

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 10th, 2014
McCormick Room, Library

Faculty Senate Members Present

Haley Andres, Brad Dillman (chair), Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Andrew Gardner, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Andrea Kueter, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

Guests

William Morse, Travis Nation, Amy Ryken.

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

Announcements

Andres called attention to the performance of the Vagina Monologues at 7pm. Wiese announced that there will be a Women and Leadership panel on 2/19 at 6:30pm.

Approval of Minutes

M/S/P to approve minutes of January 27th, 2014 as revised.

Agenda Item: People Soft Update

William Morse and Travis Nation gave a report on the current status of the PeopleSoft project.

Morse indicated that he was aware that the transition to PeopleSoft has been difficult for everyone, both for the community using the software and for those who are implementing it. He pointed out that we are not where we want to be (or where we will be) but he expressed confidence that we will get there. He said that we are finished with the implementation phase but that this is not the end of the project as there is a lot of work being done and still to come in order to complete the transition. He made an analogy to a house that once it's built can be occupied but it is not comfortable yet – he acknowledged that PeopleSoft is functional but not comfortable. He emphasized that no organization takes on a project of this magnitude unless it has to and that we had to transition out of Cascade given that the underlying technology used by Cascade is nearing the end of life and it's missing a lot of core capabilities.

Nation gave an update on the current state of the project. He highlighted the project management office website: www.pugetsound.edu/pmo. This website contains the list of current projects, their current status, and the projected date to go live. The projects are broken down by system (Human Resources, Financials, etc.), and technology services uses the Agile methodology to schedule their completion (they are broken down in 6 weeks segments, or sprints, even though some projects can take

multiple segments.) From that website, one can access the sprint schedule and find out when each project will be completed. Nation noted that each sprint includes a design, development, testing, and production phase and that having the work divided in sprints allows everyone to plan ahead and see when things will be ready. They currently have around 400 PeopleSoft related outstanding projects, involving a total of more than two thousand tasks. Some of these projects will be completed by the Puget Sound technology team but others will be referred to consultants or to Oracle. He mentioned, for example, that together with other schools, they were able to leverage Oracle to promise an update in 2013 that will allow searches by the faculty preferred name as opposed to just the legal name. He acknowledged that creating reports, for example, is difficult at this time but their list includes making these features more user friendly. With an eye to making the system more user friendly, he indicated that the “my Puget sound” portal should be coming out this summer. Some advantages of the portal are: the user will login one time (not to the Campus and HR systems separately, for example); there will be links to particular menu items, like “my benefits;” there will be links to outside news sources (like yahoo) and to campus news; the portal will allow for some customization and this could include workspaces or discussion boards, a link to the HR system or to the Campus system, a list of things waiting for approval, or a list of advisees, for some examples. Morse and Nation said that having a centralized, user-friendly home screen providing a unified access point for all the systems will greatly improve the experience with People Soft for most users.

Buscher asked if once we have access to the portal, we will still have to deal with the several PeopleSoft menus for approving something, for example. Nation said that although the portal will cut some of the steps, there will still be some navigation within PeopleSoft that can't be avoided for the time being. Sampen asked if information regarding student recruiting will go on the portal. Nation said that admissions is moving to PeopleSoft in the fall although it may take a while for all the information to show up there. Nation and Morse mentioned that Cascade will not go away for now since we would want to keep the data that is found there around for a while but they thought that within a year or so, the vast majority of people will not need to go to Cascade for anything.

Wiese suggested adding to PeopleSoft a “Chair Center” in addition to the currently available advisor and faculty centers so as to be able to look at lists of majors and advisors within a department. Nation mentioned that the capability to select advisors and change majors will be developed soon and should be coming out this fall. Once that is done, the information will be available in the system and will make the search for majors and advisor load information more easily available. Bartanen clarified that as chair, you need to be able to see how many advisees other faculty in your department or program have, so perhaps there is a need to adjust the security so as to allow for chairs to access the relevant information. Wiese also mentioned that coming up with lists of majors requires building a query and it is too complicated for chairs to do regularly. Nation mentioned that the new reporting tools that they are exploring would be helpful in that regard. Buescher also expressed the need for a

“Chair Center” that allows for easier access to the information required by chairs. Tubert asked whether the discussion board feature will be available in the fall together with the portal as it could be useful for committees or to replace the governance listserv. Morse said that probably not in the fall but that it is likely to come around in the near future as it provides some nice features but that right now the focus is on minimal functionality.

Saucedo asked whether we could have built our own system. Morse replied that it would have been very costly and would take a long time as it would require reinventing things that people are already doing in other places (he emphasized that the security aspects, for example, are very complex.) Morse said that very few schools have attempted to build their own system and that pretty much only big state schools are able to do it. He mentioned that the technology used by Cascade is not well supported any more and does not allow for customization while PeopleSoft is supported by Oracle which allows for customization both in house and by Oracle. Saucedo asked if they had considered removing the shopping carts. Morse replied that students love it. Saucedo and others wondered about changing the name of the shopping cart so as to break the association with purchasing a class. Morse indicated that the shopping cart feature allows for running analytics on what courses students want and how often they get the courses they would like to take.

Nation emphasized that he appreciates feedback from faculty as to what still needs work. Many of the projects are already on the list but others may not be and they may be small fixes that could be done quickly. He also encouraged faculty to look at the sprint schedule and to advise if there are certain projects that are especially urgent. Questions or requests can be directed to Travis Nation or to the Service Desk.

Agenda Item: Consideration of Know Proposal

Ryken reported on the discussion of the Know rubric at the previous full faculty meeting. She said that the main motion on the floor was substituted with the revised proposal. She indicated that the new rubric provides for a requirement that is not as distinctive as the original one. The motion will be discussed again at the next faculty on March 25th and perhaps there will be a vote at that meeting. She met with the ASUPS senators and was impressed with their substantive questions and thoughtful discussion.

Kessel noted that the conversation at the faculty meeting was all about implementation and details and she appreciated the request at the end of the meeting to move to a more general discussion of the reasons for the requirement. She wondered how much does it matter what the exact language in the proposal is given that the curriculum committee will be the one interpreting it. Tubert noted that this is an interesting general question about how written rules relate to practice but that if one takes it too seriously then one could not pass any rules because everything will be interpreted by those putting them in practice. Stockdale spoke in support of Tubert’s point and said that it seems to be a general issue not particular to the

diversity proposal. Gardner asked why we are proposing a new requirement as opposed to reorienting the core as a whole. Ryken responded that the COD was charged with looking at the possibility of a diversity requirement but not with revising the whole core. She also noted that revising the whole core will take a longtime but that in the meantime students could already be taking courses in the new requirement.

Gardner indicated that almost all the courses taught by the SOAN department already deal with the issues highlighted in the proposal. Stockdale said that there may be other courses developed, outside the SOAN courses, like courses satisfying the humanistic approaches core or even outside of the core. Tubert mentioned that not all courses meeting the social sciences core will meet this requirement even if all the SOAN courses do. So even if all SOAN courses end up meeting the new requirement and many SOAN courses satisfy the social science core, not all students take the SOAN courses to satisfy the social science core so the new requirement will still have an effect on the courses that many students take. In support of that point, Kessel mentioned that most Politics and Government courses do not meet this requirement. The part of the rubric requiring that the courses deal with issues of identity and that they involve personal engagement means that two courses with very similar reading lists could differ as to whether they meet or not meet the new requirement. Dillman mentioned that, if the requirement passes, the curriculum committee should be proactive and provide further information as to what is needed for a course to meet the requirement.

Kotsis mentioned that she appreciates the revisions in response to faculty feedback and that the new version is more implementable than the previous one. Kessel asked if the Burlington Group encourages suggestions to change the wording either at the faculty meeting or before. Ryken said that they have worked really hard on the proposal and they are happy to see suggestions for improving the proposal. She thought the faculty can amend the motion at the faculty meeting as needed so as to improve the wording. Stockdale asked if there is a way to emphasize the diversity component a bit more. He asked if a course on capitalism, for example, would fit the rubric. He suggested perhaps adding a more concrete list mentioning diversity and inclusion to give students and faculty a better sense of what the requirement is about. Ryken mentioned that the ASUPS students that she met with were clear on what the proposal was. She also said that the group considered adding the university definition of diversity to the proposal but not everyone was happy with that idea since there may be a category that is not on the university list that faculty may want to take into account in their teaching. They also considered using the word "diversity" but it is not helpful because it is too vague. She thought that suggestions of that sort could be brought on through amendment at the faculty meeting.

A short discussion ensued as to how a course on capitalism for example, could meet or not meet the rubric, depending on how it was designed and delivered.

Kessel emphasized that “Part 2.b” helps to assess whether a course would meet the rubric or not. Buescher asked whether the interpretation of 2.b. should mention particular categories, and whether the language “consider linkages” is strong enough.

Buescher moved that the Senate endorse the rubric as presented at the full faculty meeting of February 3.

M/S/P

Other business

Tubert presented a draft of the faculty governance survey and indicated that Ellen Peters in Institutional Research was planning for an early March roll out of the survey. The survey will have the look of the HERI survey that was just conducted. The draft is focused on attendance and involvement at faculty meetings, on the use of the faculty governance listserv, and other participation in faculty governance. Tubert mentioned that one thing considered but not included in the draft is the possibility of electronic voting by the faculty but suggestions to include that as well as other issues related to governance are welcome.

Saucedo suggested creating a more general question about ways to improve faculty governance. Kotsis suggested that the question, “in which ways do you enjoy participating in faculty governance?” gets to the same issues. But perhaps it could be rephrased as “in which ways to find contribution rewarding?” Wiese asked to see a question about increasing the level of civility in governance, as there is sometimes lack of respect on the listserv. She suggested that we ask about how to improve the level of intellectual engagement. Kessel suggested changing the categories in the question that asks “in which ways in the faculty listserv valuable?” by adding to the chart words like “civil” or “inclusive” or “intellectually valuable.”

Kessel mentioned that we list the senate standing committees and that we should include the Faculty Salary Committee even though it is not a standing committee of the senate. She also mentioned that there is a difference between service and governance and we don’t want people responding to the survey to collapse these two items. Tubert asked if she was suggesting an additional question about service or some kind of clarification. Kessel responded that it is a matter defining faculty governance as different from service and making clear that this is what the survey is about. Dillman suggested we define what we mean by governance and Wiese echoed Dillman. Kessel suggested that the list in the first question was leaving things off that are part of faculty governance. Dillman mentioned that the senate should vote on the final version of the survey before it is implemented.

Meeting adjourned at 5:32pm.

Respectfully submitted by Ariela Tubert.