

Meeting of the Faculty Senate, University of Puget Sound, November 6, 2006.

Present: Bill Haltom, Ross Singleton, Barry Anton (Chair), Nancy Bristow, John Hanson, David Sousa, Robin Foster, Terry Beck, Priti Joshi, Amy Ryken, Hans Ostrom (scribe of the day).

Visitors: George Tomlin, Don Share, Wayne Rickoll, and, pinch-hitting for Kris Bartanen, Alyce DeMarais, who leads the league with a .395 batting average.

The meeting opened at 4:37 p.m. Pacific Standard Time.

Anton asked whether there were any suggested corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. Ostrom, barely able to speak and to take minutes at the same time, said he thought that the task force looking into scheduling-matters had been directed by the Senate to draft some proposed principles by which administrators could construct a class-schedule. Ostrom noted that such a draft of principles would, of course, go to the Academic Standards Committee for its consideration before coming back to the Senate. Anton asked Joshi to make this suggested correction to the minutes. Joshi acceded to the request.

M/S/P: Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting, with the one correction/addition.

Announcement: Anton announced that President Thomas and Mr. Beers will visit the Senate at the next meeting, and that they will discuss the emerging capital-campaign.

There's No Business Like Old Business

The topic: whether untenured members of the faculty and/or directors & deans should serve on the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC).

Sousa said he still recommended that untenured members of the faculty not serve on the FAC, but that, owing in part to information distributed by Kris Bartanen, he had decided the issue concerning deans & directors was too complicated to pursue at this time. Therefore, he said, he would simplify the suggested revision to the *By Laws*, as follows:

Where the language, with regard to FAC membership, now reads "five faculty," the language will read "five tenured faculty."

Sousa moved this change to the *By Laws*. Hanson seconded the motion.

Sousa reiterated his reasoning, expressed in the previous meeting: 1) Colleagues who haven't met standards should not be asked to apply such standards (for tenure); 2) Participating on the FAC puts untenured colleagues in an extremely difficult political situation.

Singleton said that he largely agreed with Sousa, but that he had the following concern: The university seems to be hiring more colleagues who are untenured but who have considerable experience elsewhere and who are at advanced ranks (Associate and Full Professor). Is it, then, correct to exclude such colleagues from the FAC?

Singleton offered an amendment to the motion: “five members of the faculty who are not assistant professors [i.e., `junior faculty’].”

Joshi asked how many of such untenured senior colleagues there were.

Singleton: --An increasing number, and some of these colleagues have received tenure elsewhere, and so they have indeed met certain standards.

Haltom expressed two concerns: 1) **Procedural:** It is not wise to change the *By Laws* in a way that cuts out junior faculty from the process without letting the junior faculty know that we are proposing such a change. He noted that representation of the junior faculty on the Senate was not overly abundant. He suggested that the junior faculty be made well and widely aware of the proposed change. 2) **Concerning Vulnerability:** The Academic Vice President, he noted, serves on the FAC. He stressed that he has served with Kris on the FAC and has no doubt about her integrity in that capacity; she does not, he observed, “muscle” people. Therefore, his remarks were not personal. He argued that procedures should be based on the office or the structure of governance, not on the person. He observed that there are many opportunities even for the tenured to feel pressured on the FAC because, with regard to human nature, one cannot expect to get rid of the corrosive aspects of ambition. He observed that some tenured colleagues on the FAC may worry about what the AVP could do to them (in the event of a disagreement) even when the AVP would have *no intention* of doing anything to them. He admitted that no particular suggestion flowed from these observations, but he reiterated that even advanced colleagues, not just the untenured, are subject to political pressure, real and imagined, on the FAC.

Bristow agreed with Haltom’s first point, noting that there are so few junior-faculty present in the meeting today that we need to seek a greater range of junior-faculty input on the issue.

Sousa reiterated his concern that deans & directors really aren’t faculty peers and that, therefore, their serving on the FAC may remain problematic. He noted, however, that the information Kris Bartanen had provided showed that there was great variety in the nature of dean and director positions, so the issue was probably too complicated to address, at least today.

Joshi observed that she doubted whether a substantial number of junior-faculty would feel as if something were being taken away from them if they were to be prevented from serving on the FAC. She noted that when she had been nominated to run for the FAC, her response was, “. . . not a snowball’s chance in Hell.” She also noted that, apparently,

only one junior faculty member had served on the FAC as far back as anyone [including Haltom] could remember.

Joshi went on to observe that UPS has a peculiar set of norms with regard to evaluation, at least when these norms are viewed by those who teach or have taught elsewhere. For example, first-year colleagues help to evaluate colleagues in tenure-cases, and no outside letters are required (in tenure cases); such practices are rare at other colleges and universities, she noted. Therefore, she argued, although new senior-level, untenured colleagues may have experience elsewhere and may have met standards elsewhere, they will still not have been acclimated to the UPS evaluation-system.

Foster observed that Sousa's motion would reflect a deviation from an ethos of inclusivity at the university.

Sousa agreed, but he observed that, in some cases, it may make sense to deviate from general egalitarian principles. He agreed with Joshi that the aspects of the evaluation process were weird and pointed to the example of junior-faculty members sitting in on tenure-decisions.

Beck questioned the logic of not allowing the junior faculty to sit on the FAC because they had not met the standards they were applying. He said the logic ran counter to departmental policy across campus, policy that assumes the junior faculty can indeed apply standards which, because of the stage-of-career, they have not been asked to meet. Following this logic, he said, would lead us to a potentially absurd situation in which only full professors could evaluate full professors. Beck agreed, however, with the reasoning that the junior-faculty, because of political pressure, should not sit on the FAC.

Sousa, in response to Beck's first point, argued that departmental guidelines and standards are specialized, whereas FAC guidelines and standards are more general--are university-wide and therefore not as closely tied to expertise in a certain field.

Foster observed that the process for assembling an FAC is selective and that it ostensibly protects against a person who is too young being selected for the FAC.

Sousa observed that the combined election/selection process for the FAC is not a particularly good mechanism for translating faculty-preferences into outcomes, given the ways in which the number of options typically divides the vote.

Ostrom noted that Singleton's motion for an amendment had never been seconded.

Bristow seconded it.

Ryken asked the senators to ponder the question, "What is expertise?" She observed that expertise comes in all sorts of packages. She said she certainly understood the concerns with regard to the junior-faculty's feeling pressured when or if they sat on the FAC, but she noted that, apparently, this had actually happened only once. Is this, she asked, a problem that needs fixing? She said the evaluation-system at UPS did not seem

particularly unusual to her, partly because of efforts for transparency but also because of equal access for junior and senior faculty in the process, and she suggested that the senators should trust the junior-faculty to protect themselves.

A voice-vote on Senator Singleton’s amendment was taken. The amendment was defeated.

Several votes—by voice, by show of hand, by improvised combinations thereof—were taken on the Sousa motion [excluding junior faculty from serving on the FAC]. After everything was appropriately and patiently sorted out by Chair Anton, the motion passed, 6-4, with two abstentions, these belonging to Alyce DeMarais and Barry Anton.

New Business

The Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards, composed of Senators Bristow, Hanson (chair), and Sousa, gave its report, but not before Anton thanked them for their hard work and diligence.

Hanson began the discussion.

1. He suggested that the report of the AHCPS be received by the Senate.
2. He suggested that the report be sent to the whole faculty.
3. He encouraged the Senate to approve the recommendations of the AHCPS.
4. He suggested that the Senate may also want to propose additional recommendations at subsequent meetings.

Hanson moved to receive the report. Singleton seconded the motion.

A discussion ensued.

Hanson said the AHCPS opened the investigatory process to all faculty by means of electronic mail and other modes of soliciting input. The committee also asked particular individuals to speak with it.

Singleton asked whether participants knew that the meetings of the committee would be private.

Hanson said that he wasn’t sure what “private” meant in this case but that participants understood that confidentiality regarding substantive issues [in grievance-cases, for example] would of course need to be upheld.

Singleton asked whether some people might not have approached the committee had they *not* known for sure whether the meetings were private.

Hanson said he didn’t know.

Hanson said the committee gathered a great deal of information, deliberated, and came up with recommendations to address concerns. He said the committee decided not to document testimony or necessarily to validate information. He described the thought-process of the committee as forward-looking. The committee, he observed, did not believe it was necessary to recount everything it heard. The committee thought the recommendations would stand on their own merit. He said the committee chose not to explain how it arrived at these recommendations. He asserted that not focusing on the past was the best way to effect change.

Ostrom asked in what order the recommendations from the two ad hoc committees would be taken up by the Senate. A report, with findings and recommendation, was presented to the Senate in the previous academic-year, he noted, and recommendations from that report were still pending.

Anton asked the Senate how it would like to proceed with regard to the order in which to consider recommendations from two separate ad hoc committees.

Foster argued that it would make sense to take up the recommendations of the first ad hoc committee first, in part because many of its recommendations were broad, whereas the recommendations of the AHCPS were, by comparison, narrow. She also mentioned that some of the recommendations of the AHCPS concerning the Professional Standards Committee may dovetail with recommendations in the previous ad hoc committee's report.

