

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the August 29, 2016 meeting

Attendance:

Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Bill Haltom, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Brendan Lanctot, Noah Lumbantobing, Pierre Ly, Casey O'Brien, Emelie Peine, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Peter Wimberger
Guests: Jennifer Hastings, Eric Scharrer

Chair Kessel called the Senate to order at 4:04 p.m.

Pages 200-201 from the Sturgis's *Standard Code* were distributed as the only announcement.

M/S/P to confirm Brendan Lanctot & Pierre Ly respectively as Vice Chair & Secretary of the Faculty Senate

M/S/P to approve Minutes of 9 May 2016 at the next meeting of the Senate. ["ASC Guidelines" in the distributed draft was transformed to "ASC Proposal" before approval of minutes was postponed.]

Chair Kessel asked liaisons please to use the most recent list of appointees to Faculty Senate committees.

ASUPS President Lumbantobing reported that he had no ASUPS actions to report yet, but meetings would soon guarantee reports to the Senate.

Staff Senate Representative Skeel reported that Staff Senate had yet to meet.

M/S/P to approve the following charge to the Academic Standards Committee [Fox-Dobbs, liaison]:

"In addition to the ongoing charges in The Faculty Bylaws, review the policy of the university for the transfer of Running Start credits as articulated by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions and recommend approval or suggest changes."

M/S/P to charge the Institutional Review Board [Ramakrishnan] as follows:

"In addition to the ongoing charges in The Faculty Bylaws,

1. make recommendations on how the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) fits into the IRB structure;
2. develop training of new IRB members, including procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols and regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding; and
3. formulate practices for off-campus researchers to conduct research with members of campus community."

M/S/P to charge the University Enrichment Committee [Haltom, liaison] as follows:

"In addition to the ongoing charges in The Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the University Enrichment Committee a) to determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding online,

public-access fees for publication and, if the UEC determines there is such a need, b) to create and publish the guideline.”

The Senate then considered informally the common period: Guest Scharrer argued that faculty should revisit the common period, the 2015-2016 Senate’s passage of which caught him and other colleagues by surprise. He articulated problems for curricular offerings and scheduling in sciences [among other venues]. Senator Ramakrishnan asked how Professor Scharrer would have the faculty discussion proceed: survey, debate at a faculty meeting, or other means? Professor Scharrer and others argued that more discussions would give faculty more chances to voice concerns. Chair Kessel informed senators that she has conferred with many principals to establish facts, to clarify issues, and to focus faculty discussion. Senator Bristow favored a reminder to faculty at the faculty meeting of the process to date to inform attendees. Chair Kessel asked how the discussion could best be conducted. Chair Kessel and Professor Scharrer argued that a motion might be presented so that faculty might effectively be informed and solutions to problems efficiently constructed. Professor Scharrer stated that he worried about “compression” of students’ schedules. O’Brien commented that a common hour would be helpful for student group meetings. Ramakrishnan, Bristow, and Jacobson volunteered to help Kessel to construct an FAQ to guide the faculty in and after the upcoming meeting.

The Senate then discussed the language of the Faculty Code with regard to promotion to full professor. How should the process(es) proceed? Chair Kessel asked whether this topic would be suitable for faculty discussion or whether colleagues should offer proposed changes to the Faculty Code? Senator Lanctot wondered whether veterans of the Faculty Advancement Committee might be invited to inform the senate or the faculty in full about practices and understandings. Senator Jacobson agreed that “service” and other key nouns might be more profitably discussed rather than the adjectival forms such as “distinguished.” Chair Kessel suggested that aspirational as well as interpretive usages might be established. Dean Bartanen reminded senators that the FAC had asked that, in the short run, the PSC interpret the language and, in the longer run, faculty discuss developments since 1999 and changes in professional growth and other aspects of performance at the University of Puget Sound. Chair Kessel asked how to gather information for the aspirations of faculty for clarity in the Faculty Code. Dean Bartanen suggested that some volunteers might open the conversation at a meeting of the full faculty: questions, problems, concerns, and other matters. Senator Wimberger agreed that issues and problems should be defined so faculty know what is being discussed. The Senators concluded that they would not charge the PSC with writing an interpretation, but would focus instead on opening up a faculty-wide conversation on the issue in order to determine the aspirations of the faculty on this issue.

Robin Jacobson then volunteered to be the Faculty Senate’s representative to the ad hoc committee on educational goals.

M/S/P to adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

Inscribed,

Wild Bill

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate