

**Report to Faculty from Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel
3 October 2016**

Strategic planning process:

The Faculty Senate welcomed President Crawford at its September 12th meeting. Among other things, President Crawford discussed the importance of identifying a sound process this year (2016-7) for developing a successful strategic plan in the following year (2017-8). Subsequently, the Faculty Senate has begun a conversation about how best to support the faculty in considering options for these processes, prioritizing faculty concerns, and communicating those concerns to the President. The Senate will continue to work to facilitate this discussion in the months ahead.

Charges for standing committees: Much of the conversation at the Faculty Senate retreat in August focused on the Senate's role in clarifying and advancing the priorities of the faculty. As part of that work, the Senate tried to limit the number of charges it assigned to standing committees in order to identify the priorities of the faculty and to support the work that committees already do as part of the standing charges. The Faculty Senate completed approval of additional charges for standing committees in its September 26, 2016, meeting. The Senate issued the following charges:

ASC:
In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Academic Standards Committee to review the policy of the university for the transfer of Running Start credits as articulated by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions and recommend approval or suggest changes.

COD:
In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Committee on Diversity to:

1. in collaboration with International Education Committee and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students;
2. examine responses to Question 6 of the Department and Program Curriculum Review ("In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"), evaluate whether the question elicits productive reflection on how best to support diversity in the curriculum, and propose to the Curriculum Committee, if desired, revised wording of the question; and
3. develop and implement a strategy to educate students about bias in course evaluations.

CC:
In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Curriculum Committee to:

1. investigate and report on potential impacts and opportunities of options A and B identified by the Curriculum Committee last year to equalize teaching days in Fall and Spring semester; and
2. create guidelines for unit limits for majors to fit existing practices, core curriculum, and educational goals.

IRB:
In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Institutional Review Board to:

1. make recommendations on how the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) fits into the IRB structure;
2. develop training of new IRB members, including procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols and regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding; and
3. formulate practices for off-campus researchers to conduct research with members of campus community.

IEC:
In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the International Education Committee to:

1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence:
 - a. Continue the review of sexual violence policies at study abroad programs used by Puget Sound students.
 - b. Finalize and distribute the sexual violence crisis response documents drafted last year.
 - c. Develop sexual violence prevention and response training for Puget Sound faculty and staff involved in Puget Sound study abroad programs;

- 2a. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g. language, discipline, or geography) or are expensive.
- 2b: Develop language that clearly incorporates this charge into the standing charge that deals with program review;
- 3: In collaboration with the Committee on Diversity and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students; and
- 4: Work with the Office of Institutional Research to gather and analyze study abroad participation rate data for students of color and first-generation students and, based on those findings, make recommendations to address any disparities in participation rates.

LMIS:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Library, Media, and Information Services Committee to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to review and [if needed] develop policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus.

PSC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Professional Standards Committee to:

1. recommend to the Senate specific, concrete changes to the evaluation process to mitigate well-documented bias in student evaluations during the evaluation process; and
2. develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

SLC: The Faculty Senate has no additional charges for the Student Life Committee at this time.

UEC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the University Enrichment Committee a) to determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding online, public-access fees for publication and, if the UEC determines there is such a need, b) to create and publish the guideline.

Committee chairs for fall 2016

Academic Standards Committee—Jo Crane (Chemistry)
Committee on Diversity—Kirsten Wilbur (Occupational Therapy)
Curriculum Committee—Elise Richman (Art & Art History)
Faculty Advancement Committee--*has no chair
Institutional Review Board—Tim Beyer (Psychology)
International Education Committee—Lea Fortmann (Economics)
Library, Media, and Information Systems—James Bernhard (Math & Computer Science)
Professional Standards Committee—Jennifer Neighbors (History)
Student Life Committee—Megan Gessel (Chemistry)
University Enrichment Committee—Roger Allen (Physical Therapy)

Common period

At the end of the September 19, 2016, faculty meeting, the faculty had not yet acted to endorse, amend, or withdraw the revised scheduling guideline created by the 2015-6 Faculty Senate. Upon learning that the request for the 2017-8 schedule would be distributed before the next faculty meeting and *would include the 2015-6 revised guideline*, the Faculty Senate decided to reconsider the 2015-6 Senate action to create a common period on Wednesdays from 12:00-1:30. The Senate had not anticipated taking action on the common period at this point, since the faculty was discussing (and presumably would eventually vote on) the matter, yet action seemed necessary in order to allow for the faculty conversation to continue.

In particular, the Senate reconsidered the timing of the common period, after taking into consideration the feedback it received from faculty members at the September 19, 2016, faculty meeting. The Senate perceived widespread support of the common period, but also concern, expressed by some faculty members, about whether there might be a better

option for a common period on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The Senate evaluated those concerns using data provided by the Registrar.¹ In the end, the Senate re-affirmed its decision to create a Wednesday midday common period to facilitate faculty governance.² The motion carried without opposition. The Senate elected not to intervene on those matters about which a consensus had yet to emerge (e.g. the length of the common period) and amended the guidelines to allow for continued discussion of these matters by the faculty at its October 10, 2016, meeting. The aim was to have workable scheduling guidelines for the AY 2017-8 even though we knew that some of the conversation about the common period would be ongoing.

The amended guideline is (amended portion is italicized):

“Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.

If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30, they should only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.”

In considering this motion, the Faculty Senate utilized two criteria:

1. to minimize adverse impact on course schedules, while
2. maximizing the likelihood that faculty members could participate in governance.

Although the second criterion enumerated here has received less attention in full faculty meetings than the concern about scheduling impacts (and classroom availability) has, the minutes from the 2015-6 Senate indicate that the second concern was a central consideration in determining the best time for the common period. The Senate (both 2015-6 and 2016-7) has been especially reluctant to implement a common period that seems to disenfranchise, systematically, a large part of the faculty (and untenured or junior faculty particularly). The results from the 2014 Senate-administered survey on faculty governance (relevant portions were included in the FAQ that was recently distributed via the

¹ Those data were shared with the faculty in an email to the facultygovernance listserv on September 23, 2016. Some of the data requested by faculty could not be provided by the Registrar (we *did* ask!). For example, requests for information about how particular students might be impacted by changes to the course schedule or how access to electronic classrooms might be impacted are difficult to determine using data based on the *existing* schedule. In essence, we need a model of a new schedule in order to answer those questions. One rationale for the modified guidelines enacted by the Senate on September 26, which *encouraged but did not require* faculty to abide by the common period, and which invited creative scheduling, was to make it possible for the faculty to begin to answer those questions.

² To address those concerns, the Faculty Senate/Senate Chair took the following action in the week of September 19-26, 2016:

- a. asked the Registrar to withhold distribution of the Scheduling Guidelines until the Faculty Senate could review its options and make a determination about how to proceed;
- b. requested, received, and distributed to the faculty a document detailing the number of classes and the number of students enrolled in classes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays in AY 2015-6 (again, this document was requested by members of the faculty at the September 19th meeting and was distributed via facultygovernance on Friday, September 23; it was redistributed on that same listserv by Nancy Bristow on Thursday, September 29);
- c. reviewed reports, feedback, and minutes from last year’s ASC, Faculty Senate, and full faculty meetings to re-evaluate the rationale used to establish a common period at noon on Wednesdays; and
- d. communicated with department chairs in Biology, Chemistry, Music, OT, and PT (departments whose scheduling demands are unusual and which seemed to be hardest hit by the creation of a common period). The purpose of that communication was to confirm, in light of discussion at the Monday (9/19) faculty meeting, that the Wednesday noon slot was still considered workable. Of those five departments, all five agreed that the Wednesday midday period was workable (and in some cases, strongly preferred over other options). Both the OT and Music programs had already re-worked part or all of their course schedules to accommodate the 12-1:30 Wednesday common period.

facultygovernance listserv) also suggest that the Senate's attention to these concerns is warranted.

In light of positive feedback from Staff Senate and ASUPS Senate, the Faculty Senate also wanted to ensure that the common period would afford those bodies opportunities for their own governance. The Senate has worked to facilitate a conversation that is open and accessible for all, in which the concerns of the faculty are heard and addressed as much as possible, and in which we have distributed the best data available to facilitate sound decision-making.

Ad hoc committee on Faculty Code sexual misconduct procedures

The Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) has worked with relevant on-campus governing bodies over the last year to revise the University's sexual misconduct policies (for staff, students, and faculty) so that they will be compatible with Title IX and Department of Justice guidance regarding sexual misconduct. This year, the SGVC is working to ensure that the student, staff, and faculty procedures regarding allegations of sexual misconduct are also compatible with Title IX and DOJ guidance.

After some discussion, the Faculty Senate passed a motion on October 3, 2016: "to establish an ad hoc committee to: review the Faculty Code's compliance with the standards of investigation and adjudication required by Title IX and Justice Department guidance regarding sexual misconduct and, if appropriate, develop a policy clarifying and updating procedures around sexual misconduct alleged either by or against faculty. The committee shall be composed of at least three faculty members, including faculty representatives from the Professional Standards Committee, the Student Life Committee, and the policy and procedures subcommittee of the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee. The Academic Vice President will serve on the committee in an advisory role."

Board meeting

The Board retreat will be held in Kirkland, WA October 6-8, 2016. The theme of the workshop for this retreat is "The Student Experience." I will attend as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member of the Executive Committee of the Board. Board committee representatives Sigrun Bodine (Mathematics and Computer Science, representative on Academic and Student Affairs) and Eric Orlin (Classics, representative on Finance and Facilities) will attend the meeting and participate in the workshop. Terry Beck (Education) will also attend and participate in the workshop.

Kind regards,

Alisa Kessel
Faculty Senate Chair
Associate Professor and Chair, Politics & Government