

Faculty Senate Meeting

September 8, 2014

McCormick Room, Library

Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Present: Leslie Saucedo, Andrew Gardner, Zaixin Hong, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese, Brendan Lanctot, Bill Haltom, Maria Sampen, Derek Buescher, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segewa, Jonathan Stockdale, Chris Spalding, Paige Maney, Shirley Skeel, Emelie Peine, Laura Krughoff

Announcements:

The Puget Sound Football team won last weekend (9/6/2014).

Brendan Lanctot is giving the Daedulus lecture: "The Tiger and the Daguerreotype, or Capturing Sovereignty in Post-Revolutionary Latin America," Murray Boardroom, Wheelock Student Center Reservations are \$15 per person, made on a first-come, first-served basis, and must be made by Sept. 10. Contact x3207 for more information.

The Black Student Union is hosting a dinner and silent auction prior to the Race and Pedagogy National Conference kick off. The dinner will be 5:00-6:30 pm Thursday September 25 in the Rotunda with the silent auction beginning at 4:00 pm. RSVPS are necessary.

Secretary and Vice Chair:

Wiese moved to confirm Leslie Saucedo as vice chair of the faculty senate and Brendan Lanctot as secretary of the faculty senate.

M/S/P

Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P to accept the minutes of May 12th, 2014 as revised.

Curriculum Committee Year-end-report:

Tubert noted that the CC report was submitted late and that the senate needed still to determine if a representative of the CC should present the report and answer questions before the senate. **M/S/P** to accept the report.

Stockdale noted that the year-end report was unique in its length and wondered if there was a way to allow the chair of the committee to shorten the length and work load regarding the report. Saucedo mentioned that much of the material was actually in the appendixes. Buescher suggested that the report could eliminate the appendixes and rely on readers to read minutes.

Tubert asked if we wanted a member of the CC to meet with the Senate still. Buescher requested that a representative attend to answer questions about the report and in particular to provide an explanation regarding the rationale for the 9-unit major in the curriculum. Tubert indicated a representative of the CC would be invited to the first Senate meeting of October 2014.

Committee Reports:

ASC elected Jim Jasinski as chair.

Charges to Committees:

Curriculum Committee:

Stockdale presented the proposed charges to the curriculum committee. Regarding proposed charge #1 (Complete the review of the core in general). Haltom asked whether the Senate wishes to be making charges that are part of the standing charges already present in the faculty bylaws. Stockdale noted that in this case, since the review of the core was deferred from 2013-2014, it makes sense to remind the committee.

Regarding charge #2 (create a Curricular Impact Statement), Buescher suggested the Senate consider whether curricular proposals should be made known to the full faculty at, for example, faculty meetings in a process similar to amending the Faculty Code. Wiese asked if the language “process of formal communication” The language of the charge was altered to cover the potential options of informing the faculty at large. Lanctot asked whether the charge required a “thing” in the form of a formal Curricular Impact Statement and questioned both the thing and the title with the word “impact.” The capitalization was removed.

After noting that the Senate took considerable time to approve charges in the prior year, Stockdale continued to present the Curriculum Committee charges and the Senate continued discussion.

Regarding charge #5 to “explore whether a language class taken in a quarter system or community college could be transferred for a full unit, pending instructor or department chair approval,” Segawa asked if this was an attempt to count less than six quarter hour courses as semester unit courses. Stockdale clarified that was the issue in part, but also at issue was that some foreign languages faculty thought it onerous to ask students to take more than the required units for the language core requirement. In addition, Stockdale noted the current system complicates summer transfer units where students attend quarter-based institutions to complete their foreign language requirement. For example, if a class transfers as only 0.5 or 0.75 requiring the students to take another class at UPS (1unit), they then end up taking more units than required Wiese noted that students should know the limitations of transfer credits prior to taking the summer course.

Regarding charge #6 “Assess the manner in which working groups communicate both a) on behalf of the full committee with departments and programs under review, and b) to the full committee regarding those reviews, to determine whether any changes in process need to be undertaken,” Segawa asked if there was a specific incident where the working group was making decisions without the consent of the full committee. Stockdale said there was not a specific incident where a working group made decisions but that, as noted in the year-end report of 2013-14, a specific incident occurred where a working group communicated directly with a campus program. This communication created campus discussion. Haltom asked about how offended Stockdale might be if he were to move to remove the charge since the committee should work it out internally. Stockdale said he would not be offended but this was a potential self-charge from the final report. Wiese, wondered if the CC thought internal matters made the discussion of the working group process difficult and thereby required Senate intervention to allow a space for discussion. **MSP** moved to accept charges 1-5 as discussed at the meeting.

Senate charges to Curriculum Committee 2014-2015

deferred standing charge:

1. Complete reviews deferred from 2013-2014:
 - a. The Core in general

deferred Senate charge:

2. Continue the CC’s work in accordance with Senate Charge 2 from AY 2013-2014 to develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors, or even the full faculty) prior to program approval.

[Rationale: This process would allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.]

Curriculum Committee self-charges:

3. In connection with Charge 2, clarify the distinction between an interdisciplinary *emphasis* and an interdisciplinary *minor*.
4. Working with the Registrar, explore whether a language class taken in a quarter system or community college should be transferred in for a full unit, pending instructor or department chair approval.

[Rationale: this self-charge from last year’s CC came as a result of conversations with Foreign Language faculty over the foreign language graduation requirement, some of whom expressed the desire for greater freedom in allocating transfer credit.]

new Senate charges:

5. Determine whether 201- and 202-level language courses can count toward fulfilling the upper division graduation requirement.

[Rationale: some 200 level language courses currently do count toward the upper division graduation requirement, while some don't, on what seems an ad hoc basis. The Registrar's Office would like to see a consistent policy for all 201-202 language sequences, or, at minimum, some guidance on how to apply the existing rule.]

6. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

Institutional Review Board

Gardner presented the proposed charges for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) with explanation. The Senate discussed the proposed charges with clarification of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) and discussion of how the IRB may work most effectively to a) streamline existing processes of IRB approval and b) work on thinking more broadly about new structures of approval. **MSP** to accept charges 1-4 proposed for the IRB with the additional of rationale regarding language on undergraduate processes.

Senate charges to the IRB:

1. Streamline the existing University of Puget Sound IRB protocol process where possible and communicate with IRB-reliant departments regarding revision of the post-designate IRB protocol process.

[Rationale: The Faculty Senate understands that the IRB already envisions several ways that the current protocol process might be streamlined and condensed, and encourages the IRB to continue to revise the structure of protocol evaluation with those goals in mind. The Faculty Senate also recognizes that the abandonment of the designate system has been a significant change in the IRB protocol process, and suggests that the IRB should explore opportunities to communicate the revised protocol process with departments that perennially rely on the IRB. The IRB should also provide opportunities for departments that infrequently require IRB approval to stay abreast of changes in the protocol evaluation process.]

2. Finalize and conclude revisions to the IRB handbook and the website.

[Rationale: Both the handbook and the website have been under revision for several years. The Faculty Senate would like to see this process concluded in AY 2014-15.]

3. Finalize CITI training procedures and disseminate information regarding CITI training to faculty and departments.

[Rationale: CITI training for research with human subjects has been widely adopted in the U.S. and around the globe. As the University of Puget Sound adopts this training option, the Puget Sound IRB needs to disseminate information about this option to faculty and needs to determine where in the protocol process this certification should fit.]

4. Explore options for significantly reconfiguring the IRB protocol process options, based on the experience of the Puget Sound IRB and the experiences of similar small, private liberal arts colleges.

[Rationale: The Faculty Senate would like the IRB to explore alternative options to the existing structure of IRB evaluation at Puget Sound, with particular emphasis on alternatives to the (widespread) adoption of those regulations and criteria required of federally-funded grants to all protocols the IRB receives. This exploration might also focus on how IRBs on other, similar campuses balance the diversity of disciplinary research involving human subjects with the clinical tenor of federally adopted criteria and guidelines.]

5. With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

University Enrichment Committee

Sampen presented proposed charges for the University Enrichment Committee (UEC). The Senate discussed the charges with particular attention to charge number three regarding the deadlines for research funding and timeliness of that funding to the research conducted. MSP to accept charges 1-4 as proposed for the UEC.

Senate Charges to the University Enrichment Committee

1. *Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding.*

[Rationale: In the 2013-14 Final Report, the UEC suggested implementing a small additional reporting requirement as a way to generate raw information for this showcasing. These reports could be archived within a dedicated webpage. Also, the UEC would like to identify the audience for whom the showcasing is intended (likely candidate groups include prospective student applicants, alumni and current award-eligible faculty).]

2. *Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Awards.*

[Rationale: Symmetry between these two awards would draw attention to and support the teacher/scholar model that lies at the heart of the liberal arts experience.]

3. *Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods.*

[Rationale: Currently, there are two application deadlines (one in Fall, one in Spring) and funding from either must terminate at the end of the summer. It has been argued that this puts applicants for Fall research at a disadvantage, or in the position of needing to request retroactive funding. The Senate requests that the UEC look into moving application deadlines to better serve the needs of the faculty and students.]

4. *Formalize and publicize rules for a streamlined application for UEC summer student research support.*

[Rationale: Particular attention needs to be paid to the exact requirements for a revised coverletter and how budgetary contingencies should be dealt with. These guidelines would ideally be formalized in the Fall semester, so as to allow implementation in the Spring.]

5. *With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.*

Saucedo asked about the additional charge to all committees: ""With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous." In particular, Saucedo asked if the charge could be a given to all committees to be inserted into all committee charges for 2014-15. **MSP** to add this charge for all committees. The charge has been added to above charges approved on September 8, 2014 Senate meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:26

Respectfully submitted by Derek Buescher