

**Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the September 14, 2015 meeting**

Senate Members Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Raine Black, Derek Buescher, Rachel DeMotts, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Nakisha Renee Jones, Brendan Lanctot, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Jennifer Utrata, John Wesley.

Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:02pm.

Announcements

Tubert has updated the Faculty Senate Soundnet site (password protected), adding our handbook and other documents; we also have a (public) Faculty Senate website.

Utrata reported appreciatively on the recent Victim Advocacy & Sexual Assault Prevention Educator Workshop.

Raine Black introduced herself as a new student representative, in addition to Nakisha Renee Jones.

Elections of Senate vice chair & secretary were held (ratifying the informal selections from last spring): the Vice Chairs are Derek Buescher (fall) and Jonathan Stockdale (spring); the Secretaries are John Wesley (fall) and Pierre Ly (spring).

Senators reported on their work as liaisons to standing committees with a recitation of recently elected chairs. Gardner: Tatiana Kaminsky will chair the Institutional Review Board; Peine: Alva Butcher (fall) and John Lear & Eric Orlin (spring) will chair the International Education Committee; Sampen: Dawn Padula will chair the University Enrichment Committee; Stockdale: Rich Anderson-Connolly will chair the Curriculum Committee for the fall; Utrata: James Bernhard will chair the Library, Media, and Information Systems Committee; Beardsley: Brad Reich will chair the Student Life Committee; Holtom: Mark Reinitz will chair the Professional Standards Committee; Lanctot: Suzanne Holland will chair the Academic Standards Committee.

Approval of Minutes

M/S/P Approval of minutes from May 11, 2015 with no discussion.

Update from ASUPS Representative

Jones reported that she and ASUPS leadership have been busy preparing reports for the board of trustees, revising aspects of the honor court, and determining constitutionality

issues regarding the student senate. In addition, ASUPS would like to keep the moment going on certain actions taken last year, including the resolution adopted on police brutality, as well as issues surrounding transgender student accessibility (including the climate in classrooms regarding the use of gendered pronouns). Jones also reported that she will be sponsoring monthly “Town Hall Tuesdays” at lunchtime to discuss issues of importance to the campus; the first meeting will take place 9/22 around noon.

Update from Staff Senate

Skeel mentioned that the first Staff Senate meeting is coming up.

Faculty Senate discussion of Curriculum Committee draft charges

Stockdale presented draft charges to the Curriculum Committee for Senate approval. The Senate spent the most time discussing draft charge #2, which read “determine the feasibility of implementing last year’s faculty meeting motion to reduce the number of teaching days in spring semester; report back to the senate with recommendations or proposals.” In the end the Senate decided to strike the language about “feasibility” from the charge, as it was not present in the original faculty meeting motion.

M/S/P to accept the revised charges to the Curriculum Committee. (See Appendix A.)

Faculty Senate discussion of Academic Standards Committee draft charges:

Lanctot presented draft charges to the Academic Standards Committee for Senate approval. The majority of discussion revolved around charge #2: “recommend a common hour.” Buescher noted that the charge would be difficult to enact without also involving a review of the course schedule; Bartanen suggested that the registrar’s office (Brad Tomhave) could get involved on the scheduling side, in conjunction with the associate dean’s office (Sunil Kukreja), in order to provide the necessary data for considering a common hour. Gardner suggested that the Senate (rather than the ASC) solicit proposals and data from Tomhave and Kukreja, as a kind of feasibility report. Buescher and Gardner agreed to help assess the costs and benefits of a common hour once the data comes in from Tomhave and Kukreja.

In response to a question from Stockdale, Tubert responded that last year’s questionnaire from the ASC regarding a common hour was only directed to chairs of programs, and had a very low response rate, yielding little in the way of usable data.

In the end, the Senate decided on just one charge for the ASC:

“1. Review for approval the policy of the university for the transfer of running start credits as articulated by the offices of the registrar and admissions.”

M/S/P to accept the revised charge to the ASC.

Faculty Senate discussion of the Diversity Committee draft charges

DeMotts presented draft charges to the Diversity Committee for Senate approval. The Senate approved two charges and decided to postpone decision on the third charge until charges for other committees working on the same issues are discussed. The first two charges are:

1. Review department responses to Question 6 [“In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?”] written during five-year curriculum assessments.
 - a. Rationale: Suggested by the 2014-15 CoD, and reflective of an ongoing priority.
2. Continue to monitor the number and distribution of approved KNOW courses and take what measures it can to encourage such proposals being submitted by faculty.
 - a. Rationale: Suggested by the 2014-15 CoD, and addresses an important consideration for the implementation of the KNOW requirement.

M/S/P to accept the revised two charges to the Diversity Committee.

Faculty Senate discussion of the University Enrichment Committee draft charges

Sampen presented the following draft charges to the UEC for Senate approval:

1. Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording the Faculty Research Award application itself.
 - a. Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report. Such a rubric would mirror the newly established and adopted rubric for evaluation of Student Research Award applications.
2. Determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.
 - a. Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report (see report, item #4 under the sub-category “Other Noteworthy UEC Activity” for further clarification).
3. Work with the ASUPS Finance Committee to assist them in determining allotments for student travel.
 - a. Rationale: Charge requested by ASUPS President. The work of the ASUPS Finance Committee is similar to that of the UEC. ASUPS would like suggestions as to how to better coordinate and streamline their process for determining student travel allotments.

M/S/P to accept the revised three charges to the UEC.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:27pm.

Minutes prepared by Jonathan Stockdale.

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: Curriculum Committee charges for 2015-16.

Senate charges to the Curriculum Committee 2015-16

1. Complete the review of the Natural Sciences Core deferred from 2014-15.

[Rationale: this is a deferred standing charge from last year.]

2. Craft proposal(s) to reduce the number of teaching days in spring semester; report back to the Senate.

[Rationale: at the April 14, 2015 faculty meeting, the following motion was passed: “*The Faculty invites the Senate to craft proposals to shorten the number of regular teaching days in Spring Semester to 67-68 days.*” (Note: the curriculum committee has purview over the academic calendar.)]

3. Draft guidelines for evaluating short term, study away, experiential learning, and other “new format” course proposals.

[Rationale: course proposal envisioning new formats (e.g. Food Systems Northwest; CONN 370 in Rome; Washington State Legislature Internship) required significant attention by the Curriculum Committee last year. It appears that some guidelines would be beneficial both for the Curriculum Committee (in evaluating) and for faculty (in proposing) such courses.]

4. Review the “continuity work” of the Curriculum Committee Burlington Northern group this past summer (2015) and determine how best to integrate those results into the work of the Curriculum Committee this year.

[Rationale: A few items that the Curriculum Committee worked on last year were carried over into the summer for final resolution, including:

- a. how best to communicate about and implement the Curriculum Impact Statement (CIS) developed by the CC last year;
- b. developing evaluation guidelines for future CC working groups regarding interdisciplinary program reviews;
- c. locating and centralizing key documents from the CC “archive” to enable greater efficiency & continuity going forward.