

## **Senate Meeting Minutes April 18, 2011**

Senators present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Gareth Barkin, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Keith Ward, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Marcus Luther, Savannah LaFerrière, Fred Hamel, Ross Singleton, Brad Dillman, Steven Neshyba, Elise Richman, Bill Barry

Visitors present: Derek Buescher, Alyce DeMarais, Martin Jackson, Amy Ryken, Michel Rocchi

**Item I – Call to order.** Senate Chair Neshyba called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

**Item II – Approval of minutes of April 4, 2011.** Minutes approved with slight changes.

**Item III – Announcements.** Neshyba announced the results of the recent election of next year’s senators. Given that Richman will be on leave in the fall, first runner-up Gareth Barkin has agreed to serve as replacement senator. Mott Greene was elected to the Faculty Salary Committee. The election results are also in for the FAC, but the selection has not been finalized. In response to a request from Barry, Neshyba reported that the top 6 candidates for the FAC are Cathy Hale, Alexa Tullis, Julie Christoph, Suzanne Holland, Bill Beardsley, and Fred Hamel.

Barry announced that a faculty meeting will occur tomorrow.

Neshyba expressed thanks to out-going temporary senators Barkin, Dillman, and Burgard, and to Hutchinson and K. Johnson, who are completing their terms. He also announced that the Senate will meet on May 9<sup>th</sup> from 2:30 to 4 in order to complete the review of year-end reports.

**Item IV - Special Orders.** None

**Item V – Year-end report from the Committee on Diversity.**

The Senate received the End of the Year Report of the Committee on Diversity . Ryken noted that her year on the committee has been both educational and eye-opening. She described how the process of working with a range of initiatives has been quite complex (noted at the end of report), and pointed out that often the committee was placed in a reactive more than proactive mode, given that the committee must respond to events as they occur.

Rocchi echoed Ryken’s account, noting that the Committee faces a tension in not possessing any authority to act in response to events on campus, except through a committee member on BERT. He pointed out that the committee’s role amid the various diversity initiatives on campus might need to be reviewed. Ryken added that a particular strength of the committee’s organization is that the Chief Diversity Officer and Director of Multicultural Student Services serve on the committee as well facilitate communication across the varied initiatives.

Hamel asked for more information regarding the committee’s rationale for increasing the role and number of diversity narratives. Ryken noted that the committee has about nine narratives written by Puget Sound faculty members regarding a moment in class during which - despite our best efforts to be inclusive - something occurs that places attention on a

student's "difference." Three of these narratives were taken to the most recent faculty orientation to serve as springboards for discussion. Both Ryken and Bartanen described how the resulting dialogue seemed especially productive, leading, for example, to an extensive discussion of potential pedagogical alternatives concerning the sometimes unexpected role of diversity in the classroom. In particular, these narratives, Ryken concluded, can serve as a powerful means of stopping the silencing that often occurs on campus regarding diversity.

Neshyba asked whether Ryken is serving on the Diversity Advisory Council since she is chair of the Committee on Diversity. Ryken replied that yes, this dual service seemed to be a convention.

MacBain requested suggestions for revised charges given Rocchi's comments regarding the need to rethink the role of the Committee on Diversity on campus. Rocchi replied that he is particularly concerned by the fact that the committee discusses many issues but is not empowered to act. He noted that, while the recent change in the committee's bylaws represents an improvement, the committee's structure still does not allow for any useful action to be taken. He praised Ryken's efforts to make the Committee on Diversity more valid and active.

Ward urged that the recording of faculty narratives has been powerful and important, and that the Committee on Diversity should indeed see them as a useful result of the committee's work. He pointed out that the very process of having conversations that created a better understanding of diversity is itself crucial. Rocchi agreed, noting that the committee had had a year-and-a-half long conversation regarding the meaning of diversity. While he noted that the narratives were wonderful resources, he reiterated that there must be something more that the committee can do. Ryken added that the Committee on Diversity has been using the campus's definition of social diversity. She noted the committee's awareness of a pervasive pattern on campus where campus community members equate diversity initiatives with race rather than the broad definition identified in the Diversity Strategic Plan, and shared that the committee is often caught (in a positive way) in the tension between capturing diversity and being trapped by categories.

M(Ward)S(Hamel)P to receive the Diversity Committee's End-of-the-Year Report.

#### **Item VI – Year-end report from the Faculty Advancement Committee**

Jackson presented the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC)'s End of the Year Report. The FAC completed 55 Evaluations (23 of which were streamlined). That body has also composed a draft of an amendment to the bylaws, which will have its first reading at the next faculty meeting. Barry requested more information on the process of streamlined evaluations. Jackson replied that one member of the committee is assigned to each streamlined file. That member then reports back to the FAC. Dean Bartanen reviews all the letters. Singleton asked whether the various concerns that have been raised in the recent past regarding open files continue. Jackson noted that he has not been on the committee long enough to notice a pattern but observed that he could not predict which letters were composed within open or closed evaluations. In that sense, he does not see an issue, but noted that someone with a longer experience on the FAC might have noticed a difference. Neshyba asked about the process of dealing with teaching awards, given the move to streamlined evaluations. Jackson replied that the committee member assigned to a

particular file recommends honors (such as distinguished professor), and then the FAC discusses all the recommendations as a group at the end of the process.

M(Hutchinson)S(Ward)P to receive the Faculty Advancement Committee's End-of-the-Year Report

**Item VII – ASC revised language for the Upper Division Requirement**

Hamel brought forward the ASC's proposal for revised language for the Upper Division Requirement, which was approved on February 16, 2011 by the Curriculum Committee. [Attachment C: Handout providing a timeline of the changes attached]. Hamel asked Buescher to speak to the return to the original language. Buescher replied that the primary issue under consideration was how to make the application consistent and fair. He noted that the committee had started from a) the fact that the upper division requirement is in place and b) the assumption that the intent of the original language reflects a consensus regarding the need for and spirit of the upper division requirement. Buescher noted that testing the latter assumption is something to which future attention may need to be given. DeMarais echoed that there was concern on the part of some ASC members regarding the upper division requirement itself.

Ward wondered whether the initial concerns that had inspired the revision (e.g., a biochemistry major using a biology class as an 'Upper Division Outside of Major' course) have been addressed by the new wording. Buescher replied that, yes, the changes will indeed eliminate the above problem.

Hutchinson expressed concern regarding the change, given that he has been informed that as a change in the core, the new wording will be effective for *everyone* next year, rather than only for those students using the 2011/2012 bulletin.

Dillman requested clarification regarding how exactly "outside major/program" is going to be defined, given the new language. What, for example, if a course is cross-listed in two different departments? (i.e. IPE and CSOC). What, for example, of courses that are listed as IPE but are actually connections courses? Finally, what about Study Abroad classes that students wish to count as an upper division course outside the major? He emphasized that there are many problems that occur when trying to define what is "inside/outside a department or program." Buescher replied that Brad Tomhave and Sarah Moore would ultimately have to be consulted regarding all of Dillman's questions and scenarios. DeMarais suggested passing these questions back to the ASC, on the grounds they need to develop some rules for how to address such issues.

Furthermore, DeMarais suggested that some of Dillman's concerns reflect long-standing concerns with the "within the requirements of the first major" language. For example, concerns have been raised that, given that interdisciplinary programs are defined so broadly, a wide range of courses could potentially be used to serve the major (thus limiting the number of courses available for the upper division requirement). In contrast, for majors – in such disciplines as biochemistry – in which the requirements are much more defined, a student could take another science course and fill the Upper Division Requirement. Dillman reiterated his concern that the new language could constrain students who are in fact trying to go outside their major, yet still allow other students to get around the intent of the

requirement (for example, by using a connections course offered by their major as an Upper-Division Requirement).

Ward suggested that the Senate forward these questions and concerns to the ASC now so they can be forewarned of the petitions this change will likely inspire. Buescher noted that the new language was developed in response to prior petitions inspired by the previous language. Ward replied that the fix might simply create new questions and, ultimately, petitions. Barry suggested accepting the changed language and allowing the new petitions to be generated in response, which may in turn generate new language (as opposed to trying to anticipate the nature of the petitions before hand).

Singleton followed up on Hutchinson's question regarding implementation on the grounds that, given that the change will apply to everyone rather than just those using next year's bulletin, many students may be placed in a bind. He suggested a process of "grandfathering-in" may be needed. Barry agreed, unless the new language simply clarifies current practice. DeMaris pointed out that this revision is more restricted than current practice. She also noted she would check with Tomhave regarding which entering class(es) would be subject to the language change. Buescher noted that the "Core argument" (that a change in the Core applies to everyone) had not been applied to previous changes. In the face of the potential problems with the new language, Hutchinson urged that advisors be apprised of how and when the change would apply to particular classes.

M(Barry)S(Hamel)/F (Yea: 7 Nay 7) to affirm the CC's incorporation of the ASC's revisions to the Upper Division Requirement.

Discussion: Singleton noted that the same result would occur, whether the Senate takes action or not, but he did not want to establish a precedent that the Senate must affirm every one of its committees' actions. He pointed out that doing so seems to establish an unnecessary additional level of work for the Senate. Barry responded that he made the motion mainly because we took the matter up as an agenda item. Dillman spoke against the motion on the grounds that he does not know how the new language will be applied or how it will affect his advisees, and wished for the ASC to clarify what would constitute a "petitionable" action. Hamel, speaking in favor of the motion, noted that we are unlikely to achieve the perfect policy. Any policy, for example, will yield its share of petitions. But he pointed out that the ASC has devoted a significant amount of time to this issue, and that any new problems will come out in the petitions process. He also noted that simply letting the "30-days Rule" play out could interfere with the Registrar's need to plan for the Fall, and expressed support of the ASC's efforts so far. Yea: 7 Nay: 7. Motion fails. Barkin and Segawa suggested clarification be requested from the ASC regarding the questions raised so far.

Buescher suggested a potential charge for the Curriculum Committee next year regarding the Upper Division Requirement, given the concerns expressed in response to the language change. DeMarais noted that the requirement was reviewed two years ago and was approved by the Faculty. She also expressed concern regarding the proposal to send the language back to the ASC, given that today's agenda item concerned the Curriculum Committee's adoption of a change approved by the ASC in the 2009/2010 Final Report.

Barry suggested that, as ASC Liaison, he request clarification from the ASC in response to Dillman's and others' concerns.

M/S/P to adjourn at 5:15.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristin Johnson  
Scribe of the Day

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain  
Secretary, Faculty Senate

**Committee on Diversity  
2010-2011 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

**Committee Membership**

Kim Bobby, Lynette Claire, Lisa Ferrari, Nadar Heyman (student member, Fall 2010 only), Pepa Lago-Grana, Mark Martin, Susan Owen, Michel Rocchi, Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken (Chair), Justin Tiehen (Fall 2010 only)

**Committee Activities**

Committee Responsibilities Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charges	Committee Activities
1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus.	--The committee analyzed the university's diversity statement in relation to revisions suggested by the Coalition Against Injustice and Racism. Nation of origin was identified as an important factor missing from the campus definition of social diversity.
2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.	--The committee engaged in research about the hiring and retention of Puget Sound faculty. We reviewed existing 10-year data about the retention rate of white faculty (96%) versus faculty of color (50%). Each committee member also sought feedback from two faculty colleagues about faculty hiring and retention at Puget Sound, the responses were compiled and themes were identified (e.g., the co-existing concepts of the richness that hiring with diversity as a priority brings and diversity as limiting our hiring choices, the lack of focus on aspects of social diversity other than race and gender in hiring decisions, the perceived tension of a focus on "merit-based" decisions versus enriching faculty diversity) . The committee read four reports about hiring and retaining faculty of color in the academy and identified themes (e.g., proactive/strategic recruitment, decentralized hiring and recruitment practices, and institutional conceptualizations of diversity as adding more faculty of color versus institutional change and curriculum re-thinking).
3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity	--Amy Ryken serves as the Committee on Diversity representative on the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) and on the Center for Writing Teaching (CWTL) and Learning Race and Pedagogy group.

<p>initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p>	
<p>4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.</p>	<p>--The committee interprets the breath of the term "initiatives" to include diversity-related initiatives such as the Spanish Matters Colloquium. The committee collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BERT, CWTL, and new faculty orientation, the Chief Diversity Officer and Multicultural Student Services.</p> <p>--The committee collaborated with the Staff Senate Chair to discuss how to support staff participation in the Race and Pedagogy Conference.</p> <p>--The committee provided feedback about developing a student cohort program to recruit and retain students from historically underrepresented populations.</p>
<p>5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</p>	<p>--Kim Bobby, Lisa Ferrari, Susan Owen, Czarina Ramsay, and Amy Ryken developed and facilitated a workshop for new faculty focused on using teaching narratives written by Puget Sound Faculty members on unintended moments of student spotlighting.</p> <p>--The committee worked to increase the number of faculty narratives by inviting submissions from faculty colleagues.</p> <p>--Kim Bobby, Pepa Lago-Grana, and Amy Ryken planned and participated in a CWTL dialogue entitled, "Who Defines Race Inside and Outside the Classroom."</p>
<p>6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</p>	<p>--BERT was activated in September 2010. Pepa Lago-Grana serves as the Committee on Diversity representative on BERT.</p>
<p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p>	<p>--This document is our annual report.</p>
<p>8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate. Charge 1: Promote faculty and</p>	<p>--Funding was not offered because the Committee on Diversity has no funding.</p>

<p>student engagement with the Fall 2010 Race and Pedagogy Conference (including offering any funding that might be available from the committee's resources).</p> <p>Charge 2: Increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the Campus Climate Survey.</p> <p>Charge 3: Investigate the possibilities of grant writing to support diversity efforts.</p> <p>Charge 4: Create and maintain a website with technical assistance from the Associate Deans' Office that displays courses at Puget Sound with significant diversity content</p>	<p>--The campus climate survey has been postponed until the 2011-2012 academic year.</p> <p>--The committee did not investigate grant writing opportunities because we have not yet identified a specific project.</p> <p>--The Diversity Curriculum Resource (<a href="http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/diversity-curriculum/">http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/diversity-curriculum/</a>) is reviewed every 2-3 years. The next review cycle is the 2011-2012 academic year.</p>
--	--

### **Dilemmas of Committee Work**

This committee's responsibilities are described by three broad areas of focus: 1) develop initiatives to support the hiring and retention of faculty from historically underrepresented groups, 2) support campus diversity efforts, and 3) create liaisons with diversity groups on campus. Much of the committee's work is shaped in relationship to a range of diversity initiatives across campus. At times this creates a tension as we respond to the committee's charge while being responsive to evolving initiatives and incidents that impact the campus climate. To better understand the range of experiences of campus community members, we have built a shared dialogue among committee members by engaging narratives written by campus community members (students and faculty). The tension of a dialogue-focus versus an action-focus is another tension of this committee's work. This tension also stems from the variety of initiatives and groups working on issues of diversity on many levels. The committee's dialogue-focused role is amplified by the fact that other entities are responsible for a much more active role in diversity matters and have the resources for their charges, such as the Chief Diversity Officer, the Diversity Advisory Council, the Multicultural Student Services Director, BERT, etc.



**Suggested Charges for 2011-2012**

--Systematically gather information about faculty attitudes about faculty hiring and retention and suggest initiatives to recruit and retain new faculty from historically under-represented populations.

--Increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the Campus Climate Survey.

--Create and maintain a website with technical assistance from the Associate Deans' Office that displays courses at Puget Sound with significant diversity content

--Expand the collection of faculty narratives

Attachment B

April 14, 2011

TO: Faculty Senate  
FR: Faculty Advancement Committee  
RE: 2010-2011 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 55 evaluations:

Type of review	Number & status of evaluation files
Tenure	4 (3 open, 1 closed)
Tenure and promotion to associate	9 (6 open, 3 closed)
Promotion to associate	8 (5 open, 3 closed)
Promotion to professor	3 (1 open, 2 closed)
3-year assistant	6 (3 open, 3 closed)
3-year associate	5 (5 streamline)
5-year professor	16 (2 closed, 14 streamline)
3-year instructor	4 (4 streamline)
Total	55

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2011 meeting, some will be considered at the May 2011 Board meeting.

The Advancement Committee met 4 hours per week from October 4 - December 10, four hours per week January 19 – present, and anticipates completing its work by May 4. Committee members' work outside of meeting times is extensive, estimated at 40 hours per month. Committee members receive one release unit for service on the Advancement Committee. The greater use of streamlined reviews has reduced the workload of the FAC.

The Advancement Committee, at the request of the Faculty Senate Chair, drafted an amendment to the Faculty Bylaws. The Senate Chair will forward the amendment at the April 19, 2011 Faculty Meeting.

At this point in time, 55 faculty members are scheduled for evaluation in 2011-2012.

Continuing members express appreciation to Martin Jackson, Priti Joshi, and Stuart Smithers for their considerable and careful work over the past two, three and three years. The Dean will confirm 2011-2012 membership of the Advancement Committee before the end of the Spring 2011 semester.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristine Bartanen  
Dexter Gordon  
Martin Jackson  
Priti Joshi

Eric Orlin  
Stuart Smithers

Attachment C

*Upper Division Graduation Requirement (outside the major)*

1. ASC proposed changes to the following degree requirement:

“Earn at least three academic units outside the first major at the upper division level, which is understood to be 300 or 400 level courses or 200 level courses with at least two prerequisites.”

The change is as follows:

“Earn at least three academic units outside **the department/program of the first major, and the requirements of** the first major, at the upper division level, which is understood to be 300 or 400 level courses or 200 level courses with at least two prerequisites.” (ASC final report, 2009-2010).

2. Curriculum Committee voted in favor of just the first part of this revision: “the department/program of the first major” but NOT “and the requirements of” the first major.

Revised wording: “Earn at least three academic units outside the first major, and outside the requirements of the first major, at the upper division level.” (October 20, 2010)

3. Finding the intent of the approved language unclear, Senate sent the language back to the Curriculum Committee for review. (December 13, 2010)
4. Curriculum Committee voted to approve the original ASC language revision (February 16, 2011).  
See #1 above.