

Minutes to the Oct. 15, 2013 meeting of the Puget Sound faculty

Attending: See attached.

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Dean Bartanen at 4:01 p.m.
MSP Selection of Steven Neshyba to act as secretary for the meeting.
An attendance sheet was circulated.

2. Approval of the minutes of the September 23, 2013 meeting

MSP Approval of posted minutes to September 23, 2013 meeting, with minor revisions

3. Announcements

Bartanen noted that attendance is recorded as a result of a faculty initiative.

4. Academic Vice President's report (Dean Bartanen)

- President Thomas is away at a meeting.
- We are still seven seminars short for next semester.
- Faculty are encouraged to check out the call for proposals on the Northwest Five Consortium website, NW5C.org.
- There is also funding to support attendance at a meeting sponsored by the Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership Center, *The Art of Networking*, Nov. 15-16 (see http://pnlc.rollins.edu/events/event_list.asp); interested faculty are encouraged to contact Dean Jackson for details.
- Associate Vice President Matern is hosting discussions among faculty regarding health insurance, including in the Faculty Senate.
- Regarding the 2014-15 budget, among many positive indicators, increases in health insurance may adversely impact salary and tuition goals. Information is needed from department chairs about possible cost savings.

5. Faculty Senate Chair's report (Faculty Senate Chair Dillman)

- The Faculty Senate has met twice so far this semester, mostly addressing charges to standing committees. Three more Senate meetings are scheduled for the fall semester.
- Yesterday, the Senate received a substantive and informative report from Prof. Ryken and others regarding the overlay proposal on the floor.
- Prof. Kessel will work with an *ad hoc* committee focusing on raising

awareness of sexual violence on campus.

- Prof. Stockdale added that a review of the Connections core by the Curriculum Committee is under way, noting that disparate opinions about how to make adjustments to the core rubric. The committee is seeking feedback from an *ad hoc* group.
- In response to a question from Prof. A. Spivey whether there was a motion in the Senate to endorse the overlay, Dillman replied that there was discussion but that the Senate has not decided on a way forward.

6. Continued consideration of a motion to adopt an overlay requirement entitled Knowledge, Identity, and Power

In response to a question from Bartanen, Parliamentarian Haltom opined that it is possible proceed in informal conversation (IC) if the body chooses to do so; we can also move out of IC via a motion. Cannon noted that nothing binding is decided during IC.

MSP Move to IC

Regarding a perception of tension in the faculty's consideration of the proposal, Ryken noted that the Burlington Northern and Diversity groups have always invited substantive discussion.

Ward voiced opposition to the motion, on grounds that

1. the definition of diversity is too narrow;
2. the proposal effectively expands the core and adds to graduation requirements, which is not budget-neutral; and
3. if we are to expand the core, we should do so holistically so that other curricular questions may also be addressed.

Breitenbach noted that two additional courses are one too many. Specific concerns regarding the proposal were that

1. a lack of sequencing implies staffing problems, because we'd have to offer both each semester;
2. the choice of "emotional modes of learning" may constrain the pedagogical approach of teachers; and
3. the "power/injustice" component of the proposal is potentially divisive and normative.

Citing his identity as a gay and as an underrepresented minority, Velez-Quinones argued that he can see that power and injustice are realities our

students need to be more aware of.

Kontogeorgopoulos asked that the Sept. 14 rubric be put on the overhead.

Citing work by Galston, Kessel expressed her preference for a power/privilege perspective, over a diversity/pluralism perspective, as a pedagogical strategy.

Hooper expressed a desire to look sympathetically on the proposal because of the hard work that colleagues have put into it.

Holland endorsed Kessel's view that the Power/Privilege perspective is a better intellectual framework for teaching, and expressed a desire to hear from science faculty.

Richman stated that she can see how the Power/Perspective lens opens up new pedagogical possibilities, especially in the context of promoting effective democratic citizenship.

Joshi asked why the objectives of the proposal cannot be accomplished within the existing curriculum; Ryken responded by noting that 43-72 courses on the books could satisfy the rubric.

Bristow noted that affective learning includes engaging emotionally in a topic, although not to the exclusion of intellectual engagement. She added that we need to acknowledge that this is how the world works.

A. Smith noted that the proposal would result in students taking fewer courses in science, technology, and math, which in turn would diminish their power in the job market.

Kontogeorgopoulos noted that the definition of diversity in the proposal is too narrow; he would like his students to be exposed to diversity in ways that do not include Power/Privilege perspectives.

Ryken wondered whether there is the collective will on the part of the faculty to proceed with the proposal.

A. Spivey noted strong concerns about the motion, on grounds that it will create difficulties on the science majors.

Anderson-Connolly noted that social scientific coursework already includes power and privilege content. He added that implementation would be difficult because of diverging opinions as to the content of single courses taught by

different professors.

Wimberger voiced general opposition to adding graduation requirements. More specifically, he asked why the requirement for “heightened awareness” in the Mission Statement should be met by diversity rather than by other possibilities, such as global citizenship and environmental sustainability.

Neshyba related an anecdotal incident in which a science major expressed strong opposition to additional graduation requirements.

Benitez suggested that current literature pointing to multiple frameworks could inform the discussion.

Rickoll noted that the proposal would represent a burden on science majors.

MSP Adjourn, at 5:29 p.m.

These minutes were written by Steven Neshyba based on notes taken during the meeting.