

**Faculty Senate Meeting
September 22, 2014
McCormick Room, Library**

Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

Present: Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Paige Maney, Bill Haltom, Shirley Skeel, Andrew Gardner, Ariela Tubert, Brendan Lanctot, Judith Kay, Nila Wiese, Maria Sampen, Derek Buescher, Zaixin Hong, Kris Bartanen, Chris Spalding, Emelie Peine

Announcements:

Bartanen notes that the Race and Pedagogy conference begins on campus this week. Stockdale asks where the tickets for the keynote address must be obtained separately. Kay responds that there are three ways to obtain tickets or register, and that registration available to faculty includes admittance to all events. Stockdale notes that there is some discrepancy in regards to where tickets and registration are obtained.

Tubert notes that the faculty meeting is tomorrow, and that we need to elect a faculty secretary. She advises faculty senators to discuss this post with our departments and seek candidates for nomination prior to the meeting.

Tubert notes that the next meeting of the Faculty Senate will also consist of reviewing Senate charges to the committees. There is still some room on the agenda for October, and Senators should suggest items for the agenda.

Skeel announces that the University has developed a new commitment to meet full financial need for Tacoma Public School students admitted to Puget Sound, effective Fall 2015.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the September 8 Senate meeting are discussed. Stockdale notes that the time indicated for the meeting's conclusion should be changed from 4:26 to 5:26. Buescher seeks some clarification on the wording concerning the units required for majors in academic departments. Stockdale suggests rephrasing comments regarding the issues discussed regarding the Curriculum Committee and its charges, as he doesn't recall his comments concerning the working group sounding judgmental. Buescher suggests altering the phrase in the minutes to "a campus discussion about ..." Wiese notes that there appears to be a word missing in this section of the notes. After some discussion, the Senate settles on the phrasing "the working group communicated directly with a campus program. This communication created some campus discussion."

Tubert leads a short, additional discussion of the draft charge regarding the internal structure of the Curriculum Committee.

M/S/P to accept the minutes of September 8, 2014 as revised.

Liaison Updates:

Tubert requests updates from the Senate Liaisons.

LMIS elected James Bernhard as chair.

SLC elected Brad Reich as chair.

CoD elected George Tomlin as chair.

PSC elected Tiffany MacBain as chair.

UEC elected Dawn Padula as chair.

Curriculum Committee elected Sara Freeman as chair.

IRB elected Kirsten Wilbur as chair, with Tim Beyer as co-chair for the Fall semester

Discussion of Charges to the Student Life Committee

Draft charges for the Student Life Committee were reviewed. Regarding draft charge #1, which concerns increasing faculty awareness of sexual assault issues on campus, it is noted that it is a continuation of last year's work. Charge #2, which regards the appointment of an SLC member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC), is also read. Haltom questions the word "viability" in draft charge #2. He suggests the words *practicality* or perhaps *advisability* instead. Bartanen notes that this is not a substantive change. Buescher notes that we should clarify who is to report back. Wiese suggests stating that "the faculty representative" should then report back to the full committee. Tubert asks if we can omit the charge related to expanding the number of reporting officers. It is agreed to omit this part of the charge as it is a separate issue.

Wiese suggests that we should strengthen the rationale for charge #2. She notes that when she convened the first SLC meeting and shared the draft charges, some committee members expressed concern about whether this charge fell under their responsibilities, and whether it would overburden the committee. Maney looks up the SGVC's meeting schedule and confirms that the committee meets twice a semester; thus the time commitment should be manageable.

Bartanen notes that the Faculty Bylaws clearly articulate that SLC members serve as a pool from which to draw participation on student affairs ad hoc committees. Tubert notes that Dean Benitez asked for faculty representation on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) and that along with the CoD, the SLC is a logical group from which to request that representation.

Wiese reads charge #3 [charge, as drafted, to identify initiatives or mechanisms for enriching (1) the academic component integrated into the first year experience (e.g. Prelude); and (2) the intellectual life on campus (i.e., outside the classroom).] She notes that the issues mentioned in the charge are of interest to both students and faculty. Saucedo asks whether the First Year Task Force is distinct and separate from this. Bartanen notes that the First Year Task Force completed its report and is therefore done. Wiese clarified that this charge did not necessarily imply participation in a task force or committee, but it was intended as a way to allow faculty to remain engaged in these conversations and initiatives.

Wiese reads charge #4 (asking the SLC to conduct a self-evaluation of their current responsibilities and charges and make recommendations to the Senate about needed changes). This charge is in direct response to the desire expressed by the committee's chair at the end-of-year report presentation last spring to engage in more meaningful and relevant work. A question was asked about whether this charge was in lieu of the charge approved for all committees regarding monitoring of size and superfluous work. Wiese responds that it can be. The Senate chooses to keep Charge #4 in addition to Charge #5. Kay moves to approve charges as amended.

M/S/P to accept the charges as amended.

Discussion of Charges to the Committee on Diversity

Kay presents the first draft charge for the Committee on Diversity about reviewing department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments. Stockdale notes that there was lots of discussion between the Curriculum Committee and the Committee on Diversity regarding Question 6 on the department self-study guide, but the Curriculum Committee decided not to change the question. Are we therefore asking the Committee on Diversity to jump back into the fray? Saucedo notes that question 6 was already changed. Bartanen notes that the Committee on Diversity wanted a different change than the one the Curriculum Committee made to question 6. Stockdale asks again whether we are asking the Committee on Diversity to go back and revisit this issue, and asks whether we should add "2014-2015" to ensure our intentions are clear. Tubert asks whether we should also clarify if we are asking that an additional charge be proposed for the Curriculum Committee. Or perhaps we could be more general, and use the charge to ask the Committee on Diversity to "provide feedback to the Curriculum Committee regarding the effectiveness of question 6 in eliciting the desired information."

Kay reviews draft charge #2 about examining the distribution of approved KNOW courses among departments, disciplines, and cores, and notes that aside from ascertaining how many KNOW courses were approved by the Curriculum Committee, the Senate and faculty needed an overall picture of how the KNOW courses were distributed within the curriculum. Buescher asks about the term "meta-analysis." Kay adds that it was thought, for instance, that the KNOW course load might fall heavier on the humanities, and notes that this charge indicated a desire for more useful information than just the number of approved courses. But perhaps "meta-analysis" is too strong of a term. Haltom suggests clarification — perhaps "provide an analysis of the distribution of the KNOW courses."

Kay reads draft charge #3 about the work of the diversity liaisons for hiring. It is noted that "liaison" should be plural here. Bartanen clarifies that the Academic Dean's Office collected follow-up information, not separate information. Stockdale says that it looks like the task as it is stated here is to analyze, and that that should be clarified.

Kay reads draft charge #4 about hiring and retention data, and adds that this committee self-charge was difficult to interpret. Bartanen asks whether we could potentially roll this charge into draft charge #3. Kay notes that hiring and retention data over-aggregate, and that from what she understands there is a desire for disaggregated data. Haltom asks whether we should change the

charge to say that the Committee on Diversity “should see if” the data could be disaggregated in the way that the committee desires. That formulation is restated: “Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, their intersections, and any other categories to see if the data might be disaggregated in more revealing ways.” Kay notes that the rationale therefore also needs to be reworded.

Kay reads draft charge #5 about appointing a Committee on Diversity faculty member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) and with that group assess the advisability of expanding the number of faculty Harassment Reporting Officers (HROs). The charge for the CoD should use the same wording developed for the Student Life Committee. Kay notes that one CoD member usually serves on BHERT (the Bias and Hate Education Response Team). Dean of Diversity Michael Benitez requested two faculty from CoD to serve on the Diversity Advisory Council as well as one faculty for the SGVC. Thus, four of the CoD faculty committee members serve on other committees.

[Peine arrives]

Kay reads draft charge #6 about the size and work of the committee. Wiese questions why this charge was modified from the original senate charge to focus only on work that could be done by administrative units. The wording of the original senate charge was reinstated.

M/S/P to accept the charges as amended.

Discussion of Charges to the International Education Committee

Peine reads draft charge #1, which concerns the IEC and University’s capacity to ascertain risk of sexual violence in study abroad programs. The IEC has asked for guidance as to what to do about programs that don’t report any information on sexual violence. The Senate is charging the IEC with the task of figuring out how to evaluate programs that fail to report information on sexual violence. Saucedo asks if this is true of only a handful of programs, or if this is the case for most of them. Peine notes that the IEC is basically looking for guidance from the Senate, but the Senate feels that the IEC is better positioned to suggest a protocol on this matter.

Kay asks if, with section C of the draft charge #1, we can clarify by adding “provided to students” to ensure that students are informed about potential risks associated with a particular program. Bartanen notes that our support for programs might be altered according to what sort of support system they have in place.

Maney notes that international education is a big issue with president Obama.

Peine questions how this charge will exactly work, and particularly section B, with the question of how to manage this evaluation. Buescher suggests adding the phrase “determine a process for communicating this information to students.” He adds that section C of charge #1 should explicitly direct the IEC to formulate a reporting process. Peine asks if we can continue altering this draft charge to focus on communicating this information to students. Maney adds that this information and these evaluations (or lack thereof) need to be visible to students. Bartanen

suggests that we approve the charge as amended and then let Senator Peine report back on this issue.

Saucedo and Buescher discuss section C of draft charge #1. Buescher notes that assessing information is different from actually reporting it to students. Kay asks if we ought to remove “Puget Sound” from section C of the draft charge for clarity. Peine summarizes the proposed revision as “reporting procedures for each study abroad program,” and continues discussing the phrasing of revisions by suggesting the phrasing “how to manage programs” instead of “whether” to manage them, and for section D, “an incident of sexual violence.”

Peine reads draft charge #2, which concerns the IEC’s ongoing task of reviewing approved study abroad programs. No discussion ensues.

Peine reads draft charge #3, which concerns the development of short-term study abroad programs. It is suggested that the phrase “is resolved” be removed, and it is noted in the rationale that the task described in section B of charge #3 cannot be undertaken until the task in section A is addressed. Skeel notes that Professor Barkin has a model for this sort of study abroad program. Bartanen clarifies that Barkin has developed an example, not a model yet. Bartanen adds that it is not the IEC’s responsibility to develop or adopt a financial model, but they could certainly provide input regarding a financial model. Stockdale wonders if this committee is the appropriate recipient for a charge concerning the financial model of these programs. Bartanen notes that International Programs, the Associate Deans, and colleagues in Finance are working toward this development. Peine questions whether the “financial” aspect of this charge is really a separate, and perhaps inappropriate, task. Wiese wonders if we should add the phrase “in collaboration with” to section B of charge #3. Stockdale asks if the IEC has anything to contribute to determining a “financial model.” Are we charging them to enter a conversation where they have no voice? Bartanen suggests the phrasing “develop a template for proposing ...” Peine suggests the charge should clarify that the IEC is encouraged to participate in financial discussions.

Peine reads draft charge #4, which concerns lagging campus enrollment of international students, and notes that the IEC sent the rationale for this self-charge. Haltom suggests striking everything after the first sentence. Bartanen notes that Jenny Rickard has been working on international student recruitment, so maybe the charge is outdated. Lanctot wonders if the faculty need to be alerted here. Tubert questions whether the IEC actually has any say in this matter. Haltom notes that anything can be placed on the docket of a faculty meeting.

M/S/P to accept charges 1, 2, and 3, as amended.

The meeting concluded at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Andrew Gardner

Addendum A: Faculty Senate Charges for the Student Life Committee (SLC) - 2014-15
(Approved on 9/22/14)

- 1. Identify initiatives to increase faculty awareness regarding sexual assault issues on campus and faculty's reporting obligations.**

Rationale: This is an area where the concerns of students and faculty intersect. Therefore, the Senate would like the SLC to actively engage in this conversation and to identify specific ways in which the faculty can be made more aware of this issue as it impacts the campus community, as well as the faculty's reporting responsibilities (See related charge 2 below).

- 2. Appoint a Student Life Committee member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC). The SLC faculty representative to the SGVC will report back to the full Student Life Committee with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty.**

Rationale: Dean Benitez recently convened the SGVC and approached the Senate to request faculty representation on the SGVC. The Senate would like to see such faculty representation emerge from the current governance structure and thus is asking the Committee on Diversity and the Student Life Committee to each appoint a member from their committees to the SGVC. This faculty member should then keep his/her full committee (and the Senate) informed of any recommendations or actions that impact the work of the faculty. (A brief description of the SGVC's mission and purpose is attached to these charges). This charge is in line with the Faculty Bylaws describing the SLC's standing charges (Article V Sec.6.F.b).

- 3. To identify initiatives or mechanisms for enriching (1) the academic component integrated into the first year experience (e.g., Prelude); and (2) the intellectual life on campus (i.e., outside the classroom).**

Rationale: As conversations continue regarding both the structure and content of the first year experience and the need for enhanced intellectual engagement on campus, the Student Life Committee is in an ideal position to capture the concerns and perspectives of students and faculty on these two areas. We expect the SLC to collaborate with relevant parties and working groups on campus, and report back to the Senate throughout the year on any initiatives or changes that might impact the work of the faculty.

- 4. Conduct a self-evaluation of the SLC's standing charges and current responsibilities, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes that would enhance the**

efficiency and relevance of the work conducted by the committee (including ASUPS liaison functions and other potential advisory roles).

Rationale: The 2013-14 end-of-year report presented by the SLC to the Senate indicated the committee was seeking to make their work more relevant and meaningful. The Senate values faculty time devoted to service in governance positions, and thus, agrees with the committee that its work should be worth pursuing. Conducting a self-assessment will allow the Senate to have more detailed information and recommendations from the committee to make decisions regarding the role and functions of the SLC for the future.

- 5. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.**

Rationale: The Faculty Senate is gathering information on all standing committees' size and activities. This charge was approved for all committees at the Senate meeting on September 8, 2014.

Proposed Faculty Senate Charges to the Committee on Diversity (CoD)
Prepared by Judith Kay, Brendan Lanctot, and Nila Wiese

1. Review department responses to Question 6 written during five-year curriculum assessments (available from Curriculum Committee) in order to evaluate how well the new language elicits useful information on diversity in the curriculum. Propose revisions to Question 6 if warranted;

[Rationale: Members of the CoD met with the Curriculum Committee last year to discuss the CC's action to change Question 6. The CoD's self-charge stated: "Collaborate with the Curriculum Committee to consider strategies for supporting and reviewing department responses to Question 6." Senate members thought the charge should be reworded to identify clear tasks for the CoD.]

2. By the end of spring semester provide a meta-analysis to the Faculty Senate and Curriculum Committee of the distribution of approved KNOW courses among departments, disciplines, and cores. If there appears to be an insufficiency of KNOW courses based on the target goal for the first year, informally encourage colleagues, in collaboration with the Office of the Associate Deans, to submit KNOW proposals;

[Rationale: The CoD's self-charge stated: "Support implementation of the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) proposal." Senate members thought that the CC would not conduct such a meta-analysis and that the charge should be reworded to identify clear tasks for the CoD. It is assumed that the Office of the Associate Deans will have most of the needed data.]

3. Make recommendations to support better the work of the diversity liaison for hiring based on feedback solicited last year (from search chairs, diversity liaisons and responses secured by the Academic Dean) as well as from 2014-15 interviews with faculty of color about their hiring and retention experiences);

[Rationale: Last year the CoD developed post-search follow-up questions for search chairs and diversity liaisons. Dean Bartanen also solicited responses. These now need to be assessed. It is recommended that interviews be added to the data to be reviewed.]

4. Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, and their intersections, and work with the Academic Vice President and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer to obtain data on subcategories of faculty of color (e.g., disaggregating by race and international affiliation);

[Rationale: This wording is directly from the CoD's self-charge.]

5. Appoint a committee member to serve on the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) and with that group assess the viability of expanding the number of faculty Harassment Reporting Officers (HROs). Report back to the full CoD with any specific recommendations of relevance to the faculty;

[Rationale: The CoD did not discuss a similar charge last year because the new SGVC was charged with making recommendations about HRO selection and role. The self-charge stated: "Continue to collaborate with the Chief Diversity Officer in the development of the sexual assault committee structure and accessibility of HRO's."]

6. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in the end-of-year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that might be handled better by administrative units.

[Rationale: As requested by the Senate]

Extra notes for the Committee:

The CoD is encouraged to undertake the following as part of its standing bylaw charge #5.

- Host discussions about student letters that speak to classroom and campus climate.

The CoD is encouraged to undertake the following as part of its standing bylaw charge #2.

- Support the 2014 Race and Pedagogy National Conference.

Senate charges to the International Education Committee 2014-2015:

1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence,

- a. Continue to develop a protocol for reviewing study abroad programs that do not collect or report information regarding sexual violence;
- b. Determine how to manage programs that do not report having student support services and response protocols for student safety in place;
- c. Continue to assess the efficacy of safety information provided to students before they study abroad, including sexual violence support and reporting procedures for each study abroad program;
- d. The efficacy of Puget Sound reporting and response processes should an incident of sexual violence occur.

[Rationale: The IEC reported that this work is ongoing, and therefore constitutes a continuing charge. The Senate determined that it is the role of the Committee to determine the proper procedure for evaluating programs that do not provide information on sexual assault.]

2. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate expensive programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g., language, discipline, or geography.)

[Rationale: the Committee reported that this work was unfinished in 2013-2014]

3. With respect to short-term study abroad programs,

- a. Develop a template for proposing, organizing, and leading short-term study abroad programs.

[Rationale: the Committee reported that this work is ongoing and so constitutes a continuing charge.]