

## **University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Dec. 6, 2010**

Present: Amy Spivey, Fred Hamel, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Keith Ward, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Dan Burgard, Dan Miller, Rob Hutchinson, Steven Neshyba, Lisa Johnson, Ross Singleton, Elise Richman, Kristin Johnson. Visitors: John Hanson, Kate Stirling, John Baron, Liz Collins

Bartanen introduced the Committee for Selection of Honorary Degrees and Commencement Speakers. **Hamel M/S/P to accept the recommendations of the committee regarding honorary degrees.**

**M/S/P to approve minutes with minor corrections.**

Ward announced that the Executive Committee has been working on reviewing formal versus informal procedures in the faculty governance system, especially regarding informal discussions that might occur. A checklist/guide is in the works and will be circulated among committees for approval.

Bartanen encouraged Senate members to review and comment upon the outline of Core themes suggested by the Accreditation Review Committee for the purposes of reaccreditation through the NWCCU. These can be found at: [www.pugetsound.edu/about/reaccreditation](http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/reaccreditation).

Neshyba announced that a Hearing Board roster needs to be established, a responsibility of the Senate's Executive Committee. Bartanen suggested that Chris Vernon could provide the roster of tenured faculty who are not on sabbatical leave. Neshyba also shared a request from ASC Chair Gary McCall that the Senate develop a charge concerning gaps in the academic integrity policy concerning staff's ability to report incidents of academic dishonesty.

Barry asked when the Senate will discuss Instructor Evaluation Forms; Neshyba replied soon. As a member of the IEF the committee, Hutchinson requested that the issue be on the agenda in the spring.

### **Reports of Committee Liaisons**

K. Johnson notified the Senate that the LMIS working groups have been working on their charges, and that a discussion of print management will be taking place soon within the committee. LMIS may need the Senate's help in soliciting input from faculty on the proposed changes to print management in the library.

Hamel shared that Derek Buescher has taken over responsibilities of chairing the Curriculum Committee to replace Bob Matthews. He also brought to the Senate's attention the Curriculum Committee's revision of the rules concerning the requirement that students take three upper-division courses outside the major in order to graduate. Some discussion ensued whether the change entailed one of wording rather than policy, but the consensus seemed to be (Barry, Hutchinson and Ward) that the policy change did in fact amount to a reassertion of the spirit of the requirement. Specifically, Ward wondered whether this change allows more "double dipping." He added as an example that formerly a business class required in a Music major could not be used to fulfill the requirement but that the change would allow it to. Burgard noted that currently chemistry reads the requirement as permitting no additional biology or chemistry classes. Hamel read from the relevant Curriculum Committee minutes to help clarify the issues that inspired the change. Singleton suggested that this action goes into effect 30 days from when the Senate is notified of the change. Barry noted he assumed the rationale behind the change was to make it easier for students to fulfill the requirement while maintaining the spirit of the requirement. Burgard noted that indeed the change could prevent students from having to take three Connections

courses to fulfill the requirement. Neshyba requested that communication to department chairs be pursued, as planned by the Curriculum Committee, and that the deadline for instituting a delay be clarified.

Hutchinson noted that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) forwarded to the chair of the department its response to proposed changes to the evaluation guidelines for Politics and Government. In response to the charge to improve the description of the grievance process, the committee decided not to recommend changes to the Faculty Code, on the grounds that the current language is sufficiently clear. A subcommittee did recommend, however, adding a clarifying sentence to the PSC's Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures (aka "buff") document.

Barry shared that ASC is working on the logistics of developing a common hour and is surveying departments for guidance.

### **Follow-up on Academic Standards Policy on Incompletes**

Ward reported that the Executive Committee met informally on November 2, 2010 with Academic Standards Committee (ASC) members with the aim of addressing various concerns regarding governmental procedure (such as those that led to the rescission of the policy on Incompletes). Specifically, Ward noted that matters of "communication, consultations, and deliberation" were discussed, including the responsibilities of the liaisons in the Senate, with the ultimate goal of fostering and ensuring open communication. In the spirit of providing concrete suggestions that aid communication, Barry shared his observation that first, problems arise when initiatives generated within committees develop as policy changes without charges from or consultation with the Senate, and second, repealing something a committee has worked hard on should be done only after consultation and careful consideration.

After noting that the Senate's rescission of the ASC's change in the deadline for incompletes may have inadvertently rescinded the entire policy on incompletes, **Barry M/S/P that we reaffirm the policy on Incompletes of 2009/2010.** L. Johnson objected to the interpretation that the original policy has been rescinded by the Senate's action, and furthermore to the sense that the Senate should be concerned about offending committees given the Senate's standing as a body overseeing those committees. Ward pointed out that the Senate did not act within the 30-day timeframe in which a committee's policy change can be repealed, and thus gave tacit approval to the ASC policy change. Miller wondered if a "no" vote on Barry's motion would result in there being *no* policy in effect. Neshyba offered that a "no" vote would require another motion. Barry suggested that the minutes show that *all* other changes to the Incomplete Policy suggested by the ASC are assumed to be replaced by the old policy. Burgard wondered what would happen to a student who takes an Incomplete this semester; the consensus was that the policy to apply would be the one currently in the handbook.

**Bartanen M/S/P that the Senate charge the ASC with modifying the policy for reporting academic violations in the "Response to Violations of Academic Integrity" section on pages 4-5 of the Academic Handbook to allow staff members to report suspected violations of academic integrity.** Segawa asked whether students are currently permitted to file reports, and wondered whether that might be included as well. L. Johnson noted that currently students report such incidents to professors, and asked whether would such a policy would involve students bypassing professors. Neshyba requested that this issue be separated as a different motion. Bartanen suggested the ASC incorporate into its discussion of the charge the fact that this question came up in the Senate's discussion. Ward expressed concern with

a student-reporting policy on the grounds that student reporting would not be an appropriate role for a student. Burgard countered that it would indeed be an appropriate role for students.

Segawa wondered if work on the Incomplete Policy is going to be continued. Barry noted that it is conceivable that the Senate could work with the ASC to take this up again (for example, regarding a four-week deadline after the first day of the subsequent term, rather than the midterm). MacBain and Spivey were in favor of dropping the matter altogether on the grounds that the current policy has enough flexibility. Ward suggested that the issue of precisely how Incompletes are used may be a more important, broader concern that needs to be discussed.

**Miller M/S/F that the ASC be charged with reexamining the recent changes adopted for the P/F policy (allowing an instructor-cap on P/F and *not* allowing a limitation to juniors and seniors) with the purpose of ensuring that the policy changes match the goals and address the original concerns of the ASC.** Miller explained that he wanted to ensure that the policy change is addressing the issues originally identified regarding the P/F policy, rather than serving as an ad hoc solution. Hamel (in general speaking in favor of the motion) noted that there seemed to be a number of issues raised by the motion. He thought the policies passed at the Faculty Meetings regarding P/F seemed arbitrary (particularly the instructor-cap). Bartanen (speaking against the motion) pointed out that the original impetus for the consideration of P/F arose from difficulties that some faculty members were experiencing with the current policy, namely a high enrollment of P/F students in particular courses that in turn made it difficult to accomplish the course's objectives. The instructor cap, she noted, seemed to be a means by which to address that concern. Burgard offered that he had seconded the motion because he wanted to know Miller's perspective as a student, and asked Miller to give the Senate further insight on that perspective. Miller replied that he worried that the adopted changes do not address all of the issues of concern. Spivey noted that the Faculty had voted on the matter, as the governing body over the committees, and returning the issue to the ASC seemed like asking that committee to do a lot of work in spite of that vote. Hamel suggested that solving problems raised by particular individuals (with regard to certain courses) with policy changes like this could create a dangerous precedent. But he also expressed concern regarding the precedent of rapid policy reversals that might occur if this motion passes. Barry (speaking against the motion) concurred with the concern regarding policy reversals, and noted that while the vote at the Faculty meeting had indeed not been representative and the P/F instructor-cap seemed arbitrary, the issue in general did not seem worth raising again. He emphasized that procedure had been followed. Miller expressed a wish for clarification from the ASC that this policy change dealt with the issues at stake, particularly given the resolution on the policy passed by the Associated Students of the University of Puget Sound (ASUPS). Ward (speaking against the motion) pointed out that the faculty has grappled with P/F for a while and that we need to see how this recent policy change goes before sending it back to the ASC. Bartanen expressed respect for the work done on this policy by ASUPS but also agreed that the faculty has been examining P/F for a while and said that ultimately the faculty sets the university's academic policy. L. Johnson (speaking against the motion) agreed with Spivey regarding the work involved in returning the issue to the ASC in spite of the Faculty's vote, and called the question.

### **Discussion of Ad Hoc Committee on Benefits**

Neshyba explained that Rosa Beth Gibson is meeting with the Cabinet to discuss the recommendations of the Benefits Task Force (BenTF), which will then take these to the Trustees in February. Upon request, Singleton clarified the history of the two benefits committees (the BenTF was commissioned by Sherry Mondou, and the Ad-Hoc Committee on Benefits (AHCB) consists solely of faculty members). The business of the AHCB is finished, since the BenTF will dissolve upon sharing its recommendations

with the Cabinet. Neshyba asked for guidance on the future of the AHCB. Ward requested a report. Singleton reported that the original aim of the AHCB had been to ensure that the BenTF was hearing the concerns and perspectives of the faculty, and he thought the process had gone well. He noted that the BenTF's recommendations and rationales will be made public. **L. Johnson M/S/P to thank the AHCB and to dissolve it.** L. Johnson wondered when the report will be coming out on the grounds that some fear-mongering seems to be taking place concerning benefits.

**M/S/P to adjourn.**

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Johnson  
Scribe

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain  
Secretary