

## Minutes for the March 25, 2014 University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting

1. President Ron Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:04 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 February 3, 2014 faculty meeting
3. Announcements
  - President Thomas encouraged attendance of the Pierce Lecture tonight with speaker E.J. Dionne and noted that he would need to leave the meeting early in order to have dinner with the speaker.
4. President's Report
  - President Thomas noted a promising admissions cycle with applications up 24%. The composition of the admitted pool is comparable to last year's with exception of more international admits (about 50).
  - The President noted that fundraising is on track for the campaign.
  - The President addressed the topic of faculty compensation, noting that there have been faculty, cabinet, and Board discussions. In the most recent Board meetings, several committees took up the issue. Board Chair Rick Brooks has agreed to meet with Brad Dillman and indicated he would accept an invitation meet with the Faculty Senate to discuss, among other things, executive compensation. Separately, the Faculty Salary Committee has expressed interest in discussions with senior administration members and a meeting is being scheduled for April 29.
5. Academic Vice President's Report
  - Academic Vice President Bartanen pointed out that the FAC will have significant turn-over this spring requiring four replacements for fall and one for springs. The Faculty Bylaws require a slate of ten for the five positions. She asked faculty to consider this important work when the call for nominations comes out.
  - Department chairs, directors, and deans will meet tomorrow morning with a primary topic being improving the process for submitting class schedules.
  - AVP Bartanen reminded that nominations for the McCormick Professor of Natural Science can be submitted through April 1.
6. Faculty Senate Chair report
  - Senate Chair Dillman reported highlights from recent Faculty Senate meetings.
    - On February 10, the Senate endorsed the KNOW proposal.
    - On February 24, the Senate heard from the Faculty Salary Committee about salary scale questions, erosion of the real value of salaries, executive compensation, and a lack of specific institutional priorities relating to faculty compensation.
    - On March 10, the Senate reviewed a revised policy on course withdrawal from ASC and took no action so the revised policy is now effective. The Senate also endorsed a policy from the ASC and the CC on requirements allowing a student to earn two baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

- On March 24, the Senate appointed an ad hoc group to compile data from the faculty governance survey and a group to examine the university's FMLA policy as it applies to faculty members.
  - Chair Dillman noted that the PSC has passed a motion allowing a faculty member being evaluated the option of submitting an evaluation file electronically.
7. Presentation by Krystle Cobian on faculty reporting obligations regarding sexual violence
- Krystle Cobian, the Student Affairs Conduct Coordinator; presented a summary of responsibilities faculty members have to report information about sexual violence incidents in the campus community. She noted that reporting means letting the institution know of a possible sexual violence incident and that faculty are considered mandatory reporters. She distributed a handout entitled "Creating a Culture of Care on Campus" (Appendix 3) with details on what to report, who to report to, and when to report.
8. Continued consideration of a motion to adopt an overlay requirement entitled Knowledge, Power, and Identity
- President Thomas recognized Amy Ryken to remind the faculty of the motion details. Ryken distributed a copy of the motion and noted that various groups (Faculty Senate, Committee on Diversity, ASUPS Senate, Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity) have endorsed the proposal. In response to a suggestion made at the end of the previous faculty meeting that we speak to purposes for adding the requirement, she articulated what she sees as the two main values in the proposed new requirement. The first is to ensure every single Puget Sound student has at least one class that engages questions of difference, power, and equity. The second is to build on our collective knowledge about these issues and to work together to demonstrate an institutional commitment to address these issues.
  - Jonathan Stockdale stated that in reflecting on process and conversations to date, he had noticed possible perceptions that the proposal constitutes a rebuke to current teaching practices. His perception is that he sees brilliant teaching around diversity here. The lack is in any explicit attention to diversity in our Core curriculum design. He sees a need to offset institutional identity and what students (past, current, and prospective) have experienced, pointing, for evidence, to a piece by Sandra Rosa Bryant in Arches on the physical toll she experienced in being here. He noted that student focus groups from the Core assessment had expressed desire for theory and framework relevant to the issues the proposal addresses. He imagines that prospective students might easily encounter this place as a starkly white environment with no mention of diversity in Core curriculum. By supporting the proposal, we can affirm at the institutional level our commitment to making progress regarding diversity.
  - Geoff Proehl joined in support of the motion for many of the same reasons as Stockdale. He noted that Theatre has developed a series of World Theatre courses that speaks to these issues and that impetus came from voices of students. He also noted that work with students of color has been vital to Theatre.

