculty were present by 4:19 p.m.
2. We approved the minutes of the January 29, 2007 faculty meeting as posted.
3. In response to the call for announcements, George Tomlin announced that the occupational therapy program was hosting ten students and faculty from Japan for a few days.
4. President Thomas reported that Dennis Bakke '68 would be speaking at the 2007 Puget Sound Business Breakfast tomorrow morning at the Bell Harbor International Conference Center in Seattle.

President Thomas reported on last February's board of trustees meetings, held in Seattle because of the space crunch on campus resulting from the science center renovation. Agenda items included advancing the planning for the upcoming capital campaign. He said that this semester he was traveling frequently, primarily doing pre-solicitation of potential donors in advance of the campaign. He said he was getting a good response and was encouraged by the enthusiasm being shown for the objectives of the campaign. His hope was that a decision to begin the quiet phase of fundraising would be made at the May meeting of the board.

President Thomas reported that his travels had also included completion of the strategic plan rollout meetings with alumni clubs around the country. He noted that the next round of alumni club meetings would begin in a couple of weeks, for the purpose of introducing the specifics of the plan for parent and alumni volunteers, and to introduce Allison Cannady-Smith, our new director of the new office of Alumni and Parent Relations.

President Thomas reported that the cabinet has been giving attention to the need for a new head information officer. He said this provided an opportunity to take a much more ambitious approach to the use of technology strategically institution-wide. He said he appreciated conversations faculty and others have had with Sherry Mondou about this, because this was "an important and not an easy appointment."

5. Academic Vice President Kristine Bartanen's report consisted of three sets of announcements:
 - (1) Professor of Psychology Sarah Moore Sherry has accepted appointment as Associate Dean and Dean of Graduate Studies, to begin July 16, 2007. Dean Bartanen asked us to resist infringing on Professor Sherry's time until then in order to give her the opportunity to bring her Lantz Sabbatical to an orderly conclusion.

(2) Extra things faculty are doing include:

Mikiko Ludden, Instructor of Japanese, and four students have been awarded a \$22,000 grant from ASIANetwork to support their collaboration research project in Japan in Summer 2008.

Jim McCullough, Director of the School of Business and Leadership, crafted an application for and was accepted to the Council of Independent Colleges Conference on Liberal Arts and Business.

Julian Edgoose, Education, represented Puget Sound at a Whittier College sponsored conference, "Beyond Valuing Diversity: Promoting Equity and Social Justice for Children and Youth in Multicultural Societies."

Rob Beezer, Mathematics, joined Dean Bartanen and Library Director Karen Fischer for a Council of Independent Colleges workshop on "Transforming the College Library," which focused on matters of student research skills and information literacy.

Alexa Tullis, Biology, and Pepa Lago Grana, Foreign Languages and Literature, will participate in a Council of Independent Colleges Department Chair workshop at the end of March.

David Smith, History, is hosting the Pacific Northwest British Studies Conference at Puget Sound over the weekend of March 30.

Puget Sound was successful in having all three of its Watson Fellowship applicants earn awards. Dean Bartanen gave kudos to Priti Joshi, English (who serves as the faculty coordinator for the Watsons) and the faculty committee of Susan Owen, Bill Breitenbach, Lisa Ferrari, and Jeff Tepper.

Puget Sound has also had three students recommended (awards have not yet been determined) for Fulbright Fellowships, two for teaching in Germany and one for research in Brazil. Dean Bartanen gave kudos to Graduate Fellowships Advisory Committee members Michael Curley, Alyce DeMarais, Kate Stirling, Wayne Rickoll, and particularly Kent Hooper and David Tinsley who have worked hard to develop a "legacy" of success for students receiving Fulbrights for Germany.

Andreas Madlung, Alexa Tullis, Jennifer Burnaford, Scottie Henderson, Stacey Weiss, David Scott, and Alyce DeMarais have attended workshops and prepared a proposal for improved recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students in the sciences and mathematics at Puget Sound.

Puget Sound has also been awarded one of fifteen grants from the NCAA Division III to bring a minority intern to our Athletics program for two years. Director of Athletics Amy Hackett led the application process.

And, Dean Bartanen expressed appreciation to the twenty faculty members and staff members who are participating in the PKAL/CIC/NITLE Learning Spaces and Technology Workshop hosted by Puget Sound March 23-25. Faculty participants include Tom Rowland, Rob Beezer, John Hanson, Lotus Perry, Michel Rocchi, Ross Singleton, Robin Hamilton, Patrick O'Neil, Julie Neff-Lippmann, along with Alyce DeMarais and John Finney.

President Thomas interjected that the three Watsons for next year were very exciting, and that no school received more than three. He added that we have received from the Murdock Foundation a grant for \$600,000 for the Science Center Thompson Hall renovation. He said that this second Murdock grant shows the foundation was pleased with the impact of their first \$800,000 gift, for Harned Hall.

- (3) At our April 17, 2007 faculty meeting university counsel will be present to discuss issues surrounding the writing of evaluation support letters, given that personal and professional characteristics are not among the criteria for tenure or advancement.
6. Faculty Senate Chair Barry Anton reported that in the next few days we would receive notice of the opportunity to nominate colleagues for four positions on the Faculty Senate. He said the election would be held electronically.
7. We moved to the second reading of proposed amendment to V.6.C.a. of the Faculty Bylaws. The proposal was to replace the words "tenure-line" with the word "tenured" in the first paragraph in the section on membership of the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Current language: "Membership. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex officio) and five tenure-line Faculty members."

Proposed language: "Membership. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex officio) and five tenured Faculty members."

President Thomas turned to Barry Anton, who explained the pros and cons of the proposal. On the pro side, he said that it is difficult for untenured faculty to sit on a committee passing judgment on the tenure of others; that this might put them in an uncomfortable political position; and that historically only one untenured person has served on the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC). On the other hand, changing the wording reduces inclusivity that makes it possible for everyone to participate on an important committee.

Suzanne Barnett wondered if the next step would be to propose that untenured faculty should not participate in the reviews of faculty up for advancement. She asked if the senate "had put this through the discussion wringer." Anton responded that standards

for advancement are department-specific, but standards for tenure are institutional in scope. “So the two aren’t linked in any way?” asked President Thomas. Anton responded that he wouldn’t go so far as to say that, just that “tenure requires a broader view than a department view.”

Bill Beardsley asked how this proposal happened to come up since there was only one untenured faculty member who served on the FAC in the past “and she served well.” Anton responded that each committee was charged with reviewing its own section of the bylaws and, in doing that, the Faculty Senate felt this issue deserved attention. It was not out of any sense of urgency.

Jim McCullough observed that no one is forced to serve on the FAC, so that an untenured person could always choose whether or not to serve. Anton agreed that any person can opt out of serving. Nancy Bristow pointed out that the Faculty Senate vote to forward the proposal to the faculty was not unanimous. She argued that whether or not serving on the FAC was dangerous to junior faculty members should be in their hands to decide. Harry Velez-Quinones disagreed, arguing that even asking a junior colleague to serve on the FAC puts that person in a risky situation.

Barnett made the observation that there must have been two untenured faculty with past FAC service if one was a woman as Beardsley had indicated, because the one she knew of was a man.

Velez M/S/F “to approve the proposal.” Approval would have required a three-fourths vote in favor. The outcome of a voice vote was unclear. On a hand vote, the motion was defeated.

8. We then turned to the second reading of the proposed amendment to II.2. of the Faculty Bylaws. The proposal was to replace the current language (see below) with revised language (see below):

Current language:

Sec. 2. **Responsibilities of the Faculty.** The Faculty shall create and maintain a superior academic climate in the University. To this end, the Faculty shall prescribe, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, the graduate and undergraduate courses of study, the specific courses to be offered, the nature and requirements of graduate degrees to be conferred, the requirements for graduation and recommend all candidates for baccalaureate and advanced degrees and/or honors to the Board of Trustees, the standards of instruction, and the general rules and methods for the conduct of educational work of the University and any rules for the regulation of student publications, musical, dramatic and literary clubs, and other student affairs related to the academic life of the University.

Revised language:

Sec. 2. **Responsibilities of the Faculty.** The Faculty shall create and maintain a superior academic climate in the University. To this end, the Faculty shall contribute to the development of the University.

The Faculty shall establish the standards and methods of instruction and oversee how the educational work of the University is conducted. The standards of instruction are subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall create the graduate and undergraduate courses of study in schools, departments, and programs. The Faculty shall approve the specific courses to be offered and establish the requirements for undergraduate and graduate degrees.

The Faculty's decisions regarding courses of study and requirements for degrees are subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall recommend all candidates for baccalaureate degrees, advanced degrees, and honors-at-graduation to the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall advise students' media, including, but not limited to, newspapers, magazines, radio programs, video programs, and electronic publications, when such media are related to the academic and co-curricular life of the University. The Faculty shall advise students' artistic, dramatic, literary, and musical organizations, insofar as such organizations affect the academic and co-curricular life of the University.

Anton introduced Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, chair of the Student Life Committee (SLC), who brought from the committee a proposal for additional wording to be incorporated into the proposal before us. The additional language was essentially a replication of Faculty Code language.

Anton M/S/vote reported later “to approve the proposal, including the additional wording brought forward by the Student life Committee.” The entirety of the proposed change, including the new SLC language (underlined) is:

Revised language:

Sec. 2. **Responsibilities of the Faculty.** The Faculty shall create and maintain a superior academic climate in the University. To this end, the Faculty shall contribute to the development of the University. The faculty shall participate in service that advances the mission of the university, including participation in departmental and university governance, in co-curricular programs, in promoting intellectual vitality and a high quality of life on the campus, and in activities that help convey the nature and purpose of the university to its constituencies.

The Faculty shall establish the standards and methods of instruction and oversee how the educational work of the University is conducted. The standards of instruction are subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall create the graduate and undergraduate courses of study in schools, departments, and programs. The Faculty shall approve the specific courses to be offered and establish the requirements for undergraduate and graduate degrees.

The Faculty's decisions regarding courses of study and requirements for degrees are subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall recommend all candidates for baccalaureate degrees, advanced degrees, and honors-at-graduation to the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty shall advise students' media, including, but not limited to, newspapers, magazines, radio programs, video programs, and electronic publications, when such media are related to the academic and co-curricular life of the University. The Faculty shall advise students' artistic, dramatic, literary, and musical organizations, insofar as such organizations affect the academic and co-curricular life of the University.

Beardsley, reading from the original Faculty Code language from which the added SLC wording was taken, observed that the code says the faculty "shall prescribe" these things (subject to the approval of the board of trustees), which is much stronger than "shall participate in." He said he liked the code language better; that the SLC language "gives away our authority just to make the language more elegant."

Bristow pointed out that the proposal attempts to correct the bylaws to correspond to what faculty actually do, particularly with regard to student media. Anton added that in practice there are a number of student media over which the Faculty Senate does not have oversight. Beardsley responded that the Faculty Bylaws say the faculty shall prescribe and shall have these powers over the media. "How," he asked, "can we say that we don't have these powers?" Bristow said that in practice we don't have these powers, and that the ASUPS bylaws say different things.

Dean Bartanen said that the Faculty Senate had put the proposal forward in an effort to clean up the language, but that it was the case as Beardsley had pointed out that there is a substantive difference between existing language and proposed language. Dean Bartanen quoted from various documents, including the student integrity code and the SLC bylaws, that implement the rule-making authority of the faculty. On the other hand, the media board bylaws indicate that faculty have a review function to play but do not say that faculty set the rules for student media. So there seem to be two pieces to the puzzle: what are the powers of the faculty with regard to student life; and, what is faculty involvement in life outside the classroom in the campus environment. The latter issue is what the SLC was trying to clarify, but perhaps we need to think about both of these two areas.

Beardsley argued that “historically a lot of these responsibilities have been outsourced, but when push come to shove, faculty have the authority.” He said that the dean of students can’t change these rules. He argued that “even if this power lays unused, we could always take it up to save things if we need to; we have this power and we should keep it.”

President Thomas clarified that the motion before us was to approve the entire proposal with the SLC wording included. The outcome of a voice vote was unclear. On a show of hands, the motion was defeated, with ten in favor and twelve opposed.

9. We turned to the next agenda item, which was to have been a first reading of a proposed amendment to sections 6 and 7 of chapter III of the Faculty Code. However, Doug Cannon, speaking for the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) reported that the PSC was not ready to bring the proposal forward. The PSC will do that instead at the April 17, 2007 faculty meeting. The Faculty Senate has called for an additional spring meeting of the full faculty, to be held on May 1, 2007, to provide the opportunity for a second reading this spring of the PSC proposal.

We adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty