

## **Faculty Senate Minutes September 23, 2002**

**Senators present:** Hans Ostrom(Chair), John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Chris Kline, Curt Sanders (ASUPS representative), Alexa Tullis, Roberta Wilson, Barry Anton, Karen Porter, Julian Edgoose, Bill Haltom, Juli McGruder, David Tinsley, Kris Bartanen (Dean of Students), Terry Cooney (AVP).

**Visitors present:** J. David Macey

Senate Chair Ostrom called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM.

### **Approval of minutes:**

It was M/S/P with one abstention to approve the minutes of the September 9, 2002, meeting as amended

- The charges to the ASC were amended at the suggestion of Edgoose to include a fifth charge, that of considering the routing routine petitions to the Associate Dean.
- Hanson noted that "Hanson" is spelled with an "o".

It was M/S/P with one abstention to approve the minutes of the May 9, 6 2002, meeting as circulated

### **Senatorial Rants:**

Hanson noted that the University health plan for 2003-4

- would require all faculty to subscribe to the "Options" option, even if they could get a better deal elsewhere
- would cut the reimbursement benefit by 50% for all faculty who opt for their spouse's plan
- that only the "Options" option would be available

Hanson asked why these changes were presented as a fait accompli, with no attempt to solicit input from the faculty. He expressed dismay at another essential issue being decided without faculty consultation.

### **The ASUPS report**

- Joe Turner is on leave. ASUPS will appoint a substitute soon.
- He introduced two new ASUPS publications, the "LOGG Review" and "You PS"
- He announced several events: Anita Hill on Oct. 3, the Logger Olympics during Homecoming Week, the String Cheese Concert, and the Friedman lecture.
- He described improved participation and morale in ASUPS, including the possibility of every senatorial position being filled, and the successful retreat last week.
- ASUPS is spearheading a new effort to establish a film major, and will focus on DVD productions this year.

### **Faculty Senate Charges to the Faculty Advancement Committee**

Edgoose asked whether these charges were more appropriately addressed by the FAC or by the PSC.

Cooney questioned the need for Charge 1 (develop a template regarding the stages and Code-requirements of the evaluation process), given that

- each department is required to generate a document in which its expectations are set forth
- the expectations differ, for example, performance faculty in music are evaluated on their success in recruiting, a category found in no other department or school
- a checklist of expectations is distributed each year to department chairs
- the revised Faculty Code will also include such a list

McGruder agreed with Cooney. Edgoose and Hanson concurred. A consensus was reached to strike Charge #1.

Discussion turned to Charge #2 (to distribute to the whole faculty information regarding how the FAC applies the Faculty Code and PSC documents to the category of Service) . Ostrom reported that colleagues at the faculty conversation wanted clarification as to what service counts in evaluation. Cooney thought that a document could be generated easily from PSC documents. Haltom noted that the focus of the charge was on the FAC's interpretation of the PSC documents, but that it shouldn't be a problem to document what counts as service. The consensus was to keep Charge #2.

It was M/S/P with two abstentions to send the charges as amended to the FAC.

### **Faculty Senate Charges to the Institutional Review Board**

McGruder expressed approval of Charge #2 (to include a "No Compensation for Injury" section in consent forms), but characterized Charge #1 (that oversight by the IRB include random site visits, checks on consent and anonymity procedures, etc.) as unreasonable. The IRB has enough to do. This is an issue of trust.

Anton agreed and asked whether specific violations had provoked this response. What was the reason?

Wilson noted that she thought these measures were required by law.

Hummel-Berry and McGruder had seen no precedents for such actions by the IRB at any institutions where they had previously conducted research.

Ostrom noted that the charge came from the IRB itself, and that Roger Allen was the chair who made the report.

Hummel-Berry suggested that it should suffice for the researcher to develop a plan by which consent and anonymity requirements would be met.

Ostrom proposed that the Faculty Senate forward Charge #2 to the IRB and consult with the new chair on Charge #1.

Haltom remarked that any committee has the power to institute procedures but that the IRB should be aware that at least three senators had reservations regarding the actions described in Charge #1.

Kline asked for more information regarding the reasons for these procedures.

A consensus was reached to send Charge #2 only and to consult regarding Charge #1.

It was M/S/P with two abstentions to send the charges as amended to the FAC.

## **Faculty Senate Charges to the Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee**

Haltom proposed consideration of Charge 2 first, since it addresses the question of whether LMAC should exist at all.

Cooney noted that OIS and the Library would still need to consult with faculty committees, in the event that LMAC were disbanded.

McGruder referenced her own service on LMAC, which consisted of members hearing reports regarding media issues and members voting to rubber-stamp policies developed elsewhere. She called for LMAC to be given autonomy or for a clear statement that LMAC has no autonomy (See Charges 2A and 2B).

Hummel-Berry inquired as to whether LMAC itself had ever called for its own dissolution.

Cooney replied that such a proposal had come from the Faculty Senate, and that LMAC had responded in defense of its necessity.

Bartanen reminded the FS that the Technology Planning Group and the Administrative Computing Group have been established to address many of these issues and that the role of LMAC might need to be redefined, given the new situation.

Edgoose proposed amending Charges 2A and 2B to charge LMAC with considering its dissolution or to consider redefinition of its duties.

Cooney spoke in favor of deleting references to "media" and "library" in Charge AB. He saw no reason for the FS to determine LMAC deliberations. Senators concurred that a period be placed after "duties" and that the rest of the charge be deleted.

It was M/S/P with two abstentions to send the charges as amended to the FAC.

## **Faculty Senate Charges to the Professional Standards Committee**

Haltom proposed that the final sentence in Charge #1 be deleted because of poor diction and lack of clarity. McGruder asked if he would approved a better-crafted version of the same sentiments. The FS reached a consensus to delete the final sentence of Charge #1.

Cooney reminded the FS that this charge was sent to the PSC last spring, and that the PSC's wish to continue its deliberations focussed upon specific information presented by Randy Nelson, Director of Institutional Research. Cooney asked that this narrow focus be maintained.

Kline expressed her concern about the enormity of the charges being forwarded to the PSC, given the extensive scope of their duties.

Discussion turned to Charge #3. Tinsley asked that the PSC give top priority to the proposed policies on confidentiality, "political statements" in e-mail, and campus security. He sees them as a direct assault on academic freedom. McGruder concurred and asked that the issue remain a part of the FS's agenda for this year. Hanson asked that the efforts of the PSC and the FS be coordinated such that each body would be aware of its role in the process. A consensus was reached such that Charge #3 would become Charge #1, and that Ostrom would stress to the Chair of PSC the FS's view of the importance of this issue.

Discussion turned to Charge #4. Ostrom stressed that the charge was no reflection upon the current Dean but rather reflected the faculty's desire that the University review policies regarding evaluation in light of the future. It was determined that "Dean of the University" is Code language for reference to the position.

Discussion turned to an additional charge, Charge #5, as proposed in Bartanen's memo of September 6, 2002, asking for the PSC to consider proposed changes in language to the University's Alcohol and Drug Policy (Items 1A and 1B of the memo). Haltom asked whether the Presidential Cabinet had the power to approve these changes without action of the faculty or Faculty Senate. Cooney clarified that, while the Cabinet has no such power, the President can take such action. Bartanen stressed the administration's desire to consult with the faculty.

Discussion turned to Charge #2. McGruder asked how the proposed changes would affect the University's accreditation procedures. Cooney gave the history of the request to evaluate all faculty every three years. He indicated that the Accreditation Board had changed the policy to allow for five-year intervals. He thought action would probably focus on the Three-Year Associate and Five-Year Full Professor reviews.

It was M/S/P unanimously to send all five charges as amended to the PSC.\

### **Faculty Senate Charges to the Student Life Committee**

In response to inquiries, Bartanen explained the "Conspiracy of Hope" project, a student-initiated proposal for community service.

Discussion turned to Charge #5. Bartanen expressed her concern that the wording of the final sentence seemed to mandate the annual review of an administrative body by the SLC. She stressed that the Dean of Students' Office would be happy to share data from the CHWS Self-Study. Ostrom reminded the FS that the suggestion had come from Houston Daugherty. Bartanen suggested it might have been a misunderstanding. A consensus was reached to delete Charge #5.

Discussion turned to Charge # 3. Haltom asked why the SLC would have to be directed to invited Monica Nixon to present her findings again. He also asked whether the proposed hearings would include students who had been harassed by neighbors or by off-duty members of the Tacoma Police Department. Bartanen replied that the vast majority of complaints come from neighbors, not from students, and that these problems had been a major issue for the SLC last year. McGruder reported upon her own difficulties with off-campus students and stressed that Campus Security would not respond to off-campus complaints. It would have to be the TPD. Bartanen confirmed that this was the case.

Discussion turned to the additional charge proposed by Bartanen in her memo of September 6, such that the SLC explore allegations involving student refusal to cooperate with Security and faculty advising students against cooperation. Tinsley spoke against this charge, noting that the PSC was the proper body for review of faculty misconduct, and registering his strong concerns that the SLC was being given the power to conduct investigations of faculty.

Cooney reminded the FS that no student or staff member can bring charges before the PSC, and that it is his responsibility to bring charges on their behalf.

Bartanen stressed that the Charge reflects the D of S's desire to begin a campus dialogue regarding these issues.

Tinsley proposed amending the language to read "that the SLC initiate efforts to promote conversations regarding responsibility, accountability and civility on campus", and that the specific instances cited in the first part of the original charge be deleted.

Sanders announced that ASUPS would be pursuing its own deliberations and conversations on campus regarding these issues.

Cooney reminded the FS that many of the concerns regarding student conduct had been expressed by the students themselves, and that he was supportive of ASUPS efforts in this area.

Bartanen indicated satisfaction with the proposed wording, and a consensus was reached that the new charge be added in its amended form.

It was M/S/P to send the charges as amended to the SLC.

### **Faculty Senate Charges to the University Enrichment Committee**

A consensus was reached that the section of Charge #1 be deleted following the word "ideas".

Discussion turned to Charge #3. Anton asked why reports were required following faculty travel for presenting at conferences. Shouldn't an abstract and receipts be enough? It is an issue of trust. McGruder indicated that she thought the requirement was reasonable. Hummel-Berry reported that Dean Finney had wished for more extensive documentation of such trips. Cooney reminded the FS that the UEC itself had asked for reports and that it shouldn't be too burdensome to attach an electronic copy of the paper to an e-mail. He indicated that such reports helped the University maintain its databank of faculty research activity, which was important for documenting faculty research for national fellowship organizations like Mellon. Hanson proposed that the charge remain on the list, and that clarification was needed regarding faculty reporting. A consensus was reached to keep Charge #3.

Anton proposed a new charge, Charge #4, that the UEC look into Faculty Travel Policy, especially into the requirement that faculty use their own credit cards if they do not book with the University travel agency. He noted that this procedure was wasteful and costly. Cooney acknowledged that this was a huge problem, and noted the University's efforts to ease the problem. A consensus was reached to add the proposed charge to the list.

It was M/S/P to send the charges as amended to the UEC.

M/S/P adjournment at 5:25 PM.

Texts of Revised Charges

### **Emendation of the Charges to the ASC (Minutes of 9-9-02)**

*Determine whether some types of students' petitions to the ASC are so routine in character that they may be referred directly to the associate dean and not the ASC's petitions committee. One goal of the charge is to save members of the petitions committee time.*

**To the IRB:**

Consider redrafting language that appears on consent forms--specifically, language concerning physical or emotional injury suffered by volunteers.

**To the PSC:**

1. Consider whether the four new written policies on confidentiality, so-called "political statements" appearing on email, distribution of information, and security of information threaten the academic freedom guaranteed by the Faculty.; Determine the extent to which these policies have been implemented. Recommend appropriate responses and or actions, if any, to the Faculty Senate. (These policies, apparently drafted by Karen Goldstein, were presented to the PSC in draft-form last year.) The Senate considers this charge to be of the highest priority.
- 2; Review the Instructor Evaluation Form currently in use.
- 3 Investigate ways to streamline the evaluation process.
4. Consider establishing formal means by which the faculty can contribute regularly to the evaluation of the Dean of the University.
- 5, That, given no provision in current policies to address public intoxication on campus, the **Professional Standards Committee** review and comment on behalf of the faculty on the following proposed amendment to the University's Alcohol and Drug Policy
  - A. Policy Statement: The University of Puget Sound prohibits the irresponsible or unlawful possession, use, or distribution of alcohol and drugs by students, faculty, and staff on University premises or as part of any of its activities.
  - B; Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Requirements: &nbsp; add (5; Any person who chooses to drink alcoholic beverages is expected to do so responsibly. Behavior that evidences irresponsible consumption of alcohol, including but not limited to obvious intoxication (e.g., staggering, passing out, being unable to care for oneself), excessive noise, vandalism, excessive messes (e.g., litter, spills on carpets or furniture, throwing garbage or liquids), sickness, or verbal, written or physical harassment, will be addressed through the procedures outlined in section E.

**To LMAC:**

1. Continue reviewing potential "course-ware" products and continue other business carrying over from last year.
2. Suggest ways to enable faculty-members of the LMAC to function more autonomously and to address concerns of the faculty with regard to library, media, and computing issues more effectively.
3. Given the establishment of the Technology Planning Group, the LMAC should consider a redefinition of the LMAC's duties. (Some specific suggestions for redefinition arose at the Senate meeting, but for the time being the Senate wishes to keep this charge broad.)
4. If the LMAC determines that it is unable to achieve meaningful progress with regard to charges 2 and 3 above, then the Committee should consider recommending the dissolution of the LMAC.

**To the Student Life Committee:**

1. Give comments on the revised Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities.
2. Continue to give suggestions on the Conspiracy of Hope project.
3. Hear from Monica Nixon about the "Safe Streets" block part and improving off-campus student/neighbor relations. Hear also from a range of students living off-campus to gain students' perspectives on student/neighbor relations, relations with campus security, and so on.
4. Survey students and faculty to find out what problems they think the SLC might effectively address.

5. *Communicate with appropriate offices to streamline the recommendation-process to which faculty-members contribute for R.A.'s, Peer Advisors, Orientation Leaders, Trail editor, theme houses, etc.&nbsp; One goal is to make routine recommendations less burdensome for the faculty: The SLC may want to consider whether recommendation-forms might be simplified.*

6. *Explore ways of encouraging campus conversations aimed at promoting greater responsibility, accountability, and civility on campus.*

**To the UEC:**

1. *Consider establishing and supporting a Student Research Day.*
2. *Continue the regular duties of dispersing funds.*
3. *Consider ways of making the reporting process less burdensome for faculty (reporting on conference-participation, summer research, etc.)*
4. *Review and discuss policies for procuring airline tickets (etc.) for professional travel.*

**To the FAC:**

1. *To write and distribute a statement to the whole faculty regarding how the FAC applies the Faculty Code (and PSC interpretations of the same) with regard to "Service".*

Respectfully submitted,

David F.Tinsley  
Scribe-Slave and Professor of German