

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate

Meeting November 19, 2012 McCormick Room 4:00 pm

Present: Kriszta Kotsis, Elise Richman, Judith Kay, Ross Singleton, Amy Odegard, Amy Spivey, Kelli Delaney, Brian Ernst, Brad Dillman, Alisa Kessel, Zaixin Hong, Mike Segawa, Kris Bartanen, Alyce DeMarais (guest)

I. Call to order

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm

II. Announcements

Dillman reminded those present that there is one remaining Senate meeting this semester and asked if anyone felt the need for an additional meeting; if so, individuals should contact Dillman directly.

Brian Ernst made two announcements: 1) Nancy Bristow has agreed to be the faculty representative of ASUPS Senate and 2) John Carlos (former Olympic athlete) will be speaking at the upcoming MLK day celebration.

III. Approval of the minutes of 11/05/12

M/S/P to accept the minutes from November 5 with some minor revisions.

IV. Updates from Liaisons

- A. Staff Senate:** Alisa Kessel brought up a discussion from last year regarding quiet hours at the fitness center. Kessel recalled that Faculty Senate passed a resolution regarding quiet hours and asked the Staff Senate to endorse it - the resolution was written to say that quiet hours would be enforced whether a faculty member was present or not. The resolution was endorsed by staff; however, it was noted that the resolution should specify 'faculty or staff members'. It was then clarified by other members of the Senate that this resolution was actually dismissed and the issue was worked out without a formal resolution.
- B. IRB:** The designate system the university uses to evaluate research projects using human subjects is not in compliance with federal law. The IRB is in the process of creating a proposal to submit to the Faculty Senate, which proposes to eliminate the current system, expand the IRB, and make other necessary changes pertaining to the use of human subjects in research.
- C. Academic Standards:** The ASC is working to clarify problems regarding the current course schedule. A survey was distributed to department chairs and the committee is in the process of compiling the results of the survey in preparation for a discussion on how to proceed with the issue. The ASC also

- discussed the advantages and disadvantages of instituting a bereavement policy. The committee is interesting in developing such a policy in consultation with the Faculty Senate and Student Affairs. Although, the committee noted possible drawbacks of replacing our current system in which students and faculty deal with bereavement issues on a one-on-one basis. This is not currently a formal charge, but the ASC requests feedback from the Senate on how to proceed with this matter. The Senate expressed support for ASC to continue working on the issue. Dillman agreed to contact the chair of the ASC (Kristin Johnson) directly to convey the Senate's thoughts.
- D. **IEC:** The IEC is in the process of drafting criteria for the review for faculty sponsored international programs. The committee has determined criteria for student selection for international programs, if need be. The committee also continues to work on the ongoing process of reviewing the current 38 international programs.
 - E. **Diversity:** The committee is discussing ways to integrate diversity into the curriculum, including 1st year seminars and other classes. The committee is also discussing a proposal to include medical coverage for gender transition services.

V. Motions to encourage faculty participation at full faculty meetings.

Amy Spivey drafted and presented four motions (A-D) below. Each of the following motions is related to increasing the effectiveness of full faculty meetings and/or encouraging more faculty members to participate in full faculty meetings. Spivey noted that currently only 20-25% of faculty members attend the meetings and all voices aren't being heard.

Rationale - Full faculty meetings at the University of Puget Sound are generally attended by 40-50 faculty members. This represents a small fraction of the faculty, and yet decisions are made at the faculty meetings that have significant consequences for the faculty as a whole. Discussions in the October and November 2012 faculty meetings have centered around requesting the Board of Trustees to increase faculty representation on the board. It seems difficult for the faculty to justify increased representation on the board of trustees, given that we do not take full advantage of our existing opportunities to participate in faculty governance and have our voices heard. The Senate should play a role in both helping to increase the importance of business that is conducted at full faculty meetings and encouraging faculty members to be part of their own governance by attending faculty meetings.

- A. **Motion A** - That the Senate propose, for full faculty approval, that the names of faculty members who attend faculty meetings be added to the minutes for each faculty meeting.

Kotsis noted that it is a good idea to convey to the rest of the faculty that some decisions are significant and greater participation at faculty meetings will result in greater participation in the decision making process.

Time conflicts were mentioned as a possible reason why faculty meetings are poorly attended. Kessel pointed out that the meeting times are staggered to alleviate this problem. Kotsis asked where we stand on the idea of developing a common hour, since that could be a potential time to schedule faculty meetings. It was noted that ASC has been charged with assessing the feasibility of a common hour.

Dillman asked what would be the intention of taking attendance. Spivey replied that recording attendance would increase accountability, encourage attendance, and provide a record of how many faculty voted and who voted. Spivey also added that we take attendance for other committee meetings, so why should faculty meetings be treated differently. Dillman asked if attendance has ever been taken at faculty meetings. Bartanen replied that attendance has never been taken in her memory. DeMarais added, on a related note, that it may be useful to keep a record of who is speaking at faculty meetings.

A move was made to vote on Motion A. Motion A was approved with 11 yes votes and 2 abstentions.

- B. Motion B** – That members of the Faculty Senate (or someone who knows about these things) give a presentation at one of the Spring 2013 faculty meetings outlining, especially for new members of the faculty, the faculty governance structure at Puget Sound, as laid out in the Bylaws. This would include explanation of the duties of each standing committee as well as the relationship between decisions made by the standing committees, the Faculty Senate, and the faculty as a whole.

Singleton commented that he sees this as an unpopular meeting to attend and this meeting may be better suited for new faculty members. Kessel wondered if information about faculty governance could be included in new faculty orientation, perhaps in the spring session. Bartanen said that the new faculty orientation schedule is already full and it would be hard to find time to include this information. Bartanen suggested that perhaps there could be a short meeting for first year faculty members in April, prior to sign-up for committees, to discuss faculty governance and committee work. Spivey clarified that a faculty meeting addressing faculty governance structure is not something that would have to be done every year; it would be useful even for people who aren't brand new.

Dillman wondered if it should be the role of department chairs to educate department members, especially junior faculty, about the importance of faculty governance. Kessel responded that the message that faculty governance is important should come from the Senate, not only the department chair.

A move was made to vote on Motion B. Motion B was approved with 6 Yes votes, 3 No votes, and 4 abstentions.

- C. Motion C** – That the Faculty Senate bring to the full faculty the following recommendation: The 2012-2013 Faculty Senate recommends that each department ensure that at least one member of their department attend each meeting of the full faculty and report back to the department concerning the discussion and outcomes of that meeting.

Spivey clarified that Motion C is only a recommendation and there would be no way to enforce it. She added that it is important for people to know what happens at faculty meetings and there are sometimes entire departments that don't attend. Kotsis commented that this would promote representation from all departments and information may be disseminated more quickly this way. Kessel wondered if this policy would send the wrong message by telling people that they don't need to come and the department only needs to send one member. She added that it's better than nothing, but not what we're aiming for. Kay asked if the Senate should include a more general amendment saying that each department is encouraged to discuss issues brought up at faculty meetings. Kessel felt that this more general statement would be too vague and the Senate should instead vote on the full motion.

A move was made to vote on Motion C. Motion C was not approved with 1 Yes vote, 8 No votes, and 4 abstentions.

- D. Motion D** – That the Senate propose to the full faculty a change to the Faculty Bylaws or Faculty Code requiring a quorum of 1/3 of the faculty at faculty meetings for any decisions to be binding. (New language for this Bylaws change would be brought before the full faculty at one of the Spring 2013 faculty meetings. Currently, Article III, Section 2, Item D of the Bylaws reads, "A quorum necessary for the transaction of all business shall be constituted by the members of the Faculty present.")

Kotsis suggested this requirement might result in gridlock. Kessel added that while this is an important issue, perhaps we are not quite ready for this yet – if we can't make a case to promote faculty governance, gathering enough faculty for a quorum will be an ongoing problem.

It was further clarified that a change in the bylaws requires that 3/4 of the faculty present at faculty meetings agree to a change in the bylaws; therefore,

the 1/3 faculty quorum would make it even more difficult to make changes to the Faculty Bylaws or Faculty Code.

Dillman posited that perhaps some faculty members truly don't care about the issues brought up at faculty meetings - forcing someone to participate won't generate the kind of enthusiasm that we are looking for. Bartanen agreed that, based upon a recent survey, Puget Sound faculty are quite satisfied with the current state of affairs; in other words, it is possible that faculty don't feel motivated to go to faculty meetings because things are already pretty good.

It was discussed whether it would be a good idea to have the Faculty Senate Chair draft a paragraph to go along with faculty meeting agenda items in order to encourage attendance. It was also suggested that people who put items on the agenda could provide a summary, ensuring topics are researched ahead of time. It was agreed that a description of agenda items might motivate attendance and it would be useful to look at the motions ahead of time. There are certain agenda items that tend to draw faculty out more than others. For example, meetings discussing changes in curriculum are generally well attended, while meetings focusing on changes in bylaws or other resolutions are less popular.

A move was made to vote on Motion D. Motion C was not approved with 1 Yes vote, 8 No votes, and 4 abstentions.

E. Wrap-up discussion regarding faculty attendance at faculty meetings.

Kay suggested it might be a good idea to look at research about effective ways to encourage participation. Dillman raised that question as to why full faculty meetings are not considered obligatory as part of our service. Spivey pointed out that faculty members are busy and it is difficult to set aside the time. Kessel responded that we need to find ways to support faculty and make it less burdensome to participate.

VI. Updating the Faculty Senate Handbook

- A.** Dillman asked for ideas/suggestions about ways to continue drafting the Faculty Senate Handbook and moving the document forward. He also asked who should continue the work - executive members of the Senate or other designated individuals/groups.
- B.** He then discussed items that need to be added to the handbook. Currently the handbook provides guidelines for various topics, including the different duties of the senators/senate officers, policies/procedures, clarification of the 30-day-clock once a motion is passed, an outline of governance rules, and roles of the Senate Chair. Ideas for additional items to include in the handbook included the following: 1) information for faculty representatives attending Trustee's meetings, 2) a written procedure for spring elections and committee assignments, 3) a general calendar, 4)

guidelines for committee chairs about how to write the year-end report in order to make it easier to draft charges in the fall, 5) guidelines for taking minutes at committee meetings, 6) information regarding how agenda items are brought to the Senate. It was also suggested that it would be helpful to define the various acronyms (committee names, etc.) and to number the pages of the handbook.

- C. Although the Senate Handbook may not be the place to include this information, Kay brought up the issue that the Trustees may not fully understand roles of the faculty and suggested a written document to clarify this. Kessel suggested that time at a Trustees meeting could be devoted to clarifying/defining faculty roles. Bartanen said that there are workshops at Trustees meetings where this information could potentially be communicated.

Dillman asked the group to look at the handbook document on Soundnet and the Senate will revisit the issue next meeting and decide then who will start drafting changes.

VII. Senate priorities for next semester

- A. Dillman asked the committee what issues should be considered priorities for the next semester. Spivey suggested the Senate should focus on ways to support faculty scholarship. Kessel suggested looking at ways to make internal processes less work for faculty (i.e. writing letters of student recommendation for campus positions). Kotsis suggested the Senate assess committee structure to ensure equal distribution of responsibilities and proportionate committee sizes. It was also suggested that it would be a good idea for the Senate to periodically discuss changes related to the new Optimize Puget Sound system.

A motion was made to adjourn, seconded, and approved. Senate adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Minutes recorded by Amy Odegard