

**Faculty Senate  
McCormick Room, Collins Library  
Minutes of the September 21, 2015 meeting**

**Senate Members Present**

Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Derek Buescher, Rachel DeMotts, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Nakisha Renee Jones, Brendan Lanctot, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Jennifer Utrata, John Wesley.

**Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM**

**Announcements**

Lanctot: Abraham Acosta “Crisis and migration in post-hegemonic times” Trimble forum at 5:00pm on Sept. 23.

**M/S/P Approval of minutes from September 14, 2015**

**Updates from Liasons to Standing Committees**

Lanctot: Academic Standards Committee would like to get a charge regarding a common hour from the senate. They would like to address it, and would like their work to be in concert with the senate rather than duplicating work being done elsewhere.

**Updates from the ASUPS Representative**

Jones: A campus email went out regarding the vision for ASUPS this year: “To redefine the status quo.” One such initiative is Town Hall Tuesday, a group discussion of issues relevant to campus life, with the theme established at the time of meeting. Town Hall Tuesday will meet in the Wheelock piano lounge on Tuesday, September 22<sup>nd</sup>, from 11am-1pm. The goal here is to facilitate discussion about difficult topics. Voting for the ASUPS Senate will be happening next month. The ASUPS president will hold open café hours on Friday mornings in Diversions. Sexual assault prevention info will be sent out to students.

**Updates from the Staff Senate Representative**

Skeel reported that she and Andrea Keuter will share the role of representative to the Faculty Senate (Andrea will take over in the spring). Skeel shared the status of a discussion about the staff performance appraisal process. An outside consultant has been hired to go through appraisal forms to establish the next steps. One significant problem with the current process is that the “Expectations” box (with options for *exceeded, met, did not meet expectations*) was often not selected, so more training is needed on how to execute the assessments. The issue of merit pay based on performance appraisal forms is off the table until supervisors gain more expertise in completing the review process.

**Discussion of Charges for the Professional Standards Committee**

Bill Haltom presented charges for the Professional Standards Committee for senate approval.

Haltom pointed out that several of the charges requested by the PSC were redundant of standing charges and therefore were not included in the final list of charges issued to the committee.

Tubert asked about issues raised in the 2014-2015 final report that did not appear in the list of charges for 2015-2016 including extended time for students with disabilities to complete evaluations, and bias in evaluation forms. The wording in the final report was vague, so the senate may come back to those for the next meeting to decide whether to add them to the PSC charges.

The senate approved 3 charges to the Professional Standards Committee:

1. Review of the remaining interpretations of the Faculty Code related to Title IX.

*Rationale: The PSC asked to be issued this charge in its year-end report.*

2. Propose the creation of a cycle of review for department and program faculty evaluation standards and criteria.

*Rationale: The PSC asked to be issued this charge in its year-end report. At present, there is no cycle or timeline for the revision of said evaluation standards and criteria.*

3. Review and consider revising the following statement in the Faculty Code: "Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the abovementioned areas" (III.3.e).

*Rationale: The wording is ambiguous, as it can suggest either that a candidate's record must be distinguished in all areas, or specifically university and community service must be. The PSC asked to be issued this charge in its year-end report and received a letter from faculty members pointing to this issue with potentially high-stakes consequences.*

**M/S/P To approve the charges to the PSC as revised.**

#### **Discussion of Charges for the International Education Committee**

Emelie Peine introduced the proposed charges to the International Education Committee. The Senate discussed the ongoing need to assess study abroad programs for their sexual violence response protocols.

Chair Tubert asked about the process by which the IEC culls programs from its list (potential charge #2). DeMotts, as a former member of the IEC, explained that popular programs are not eliminated routinely or without consideration to the student goals of study abroad. Jones asked if there was an endpoint for the process of culling programs. DeMotts suggested that while program review is a duty of the committee this charge gets to specifically eliminating programs that are undersubscribed, expensive, and redundant in a given location. Lanctot noted that charge #2 seems distinct from standing duties of the committee, a question raised by Gardner, to evaluate and maintain programs. Bartanen noted that the goal is a clear, “pruned,” set of program offerings that best meets student needs across a variety of criteria.

The senate spent some time discussing the charges to the IEC regarding the committee work with faculty to develop exchange programs abroad and in-house study abroad programs. Questions were raised about the history of this process and the potential need and goals of such programs given that OIP has developed a set of processes for faculty to propose exchanges and in-house study abroad.

The senate approved 6 charges for the International Education Committee:

**1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence:**

- a. *Work with the Office of International Programs (OIP) and the Dean of Students office to determine a course of action regarding study abroad programs that have reported that they do not have a sexual violence response protocol, and those that have not responded to requests for information.*

*Rationale: Last year the committee collected information about the sexual violence protocols (or lack thereof) from study abroad programs. This year they will determine how to use that information to best serve our students. They determined that this is not something the committee should pursue alone, but in partnership with other relevant departments.*

- b. *Assess the efficacy of safety information provided to students before they study abroad, including sexual violence support and reporting procedures and;*
- c. *The efficacy of Puget Sound Reporting and response processes should an incident of sexual violence occur. This will also be in partnership with OIP and the Dean of Students office.*

*Rationale: This is a continuing charge from 2014-2015.*

- 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: This is a continuing charge from 2014-2015.*

**3. Work with faculty to develop exchange programs with colleges and universities abroad.**

*Rationale: After investigating ways to increase international student enrollment in 2014-2015, the committee determined that helping to develop exchange programs was the proper and most effective role for the IEC in addressing this ongoing concern.*

**4. Make recommendations for improving the rate of participation in study abroad based on survey data collected in 2014-2015.**

*Rationale: In 2014-2015 the IEC had a self-charge to investigate the reasons for the dramatic decline in Puget Sound students studying abroad. They conducted a survey and are requesting a 2015-2016 self-charge to analyze those results and make recommendations.*

**5. Work with faculty to develop in-house study abroad programs.**

*Rationale: As a result of the process described in the rationale for charge #4, the IEC determined that the best role for the committee in achieving the larger goal of improving participation rates in study abroad is to work with Puget Sound faculty to develop new courses and programs that involve overseas travel and study.*

**6. Work with OIP to revise the returning questionnaire for study abroad students, particularly those questions that deal with the benefits of the experience.**

*Rationale: This is a continuing charge from 2014-2015.*

**M/S/P Approval of charges as amended**

**Discussion of Charges for the Institutional Review Board**

Andrew Gardner presented charges for the Institutional Review Board for senate approval.

DeMotts asked whether there was any consideration to whether the committee has any purview over research regulations in other countries. Notes a proliferation of students going abroad without getting proper research permissions from the country where they want to do research. The failure of students to get proper permissions can make it increasingly difficult for researchers working in these areas. Peine noted that, yes, students need to be aware of this, but that is probably not within the purview of the IRB. If we want to make sure students are getting the proper permissions in other countries, it is probably the job of the UEC and faculty advisor to ensure that that happens.

Utrata asked about the phrasing of charge 2 and Gardner clarified that the goal of the charge is to prompt the committee to continue to refine the way that it addresses non-clinical research, particularly in reference to the way it is handled on other liberal arts campuses.

The senate spent some time discussing the intent and language of charge 2. It was suggested that DeMotts's concern about foreign research permissions can be raised as a later charge for the IRB or UEC.

The senate approved **two** charges for the Institutional Review Board:

#### 2015/2016 Senate Charges to the IRB:

1. Establish guidelines for the use of CITI training modules at Puget Sound. Broadcast or otherwise disseminate information about those guidelines and procedures to relevant portions of the campus community.

[Rationale: Puget Sound now subscribes to the international, online training and certification system known as CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative). The system is organized into modules designed for particular academic and research constituencies. This charge is intended to encourage the Puget Sound IRB to integrate these modules into our campus' IRB procedures and to disseminate information about those procedures to the campus community.]

2. Maintain an awareness of IRB procedure and purview on other liberal arts campuses (including the NW5C), with particular attention to how other campuses navigate non-clinical research proposals (ethnography, oral history), student projects, journalism, and research outside the United States.

[Rationale: This charge asks the Puget Sound IRB to ensure that it maintains an informed awareness of how other, similar universities are organizing and categorizing the diverse research agendas and traditions found in universities and colleges focused on the liberal arts, thereby allowing Puget Sound to continue to tailor its policies and procedures accordingly.]

#### **M/S/P Approval of charges to the IRB as amended.**

##### **Discussion of the common hour charge to the ASC**

Lancot stated that ASC would like clarification about their role in the consideration of a common hour.

Stockdale points out that the ASC has only one charge, so perhaps this can be handed back to them? Gardner asks whether the issue at hand is simply carving out a common

hour or re-thinking the whole schedule? Is this larger than the ASC? Lanctot reports that Suzanne Holland, ASC chair, communicated that they are already moving ahead with compiling info about models for a common hour. Buescher notes that the goal is to avoid duplicating work, so he and Gardner will meet with Sunil Kukreja and the senate can take up the question of whether to pass on a charge at the next meeting. Decision to postpone the discussion until next week. If Buescher and Gardner decide a charge is merited they will draft one for consideration at the next meeting.

### **Discussion of freedom of expression**

The senate discussed an issue raised last year by the Committee on Diversity regarding academic freedom and freedom of expression. The CoD proposed a draft charge that the committee should work with the Student Life Committee, PSC, and Bias Hate Education Response Team (BHERT) to resolve possible conflicts between the Faculty Code and the response protocol with regard to freedom of expression. SLC recommended that the senate create an ad hoc subcommittee to determine guidelines for freedom of expression. COD disagrees with where PSC landed with language, so they are asking for all three groups to work together to get on the same page. Buescher points out that part of the problem is that the documents (faculty code, response protocol) are out of alignment. Tubert suggests that they could all meet and determine who has purview over which documents and how they can be brought into concert. DeMotts read the charge proposed by COD. The senate discussed how to make this happen. This was a charge requested by the COD. The senate decided to charge all three committees to work together on the issue. Haltom requests that the charges be written up so that the senate can vote on them at the next meeting. Beardsley asks for clarification on the roots of the charge, and volunteers to write the charge for the SLC. Liaisons for each committee will send wording for their charges for the next meeting.

### **Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.**

Minutes prepared by Emelie Peine.

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty Senate