

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, November 21, 2011
Misner Room, Collins Library

Senators present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Fred Hamel, Bill Barry, Amy Spivey, Kris Bartanen, Ross Singleton, Leslie Saucedo, Steven Neshyba (Chair)

Guests present: Bill Kupinse, Lisa Ferrari, Pierre Ly, John Hanson, Liz Collins

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

The minutes of November 14, 2011 were approved with minor changes.

Announcements

- I. I. Kessel announced that she and MacBain decided it made sense to distribute their report on the 2011 AAUP Shared Governance Conference and Workshops to the Senate Executive Committee and to Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen for fact-checking before Kessel and MacBain disseminate the report more widely.

Special Orders

- I. I. Barry noted that the item "Reports from Committee Liaisons" has not appeared regularly on the Faculty Senate agendas this semester. Neshyba acknowledged the oversight and said he would correct the omission.
- II. II. Barry presented an update on the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). The ASC has been discussing whether or not to make a student who has committed an act of academic dishonesty ineligible for university honors and has decided not to change the existing procedure governing such a situation. Instead, the ASC will make explicit in the student handbook that the Honor Court may render a student ineligible for honors.
- III. III. Singleton suggested that making available on Cascade photos of all faculty, staff, and students would be a great way to build community and facilitate more efficient communication between faculty, staff, and students. Bartanen said that this feature will be a part of the new ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system, but she does not think that such a change will be made to Cascade. She will follow up on the idea.
- IV. IV. Spivey indicated an interest in finding out if this campus would be interested in grant programs to which people can apply to defray childcare costs when traveling to conferences or to do research. Saucedo said that Alyce DeMarais may be investigating this at some level, for DeMarais has brought up the possibility before.
- V. V. Barry was curious about whether there is any follow-up to be done in the wake of the Faculty Meeting's straw poll over the issue of a 3/2 load, which received an affirmative vote. Neshyba said that Mott Greene and Suzanne Holland asked that the item not be put on the agenda today. Neshyba

encouraged Greene and Holland to send out some notes on the facultygovernance listserv. Neshyba wondered if Barry was suggesting that Neshyba put the item on the next Senate agenda, to which Barry responded that there was no mechanism in that straw vote for the creation of any committee and that by default that task may fall to the Faculty Senate. Neshyba said that he will look into the issue further but for now is respecting Greene and Holland's request to put a hold on the conversation.

Standardization of the Length of Summer Courses

I. I. Director of Summer Sessions, Lisa Ferrari, presented the question at hand on the International Education Committee (IEC): the length of study-abroad summer courses. She explained that:

- Currently, summer session comprises two separate 6-week terms;
- the courses that students take during summer terms are the same as offered during regular semesters, which is to say that they yield 1 unit of credit and require roughly the same number of classroom hours (45 classroom hours during the regular term and 48 classroom hours during the summer term).

In the past, the university has not approved for credit any study abroad courses that run fewer than 6 weeks in the summer. More recently, the IEC has approved two new programs that last for 4 weeks: Japanese Language (in Kyoto, Japan), and an Immersion Biology field school in the Turks and Caicos Islands. Ferrari noted that the Japanese program requires 80 hours of classroom time + other cultural immersion. In the Biology program, students devote many hours to working in the "field," collecting data, etc., so in both programs instructional time is not a concern.

- I. II. The IEC is now considering a request to approve a study-abroad summer course that is 3 weeks long, so this seems to be a good time to revisit this question about what constitutes coursework during a condensed summer program that is nonetheless equivalent to a semester's program. Ferrari noted that, ideally, we would have had this conversation before the two 4-week programs were approved but said that's not where we are.
- a. a. Ferrari met with the chairs of the IEC, the Curriculum Committee (CC), and the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), the four of whom concluded (together) that there were some large issues that would need to be addressed in order to have a reasonable wide-range or broader discussion about what the future of summer session courses should look like, e.g., laying out some parameters by which faculty colleagues might want to identify what can and cannot be learned in a short period of time, what we can know about that kind of learning, whether or not immersion is important, what constitutes immersion, etc.
 - b. b. Ferrari reported having asked Neshyba for permission to create a joint subcommittee of the three committees that would comprise one faculty member from each committee, Ferrari, and Brad Tomhave, the Registrar.

The joint subcommittee would begin to identify issues and parameters for further faculty discussion of the topic. Ferrari said that Neshyba approved the request and asked that Ferrari come to today's Faculty Senate meeting to get senators' input on or questions about what the subcommittee ought to address.

- I. III. Saucedo asked if the subcommittee has looked at Colorado College's model, for they use a "block" system all year long. Bartanen said that Cornell College of Iowa does the same.
- II. IV. Spivey said that students might perform a significant amount of work before they leave the country. She suggested asking the programs if all of the work fits into the set time frame.
- III. V. Hamel posed one question for the sub-committee to ask of themselves: Are you concerned primarily about the summer session as opposed to a definition that might apply across the curriculum? Ferrari responded that right now her concern is summer session because that's where the immediate questions have been arising. Yet she agrees that it's hard to imagine this discussion going forward without its having some larger implications about what counts as a unit or half-unit of academic work.
- IV. VI. Kotsis asked if Ferrari is thinking about decreasing the number of hours of summer sessions. Ferrari said that part of the reason there are more contact hours in a summer session than in a regular semester is that the extra hours make up for the compacted period of time. In the summer, students and faculty do not have the same number of weeks to consider a topic, to wait for their materials to come to campus, etc. When Ferrari spoke with the three committee chairs, the question was whether a comparable level of rigor could occur during a shorter period of time.
- V. VII. Kotsis asked, When students take summer courses, how many do they generally take? Her thinking was that the number of courses may have an impact on how engaged students are with the material. She made a second point that it must be incredibly difficult to compare a course conducted on campus to one conducted abroad and noted that the intensity of a program can compensate for shortness. To Kotsis, three weeks sounds short; four weeks sounds reasonable and comparable Puget Sound. But it's important to think that in study abroad, it's such a different experience than when a student is in the classroom here. Ferrari said that this was exactly the argument that swayed the IEC to add the two four-week programs. She concurred that, intuitively, the difference between 3 and 4 weeks seems big, and to Kotsis's question responded that "full-time" during summer session is 2 courses, so a student cannot register for more, except for a half-unit of p.e. Most students do take 2 courses in a summer term, but a healthy minority each session takes only 1 course.
- VI. VIII. Barry said that it sounds like the subcommittee would explore the study abroad summer programs and look at the length of study on campus during summer sessions. Ferrari agreed and said that part of that task may be to distinguish campus courses from study abroad courses. They would also need to determine the overall summer model. In the interest of saving the time of

- the subcommittee, Barry spoke in favor of not questioning the model that exists. He added that he is not sure what is wrong with the current model and said that if the sub-committee gets into what is a valid summer model, and if that gets into implications for the regular semester, the tail will be wagging the dog. Ferrari replied that, on the other hand, during the academic year the university does not treat study abroad courses differently than regular courses. It would be logically problematic not to follow suit during the summer. And from a practical standpoint, it gives Ferrari problems explaining the rationale for why a shorter course may not be sanctioned, for the policy is unwritten and, therefore, it can be challenging to determine when exceptions are appropriate. Barry maintained that this seems to be a problem with study abroad and not with our program at Puget Sound. He recalled having been on the CC in the early 1990s when the committee dealt with the shift from 4.5- to 6-week summer sessions. He said it seems that it would be a big issue for the sub-committee to examine unit assignments, contact hours, etc., when the system seems to work pretty well, absent the problem that has cropped up with study abroad.
- VII. IX. Neshyba reminded the Senate that they are not charging this subcommittee right now and asked Ferrari for her timeline. Ferrari replied that her goal is to have the three faculty members for the subcommittee identified by the end of this semester. She plans to hold a preliminary meeting during exam week and then early in spring semester to have something to bring to the Faculty Senate. Spivey asked whether or not having one person from each committee would be adequate, and she asked about Ferrari's process of selection. Ferrari predicted that it may be difficult to attract more than one volunteer from each committee. She also told the Senate that it may be helpful to keep in mind that the role of the sub-committee is not to make policy but rather to discuss the range of issues that may be relevant here and to try to bring those forward. In this sense, having a relatively small group will make the discussion more efficient.
- VIII. X. Neshyba issued thanks to Ferrari and the three committee chairs with whom she has met.

Intellectual Property Policy Contained in Year-End Report

Ly issued a brief update: The policy is a 3-page document that was produced last year and presented to the Faculty Senate (on May 2, 2011) by Mark Reinitz, Chair of the Library, Media, and Information Systems (LMIS) Committee last year. From the minutes of that meeting, Ly saw that one or two people raised issues about the legal wording of the university's policy on intellectual property. The policy has been sent to counsel, and LMIS has not yet heard back. Ly reiterated the point Reinitz made last year, that every time an issue having to do with intellectual property rights was raised during the committee process, William Morse, a J.D., was extremely insightful.

- I. I. Bartanen indicated, by way of clarification, that she has been waiting for the policy, and thought it was in LMIS; then she learned that LMIS thought it had forwarded the policy with its year-end review. Bartanen said that we will have to get these pieces together when we have all of the information.
- II. II. Neshyba sought agreement that the 30-day clock has not begun, for we have not yet seen the policy. Hamel asked if there were any changes made between

May and when the document went to counsel, to which others responded that the document that has been circulated is the same document LMIS described to the Senate in May of 2011.

- III. III. Singleton suggested that as a courtesy the Senate invite Brad Dillman to the meeting during which we discuss the policy, for the concerns with legality were Dillman's own. Neshyba said that he is in contact with Dillman and would be certain to extend another invitation to him.

Appointment of a Faculty Meeting Parliamentarian

- I. I. Neshyba explained that this charge was generated by Bill Haltom, who suggested that Faculty meetings could benefit from advice on procedure from time to time and that it would be good if a person were designated for that purpose.
- II. II. **M (Barry)/S/W:** Barry moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the idea of a parliamentarian. He said that it was a good idea, for from time to time we stumble, and we look over at Haltom. At the last meeting we stumbled, and Bill said that he is not a parliamentarian.
- a. a. Singleton, speaking in support of the motion, added a point of interest: David Droge helped out with this issue years ago, not as an officially designated parliamentarian but as someone familiar with parliamentary procedure.
- b. b. Barry said that if someone were to step up, we would not need a motion.
- c. c. Neshyba said that Haltom reasons that since he has been asked to do the job informally, he would like to be officially designated and get a committee release for it. Neshyba added that the penalty for instituting a parliamentarian is that by adopting the practice we would have to lose one committee person.
- d. d. Kessel asked, as a point of information, if someone serving in this capacity would be restricted from participating fully in the meeting. Bartanen said that she has observed that the parliamentarian can participate fully. Kessel observed that those who have served in this capacity have not been official parliamentarians. Neshyba said that he does not see anything barring a parliamentarian from participating: Procedurally, the chair would recognize the parliamentarian, the parliamentarian would render a decision, and whatever decision was rendered, the item would be returned to the floor. Even a conflict of interest could be handled by Sturgis.
- e. e. Speaking against the motion, Spivey said that she does not think that attending five or six Faculty Meetings a year is a fair trade for committee work.
- f. f. Hamel, as a point of clarification, said that he is not sure what the motion means. Are we proposing to change the By-Laws? Or is this a decision to have someone be a parliamentarian for us ad-hoc this year? Barry said that he didn't see it as a change in the By-Laws; he would think the designation would happen at the beginning of every year when we appoint a secretary. If we're not prevented in the By-Laws from doing it, we can do it.

Faculty could endorse a particular person for parliamentarian in any given year.

- g. g. Speaking in favor of the motion, Kessel said she thinks it is a good idea to have someone who is willing to verse him- or herself in Sturgis. She agreed with Spivey that it isn't appropriate to grant a release of service for that service, and we might even consider designating the job to a member of the Senate. MacBain disagreed with Spivey and Kessel's assessment of the position's workload, saying that being a parliamentarian would involve internalizing Sturgis's rules, a major undertaking. Kotsis wondered if there is a compromise: Maybe the person could get a course release; maybe the person could go on a two-year fallow period rather than a one-year; etc. MacBain asked if we might hire a parliamentarian. Barry said that another solution might be to ask one of the associate deans to take on the job.
- h. h. Hamel spoke in favor of the motion but said that he remains unclear on the process: Would it be an appointment? Would we vote on it as a body? Neshyba said that we should decide on this motion now, and then subsequent motions can address the issue of implementation.

Based upon concerns with implementation, the motion was withdrawn.

- a. III. **M (Kessel)/S/T:** Kessel moved that we change the By-Laws to appoint a parliamentarian for faculty meetings.
 - b. a. Speaking in support of the motion, Kessel said that Parliamentarian is an important enough position for it to be standard procedure. The By-Laws discuss who chairs the Faculty meetings, etc., so they could formalize this procedure, too. She said that she realizes that the process of changing the By-Laws is very formal, but we must signal that parliamentary procedure is important: not having a good procedure dooms meetings.
 - c. b. Speaking in favor of the motion, Hamel asked if we should strategize the making of a motion at the next Faculty meeting with an eye to having a parliamentarian for one year? Simultaneously we could initiate the process of changing the By-Laws.
 - d. c. Speaking against the motion, Barry reiterated that if assigning a parliamentarian is not prohibited by the By-Laws, we could take care of it quickly, and then it could become a ritual at the beginning of each year. Saucedo agreed with Barry; she did not like the idea coming from the Senate as some kind of formal procedure. MacBain said that the faculty could still nominate a person; the Senate would not appoint a parliamentarian.
 - e. d. Bartanen suggested that there may be other changes to the By-Laws as a consequence of the meetings Kessel and MacBain attended at the AAUP Shared Governance Conference and Workshops. Bartanen said that perhaps for now we could do something informal and then consider a sort of "package" of amendments to the By-Laws if other issues come up when we discuss MacBain and Kessel's report. Bartanen reasoned that If we're going to have a discussion about faculty and faculty governance, we ought to do it all at once.

- f. e. **MacBain moved to table the motion** so that we might consider the idea of a Faculty parliamentarian in tandem with forthcoming discussions about shared governance. The motion to table the motion was seconded and passed.

Honorary Degree Committee – Closed Session

M(Spivey)/S/P: To approve a candidate for an honorary degree.

The Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary