

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the April 20, 2015 meeting

Attendees: Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Bill Haltom, Bill Beardsley, Andrew Gardner, Nila Wiese, Leslie Saucedo, Zaixin Hong, Ariela Tubert, Pierre Ly, Chris Spalding, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo

Guest:

Julie Nelson-Christoph

Meeting convened at 4:02pm

Announcements

No nominations have come in yet for the Walter Lowrie award so please encourage nominations

Final reports will be coming in starting next week. Chairs have been asked to talk for no more than 5 minutes. Please read reports ahead of time and plan on full meetings with possible extension of one to decide on Walter Lowrie award.

Senate elections: we are short 2 fall-only sabbatical replacements for senate. Senate will nominate candidates and ask them if they are willing to stand. If they are then we will vote anonymously in the next senate meeting. Please send nominations to Pierre by Monday, April 27th.

Elected senators are: Pierre Ly, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Robin Jacobson, Siddarth Ramakrishnan.

Sabbatical replacement senators will be Bill Beardsley and Renee Houston, each for a full year.

M/S/P approval minutes from April 6th with no discussion.

Staff Senate update:

Senate drafted a letter to halt the merit pay system and let the new performance review system be fully implemented for a year before trying to layer a merit system on top.

Updates from liaisons to standing committees:

SLC

Wiese shared a motion from the Student Life Committee (SLC) to revise committee procedures.

Segawa clarified some aspects of the motion: Faculty members in the SLC are interested in revising the work of the committee, primarily regarding the ad hoc work related to student life issues. Many faculty members on the SLC are participating in ad hoc groups, but in many cases faculty act simply as liaisons rather than as full-fledged members of those ad-hoc groups. The SLC wants to have more consistency in their level of participation in the work of ad-hoc groups to which they are assigned. There is a recognition that a large part of the work of the SLC happens through their participation in other groups like honor court, sexual violence committee, CHWS, etc. Staff and students also expressed interest in being assigned to these other committees rather than just faculty.

Tubert expressed concern that students and staff wouldn't serve the role of needing faculty reps to other groups.

- Segawa responded that some groups do not specify that the SLC rep needs to be a faculty member, so those could be students or staff.

Part of motion involved changes to the procedure for determining charges; as worded the motion seemed to require changes to the bylaws.

- Segawa clarified that the intention of the motion is not to change the method for determining charges.
- Tubert said that the language suggests that determining the charges is done in a consultative process rather than by the faculty senate, which is not aligned with the bylaws.
- Gardner clarified that the motion seemed to be asking for implementation of charges to be consultative, not necessarily the development and approval of charges.
- Tubert reiterated that the language of the motion seems to suggest a change to the process of determining charges, and so that language should be clarified in order to avoid prompting a discussion about bylaws. It was recommended that the SLC revise the language of this motion prior to the committee's completion of its end-of-year report.

IRB

Gardner reports that there have been some delays in the IRB approval process this semester that have caused some teaching delays.

IEC

IEC has culled 14 programs from UK that they deemed redundant or too expensive. Students can still petition if they want to attend a program that is not on the list.

Discussion of the possibility of creating advisory boards for various areas of the Core

Julie Nelson-Christoph provided an overview of the proposal (see appendix). A lot of work has gone into the creation of the new SSIs but there is little support for keeping that collaboration going. Departments have regular meetings to discuss curriculum and how things are going, but there's no structure for that with the SSIs.

Weise asked about the size of the board.

Nelson-Christoph suggested 4-5 people, with the intention of being enough to have a diversity of ideas but not too big to be unwieldy.

A discussion followed largely between Haltom and Nelson-Christoph about whether teaching writing requires a different set of skills and a different kind of support than teaching other skills/subjects, and whether other core requirements such as KNOW would also benefit from a similar kind of advisory board. This led to a discussion of whether the advisory board would function more as an academic department that would meet regularly to discuss curriculum and pedagogy, or whether it would function more as a resource for faculty who are voluntarily seeking support for the creation and implementation of SSIs.

Tubert said that the idea reminded her of the workshop on Connections last year, with activities to improve Connections and strengthen the core, and to help faculty especially those who are new to teaching these classes. We have enough turnover in these classes that people might want those resources.

Saucedo suggested that this might be especially important for new faculty who might feel outside their comfort zone, because we learn how to better teach outside of our comfort zone the longer we're here.

Haltom took exception to the language on the page that reads "KNOW courses require faculty to stretch beyond their disciplinary expertise". He was concerned that faculty teaching KNOW courses would be *required* to teach something that falls outside their disciplinary specialization.

Nelson-Christoph clarified that that's not the spirit of what the proposal is trying to say. What the team meant is that faculty often *feel* stretched, not that they are required to stretch.

The discussion then turned to whether service on the advisory board would be counted in lieu of or in addition to other standing committee service. It was agreed that the conversation of "what counts" as service is a larger issue that should be addressed separately.

Haltom pointed out that as it stands, the proposal isn't something that the senate can act on. It needs to get rid of the "standing committee" language unless we want to make a change to the bylaws. He noted the need to rephrase the "requirement" language as well. He stated that he is averse to moving forward until we understand what the senate is actually able to do. We can advise executives of the senate that they should take this kind of service into consideration when making assignments, but we cannot direct the other bodies in charge of making service assignments. In other words, we can tell Kris that the senate feels that this service should be taken into account, but we can't direct her to do that. Beardsley agreed that we don't have the authority to do anything about this. This is

more than an ad hoc committee. It's an ongoing thing that looks much more like a standing committee that is meant to be an ongoing resource for faculty teaching these classes. Tubert emphasized that the senate might not want to give up a chance to have input. Nelson-Christoph noted that the group wants the creation of the board to be a faculty-driven decision, and the senate is the body that puts people on committees.

Wiese notes that this should be an agenda item for next year.

M/S/P to support the idea for advisory groups for SSI, Know, and Connections

Beardsley wanted to make sure that the minutes reflect that this is not tying our hands about what we can do. It is a general endorsement of the idea.

Discussion of Faculty Service Assignments

Tubert introduced the item by noting that in reviewing the list of committees that is distributed to faculty that they use to determine their service their preferences, it is unclear how and why some assignments on page two are made *in lieu of* an assignment on page one, and some are *in addition to* assignments on page one. Maybe that's ok, but it seems that people don't really know why or how that relates to workload.

Beardsley said that we need to make a distinction between general service and governance specifically. When you serve on a standing committee, you are serving as a representative of the full faculty. It can't be that *anything* one does for the university takes the place of an assignment on a standing committee.

Bartanen clarified that historically the things on page 2 are not committees of the senate. But some of them have been considered to be equivalent to service on a standing committee. Many of these fall under the bylaw that faculty want to have input into campus life. They are different levels of work for sure. Trustee committees take the place of service. Scholar advisors come with financial support for release time.

For example, the ambiguous ones include athletics and accreditation.

Wiese pointed out that it is hard to account for how much work all the different assignments are, and all the various kinds of service that everyone is doing.

Haltom agreed that it is true as Kris said that there's no service that "doesn't count", but another issue is that junior faculty do far more service than they need to. Maybe the senate should figure out whether we should insinuate ourselves into rookie camp or whether we want to get the word out that whatever service they do will be sufficient.

Tubert notes that in the interest of time we need to move on, but any further feedback on the issue can be sent to the senate chair.

Faculty input on reviews of non-academic departments

How faculty can have feedback into evaluations of non-academic departments?
Presumably these departments get reviewed and those review committees have faculty representatives?

Bartanen noted that there are program reviews. The process is modeled after the 5 year department review. If a faculty member has feedback about other areas of the campus, then it should go to the director of the office or department, and if that isn't sufficient, the faculty member can take it to the appropriate vice president.

Tubert suggested that maybe the senate could collect feedback on departments, but Saucedo pointed out that staff often have feedback that they are afraid to bring forward.

Segawa noted that there have not been program reviews in student affairs but the SLC issue speaks to this. When we do a student affairs review, we will ask SLC for a faculty rep or faculty feedback.

Tubert suggested that it could be something as simple as sending an email out soliciting feedback

Other business

Discussion of Andrew Gardner's letter to the IRB (see appendix B).

Bartanen suggested writing an MOU between SOAN and the IRB. The IRB does deal with federally funded research and is needed by programs like OT/PT. She also noted that the "us vs them" tone letter is unfortunate, because it makes it sound like this process is being foisted on faculty by the administration.

Gardner countered that there *is* an MOU but the IRB has had it for 8 months and has thusfar failed to take any action. The letter is (in part) an attempt to prompt some movement on the issue.

Haltom commended the transparency and openness of the letter. It is all being done in the open and you are spurring the IRB to act, and Haltom is in favor of that.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:33pm.

Minutes prepared by Emelie Peine

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly, secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: Proposal for creating advisory boards for various areas of the Core

Appendix B: Letter from Andrew Gardner to the IRB committee

Proposal to the Senate for Advisory Boards for SSI, KNOW, and Connections
Julie Christoph and Martin Jackson
April 6, 2015

We would like to propose that advisory committees be formed as standing committees for the graduation requirements that regularly require faculty to stretch beyond their disciplinary expertise.

We bring this proposal now for several reasons:

- There have been conversations this year in the Senate about the efficacy of our current faculty governance structures. Many faculty have expressed concern that our current committee structures are adjudicatory in nature, while there are less formalized structures in place for ongoing professional development.
- The SSIs and KNOW are new curricular initiatives that have involved a great deal of faculty thought and time, but there are no existing structures in place to ensure that faculty have opportunities to talk with each other on an ongoing basis about new ideas for addressing the evolving challenges of teaching these kinds of courses.
- Members of the Senate ad hoc committee on Connections courses led a faculty development workshop last summer for Connections faculty, which faculty found to be very successful.
- Faculty have been attending pedagogy workshops offered in the summer and during the year, and they have asked for more frequent, shorter opportunities to talk with faculty about pedagogy.
- Faculty teaching in the SSIs, in particular, have observed that it is challenging to do such elements of the SSIs as
 - Peer review (and this was best attended session of spring's Wednesday at 4)
 - Responding to student writing
 - Oral presentations
 - Information literacy assignments
 - How to structure time in the research paper
- Aside from the faculty who teach in the CWLT, there are no faculty who currently have official responsibilities for developing faculty development opportunities around teaching—and in the CWLT, these responsibilities are included among many other responsibilities. Having more faculty involved would enable not only more offerings but also greater diversity of perspectives and offerings.
- The SSI, KNOW, and Connections seminars by definition push faculty beyond disciplinary comfort zones, and new issues have been arising that require faculty attention and ongoing professional development, such as how to work effectively with second language learners.

These committees would be along the lines of the Prelude Committee, with faculty representing different disciplinary expertise and with some ex officio membership.

Advisory committees would be needed for the SSIs, as well as likely KNOW and Connections.

The goals of the committees would be to discuss goals, offer faculty development and support, assessment, course development, advocating for resources, and possibly recruiting faculty to teach.

Creating new committees would mean some shifting of resources from some existing standing committees; we believe that some reallocation of faculty is warranted and is in keeping with larger Senate goals of revisiting governance structures.

Andrew Gardner

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND
TEL (253) 879-3490

gardner@pugetsound.edu

April 19, 2015

To the Puget Sound IRB,

In this letter I will describe a project that I intend to conduct as part of a course plan in the upcoming Fall semester. This is a long letter. If you can stick with me, I conclude with a point that the IRB will want to discuss.

Some members of the IRB know that much of my research explores the experiences and social fields of transnational labor migrants to the hydrocarbon-rich states of the Arabian Peninsula. I am also very active on academia.edu. If you're unfamiliar with this website, it consists of a Facebook-like media framework for disseminating academic research and connecting with other researchers and scholars worldwide. It currently has 40,000,000 members. When I arrive at the office, I often briefly peruse my "analytics," which (among other things) reveal the country and search terms used by individuals who find and download my publications. In perusing these search terms, I readily noticed that many searches yielding my work (via Google and Bing) were written in broken English, and were obviously (to me) searches scripted by potential migrants in a constellation of labor-sending countries. To better illustrate this, I'll give you an example: weeks after uploading a scholarly paper entitled "Ethiopian Labor Migrants and the Free Visa System in Qatar" in December of 2014, I noticed dozens of daily hits (i.e. locating and perusing this scholarly paper), many from Ethiopia, using search terms like "companies in Quatar which requires workers from ethiopia in 2015" or "how to get visa from Qatar from Ethiopia with out full payment" (sic ... both notably sic).

What these terms reveal to me is that legions of potential migrants, from Ethiopia and many other places, are using the internet to assess their potential migration and, in some cases, evaluate the potential challenges they might face. These are obviously not the search terms a foreign scholar or academic would use to locate my work. The work that these potential migrants are finding online – my work – is largely impenetrable to this audience (although I do try to push my scholarly writing to a vernacular comfortable to the reading public). But the key point here isn't that my papers are poorly articulated for semi-literate potential migrants, but rather this: through academia.edu's connections to Google and Bing, I have access to a significant point of dissemination, via which I can reach thousands and thousands of potential migrants, and maybe even more! Reaching them, with the *migration briefs* I describe below, is the essential mission of this class-based project.

In the first half of the semester, students will read all available scholarship (and gray literature – reports and journalism) on a particular, assigned migratory conduit. We will begin with Ghana-Arabia, Ethiopia-Arabia, and Nepal-Arabia. Students will:

- Master the scholarship and research concerning the broader Gulf migration system
- Master and digest any existing scholarship and research concerning their particular, assigned migration conduit
- Develop a basic understanding of the social field these migrants depart, including its political, economic, social, cultural, historic, and geopolitical manifestations

This material will provide the basis for the preparation of the *migration briefs* drafted by students, who will be organized in working groups (again, each of which is assigned a migratory conduit). The brief will, obviously, be tailored to that specific migratory conduit. This aspect of the *migration brief* draft will be coupled and enhanced with:

- ➔ Ethnographic interviews and migration narratives, all collected via social media from actual migrants with past or present experience in these particular migratory conduits

Quotes and experiences from real migrants will enhance and illuminate the migration briefs.¹ For some migratory conduits, the availability of scholarship, research, and migrants on social media will be quite dense (Nepal/Arabia, for example). For others, little will be available and migrants may be difficult to locate or contact via social media (Ghana/Arabia, for example). These are unknowns, and this exploration of the possibilities is something that I very much intend to carry and accompany students through. We will be working as teams.

If we are able to locate migrants on social media who are willing and eager to speak about their experiences, I don't know what we'll ask them. We certainly won't approach them with a list of questions. Perhaps they'll want to talk about the horrible unfamiliar food they're consigned to eat in their labor camp's canteen. Perhaps they'll want to talk about financial exploitation they're enduring in Arabia. Perhaps they'll want to talk about a workplace accident or death they witnessed. Perhaps they'll want to talk about how difficult things have become at home. Perhaps they'll want to flirt with students and propose marriage to a beautiful young American. Moreover, many of these migrants are often in extremely pressing situations – they might be desperate, disconsolate, depressed, even suicidal. Certainly they'll want to talk about things that I can't foresee or predict here. Our mission, simply put, will be to describe our project (AKA obtaining informed consent), to get to know them, to see what they want to tell us about, and to encourage them to tell us what they want to tell us about. That's how ethnography often works.

In the anthropological and ethnographic tradition, all quotes, stories, and synopses that appear in the migration briefs will use pseudonyms. The briefs themselves will be uploaded as

¹ In a style/format with which I have some experience. For example, see Gardner, Pessoa and Harkness (2014) *Labour Migrants and Access to Justice in Contemporary Qatar* (LSE/Middle East Centre/Open Society Foundation)

publications to [academia.edu](https://www.academia.edu) upon revision (by me). Ideally, they would be published under some official Puget Sound title, but I recognize that the legal imaginary fostered by our institutional culture may prevent this. If that is not possible, I intend to inquire as to whether the LSE, Georgetown, Cambridge, NYU, or the American University in Kuwait – all of whom are active in the region and with whom I have previously worked – would put their institutional name on these migration briefs.

So, overall, I have high aspirations for this project. I think that this project is undoubtedly emblematic of the global social justice that serves as a lodestar for me and many of the students I encounter in SOAN. With good information presented in the right style and vernacular, we (me and the students) can effect positive change now. I think this project and plan is also good pedagogy. Students and I will embark on this journey, explore the possibilities, consider the risks, and hopefully produce something valuable to others in the course of eight weeks in a Puget Sound classroom. This seems like meaningful learning via an experiential approach, which was the essence of my graduate school experience and shapes my pedagogy at Puget Sound. I also hope that students will be able to practice and understand the sort of anthropology that I value and seek to inculcate in the classroom – an anthropology that marries the scholarly and academic traditions of my discipline to applied, real world scenarios and problems.

Although this project clearly involves human subjects, I do not intend to submit this project to the Puget Sound IRB. My reasons for this are manifold, but include:

- I am unable to specify what I will direct students to ask migrants they contact. That specificity, often and typically required by IRB, is antithetical to the form of ethnographic inquiry I practice and teach
- I am unable to estimate how many of these migrants students and I will be able to find or locate. It may be three, it may be fifty, it may be in chatrooms, it may involve Skype. It's hard to predict where we will find success
- I am unwilling to sacrifice the publication of this work to the IRB's exception for "classroom activities" (and therefore not "research"). The students' work has the potential to significantly alter the life-course of thousands of potential migrants over the coming years, and maybe even more. I want students to see the connection between our scholarly work in the classroom and real, actual, and positive interventions in our world
- As a Puget Sound faculty member, I am unwilling to subject my pedagogic creativity to the cumbersome (and sometimes lengthy) process of IRB review. What might happen if I had thought up this plan during the second week of class in the Fall? What would happen if I thought this idea up in class in conversation with students? I don't want that kind of creative energy to be off limits in my classroom
- As an anthropologist and ethnographer, I am also unwilling to subject the heart of our methodological craft to the clinical categories and limitations of the IRB criteria we

“inherited” from federal policy. That clinical, federal framework has frustrated ethnographers for decades, and it is reshaping the frontiers of ethnographic enquiry

- As a teacher with a social conscience, I am increasingly concerned that IRB regulations guide my students away from the ragged edges of our society. Students often come to my department interested exploring the experiences of the homeless, the detained, the illegal, and the poor. They inevitably discover that these topics are logistically difficult to arrange, particularly over the course of a single semester. As a result, the collective, topical output of students’ work in our department has been steadily altered by the IRB – away from the components of our society defined by the IRB as vulnerable

I urge the IRB to explore the possibility of another avenue for evaluating non-federally-funded research at Puget Sound. I believe this “other avenue” should be attentive to the diversity of research methods that we (students and faculty) use to explore the human experience. That “other avenue” could perhaps accommodate descriptions of research projects in the sort of detail provided in this letter. I believe that this “other avenue” for evaluation could also give us, as a faculty, a healthy distance from the administratively-ensconced legal imaginary that informs and drives the IRB. We, the faculty, should retain the power to decide HOW we evaluate all non-federal projects on our campus.

I welcome any responses, from the IRB or any individual members, and would very much like to know how the IRB intends to respond if I purposely fail to submit this project as a protocol for evaluation by the IRB. I’m particularly concerned with any vulnerabilities my students may have as we (students and me) navigate this project through several institutional environments.

Best wishes,

Andrew Gardner
Associate Professor of Anthropology