

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the September 18, 2017 Meeting

Present: Kristin Johnson, Paula Wilson, Sunil Kukreja, Robin Jacobson, Gwynne Brown, Debra Grady, Alisa Kessel (chair), Pierre Ly, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Jung Kim, Sarah Walling-Bell, Rachael Laitila, Lynda Livingston, Kris Bartanen, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Peter Wimberger, Tiffany MacBain

Guests: Gayle McIntosh, Bill Haltom

The meeting was called to order at 12:01 p.m.

M/S/P to approve the minutes of September 11, 2017 as amended.

Announcements

Walling-Bell shared ASUPS's four-pronged response to the federal government's shifting stance on DACA. ASUPS 1) has allocated \$7,000 for DACA renewal fees due by 5 October, 2017; 2) is raising money for an emergency or legal fund for students, staff, or faculty impacted by DACA policy changes; 3) is crafting a statement in response to the university's position on sanctuary status, and seeking endorsement of that statement from the faculty, faculty senate, and staff senate; and 4) drafting a policy to create sanctuary spaces on campus. Dean Bartanen suggested that ASUPS connect with the Undocumented Students Working Committee regarding work in progress on the DACA issue.

Updates from Standing Committees

Ramakrishnan reported that Tim Beyer (fall) and Joel Elliott (spring) will chair the Institutional Review Board. The IRB has voiced some confusion over the wording of their fourth senate charge and will work with the Office of Institutional Research to clarify OIR's concerns related to student research.

Livingston reported that she and Jacobson are working on a proposed charge for the University Enrichment Committee related to a review of the travel policy and distribution of funds. This proposal will be ready for review at the next senate meeting.

Johnson reported that Poppy Fry will chair the Student Life Committee.

Discussion of Charges to the Curriculum Committee (See Appendix)

M/S/P as amended to approve the charges. Amendments include a) correction to possessive form of *departments'* and *programs'* in charge 1; b) dropping draft charge 2; and c) changing the wording of draft charge 3 to "Review the standard workflow of the Curriculum Committee to consider how to streamline course approval *and fulfill other standing charges related to review of courses and programs while providing necessary vetting and faculty control of curriculum.*

Discussion of Charges to the Professional Standards Committee (See Appendix)

M/S/P to approve the charges as amended. The amendment was to draft charge 1: the words *approve* and *approved* were changed to *endorse* and *endorsed*.

Discussion of Charges to the Student Life Committee (See Appendix)

Johnson explained that the committee's charges are minimal because committee members are called to serve on hearing boards, honor courts, and the like. Following some discussion of adding a second charge—dismissed because the proposed charge creates a redundancy with the standing charges—the senate approved a single charge.

In a related conversation, Livingston requested that the university consider faculty expertise when assigning committee members.

Discussion of Revision to Draft Guidelines of the Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech Document

Senate members discussed and affirmed faculty responses to the original draft of the guidelines. Because another revision is forthcoming, senate members offered general feedback regarding how to a) make the related Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct more visible to the campus community; b) clarify who responds to situations and what constitutes a situation meriting response; and c) facilitate student access to information related to the policy.

Discussion of Revision of Educational Goals (See Appendix)

The senate had an informal discussion about the most productive way to continue the conversation about the university's educational goals with the full faculty. In response to senators' thoughts and the considerations voiced at the last faculty meeting, Kessel determined to distribute alternative language options for goal #6 and to add the original goal #7 (RE: "an acknowledged set of personal values") to the document.

Discussion of Independent Colleges of Washington Faculty Leadership Conference (See Appendix)

Having received from senate members a list of faculty recommended for invitation to the November 2017 conference, Kessel and Kukreja will solicit recommendations from the full faculty. From the list of recommended faculty, Kessel and Kukreja will select five to invite to participate in the conference.

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Tiffany MacBain.

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: draft charges to CC

Draft Senate Charges to Curriculum Committee

1. Respond to the COD's 2016-2017 recommendations for review and support of departments and programs approaches to diversity.
2. Evaluate the suggested procedures for initiating a core revision in the CC's 2014-2015 end of the year report.
3. Review the standard workflow of the Curriculum Committee to consider how to streamline course approval and fulling other review standing charges while providing necessary vetting and faculty control of curriculum.
4. Propose mechanisms for providing support for programs and faculty to utilize completed core area reviews to improve the curriculum.

Background to proposed Charge 2: 2014-2015, the CC conducted a survey of the faculty and found little support for the current core. They suggested that a new committee should be convened to revise the core as they considered it too big of a task for any single standing committee. In 2016-2017, the CC recommended more discussion about the CC's role in a broader core review process: "The CC spends a great deal of time reviewing individual courses, core areas, majors/minors/emphases, departments/programs/schools. A consideration of how the CC can contribute to more comprehensive curricular review matters is recommended." We are hoping to get some clarity on what role the CC thinks they should have in a core revision, and identify a process for moving forward with a core revision as initiated by the CC in 2014-2015.

From the 2014-2015 report:

Moving forward, we suggest that in the Curriculum Committee's final report for 2014- 2015, a request be made that the Senate create an ad hoc committee, workgroup, task force (or whatever term best fits the situation) to examine the core curriculum, with the purpose of soliciting ideas and working on potential revisions to the existing core. This group will receive the results of the core survey, as well as work with Institutional Research to identify potential areas of change. The group will also get information such as the recent Senate report on Connections. Since only 18% of faculty surveyed want to keep the core as it is, there obviously needs to be a conversation about possible revisions to the core. Working Group Two believes that it makes sense that a wide range of data (from the Curriculum Committee, from the Senate (e.g., the Connections report), Institutional Research, and elsewhere) be reviewed by one group, all year long (or longer) in order to consider possible revisions to the core. We believe that this kind of work cannot be handled by any one existing committee at the moment, because there is simply too much other work to be done already in our committees. The ad hoc committee that is formed can work on nothing else other than possible changes to the core, and ideally, this group will be open to faculty who are interested in getting involved.

Appendix B: draft charges to PSC

Senate Charges to PSC for AY 2017-18 – Draft

1. Review the "Faculty Opportunity Hire Policy" initiated and approved for a two-year term in 2015. Decide to approve, approve for a set term, or not to approve the policy.
2. Read the "Observations and Recommendations" section of the 2016-17 year-end report of the Faculty Advancement Committee. Self-designate charges as, and if, you see fit.
3. Continue to address the issue of bias in the student evaluation process, and recommend one or more options for addressing bias on an interim or long-term basis. Share your

findings with the Committee on Diversity so that that committee can draft introductory language for the administration of evaluations.

4. Reassess the student evaluation process as a whole.

Appendix C: draft charge to SLC

Draft charge for SLC
(Email from Kristin Johnson)

(In addition the Standing Charges), Charge #1 (Draft): Assess (and make recommendations regarding) how the SLC might best facilitate the faculty's understanding of processes and procedures related to Student Affairs.

Rationale: This is a charge that arises out of conversations the SLC had last year regarding various challenging episodes on campus that ultimately involve Student Affairs, student life, conduct policies and procedures, etc. During those conversations students on the committee hoped that some means of improving faculty understanding of (and thus communication with students regarding) issues related to Student Affairs (including conduct procedures, etc.) could be developed. Originally, improving understanding of FERPA was in the charge as well, but that is being taken care of through other avenues. The above is a charge that the SLC thought they could efficiently and usefully complete.

Appendix D: Revised educational goals

Appendix E: Faculty leadership conference

Revision of the educational goals of the university Spring 2017

General Considerations

The University of Puget Sound as an academic community provides a meeting place for those committed to the generation, study, analysis, and exchange of ideas. The intellectual purposes of the University are of paramount importance. At the same time, the University recognizes that the life of the mind creates a context for the personal and professional growth of individuals as whole persons. The University thus encourages both formal thought and self-reflection and offers a curriculum supporting the exploration of diverse ideas, values, and cultures.

An undergraduate liberal arts education should provide the foundation for a lifetime of intellectual inquiry by grounding undergraduates well in a field of specialization, developing their ability to write with clarity and power, deepening their understanding of the structures and issues of the contemporary world, and broadening their perspective on enduring human concerns and cultural change. Such an education should prepare a person to pursue interests and ideas with confidence and independence, to meet the demands of a career, and to cope with the complexity of modern life.

The curricular requirements set forth in this document represent the minimum demands of a liberal education. Academic advisors should urge each student to explore varying fields of study in the process of constructing a broad educational program on the foundation of the required curriculum.

To these ends, the faculty has selected the following goals to emphasize in the undergraduate curriculum:

A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to

1. think critically;
2. communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
3. develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

and will have developed

4. familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
5. solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing; and
6. informed awareness of self, others, and influence in the world.

Senate Charges to PSC for AY 2017-18 – Draft

1. Review the “Faculty Opportunity Hire Policy” initiated and approved for a two-year term in 2015. Decide to approve, approve for a set term, or not to approve the policy.
2. Read the “Observations and Recommendations” section of the 2016-17 year-end report of the Faculty Advancement Committee. Self-designate charges as, and if, you see fit.
3. Continue to address the issue of bias in the student evaluation process, and recommend one or more options for addressing bias on an interim or long-term basis. Share your findings with the Committee on Diversity so that that committee can draft introductory language for the administration of evaluations.
4. Reassess the student evaluation process as a whole.

Draft charge for SLC
(Email from Kristin Johnson)

(In addition the Standing Charges), Charge #1 (Draft): Assess (and make recommendations regarding) how the SLC might best facilitate the faculty's understanding of processes and procedures related to Student Affairs.

Rationale: This is a charge that arises out of conversations the SLC had last year regarding various challenging episodes on campus that ultimately involve Student Affairs, student life, conduct policies and procedures, etc. During those conversations students on the committee hoped that some means of improving faculty understanding of (and thus communication with students regarding) issues related to Student Affairs (including conduct procedures, etc.) could be developed. Originally improving understanding of FERPA was in the charge as well, but that is being taken care of through other avenues. The above is a charge that the SLC thought they could efficiently and usefully complete.

Overview

University of Puget Sound President's Cabinet has identified a need to have in place this fall a statement that affirms vigorous support of academic freedom and the exercise of free speech, including demonstrations and protests, in a manner that protects the rights and safety of all members of the campus community.

Such a statement is intended to articulate community standards that all members of the Puget Sound campus community are obligated to uphold. It sets an expectation that the exercise of freedom of expression carries responsibilities and can—and should—be challenging. It affirms that the university is and must be a site for the free expression of ideas, while acknowledging that ideas can come into conflict, that disruption in the form of protests or demonstrations can and will happen, and that the university supports disruptive activities that don't deprive others of their rights or compromise their safety.

Many colleges have protest policies included in their student handbooks. Puget Sound does not address this issue as clearly or extensively as some other colleges. The most fully developed statements appear to include:

- Commitment to freedom of speech/expression and the right to gather peacefully
- Prohibition (and definition) of disruptive actions
- Prohibition of protests led by those who are not members of the campus community
- Authority of campus officials and local law enforcement to intervene
- Clarification that participants speak for themselves and do not represent the college

Puget Sound's statement must reflect the needs of our community and will only be effective to the extent it is endorsed by the governing organizations of the faculty, student body, and staff. It is brought forward for consideration by the Faculty Senate as a first step in this process.

Academic Freedom and the Exercise of Free Speech at Puget Sound
Faculty Senate – September 11, 2017

Examples

Colorado College

<https://www.coloradocollege.edu/other/studentguide/pathfinder/college-policies/protest-and-dissent.html>

Emmanuel

<http://www.emmanuel.edu/student-life/student-affairs-administration/emmanuel-college-student-guide/policies-procedures/general-college-policies-procedures/peaceful-demonstrations-protests-and-expressions-of-dissent.html>

The Evergreen State College

The Evergreen State College has links on its website to some 200 policies, including [Event Security and Safety](#). See also: Safety, Equity and Free Speech at Evergreen, <http://evergreen.edu/news/update-safety-equity-and-free-speech-evergreen>. Evergreen's Student Activities Handbook includes a Risk Assessment Review Process required for student-planned events that are open to public and expect an audience of 100 or more. The assessment must be submitted four weeks prior to the event.

Franklin and Marshall

<https://www.fandm.edu/college-policies/campus-events/public-demonstrations-and-protests-policy>

Lewis and Clark

<http://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3934-freedom-of-expression-amp-academic-inquiry-policy>

Middlebury

http://www.middlebury.edu/about/handbook/misc/demonstrations_protests

Oberlin

<https://new.oberlin.edu/students/policies/policies-and-procedures-for-protests-and-demonstration>

Pacific Lutheran

<https://www.plu.edu/srr/>

Reed

https://www.reed.edu/academic/gbook/comm_pol/dissent.html

Simmons

<http://www.simmons.edu/student-life/handbook/rights-responsibilities/protest-and-demonstration-guidelines>

Whitman

<https://www.whitman.edu/academics/academic-resource-center/student-handbook/student-rights-and-responsibilities/other-prohibited-conduct>

Willamette

http://willamette.edu/offices/conduct/student_rights/rights_reponsibilities.html

Academic Freedom and the Exercise of Free Speech at Puget Sound

Academic Freedom and the Exercise of Free Speech at Puget Sound

University of Puget Sound fully embraces, supports, and defends academic freedom as a fundamental expression of its mission and core values as a liberal arts college, and in accordance with the First Amendment right to free speech.

The community standards to which we ascribe as members of the faculty, staff, and student body call upon us to promote academic freedom and free speech, and to do so in a manner that protects the rights and safety of all members of the campus community. Our commitment to the free exchange of ideas includes the right to assemble, protest, and demonstrate in accordance with university policies designed to respect the rights, promote the dignity, and protect the safety of campus members and guests.

Controversial topics

- Both in and out of the classroom, the right to free expression extends to all ideas—including those that spark disagreement, are known to be false, or are antithetical to liberal arts ideals—but not to those that are discriminatory or defamatory.
- Per guidelines established by the American Association of University Professors, professors may choose to restrict engagement in controversial topics during class time that are unrelated to course content.

Protests and demonstrations

- All such events (including those that involve participation by alumni, local community members, or others) must be sponsored, organized and/or led by current students, faculty, or staff members.
- Students involved in a protest or demonstration are expected to maintain responsibility for their academic requirements, including class attendance.
- The campus will preserve space for demonstration or protest to occur. If an event or essential operation is adversely impacted by a demonstration or protest, a representative of the college may ask those involved to relocate to an alternate location or to otherwise modify activities so as not to interfere with the rights of others, including the right to listen. Individuals or groups who fail to comply with such requests are in violation of college policies and may be subject to applicable conduct and safety policies.
- An unacceptable level of disruption is defined as interfering with operations or the ability to provide services in a manner that intimidates or infringes upon the rights of others, including impeding the ability of others to attend, see, hear, speak, access or participate in events or activities; or materially threatening the safety of persons or property.

Distribution of material

- Members of the campus community are welcome to distribute literature in accordance with university policies.
- Distribution should not significantly obstruct or disrupt classes, events, or other college functions such that it interferes with the ability of others to see, hear, speak, access, or participate in events or activities.
- Distribution of material that harasses or defames individuals or groups is not permitted.

Academic Freedom and the Exercise of Free Speech at Puget Sound

Public postings

- University of Puget Sound students, faculty, and staff members are entitled to exercise free speech through postings in public spaces. Postings must comply with existing college policies designed to protect the safety of persons and property (including those that specify on what surfaces and with what substances postings can be made) and are defined as those made in contexts both physical (walls, doors, sidewalks) and electronic (blogs, websites, social media).
- Postings that are related to a specific person or group may be removed at the discretion of the individual or group; postings that are defamatory or harassing should be removed upon discovery and reported to college officials.
- All physical postings will be removed at the end of the event to which they are related.

Anonymous expression

Anonymous authors exercising the right to free expression are responsible for the content of their speech or other form of expression. Anonymous expressions may be removed at any time by any person.

Freedom of movement

Protesters may neither impede nor harass pedestrians or vehicular traffic, or deny or obstruct use of pathways, offices, or facilities used by students, faculty, staff, or campus visitors.

Representing the college

Every person has the right to have an opinion and state it publicly. Members of the campus community are encouraged to make clear in their public expressions, writings, demonstrations, or posts if they are speaking on behalf of a group or the college as a whole, or if they are speaking only for themselves and sharing thoughts that do not necessarily represent the views of the college or the college community as a whole.

Time, place, and manner

College officials have the right and responsibility to limit the time, place, and manner of protests or demonstrations to ensure that they do not censor or obstruct the exchange of ideas or place individuals or campus property at risk. Criteria to be considered before requesting relocation of a protest or demonstration include:

- *Is personal safety at risk?*
- *Is property at risk?*
- *Is the ability of others to see, hear, or speak impeded to such a degree that they are not able to exercise their rights to free speech and freedom of movement?*

Adherence to law

Any action or communication that violates college policy or federal, state, or local law is prohibited.

Related information

- [Political Activity Policy](#)
- [Email, Voicemail, and Network Use Policy](#)
- [Campus Policy Prohibiting Discrimination and Harassment](#)



Independent Colleges of Washington

2017 ICW Fall Faculty Leadership Development Conference | November 9-10, 2017

Theme: "LEADING YOUR PEERS"

Hosted by Gonzaga University | Spokane, WA

AGENDA

Thursday, November 9

- 4:00pm Welcome reception** HEMMINGSON CENTER – JOANN JUNDT LOUNGE (2nd floor)
- *Pick up materials and nametags*
 - *Informal networking*
 - *Light refreshments will be provided*
- 5:30pm Dinner & Speaker**
- HOST: **Brian Severson, Gonzaga University**
- *Introduction of context that brings us together*
 - *Introduction of Planning Committee members*
 - *Introduction of speaker*
 - **SPEAKER: Dr. Thayne McCulloh, President Gonzaga University**
- 7:00pm Evening dismissal**
- FACILITATOR: **Dawn Keig, Whitworth University**
- *Review of materials packets*
 - *Review of "homework" for Friday's sessions*
 - *After dinner participants are encouraged to take advantage of GU's proximity to downtown Spokane and enjoy some social time. Information about local venues will be available in packets..*

Friday, November 10

- 8:30am Breakfast** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
- Breakfast bar/buffet be provided.*
- 9:00am Session I: Leadership Challenges Roundtable** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
- FACILITATOR: **Barry Balof, Whitman College [UNCONFIRMED]**
- The purpose of the initial session is to set the tone for the day's activities. We will start with a facilitated and interactive roundtable session to provide semi-structured opportunities for all participants to begin to discuss, share, and explore key faculty leadership issues and ideas.*
- **Formal Introductions:** name, school, faculty position, academic leadership positions holding/held/targeted for future
 - Recognition of different types of academic "leadership" (administrative, governance, department/program)
 - **Warm-Up Activity:** Discuss short reading and case study (*included in materials packet*)
 - **Hot Topics Discussion:**
 - Review of top 10 leadership development categories identified by ICW Leadership Planning Team (*this list is included in materials packet*)
 - Discussion of individual and institutional goals from today's investment
- 10:30am BREAK**
- 10:30am Session II: Lessons from the Trenches Panel** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
- Three experienced faculty leaders will each deliver 10-15 minute talks relating a personal experience they have had with an academic leadership challenge, how they handled it, and what they learned from it. Each talk will include specific advice/takeaways. Session will include Q&A with all panelists.*
- MODERATOR: **Cheris Current, Walla Walla University**
- PANELIST #1: **Alisa Kessel, University of Puget Sound [UNCONFIRMED]**
- PANELIST #2: **Craig Hinnencamp, Whitworth University [UNCONFIRMED]**
- PANELIST #3: **Brian Severson, Gonzaga University**



- 12:00pm Lunch** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
During lunch we will review the afternoon agenda including the breakout session logistics
- Session III – Practical Leadership Skills Breakout Workshops**
There are two different interactive breakout workshops; everyone will participate in both. Group A will go to Session A first; Group B will go to Session B first. Then we will switch at the break, and the sessions will be repeated. (Groups will be denoted in the materials packets).
- 1:00pm BREAKOUT SESSION A** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
TOPIC: **Organization and project management skills for faculty leadership**
FACILITATOR: **Dawn Keig, Whitworth University**
- 1:40pm BREAK**
Participants move to other breakout session room
- 1:50pm BREAKOUT SESSION B** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
TOPIC: **Soft skills development for faculty leaders**
FACILITATOR: **tbd, Gonzaga University**
- 2:30pm BREAK**
- 2:45pm Session IV – Sharing Best Practices & Resources** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
FACILITATOR: **Brian Steverson, Gonzaga University**
One of the goals of the conference is to share resources with each other related to leadership development that we can take back to our respective institutions.
- **Tips:** *Participants will discuss the “homework” tip/advice that they prepared (in materials packet), which is related to one practical tip or technique that they have found useful in faculty leadership experiences.*
 - **External Resources:** *Participants will share regional and national resources for faculty leadership training that they have used, participated in, and/or heard of. Resources will be gathered, consolidated, and distributed after the meeting.*
 - **Resource Network:** *Additionally, WE are all resources for each other. So to supplement the informal relationships that will be forged throughout the workshops, we will also formalize specific topics/areas/scenarios that each of us could potentially be a resource for each other. Everyone has something to offer, regardless of depth of experience. We will gather some of that information together to formalize a peer-to-peer ICW leadership support network that we can all participate in and call upon throughout the year.*
- 4:00pm BREAK**
- 4:15pm Wrap Up – Reflection, Learnings, Future Planning** CROSBY CENTER – ROOM TBD
- **Individual Reflection:** *Structured reflection on key takeaways*
 - **Institutional Follow-up:** *How will we each carry the information from this investment back to / within our respective institutions? Idea sharing, plans formulated*
 - **Future Planning:** *Ideas, priorities, topics, formats, resources for future training*
- 5:00pm Conference dismissal**