

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Monday, September 17, 2018  
Minutes

Present: Uchenna Baker, Kris Bartanen, Nick Brody, Gwynne Brown, Sara Freeman, Andrew Gardner, Megan Gessel, Alison Tracy Hale, Robin Jacobson, Kelly Johnson, Kristin Johnson, Chris Kendall, Andrew Monaco, Collin Noble, Heather White, Peter Wimberger,

- I. Chair Freeman called the meeting to order
- II. Announcements: Brown announced there will be a Collage Concert Friday at 7:30, ticketed at Schneebeck
- III. **M/S/P** approval of the minutes from the meeting for September 10th
- IV. Updates from Student and Staff representatives: Noble noted ASUPS is working hard on the Race & Pedagogy conference; welcome to Kelly Johnson as the second student member. Shives expressed gratitude toward Senator Brown for attending the Staff Senate meeting, and noted the Staff Senate is working on Bylaws and receiving visits from various campus members.
- V. Senate Charges to Student Life Committee and University Enrichment Committee

Discussion of additional charges to the Student Life Committee:

Committee liaison Wimberger explained that the first draft charge is a continuing charge from last year, the second is a suggestion from Dean Baker, and the third seems to be a holdover from a prior discussion regarding the potential for streamlining committee assignments (including the question of whether some of the things the SLC does could get done without having a standing committee, for example service on ad hoc committees of the student affairs division, honor boards, conduct boards, etc. Discussion ensued regarding whether the standing charges could be revised to help deal with issues that inspired such questions. Gessel noted as a former chair of the SLC that there had been previous discussion regarding the committee's work and role, including whether some service assignments could be rolled into the SLC (Elements, etc.). Noble noted it would be valuable to reflect and consider potential restructuring, and that the service taken up by faculty members (for example, in liaising with ASUPS) in their role as SLC members has varied. A conversation about how faculty rep service could be bolstered while not being overwhelming would be welcome. Jacobson and others noted that the advisory (rather than policy-forming or oversight) role of the committee is similar to that of the CoD and LMIS, committees that also struggle with their roles. Gardiner pointed out that the SLC's advisory capacity is also a means of ensuring information transfer to (not just from) faculty. Baker noted the particular importance of Charge 2. Noble suggested that the phrasing of charge #3 seems to ask a leading question ["examine the need for the SLC as a standing committee. Is there work/Are there other mechanisms by which faculty can be assigned to the hearing boards, ad hoc and student comments that would be more efficient? Report your conclusions to the Senate"].

Senators agreed draft charge #3 should be set aside for now, given the work being undertaken and the new Dean of Student Affairs. It could be taken up again in the future.

**M/S/P** In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty ByLaws, the Faculty Senate charges the SLC to:

- 1) assess (and make recommendations regarding) how the SLC might best facilitate the faculty's understanding of processes and procedures related to Student Affairs;
- 2) assist in the review of marketing materials, policies, and procedures for the Division of Student Affairs in an effort to provide external commentary and feedback about our messaging, strengths and areas of improvement and provide feedback to the Division.

Discussion of additional charges to the University Enrichment Committee:

UEC liaison Gardner explained the reason for Charge #1 is to clarify expectations for graduate programs given some concern regarding the IRB turning down proposal because applicants did not follow formal rules.

**M/S/P** In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty ByLaws, the Faculty Senate charges the UEC to:

- \* Implement a plan for conveying to Puget Sound's graduate school students the expectations and evaluation criteria for those seeking UEC-managed research awards.
- \* Revise and coordinate the submission guidelines and the evaluation rubrics for UEC-managed awards.
- \* Review and recommend updates to how professional development opportunities, procedures, and application expectations are broadcast to faculty.
- \* Maintain oversight of the Associate Dean's Office's pilot study of potential alternatives for faculty travel award allocations and assess that plan's viability for potential adoption.

Committee Updates: Andreas Madlung is the chair of the PSC (Professional Standards Committee) and Roger Allen is the chair of the UEC (University Enrichment Committee).

## VI. Review of motion concerning code language regarding the promotion to full professor

Chair Freeman noted a need to discuss process and preparation for October full faculty meeting when the draft language will receive its first reading. Given how they are written (with part 1 concerning phased implementation and part 2 concerning the language for promotion), each needs to be voted on separately. Bartanen noted it makes sense to debate changing the language for promotion first, after which conversation regarding implementation could proceed. Jacobson suggested that individuals' response to the change might be influenced by whether they think the revision is being implemented now or later, and in that case the debate over process might need to come before content. Discussion ensued regarding the fact there did seem to be concern regarding the proposed language last Spring, including concern from some junior faculty who see the language as making it harder to be promoted (in contrast to other interpretations). Noble

noted evidence that junior faculty also feel constrained in contributing to the discussion of the language, and raised the question whether due diligence has been done to alleviate that concern. Kendall asked for clarification regarding why they have to be brought forward separately, because unfortunately such a procedure seems to divide the response into those who it affects, and those it does not affect. Senators seemed in agreement that implementation should be brought forward first. A system will be established whereby anonymous feedback can be received by the Senate after the first reading, to ensure junior faculty are heard.

## VII. Continued discussion of next steps with Strategic Plan

Brown noted that the last few minutes of the September Faculty meeting seemed like a good start to the conversation about the Strategic Plan that faculty have been needing to have, but just a start. President Crawford was enthusiastic about the possibility of continuing the conversation, and senators decided to hold a Senate retreat with him at the University Club on the evening of October 10th to help provide a platform for faculty feedback and questions. Freeman raised the issue of a need for additional formats of dialogue, and emphasized that the job of the Senate is to figure out whether the faculty wants to take action on the various issues affecting the university and culture at large. We need to establish an answer to the question: “What kinds of conversation do we need to have?” and the Senate will continue to set aside time during our meetings to consider these issues and concerns, including questions about process, how particular initiatives generated in Goal Teams were chosen, where and when will faculty input make a difference, is the Strategic Plan a “given” or not, and how do we best navigate the Strategic Plan to support educational goals and values (the job of the faculty) even as we support the work of those working to improve enrollment, etc., what revisions would we make to the Strategic Plan, how do we move these forward, and what is the relationship between the operational and curricular components of the Strategic Plan?

**M/S/P** to adjourn the meeting at 1:30pm

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Johnson