

Faculty Senate Meeting
November 25, 2013
McCormick Room, Library

Present: Brad Dillman (chair), Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Mark Martin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese

Guests: Nancy Bristow, Doug Cannon, Dexter Gordon, Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken, Carolyn Weisz

Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Announcements:

Saucedo noted that the ASC is looking at revising the policy regarding WF.

Approval of Minutes:

Wiese moved to approve minutes from the 10/28/13 Senate Meeting. Seconded by Saucedo.

10/28/13 minutes approved with no objections

Mifflin moved to approve minutes from the 11/13/13 Senate Meeting. Seconded by Wiese.

11/13/13 minutes approved with minor corrections.

Liaison Reports:

1. UEC (Sampen). Sampen read the following correspondence from Justin Tiehen, chair of the UEC:

At the most recent UEC meeting we were discussing our charges from the Senate, and there was some confusion about charges 2 and 3. (They are included in your email below.) We were wondering if the Senate could provide further guidance regarding what it would like the UEC to do.

Maybe here's a way to put our concern. On one end of the spectrum, if all the Senate is looking for is a *recommendation* from the UEC, well that's no problem: we can hold a vote at our next meeting about whether a per diem approach sounds good (regarding charge 2), for instance. But presumably the Senate wants more than this. On the other end of the spectrum, if what the Senate wants is for us to figure out whether PeopleSoft can be programmed to actually keep track of such information--for instance, to keep track of per diem payments--

well, that seems more like a question for the university's IT people than for the UEC. So, between these opposite ends of the spectrum, what concretely would the Senate like from the UEC?

Charges are as follows:

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.

Tubert noted that the charges in question were self-charges from last year's University Enrichment Committee. Saucedo suggested talking with the Associate Dean's Office for clarification about the nature of these charges and gathering more information. Dillman asked to postpone further discussion on this until our next meeting. Sampen said she would follow up and gather more information from Sunil Kukreja and Sarah Moore.

2. Curriculum (Stockdale). Stockdale shared the following correspondence from the Curriculum Committee:

I received the message below from a working group of the curriculum committee, and would like to ask the advice of the Senate on how to respond; hopefully we can discuss this during our liaison reports. The basic question is what faculty body has the authority to approve a course [usually that would be the curriculum committee] in the unusual situation that the course proposed is only 3 weeks long [our usual minimum is 6 weeks]. The working group felt it was outside their authority to approve the course, and asked the Senate to provide guidance.

Thanks,

Jonathan

Here's the original email:

"Last week Working Group 5 discussed a new proposal, IPE/ENVR 360, that raises a curriculum issue that WG5 believes is larger than WG5 has the authority to make a decision on. I'm bringing it to your attention so that we can decide how to proceed.

IPE/ENVR 360, "Food Systems of the Northwest," would be a new type of course. Students would spend three weeks in the summer investigating the process of food production and distribution in the Pacific Northwest. Students would spend a week at Whitman, looking at rural food production in Eastern Washington. Then they would spend a week at Puget Sound, focusing on urban agriculture and issues of food justice. The third week would be spent at

Willamette, working at Zena Forest and Farm and learning about sustainable agriculture. This is one of the university's first attempts at a course that would bring together resources from the Northwest Five liberal arts colleges, and (I believe) students from any college would be allowed to enroll in the course.

The curricular issue is that Puget Sound has a policy that courses must last a minimum of six weeks. This course proposal clearly violates that policy. However, that policy is aimed at courses on our Tacoma campus, and some study abroad courses have been approved, on a course-by-course basis, that meet for shorter than six weeks. This course is not a study abroad course, though, and so sending it to the IEC for approval doesn't seem appropriate. Lisa Ferrari characterized it as "study away," which Puget Sound hasn't really done much of to this point. Working Group 5 believes that granting a waiver of the six-week minimum for such a study away course is out of its sphere of authority and would like for the full Curriculum Committee or Academic Standards or whomever the Senate deems is the appropriate authority to make a decision on this."

Buescher brought up the fact that contact hours can sometimes be counted in lieu of a prescribed number of weeks or class meetings. Bartanen stated that the course in question has morning, afternoon and evening classes and thus she believed that the equivalent number of contact hours would be met. Wiese suggested that if a new policy needs to be developed for this particular course that the Academic Standards should take on this issue. Bartanen noted that the course would meet the federal credit hour policy that was written last year. Buescher suggested that Stockdale talk with the chair of the Curriculum Committee to ask what the existing policy is regarding contact hours.

Revision of charge to the International Education Committee (IEC)

Tubert read the following revised charge to the IEC:

"With respect to the issue of sexual violence particularly, determine a process for assessing, as part of the approval processes for Puget Sound study abroad programs: (1) the student support resources and response protocols for student safety; (2) the number of reported instances of sexual violence at the international program; (3) the efficacy of Puget Sound's safety information for students before they study abroad; and (4) the efficacy of Puget Sound reporting and response processes should a sexual violence incident occur."

Bartanen stated that she conferred with Puget Sound's legal counsel and its insurers regarding the issue of liability and received the following response:

As with faculty participation in emergency preparedness, so long as faculty members remain within the course and scope of their employment, the following applies:

In response to questions from faculty regarding the possibility of individual liability for incidents that occur during university-affiliated student study abroad, the university has conferred with legal counsel and its insurers to confirm that Puget Sound's faculty, while performing their job responsibilities both on and off campus, are covered by the university's liability insurance policies. The intent is to protect Puget Sound faculty individually while performing their job responsibilities, including faculty governance duties.

Bartanen also summarized information from our insurers that “faculty are Puget Sound representatives relative to study abroad planning, execution, and risk management. They have shared responsibility for Title IX compliance and appropriate risk management practices.” She added that “it would be a greater risk to faculty and to the college if we did not involve them in this risk assessment endeavor.” She added that this is about looking at the processes and support mechanisms as opposed to promising that safety is always there.

A motion was made and seconded. The motion to accept the revised charge was approved with no objections.

Consideration of two additional charges for the Academic Standards Committee (ASC)

Saucedo moved to add the following two self-charges to the ASC's charges:

1. Review and address the policies and procedures associated with record keeping and formal communications with students in cases involving violation of academic integrity
2. Review and address university policies related to accepting transfer credits either from incoming students or students already matriculated at Puget Sound

The ASC included the following note to the Senate regarding Charge #2:

A number of transfer issues are included here: transfer of credits from Community College beyond the current "junior status" (16 units); transfer of Running Start credits; inclusion of exam scores from the Cambridge Advanced International Certificate of Education in the grouping with current AP and IB transfer credits.

Tubert seconded the motion.

Bartanen stated that Jenny Rickard thought it would be proactive for us to develop a policy on transfer credit for international students (given the university's interest in recruiting more international students). With regard to the first charge, Bartanen noted that one of the main issues is insuring that students get clear communication from the university when an incident report is filed for the first time.

Dillman asked about granting credit for experiential learning. He wondered if this was something the ASC could look at and whether this issue was one that could be examined with the language of charge #2 as it currently stands. He noted that some universities offer credit for on the job experience. He also mentioned online courses and asked if this was something they might be able to look at with regard to this charge.

Buescher stated that the charge seemed broad enough to cover these things and suggested that Saucedo pass on Dillman's additional comments to the ASC.

Charges approved w/no objections.

Motion to survey the faculty and charge the Committee on Diversity (COD) regarding the diversity in the curriculum proposal.

Tubert proposed the following three items (prepared by Tubert and Alisa Kessel, who was unable to attend today's meeting):

Charge for the COD:

Collaborate with the Burlington Northern group to draft a revised proposal for a diversity requirement incorporating data from the Faculty Senate Survey on a Diversity Requirement and other faculty feedback methods (for example, faculty meetings, individual meetings, focus groups, the Curriculum Committee, Wednesdays at 4 meetings, comments on the faculty governance listserv). Present the revised proposal to the Faculty Senate.

Motion 1:

To contribute to the data collection already underway by the Burlington Northern group, the Faculty Senate will conduct an electronic survey of the faculty to understand the faculty's attitude on a diversity-in-the-curriculum requirement and different ways of thinking about it. The survey will also invite comments from faculty members in an open-ended question. The COD and OIR will assist the Faculty Senate on the final language of the survey. Draft language is attached to the motion, but the Faculty Senate will approve final language before the survey is conducted.

Please see appendix A for Draft Survey Language

Motion 2 (for consideration in connection to Senate priorities for the rest of the year):

The Faculty Senate will investigate ways to facilitate inclusive faculty deliberation and involvement in decision-making. Some examples might include: creating a "common hour" to encourage attendance and participation at faculty meetings; restructuring the Senate in representative, rather than at-large, positions; employing electronic "opinion polling" to gauge faculty attitudes about matters of widespread concern; and assessing the efficacy of the faculty governance listserv in fostering dialogue.

Tubert moved to approve the COD charge, Saucedo seconded the motion.

Buescher moved to amend the COD charge to the following:

“Collaborate with the Burlington Northern group on drafting a revised proposal for a diversity requirement.”

Stockdale seconded the amendment.

Buescher stated that the purpose of his amendment was to remove the faculty survey from the motion at this time. He said that he hoped that this might also resolve the issue of the distinction between the COD and Burlington Northern Group (BNG). He added that this would also put the BNG within the faculty governance structure.

Saucedo stated that if the Senate were to run a poll, we should first identify what information, if any, the BNG may still need while they are in the process of revising the proposal.

With regard to Saucedo’s comment, Segawa stated that this was a level of detail that the Senate didn’t normally provide for curricular development. He then asked Buescher whether he purposely left out the phrase “report back to the Senate” in his motion.

Buescher answered with yes, but with the understanding that the proposal would come back to the Senate (because most committees report back to the Senate).

Wiese stated that the assumption was that this would be communicated on end of year report but since this is a more time-sensitive issue it would need to come to the Senate sooner.

Stockdale commented that it seemed like the BNG was already collaborating with the COD. He asked why the Senate needed to charge two groups to collaborate who were already collaborating.

Tubert responded by saying that the 2013-14 Senate has not yet charged the COD with any kind of charge with regard to its work with the BNG or the diversity in the curriculum proposal.

Wiese stated that because there is no official charge, this collaboration was not required on the part of the COD.

Tubert stated that she would like the Senate to be able to review the revised diversity in the curriculum proposal before it goes forward.

Ryken clarified that the only members of the BNG that overlap with the COD are herself, Carolyn Weisz and Michael Benitez. The Burlington Northern participants are as follows:

Nancy Bristow, Professor, History
Dexter Gordon, Professor, African American Studies & Communication Studies
Judith Kay, Professor, Religion
Grace Livingston, Associate Professor, African American Studies
Elise Richman, Associate Professor, Art
Amy Ryken, Professor, School of Education
Carolyn Weisz, Professor, Psychology
Michael Benitez, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion

The Committee on Diversity members are as follows:

Michael Benitez, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion
Aislinn Melchoir, Associate Professor, Classics
Heidi Orloff, Professor, Exercise Science
Czarina Ramsay, Director Multicultural Student Services
Amy Ryken, COD Chair, Professor, School of Education
Oriell Siu, Assistant Professor, Foreign Languages and Literature
Hannah Smith, Student Member
Jennifer Utrata, Assistant Professor, Sociology and Anthropology
Mike Valentine, Professor, Geology
Carolyn Weisz, Professor, Psychology

She went on to point out that last year the COD was asked to explore including a diversity requirement in the curriculum to be presented to the Senate *or* the full faculty. She added that the current BNG proposal needs to be reconsidered because of the action at the last faculty meeting, thus necessitating more discussion at the next meeting in February.

Bartanen noted that the next faculty meeting is February 3 and that the Senate meeting is on January 27. This presents a tight timeline if the Senate is to review the proposal before it goes to the full faculty.

Stockdale asked if the BNG wished for a collaboration between the COD and the BNG.

Weisz explained that the BNG grew out of a Wed at 4 event, and at that event people expressed interest in moving forward to create a proposal. She said that she was pretty sure that the amount of time put forth to create the diversity in the curriculum proposal is more than that of any standing committee. She clarified that the people who self-nominated into the BNG group had expertise in the area of diversity. She added that the Burlington group meets for long periods of time to discuss the issues. The COD adds another lens but is not the core working group.

Dillman asked if there will be any point at which the COD will take a formal vote about the proposal that is being revised. He also asked whether the Senate will have a chance

to take a vote on the revised proposal. He asked if it was the intent of the BNG to take the proposal directly to the full faculty without going through the Senate or the COD.

Ryken stated that in the timeline that was presented two weeks ago, the proposal will go to the Senate before the next full faculty meeting. She expressed that the COD is unanimous in its support of a diversity requirement. The plan is to have the revised proposal out in December so that faculty will have a chance to look at it before January.

Weisz said that the proposal can move forward with or without a Senate vote. It can still be put forward at the full faculty meeting; and that this would not be in violation of proper procedure.

Dillman said that the Senate will not have a lot of time for significant discussion before the next faculty meeting. He asked why the COD was not doing the revision with the BNG. He reiterated by asking again why this couldn't occur in the COD.

Weisz stated that the volume of materials prepared by the BNG goes beyond the scope of what the COD can do.

Ryken asked whether the Senate, the COD and the BNG could come together and say that there has not been enough time for the Senate and the COD to consider these issues before moving to the full faculty. She suggested that this would send a message to our faculty that we were working together to take this to the next level.

Bartanen added that any faculty member can call an additional meeting of the faculty. (Subsequent clarification, from Faculty Bylaws: "If the need should arise, the Faculty may be called into session by the Senate or its officers, or by written petition of not less than twenty (20) Faculty members.")

Cannon stated that the faculty is committed to taking this up for further discussion but any of the Senators can make a proposal to postpone discussion.

Buescher said that because this is already on the floor of the faculty, the Senate's intervention in the process would be overstretching its authority.

Tubert stated that if the proposal is supposed to come from the COD (which is a Senate committee) then the Senate should be able to intervene.

Dillman added that he wants the COD to take a formal vote on the proposal that they intend to endorse and he wants the Senate to be able to have a chance to review what the COD votes on before it goes to the full faculty. He stated that the full faculty can disregard what the Senate says but the Senate should still be involved.

Gordon explained that the BNG came from a group of faculty with expertise in the area of diversity. Three faculty members from three different disciplines met extensively and then brought the research work to a group of seven. This group met and revised the

work. This was then brought to a group of 14. He stated that the BNG is a group of legitimate faculty members who have bent over backwards to go through all the correct channels. He added that the BNG has engaged in the most open process that he has seen in his 12 years on campus. He viewed a survey structured in the way the Senate was proposing as demeaning the expertise that the BNG brings to the issue of power, privilege and diversity and makes it into “either/or.” He stated that the survey undermines faculty expertise and that he found it to be borderline offensive.

Tubert reiterated that the survey included in the motion is just a draft. She said she was trying to come up with something to give people context. She added that she is in favor of the power and privilege model. She said that she would be happy to have the language revised.

Ryken stated that neither the BNG nor COD is in favor of polling the faculty at this time. She said that the COD discussed this idea in their meeting earlier today (11/25/13). At this meeting the COD unanimously passed a motion stating:

“The Committee on Diversity opposes talking a poll because 1) the reasons for and use of the poll are unclear, 2) the content of the poll is problematic, and 3) doing so undermines the research that has been done so far.”

Tubert said that there are a lot of people on campus who feel they are not being heard. She noted that in particular, younger untenured professors fall under this category. She stressed that it is important for people to feel they are part of the process. The idea of a survey is partially so these voices can be heard and partially so the process can be inclusive. She stated that although the COD has a lot of data, the survey would provide additional data that the COD could then use or not use as needed.

Stockdale stated that in previous Senate meetings there has been a great deal of discussion as to what the Senate’s role in this should be. He quoted the minutes saying, “this would put the Senate back in the conversation of regaining control of the conversation that we started.” He stated that holding a vote at this time as well as language quoted above is disempowering to the faculty.

Bartanen said that her concern is that a poll at this point is not the answer to people (a) not understanding what the terms mean and (b) not having time to talk about it. She said that we need to provide other forums for this discussion and polling could reduce the education process when it sounds like opening up the educational process would be most helpful.

Weise expressed that her concern was giving a voice to those who don’t feel comfortable enough to ask the questions for fear of being placed into “a camp” either in favor or against the proposal, when all they may really want is information.

Gordon said he would like to make the BNG’s processes more visible. The BNG has solicited feedback in a range of ways: blind feedback, one-on-one, chair meetings. The

group has tried every possible way to reach every person on campus. He stated that the BNG has 100 single spaced pages of feedback. He said that people can write to the group anonymously or with their names. He reiterated that the BNG has accepted every bit of feedback. They have taken it, studied it. He stated that there cannot be a more open process.

Motion to extend the Senate meeting beyond 5:30. Seconded/Approved.

The Senate voted to approve Buescher's amendment. Passed w/no objections.

The Senate voted to accept the amended motion:

Charge to the COD:

“Collaborate with the Burlington Northern group on drafting a revised proposal for a diversity requirement.”

Passed w/no objections.

Dillman stated that the Senate will come back to the other proposals at its next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:40.

Respectfully Submitted by Maria Sampen

Appendix A:

**Faculty Senate Survey on a Diversity Requirement
(Draft)**

1) In principle, do you support the inclusion of a diversity requirement in the University's curriculum?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Some people say that the best way for students to learn about diversity is to

learn about inequalities of power and status between different persons and groups. Others say that the best way for students to learn about diversity is to learn acceptance and mutual toleration of differences.

2) Would you support a diversity requirement framed primarily in terms of power and status?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

3) Would you support a diversity requirement framed primarily in terms of difference and toleration?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

4) If you have additional comments or recommendations regarding the addition of a diversity requirement more generally or more specifically, regarding the diversity-in-the-curriculum proposal that the faculty has reviewed for the past few months, please include them here: