

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the February 9, 2015 meeting

Present:

Kris Bartanen, Bill Haltom, Bill Beardsley, Paige Maney, Nila Wiese, Pierre Ly, Ariela Tubert, Jonathan Stockdale, Derek Buescher, Andrea Kueter, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Emelie Peine

Meeting called to order at 4:04pm

Announcements

Nominations are now open for the Bryning, Wallerich, and Wyatt scholarships, and are due Feb. 20th.

M/S/P Approval of minutes from January 26th meeting with no discussion.

Ly suggested that the minutes be uploaded to a Google doc to facilitate editing by the group. It was agreed that the Google doc should not be open to the public, but should only be open to invited individuals (sitting senators) to edit.

Update from the ASUPS representative

Maney reported that packets just went out for ASUPS elections: president vice president, senior senator, and at-large positions. Students should be advised that if they have any interest in student government they should pick up a packet as soon as possible. Elections will be held March 9-13. Major spring popular event is still in progress.

Update from the staff senate representative

Kueter reported that the BTF presented its report to the staff senate. The staff senate will soon open nominations for 2015-2016 senators. The spring basket raffle for the staff book scholarship will take place April 23 and 24, and there is a group working on the 2015 staff recognition luncheon.

Leslie Saucedo is the faculty representative to the staff senate. Sarah Moore has been coming to the meetings as well, but she will be stepping back. Staff senate meets February 10.

Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Discussion of proposed updates to library policy with regards to faculty borrowing

The Library, Media, and Information Systems committee has proposed a change to library lending policies and seeks the senate's endorsement. (See Appendix A)

Buescher asked how item 2 will function procedurally. What is the timeline for billing and returning the fee to faculty if a lost item is returned? If the item is replaced, then will

the fee still be returned? What is the procedural difference between billing and payment? Beardsley suggested that in practice it probably means that if you get billed and return the book before they replace it then the fee is waived. Wiese suggested an established time frame within which the material can be returned for a fee waiver.

Beardsley clarified that this was a modification to a newly adopted policy. Tubert further clarified that the current policy was enacted without senate approval, and so the new policy can also be enacted with or without approval from the senate.

Bartanen suggested adding language that says fee will be refunded if the material is returned before it is replaced.

Maney asked for clarification on recalls. Kueter clarified that there has always been a recall system.

Haltom stated that standing committee decisions become the law of the land after 30 days.

M/S/P to endorse the new LMIS policy with a friendly suggestion to modify the language in item 2 to read: “Faculty will receive overdue notices for materials not returned, but will not be fined overdue fees for Puget Sound materials, including short-term loans like media, reserves, popular books, and print journals. Faculty will be billed for the replacement cost of items held longer than 18 months. ~~This amount is waived once materials are returned.~~ **This amount might be waived if items are returned before they are replaced.** This addresses concerns about fines expressed by faculty”.

Discussion of charges to the Student Life Committee and the Professional Standards Committee regarding freedom of expression on campus

Buescher read the proposed charge to Student Life and Professional Standards committees to investigate existing policies and propose necessary changes (see Appendix B)

Stockdale asked why the senate is asking these committees to investigate and change the policy if we already have a policy? Wiese argued the senate can charge them to look at it and if they decide it is sufficient then that’s an acceptable conclusion.

Stockdale asked if the phrase “including a statement of freedom of expression” should be deleted, since the University already has a statement. Haltom suggested it could be changed to “including *another* statement of freedom of expression”

Saucedo suggested that in addition to “immediate response” it seems necessary to *determine what* is threatening. Buescher clarified that that is already spelled out in the policy. What caused consternation last year was the lack of clarity regarding how to handle something that seems to be immediately threatening. Buescher further clarified that what is up for revision is not the determination of threat but the response policy.

M/S/P with two abstentions to amend the charge to read: “The Faculty Senate charge the Professional Standards and Student Life Committees to collaboratively work with the

Bias-Hate Education Response Team to: 1) investigate existing University policies pertaining to the display of materials for campus/public consumption, 2) make recommendations for changes or additions to the existing University policies including the possibility of a **another** statement regarding freedom of expression, and 3) consider revision or clarification of the procedures for “immediate response” to reported incidences of Bias-Hate (“Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents,” Section V.B.1.).

Academic Standards Committee charge to re-evaluate course schedule

Peine read the original charge that raises issues with existing course schedule:

- Desire for more 80 min slots
- Desire for a common hour
- Concern that afternoon/evening classes are encroaching on extracurricular and co-curricular activities

Bartanen recalled that the ASC discussed these issues until it got to the point where it needed input from the registrar’s office, but the registrar’s office has been busy implementing Peoplesoft and so has thus far been unable to provide the necessary information.

Tubert suggested creating an ad hoc committee to work on this charge because the ASC may be too busy to go forward with it in a timely manner. Saucedo agreed with this proposal, and pointed out that the ASC might not represent the different interests across campus that have scheduling issues.

Tubert recalled that there was a proposal put forward at the faculty meeting to shorten the spring semester by one week that came from people not on the ASC.

Weise reiterated that the rationale of creating an ad hoc committee was because the ASC already is too busy to consider this charge. Haltom suggested having the liaison to the ASC (himself) contact the committee to see if they have time to consider the issue and to go from there.

Tubert maintained that that doesn’t capture the issue of lack of representation on the ASC. There were many arguments offered in favor of creating an ad hoc committee (including representation and allowing people who are passionate about the issue to work on it) but also concern about the proliferation of ad hoc committees, and a desire to limit the number of them that are created each year to one, especially if the work is substantive.

After further discussion of the likelihood (or lack thereof) that the policy will ever be changed given the numerous times it has been raised, and discussion of the utility of passing the charge back to the ASC or creating an ad hoc committee, the senate asked Senator Haltom to talk with the ASC to determine whether they are open to accepting the charge, and what information they will need from the registrar. Bartanen will talk to the registrar to determine whether they will be able to compile that information this semester. Once those questions are answered the senate will decide how to proceed.

Discussion of the process for electing a Faculty Secretary

Tubert said that the process for finding a faculty secretary is problematic because it is a job that is done in addition to the regular service assignment. She suggested electing a faculty secretary during senate elections and counting the position as a service assignment. There would then be a formal election at the first faculty meeting of the year to “confirm” the person who was elected by ballot so that the bylaws do not have to be changed.

Saucedo noted that this election might exclude people in the sciences who teach labs in the evenings, but that is already the case with the current election process.

M/S/P to elect a slate of candidates for faculty secretary during the spring senate election with the understanding that the candidate with the most votes will be put forward at the first faculty meeting of the year for election. The position of faculty secretary will fulfill the university service requirement for the elected candidate.

Discussion of creation/modification of a senate/faculty governance webpage or portal

Tubert asked how to proceed with this idea — get a couple of people who are interested in looking into this, and to think about things we might want to have accessible for faculty.

Saucedo appreciated the informal emails sent out by former chair Neshyba and suggested that the senate chair should live-tweet senate meetings. Tubert clarified that she’s talking about a web page rather than an email list. Weise didn’t want to make extra work for anyone. We already have the minutes available and maybe all we need is a more accessible link to the page. Several senators suggested a governance link on the MyPugetSound portal.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm

Minutes prepared by Emelie K. Peine

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Attachments: Appendix A and B

The 2013-2014 LMIS Committee and the current LMIS Committee have spent a considerable amount of time and effort evaluating faculty loan policies. As a result of our thoughtful deliberations:

- We recognize the many diverse points of view associated with loan policies.
- We affirm library resources are a community resource that benefit faculty, staff, students, and our colleagues in the Alliance.
- We recognize the financial concerns associated with fines, loans and loss of materials as well as the research and teaching needs of our community.

Therefore, the LMIS Committee recommends the following modifications to the loan policy for faculty. We believe these recommendations provide a fair and equitable policy. We ask that the Senate review and approve these modifications so that we may then focus on other charges.

1. Faculty will receive a one year (12 months from the time of check-out) loan for regular Puget Sound materials, with one six month renewal. This addresses concerns for extended loan of materials by faculty and supports academic research associated with sabbatical leaves.
2. Faculty will receive overdue notices for materials not returned, but will not be fined overdue fees for Puget Sound materials, including short-term loans like media, reserves, popular books, and print journals. Faculty will be billed for the replacement cost of items held longer than 18 months. This amount is waived once materials are returned. This addresses concerns about fines expressed by faculty.
3. Materials borrowed by all library users, including faculty, through Inter-Library Loan (ILL) or Summit will be subject to fines. There is no change to this policy as fines for Summit and ILL materials were in place prior to implementation. In compliance with the Summit sharing policy, the replacement cost for a lost Summit item is \$90. Daily fines accrue at \$1 per day. This supports our partnership with Alliance libraries and the scholarly community.
4. Items recalled by a Puget Sound library user will be subject to fines of \$1 per day. Only Puget Sound users may recall Puget Sound materials. There are no recalls associated with borrowing and lending within Summit by patrons. However, each Summit institution may recall a Summit loan if it is needed for Course Reserves or DVD/Video class viewings (Bookings). This provides the opportunity for Puget Sound materials to be used more broadly.
5. We recommend that faculty on sabbatical or out of town coordinate renewals and/or returns accordingly. We recommend that faculty who receive recall notices but are unable to return the materials due to extenuating circumstances contact the circulation staff to make appropriate arrangements. This reinforces the library's willingness to work with faculty on an individual basis to support academic engagement.

The Faculty Senate charge the Professional Standards and Student Life Committees to collaboratively work with the Bias-Hate Education Response Team to: 1) investigate existing University policies pertaining to the display of materials for campus/public consumption, 2) make recommendations for changes or additions to the existing University policies including the possibility of a statement regarding freedom of expression, and 3) consider revision or clarification of the procedures for “immediate response” to reported incidences of Bias-Hate (“Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents,” Section V.B.1.).

Note, the following is the existing statement on freedom of expression contained within the “Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents.”

(<http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/communicationresponse-protocolfor-biashate-inciden.pdf>)

“As a fundamental commitment and as part of the progress we envision, the Puget Sound community protects academic freedom, the open exchange of ideas and creative, intellectual expression. Freedom of expression on this campus means equally that we shall not seek to limit individuals’ First Amendment right to express their views and that we shall reject conduct that hinders in any way the right of all to pursue their educational goals in a safe and respectful environment. We understand that these freedoms and rights do not permit us to tolerate speech, symbols, or other actions that are wounding or threaten harm to specific individuals or groups because destructive hostility has no place in open and honest learning” (“Response Protocol of Bias-Hate Incidents,” p. 1).