

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
November 14, 1995

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. in room 103 of McIntyre Hall.

Suzanne Barnett nominated John Finney to serve as Faculty Secretary for the 1995-96 year. No other nominations were forthcoming, and Finney was elected.

Minutes of the April 25, 1995 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

There were several announcements:

Terry Mace announced the results of the recent Faculty Advancement Committee election. The names of four faculty, Professors Curley, Haltom, Ostrom, and Ragan, were forwarded to Dean Potts. Professors Curley and Ragan have agreed to serve in response to the Dean's invitation. Mace noted that thirteen per cent of the ballots had to be disqualified because proper voting procedures were not observed. He encouraged faculty to follow instructions in future elections. In particular, care must be taken to ensure that the ballot envelope is not discarded during mail opening.

Finney reminded faculty about the Regester Lecture, to be held tomorrow night, November 15, 1995, at 8:00 p.m. in Thompson 126. Professor Alan Thorndike is the Regester Lecturer.

Gary Peterson announced that the Department of Communication and Theatre Arts has received a "Programs of Excellence" Award from the Speech Communication Association. This announcement was greeted with a round of applause. Several CTA faculty will travel to San Antonio, Texas soon to receive the award on behalf of the University.

President Pierce announced that the University has been nominated for a Pew Charitable Trust Leadership Award, recognizing institutions that have made significant transformations to support undergraduate education. Nominations were made by a group of national leaders in higher education, and the selection process will be completed next September.

New Business

Kate Stirling gave the first reading of a Faculty Senate motion to amend Section 7 of the *Faculty Bylaws* to eliminate the Athletic Advisory Board, as follows:

Sec. 7. University Community Committees.

A. ~~The Athletic Advisory Board.~~

a. ~~One member, the Faculty Athletic Representative, is elected by the Faculty for a three-year term and serves both as a member of the Board and as the Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, certifying eligibility for all athletes. Two members from the Faculty are appointed annually.~~

b. ~~The duties of the Board are:~~

- ~~1. To recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the policy for the intercollegiate athletic program of the University.~~
- ~~2. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.~~

Stirling said that this action brings us into compliance with NCAA rules. Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) Bill Dasher explained further that NCAA rules require that athletic eligibility oversight be performed by an FAR appointed by the President. The dormant Athletic Advisory Board is not a proper oversight authority. He said that the Board has not been constituted for many years, and that the motion to amend the *Faculty Bylaws* simply brings the document into conformity with actual practice.

This motion to amend the *Faculty Bylaws* will have its second reading, discussion, and vote at the next faculty meeting.

New Business

Tom Goleeke M/S: "The Faculty Senate will establish a six member ad hoc committee to work with the University community to examine the purpose and effectiveness of the core curriculum with particular reference to the freshman curriculum. The committee shall consist of four faculty, one student and one administrator. The faculty shall be elected by the method specified for electing Senators. The student shall be appointed by ASUPS. The administrator shall be the Dean or his designee. The faculty who serve on this committee may be excused from other University service. The committee shall consult with the University community and report regularly to the faculty. Committee findings will be presented at a faculty meeting in the spring of 1996.

The committee shall be charged with considering the core curriculum with particular attention to the freshman experience within the context of the curricular goals of the institution. In particular, the committee should review the number of core requirements and assess the resources and curricular implications of reducing the size of core courses."

Ted Taranovski asked whether the proposal was to review just freshman core courses or the whole core. Goleeke responded that the intent is to look at the entire core curriculum.

Barnett questioned the wisdom of electing faculty members at large, and argued that there should be some means of ensuring representation. She also questioned whether it was in a student's best interest to expend so much time on this committee. Nancy Bristow responded that representing various constituents is not possible in such a small committee, requiring that faculty committee members represent all faculty. Margo Holm said it would be helpful to have a student serving as a conduit of information (from students) on what she viewed as being a data-gathering committee.

Bill Breitenbach asked whether the purpose of the committee is to gather information or to come up with proposals. He said all committee members should be faculty if it is a proposal-generating group. Mace said the committee should be small in order to consult with faculty, students, and the administration on resource impact, and that perhaps "findings" is the wrong word in the motion. Jacquelyn Warwick argued that student input on the committee is important, as is their vote. Taranovski said he thought students were important on faculty committees "because they are good at detecting B.S." He also argued that the committee should produce policy options as well as information. Holm reiterated her argument that the committee should be primarily a data-gathering group. She said the issue of the size of core classes came up during the October 29 "faculty conversation" and that it is important and necessary to examine the facts and the implications of reducing class size before policies are proposed. She said this committee should not be a policy-making group.

Doug Cannon said he is not bothered by the idea that the committee might come up with proposals as well as facts. He said this would be more efficient than constituting a second

committee later. He said the committee should feel free to make proposals if it wants to. Haltom said he believes that policy proposals should come from the faculty, not from a small committee which might have undue influence on the outcome of a policy discussion.

Gary Peterson M/S/P “to amend the motion by adding the words ‘and recommendations’ to the last sentence of the first paragraph, following the word ‘findings.’” The motion to amend passed on a voice vote.

Barnett M/S/F “to amend the motion by changing the third sentence of the first paragraph to read: ‘The faculty shall be elected by the method specified for electing Senators; the Senate Executive Committee will choose the final faculty membership in order to assure some academic variation.’” Taranovski spoke against the motion to amend, saying he does not want the committee “stacked.” He said that the Senate does not need to tinker with faculty free choice. Rocchi added that “we should have more faith in the election process.”

Rocchi M/S/P to close debate on the Barnett motion to amend. The Barnett motion failed on a voice vote.

Goleeke’s main motion then passed on a voice vote. The approved motion as amended is:

“The Faculty Senate will establish a six member ad hoc committee to work with the University community to examine the purpose and effectiveness of the core curriculum with particular reference to the freshman curriculum. The committee shall consist of four faculty, one student and one administrator. The faculty shall be elected by the method specified for electing Senators. The student shall be appointed by ASUPS. The administrator shall be the Dean or his designee. The faculty who serve on this committee may be excused from other University service. The committee shall consult with the University community and report regularly to the faculty. Committee findings and recommendations will be presented at a faculty meeting in the spring of 1996.

The committee shall be charged with considering the core curriculum with particular attention to the freshman experience within the context of the curricular goals of the institution. In particular, the committee should review the number of core requirements and assess the resources and curricular implications of reducing the size of core courses.”

Taranovski said that the committee should take direction from today’s discussion.

We adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty