Faculty Senate Minutes
October 6, 1997

Senators present: K. Barhydt (student), B. Beardsley, N. Bristow, T. Cooney (ex-officio), C. Hale, B. Haltom, K. Hummel-Berry, J.Kay (ex-officio), G. Kirchner (chair), B. Lind, R. Steiner, G. Tomlin, A. Wood

Visitors: K. Bartanen, D. Droge, J. Riegsecker

Meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

Minutes of 29 September 1997 were approved without emendation.

Announcements:
Kim Thomas will replace Mike Farmer as student representative to Senate.

Conferences and appearances of special interest in the coming days were highlighted.

Chair's Report:

Kirchner reminded the Senate that the Library and Media Committee has no charges, and that charges for that committee would be considered later in the meeting.

Consideration of deadlines for tuition refunds:
Last spring, the Controller and Vice President for Finance and Administration approved a change to the University's tuition refund policy, effective fall 1997. The revised refund schedule was published in the UPS Bulletin, and also in the Tuition and Fees section of the University's Web Page. It was recently discovered that the 1997-98 LOGGER handbook still reflected the old refund schedule, and that the Academic Calendar had not been updated to include the revised tuition refund schedule.
On request of Maggie Mittuch, Student Accounts manager, the following motion was made:

Kay **(M/S/P)**: The Academic Calendar be changed to update the tuition refund dates to the new dates currently in effect. These dates are as follows:

Fall 1997

Last Day for 100% tuition refund	September 2
90% tuition refund	September 3 - 5
50% tuition refund	September 8-26
25% tuition refund	September 29-October 24

Spring 1998

Last day for 100% tuition refund	January 20
90% tuition refund	January 21-23
50% tuition refund	January 26-February 13
25% tuition refund	February 16-March 13

Discussion of process for dealing with code revisions in the committee of the whole:
Senators discussed a proposal for process written by the Senate Executive Committee at length, separately considering each step to come to agreement as to the wisdom of the process and the clarity of the language describing it. A copy of that process, in the form finally agreed upon by the Senate, is appended to the end of these minutes.

Haltom **(M/S/P)** acceptance of the process for dealing with code revisions as drafted by the Senate Executive Committee, and revised in today's discussion.

It was agreed that this plan would be emailed to faculty prior to the 10/8/97 faculty meeting, together with explanation as written by Grace Kirchner, who will make a motion to use this procedure at that meeting after a short explanation by David Droge. Additionally, a 24 page document pointing out changes to the code (which will not be ready by 10/8) will be mailed to all faculty.

Riegsecker pointed out that according to the bylaws voting is by acclamation, or if two people suggest a written vote. He questioned if that language renders a show of hands illegal, i.e., whether the term "acclamation" requires that a sound be made. Haltom pointed out that a vote using spoken ayes or nays is potentially more anonymous than showing hands, and that he prefers that level of anonymity. Kirchner indicated that this wording is strange and worth considering more carefully.

Discussion of what to do regarding core revisions:
Haltom suggested that the need to get the code revisions to the trustees with good speed suggests postponing work on the core until after the code. This idea met with general agreement.

 Haltom **(M/S/P)** "Faculty will do the code, and when done, will do the core."

Beardsley pointed out the need to report what has been done, in terms of Senate's action in Spring 1997, then keep the issue on the table. Some confusion remains about whether we were in the committee of the whole at the time that three motions were made (during the 4/22/97 faculty meeting) regarding the core. Smith's minutes of that meeting seem to suggest that we were, since we had not been removed from the committee of the whole. Hence, as a matter of housekeeping, the following motion was made:

Haltom **(M/S/P)** The will of the Senate is that we report to the faculty that the three motions made in the committee of the whole be brought forward and laid on the table. These are as follows:

1. That the size of the core be reduced ;
2. That two freshman seminars, a topic seminar and a seminar in writing and rhetoric, be established.
3. That discussions on the core begin with consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Core Review Committee elected by the faculty.

The Senate furthermore recommends postponing discussion of the core while we consider the code.

Charges for Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee:
Senators considered suggestions for charges for this committee made in their May 1997 committee report. These suggested charges were two. Cooney argued that the first, "that the Committee develop and implement the plan to act as liaisons with the library and computing groups" calls into question the necessity of the committee, expressing concern about a charge to implement a plan. It was agreed that the language in that suggested charge was unnecessary, and it was eliminated as a charge per se. Kay asked whether a committee can appropriately advocate funding, as stated in the second suggested charge "that the Committee continue to serve as an advocate for adequate funding of the library and academic computing. This charge was generally agreed to be acceptable as written. Additional charges emerged from the discussion.