- Richard Anderson-Connolly stated that he was not sure that the comments so far were directly related to the language of the proposal and is not sure that adding a graduation requirement is the best way to address to concerns expressed in those comments. He added that the nice things that have been said about the proposal in earlier comments have been contradicted in his experience. He stated that some supporters of the proposal believe that all whites, even poor whites, have privilege over all blacks, even rich and powerful blacks. He noted that some have labeled him as a racist for promoting the idea of colorblindness. He wondered if it would be allowed for a white kid on welfare to refuse to acknowledge being in a position of privilege. He expressed worry about the way students who wanted to move beyond the lie of race would be treated in the classroom by supporters of the proposal. He does not think that we should force students to take a dose of this heavy, divisive ideology.
- Judith Kay noted that she appreciated Anderson-Connolly's reference to the existence of heavy divisions. She stated that these divisions are created by structural oppressions that began as external to the university; they are international, regional, national, and local. They now exist within the university as well as in our hearts and minds, making our work difficult. It is naïve to think anyone is outside these oppressions. As such, we need to provide our students and ourselves with language and frameworks for engaging these deep divisions.
- Stockdale stated that Anderson-Connolly's points are important and that it would be great to have a course around these ideas that could satisfy the proposed requirement. He can envision a course which all of the things Anderson-Connolly raised could be included as one voice within a larger tapestry of courses satisfying the requirement.
- Sara Freeman commented that, since fall, the committee has listened and been responsive. She sees the proposal as having landed in place that is about doors being open. From working with colleagues on the Curriculum Committee (CC), she can see that a syllabus proposed for KNOW designation would need to be evaluated for the way it provides critical engagement and opportunities for certain types of learning rather than mandated outcomes.
- Derek Buescher that he was on the CC when issue of the diversity first arose there and that it has been a long and productive journey since then. He has found value in thinking about whether his courses will fit the proposed requirements and, if not, how he might change those courses. In his view, having a structural location for conversations is beneficial for the work we are already doing.
- Steven Neshyba recalled the process by which the Approaches to Knowing in the Core were established. He wondered if this proposal fits as an Approach to Knowing and, if so, whether it should be part of the Core rather than a separate graduation requirement.
- Freeman responded that she sees proposed requirement as addressing things that are part of all ways of knowing; issues of power and difference impact every way of knowing.
- Neshyba noted that this sounds a lot like a Connections course and asked why not address this as part of Connections?

- Brett Rogers noted that another response to this question centers on the ease of conflating epistemology with the subject itself, that is, conflating a thing we study with the method by which we study it. For example, Classics is not a Way of Knowing but rather the study of a particular place and time. Because of this ease of conflation, we have to work hard to articulate to students which mode we are in. This might come up in, for example, distinguishing women studies as the study of a subject from gender studies as the study of an approach. He finds the foregrounding of epistemology to be an appealing aspect of the proposal at hand and envisions that this could be a basis for how we refine the Core Approaches to Knowing.
- Ariela Tubert noted that drawing an analogy to Writing Across the Curriculum has helped her thinking. Writing Across the Curriculum is not a way of knowing; rather, it is built into graduation requirements as a means of ensuring students have done enough writing.
- M/S/vote reported later (Haltom/?) to amend with the main motion by replacing the sentence “Students will take one KNOW course” with “Students must take at least one KIP course to graduate.”
  - In support of this motion, Haltom stated that his goal here was to tidy up language in order to be precise and accurate. He noted that “KNOW” was nowhere defined in the original motion whereas KIP could be deduced as an acronym for “Knowledge, Power, and Identity”.
  - Kay pointed out that the BN group has referred to this requirement as KNOW from early in its planning stages. Aside from this, the proposed changes were acceptable to her.
  - Nancy Bristow noted that a simple solution would be to put “(KNOW)” following “Knowledge, Identity, and Power”.
  - In response to a question about whether the motion to amend could be taken as a friendly amendment, Haltom declared that it could not since Kay’s remark already constituted an objection
  - M/S/P (Barry/?) to amend the amendment motion by inserting “(KNOW)” following “Knowledge, Identity, and Power” and replacing “KIP” with “KNOW”.
  - The amendment motion (now including reference to KNOW) passed by voice vote.
- M/S/ vote reported later (Haltom/?) to amend the main motion by (1) replacing “knowledge representation and production” with “representation and production of knowledge” and (2) changing “can” to “may” in Guideline 3.
  - M/ (Cannon) to close debate to which there was an objection.
  - M/S/P (Sackman/?) to amend the amendment by inserting “the” before “representation”.
    - In favor of excluding the “the”, Haltom cited Orwell’s “Politics and the English Language”.
    - M/S/P (Cannon/?) to close debate.
  - M/S/P (Cannon/?) to close debate on the amendment motion (stating an intention to then move to close debate on the main motion).

- The amendment motion (now including the “the”) passed by voice vote.
- M/S/ vote reported later (Haltom/Spivey) to amend the main motion by appending a new paragraph with the heading “Implementation” and reading “The ‘Knowledge, Identity, and Power’ requirement for graduation shall not be implemented until a majority of the faculty shall consent by means of a mail ballot corresponding to the electronic process used to elect members of the Faculty Senate.”
- In support of the motion, Haltom provided two reasons: one, to not cut out from voting those who have perfectly good reasons for not attending today, and two, to have potential implementation depend on the will of the faculty rather than on the accident of who attended today.
- Heidi Orloff noted that she does not object to this approach being a general process policy but does object to this approach being tied to this specific proposal. The amendment seems out of place.
- Ben Lewin spoke in favor noting that it aligns with spirit of the proposal itself in allowing all to have a voice.
- Keith Ward spoke in favor by noting that the amendment is content neutral and allows all faculty to participate. In his search of the class schedule, he found 28 classes that conflict with the current meeting time and other faculty have obligations outside of the university. He noted that this is the first time in eleven years that we have a proposal to add a graduation requirement and argued that the profundity of this warrants full participation. He noted that the proposal has been vetted thoroughly and exhaustively.
- Bartanen asked for a point of parliamentary inquiry: Why is this presented as an amendment to the main motion rather than using the Bylaw provision for a mail ballot?
- In response, Haltom noted that a motion to have a mail ballot is an incidental motion on which there is no debate allowed. He took this approach because it affords an opportunity to provide rationale.
- Priti Joshi stated that she is sympathetic to electronic voting and noted that the idea has been in the air for some time. It would have been preferable to address this earlier so that it could have been discussed thoroughly.
- President Thomas passed the chair to Academic Vice President Bartanen.
- M/S/P (A. Spivey/?) to call the question.
- The amendment motion passed on a vote of 50 to 29 by show of hands.
- Sackman asked for confirmation that the main motion could pass but electronic vote not result in consent by a majority so we would have a requirement that is not implemented to which Haltom replied in the affirmative.
- Bristow asked for clarification on the implementation paragraph: does the paragraph mean “majority of those who vote” or “majority of faculty” to which Haltom replied that it reads as is so” majority of the faculty”.
- M/S/ vote reported later (Buescher/?): to reconsider the amendment.
- Joshi asked why the motion is written to require consent by a majority of the faculty rather than a majority of those who vote to which Haltom replied that he wants the majority of faculty to consent.

- Joshi noted that faculty could choose whether or not to participate. Why not allow that choice?
  - Cannon objected that the chair has not recognized individuals in recent exchanges and that he was concerned about a mixing of the parliamentary role with advocacy for a motion.
  - Bartanen noted that the provision in the Faculty Bylaws provides that mail voting be consistent with the practice for Senate elections; this process is that decisions are made by a majority of voters.
  - Buescher spoke in favor of reconsideration, noting that the language of the amendment has various interpretations that we need to clarify.
  - Lisa Wood concurred with the interpretation offered by Bartanen.
  - John Lear commented that the amendment as passed does not make sense.
  - Freeman spoke in favor of reconsideration in which case she would vote against the amendment motion and then move to vote on the main motion (ideally without the implementation paragraph). She voiced frustration with the late introduction of this topic and argued that resisting a vote on the main motion due to concerns that today's attendance is not representative suggests that all past actions taken in faculty meetings, with attendance small or not, are invalid.
  - M/S/P (Buescher/?) to call the question.
  - The motion to reconsider the amendment passed by voice vote.
  - Reconsideration of the amendment motion (adding the implementation motion) began.
  - M/S/P (Beardsley/?) to amend the amendment to insert "voting" following "majority of the faculty".
  - The amendment motion passed 41 to 33 by a show of hands.
  - M/S/W Cannon: move to extend meeting by 15 minutes
  - M/S/P Buescher to call the question.
  - The main motion (with wording as given in Appendix 2) passed 59 to 14 by a paper ballot.
9. M/S/P to adjourn at 5:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Martin Jackson, Faculty Secretary

## Appendix 1

Attending

Richard Anderson-Connolly  
 Gareth Barkin  
 Bill Barry  
 Kris Bartanen  
 Bernard Bates  
 Bill Beardsley  
 Mike Benitez  
 Lucretia Berg  
 James Bernhard  
 Bill Breitenbach  
 Nancy Bristow  
 Gwynne Brown  
 Derek Buescher  
 Douglas Cannon  
 Julie Christoph  
 Rachel DeMotts  
 Brad Dillman  
 Sue Doyle  
 Joel Elliott  
 Sara Freeman  
 Melisa Galvan  
 Dexter Gordon  
 Chad Gunderson  
 William Haltom  
 John Hanson  
 Mark Harpring  
 Jennifer Hastings  
 Suzanne Holland  
 Kent Hooper  
 Anne James  
 Judith Kay  
 Alisa Kessel  
 Nick Kontogeorgopoulos  
 Kriszta Kotsis  
 Alan Krause  
 Pat Krueger  
 Sunil Kukreja  
 Pepa Lago Grana  
 David Latimer

John Lear  
 Ben Lewin  
 Martins Linaut  
 Pierre Ly  
 Tiffany MacBain  
 Amanda Mifflin  
 Andrew Monaco  
 Margi Nowak  
 Heidi Orloff  
 Emelie Peine  
 Sally Perret  
 Matt Pickard  
 Geoff Proehl  
 Siddharth Ramakrishnan  
 Elise Richman  
 Steve Rodgers  
 Brett Rogers  
 Amy Ryken  
 Doug Sackman  
 Leslie Saucedo  
 Oriol Siu  
 Adam Smith  
 Katherine Smith  
 Stuart Smithers  
 Mike Spivey  
 Amy Spivey  
 Yvonne Swinth  
 Ron Thomas  
 George Tomlin  
 Ariela Tubert  
 Jennifer Utrata  
 Harry Velez Quinones  
 Keith Ward  
 Carolyn Weisz  
 Kirstin Wilbur  
 Paula Wilson  
 Lisa Wood  
 Randy Worland

Guests

Jane Carlin  
 Andrea Kueter  
 Ellen Peters  
 Czarina Ramsey  
 Brad Tomhave  
 Landon Wade

## Appendix 2

*Version of the main motion for agenda item #8 indicating changes approved during this meeting.*

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

### **Learning Objectives**

Courses in Knowledge, Identity and Power (KNOW) 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~~ the representation and production of knowledge. 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~~ may also fulfill other program or graduation requirements.

### **Implementation**

The “Knowledge, Identity, and Power” requirement for graduation shall not be implemented until a majority of the faculty voting shall consent by means of a mail ballot corresponding to the current electronic process used to elect members of the Faculty Senate.



*Clean version of the main motion for agenda item #8 as approved during this meeting.*

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

### **Learning Objectives**

Courses in Knowledge, Identity and Power (KNOW) 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 the representation and production of knowledge. 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 may also fulfill other program or graduation requirements.

### **Implementation**

The “Knowledge, Identity, and Power” requirement for graduation shall not be implemented until a majority of the faculty voting shall consent by means of a mail ballot corresponding to the current electronic process used to elect members of the Faculty Senate.

# Creating a Culture of Care on Campus

Incidents of sexual assault are vastly underreported on college campuses. In an effort to promote a culture where sexual violence of any kind is not tolerated, this handout provides information for faculty/staff and anyone employed by the University for reporting possible incidents of sexual violence. Thank you for helping our campus better understand the nature and prevalence of incidents of sexual violence within our campus community so that we can work toward creating an environment where all students feel mentally, physically, and emotionally safe to pursue their academic endeavors at Puget Sound.

**“REPORTING”** means letting the institution become aware of a possible incident of sexual violence. The university is required to take prompt and effective steps to stop an incident of sexual violence, prevent its recurrence, and address its effects. Faculty, staff, and most students on campus are considered mandatory reporters.

**WHAT TO REPORT:** anything that you believe may be a violation of the [Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct](#), and any details that the person who has confided in you feels comfortable being shared

- Ex: a student shares that they were sexually assaulted by another student last semester, but does not want you to tell anyone. You will report the information regarding the assault, though the student can remain anonymous
- Ex: a student asks you what to do about a friend who was sexually harassed. You will report the information regarding the incident, and note that information you have was received from a third-party
- Ex: a student would like resources on being a victim of sexual assault but does not want to share whether the perpetrator was a student or staff member. You will report the information you have, although it is incomplete

**WHO TO REPORT TO:** there are several ways to pass information along and no one right way to do it. Below are guidelines on who to approach to pass on a report:

- Student-student incidents: Department Chair, Kris Bartanen, Michael Benitez, or any of the Harassment Reporting Officers (HROs)
- Staff-staff or staff-student: Human Resources HRO, Grace Kirchner (Ombudsmen and HRO), Department Chair of the person affected or the person displaying objectionable behavior

**WHEN TO REPORT:** within 24 hours. The information can be shared via a phone call, email message, or conversation in person as long as the information is passed along in a timely manner

**A report may be brought to any of the following designated [Harassment Reporting Officers](#):**

Kris Bartanen  
Academic Vice President/Dean of the University  
253.879.3205 | acadvp@pugetsound.edu

Michael Benitez  
Chief Diversity Officer and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion  
Title IX Coordinator/Affirmative Action Officer  
253.879.3929 | mbenitez@pugetsound.edu

Debbie Chee  
Assistant Dean of Students  
253.879.3360 | dchee@pugetsound.edu

Sunil Kukreja  
Associate Academic Dean, Professor of Sociology and  
Anthropology  
253.879.3588 | kukreja@pugetsound.edu

Grace Kirchner  
Sexual Harassment Complaint Ombudsperson  
253.879.3785 | kirchner@pugetsound.edu

Cindy Matern  
Associate Vice President for Human Resources  
and Career and Employment Services  
253.879.3116 | cmatern@pugetsound.edu

Nancy Nieraeth  
Director of Employment and People Development  
253.879.3541 | nnieraeth@pugetsound.edu

Czarina Ramsay  
Director of Multicultural Student Services  
253.879.3373 | cramsay@pugetsound.edu

Mike Segawa  
Vice President for Student Affairs/Dean of Students  
253.879.3360 | msegawa@pugetsound.edu

Questions? Contact Krystle Cobian, conduct coordinator at [kcobian@pugetsound.edu](mailto:kcobian@pugetsound.edu)