

**University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 22, 2008**

1. In the absence of President Ron Thomas, Academic Vice-President Kristine Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. Twenty-nine faculty members were present at 4:30 p.m.
2. The minutes of March 11, 2008 were approved as distributed.
3. Vice-President Bartanen reported that President Thomas was meeting with the Investment Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. On his behalf she reported that 310 prospective first-year students had accepted admission as of last Friday, an increase of 50 as of the same date last year. The capital campaign has achieved \$30 million in commitments during this initial “quiet” phase.
4. In her own report Bartanen noted that the University had sponsored three campus days during the present term for admitted students and their families, and that 50% more of these students and their families had participated than last year. She expressed her appreciation to faculty members who had participated in these events, and assured assembled faculty that the logistical difficulties encountered this year would be addressed in a timely fashion.

In response to the recent survey of faculty regarding attendance at faculty meetings, Bartanen reminded faculty members that suggestions for items for faculty meeting agendas can come from any faculty member.

5. Faculty Senate Chair Douglas Cannon reported that voting for the Senate, the Faculty Advancement Committee, and the Faculty Salary Committee would begin Wednesday, April 23. The election will be conducted by electronic ballot. The period for the primary election would be one week, and a final ballot for some positions will be needed.

This year the solicitation for faculty preference for service appointments also will occur electronically.

The Senate recently approved a plan to shift from the Blackboard electronic course management system to Moodle.

The Senate will be devoting attention to evaluation issues, examining the faculty survey regarding the evaluation form. In addition, the Senate has asked the Professional Standards Committee to consider revisions in the Faculty Code regarding early tenure and criteria for evidence of professional growth. The Senate plans to conduct faculty forums regarding these two topics during the upcoming academic year. In addition, Cannon said he was concerned that only four faculty members’ names appeared on the ballot for the FAC—exactly the number to be forwarded to the Dean according the

Faculty By-Laws. Cannon indicated that the Senate would be addressing this problem in the future.

Questions of diversity continue to receive consideration from the Senate. On March 24 the Senate adopted a motion to support the inclusion of diversity issues in on-campus faculty development, for example in advisor training. The Senate referred this motion to the Faculty Diversity Committee for further consideration. The Senate also has been considering modifications to the University's Diversity Statement suggested by the group known as CAIR (Coalition Against Injustice and Racism). Cannon urged faculty to attend the President's sessions on the Diversity Strategic Plan later in the week. He stressed that curriculum issues remained a faculty purview and noted that hiring of new faculty was included in the plan. Academic Vice-President Bartanen will be meeting with Department Chairs on Tuesday, April 23 to consider next steps in faculty recruitment.

In response to a faculty member's question about the role of Chairs in governance decisions, Bartanen indicated that she would be sharing ideas with chairs as part of an on-going effort to consider initiatives and received feedback from a number of groups. Two examples cited were working with a consortium for faculty diversity for liberal arts colleges to bring faculty fellows to campus and examining search procedures to engage in more "opportunity hiring" by starting searches earlier. She concluded by noting that she was inviting discussion from chairs rather than making formal proposals.

6a. Professor Julian Edgoose from the Professional Standards Committee introduced the Second Reading of a proposed amendment to the Faculty Code regarding "streamlined" evaluations for instructors.

Edgoose M/S adoption of the following amendment (added language in italics):

Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and professors in years 5, 15, 25, *and 35* of service in that rank may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. *Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.*

Edgoose explained that the University now employs several instructors who have provided at least 17 years of service. Instructor contracts call for evaluation every three years. This amendment would allow long-serving instructors to be eligible for "streamlined" reviews on a schedule alternating with full reviews, which would occur every 6 years.

Cannon noted that the amendment also extended the opportunity for 'streamlined' reviews to faculty who have been in service at the rank of Professor for 35 years.

The motion passed by voice vote.

6b. Cannon introduced for a Second Reading two amendments to the Faculty By-Laws. He reminded those present that passage of amendments to the By-Laws requires a 2/3 majority of those present and voting.

Cannon M/S adoption of the first proposed amendment: (substituted language is in *italics*; removed language is indicated by ~~strikethrough~~)

Article V. Section 6. H. The Committee on Diversity.

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio); the Dean of Students (ex-officio); the Dean of Admission (ex-officio); the ~~Affirmative Action Officer~~ *Chief Diversity Officer* (ex officio); no fewer than five appointed faculty members; a maximum of three members of the staff, to be selected by the Staff Senate; and four students.

In response to a question from a faculty member, Cannon indicated that the term “Chief Diversity Officer” was more generic than “Affirmative Action Officer.” Bartanen added that the American Council on Education had noted that “Chief Diversity Officer” is more generic. Hence the title is likely to continue.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Cannon introduced the second amendment, initiating a faculty standing committee on International Education.

Cannon M/S adoption of the following addition to the Faculty By-Laws:

Article V. Section 6. J. The International Education Committee

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Dean of Students (ex-officio), the Director of International Programs (ex-officio), no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two students.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be:
 1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.
 2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.

3. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.
4. Represent the interests of the Faculty in international education.
5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

This proposal grew out of the work of the Interim Study Abroad Committee, which recommended the addition of a permanent committee on international education.

Cannon responded to a faculty member's question by indicating that the size of the committee was determined by the anticipated workload as well as considerations of scheduling difficulties for meeting times. He expressed concern over the accretion of governance responsibilities.

The committee should be of sufficient size to review the large number of Study Abroad programs available for students as well as applications for Study Abroad from students requesting waivers of existing policies. In order to obtain a balance of perspectives, at least five faculty members should serve.

Cannon reminded those present that the Board of Trustees must concur with amendments to the Faculty By-Laws. This amendment would be presented to the Board at their May meeting.

When asked by a faculty member, Associate Dean Alyce Demaris indicated that at least one of the Committee members was from the Foreign Language and Literature Department, and that this practice would continue for the foreseeable future.

Discussion having ended, a vote was called for.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Professor John Hanson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, urged faculty members to vote early in the upcoming elections so that any problems with electronic balloting could be corrected. He assured faculty that paper ballots were available for those members choosing that option. After some discussion of whether to allow write-ins on electronic ballots, during which no strong sentiments were expressed, the discussion ended.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Droge
Secretary to the Faculty