

## Minutes for the February 3, 2014 University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting

1. Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4:01 pm. A list of those attending (from a sign-in sheet circulated during the meeting) is given in Appendix 1.
2. M/S/P to approve the minutes of the November 18 2013 faculty meeting
3. Announcements
  - Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen noted that Daedalus is scheduled for next week with Keith Ward presenting.
4. President's Report
  - The President was not available for this meeting.
5. Academic Vice President's Report
  - Academic Vice President Bartanen noted that there are about 5,300 applicants in the current admissions cycle, up 20% from last year. Admissions is now moving to yield season. AVP Bartanen thanked for faculty for their efforts in the admissions process.
  - AVP Bartanen noted several items of potential interest that are available online. The university's 2013 financial report is available on the university web site. Material from three work groups (Teaching & Technology, Big Ideas, Experiential) is available on the Faculty Conversation Soundnet site, as is a summary of NW5 Consortium activities.
  - AVP Bartanen concluded by noting that we are in the midst of candidate season for eight tenure-line positions of which two are now filled.
6. Faculty Senate Chair report.
  - Senate Chair Dillman reported on the last three Senate meetings, noting the following actions:
    - Revised a charge to the IEC in relation to the work of the ad hoc committee on sexual violence.
    - Charged the ASC with reviewing transfer credit policy.
    - Charged the COD to collaborate with the BN group on drafting a revised proposal for an overlay requirement.
    - Received a Faculty Code interpretation from the PSC concerning guidelines for use of course assistants.
    - Discussed potential improvements to communication in the faculty governance process.
7. Update on PeopleSoft from William Morse and Travis Nation (Technology Services)
  - William Morse reported that basic implementation is done but much work remains on configuration to better meet needs. He noted that Technology Services recognizes the current state of things is not complete or comfortable.
  - Travis Nation described the "agile development process" that focuses on six-week "sprints" and pointed out the project management page at [pugetsound.edu/pmo](http://pugetsound.edu/pmo). He also noted that search by preferred name will be released by PeopleSoft in 2014 and that Sprint 2 will include improvement to waitlist enrollment. The portal ([myPugetSound](http://myPugetSound)) is scheduled to come online in

Summer 2014. He is happy to receive feedback on any aspect of PeopleSoft by email ([tnation@pugetsound.edu](mailto:tnation@pugetsound.edu)) or phone (x2710).

- In response questions, William Morse noted that the portal will put information from all three modules (Campus, Finance, HR) in one place and can draw on information from other sources.
  - In response to another question about functionality allowing students to declare majors in the system, Travis Nation stated that the details, such as ensuring a given advisor is not overloaded, are complex so a timeline is not currently clear.
8. Renewed consideration of a motion to adopt an overlay requirement entitled Knowledge, Power, and Identity
- M/S/ (Amy Ryken/Doug Cannon) to amend the main motion by substituting new wording (Appendix 2) for the original motion made by Cannon on September 23, 2013. Bartanen asked for objections to substituting the new wording; hearing none, the group proceeded to consideration. Bill Haltom clarified that the substitute motion is now the main motion.
  - Ryken noted that revisions are based on feedback, including that from faculty. The revision is for a one-course overlay with less prescriptive guidelines. In her mind, the proposal is now less distinctive. She encouraged discussion on this important decision and noted the group that developed the proposal has a forum and Wed@4 session for discussion.
  - Geoff Proehl stated that Theatre talked long and hard about the original proposal in several department meetings that included a member of the BN group. The department appreciates the changes as a collaborative response.
  - Richard Anderson-Connolly said that the new proposal sounds like a SOAN course and asked, with distinctive elements gone, do we need this? Are we now just expanding the Social Sciences and/or Humanistic Approaches?
  - Carolyn Weisz called attention to one aspect differing from what we now have in place, namely this is a graduation requirement for all students. She noted that there is value both in signaling commitment and in changing the nature of courses students take.
  - Bill Breitenbach asked if Guideline 3 apply to Core requirements? He also noted that the Learning Objectives include language from the sociology of knowledge (“knowledge representation and production”) and asked if this necessarily refers to sociology of knowledge for the students in the classroom?
  - In response, Ryken said yes, faculty would make the connection. In response to an earlier question, she stated that the learning objective about “communicating meaningfully” distinguishes this requirement from the Social Sciences Approach.
  - Keith Ward thanked the BN group for listening and revising and then asked questions about how the overlay proposal would work. Which rules would the Curriculum Committee be using? As an overlay, new courses will be developed to satisfy requirement and existing courses might be modified. To what extent will modifications of existing courses be needed? Is there more guidance on how an existing course would need to be modified, if at all?

- Carolyn Weisz noted that, like other requirements, not every course that could satisfy a particular graduation requirement need satisfy the requirement. Each instructor has the choice to submit or not.
- In response to Ward's question, Brett Rogers stated that as a new member of the CC, one nice thing he finds about this set of objectives is that these provide more clarity than others currently in place for existing requirements. He noted that the CC and its working groups strive to have productive conversations with faculty submitting course proposals. He further noted that the Wed @ 4 session on developing and modifying courses to meet the potential requirement should also produce productive conversation.
- Ward proposed that this question needs discussion between now and March. One thing we may want to consider is that we are expanding to historical contexts. Are we also open to considering global perspectives?
- Heidi Orloff said she would imagine that there would be a faculty development process around this requirement as there was with the new SSI. This seems like a smaller change in comparison to SSI.
- Bill Barry noted that he is concerned about what would be involved in approving a course that meets this proposed requirement.
- Bill Brietenbach asked, from the perspective of students, if there is a course out there that legitimately satisfies requirement, could the student petition? To whom? Could this be automatic?
- Judith Kay stated that individual, institutional, and cultural components are always linked so it should not be difficult to design a course satisfying the requirement. She noted that it is up to the faculty member proposing the course to make the case.
- Doug Cannon called attention to another effect of the learning objectives and guidelines not as hurdles but rather as stimulants for faculty thinking about designing and modifying courses.
- Anderson-Connolly declared that he was still not seeing enough value to justify additional faculty time in designing, modifying, and approving courses. He also noted that each year, a new CC would have its own interpretation.
- Mike Benitez stated that diversity can be addressed without addressing power and privilege and noted that a one-unit requirement puts us at the norm while two units would have been innovative.
- Jennifer Utrata stated that she was not sure that all social science courses here fit the proposed requirements and noted that lending institutional support to these kinds of social changes is more than symbolic.
- Derek Buesher offered a comment and a question. He reminded the group that impetus for this came from students. The fact that we are pointing out what we are doing is important. He then noted that these are necessary conditions and asked what are the sufficient conditions?
- Tiffany MacBain stated that it would be easy to teach English courses that fit the requirement but wondered about colleagues in the sciences. Within some disciplines, more extensive modifications would be needed than in others. She would like to hear from those from other disciplines.

- In response to the sufficient condition question, Dexter Gordon stated that the language that went away was an attempt to avoid minimalist inoculation; with that language gone, what is left are opportunities for faculty discussions in which these become touchstones.
- In response to Tiffany MacBain's question, Heidi Orloff noted that from the perspective of Exercise Science, Gary McCall's nutrition course could be modified to include issues such as food politics including topics such as the availability of nutritious food in certain geographic regions.
- Nick Kontogeorgopolis said that many of his concerns with the original proposal satisfied. He agreed with Anderson-Connolly that it would be difficult for student to not encounter these issues in at least one course. In regard to Guideline 2b, he stated that every course he taught addresses these issues (in an international context) but do not necessarily require students to reflect on linkages between their own social positions and course themes.
- Amy Ryken noted that, for any requirement, not every course that qualifies need be proposed to be included. In regard 2b, if a course did not include this, the CC should not approve the course as satisfying this requirement. The proposing group views connection to social positions as an essential aspect of the requirement.
- Bill Haltom stated that none of us can foresee what future Curriculum Committees will do so we should get as literal as we can at this time because there is more circumscription of future CC thinking if all of us in the room make details as specific as we can.
- Julie Christoph declared support for the argument that having personal position is an essential part of the requirement.
- Doug Cannon invited everyone to read the guidelines for the Core areas and noted that he would be surprised if those provide substantial overlap with these proposed guidelines. He also supported Amy Ryken's point that other areas do not have the level of specificity being asked for here.
- Amy Spivey responded to an earlier question about science courses. Physics courses do not currently fit the requirement. A course could be modified to spend a week on something like women in physics but, in her view, that would be inadequate for the purposes of this requirement. She would not feel competent to lead a discussion on power and privilege.
- Derek Buescher noted that he was initially approaching this as a Core area but now sees that this proposed requirement differs in function. Those who choose to propose courses for this overlay will likely do so with the interests of the requirement in mind.
- Wayne Rickoll noted that he worries that this requirement will be a burden for students.
- Bill Beardsley expressed hope that the discussion in March will regain focus on why this is needed, something that seems to have been lost in questions about implementation. The motion is about increasing graduation requirements, which is a serious matter.

- In a response to earlier comments, Richard Anderson-Connolly noted that background knowledge fills in details on Core rubric; this requirement is different in that it is an attempt to shape values in a certain direction.
  - Bill Barry suggested that guidelines might be clarified using language along the lines “Students in these courses will....”
  - Dexter Gordon responded to the question of whether students are likely or not to graduate without engaging these issues by reminding the group that it was a group of students who petitioned the president in 2008 in regard to a lack of attention to these issues.
9. M/S/P to adjourn at 5:29 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Martin Jackson, Faculty Secretary

## Appendix 1

Attendees

Richard Anderson-Connolly  
Gareth Barkin  
Bill Barry  
Kris Bartanen  
William Beardsley  
Michael Benitez  
William Breitenbach  
Nick Brody  
Gwynne Brown  
Derek Buescher  
Dan Burgard  
Doug Cannon  
Julie Christoph  
Monica DeHart  
Denise Despres  
Brad Dillman  
Joel Elliott  
Jim Evans  
Lisa Ferrari  
Amy Fisher  
Andrew Gardner  
Dexter Gordon  
William Haltom  
Fred Hamel  
Martin Jackson  
Kristin Johnson  
Lisa Johnson  
Judith Kay  
Alisa Kessel  
Grace Kirchner  
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos  
Kriszta Kotsis

Guests

Liz Collins  
Ellen Peters  
Brad Tomhave  
Landon Wade

Alan Krause  
Pat Krueger  
Bill Kupinse  
David Latimer  
Ben Lewin  
Pierre Ly  
Tiffany MacBain  
Lindsay Morse  
Heidi Orloff  
Emelie Peine  
Geoffrey Proehl  
Andrew Rex  
Brad Richards  
Elise Richman  
Wayne Rickoll  
Brett Rogers  
Amy Ryken  
David Sousa  
Amy Spivey  
Mike Spivey  
Jonathan Stockdale  
Ariela Tubert  
Jennifer Utrata  
Keith Ward  
Seth Weinberger  
Carolyn Weisz  
Linda Williams

## Appendix 2

I move to substitute for the Cannon motion, the following motion:

I move that the faculty adopt a graduation overlay requirement for the baccalaureate degree under the title “Knowledge, Identity, and Power.” Students will take one KNOW course.

### **Learning Objectives**

Courses in Knowledge, Identity and Power provide a distinct site for students to develop their understanding of the dynamics and consequences of power differentials, inequalities and divisions among social groups, and the relationship of these issues to knowledge representation and production. In these courses, students also develop their capacity to communicate meaningfully about issues of power, disparity, and diversity of experiences and identities.

### **Guidelines**

1. These courses promote critical engagement with the causes, nature, and consequences of individual, institutional, cultural and/or structural dynamics of disparity, power, and privilege.
2. These courses provide opportunities for students to:
  - a. engage in dialogue about issues of knowledge, identity, and power, and
  - b. consider linkages between their social positions and course themes related to these issues.
3. Courses can also fulfill other program or graduation requirements.

Amy E. Ryken  
Professor, School of Education  
Chair, Committee on Diversity  
February 3, 2014