

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Monday, November 14, 2011**  
**Misner Room, Collins Library**

Senators present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Marcus Luther, Keith Ward, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Kelli Delaney, Kriszta Kotsis, Alisa Kessel, Sue Hannaford, Ross Singleton, Gareth Barkin, Steven Neshyba (Chair), Leslie Saucedo, Fred Hamel, and Bill Barry

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of October 24, 2011 were approved with minor changes.

Announcements

- I. MacBain announced that in the interest of efficiency she would like to discontinue the practice of appointing scribes for each meeting and would prefer, as Secretary, to take the minutes herself. Senators voiced general approval of the suggestion, with the caveat that the decision be revisited if the new practice becomes untenable.
- II. Kotsis announced that the student show is now open in Kittredge Gallery. Viewing hours are M-F 10 to 5, and Sat 12-5. The show includes the artwork of students across the disciplines.
- III. Kessel and MacBain returned from the AAUP Shared Governance Conference. In a week they will provide the members of the Faculty Senate with a report containing information they gathered.
- IV. Ward announced that the Senate's SoundNet site is functioning. Under the title "Faculty Senate" we are listed as a "committee." The site shall act as a depository for any documents we would like to share with each other.
- V. Hamel announced that beginning on November 21<sup>st</sup> in Collins Library, the South Sound Gender exhibit, "T-Town Transgender Neighbors," will be available to view. The exhibit will feature photographic portraiture and stories from members of the South Sound community who identify as transgender.

Special Orders

- I. Kotsis said that she has one more thought on the LMIS charges and accepted Neshyba's invitation to include the topic on next week's agenda. (Note: The Senate found that it had time at the end of this day's meeting to address Kotsis's idea.)
- II. Kotsis asked for clarification on whether or not Senate liaisons to standing committees ought to distribute the newly wrought charges to their committees. Neshyba indicated that liaisons should perform that service.

Charges to 2011-2012 Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC)

- I. This agenda item was struck.

### Charges to 2011-2012 Institutional Review Board (IRB)

- I. **M (Hannaford)/S/P** to approve the charges to the IRB as written by Amy Spivey. (Attachment A contains draft charges for each of the standing committees on today's agenda.)
  - a. Speaking in support of the charge, Hannaford indicated that all the charges seemed reasonable given that they are under the purview of the IRB.
  - b. Barkin suggested adding the word "the" between "Complete" and "revision" in Item 7 (Item g below) ("Complete [the] Revision of the IRB handbook") in order to clarify the intention of the charge. The suggestion met with unanimous agreement.
- II. The charges to the IRB are as follows:
  - a. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and monitor records for research involving human subjects.
  - b. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regarding oversight of OIR work.
  - c. Develop and distribute (via the IRB website) a set of procedures for researchers wishing to appeal a decision by the Board regarding a research protocol.
  - d. Investigate and provide guidance for researchers regarding the responsibilities, legally and ethically, for reporting evidence of child abuse which comes to light in the process of research involving human subjects.
  - e. Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.
  - f. In consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, complete the revision of the Scientific Misconduct Policy.
  - g. Complete the revision of the IRB handbook.
  - h. Once the handbook is complete, update the IRB website to reflect the changes and make the site easier to navigate.
  - i. Design and implement a program for training of departmental delegates.
  - j. Continue to discuss the ways in which the IRB can be more transparent and supportive of research on campus.

### Charges to 2011-2012 Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

- I. **M (Ward)/S/P** to charge the PSC with items 1-4 (on Attachment A) as written by Bartanen, and Ward and Saucedo.
  - a. Neshyba asked for clarification on whether Ward moves that the rationale be included too, to which Ward responded "No." (He noted that the PSC has already seen the rationale for #1.)
  - b. Saucedo suggested that for Item 4 (Item d), we should include the rationale and background. Ward agreed and clarified the motion.
  - c. MacBain asked if Item 2 (Item b) is something the PSC will have to request formally of HR. Bartanen indicated that both bodies are aware of the charge but that she would be happy to issue a friendly reminder to HR.
  - d. About Item 4 (Item d) Neshyba said that the language "sexual relationship" within the draft charges strikes him as odd, for he understands the point to be about a relationship that is intimate rather than "sexual," per se. Bartanen indicated that this observation may point to a need for clarification, as suggested by the draft charge. She said that there are two different documents in which the issue at hand is addressed, the university's Shared Appointments Policy and the

Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct; the wording in each document (e.g., “partner,” “spouse,” etc.) is inconsistent with that in the other. Hence, the documents are not necessarily comprehensive.

Kessel asked if the Shared Appointments Policy should be the one the PSC looks at. Saucedo added that she believes the charge makes it implicit that the PSC will have to review any others, as well.

Bartanen suggested the following wording to clarify the charge: Clarify policy language regarding evaluation among spouses, partners, and persons involved in partnerships.

Kessel asked if Bartanen thinks evaluation should be the only thing we should be thinking about, and MacBain asked whether it was under the purview of the PSC to clarify language in documents that may be generated by Human Resources. Bartanen answered MacBain in the affirmative and, in response to Kessel’s question, asked the Senate which issue we are trying to clarify. Saucedo responded that the draft charge concerns itself with supervision more so than with evaluation, except insofar as to suggest that evaluations do not necessarily involve supervisor and supervisee (as in the case of departmental reviews of faculty). Bartanen indicated that the regulations address what is fundamentally a conflict of interest issue, that within the problem of relationships between colleagues are concerns with respect to the evaluations process. Saucedo spoke in support of clarity and clarification, and asked whether or not the spirit of the policies is about supervision or about conflict of interest.

Barry suggested that we add to the charge, after the word “applied,” the following phrase: “with respect to supervisory responsibility and evaluation.” He suggested, too, that we delete the background information. Ward, the originator of the motion, found Barry’s suggestions amenable. MacBain asked if we want to go beyond asking the PSC to “review” the wording, to which Ward responded that the review will be sufficient, for the PSC will report to the Senate. The motion passed.

- II. The charges to the PSC are as follows:
  - a. Review potential for more family-friendly "stop the clock" provisions related to the intersection of the timing of evaluations and personal medical, family medical, and/or parental leave.
  - b. Review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.
  - c. Consult with the IRB as they review the "Scientific Misconduct Policy" and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.
  - d. Review how the following Campus Policy regarding consensual sexual relationships is applied with respect to supervisory responsibility and evaluation: "In accord with the university’s conflict of interest provisions, this policy prohibits faculty or staff members from exercising supervisory responsibility with respect to another faculty or staff member with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship."

#### Charges to 2011-2012 Committee on Diversity

- I. **M (Barry)/S/P** to accept Item 1 (Item a): to systematically gather information about faculty attitudes on hiring and retention of faculty and to develop recommendations for the recruitment and retention of new faculty from historically under-represented populations.

- a. Barry asked why it is important to gather faculty attitudes and whether we want to identify to whom the recommendations should go.  
Bartanen said that every three years the university participates in a faculty survey that has these very questions in it, and that the Committee on Diversity is working on surveying the campus on the climate. She suggested striking the first half of the charge.  
Hamel asked whether the assumption of the second part of the charge isn't that the recommendations would go to the Faculty Senate, through Barkin, newly appointed substitute liaison to the Committee on Diversity.  
Ward wondered whether the charge contains a certain amount of redundancy, whether it duplicates efforts we already make on the department level, in consultation with Kim Bobby and Dean Bartanen.  
Kessel offered that this remark does not necessarily apply with respect to retention. Saucedo opined that it would be good to have feedback from faculty who may have opinions about how searches go. She indicated that Kim Bobby might find this information useful.  
Neshyba said that he is reluctant to specify that a standing committee of the Faculty Senate report to a different body.
- b. **M (Ward)/S/D** to remove "recruitment" from the charge.  
Speaking in favor of the motion, Kessel said that the retention question is a serious one for the university, and it's important to address it.  
Singleton asked to clarify that this is a self-charge of the committee. In his view, members of the committee have some interest in a charge that would allow them to investigate and make recommendations regarding recruitment and retention, so they must feel that they can make some positive contribution in this regard. Singleton did not see the basis for the Senate denying them the freedom to do that. He said that we should respect their wishes.  
Barry agreed, indicating that the committee is the faculty's committee on diversity and that they may have some interesting perspectives.  
Ward's motion was defeated.

The question was called on Barry's motion, and it passed.

- II. **M (Barkin)/S/P** to accept Item 2 (Item b): to increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the Campus Climate Survey.
  - a. The motion passed.
- III. **M (Barkin)/S/W** to accept the first iteration of Item 3 on Attachment A.
  - a. Speaking in explanation of the motion, Barkin indicated that he and Barry also came up with a second and third option for Item 3 (see Attachment A). Barkin suggested that the Senate could pass the first two items individually or else pass the third item, which combines the first two.  
Bartanen indicated that the chart already exists on the Diversity webpage. The committee just wants it updated and in a place where people can easily refer to it, so that it can stay current. Her understanding is that with the help of the Associate Deans the chart will be in a place where it can be looked at.  
Barkin asked if Bartanen knows how courses got chosen for that list, to which Bartanen replied that the task force did that work.

Kessel spoke against the motion, citing that the Curriculum Committee (CC) is trying to figure out what constitutes diversity content, so collaboration between the committees has to happen.

Barry agreed with Kessel. He feels that questions of course content fall to the CC.

Barkin withdrew the motion.

IV. **M (Barry)/S/P** to accept the second iteration of Item 3: “to collaborate with Curriculum Committee as it explores integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements.”

a. Speaking in support of the motion, Barry said that this wording neatens things up because it’s consistent with the current charge to the CC. He added that the big issue at hand is why we leave out the website; his sense is that the CC should be the committee posting curricula on the website.

Bartanen suggested that the Senate’s liaison to the Committee on Diversity could communicate that our charge focuses on collaboration with the CC because the charge focuses on curriculum, and that the liaison could add that if the chart would be helpful to the collaborative process, the Senate would be in support of that work.

Neshyba brought the motion to a vote, and it passed.

V. **M (Barkin)/S/P** to accept Item 4 (Item d): to expand the collection of faculty narratives about diversity-related issues and experiences in the classroom.

a. After some discussion of the existence and utility of the narratives, the motion passed.

VI. The charges to the Committee on Diversity are as follows:

- a. to systematically gather information about faculty attitudes on hiring and retention of faculty and to develop recommendations for the recruitment and retention of new faculty from historically under-represented populations;
- b. to increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the Campus Climate Survey;
- c. to collaborate with Curriculum Committee as it explores integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements;
- d. to expand the collection of faculty narratives about diversity-related issues and experiences in the classroom.

#### Charges to 2011-2012 International Education Committee (IEC)

I. **M (Hamel)/S/P** to charge the IEC with the five charges listed in Appendix A.

a. Speaking in support of the motion, Hamel indicated that these are all charges that the committee set to itself in its year-end report, minus a sixth charge, which was dropped. Speaking to the sixth charge, Singleton said that he spoke with Jan Leuchtenberger, who said that the committee members were going to create and administer a survey to assess the impact of the new financial report on the study abroad program. Jan is satisfied that this assessment is occurring, so she thinks that a survey at this point would be unnecessary.

With respect to the first charge Kessel asked what the IEC is looking for: Is the probation about safety or about a program being bad?

Singleton said that he thinks it's about the quality of the program. Hamel agreed, saying that they are making sure that they're re-evaluating programs of this sort and those that have become idle.

Saucedo expressed surprise that this is not a standing charge. Hamel suggested that there are programs that have been sitting out there, perhaps off the radar. Neshyba consulted with the Faculty By-Laws and read the second standing charge to the IEC: "Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty."

Barry said he sees this charge as a note to self: "Don't forget to pick up milk on the way home." In other words, the committee members want to get it on the list so that they make sure to do it.

