

Faculty Senate 10-9-06

Senators Present Anton (Chair), Bartanen, Beck, Bristow, Foster, Haltom, Hanson, Joshi, Kim, McGruder, Racine, Rowe, Singleton, Sousa

Visitors Nila Wiese

At 4:31 p.m. Chair Anton called the Faculty Senate to order. Noting that the next senator in alphabetic order (Senator Foster) was on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Chair Anton and the Senate affirmed the established practice that officers of the Senate be excused from minute-taking. The duty of the minutes fell then to Senator Haltom.

Senator Bristow's minutes of 9-25-06 approved as amended.

Announcements

The Faculty will meet on 30 October 2006 at 4:00 p.m.

New Business

1. Senators Bartanen, Anton, Ostrom will look over guidelines for Honorary Degrees Committee.
2. Charge to Diversity Committee – Diversity Committee Chair Nila Wiese asked about the Senate's purpose in charging the Diversity Committee to gather data about recruitment, retention, and graduation of diverse student body. Senator Ostrom said that Senate sought to fulfill faculty's responsibility to assist Dean of Admissions with information, perspective, and encouragement. Senator Joshi encouraged Diversity Committee to go beyond charge in any way that Diversity Committee elects. Senator Bristow saluted energy and candor of Diversity Committee in asking about the charge rather than skipping it or skimping on it. The gist of the free-form, wide-ranging discussion was that the Diversity Committee should "Go for it!"
3. Chair Anton asked who was/is responsible for the schedule, especially for the current time-slots (changed in 2001-2002) and for prohibitions/restrictions on classes running 1500-1620 on Mondays and Wednesdays. A recent memorandum that at least appeared to bar MW 1500-1620 classes in 2007-2008 incensed multiple colleagues, senators were informed. Chair Anton requested that the Senate charge the Academic Standards Committee [ASC] to analyze in depth a) who established the "legal" time-slots and by what authority; b) what role the faculty may/must play in scheduling; and c) what Puget Sound might learn from alternative schedules from other schools. Senator Sousa [ASC Liaison last year] said that the ASC had last year found these issues to be complicated and multi-faceted and perhaps

beyond the capacity of a burdened ASC to undertake as systematically as some senators seemed to desire. Senator Sousa wondered aloud whether the “administrative prerogative” claimed by the immediately previous Academic Vice President [AVP] left room for ASC involvement. The immediately current AVP and Senator Bartanen allowed that, should the ASC explore dimensions and issues of interest to faculty and inform Senate and herself, administrators could consider changes that might accommodate faculty values. Some senators suggested that Senator Bartanen’s openness to information from faculty might shift the charge to the ASC: the ASC might supervise the definition of faculty goals, values, and preferences. Senator Ostrom hoped for a forum for expression of faculty views. Senator Kim hoped that students’ interests would be solicited and considered as part of that investigation/shaping/prioritization. Senator Rowe stated that a student forum on issues and questions would be terrific. Senators further noted that music and athletics at 1600 daily would also be at issue and that ASUPS has problems with common time.

Senator Ostrom undertook to formulate a charge to the ASC to gather information, concerns, and views from students, staff, administrators, and faculty and to process the information so that the ASC may suggest priorities, preferences, and/or principles regarding the scheduling of classes.

4. By-Laws

4a. By-Laws Article IV, Section 5, sub-section A was amended and sent to the full faculty. Please see Appendix A *infra* for revisions proposed by the Senate.

4b. Faculty By-Laws Article V, Section 5 were amended and sent to the full faculty. Please see Appendix B *infra* for revisions proposed by the Senate.

4c. Senator Sousa asked whether the language of Art V, §6 C a seemed to other senators a bit too inclusive in making eligible for service on the Faculty Advancement Committee [FAC] untenured tenure-line faculty and deans or directors of programs, departments, or schools. Senators agreed with Senator Sousa that such a query was utterly unrelated to anyone on the FAC recently or at present; rather, the query related to conflicts of interest or of loyalties in the abstract.

Senator Sousa “unpacked” his question to consider each sort of faculty in turn. He observed that untenured faculty have yet to meet the university’s standards for tenure when they are in a position to apply the university’s standards. Senators Ostrom and McGruder added that it might make sense to get the untenured out of the line of fire. Senator Foster noted that many untenured faculty find it hard to say no even to overwhelming burdens. Senator Joshi said it might seem that the risks to vulnerable outweigh the inclusiveness. Senator Beck likened excluding the untenured from the FAC to the practice of excluding 1st year faculty from committee service.

At this point, discussion was suspended in view of the lateness of the hour [despite the fact that the hour came neither later nor earlier than it customarily does].

Submitted by Senator Haltom