

## Minutes of the April 15, 2013 University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting

1. President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. President Thomas, 35 faculty members, and one staff member were present (see Appendix I for a list of attendees).
2. **M/S/P (Kay/Hastings) Approval of the minutes of the March 27, 2013 faculty meeting** with one correction: change “perspective students” to “prospective students” on page 3, last paragraph, line 5.
3. Announcements
  - Doug Cannon: the second annual Undergraduate Philosophy Conference will be held on April 26 – 27 with the keynote address on “Humor and Morality” by Noël Carroll on April 26. Ten papers will be presented by undergraduates from across the nation. Puget Sound undergraduates organized the conference and will comment on the papers.
  - Nancy Bristow: the Athletics Program achieved the Drive for 125 goal this past weekend when the men’s and women’s crew varsity rowing boats won their respective races. President Thomas acknowledged the softball team’s wins as well.
  - The Student Athlete Advisory Committee will host a Special Olympics Field Day on April 15.
4. President’s Report
  - President Thomas reported on the status of enrollment for next year’s class. We currently have 336 students that have sent deposits compared to 271 at this time last year. This is a great improvement.
  - The Capital Campaign went over the \$95M mark this month; good conversations with potential donors continue.
  - Spring family weekend and admitted student days were successful with another admitted student day scheduled for Friday, April 19.
  - The top two candidates for the Matelich Scholarship have chosen to attend Puget Sound. One of the top two Lillis Scholarship candidates has chosen to attend as has second alternate candidate.
  - Thanks to all who managed to get through preregistration this year, especially given the implementation of the PeopleSoft system.
5. Academic Vice President’s Report: Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen is attending the NITLE Summit.
6. Faculty Senate Chair’s Report
  - Faculty Senate Chair Brad Dillman expressed his appreciation for those who accepted nominations for open positions on the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Salary Committee.
  - The senate received the end-of-year report from the Committee on Diversity. The committee will bring forth a proposal next year regarding integrating a diversity component in the curriculum.
  - Senate will hear end-of-year reports from the standing committees over the next few weeks.
7. Code Amendment (attached), Second Reading

Proposed Amendment to Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 (and to Chapter VI, Section 2) of the Faculty Code: New federal regulations require that the federally-mandated Research Misconduct Policy be followed in place of any internal processes when allegations of research misconduct are made involving research conducted with federal funding. This code amendment is required to bring university policies in line with federal law by ensuring that, when necessary, the federal policy will be implemented to address allegations of research misconduct. The existing 1997 Scientific Misconduct Policy and the proposed Research Misconduct Policy are available here: [http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/faculty--staff-resources/faculty-policies/.](http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/faculty--staff-resources/faculty-policies/)

President Thomas, as chair of the faculty meeting, identified the proposed wording changes to the original amendment as minor changes; therefore, we will proceed with the second reading. Jennifer Hastings introduced the second reading and distributed the side-by-side comparison of the language (Appendix II).

**M/S/P (Kay/Shapiro) to adopt the amendment to the code (Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 and Chapter VI, Section 2) as written.**

#### 8. Faculty Governance at Puget Sound

Faculty Senate representatives Amy Spivey and Brad Dillman presented an overview of faculty governance at Puget Sound (see Appendix III for the presentation document). Last fall the Senate had conversations regarding how to encourage faculty participation in governance. This presentation was one of the items the Senate thought would be helpful, especially in advance of the committee preference selection form coming out soon.

Amy and Brad reviewed the roles of the Senate and committees. The role of the faculty in governance is our obligation and something we should take seriously. Serving in governance a great way to learn about the university and how it works. The Senate charges the standing committees, receives reports from committees, hears from the Budget Task Force, etc. The Senate hosts a faculty governance listserve; Brad encouraged all faculty members to participate in the listserve discussions. Any faculty member is invited to contact any member of the Senate to add agenda items, etc. Senate meetings are usually open to any faculty member.

The most important work of governance occurs through the standing committees. Specific roles for each committee are defined in the Bylaws. Brad Dillman briefly reviewed the main responsibilities for each committee. Refer to committee minutes and end-of-year reports for overviews of committee work and process. It is important for faculty members to serve on committees where they have an interest.

Priti Joshi asked about service on standing committees and how that service corresponds to service on other university committees. Brad responded by briefly describing the committee assignment process and how the selection group (dean, associate deans,

senate executive committee) balances requests, needs, and other obligations. Jennifer Hastings followed up to clarify that everyone has a service assignment with a one-year sabbatical from standing committee service after a three-year term of service. Doug Cannon noted that this relates to how standing committees are appointed. The degree of self-governance and responsibility that the faculty has is unusual. Doug provided some historical context: during a time of dramatic changes at the university in the early 1970s, the administration adopted the current Bylaws providing responsibilities, especially in curriculum and student life areas, to the faculty. Standing committee structure and roles are implemented in the Bylaws and, therefore, can only be changed by the faculty.

Judith Kay asked about committee size. The selection committee, working within the parameters set by the Bylaws, tries to balance committee work load and committee membership. Lindsay Morse asked about the composition of the senate and how representative it is of departments/programs across campus. Brad responded that while there is not any specific charge for the variety of faculty members, the nomination and voting process serves to provide broad representation. Lindsay followed up with a question about constituencies. Senate members do not have specific constituents but represent all faculty members. Grace Kirchner provided some historical perspective on Senate structure that was delineated more specifically in the past.

Interactions among the faculty, the senate, and the standing committees are encouraged and checks and balances are in place. Brad encouraged any faculty member to bring issues to a committee, the senate, or the full faculty. He also encouraged us to read the senate minutes. Amanda Mifflin asked if a specific number of attendees are required for faculty meetings. The Bylaws do not specify a given number of attendees.

There are other committees, task forces, and *ad hoc* committees on which faculty members serve in addition to the senate standing committees. Additional faculty service positions do not necessarily replace standing committee service but are important avenues for faculty representation and participation across campus. Brad Dillman called for someone to serve as a representative to the ASUPS Senate—this is an important position that was not filled this year.

Gwynne Brown asked about the Diversity Advisory Council and the Committee on Diversity. Amy Ryken noted that the Diversity Advisory Council is advisory to the Chief Diversity Officer and serves as the anchoring group for all issues and activities regarding diversity on campus.

Judith Kay encouraged committee chairs to suggest charges for the committee in the end-of-year reports. Brad Dillman noted the Senate meets prior to the start of the academic year to discuss committee charges. Faculty members can approach senate members with suggested charges as well.

Brett Rogers asked if there was a list of committees and members available. Amy directed

us to the Committees & Minutes page online (<http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/faculty--staff-resources/committees--minutes/> ). Sarah Moore noted an email with committee membership goes out each fall. Lisa Ferrari added that the Associate Deans' Office (ADO) helps put the list together so the complete list is available in the ADO.

9. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Alyce DeMarais, Faculty Secretary.

#### Appendix I: April 15, 2013 Faculty Meeting Attendees

Rich Anderson-Connolly	Sunil Kukreja
Luc Boisvert	Julia Looper
Bob Boyles	Pierre Ly
Nancy Bristow	Amanda Mifflin
Gwynne Brown	Sarah Moore
Douglas Cannon	Lindsay Morse
Julie Christoph	Brett Rogers
Alyce DeMarais	Amy Ryken
Brad Dillman	Sara Shapiro
Joel Elliott	Amy Spivey
Lisa Ferrari	Jonathan Stockdale
Bill Haltom	Ron Thomas, President
Jennifer Hastings	George Tomlin
Martin Jackson	Jennifer Utrata
Priti Joshi	Landon Wade, Director of Academic Advising
Judith Kay	Barbara Warren
Grace Kirchner	Carolyn Weisz
Alan Krause	Peter Wimberger
Patricia Krueger	

Appendix II: Proposed Amendment to Chapter I, Part D, Section 4 and to Chapter VI, Section 2 of the Faculty Code

CURRENT	PROPOSED Amendment
<p>Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 - Professional Ethics</p> <p>Professors are bound to observe acceptable standards of professional ethics. In general, a professor should not compromise the interests of the university or of one's students in favor of one's own. Questions related to violations of professional ethics should be 1 handled in the following manner:</p> <p>a. First notify the faculty member of suspected misconduct on his or her part. There may be an explanation that resolves the matter satisfactorily.</p> <p>b. Failing to receive an explanation that is satisfactory, or not wishing to deal directly with the person that is suspected of misconduct, one should take the matter to the Chair of that person's department. (If the Chair is the person suspected of misconduct one should take the matter to the Dean.) The Chair may resolve the matter to everyone's satisfaction.</p> <p>c. If these steps do not resolve the problem, the matter should normally be referred to the Dean and handled through the grievance process as provided in Chapter VI, with the Dean responsible for filing the grievance. In the event that the Dean does not file the grievance, faculty members retain the right to do so.</p> <p>Grievances must be filed according to the</p>	<p>Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 - Professional Ethics</p> <p>Professors are bound to observe acceptable standards of professional ethics. In general, a professor should not compromise the interests of the university or of one's students in favor of one's own. Questions related to violations of professional ethics should be 1 handled in the following manner:</p> <p>a. First, <b>take steps required by public law as implemented in university policies.</b></p> <p>b. <b>Second, when there is no relevant public law,</b> notify the faculty member of suspected misconduct on his or her part. There may be an explanation that resolves the matter satisfactorily.</p> <p>c. Failing to receive an explanation that is satisfactory, or not wishing to deal directly with the person that is suspected of misconduct, one should take the matter to the Chair of that person's department. (If the Chair is the person suspected of misconduct one should take the matter to the Dean.) The Chair may resolve the matter to everyone's satisfaction.</p> <p>d. If these steps do not resolve the problem, the matter should normally be referred to the Dean and handled through the grievance process as provided in Chapter VI, with the Dean responsible for filing the grievance. In the event that the Dean does not file the grievance, faculty members retain the right to do so.</p> <p>Grievances must be filed according to the</p>

<p>timeline outlined in Chapter VI.</p>	<p>timeline outlined in Chapter VI.</p>
<p><b>CURRENT</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED Amendment</b></p>
<p>Chapter VI, Section 2 - Prehearing Settlement Conference</p> <p>a. Within thirty (30) working days of the alleged violation, the grievant shall give written notice thereof to the respondent; provided, that the notice may be served on the dean if the grievant is without knowledge of the identify of the respondent.</p> <p>A grievance notice presented after thirty working days of the alleged violation will be considered only if the grievant demonstrates that he or she did not know, or could not have known, about the alleged violation until a later time. In such an instance, the grievance notice must be given within thirty working days of the date upon which the grievant gained knowledge of the alleged violation.</p> <p>b. The notice shall state the relevant facts with reasonable particularity, cite those portions of the appointment contract or the faculty code alleged to be violated, and include proposed remedies.</p> <p>c. Within five (5) working days of notice the respondent shall conduct formal discussions with the grievant and other appropriate persons with the intent of reaching a satisfactory settlement of the grievance, and which, if found, shall terminate the grievance process. Any party may terminate the prehearing settlement conference if they feel that further discussions will be unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Chapter VI, Section 2 - Prehearing Settlement Conference</p> <p>a. Within thirty (30) working days of the alleged violation, the grievant shall give written notice thereof to the respondent; provided, that the notice may be served on the dean if the grievant is without knowledge of the <b>identity</b> of the respondent.</p> <p>A grievance notice presented after thirty working days of the alleged violation will be considered only if: <b>(1) an alternative process is required by public law as implemented in university policies; or (2)</b> the grievant demonstrates that he or she did not know, or could not have known, about the alleged violation until a later time. In the second instance, the grievance notice must be given within thirty working days of the date upon which the grievant gained knowledge of the alleged violation.</p> <p>b. The notice shall state the relevant facts with reasonable particularity, cite those portions of the appointment contract or the faculty code alleged to be violated, and include proposed remedies.</p> <p>c. Within five (5) working days of notice the respondent shall conduct formal discussions with the grievant and other appropriate persons with the intent of reaching a satisfactory settlement of the grievance, and which, if found, shall terminate the grievance process. Any party may terminate the prehearing settlement conference if they feel that further discussions will be unsuccessful.</p>

## Appendix III: Faculty Governance and University Service

Faculty Senate (Brad Dillman, Chair, and Amy Spivey)

### **Overview**

- The Faculty Senate
- Standing committees
- Roles of the full faculty, the standing committees, and the Faculty Senate in policy-setting and decision-making
- Other committees
- Additional faculty service options
- Questions and discussion

### **The Faculty Senate**

- 17 members – The Chairperson and 11 other faculty members (elected), the Dean, the Dean of Students, two students chosen by ASUPS, and one staff member chosen by the Staff Senate.
- “...shall serve as an Executive Committee of the faculty and shall study, advise, recommend, and initiate programs of action for the good of the University and communicate its findings and proposals to the Faculty, the Administration, the Board of Trustees, and other appropriate bodies.” (Faculty Code, Article IV, Section 1)

### **Standing Committees**

- Academic Standards Committee (ASC)
- Committee on Diversity (CD) Curriculum Committee (CC)
- Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC)
- Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- International Education Committee (IEC)
- Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee (LMIS)
- Professional Standards Committee (PSC)
- Student Life Committee (SLC)
- University Enrichment Committee (UEC)

### **Constituting the standing committees**

1) Faculty Advancement Committee - Nominated by the faculty in an election process, after which final selection is made by the Dean.

2) Other committees:

- Faculty members express preferences before June 1.
- Committee members are appointed to 3-year terms by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Dean, and the President.
- One-year sabbatical from standing committee service should follow completion of each 3-year service term. (Faculty Bylaws, Article V, Section 4)

### **Interaction between the Faculty Senate and the standing committees**

- Faculty Senate delivers charges to standing committees in the fall.
- Senate liaisons serve as a bridge between each committee and the Senate throughout the year.
- Standing committees report back to the Senate at the end of each academic year.
- Committees are free to pursue activities within their purview that are separate from Senate charges, along with the charges.

### **Policy-setting and decision-making: checks and balances**

- Actions of standing committees take effect unless “modified, rejected, or delayed by the Senate within 30 class days...” (Faculty Bylaws, Article V, Section 4)
- The faculty may alter any decision of the Senate by a majority vote of the faculty at a regularly called faculty meeting.
- Committees may bring matters to the Senate or to the full faculty for consideration.
- Individuals or groups of faculty members may bring matters to the full faculty, to the Senate, or to one of the standing committees for consideration.

### **A few other committees on which faculty members serve**

- Bias-Hate Education Response Team (BERT)
- Budget Task Force
- Board of Trustees Committees (3)
- Diversity Advisory Council
- Faculty Salary Committee
- Prelude Committee
- Graduate Fellowships Advisory Committee
- Reaccreditation Steering Committee
- Sustainability Advisory Committee

### **Some additional faculty service positions**

Faculty representative to ASUPS Senate

Faculty representative to Crosscurrents (literary journal)

Faculty representative to ASUPS Media Board

Faculty representative to ASUPS Union Board

Faculty advisor to Honor Court

Member of Honor Court

Faculty advisor to the Trail (newspaper)

Faculty advisor to KUPS (radio station)

Faculty advisor to Elements (science magazine)

Faculty advisor to Tamanawas (yearbook)

Student club advisors

Faculty mentors for the Logger athletic teams