

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**September 30, 2013**  
McCormick Room, Library

**Present:** Brad Dillman (chair), Maria Sampen, Kris Bartanen, Nila Wiese, Eric Hopfenbeck, Haley Andres, Shirley Skeel (staff senate representative), Leslie Saucedo, Amanda Mifflin, Mark Martin, Cynthia Gibson, Ariela Tubert, Alisa Kessel, Derek Buescher, Jonathan Stockdale, Kriszta Kotsis.

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:04.

**Announcements**

Saucedo indicated that there may be more charges necessary for ASC: one addressing record keeping and academic integrity and another focused on transfer credits. Dillman noted that the committee is welcome to work on these and the senate will address adding these as charges after we complete charging the other committees.

**Other Business - Discussion of the KNOW proposal**

A discussion about the Senate's response to the proposed KNOW core requirement unfolded. Tubert asked what would be a good time for Ryken representing the COD to come to the senate to discuss the KNOW proposal. Kotsis suggested that the earliest possible date would be preferable for scheduling the meeting. Kessel wondered whether the KNOW working group intended to do a second reading of their proposal at the next faculty meeting. Tubert confirmed that yes, that was the case and also noted that the KNOW working group has now discussed the proposal both with the Curriculum Committee and COD. Wiese mentioned that the committee minutes that would reflect these discussions have not yet been made available. It was noted that the COD's most recent minutes were posted already.

The question was brought up: what is the difference between a 1<sup>st</sup> and a 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of the KNOW proposal at the Faculty Meeting. It was agreed that the by-laws do not require multiple readings of a curricular change and Dillman noted that it is possible that the motion could be voted on at the next meeting of the faculty and Buescher concurred. Tubert confirmed that the COD/BN group intends to put a continuation of the discussion of the KNOW proposal on the agenda of the next faculty meeting.

Dillman suggested that it would be desirable to charge the COD and the CC to look at the KNOW proposal and ask them to report to the senate about their findings; Dillman argued that it would be preferable to discuss the KNOW proposal in the senate after the COD and CC have had a chance to vet the proposal. He pointed out that there are several significant questions about which we do not have information and he believed that a more informed and rich discussion would be possible after COD and CC review the proposal and report their findings to the senate.

Kessel pointed out that there would be a value in the senate offering an opinion about the KNOW proposal because there are many faculty members who teach at 4:00 p.m. when the faculty meetings are scheduled (e.g., courses with labs, etc.) and therefore are not able to attend crucial meetings where major decisions might be made. She noted that reduced attendance at the faculty meeting means that we will have a biased outcome because we will not be able to have the perspective of those who are not able to attend the faculty meeting. She argued that this is a good example of why it is desirable to identify a common hour where no faculty members would have a conflict between teaching and attending the faculty meeting. She further pointed out that in the current situation the senate should take a look at the proposal as a body representing the full faculty and offer its views on the proposal. She further suggested

that the senate could also seek input from those who will not be able to attend the faculty meeting where the proposal will be discussed. Kessel argued that the senate could offer recommendations about the proposal that would reflect broader views of the faculty as a whole. She acknowledged that the COD is interested in pursuing a democratic process and that they wish to be inclusive in the discussion of the proposal.

Wiese suggested that if we put a discussion of the KNOW proposal on the senate agenda, we should invite representatives of COD and CC.

Dillman argued that given the time frame, we will not be able to collect all information that we need to make a recommendation; he reiterated that in his view COD and CC should be charged with reviewing the proposal first to offer us the information that we need to conduct an informed discussion about the topic. He offered a list of questions that he believes are crucial to understand the impact and implications of the proposal: e.g., How will the KNOW courses be staffed? Which existing courses will be/can be transformed into KNOW courses? Who will write the guidelines for this core area? What will these guidelines be? How will a two course requirement impact our curriculum? How are we going to offer a total of 60 courses in this area? Do faculty and students really want this curricular change? Dillman emphasized that even if COD and CC representatives attend the next senate meeting, a 30 minute presentation will not give us enough information to make an informed, responsible decision about this proposal.

Kessel emphasized that the motion at the faculty meeting only includes the learning objectives but not the guidelines, therefore, if the motion is passed, it will only mean that the learning objectives will have been accepted by the faculty but not the guidelines. She further asked the question: at what level does the senate wish to participate in this process? Is it at the level of the learning objectives or at the level of the guidelines?

Dillman stated that one possibility for the senate is to not react at this point and wait and see what happens at the next faculty meeting, since the process is already in motion.

Kessel stated that one possible course of action would be to make a motion to consider the learning objectives and the guidelines together rather than separately.

Buescher concurred that any faculty member could amend the motion at the next faculty meeting to include the guidelines. He further suggested that it may be important to decide whether the Senate needs to talk to the COD and CC regarding connecting the KNOW proposal to other possible charges to these committees such as review of Connections core area. He further suggested that we need to decide in what area we would like to take actions, but that procedurally, the faculty need not present proposals to the Senate prior to taking them to the full faculty.

Tubert suggested that keeping the conversation about the KNOW proposal is important.

Saucedo wondered: is it possible that the learning objectives of KNOW are already met by existing courses? She suggested that the KNOW working group would need to show that other courses do not fulfill the learning objectives of KNOW in order to suggest a new addition to the core curriculum. In her view this may be a reason to discuss the learning objectives and the guidelines separately.

Martin wondered whether it was normal procedure to split the learning objectives from the guidelines in a new proposal.

Kessel opined that the KNOW working group likely wished to disentangle substantive and logistical

questions by separating the learning objectives from the guidelines in their proposal.

Martin stated that he thought that the working group was seeking general approval for the proposal, yet he noted that he was not able to make a decision about the proposal without knowing the nuts-and-bolts of the issue (namely the logistical questions that would show whether or not the proposal is feasible).

Dillman suggested that we invite COD and CC representatives to the next senate meeting to discuss issues related to the KNOW proposal further.

Kessel proposed that the senate should express at the meeting with COD and CC representatives that senators are concerned about the procedural aspects of the proposal. The senate should also ask what other information the KNOW working group needs and try to establish in the meeting what the next steps should be with regard to moving the process further.

Stockdale opined that it would be helpful to have COD and CC representatives but wondered whether we should first complete our charges to committees and then meet with COD and CC representatives so as not to impede the work of other committees. It was agreed that we should try to invite Amy Ryken and representatives of the COD and CC to our next senate meeting. Chair Dillman offered to reach out to Amy.

### **Liaison reports**

Kessel reported that the Staff Senate met and elected Cori Hammock as chair. One of the main goals of the Staff Senate this year is to improve communications between the Staff Senate and Faculty Senate.

Kotsis reported that LMIS at its first meeting elected Denise Despres as chair. She also relayed Despres' comments about the burden on faculty members of such a committee as LMIS where half of the committee members are not faculty members but ex officio members, yet the responsibility of chairing is still the burden of the relatively small number of faculty serving on the committee. Kotsis also reported that Jane Carlin informed the LMIS committee about the implementation of the Shared Integrated Library System (ILS). Once completed, this system will fully integrate 37 libraries of the Orbis Cascade Alliance at all levels (e.g., not only at the level of borrowing but also at the level of library work that previously was undertaken by each library individually.)

Buescher reported that the PSC elected Jennifer Hastings as chair.

Mifflin reported that Lisa Wood will chair SLC and the committee established working groups to tackle their charges. They prioritized the charges: they will address charges 1, 3, and 4 this semester and will probably focus on the other charges in the spring.

Dillman reminded senators that liaisons need not attend committee meetings, but should read the meeting minutes and follow up with chairs in case meeting minutes are not available or in case there are significant points to clarify.

### **Approval of Minutes**

M/S/P to accept minutes of September 16, 2013 as revised.

### **Discussion and Approval of Committee Charges**

Sampen moved to approve the draft charges of the UEC. The charges below were approved after discussion and amendment of certain aspects of the draft charges:

### **UEC Charges - M/S/P**

1. Develop a request for increased funding for faculty and student research and conference travel to be submitted to Associate Dean Martin Jackson and the BTF.
2. Investigate the logistics of a per diem system for food during university travel, including how a per diem may be implemented with current and future versions of PeopleSoft.
3. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to PeopleSoft and the P-card system.
4. Continue to develop and implement the UEC Faculty Scholarship Award.
5. Work to promote UEC grants and deadlines to faculty and students and make recommendations to the Associate Deans' Office for updating the UEC webpage.
6. Make recommendations to increase the visibility of faculty and student scholarship collaborating with LMIS as needed.
7. Investigate ways to streamline UEC student research grant application submission for students who already apply for summer research stipends. The UEC should also consider whether the AHSS summer research grants might be able to use a similar system.

### **Discussion of UEC charges**

Sampen explained that charges 2 and 3 will likely be on hold until PeopleSoft moves forward as not enough information is available at this time to deal with these important issues.

In connection with charge 6: Sampen noted that the UEC is eager to receive web-based materials showcasing faculty and student research for which grant money was given, yet noted that the UEC is also interested in other research results particularly in light of the new Faculty Scholarship Award. Skeel also noted that a centralized location of faculty and student research would be a helpful tool for the Office of Communications.

Gibson moved that the IEC draft charges be approved. After discussion and amendments, the following charges were approved for the IEC:

### **IEC charges - M/S/P**

1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence particularly: assess the safety of international programs, the efficacy of Puget Sound's safety information for students before they study abroad, and the efficacy of reporting processes that inform the ongoing review of international programs.
2. Review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate expensive programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g., language, discipline, or geography.)
3. Once a financial model is resolved for short-term study abroad programs, develop a clear template for proposing, organizing, and leading short-term study abroad programs.
4. Work with the Office of Institutional Research to evaluate the questions addressing study abroad that are currently on sophomore and senior surveys, as well as the returning questionnaire for study abroad students.
5. Continue to work with faculty to encourage the integration of study abroad experiences into on-campus classes and research symposia, and work with the SLC and the Dean of Students to encourage integration of study abroad experiences into co-curricular activities.
6. Study and report on the feasibility and desirability of increasing the number of direct study abroad exchange programs.
7. Examine study abroad application documentation for clarity regarding application rules for students placed on probation.

### Discussion of IEC charges

Saucedo wondered whether inexpensive programs that are not distinctive should be also eliminated. Wiese noted that the IEC is charged with regularly reviewing the effectiveness of programs, so if a program does not serve our needs it will probably be eliminated. The focus of this charge was on expensive programs.

Mifflin asked whether the IEC is involved with domestic study away programs. She is aware of an Environmental Science program in Cape Cod that would provide excellent opportunities for our students. Bartanen responded that these programs are not under the purview of IEC.

Buescher moved that the draft charges for PSC be approved. After discussion and amendment, the following PSC charges were approved:

### **PSC charges M/S/P:**

1. Review the policy on “Background Checks of Faculty” being drafted by the Human Resources Department, including confirmation of degree completion.
2. Continue the review of Faculty Code provisions on guidelines for the use of course assistants and make recommendations for necessary changes.
3. Formulate recommendations for streamlining the faculty evaluation process in order to reduce workload on evaluatees, departments, head officers, the Faculty Advancement Committee, and the Dean of the University. Propose amendments to the Faculty Code that are entailed by these recommendations.
4. Collaborate with LMIS to assess the viability of the use of electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.
5. Work with LMIS to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files.
6. Outline guidelines in the “Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures” document for submission of evaluation materials in electronic form.
7. Consider limiting the number of colleague observers who can visit any given class session during an evaluation process.

### Discussion of PSC charges

In connection with no. 7: Bartanen noted that spacing out the visits to courses is important for our evaluation process and the FAC would like to see a widely spread, representative sample of class visits. Yet, in recent years the FAC has seen the clustering of class visits in the first three weeks of classes during the term of evaluation. This is undesirable because it does not give a holistic view of a colleague’s teaching. Others also noted that having a large number of visitors in a short period of time particularly in small classes is not desirable for class dynamics and pedagogy. It was also noted that head officers should make sure that class visits follow the guidelines presented in the buff document.

### **Other business**

Kessel announced that she is interested in setting up an ad hoc committee that will address sexual violence on campus and Sampen, Buescher, Tubert, and Andres expressed interest in participating. It was asked whether the Sexual Assault Working Group is disbanding. Kessel said that the working group had proposed that the work continue. Hopfenbeck noted that a new ASUPS organization called Peer Allies had been established; this is a peer-to-peer support system. Andres added that it was aimed at dealing with power-based personal violence. Andres also noted that Green Dot also exists on campus, which is a national program of bystander awareness, a violence prevention program. Marta Palmquist Cady and Justin Canny are involved in this program.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25.

Respectfully submitted by Kriszta Kotsis