

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting

September 30, 1996

Senators Present: Bill Beardsley, Mike Farmer (student rep), Bill Haltom, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Grace Kirchner, Bruce Lind, Bob Matthews, Ili Nagy, David Potts, Marta Robertson, Sarah Sloane, Bryan Smith

Visitors: Kent Hooper, Michael Elliott

Minutes of Sept 16, 1996: Approved with the following revisions:

1) Announcements: Grace Kirchner reminded senators of the importance of reading minutes of the various committees, all posted on the campus-only WEB page. Since significant work is being done by the Academic Standards Committee with regard to the Integrity Code, the minutes of that committee are particularly important to review.

2) Overhaul of Faculty Code: Grace Kirchner wanted to clarify that she actually brought up the idea that a small ad hoc group might most efficiently revise the Faculty Code to eliminate vagueness and ambiguities. David Potts supported this idea, and in discussion among senators, David suggested that this committee, which might consist of two administrators and two faculty members, report to Professional Standards Committee.

Announcements (9/30): None

1) Added agenda item: Eligibility to Vote for Senate and FAC: Grace Kirchner brought up that the term "faculty" as defined in Section 1 of Article II of the Bylaws is difficult to interpret in terms of determining who should receive ballots and have a vote in elections of members of the Faculty Senate and the FAC. Article IV, Section 6Ab defines those eligible to vote in election of senators, thus election of faculty advancement committee as well, as "members of the instructional staff as defined in Article II, Section 1." In Article II, Section 1, the President of the University, Academic Deans and Dean of Students are defined as faculty in a separate phrase from the term "instructional staff." While the practice, dating back many years, has been to include these administrators in the vote, confusion arises as to whether these same administrators would fit the definition "instructional staff" as it is used in Article IV, Section 6Ab. Lengthy discussion ensued on this matter. The following represents a summary of the major points brought up during this discussion, with those who supported the various points identified.

Points made in support of keeping status quo on ballot distribution revolved around the theme that the current President and Deans have faculty appointments, and do on occasion teach classes. (Potts, Nagy, Matthews) Matthews further opined that the inclusive style of ballot distribution could be considered characteristic of this institution and was a positive attribute in our institutional style. The student representative emphasized the importance to make some decision about interpretation of this language promptly because of the risk of invalidation of decisions made in Senate should the election process come into question as to its validity. Several argued that hasty decisions for change might be ill advised and that the best forum for revision of the Bylaws would be the

committee which will be formed to undertake this task. These individuals argued that maintaining status quo would be the wisest short term solution, with careful scrutiny for this document planned in the coming months. (Potts, Matthews)

Points in support of considering change included a concern that in matters such as faculty advancement committee selection the administrative contingent might be construed to have what amounts to be two votes, that is one vote by ballot for the committee finalists, and the additional "vote" which occurs during the final selection. (Haltom, Smith, Matthews) Haltom further indicated that consistently applying the inclusive definition of "faculty" would mean that theoretically the President and/or Deans could be elected as senators. Haltom also indicated that emeritus faculty have equal likelihood of teaching classes to the President and Deans, but are only given ballots when teaching full-time at the University.

There was some argument advanced about what might have been the intentions of the original authors of the document. Some felt that the fact that the President and Deans are mentioned separately from the instructional staff in Article II, Section 1 could be taken to mean that a deliberate effort had been made to draw a distinction. (Haltom) Others opined that the choice of words such as "faculty" versus "instructional staff" in Articles I and IV might have as likely been the result of multiple authorship. (Matthews)

Other concerns were raised about clarity within the Bylaws document which were not so much about the issue of whether the term "faculty" could be considered synonymous in all ways to "instructional staff" but still deserved scrutiny when this document undergoes revision for clarity. These concerns included definitions of full-time versus part-time and visiting instructional staff and emeritus faculty. As the discussion of this matter ended, it was acknowledged that ambiguity still exists in interpretation of many parts of this document including those sections discussed today, and that the issue needs to be revisited by the appropriate body.

M/S/P: The term "instructional staff eligible to vote" in Article IV, Section 6, Part A, Part b, shall be understood to include those of the President, Academic Deans, and Deans of Students who have academic appointments at the University in accordance with Article II, Section 1.

2) Committee Charges: Charges to the various Standing Committees were reviewed, with discussion of suggested additions or concerns only. Concern was expressed that the curriculum committee appeared to have a short list of charges, but the concerned party was relieved when assured by Kirchner that the Curriculum Committee had a long list of automatic tasks to attend to. Matthews suggested the addition of the phrase "in addition to usual duties" to the charges for each committee. Matthews suggested that the Library/media Committee be charged to study the problem of access to electronic documents in readable form throughout the campus. He indicated that reduction in paper waste is a laudable goal, but in pursuing this goal it is of paramount importance to assure campus wide accessibility of important documents. Potts argued that Raney Ellis could address this issue without committee action, but Matthews felt that committee input on this might be important as well. It was finally decided to add this charge to the Library/media committees duties, and contact Raney to address this problem as well. Otherwise the committee charges were accepted as written.

3) Planning for Discussion of the Core Curriculum: Three proposals have been developed and circulated variously but not consistently. By Wednesday, all three should be available on the University only WEB site. It was decided that since various individuals in the University community, out of concern for the importance of fully informing the faculty on these matters, might choose to circulate the proposals as hard copy in multiple redundant efforts, there would be a better overall reduction in paper waste if this particular set of documents was distributed in hard copy to all faculty. Thus the Senate authorized the Secretary of the Faculty to distribute hard copies of all three proposals to the faculty at large.

There was considerable discussion about the need for the faculty to have adequate opportunity to fully discuss and examine the three proposals at hand. Haltom suggested mail balloting because of the inability for all faculty to be present at meetings due to conflicting classes. Potts noted his understanding that long-established practice at Puget Sound was for important legislative decisions to be made by faculty who were present at meetings. He suggested that votes simply be taken at points of peak attendance.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathie Hummel-Berry