Kay (M/S/P) the following three charges for LMAC be approved:

1. The Committee continue to serve as an advocate for adequate funding of the library and academic computing

2. The Committee consider whether students should be required to own computers at some future date.

3. The Committee monitor the issue of supporting multiple operating systems on campus.

Consideration of Cooney's draft for the University Mission Statement:

Cooney provided Senators with a draft mission statement for the University, and asked for input from Senators. Kay suggested that language about the cocurriculum be inserted into the mission statement. Cooney replied that the mission statement is primarily an academic statement. He further described that too many insertions of language about specific programs on campus threatens to make the statement too verbose, and to further create a situation in which programs such as co-curricular programs should be evaluated in terms of how well they do things stated in elsewhere in the mission statement such as "build critical analysis." Kay indicated that it is important to see cocurriculum as enhancing student learning. After further tweaking of wording through discussion, the draft was left as follows, with the understanding that further minor changes might be made by Cooney during the accreditation process. (The final statement will need to be reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.)

"The University of Puget Sound is an independent predominantly residential undergraduate liberal arts college with approximately 2450 undergraduates. Selected graduate programs with a total enrollment of 150 students build effectively on a liberal arts foundation to provide professional education. The University maintains a strong commitment to teaching excellence, scholarly engagement, and fruitful student-faculty interaction. Puget Sound seeks to develop in its students capacities for critical analysis, sound judgment, and apt expression that will sustain a lifelong cultivation of intellectual curiosity, active inquiry, and reasoned independence. A Puget Sound education, both academic and co-curricular, encourages a rich knowledge of self and others, of commonality and difference, as well as the full, open, and civil discussion of ideas, preparing the University's graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship. Such an education seeks to liberate each person from the constraints of ignorance, narrowness, and indifference and to assist in the unfolding of creative and useful lives."

Clarification of Student Life Committee charge regarding evaluation of effects of decision to defer rush:
The original wording of this charge, taken from Faculty Senate minutes of 9/15/97 is: Review the objectives established by the Trustees and campus committees more than a decade ago for changes in Greek rush and in guidelines for the Greek system, evaluate whether those objectives are being met, and consider whether additional steps need to be taken or additional issues addressed.

Barhydt brought up the question of whether what was meant by that charge was formal rush per se, versus informal socializing, and whether this overlaps with the activities of the Greek Partnership Committee. He indicated that there are opportunities for casual interaction which familiarize students with the Greek system throughout the year, which are not a part of formal rush. Kay indicated that there is no overlap between the Greek Partnership Committee and the Student life Committee on this issue. Beardsley clarified that it is important to review the effect of the specific policies as changed, that is the now decade old policy that is called "deferred rush." He suggested that the process should entail looking at the objectives and guidelines established by the trustees (omitting the phrase "and campus committees") in terms of whether their objectives are being met. Kirchner indicated she would clarify this informally with the Student Life Committee chair.

Bristow (M/S/P) adjournment at approximately 5:30 PM.

Document outlining process for code revisions as proposed by Senate Executive Committee, and edited by Senators:

Assumptions:

1. The final "package" needs to be considered and voted upon as a whole document because of the relocation of some sections.

2. This, and only this, final action needs to meet the requirements of Ch.1, Part E, Section 1 in the code, namely, that an "amendment" be circulated in written form at least two weeks in advance of a final vote and that it be "read" in a faculty meeting prior to the one in which a final vote is taken. Prior to that time, we can follow any process that we want.

3. It is better not to be rewriting the Code on the floor of a faculty meeting. Colleagues should be able to anticipate what issues will be considered when and what they will be asked to vote upon.

4. It is desirable to get a package of Code revisions to the Trustees as soon as possible, rather than fix every perceived problem in the Code. This package of revisions will be followed by additional, phase #2 revisions.

Suggested Process:

1. The committee first seek informal feedback on the draft that it has circulated and makes any changes to its proposal that it sees fit. Revisions that appear to be likely to provoke a great deal of controversy may be postponed to phase #2.

2. After the period of informal feedback, draft #2 is circulated and becomes the working document. At that point the Senate and the Committee would have a better sense of the scope of the task in front of us, including how many additional faculty meetings might be required. The committee could then develop alternatives to draft #2. (Alternatives could include the old language.) All alternatives would be circulated in writing in advance of the faculty meeting in which they are to be voted up or down. Visual aids would be used to assist faculty in following the issues that are being considered. Changes that are voted in become part of the working document.

3. When this process is completed we would have a draft #3, which would be voted up or down consistent with the amendment process.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathie Hummel-Berry