Faculty Senate Meeting
December 9th, 2013
McCormick Room, Library

Faculty Senate Members Present
Brad Dillman (chair), Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Haley Andres, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Mark Martin, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert.

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:01.

Announcements
Kotsis announced that the 1st annual Visual Culture Colloquium of the Northwest Five Consortium (NW5) would be held next year (October 2014). Submissions that encompass work in any discipline that examines or uses forms of visual representation are welcome. Details can be found here:
http://nw5c.org/sites/default/files/NW5C%20Visual%20Culture%20Colloquium%202014%20Info.pdf

Approval of Minutes
M/S/P to approve minutes of November 25th, 2013 as revised.

Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees
Saucedo announced that the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) had completed two charges; the 1st regarding policies for students earning two, concurrent, Baccalaureate degrees and the 2nd involving a revision of the W/WF policies. Once published in the ASC minutes, she will bring to the Senate for possible endorsement.

Buescher indicated that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) continues to work with Human Resources on the charge to review the policy of "Background Checks on Faculty." Language is being drafted to include verification of education and a background check that spans 7 years.

Sampen indicated that the University Enrichment Committee (UEC) had found clarification of their questions about two (self) charges: 1) possibility of a per diem system for food during travel and 2) providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the move to P-cards and PeopleSoft. Discussions with former and current Associate Dean Moore and Kukreja led them to conclude that the motivation for the charges is outdated. Additionally, they would like to wait for PeopleSoft to fully unfold before revisiting the charges. Senate members discussed their interest and understanding of implementing a per diem system at Universities and asked that in the year-end report, the UEC be very clear as to why they did not want to pursue the charges.

Kotsis explained that most of discussion at the last Library, Media & Information Systems (LMIS) meeting focused on PeopleSoft. Currently, there is a list of 300-400 items to attend to and faculty will receive an e-mail soon explaining progress and

priorities. She indicated that problems should be reported to the Service Desk, who will be tracking and documenting issues. Admissions and Counseling, Health & Wellness Services (CHWS) will be moving to PeopleSoft in 2014.

Chair Dillman noted that Travis Norton and William Morse would be coming to present to the Faculty Senate on Feb 10th and likely to the full faculty at a later date.

Kotsis also indicated that LMIS had considered their charge (#12) to raise the print green limit for graduate students. They decided that singling out one population of students for a larger allotment of printing would not be a good move and will instead investigate reducing printing costs.

Kotsis additionally indicated that LMIS considered the charge (#11) to eliminate due dates for faculty checkout of non-Summit materials and did not support this proposal.

Finally, Kotsis noted that LMIS continues its work with the PSC on moving to electronic administration of instructor and course evaluations and faculty evaluation files (charges #8 and 9).

Agenda Item: PSC Interpretation of Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants
Buescher indicated that the PCS had modified its interpretation of the faculty code regarding the guidelines for the use of course assistants (Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2a). The plan is to present to the Board of Trustees at their February 27th meeting (Senators discussed the time frame to ensure it would be feasible; the interpretation should be posted in the Senate notes soon after the next Senate meeting on Jan. 27th, 2014, thus easily allowing 10 days for appeals).

Buescher highlighted the modifications (the original and new interpretation is attached for comparison):

1) Addition of enforcing confidentiality: course assistants will sign non-disclosure agreements and misuse of sensitive information will be grounds for dismissal.
2) Each department must develop criteria for selection of course assistants.
3) Any grading by course assistants must be limited to objective evaluation.

Bartanen stated that the only new material is 1) defining course assistants, 2) adding a non-disclosure agreement and 3) restricting grading to objective material while the rest of the changes are rewrites. She also noted the impetus for revisiting the interpretation was from comments seen by the FAC while reviewing student evaluations of faculty files as well as the recognition that the interpretation had not been reviewed since 2002.

Sampen asked whether the Senators who used course assistants thought the changes were beneficial. Saucedo and Mifflin agreed that they were.

Saucedo asked if Chair Dillman might consider alerting faculty of the proposed changes once the Senate notes are posted. Bartanen suggested that Jimmy could highlight this when the e-mail is sent to the full faculty.

Chair Dillman indicated that while the first couple meetings in the spring are full, he is interested in getting input about topics for the Senate to take on and was hoping for time to brainstorm after the next agenda item. He reminded Senators that agenda topics need to be relayed to him before the Friday afternoon preceding Monday Senate meetings.

Agenda Item: Motion to Investigate Ways to Facilitate Inclusive Faculty Deliberation and Involvement in Decision-Making

Kessel made the following motion (developed by both Kessel and Tubert):

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 position; 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.

Sampen seconded the motion and much discussion followed.

Kessel revealed that the rationale behind the motion was to follow up on lessons that might have been learned over the past couple months in relation to communications surrounding diversity in the curriculum. There was concern that the listserv perhaps had a silencing effect, that a common hour could enable a more intentional conversation.

Sampen asked for clarification about restructuring the Senate as representative rather than at-large. Kessel offered ways of spreading representation: departments, buildings, or "ways of knowing" approaches.

Tubert added that Senators could act as liaisons to specific departments across campus.

Chair Dillman asked how would the Senate follow through on this motion.

Kotsis reminded that the ASC had already been charged to investigate the feasibility of a common hour. Data from the Registrar's office regarding teaching schedules is still en route (buried under PeopleSoft issues). Kessel reported that department chairs had not found the idea of a common hour as important; can the Senate make a case for why it is? The alternative of electronic voting could disincentivize attendance at faculty meetings.

Sampen suggested that departments could have representatives dedicated to attending the meetings. Kessel felt this could be better done via a representative Senate.

Buescher supported the idea of moving forward on the motion and wondered how we increase access to deliberation, not simply voting. He stated a preference for variations on which day/hour faculty meetings are held. He also suggested the creation of additional spaces for faculty deliberations.

Kessel wondered how we could change the tone of the Faculty Governance Listserv; would it help if Senate members modeled inclusive and productive Listserv conversations?

Buescher noted the interplay between structural and cultural exchanges. Other spaces such as Trimble Forum, Wednesdays at 4 would allow multiple mechanisms to address topics.

Bartanen pointed out that discussion boards could be set up on SoundNet but that faculty would have to "go there" to participate.

Kotsis emphasized her support for a common hour to be set aside 2-3 times a semester that she feels would significantly increase participation. It would be a forum that has not existed before. She expressed her disappointment in the faculty governance listserv and her own inclination to not participate. She wondered if guiding principles could be set and by whom? And would that counter free speech? She echoed the need for other forms of communication for faculty-wide discussions.

Kessel floated the idea of canceling a couple classes to accommodate 2 of the 3 meetings that are held during the semester (with a 3rd held during reading period/ finals week) as an option to schedule around a common hour for the entire semester.

Tubert suggested that in that proposed scenario, the University should instead cancel classes.

Bartanen pointed to aiming to schedule meetings during "short" weeks of the semester (1st/last weeks, fall break etc…) since many labs (which often last until 5pm) are not held those weeks. She also noted that faculty set their schedules.

Tubert voiced that the current scheduling of Tuesday/Thursday class times makes it challenging to keep 4pm open.

Sampen indicated that she thinks a requirement for attendance will be needed. Kessel asked how can we change the culture.

Martin wondered if "bribery" was an option. He cited the bonus check that was just announced by Ron Thomas and how pizza worked to gather graduate students.

Chair Dillman stated that he saw it as unfair that meetings are held when faculty are scheduled to teach. Also, that we should think of including staff and students in conversations of faculty governance, especially if committee work is being discussed.

Kessel noted that the faculty governance listserv is currently includes all voting members of faculty, though you can opt out.

Sampen described the motion as awesome. Although she doesn't think a common hour alone will ramp up participation, she likes creating addition options for faculty conversations.

Kessel indicated her want to find an institutional way to change the culture. She worries that faculty governance is eroding. Can the Senate think creatively to foster cultural change? We can't require attendance at faculty meetings without a common hour.

Sampen suggested that we could require departmental representation though and that maybe once that started it would self-sustain. She cited the experience of making studio attendance mandatory for students. Her feeling that it is now so engrained in the departmental culture that students would go even without the requirement.

Kessel thought that requiring a departmental liaison would reduce participation by other members of the department.

Buescher relayed his feelings that current, informal discussion is dysfunctional and needs better guidance. He recommended that committee chairs could host brown bags luncheons, that lots of different time slots should be used and that we could create these scenarios.

Kotsis highlighted the value in some consistency of time, stating that Wednesday at 4 works because it is a constant.

Kessel stressed that when we create informal spaces, how do we keep less protected members of the faculty feeling safe? She noted this was a motivation behind an earlier motion for a Senate-sponsored straw poll for the faculty regarding the diversity in the curriculum requirement.

M/S/P to approve the motion.

Adjourned at 5:24.
Submitted by Leslie Saucedo

Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, a. Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants (Report to Faculty Senate 5 May 1986): <mark>Current</mark> The responsibility for teaching and instruction at the University of Puget Sound resides with the faculty members. The university recognizes, however, that in special cases it is appropriate or necessary to utilize the services of students as course assistants. Course assistants do not replace full or part time faculty. Rather they extend and augment the ability of a faculty member to fulfill the objectives of a particular class. The use of course assistants in no way reduces, replaces, or eliminates the authority or responsibility a faculty member has for a course as specified in the Faculty Code. Duties and Responsibilities of Course Assistants Specific activities for course assistants will of necessity vary (from department to department and from course to course). Each department must develop a clear statement for each course concerning the use of course assistants. The statement should discuss, at least, the following: (1) faculty supervision, (2) the role of course assistants in the classroom or laboratory, (3) the specific tasks assigned to course assistants, (4) the degree and type of interaction between the course assistants and students, (5) the role of course assistants in grading and evaluating student work, (6) the expected number of hours of work, and (7) the method of evaluating performance. This statement should be made available to all prospective course assistants and reviewed specifically with all course assistants at the beginning of their employment. Supervision and Responsibility of Course Assistants Each course assistant must be under the direct guidance and supervision of a faculty member. Unless there are unusual circumstances, the supervising faculty member should be the person responsible for the course in which the course assistant is employed. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to see that the course assistant successfully fulfills the requirements of the job. The	**Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, a. Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants (Report to Faculty Senate December 4, 2013): Current** Definition of Course Assistants Course Assistants are either paid employees of the university or students receiving compensation in a different form for their assistance in coursework. Responsibilities The responsibility for teaching and instruction at the University of Puget Sound resides with the faculty members. The university recognizes, however, that in special cases it is appropriate or necessary to utilize the services of students as course assistants. Course assistants do not replace full or part time faculty. Rather they extend and augment the ability of a faculty member to fulfill the objectives of a particular class. The use of course assistants in no way reduces, replaces, or eliminates the authority or responsibility a faculty member has for a course as specified in the Faculty Code. Requirements for Departmental Guidelines for Course Assistants Specific activities for course assistants will of necessity vary (from department to department and from course to course). Each department must develop a clear statement for each course concerning the use of course assistants. The statement should discuss, at least, the following: (1) faculty supervision, (2) the role of course assistants in the classroom or laboratory, (3) the specific tasks assigned to course assistants, (4) the degree and type of interaction between the course assistants and students, (5) the role of course assistants in grading and evaluating student work, (6) the expected number of hours of work, and (7) the method of evaluating performance of the CA; (8) how confidentiality of sensitive material is ensured (in some cases course assistants will have access to confidential information e.g., grades, performance records, or evaluations about the students enrolled in the class. The department and the supervisor must make every effort to restrict course assistants' access to such information to a minimum. Course assistants must be made aware of the sensitive nature of such information and should be

supervisor will meet in a timely fashion with the course assistant to develop appropriate material for the course and to assess the course assistant's performance.

The supervisor, or faculty member responsible for the course, should inform the students enrolled in the course about the role and duties of each course assistant. Students should also be informed that they have the right to appeal decisions made by any course assistant to the faculty member or supervisor.

Confidentiality of Sensitive Material

In some cases course assistants will have access to confidential information (e.g., grades, performance records, or evaluations) about the students enrolled in the class. It is normally inadvisable for one student to obtain confidential information about another student. Thus, the department and the supervisor must make every effort to restrict course assistants' access to such information to a minimum. Course assistants must be made aware of the sensitive nature of this information and directed to treat it in the strictest of confidence. Abuse of this privilege should be grounds for dismissal of a course assistant from employment.

Selection of Course Assistants

Each department must develop a procedure for selecting course assistants which is consistent with both the needs of the department and with the prevailing regulations and rules applicable to equal employment. Selection criteria should correspond to the departmental statements about the duties and responsibilities of the course assistant position. The primary concern of the department in selecting course assistants must be the ability of individuals to perform satisfactorily the expected functions of a course assistant. To the extent possible, departments should select students who qualify for university

required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Abuse of this privilege should be grounds for dismissal of a course assistant from employment.); and (9) the process of selection of course assistants (Each department must develop a procedure for selecting course assistants which is consistent with both the needs of the department and with the prevailing regulations and rules applicable to equal employment. Selection criteria should correspond to the departmental statements about the duties and responsibilities of the course assistant position. The primary concern of the department in selecting course assistants must be the ability of individuals to perform satisfactorily the expected functions of a course assistant. To the extent possible, departments should select students who qualify for university matching funds under existing work-study programs. Applications for positions should be solicited from all qualified students. Notification to both selected individuals and unsuccessful applicants should be in writing. The department should ensure that each selection is based on rational criteria and procedures so that they are not perceived as arbitrary or capricious. The department should be willing to discuss its decisions with unsuccessful applicants. After the selection process is completed the department is responsible for working with the university's Office of Student Employment to execute the appropriate documents as applicable).

This statement should be made available to all prospective course assistants and reviewed specifically with all course assistants at the beginning of their employment.

Supervision and Responsibility of Course Assistants
Each course assistant must be under the direct guidance and supervision of a faculty member. All course assistant duties with respect to grading must be limited to objective evaluation. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to see that the course assistant successfully fulfills the requirements of the job. The supervisor will meet in a timely fashion with the course assistant to develop appropriate material for the course and to assess the course assistant's performance.

The supervisor, or faculty member responsible for the course, should inform the students enrolled in the course about the role and duties of each course assistant. Students should also be informed that they have the right to appeal

matching funds under existing work-study programs. Applications for positions should be solicited from all qualified students. Notification to both selected individuals and unsuccessful applicants should be in writing. The department should ensure that each selection is based on rational criteria and procedures so that they are not perceived as arbitrary or capricious. The department should be willing to discuss its decisions with unsuccessful applicants. After the selection process is completed the department is responsible for working with the university's Office of Student Employment to execute the appropriate documents.

Role of Professional Standards Committee

Since course assistants perform some of the activities and have some of the responsibilities of faculty members, it is in the interest of the university to monitor their use. Thus, each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document which explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants. The committee will review this document and determine whether it is appropriate. When the department obtains committee approval it may then employ course assistants in accordance with these procedures and the departmental document.

decisions made by any course assistant to the faculty member or supervisor.

Role of Professional Standards Committee
Since course assistants perform some of the activities and have some of the responsibilities of faculty members, it is in the interest of the university to monitor their use. Thus, each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document which explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants and which should be regularly reviewed by the PSC The committee will review any revised departmental statement and determine whether it is appropriate. When the department obtains committee approval it may then employ course assistants in accordance with these procedures and the departmental document. Current departmental statement regarding the use of the CA stay in effect until a revised version is requested by the PSC.