

## Faculty Meeting Minutes October 8, 1997

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. Sixty-seven voting members of the faculty were present by 4:30 p.m.

John Finney was elected faculty secretary for 1997-98.

Minutes of the April 22, 1997 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

President Pierce announced that conceptual sketches for the new academic building are being finalized and will be posted on the web. Open meetings will be held for campus discussion of the plans.

She also announced that the issue of school colors has come up. Student sentiment seems to be in favor of settling on one set of colors, rather than the several sets we have lived with for some time. She said that staff have informally voted overwhelmingly in favor of maroon and white. She asked how the faculty felt and there was a decided absence of emotion over the issue, except from Finney, who declared that, throughout the recent era of confusion over colors, the university's academic colors have never deviated from maroon and white. The President indicated that she will next discuss this question with the National Alumni Board.

Terry Cooney announced that John Woodward, along with colleagues from two other institutions, has received a five-year grant for \$3.5 million from The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs for a "Research Institute to Accelerate Content Learning through High Support for Students with Disabilities in Grades 4-8 (REACH)." This announcement was greeted with a round of applause.

Grace Kirchner reported on the status of discussions about the university's early retirement plan. She said that efforts are continuing to design a plan that retains as many aspects of the current plan as possible.

President Pierce then turned to two items that were on the agenda at the request of David Balaam, with the understanding, proposed by the Faculty Senate, that time for each item be limited to fifteen minutes.

At 4:14 p.m. Balaam introduced a discussion of the education benefit for the children of faculty.

**Balaam M/S/P "that the Faculty Salary committee study the feasibility of a grant scholarship program funded by the faculty, staff and university to help those faculty and staff members whose children are not accepted into one of the exchange programs."**

Balaam argued that some faculty do not enjoy the benefit because their children elect to attend institutions outside those in existing exchange programs. He said that sometimes a faculty child cannot use the benefit even at a school that is within an exchange program if the "balance" of exchange with Puget Sound is unfavorable.

Before a vote was taken on Balaam's first motion, he made a second. **Balaam M/S/P "that once faculty members have served 20 years at the university, their children's education benefit cannot be taken from them, regardless of their age."** He noted that currently, if a twenty-year veteran retires before the age of 55, the education benefit is lost.

Suzanne Barnett asked what Balaam meant by "grant scholarship program." Balaam responded that beyond suggesting it be a pool of funds supporting scholarships, he couldn't say exactly what form the program would take until the Faculty Salary committee studies the idea. Barnett asked if an implication was that all faculty and staff would contribute even if this meant less salary money, Balaam said yes, if the decision was that this is a salary issue. Doug Cannon said that many

faculty are not parents, and that when he was chair of the Faculty Salary committee, the conclusion was that this may be a divisive issue, and that it may benefit staff more than faculty. Ron Van Enkevort said he doubted it would necessarily benefit staff more than it would faculty. Ted Taranovski argued that we need to evaluate this idea purely as a benefit among other benefits, not as an equity issue. Balaam responded that his intention is not to cast the proposal as an equity issue.

President Pierce noted that the fifteen minutes allotted for discussion of the education benefit issue had been consumed. **Kirchner M/S/P that debate be closed on Balaam's first motion. The first motion then passed on a voice vote.**

With the understanding agreed to by Balaam that the intent of the motion is to send the proposal to the Faculty Salary committee for study, **Balaam's second motion passed on a hand vote after a voice vote was too close to call.**

At 4:34 p.m. we moved to a discussion of the second issue raised by Balaam, that of teaching equity. Arguing that teaching loads can sometimes become so high that time for teaching innovation, scholarship, family, and other important activities is unavailable, **Balaam M/S "that the university set the enrollment of CORE courses at 25 students per faculty member."** Cooney pointed out that the average size of core courses is already well below 25 per faculty member. He said that, because of its implications for teaching resources, dramatic consequences could result if this motion is passed. Bill Breitenbach said that he agreed with Balaam's reasoning. **Breitenbach M/S/P "that we table the motion until we can take it up in the context of our discussion of the core later in the year."**

David Droge then reported for the Code Revision Committee (CRC). First, he reminded us of the charge to the Committee that came from the October 7, 1996 meeting of the Faculty Senate, to "develop a new document which defines clearer, more streamlined procedures for the appointment, promotion and tenure of the faculty, other related matters, and the professional responsibilities of the faculty in the context of a commitment to forwarding the mission and academic excellence of the University." Second, Droge reported that the CRC had worked two hours each week between January and mid-June, during which time it had solicited faculty concerns and had incorporated them into its deliberations and recommendations. Third, Droge said that the CRC's hope is for "careful and informed deliberation" by faculty colleagues of its recommended Code revisions, and that the Committee stands ready to assist faculty any way it can. Proposed Faculty Code revisions were distributed in hard copy to faculty prior to today's meeting.

**Kirchner M/S/P "that the faculty adopt the Faculty Senate's proposal for proceeding with its deliberations on the recommendations of the Code Revision Committee."** This proposal was circulated to faculty by email prior to today's meeting, was available in hard copy for distribution at the meeting, and is attached to these minutes. Kirchner explained that the proposal is an attempt by the Senate to make deliberations as systematic as possible, with a period of informal feedback followed by a second draft with point-by-point votes, leading to a third draft that is voted up or down in its entirety.

Alva Butcher asked how long this first period of informal feedback would take. Kirchner responded that it would probably take a few weeks. Walter Lowrie asked if the CRC was going to announce topics of informal discussions so that faculty can attend those in which they were most interested. Kirchner responded that the Senate's expectation is that informal feedback would be provided in writing, rather than in informal sessions. Ted Taranovski asked if we should set some deadline for this informal feedback process. Beardsley suggested that the CRC should take

whatever time it needs to complete this phase. **Kirchner's motion than passed on a unanimous voice vote.**

We next turned to the topic of the core curriculum. Beardsley read the following statement prepared by Bill Haltom, who at that moment was teaching his science in context class:

"At the behest of the Faculty Senate, I am about to move that three motions passed in 1996-1997 be treated as having been reported to the faculty and regarded as having been "laid on the table." Please allow me to explain the provenance of the motion that I am about to make.

"During its last meeting of last year, the faculty assembled in this room passed a motion that "discussions on the core begin next year with consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Core Review Committee elected by the faculty." Whether the faculty were meeting as a committee of the whole is disputed. Rather than join that dispute, the Faculty Senate would resolve the matter by treating the passed motion as a product of the Quasi-Committee of the Whole. That is, the motion passed by this faculty in full meeting would be treated as part of the report of the faculty to itself. That motion is the first of the three motions that I shall move that we acknowledge as reported and "laid on the table."

"After the last meeting of the faculty for 1996-1997, the Faculty Senate voted that the two motions passed in the Quasi-Committee of the Whole be reported to the faculty at the first business-meeting of the faculty in the 1997-1998 academic year and that both motions be treated as having been "laid on the table."

"Only two motions were passed in the Quasi-Committee of the Whole: first, that the size of the core be reduced (Faculty Meeting 10/31/96); and, second, that two freshman seminars, a Topic Seminar (seminar I) and a Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric (seminar II) be established. (Faculty Meeting 2/10/97).

"The Faculty Senate has also authorized me to recommend to the faculty that discussion of the curriculum be postponed until the faculty have considered revisions of the code proposed by the Ad Hoc Code Revision Committee. Although any faculty member may move to take up matters other than code revision, the Faculty Senate respectfully suggests that these three motions be kept on the table until faculty business regarding the code shall have been completed.

"As a point of parliamentary information, "to lay on the table" is to put a main motion "aside temporarily without setting a time for resuming its consideration, but with the provision that it can be taken up again whenever a majority so decides." [*Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*, Ninth Edition, Section Six, page 64] "To lay on the table" and "to take from the table" each require a majority vote of those assembled and, are **not** debatable.

**"On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I respectfully move that three motions be treated as having been reported to the faculty in a faculty meeting and as having been "laid on the table" by the faculty assembled:**

**first, that the size of the core be reduced ;**

**second, that two freshman seminars, a topic seminar and a seminar in writing and rhetoric, be established;**

**and, third, that discussions on the core begin with consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Core Review Committee elected by the faculty.”**

**Beardsley’s motion passed immediately on a unanimous voice vote.**

We adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty.

To: Faculty Colleagues  
From: Faculty Senate  
Re: Consideration of Revisions to Faculty Code

At the faculty meeting on Wednesday, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Revision of the Faculty Code will be making its report; you have already received in campus mail copies of the revisions that they are recommending. After the Committee's report, the Faculty Senate hopes we can establish a process by which we can consider the changes that they are proposing. Here are our intended recommendations, followed by the assumptions upon which they are based.

#### Suggested Process

1. The Committee first seek informal feedback on the draft that it has circulated and makes any changes to its proposal that it sees fit. Revisions that appear to be likely to provoke a great deal of controversy are postponed to phase #2.
2. After the period of informal feedback, draft #2 is circulated and becomes the working document. At that point the Senate and the Committee would have a better sense of the scope of the task in front of us, including how many additional faculty meetings might be required. The Committee could then develop alternatives to draft #2. (Alternatives could include the old language.) All alternatives would be circulated in writing in advance of the faculty meeting in which they are to be voted up or down. Visual aids would be used to assist faculty in following the issues that are being considered. Changes that are voted in become part of the working document.
3. When this process is completed we would have a draft #3, which would be voted up or down consistent with the amendment process.

#### Assumptions

1. The final "package" needs to be considered and voted upon as a whole document because of the relocation of some sections.
2. This, and only this, final action needs to meet the requirements of Chapter 1, Part E, Section 1 in the Code, namely, that an "amendment" be circulated in written form at least two weeks in advance of a final vote and that it be "read" in a faculty meeting prior to the one in which a final vote is taken. Prior to that time, we can follow any process that we want.
3. It is better not to be rewriting the Code on the floor of a faculty meeting. Colleagues should be able to anticipate what issues will be considered when and what they will be asked to vote upon.
4. It is desirable to get a package of Code revisions to the Trustees as soon as possible, rather than fix every perceived problem in the Code. This package of revisions will be followed by additional, phase #2 revisions.

Grace Kirchner  
206-756-3785 (phone)  
206-756-8312 (fax)