

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 11, 2006

Members present: Barry Anton (Chair), Kris Bartanen, Terry Beck, Nancy Bristow, Robin Foster, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Max Harris, Priti Joshi, Jean Kim, Juli McGruder, Hans Ostrom, Barbara Racine, Jessie Rowe, Amy Ryken, Ross Singleton, David Sousa

Senate Chair Anton called the meeting to order at 4:41 p.m.

The minutes from the May 12, 2006 meeting were approved.

Senators voted to rotate taking minutes alphabetically.

Announcements:

Chair Anton announced that the Ad hoc Committee on Professional Standards report will be discussed by the Senate on October 23.

Anton also announced that Rosa Beth Gibson will report on medical benefits and disability insurance at a future meeting.

Anton announced that proposed changes to the by-laws will be examined at the next Senate meeting.

Senator Bartanen noted that the University policies on Privacy; Information Use and Security; and E-mail, Voice mail, and Network Access (originally adopted in 2002, and reviewed by the Senate in 2002-2003 and further discussed in 2005) have been reviewed by legal counsel, approved by the President's Cabinet, and will be posted soon.

Senator Racine listed the Fall Semester Staff Senate meetings as September 13, October 11, November 8, and December 13. All meetings are at noon in the Misner room in Collins Library. She also noted that an informative booklet on Copyright law is available in the bookstore.

Anton announced the results of the Faculty Advancement Committee election. Kate Stirling – 62 votes; Wayne Rickoll – 44 votes; Sunil Kukreja – 38 votes; Betsy Kirkpatrick – 37 votes; Keith Ward – 36 votes; Wade Hands – 34 votes.

Senator Foster asked for a volunteer to convene the Institutional Review Board and Bill Haltom graciously agreed.

Max Harris introduced himself as a student representative to the Faculty Senate. Max is serving for ASUSP President Van Pham whose schedule does not allow him to attend.

Senator Juli McGruder reminded senators of the upcoming National Conference on Race and Pedagogy and encouraged all faculty and students to check out the program on the web.

New Business

- Charges to Standing Committees

Academic Standards Committee:

1. Review the academic honesty discussion in The Logger.
2. Freshman seminars: What happens when students need to repeat a seminar?
3. Review withdrawal policy that changes the dates and procedures for receiving "W" and "WF" grades.

Senator Sousa noted that the charges that came from the ASC are consistent with those in the past. Senator Singleton suggested the following additional charge for the ASC:

4. Review and reconsider the Interim Study Abroad Committee's proposal regarding how study abroad courses are reflected on Puget Sound transcripts.

Chair Anton noted that there is not a charge for the ASC to conduct a self-study because they did so last year.

Curriculum Committee:

1. The following departments and/or programs are scheduled for their five-year review: Chemistry, English, Geology, History, Internship Program, Latin American Studies, Physics, and Study Abroad.
2. The Fine Arts and Humanistic Approaches core categories should be reviewed in 2006-2007 (Connections and Social Science categories should be reviewed in 2007-2008). As part of its review of these two approaches core categories, the committee should continue reviewing current mechanisms for assessing the core.
3. The committee should examine whether the practice of "double counting" a full year of course work (as is the case with Occupational Therapy and Dual Degree Engineering) is an appropriate practice.
4. The committee should examine existing guidelines for assigning activity versus academic credit.
5. The committee should examine how graduation requirement #H (upper level course requirement outside first major) is being implemented. Specific questions the committee needs to address include: can students count upper levels courses outside his/her major but in his/her major department? Should the registrar continue enforcing a distinction between units and courses with respect to this requirement? How should the policy apply to students in interdisciplinary programs?
6. A self-assessment to be completed by 1 December 2006

University Enrichment Committee

Continue the regular duties of the committee.

1. Review proposals for travel and research grants (faculty and students) and disperse funds according to the UEC guidelines.

2. Review and rank the released time proposals and forward recommendations to Dean Bartanen.

3. Determine the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award.

4. Complete a self-assessment by 1 December 2006.

Senator Ryken noted the following additional charge:

5. Seek additional funding for student research.

Diversity Committee

1. Continue working with the Office of Admission, the Office of Human Resources, and other appropriate offices and governing bodies on support of efforts to recruit and retain an increasingly talented and diverse faculty, staff, and student body.

2. Implement the Bias and Hate Educational Response Team to address trends and incidents related to diversity.

3. Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather and disseminate information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education. This should include support and participation in the National Race and Pedagogy Conference at Puget Sound.

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

5. Support the Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF) in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity Plan for the Puget Sound campus.

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

7. Complete a self-assessment by 1 December 2006.

Senator Ostrom requested that the following charge be added:

8. Gather and analyze data (covering several years) from the Admission office regarding the number of applications from different minority groups, the number of such applications accepted, and the resulting yield (students enrolled). Link these data to geographical data (e.g., from which states do we get the most applications from African American students, Latino students, Asian American students, and so on.) Present these data and the analysis to the Faculty Senate.

Institutional Review Board:

In addition to the ongoing review of research proposals using human subjects this year's Board wishes to pass on the following recommendations for next year's IRB activity.

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.

2. Upgrade and refine the IRB Web Page.
3. Post FAQs appropriate for UPS researchers.
4. Continue developing a system for monitoring ongoing research.
5. Plan for the transition to a new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration.
6. Complete a self-assessment by 1 December 2006.

Senator McGruder suggested that the following charge be added:

7. Discuss meeting more frequently and over breaks.

Library, Media, & Information Systems:

It was noted that the charges included in the first document sent to senators were old. The charges for 2006-2007 are:

1. Ask a representative from both OIS and the library to make reports at the beginning of each semester about decisions they will be making and changes they are thinking of implementing in the future.
2. Continue evaluating Course Management Systems with an eye towards replacing Blackboard.
3. Continue discussion of establishing a copyright policy (in support of the TEACH Act).
4. Continue discussion regarding multiple-format journal subscriptions (paper & electronic).
5. Continue evaluation of "electronic classrooms" and wireless service.
6. Investigate procurement of anti-plagiarism software.

Senator Joshi requested that the following charge be added:

7. Regarding the computing work of faculty and staff that necessarily occurs remotely, examine and revamp the current policy that separates the support OIS provides into "work" (supported) and "home" (not supported).

Chair Anton asked about the written policies for OIS. Are policies written, clearly articulated, and comprehensive? What is the process for revision of policies? He suggested that the LMIS take on these questions.

Professional Standards Committee:

1. Continue efforts to facilitate faculty discussion of the amendment to Chapter III, Sections 6 and 7, on procedures for appeals and procedures for hearings.
2. Propose "housekeeping amendments" to the Code to correct typos and inaccurate internal Code citations and to replace "days" with "working days."
3. Consider revising formal Code interpretations to include "partners" in places where "spouses" are mentioned.
4. Revise the formal Code interpretation of Chapter III, Section 6, in the old Code ("Whether a five-year evaluation of a full professor entails 'altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment' so as to be subject to appeals procedures") to update internal Code citations. This formal interpretation was approved in 1997, but was

inadvertently omitted from the appendix of formal Code interpretations and consequently was not revised last year along with the other formal interpretations.

5. Examine the evaluation process for three-year visiting faculty members, which is not currently addressed in the Code. The committee recommends that the Senate charge the PSC to examine this issue next year.
6. Revise the University Evaluation Standards published in the buff document to correct errors.
7. Clarify the definition of "tenure-line faculty" by a Code amendment or formal interpretation.
8. Examine Chapter III, Section 4.b.(4), with reference to the relationship between the informal and the formal challenges that an evaluatee may make to an evaluation conducted by a department, school, or program.
9. Examine Chapter III, Section 5, to consider questions that have arisen about the so-called streamlined five-year evaluations of full professors (for example, questions about classroom visitation and about the participation of departmental colleagues in these evaluations).
10. Examine how departments, schools, and programs in their statements of evaluation guidelines handle the assessment of an evaluatee's teaching in non-departmental courses.
11. Complete a self- assessment by 1 December 2006

Senator Haltom sought clarity on the meaning of two of the committee's charges. Haltom's concern was that the PSC understand clearly what was being asked. Senator Bartanen assured Haltom that all charges were written by the PSC last year and that the PSC understands them well.

Student Life Committee:

1. The Student Life Committee serves as a part of the Student Affairs Division's ongoing departmental review process.
2. The Student Life Committee provides input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the committee by the Dean of Students.
3. The Student Life Committee provides input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.
4. The Student Life Committee reviews information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life.
5. Complete a self-assessment by 1 December 2006.

Senator Rowe noted that the SLC charges sound like a description of the committee's work rather than like the charges given to other committees. Senator Kim responded that the SLC meets every-other week and has specific items for discussion. The SLC decided to go with broad charges for this year. Senator Hanson noted that last year's charges were more specific and that the new charges had become much more generic. Senator Sousa observed that the committee, in their year-end report, said they were seeking greater specificity and yet the charges are very general. Senator Singleton identified himself as the Senate liaison from last year to the SLC and remarked that the committee often struggled with defining its function. Singleton viewed these new, more general charges as an important step in that direction since these new charges give a sense of the function of the committee. Chair Anton noted that the self-evaluation process deals with charges and the SLC might be well served by putting the self-assessment high on their agenda. Senator Kim noted that the SLC would reconsider

their charges if that is the wish of the Senate. Senator Haltom suggested that the problem was simply one of semantics not substance. Senator Bristow commented on the broad and narrow nature of the Diversity Committee's charges and wondered if Student Life might begin to include more narrow charges after they have established a sense of purpose. Bristow voiced her support for the charges as written.

Senator Haltom moved that the Senate authorize the charges suggested above as a slate. M/S/P

- Faculty Early Retirement and Career Change Plan

Senator Kris Bartanen distributed the "Faculty Early Retirement and Career Change Plan Change due to Changes in Law" memo to members of the Senate. Bartanen said that work has proceeded since last spring to bring our early retirement and career change policy into compliance with the new IRS code. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the changes in concept in May 2006. The handout includes side-by-side versions of the old and new language. The current language allows for a choice of either a lump sum or a payment plan. The new language only allows for a lump sum payment. Further, the new language requires faculty to complete essential services before the benefit is paid. This language protects faculty from unnecessary tax liability. This material is going out to the entire faculty today and will be the agenda item at the first full faculty meeting. Bartanen hopes for a vote at the October faculty meeting as the policy must be in compliance with the IRS code by December 31, 2006.

Senator Singleton asked if the new language allows for early retirement at 62, five years prior to a social security benefit beginning at age 67. Bartanen replied that she did not believe that was the case but that she would pursue the question to get a definitive answer. Singleton said that he would be interested in creating such language if the new language does not make that change. Bartanen expressed concern about the effect of such language on our retirement funds.

Senator Ostrom asked if faculty members are eligible for the Post Retirement Medical Benefits Plan. Bartanen responded that faculty are currently eligible for the plan and the new language clarifies that point.

Senator Sousa asked about the change on page three regarding career change. Bartanen clarified that the language has changed to reflect change from the option of a payment plan to a lump sum payment. If a faculty member opts to change career and then returns to higher education within five years, the proportion of the benefit must be returned. The language change reflects the new single payment option.

The Senate will return to this issue.

- Committee on Honorary Degree

Senator Bartanen handed out information on the Committee on Honorary Degrees and proposed changes to the guidelines, commenting that the guidelines have not been reviewed for many years. In response to a question from Senator Foster, Bartanen noted that the document is available from the Office of the President. The Senate agreed to study the document for discussion at a future meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Beck