

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate  
8 February 2010, 4:00, Misner Room

Senators present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Dan Burgard, Doug Cannon (chair), Kelli Delaney, Fred Hamel, Suzanne Holland, Zaixin Hong, Rob Hutchinson, Lisa Johnson, James Luu, Steven Neshyba, Marc Phillips, Mike Segawa, Keith Ward, Seth Weinberger

Guests: Alyce DeMarais, Susan Owen, Jack Roundy, Nila Wiese

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm.

**I. Approval of minutes of January 25, 2010**

- a. Bartanen asked that the minutes of 1/25/10 strike the last four words of VII:e “assuming assistant professor range”.
- b. M/S/P as amended.

**II. Announcements**

- a. Neshyba mentioned that the Senate Executive Committee sent an email to faculty last week concerning the Ad Hoc Committee on Childcare, which was delayed but eventually sent to the staff.
- b. Delaney said that the announcement of the Ad Hoc Committee on Childcare meeting will be announced to staff at the next Staff Senate meeting.
- c. Cannon reminded the senate of the Ad Hoc Committee on Childcare organizational meeting on February 11 2010 at noon.
- d. Hamel reminded the Senate that Stephen Prothero is giving a talk on religious literacy talk on Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>. Holland added that she has seen the speaker and recommends going,
- e. Hutchinson mentioned that he is hosting a conference on March 5-6 for university composers.
- f. Cannon mentioned that Library Director Jane Carlin asked him encourage faculty to participate in a library faculty survey to evaluate library effectiveness.
- g. Cannon reminded that Senate that the Senators from last semester that are on leave or removed themselves need their committee liaison positions filled. Kristen Johnson will be replaced by Seth Weinberger on ASC, Stacey Weiss will be replaced by Suzanne Holland and Tiffany Aldrich MacBain will be replaced by Zaixin Hong. Lisa Johnson will fill the open position of liaison to the Staff Senate.
- h. Cannon reminded the Senate of the full Faculty meeting 2 weeks from today on 2/22/2010.
- i. Holland asked who was bringing the BenTF recommendations to the Faculty Meeting on 2/22/2010.
- j. Bartanen said that BenTF might have more data to discuss later because a benefits survey will be out 2/21/2010.

- k. Cannon added that there will be a faculty secretary nomination since Gwynne Brown is on leave.

### **III. Special Orders**

- a. Anderson-Connolly mentioned that “water cooler” chat had brought up concern for junior, non-tenured faculty about “calling students out” for texting in class.
- b. Holland remarked that she had seen a syllabus of junior faculty member that explicitly mentioned that no texting is allowed, not even vibrating cell phones.
- c. Luu noted that he downloads pdf documents onto his phone and views them in class but asks for instructors’ permission. He thinks that students are conscientious about texting
- d. Hong said new technology allows for new creativity and wonders how to make onsite teaching more effective.

### **IV. Reports of Committee Liaisons**

- a. Hamel reported that the Curriculum Committee approved two items 1) a skeleton calendar through 2013-2014 but notes that it allows for more days in the spring semester than the fall. He said that this concern is still being dealt with and 2) approved request from Department of Education to remove pastoral counseling noting that only 3 student enrolled since 2004.
- b. Holland asked if there was any thought of how to make the days more even by semester. Hamel said there are lots of ideas and whether the Fall should be longer or the Spring made shorter
- c. Ward reported that he had spoken to Bill Haltom of PSC about open and closed files. Haltom said he is gathering data on the number of open and closed files and he is forming a list of members to be on this advisory committee and a to form a survey.
- d. Anderson-Connolly reported that the IEC charge from the senate to evaluate pre-departure/post-return surveys had begun with Peter Wimberger, Bruce Mann, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Mark Harpring, and Mike Segawa. He reported that both committees will continue to work on the charge.
- e. Weinberger asked if there was an expectation to report from committees.

### **V. Bylaws of the LMIS Committee**

- a. Burgard brought forward the need to change the membership of the LMIS standing committee and offered the following language.

#### Proposed revisions to Article V, Sec. 6:

G. The Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee.

a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), ~~the Director of the Library (ex-officio)~~, **the Chief Technology Officer (ex-officio)**, the Director of Educational Technology, no fewer than five appointed members of the Faculty, and one student.

- b. The duties of the Committee shall be:
1. To develop general policies, procedures and plans in collaboration with the Library Director **and the Chief Technology Officer**.
  2. To provide recommendations and advice to all parts of the University community on the role of the library, media and information systems in support of the academic program.
  3. To review periodically the mission and objectives of the library and information systems and to recommend such changes as are needed.
  4. To review periodically the collection development plan for the library to ensure that a balanced collection is maintained for effective support of the academic program.
  5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.
- b. Holland motioned for the following language to be submitted to the full faculty **M(Holland)/S(Luu)/P**
- c. Anderson-Connolly asked if this was to be put on the next Faculty meeting and Burgard said yes.
- d. Cannon will send to Gwynne Brown to be put on the Faculty Meeting Agenda.

#### **VI. Pass/Fail grading**

- a. Cannon reminded the Senate that the ASC recommended no Pass/Fail (P/F) grading option be allowed in the department of major, minor, or second major and that P/F was recommended to only be allowed for student with Junior or Senior status. He went on to remind the Senate that they passed a motion last semester to delay decision on the ASC recommendation to stay in line with the 30 day limit.
- b. Anderson-Connolly reminded the senate that Permission of Instructor (POI) solves a lot of problems with P/F.
- c. Weinberger mentioned that ASC was debating the idea of POI and said the committee was divided because the students on ASC were very against POI because the students would feel that the professor would hold this against the students. Weinberger also expressed the broad spirit of P/F and didn't want to limit students who wanted the ability to take classes this way.
- d. Cannon said he thought that ASC wanted to consult with Senate and Weinberger agreed.
- e. Hutchinson wanted to clarify if Core classes could currently be taken P/F and asked how many P/F classes can currently be taken by a student during their academic career.
- f. Weinberger answered that Core classes may not be taken P/F and a total of 4 P/F classes are allowed. He added that the reason for the proposed Jr/Sr limit on P/F came from the spirit of P/F is not in line with underclassmen since they are not pushing themselves outside of their major field of study at that point since they have no major and that if they did take P/F it could hurt them later if they decided to major in a field needing that course. Weinberger

- noted that only 4 underclassmen had encountered this trouble of taking a course P/F and then not being able to use it.
- g. Barry noted that if only 4 students had run into this then it wasn't that big of a deal. Barry also asked if the students on the ASC committee had any issue with the new proposed changes.
  - h. Ward spoke to the proposal and thought it spoke to the spirit of P/F and thought that only having 4 students run into difficulty showed that the upperclassmen proposal wasn't an issue.
  - i. Johnson wanted to know if sound advising wouldn't just clear this up and Weinberger said that when students sign up for P/F a screen pops up and tells of the consequences. Weinberger also said that the ASC has let the students graduate who come up against current P/F rules anyway so there is no teeth to the current system.
  - j. Luu said the warning on the computer during registration is like a computer popup and is ignored by students.
  - k. Barry wanted to know how many P/F grades are recorded each semester.
  - l. Roundy and Weinberger said they didn't know but certainly more than 50.
  - m. Holland asked if this matter of P/F is coming to the Full Faculty meeting.
  - n. Weinberger asked for clarification of whether Holland meant the idea of POI or the adoption of the proposal from ASC. He followed by saying that there has already been a straw poll taken at the last Faculty meeting of 5/5/09. And added that according to his notes that the numbers of those for and against the different P/F options were incorrect in the approved minutes from that meeting.
  - o. Barry asked if this should be passed on to the full Faculty again.
  - p. Anderson-Connolly agreed with Barry that this should come up again at the full Faculty meeting. He also noted that if 4 total P/F courses are allowed that you might end up with senioritis and find that all P/F courses could be taken in a short amount of time at the end. He continued to say that POI is not that big of a deal, he thinks the students' concerns of professor bias is a groundless worry.
  - q. Weinberger said that the number of underclassmen that take P/F classes is actually small and that most students that do take P/F classes don't take 4.
  - r. Hamel asked Roundy if struggling students used P/F as a way of lightening load.
  - s. Roundy responded that P/F is for grade protection and said that students in trouble actually need grades and wouldn't take P/F.
  - t. Hamel asked about a situation where a student's G.P.A. is fine but has a tough semester should they take P/F.
  - u. Roundy responded that he would encourage the student to take fewer classes and not take more but as less of a participant.
  - v. Anderson-Connolly said he wanted P/F to be grade protection for students to be adventurous in course selection and thought that POI would still encourage this. He added that he thought faculty would be open and not discourage P/F in those instances.
  - w. Weinberger said that ASC probably would have agreed to POI.

- x. Johnson noted that upperclassmen have tight schedules and maybe couldn't use the P/F option.
- y. Weinberger noted that currently P/F is used almost exclusively by upperclassmen.
- z. Neshyba encouraged the ASC come to the Faculty meeting and explain their proposed changes to the P/F option.
- aa. Cannon suggested that we extend this topic for another meeting or that someone motion to take the ASC recommendations to the full faculty.
- bb. Barry asked why we should extend the issue?
- cc. Cannon asked what was being forwarded to the full faculty. If it is the ASC proposal then Weinberger could take it to the full Faculty but he noted that if we want to be in on the proposal we should take more time to discuss what we are proposing.
- dd. Barry said he wouldn't want the Senate to tinker with ASC motion.
- ee. Cannon reminded the Senate that the bylaws allow the Senate to review, reject, etc... committee's proposals.
- ff. Barry asked if the ASC would be willing to take the proposed changes to the full faculty.
- gg. Weinberger said ASC wanted Senate guidance on what should be taken to the full Faculty.
- hh. Cannon terminated discussion and placed the P/F proposal on the Senate's next agenda.

## **VII. Spring governance elections**

- a. Cannon asked Anderson-Connolly where spring governance elections stood.
- b. Anderson-Connolly said that Mark Young will likely have a mock election online for senators within the week.
- c. Cannon asked the Senate to be thinking about these elections.

## **VIII. Bylaws concerning the Committee on Diversity**

- a. Cannon reminded the Senate that the amendments sent to the Board of Trustees were rejected and sent back to the Senate. Cannon introduced Nila Wiese and Susan Owen and asked them to present the new amendments. The new language was distributed.
- b. Cannon reminded the faculty that Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Nancy Bristow, and Kim Bobby, and he were at the Board meeting where the language was rejected.
- c. Owen asked Bartanen to tell the Senate what she learned today on a conference call with four Board of Trustee members.
- d. Bartanen said the concern was about the clarity of the language of H.b.5 and H.b.6. from the bylaws concerning the duties of the Committee on Diversity and that the Board liked the goals. Bartanen expressed that the Board didn't want to undermine faculty.

- e. Wiese and Owen have worked on wording and Bartanen said that the four Board members from the conference call would support the new language and then reminded the Senate of the process to pass the new language.
- f. Owen said that the concerns throughout the review of the language were that the spirit was correct but the language did not reflect this. She mentioned that the Committee duty 6 was the biggest concern and they rewrote that duty and used words and phrases from diversity website. Owen said the main concerns were
- Record keeping of bias and hate incidents and does the Diversity Committee have any adjudicatory power.
  - Where does the authority lie?
  - Who gathers data?-Security, not the Diversity Committee
  - Concerns that attention to diversity would compromise academic freedom, and Duty 5 now puts that on the table as frankly as possible.
- g. Weinberger asked what was the purpose of “emerging” in Duty 6.
- h. Wiese said that it was more about discovering issues and that some concerns were about religious freedom.
- i. Weinberger asked if once a trend is discovered does this information go somewhere.
- j. Wiese said that the Diversity Committee would look for places for this to go such as religious issues would go to Dave Wright the University Chaplin.
- k. Luu asked what was the rationale of moving from 4 to 1 student representatives.
- l. Wiese responded that students (ASUPS) never appointed anyone and that there were problems getting members. There had been student responses that since it is a faculty group they wanted to be represented but had other paths for their own diversity committees.
- m. Anderson-Connolly agreed that the language in Duty 6 was improved but still had concerns, including whether this work had to be done by BERT and not the Diversity committee.
- n. Wiese responded that BERT allows for a bigger picture and it’s an outside group.
- o. Bartanen mentioned that one of the reasons for the group mentioned in Duty 6 instead of the Diversity committee is that it makes the Diversity committee more like other standing committees rather than what it has become, which is a group that might be asked to respond to incidents that are not faculty issues such as anti-LGBT graffiti in residence halls. This is where the breadth of group members is needed.
- p. Hamel asked if the “group” in Duty 6 is BERT?
- q. Wiese responded that yes, currently it is BERT.
- r. Barry asked if the group’s membership should be reflected in the bylaws.
- s. Segawa noted that if the bylaws list membership by title that the bylaws would have to be changed every time there are title changes.
- t. Neshyba asked if membership in the Diversity committee needed to be 7 faculty members since it is difficult to spread the faculty across all the committees, including, for example, the Sustainability Advisory Committee.

- u. Wiese noted that the membership was base on similar membership as serve on other committees.
- v. Bartanen reminded the Senate that the membership of the committee had already been approved by faculty.
- w. Holland asked if the purpose of this discussion was just to give feedback on the proposed wording of Duties 5 and 6 of the Diversity committee.
- x. Wiese responded that they were just looking for feedback.
- y. Luu asked why the membership couldn't be "up to four students" and thinks that ASUPS could provide that many.
- z. Cannon said that the meeting had gone over time and said that this discussion could be put on the next Senate agenda and that there is no rush to vote on this at the full Faculty meeting. The Senate thanked Wiese and Owen.

**IX. M/S/P (Hamel/Luu) Move to adjourn at 5:34**

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Burgard  
Scribe of the Meeting

Richard Anderson-Connolly  
Faculty Senate Secretary