Singleton said that he thinks the idea of a program being placed on probation is a fairly new development. So in that regard, this is kind of a new category that wasn't specifically considered in those By-Laws charges that Neshyba just read. Hamel added that the committee may not have understood the term "existing" to apply to programs on probation.

- b. With regard to Item 5 (Item e) Bartanen indicated that the academic budget has been presented to the Budget Task Force. The Senate could charge the IEC with #5, but it would be for next year, Fiscal '13-'14. Bartanen wouldn't want them to think that they have to do something this year that wouldn't go anywhere. Singleton indicated that he would communicate this information to the committee.

Neshyba brought the motion to a vote, and it passed.

## II. The charges to the IEC are as follows:

- a. Re-evaluate international education programs placed on probation or coming off travel warnings.
- b. Communicate with Office of Institutional Research to make sure that the Study Abroad Survey is administered to students prior to leaving and again 6 months after they return from study abroad. Consider the results from the 2010-11 surveys and decide whether or not the results are useful enough to keep administering the survey.
- c. Continue work with faculty to encourage the integration of study abroad experiences into on-campus classes and research symposia, and work with the SLC and Dean of Students to encourage integration of study abroad experiences into co-curricular activities.
- d. Discuss Summer Programs including resources for faculty who are interested in offering Summer study abroad classes and how to better publicize opportunities.
- e. Discuss and recommend BTF request for study abroad.

### Editorial Comment

Neshyba shared his sense that it was a great idea to vet the charges by informal committee in advance of the Faculty Senate Meeting. He advised the senators who will continue to serve next year to urge the next Senate Chair to utilize this efficient method, and he acknowledged Spivey, Hamel, Kotsis, and Kessel for suggesting it in October.

Additional Charge to the Library, Media, and Informational Systems Committee (LMIS)

- I. **M (Kotsis)/S/P** to charge LMIS to investigate the use of digital reading devices as an alternative to printed books or course packs.
  - a. Speaking in support of the motion, Kotsis said that she talked to Alyce DeMarais about how the committee has been trying to figure out how to implement the printing limitations and revise the printing system on campus. Kotsis reported that the new policy will be rolled out in Fall 2012. In relation to these issues, copyright clearance and reading packet issues have come up. Kotsis offers this charge to facilitate a possible solution and because she believes that education is going in the direction of digital reading.

Luther said that he sees two separate issues at hand: 1) Course readers, which can be read on Moodle (on laptops), a practice that some professors do not allow, and 2) Textbooks, which are part of a larger conversation.

Saucedo said that she supports the charge because it asks merely that LMIS “investigate” these options.

Barry said that the investigation (and its findings) will not necessarily head off printing at the pass, for the advantage of the course pack is that it’s printed and comes out of the students’ budget.

Barkin said that in his experience with digital readers, annotation is cumbersome, a point echoed by MacBain. MacBain added that while she supports the spirit of Kotsis’s motion, she has found that digital readers do not work well in the literature classroom.

Hannaford said it would be foolish not to think about this technology.

Luther suggested that if we start freshmen off reading in this way, the use of such technology in the classroom will get easier. He added that the professors who put course materials on Moodle do so knowing that the printing costs go to the school, not to the students.

Hamel agreed with those saying that students are already using this technology, and he offered a classroom anecdote as support. However, he did not know what “investigate the use” means in the phrasing of the motion right now: Are we coming up with another structure?

Hannaford suggested that the motion say, “Investigate the current and potential use.”

Kessel thought that the language of the motion is sufficiently broad that LMIS can figure out how to interpret the charge.
  - b. Neshyba brought the motion to a vote, and it passed.

The Faculty Senate meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Attachment A  
Draft Charges to FAC, IRB, PSC, CoD, and IEC

**FAC (Bartanen):**

The FAC year-end report suggests no additional charges for 2011-2012. The committee has 51 files to review, only 14 of which are streamline, so has a full agenda.

**IRB (Spivey):**

Charges from 2010-2011 that the IRB didn't complete or which might be ongoing

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and monitor records for research involving human subjects.
2. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regarding oversight of OIR work.
3. Develop and distribute (via the IRB website) a set of procedures for researchers wishing to appeal a decision by the Board regarding a research protocol.
4. Investigate and provide guidance for researchers regarding the responsibilities, legally and ethically, for reporting evidence of child abuse which comes to light in the process of research involving human subjects.
5. Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.

Charges suggested in the end-of-year report from the 2010-2011 IRB

6. In consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, complete the revision of the Scientific Misconduct Policy.
7. Complete revision of the IRB handbook.
8. Once the handbook is complete, update the IRB website to reflect the changes and make the site easier to navigate.
9. Design and implement a program for training of departmental delegates.
10. Continue to discuss the ways in which the IRB can be more transparent and supportive of research on campus.



### **PSC (Bartanen):**

1. That PSC review potential for more family-friendly "stop the clock" provisions related to the intersection of the timing of evaluations and personal medical, family medical, and/or parental leave.

Rationale: (from Spring 2010 FAC year-end report) The Advancement Committee observed challenges for candidates and departments in several files related to family medical leave (or absence thereof). The Committee encourages the Dean to work on options for more family-friendly policies. The opportunity to "stop the evaluation clock" in the absence of an FMLA leave needs to be clearer and more transparent for faculty members, particularly junior colleagues.

### **PSC (Saucedo/Ward):**

In addition to the recommendation from Kris for PSC charges, here is a draft of three others. The first two are from the PSC's year-end report and the 3rd arose out of conversations with colleagues:

2. Review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.
3. Consult with the IRB as they review the "Scientific Misconduct Policy" and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.
4. Review how the following Campus Policy regarding consensual sexual relationships is applied:

"In accord with the university's conflict of interest provisions, this policy prohibits faculty or staff members from exercising supervisory responsibility with respect to another faculty or staff member with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship."

Background: this serves as the grounds for not allowing partners to contribute to one another's evaluation (although other members of the department aren't considered "supervisors") yet does not prevent partners within a department from serving as chairs (even though they serve as "head officers").

### **Diversity (Barkin and Barry)**

With minor modifications for clarity and consistency and one major modification around content (3, below), here are requested charges from year-end report of the Diversity Comm. The questions in parentheses were raised in our discussion of modifications.

1. to systematically gather information about faculty attitudes on hiring and retention of faculty and to develop recommendations for the recruitment and retention of new faculty from

historically under-represented populations; (*Question to senate: Is collection of attitudes necessary? Should we identify to whom recommendations go?*)

2. to increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the Campus Climate Survey;
3. to create and maintain a website with technical assistance from the Associate Deans' Office that displays courses at Puget Sound with significant diversity content; (*Question: Should curriculum comm have a role in this process, especially if it involves creation of diversity requirement? What is the purpose of the list? How does this charge relate to Charge 2 to the CC, namely "to continue discussion of integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements in collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer and the Faculty Diversity Committee"? An alternative follows.*)

*OR*

3. to collaborate with Curriculum Committee as it explores integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements; (*This could potentially also become a new charge, in which case it should be #3, and the website charge above should be made #4, for coherence.*)

*OR*

3. to collaborate with Curriculum Committee as it explores integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements, and undertake to publicize courses found to contain significant diversity content on a website that will be created and maintained with assistance from the Associate Deans' Office;
4. to expand the collection of faculty narratives about diversity-related issues and experiences in the classroom.

### **International Education Committee**

1. Re-evaluate international education programs placed on probation or coming off travel warnings.
2. Communicate with Office of Institutional Research to make sure that the Study Abroad Survey is administered to students prior to leaving and again 6 months after they return from study abroad. Consider the results from the 2010-11 surveys and decide whether or not the results are useful enough to keep administering the survey.
3. Continue work with faculty to encourage the integration of study abroad experiences into on-campus classes and research symposia, and work with the SLC and Dean of Students to encourage integration of study abroad experiences into co-curricular activities.
4. Discuss Summer Programs including resources for faculty who are interested in offering Summer study abroad classes and how to better publicize opportunities.

5. Discuss and recommend BTF request for study abroad.