Bristow asked Ostrom for clarification: was he referring to subsequent Senate-meetings, as opposed to this day's meeting? Ostrom said that yes, he was referring to subsequent meetings, and that this meeting would, of course, continue to focus on the AHCPS report.

Foster complimented the AHCPS on its description, in the report, of the grievance-process.

Hanson noted that the committee had discovered a great deal of confusion on the part of the faculty with regard to the grievance-process.

Bristow echoed Hanson's observation and said that many colleagues seemed to confuse hearing-boards with grievances and vice versa.

Don Share, a visitor, spoke. He noted that he has served several different times on the PSC and in that capacity has probably heard more formal grievances than anyone currently on the faculty. He urged the Senate to move quickly to adopt several of the AHCPS's recommendations, which he believed were long overdue. He said he appreciated the AHCPS's desire to have the PSC respond to the report, but he said that the language in many of the recommendations may be just fine—meaning that some recommendations may be in good enough condition, with regard to purpose and phrasing, to go before the full faculty.

Share observed that the report/recommendations could, in his opinion, be much stronger in two particular areas:

1. He applauded the committee's suggestions about recusal of PSC members in certain situations, but he said he would recommend going even further. He advised the Senate to craft a recommendation that would require the dean/AVP to recuse himself or herself in every grievance-hearing because the dean/AVP already sits on the FAC, because the dean himself/herself may often be the originator or the conduit of a grievance, and because "having `the boss' sit in on grievance-hearings" is just not a good idea. He suggested that perhaps the Senate could identify a replacement for the dean on grievance-hearings—perhaps someone not already on the PSC. However, his main point, he stressed, was that the dean should not sit in on any PSC grievance-hearings.
2. He applauded the committee's desire and attempt to hold the PSC accountable in the event the PSC violates the *Faculty Code* in a grievance-hearing or some other process. With regard to the PSC's having violated the *Code* in a grievance-hearing (hypothetically), however, he asserted that sending a letter to the President noting the violation is not a good idea. Share's reasoning for this assertion:
 - a. It is better that more than one person is the contact-point for reporting an alleged PSC-*Code*-violation. It is better for some kind of collective body to receive notice of and to respond to the alleged *Code*-violation.
 - b. In a grievance-process, the President receives the recommendation of the PSC. If he or she were to receive a letter about a *Code* violation, he or she would then be involved in the process twice. Such double-involvement may create a built-in conflict of interest, he reasoned.

Share recommended two possible collective bodies that could receive notice of an alleged PSC *Code* violation and that could deal with such an alleged violation:

1. The elected Chair of the Faculty Senate and perhaps an additional senator.
2. A panel composed of previous PSC chairs, to be selected by the full Senate or by the elected Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Share concluded by asserting that rather strict time-limitations on the PSC's rulings (in grievances) was a very good idea, especially when a tenure-evaluation has been held up because of a grievance.

Hanson said he appreciated Share's suggestions, and he said that the ad hoc committee did not necessarily believe all of the recommendations in the report to be the best possible recommendations. He said that, in general, the ad hoc committee preferred a minimalist approach that did not disrupt (for example) evaluation-processes too much,

but he said that, in the case of recommending that a letter be sent to the President in the event of an alleged PSC *Code*-violation, the committee may have favored minimalism too much.

George Tomlin told senators that, as a current member of the PSC, he was “here to listen.”

Wayne Rickoll told senators that he, too, was “here to learn.”

Alyce Demarais said she had no comments to make about the report.

Hanson moved receipt, by the Senate, of the ACHPS’s report, and Beck seconded.

M/S/P to receive the report of the ACHPS.

Hanson then moved (Beck seconded [?]) the following:

- 1. That Chair Barry Anton send the report to the whole faculty.**
- 2. That Barry Anton, perhaps with the aid of one ad-hoc committee-member, write a cover-letter to the faculty; such cover-letter shall include the following items, phrased as Chair Anton wishes:**
 - a. Anton shall encourage colleagues to contact senators with responses to the report and/or comments/concerns about professional standards, the PSC, grievance-procedures, hearing boards, and academic honesty [topics investigated by the AHCPS].**
 - b. Anton shall encourage colleagues to attend subsequent Senate meetings that concern the report and the recommendations.**
 - c. Anton shall remind the faculty that any recommendations [regarding changes to the *Code*] the Senate approves must go to the full faculty for approval.**
 - d. Anton shall assure colleagues that if they speak to senators and desire the conversation to be confidential, the conversations shall remain confidential.**

Discussion:

Singleton asked Hanson whether accommodations might be made for faculty-members to talk confidentially and privately with one or more of the members of the AHCPS.

Hanson suggested that, since the committee had finished its work, in the sense of having reported today to the Senate, colleagues should not feel as if they need to speak only with members of the AHCPS; colleagues may speak to any senator about these issues, he suggested.

Anton noted that the Senate has the option of going into Executive Session if confidential matters were to arise from conversations senators had with colleagues.

Bristow asked whether the “default” assumption should be that responses and comments from the faculty would *not* be confidential *unless* a colleague told a senator that the conversation was to remain confidential.

Singleton said that some colleagues may feel constrained by the *Code* with regard to confidential matters.

Sousa asked Singleton whether this concern was theoretical or actual.

Singleton responded that this [concern about confidentiality] was “an actual concern that has been voiced.”

Foster asked whether provisions could be made for anonymous responses to the report.

Bristow did not favor this suggestion because an anonymous violation of confidentiality [as defined by the *Code*] was nonetheless a violation.

Ostrom said he favored the provision for anonymity and said that colleagues could then decide for themselves whether they wanted to violate confidentiality [as defined by the *Code*].

Bristow said she was not convinced that it was appropriate for the Senate to set up a process that allowed for such a practice [violating confidentiality, as defined by the *Code*]. She also echoed Hanson’s earlier remark—that meeting with members of the AHCPs, *per se*, was not necessary; meeting with and talking with any senator would be fine.

M/S/P the multi-faceted “Hanson” motion, as described above.

Several visitors took flight.

More New Business!

Anton introduced the subject of regalia-at-graduation, saying that some concerns had arisen about the proliferation of regalia, specifically the deployment of cords.

Ostrom moved the following: that the Senate recommend that all regalia except the customary tassel [literalists among the Senate encouraged him to add “gown and mortar-board” to the motion, and Ostrom agreed to do so]. **Motion: With regard to regalia, only gown, mortar-board, and tassel shall be allowed at graduation [thereby excluding cords].**

Haltom seconded.

Discussion: Ostrom asserted that he had been annoyed by the fact that some graduating English majors had felt they were being treated unfairly because English majors did not

wear cords at graduation whereas other majors did. Obviously well into his Curmudgeon Years, he added that, in his opinion, the business of cords was “silly and high-schoolish.”

Sousa indicated that, oddly enough, he was interested in the cord-issue--because for him dovetailed with the issue of what we mean by a “thesis.” He said that, apparently, students in International Political Economy wrote research papers in some senior-level courses and these papers were deemed to be theses; the completion of such a thesis then meant that a student could wear a cord at graduation. Past graduation bulletins have had notices describing differences between graduates who had and had not completed a “thesis.” Consequently, some students in P & G complained about this distinction and wanted to be able to wear cords at graduation because these students had written similar kinds of papers in similar kinds of courses.

Haltom suggested that the issue went beyond cords and theses and had crept into “marketing,” whereby certain departments and programs used the graduation-program as a venue for advertisement.

Sousa said he believed that issue [using the graduation-program for the “advertisement” of departments and programs] had been addressed.

Haltom said this was good news to him, and he offered kudos to Marilyn Bailey. He said that, like Ostrom, he had been annoyed by the fact that students in his department [Politics and Government] suddenly seemed envious of majors who wore cords at graduation. He also asserted the following: “That students would care about such matters [as cords] is alarming.”

There was a brief lull; then Haltom said he had one more issue to raise.

Anton asked, with a slight note of weariness, “There’s more?”

Haltom said that “a cord-race” (the analogy being to an arms-race) may be underway. He suggested that the university “keep it simple” and use the regimentation and uniformity symbolized by gown, mortar-board, and tassel. He left the room, perhaps in search of same.

In Haltom’s absence, Singleton noted that, with regard to the military analogy (regimentation and uniformity), different branches, divisions, battalions, and so forth, of the military had different regalia; therefore, cords at graduation may be appropriate. “The more cords, the better,” he suggested.

Joshi thought the use of cords was just fine; “let the students have their cords” summarized her position.

Bristow agreed with Joshi. She said that cords made graduation more colorful. She asked Ostrom if he were opposed to the Hawaiian leis some students wore at graduation.

Ostrom said he was not opposed to the wearing of leis at graduation because that was a matter of personal choice and was not connected to departments or programs.

Singleton said that his department had been trying to develop a greater sense of community among majors and that the use of cords was one element of this endeavor.

Ostrom, growing ever more curmudgeonly, said he believed organizing a party for majors was a good enough way to develop a greater sense of community.

Ostrom, at *long* last taking the hint and realizing that the vast majority of senators were *Regaliaistas*, **withdrew his motion. The seconder, Haltom, agreed to the withdrawal of the motion**, and he implied that senators should watch the skies for increased, highly evolved regalia from Politics & Government.

M/S/P adjournment. Anton seemed visibly relieved.

Respectfully submitted,

Hans Ostrom