

## **Faculty Senate Minutes October 7, 2002**

**Senators present:** Hans Ostrom (chair), Barry Anton, Julian Edgoose, William Haltom, John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Chris Kline, Juli McGruder, Karen A. Porter, Curt Sanders (ASUPS representative), David Tinsley, Alexa Tullis, Kris Bartanen (Dean of Students), Terry Cooney (Academic Vice-President).

**Visitors Present:** David Droge, J. David Macey, Brook Irving

Senate Chair Hans Ostrom called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.

### **Approval of Minutes**

It was M/S/P to approve the minutes of September 28, 2002 meeting as amended

- Edgoose noted that "FSC" in the previous minutes should be changed to "ASC."

### **Special Orders**

Bartanen distributed the documents "The University of Puget Sound The Division of Student Affairs, Programs and Services 2002-03," "Party Planning: Tips of Planning a Successful Party – A Resource for Students Living On and Off Campus," and Numbers to Know/Know Your Numbers" to Senators. She also distributed copies of her letter to the editor of the *Trail* and a copy of the September 2002 Division of Student Affairs organizational chart.

Ostrom reported the Curriculum Committee voted to name and list seminars in Writing and Rhetoric and seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry without mention of departments from which the professors come. Some colleagues want this addressed by the Faculty Senate. The concern is that courses have never been "in limbo" and unattached to departments. Such detachment affects hiring and the definition of positions. Left un-addressed, the motion will become policy in 30 days. Discussion ensued: the Senate can choose to suspend the 30-day clock or the issue may be sorted out in the curriculum committee. It was agreed to take the issue back to the Curriculum Committee.

### **Faculty Senate Charges to the Student Life Committee, continued**

Discussion turned to the Student Life Committee and the remaining charges. Bartanen reported that the Student Life Committee discussed the charges. Given the committee's 6 charges, parallel wording, and the limited time with which to address the charges, the SLC proposed the following amendment; current charge #3 should end just after "student/neighbor relations," and that this amended charge replace the existing charge #4, and a new charge #4 be created that addressed students' relations with campus security.

Discussion ensued. Ostrom asked if current charge #4 should be deleted. Tinsley sought the origin of the charge. Bartanen said it came from the SLC.

It was M/S/P to delete existing charge #4.

Discussion continued. Sanders expressed concern for off-campus students. If we do not hear from them, are they part of the campus community? Haltom pointed out that off-campus students might interact with campus security, which is not addressed in the "new and improved" charge #4, so could not assuage Sanders' concern. Charge #4 should focus on relations between students and security. The phrase "students on campus" should be removed from Charge # 3. Tinsley asked if all issues discussed last time would still be addressed if the phrase was deleted. Haltom asked if "hear[ing] from a range of students, would include the approximately 80% of off-

campus students visited by campus security.” Bartanen assured the Senate that students will not have a problem discussing the issues.

It was M/S/P to remove the phrase “students on campus” from charge #3.

Discussion continued. Bartanen proposed removing “living off-campus” from charge # 4 and replacing it with “a range of students...”

It was M/S/P to approve the new charge #4.

### **Texts of Revised Charges**

#3 Hear again from Monica Nixon at the end of the semester regarding the “Safe Streets” block party and improving off-campus student/neighbor relations. Hear also from a range of students to gain their perspectives on student/neighbor relations.

#4 Hear from a range of students to gain their perspectives on their experiences in campus residences and with campus security.

### **Junior Faculty Focus Groups**

Ostrom raised the topic of charges remaining from the Faculty Conversation.

It had been proposed that junior faculty members meet in focus groups with disinterested persons for discussion. The idea was that the junior faculty would speak more freely in this context. McGruder asked about motive – was it therapy? Political action? Ostrom indicated the concern may derive from rookie camp and the strains of the first year. McGruder asked if a disinterested party would channel information back. Anton suggested that a consultant facilitate. Kline stressed the importance of talking but expressed concern that junior faculty members might kick up “lore” that could turn into fear. Ostrom suggested that such a focus group be tried once so junior faculty could express their views to someone not on staff.

McGruder echoed Kline’s concern, however, she emphasized that junior faculty should never be denied the chance to talk. Kline thought that unless there was an issue to resolve, the proposal seemed adversarial. Tullis sought the origin of the proposal, which Ostrom said arose in a work group at the Fall Faculty Conversation. Tullis asked what it would accomplish and wondered if junior faculty wouldn’t rather talk to those who have experience than to outsiders?

Anton suggested a junior faculty survey to get feedback. Cooney said he liked the focus group idea and that the consultant should talk to all junior faculty since there aren’t so many of them. Kline thought it important to capture junior faculty needs on paper. Anton stressed the importance of showing that the Senate cares about their concerns.

Edgoose proposed a suggestion box or similar informal, anonymous venue. Ostrom agreed that such was the spirit of the proposal. Tinsely agreed that anonymity is a serious issue. Senior faculty can talk till blue in the face but concerns won’t change direction of information flow. Direction of information flow needs to be horizontal and not vertical. There needs to be a good faith effort to allow ideas to get to the campus community; there is estrangement.

Hummel-Berry proposed having an ombudsman rather than paying an outside consultant. The ombudsman could alert junior faculty to available resources. Junior faculty could be confident the ombudsman would not disclose confidential concerns. McGruder commented that a recent survey clearly revealed the low morale on campus, frustration with the top-down authority structure, and a strong sense of futility. If the issue came up at the conversation, it needs to be addressed. Kline

noted that many junior faculty do not get information outside of their own departments; they are fearful of sounding naïve. Bartanen commented that talking in the past to women faculty enabled important issues to be raised and brought to the attention of department chairs. Some issues were brought forward because the opportunity to talk was available.

Edgoose thought if the ombudsman convened yearly, it would be not too political and would create a fair and balanced forum where junior faculty could meet and talk. Haltom indicated no strong view but pointed out that one virtue of the suggestion box was that the proposed Faculty Life Committee could manage anonymity; the more open the discussion, the greater the risk of informants carrying the tale. There would be two-tiered exposure in an ombudsman system.

Anton suggested that a senior faculty member volunteer to mentor a junior faculty member, which he argued would set up a program of empowerment and a means of getting good advice. It would be less risky having a non-departmental mentor.

Cooney noted that, as to be expected, incoming faculty in tenure line positions express strong differing views. He urged asking them what they need.

### **Faculty Life Committee**

Ostrom suggested contacting the faculty to see if they are still interested in an on-going Faculty Life Committee, with the purposed of continuing to brainstorm.

McGruder asked about the by-laws. Haltom replied that it would take a  $\frac{3}{4}$  decision in a faculty meeting to create a new standing committee. Tullis suggested the faculty as a whole discuss the issue. Cooney thought it was ironic given that the overwhelming theme of the faculty conversation was finding ways to reduce faculty burdens, we would opt to create a new committee. Ostrom said he would do the necessary tasks to set up discussion of the issue.

Edgoose and Kline would like the Senate to discuss the issue of full benefits for domestic partners to include dental care, tuition benefits, etc. Ostrom will put the issue on the Senate agenda.

Cooney noted that “Dougharty” is spelled with “ou” not “au.,” and “arty” not “erty.”

### **Proposed Faculty Senate Resolution**

Haltom raised the issue of a motion to state the senators' opposition to discrimination. As a senator he does not look forward to groups, activists etc. lobbying us and said it was not unreasonable to ask we are opening the proverbial “Pandora’s box.” However, Initiative 1 would disadvantage faculty, students, staff, and administrators in a way which Puget Sound said it will not do. Haltom does not think we will be deluged with a series of requests that we take positions on ballot issues or candidates. Initiative 1 does not deserve prohibitions – he moved that we pass the resolution he brought to the table.

As a point of discussion, Tinsley expressed procedural concern. The notion that other issues this important affect us will come up. What if we are asked to affirm our loyalty to the president (of the U.S.A.), and to go on record in such a manner? Are others concerned about this? Hanson shared Tinsley’s concern and described it as a slippery slope. He noted that UPS has the issue of discrimination in the official policy. He wonders if it is indeed the Senate’s job to take a stand on the issue.

McGruder pointed out that Tacoma has had anti-discrimination laws before. Then and now, institutions do not remain silent. Being leaders of the faculty, we have a responsibility to be involved. Our leadership sets an example for the community at large.

Cooney stated that situations can change and there may be room to distinguish between partisan and political issues. This issue is local and we are voters. President Pierce has been asked to take a stand for Puget Sound but cannot do so institutionally. We, however, can act for ourselves, as individuals. We would want to end up having taken a stand, having voted for Civil Rights, for example.

Anton agreed that the issue is important to support, and the Senate will consider each such issue brought to its attention on an individual basis. Kline echoed Tinsley's concern. Sanders wondered how the word would get out that we supported this. How would it be reflected in the community? Ostrom said he would write to The Tacoma News Tribune to make the Senators' position clear.

Cooney raised two questions of substance. One, would making a statement so affect our tax-exempt status? Could it be charged that the U is involved in political activity that would threaten its tax-exempt status? And two, Point 4 of the resolution sounds like a step down. It lowers the tone of the resolution and makes it sound that because it hurts us, we don't approve. McGruder commented that a reason to keep it is that we have a reason to take a stand. We are a significant part of the community. We could remedy the phrase to read "connects to community," as it plays an important role in the reasoning of the resolution. Bartanen suggested that we say "residents of Tacoma including..."

Haltom moved that we insert it. Ostrom asked about amending 2 on page 2. Haltom suggested that in place of "urges," we say "hopes that" And that we replace "to vote" with "will vote"

Kline agreed we should affirm the UPS policy. Hummel-Berry thought we should expand to say we oppose any legislation that would act to limit rights. Haltom thought item 2 could directly address Cooney's concerns. Bartanen thought the language should be specific, otherwise it is open to interpretation. Haltom asked about if point 3 should remain. Kline suggested eliminating point 3. All agreed.

It was M/S/P to approve the amended resolution to state the Senators' opposition to discrimination

### **Text of Amended Resolution**

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Whereas        | The University of Puget Sound's Equal Opportunity Statement commits the university not to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity,   |
| And Whereas    | such a commitment is a matter of morality, civility, decency, and democracy as well as legality,  |
| And Whereas    | Initiative No. 1 on the ballot this November would remove provisions of the Tacoma Municipal Code that prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodation, and lending based on sexual orientation or gender identity,  |
| And Whereas    | such a repeal of protections would materially and symbolically injure <i>residents of Tacoma including</i> students and employees of the University of Puget Sound  |
| Be It Resolved | that the Faculty Senate 1) <i>affirms the Equal Opportunity Statement of the University of Puget Sound</i> , 2) <i>states its opposition to discrimination against students or employees on campus or off</i> , and 3) <i>hopes that all voters in the University of Puget Sound and Tacoma communities will vote "No" on Initiative 1.</i> |

M/S/P to adjourn at approximately 5:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Karen A. Porter  
Anthropologist, Folklorist, and Assistant Professor of Comparative Sociology