

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**October 28, 2013**  
McCormick Room, Library

**Present:** Brad Dillman (chair), Haley Andres, Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Mark Martin, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel (Staff Senate representative), Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

**Guests:** Cindy Matern, Associate VP for Human Resources/Career and Employment Services (to discuss changes and challenges in health care coverage). Patrick O’Neil, Lyle Quasim, and Liz Collins (representing the Honorary Degree Committee).

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM.

**Approval of Minutes:**

**M/S/P** to accept minutes of October 14, 2013 as revised.

**Announcements**

None.

**Liaison reports**

1. Concerns about charges to the IEC, presented by Gibson. IEC felt that issues revolving around determining “safety of individual programs” were more under the purview of the Office of International Programs and the Dean of Students, and the committee was hesitant about adding such a charge to their committee. There was much discussion on this topic among Senate members. Stockdale asked about the role of the Office of International Education on this topic. Dean Bartanen pointed out that much information was available from the CDC and other government agencies on country safety. Several senators felt the charge was within the charges to the committee established in the bylaws, since the charge was asking the committee to evaluate safety of the study abroad programs, not the countries in which the programs take place. The charge is concerned with assessing safety protocols of the programs and safety-related information provided to students going abroad, specifically related to sexual violence. Gibson opined that the IEC seemed more comfortable with a charge that asked them to collect information rather than to evaluate program safety. Kotsis and Kessel pointed out that this was an issue that was discussed during the IEC’s presentation of their 2012-13 end of year report:

*“With respect to the issue of sexual violence particularly, assess the safety of international programs, the efficacy of Puget Sound’s safety programming for students before they study abroad, and the efficacy of reporting processes that inform the ongoing review of international programs.”*

Because of these concerns, Chair Dillman offered to reach out to the chairs of the IEC to attempt to clarify the charge.

2. Kessel reported actions being taken by the Sexual Assault work group. E-mails will be sent to faculty to inform and remind them of relevant resources they can refer students to. In addition, it was hoped that the student perceptions described in these e-mails would make the importance of this issue clearer to faculty.

3. There was a general reminder for liaisons to communicate with committees about the need for minutes to be posted in a timely manner.

### **Visit from the Honorary Degree Committee:**

Patrick O'Neil, Lyle Quasim, and Liz Collins, members of the Honorary Degree Committee, met confidentially with the Faculty Senate to present and discuss a slate of individuals for honorary degrees, as well as to answer questions. Kessel inquired whether the new deadlines for Honorary Degree nominations, might make it possible to incorporate information and issues relating to possible Commencement speakers into classes; there was agreement in principle, and Liz Collins offered to follow up on this inquiry. The confidential slate of candidates were recommended and seconded by the Senate.

### **Discussion and Approval of Committee Charges**

#### **LMIS**

Kotsis moved that the Senate accept the proposed charges to the committee. Thirteen charges were proposed and Kotsis invited discussion and comment. Based on this discussion, the following charges were approved:

1. Provide input and guidance to the Library during implementation of the new integrated library system (ILS).
2. Review new technologies and their potential infringement upon student privacy. Recommend ways to improve faculty familiarity with FERPA and to encourage use of the resources available on campus to assist them with compliance.
3. Develop a preservation strategy for digital archives in order to preserve the electronic history of the university.
4. Continue to monitor the implementation of Optimize, solicit feedback on areas for system improvement, and keep the Faculty Senate informed about progress.
5. Continue to support initiatives to raise awareness and use of Archives and Special Collections, building on the 2012-2013 LMIS Committee report.
6. Explore the feasibility and make recommendation about the establishment of a Humanities Teaching Lab at the Archives and Special Collections, building on the 2012-13 LMIS Committee report.
7. In collaboration with library staff, explore issues involved in 'New Publishing' as they apply to Puget Sound and suggest ways to provide faculty with guidance on fair use, intellectual property rights, and management of creative works.
8. Collaborate with the Library to develop a prominent display for recent faculty scholarship in the library (or other campus venues).
9. Collaborate with the PSC to assess the viability of using electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms.
10. Work with PSC to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty

evaluation files.

11. Assess the possibility of eliminating due dates for non-Summit library materials checked out to faculty.
12. Explore the possibility of increasing PrintGreen copy limits for graduate students.
13. Recommend ways to educate the faculty about TurnItIn and devise methods for facilitating faculty use.

(For more detail on the development of these charges please see Appendix A.)

### **Institutional Review Board**

The charges proposed by the Senate's sub-committee were seen as clear and straightforward. The charges were approved by the senate as presented.

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Implement and inform the campus community regarding changes to the IRB review process resulting from the elimination of the departmental designate system and the applicability of IRB responsibilities to their work.
3. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research regarding IRB oversight of OIR work.
4. Monitor changes at the federal level regarding regulations and requirements related to human subjects research.
5. Revise the IRB handbook into a more user-friendly resource.

### **CC and COD**

Stockdale discussed and clarified the "trimmed down" CC charges from the last meeting. Then discussion moved to the Committee on Diversity. The COD charges were discussed, as they presumably are related to CC charges. A proposed charge that the COD "make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum" was considered as already completed given the KNOW overlay proposal that the COD and Burlington-Northern Group brought to the full faculty early in the semester. Feedback from faculty comments and discussions is being compiled by the BN/COD group. Mifflin inquired about the relationship between the proposed KNOW overlay and Connections. Buescher read an e-mail from Ryken stating that there was no anticipation of a vote on implementation of the KNOW overlay at this time, until issues with faculty discussion and concerns were addressed. Kessel suggested that this topic could be taken back through the steps of faculty governance to create a charge: asking the Burlington-Northern Group to make a recommendation (that could in turn become a charge). All agreed that the hard work of COD and Burlington-Northern Group needs to be recognized, and collaboration between those two groups and the Faculty Senate would be a positive approach. Dillman suggested, because of time constraints, that this topic be tabled until the next Faculty Senate meeting.

**The senate voted to approve the following charges:**

1. Assess the viability of expanding the number of faculty HROs (harassment reporting officers) and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.
2. Identify areas of concern for the faculty based on a review of faculty responses to the Campus Climate Survey and make recommendations to the senate.

The Faculty Senate business was completed by 5:10PM.

**Other business**

As the last agenda item for the meeting, the Senate welcomed Cindy Matern who led a discussion of changes in the University of Puget Sound health benefits system (in light of changes due to the Affordable Care Act). Matern created an organized and extensive chalkboard overview of how healthcare at the University of Puget Sound has worked in the past, recent changes, and finally how the current system will interact with the Affordable Care Act, and went over this process in detail. There were great concerns about costs to Puget Sound balanced against the healthcare faculty, staff, and students would prefer. Individual situations can often lead to different strategies, adding to the complexity. It will be important for individuals to carefully consider their options, and Matern urged the Faculty Senate to spread the word on this topic.

Matern felt it was extremely important to understand the complex and evolving process that is currently taking place, and reiterated that she is willing to give presentations to individual departments and small groups as needed.

There were many questions and concerns about this complex process. The Faculty Senate was urged to communicate that it is important that faculty members (and staff and students) begin learning more about this process. The presentation by Matern ended at 5:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Martin.

## **Appendix A**

### **Details of Discussion of Charges for the LMIS**

A. #2 charge: Stockdale expressed a concern that new technology might impact the privacy of students (i.e., use of Twitter and other modes of social media). Tubert voiced a similar concern regarding the use of Dropbox (storing grades and other material electronically off campus) and thus issues of privacy. This charge is thus an important one in a changing academic world.

B. #3 charge: This was based on the current use of e-mail, which might not be maintained as a permanent record, thus leading to a loss of “institutional/committee” history or memory.

C. #4 charge: Wiese wondered if this was a suitable charge for LMIS. The members of LMIS felt strongly about “Optimize” being part of their charges; so it was suggested that we replace “oversee” with “monitor.”

D. #7 charge: Tubert (and many others) felt that this charge had too many sub-points and could seem confusing. Kotsis opined that the sub-points increased clarity for complex charges. Buescher and Wiese discussed strategies to simplify this charge. Kotsis and Saucedo brought up some of the changing aspects of publishing in a more electronic academic environment, such as making academic research in progress available off campus on-line as part of “Sound Ideas,” the costs of Open Access publishing, and related topics. Thus, there are many emerging issues related to “New Publishing” based on changes in technology that need to be addressed. Dean Bartanen suggested inviting the librarians to prepare a report outlining relevant changes in “New Publishing.” Tubert suggested that rewording the charge along the following lines might be helpful: *“In collaboration with library staff, explore issues involved in ‘New Publishing’ as they apply to Puget Sound and suggest ways to provide faculty with guidance on fair use, intellectual property rights, and management of creative works.”*

E. #9 charge: Tubert expressed concerns about electronic evaluation, asking why LMIS was given this charge. Kessel related some institutional history of this approach, and it was agreed that it warranted exploration and by the committee.

F. #12 charge (Originally worded as: “Extend sustainability discussion to include reducing the printing of campus flyers and other promotional materials.” Tubert felt that perhaps this charge might be best handled by the Sustainability Committee. Dean Bartanen pointed out that the SC is not charged by the Faculty Senate. This charge was replaced by the current no. 12 charge that considers printing needs of graduate students. Dillman brought up that Puget Sound graduate programs had a greater need for a higher PrintGreen copy limit (750 pages was thought to be too low for such students). Buescher seconded this concern. A suggestion was made that this charge would include exploring an increase in PrintGreen copy limits for graduate students (perhaps allowing the graduate program to define that limit in a program-specific fashion). Kessel also noted that ASUPS prints quite a lot (flyers, etc.), and Hopfenbeck agreed. Hopfenbeck will discuss reduction of printed materials for promotional purposes with ASUPS – perhaps move this up after 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence of F.