

Faculty Senate Meeting  
May 4, 2020  
Minutes

Secretary's note: Due to the nature of our disrupted work during the Covid 19 pandemic, several action items were completed after the May 4 meeting. A brief summary of these actions is included as an Appendix to the May 4 minutes.

Present: Alison Tracy Hale, Andrew Monaco, Brad Reich, Chris Kendall, Heather Bailey, Heather White, Jairo Hoyos Galvis, Julia Looper, Jung Kim, Laura Behling, Megan Gessel, Nicole Cariño, Nila Wiese, Sara Freeman, Sarah Moore, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Robin Jacobsen, Elise Richman, Sam Kigar, Carrie Woods

Guests: Alan Krause, David Andresen, Richard Anderson-Connolly, Dexter Gordon, Alisa Kessel, Brad Reich, Seth Weinberger, Tina Huynh

- 1) Call to Order at noon 5/4/2020
- 2) Announcements
  - a) Gessel states that Appendix 3 was added to the minutes from April 27.
- 3) Approval of the Minutes from April 27, 2020
  - a) M/S/P - Approved as corrected with MacBain's clarification to her own remarks
- 4) End-of-Year Reports
  - A. Curriculum Committee
    - Reich answered questions.  
What is the current status as to how students can meet the foreign language requirement?  
-Reich reviewed the history of the current proposal. The CC spent time figuring out whether this was a language proficiency or cultural requirement because of the language in the ad hoc group's proposed rubric. The CC determined that there was a language requirement not a cultural requirement so they approved a language rubric.  
A discussion ensued about the future work of the CC regarding this charge and the future of the charge generally, including the need for the ASC to approve courses for students who are not able to take foreign language courses due to disability. Jairo points out the need for continued discussion between CC and foreign language faculty in case of misunderstanding about the role of proficiency in language.  
What might a formal template of a 7 year review look like and how is this related to question 6?  
-The CC was concerned with a lack of uniformity in responses from departments in the self-study. While the CC has not proposed a formal template in addition to the guidance currently provided to departments, it believes a template might provide the committee

with more uniformity in the answers and the ability to more uniformly review the documents. At least one committee member would like to assess how we are using question 6, the question on diversity.

Freeman clarified that in 2012-2015 the COD undertook an analysis of question 6 and did a qualitative review but a more empirical review has not yet been suggested.

What work does the committee think needs to be done to streamline the work with the IEC? The IEC does not think that there is a problem in its working with the CC. -The CC recognizes that this charge from the Senate is unfinished so decided to list it as an ongoing need. If the senate feels that this is unnecessary, the CC would agree.

Are there enough members to do the work?

-The CC had 3 people per working group. With 5 charges there really are not enough people to adequately address these charges. Freeman states that the CC is smaller than usual due to the formation of the CTF but it is the size required in the by-laws.

## **B. . Summer Bridge Program**

Wiese answers senators' questions.

Is the group planning to develop a virtual program for 2020?

-The members of the Summer Bridge Program committee had planned to roll out the program this summer but cannot fully roll it out due to Covid-19. They are still putting together a proposal with recommendations for this summer and fall.

Question about the flow from bridge program to orientation to fall; What is good and what is too repetitive?

-There is little overlap between the bridge program and orientation. The Bridge program will have a large academic focus which is not present in orientation. Parents of students in the Summer Bridge Program will have their orientation during the bridge program so that they do not have to return to campus.

Does the research suggest that 2 week programs are long enough?

-Much of the research does not report outcomes. The research represents programs with a range from 2-8 weeks in length. The committee was mindful of student income generating time in the summer so considered a 2 week introduction in the summer and continuation in the fall semester.

Has the committee considered ways under each model to retain the supportive community developed in the program while also integrating students into the larger campus community? Do you recommend the development of specific experiences or opportunities for students beyond the target program that would help them retain their Sound Scholars connections while also finding their place in the larger campus, or does the research suggest that that part of the process will happen organically?

-The bridge program will help the students build a cohort model but also the students will be given the tools to help integrate them into the larger campus community in an organic way.

Given the work of CTF and the potential recommendation of the GPS course - how would the bridge program relate to it? especially in light of continued activities in the fall?

- The committee is collaborating with CTF and there may be pilot projects with intersecting ideas.
- The Group is also working on guidelines for the CC to review content.

### C. Professional Standards Committee

Andresen answer's senators questions

Under Part IV: Future Charges, Point 1 b states "Many presentations, performances, publications, and research programs were significantly disrupted by Covid-19 in a variety of ways, and this context needs to be understood in the future." Is the intention of the PSC to allow departments/programs/schools to have discretion to decide how to evaluate these disruptions or to have this outlined in more detail by the PSC?

- It is the view of the PSC that this needs to be taken into consideration. Context is already considered in evaluations. The evaluatees will have to contextualize this semester in their statement to help reviewers understand how their work has been impacted.
- Freeman links this to the FAC report stating that it is up to the department to determine if the candidate meets their requirements and the departments need to determine the context

Has there been work since the report on the Department of Education streamlined reviews?

- Not at this time.

Since business will carry over into next year, what is the boldest statement that the PSC can make regarding SETs?

- The PSC wanted to look deeper at this issue but with COVID-19 did not get to fully consider this. Therefore, issuing a bold statement is not warranted at this time. The code only states student evaluations are required but does not provide information about what student evaluations consist of, so an opportunity for a bold change exists without the need to change the faculty code. Freeman urges the committee to leave a strong call to action on this point in their year end report. Gessel recommends "boldness" in the changes.

### D. Academic Standards Committee

Anderson-Connolly to answer questions. The Faculty Senate recognizes Rich's strong chairmanship of this committee and the amount of work done by the committee.

Clarify the change in committee structure. Is the committee recommending this change for just the ASC or all committees?

- The ASC has 7 faculty on the committee, they decided on a structure without subcommittees, as had been used in the past.. While it was more work for the members who met weekly for 90 minutes, the changed worked well because members were able to communicate better about how petition work can inform the policy agenda. This recommendation for future committee structure was meant for the ASC only.

Was the concern about the number of faculty doing to work for policy and petitions the same or could there be a policy subcommittee?

-The ASC considered this but decided not to have a subcommittee because they like having all the people in the room for the policy discussions and that they preferred having a balance of faculty representation and administrative representation in the policy conversations.

What do you anticipate being the most salient issues around the transfer policies related to COVID-19?

-The ASC is meeting in the next few weeks to deal with unforeseen circumstances. They do not foresee having problems accepting credit/no credit transfers. There are some universities that went to a universal pass for this term and that may be a problematic issue related to transfer credits. An additional issue, particularly in the sciences, are prerequisite courses that required lab components. This term the classes continued on-line but the labs were suspended.

Rich asked senators to email him any topics they would like ASC to work on before the end of the year.

#### E. Student Life Committee

Krause to answer questions

For the SLC's ideas for the living learning communities, do you feel that your informal questions to students covered a wide range of students? It would be nice to have an LGBTQ+ community, for example, and I am wondering if the students that were sought for information included students across all groups represented on campus.

-No demographic characteristics were considered due to the framing of the question about unique aspects at Puget Sound

Was there resolution to move recruiting for Greek life to fall semester?

-The SLC was asked to provide input; which they did. The greek committee and Dean of Students were making the final decision. Moe Stephens (the point person) or Dean Baker would be good people to contact if faculty have input about this decision

There is a need to find some economies in our service roles. In the same way SLC has taken on a commitment to conduct boards, could SLC also be a node for populating the Honor Court, the Union Board, and the Media Board so we don't have to have separate people in those places (and since Dean Baker and the DSA staff largely coordinate what those boards do and could communicate with SLC about that in a centralized way)? ASUPS faculty rep seems like big enough work that it could continue as a stand alone job.

-As it was used this year, the members on the SLC should not be used in other roles but in other years this may make sense. In comparison, the SLC workload is not as much as CC so we could expect a little more work from members of the SLC.

How do you understand this committee in relation to other standing committees? Does this really fit in the domain of a standing faculty committee?

-The SLC is different in that there is an organization in the university that does the work of the committee and much of its work is determined by how the Dean of Students wishes to utilize the committee. Krause would be open to other committee structures.

## F. Curriculum Task Force

Kessel and Gordon are answering questions. There is an enormous amount of follow up to be done due to the impact of Covid 19 on this committee which was originally supposed to be finishing up its work and disbanding now.

Although it is not directly connected to the CTF work, I wonder if IR is planning to survey students on their online learning experiences this spring? It seems as though we might be able to learn about "new vistas" by asking students about the types of creative/innovative teaching methods that were most effective. I also think students are really tired, so such a survey, I believe, should be very short and well-focused.

-There was discussion about this but it has not yet happened.

What is at the top of the list of things that seemed implausible but now seem necessary? -It seems necessary to back to our question about what is ideal. faculty flexibility is also important; faculty making the necessary adjustments to form a shared community.

Will there be a final report of the committee some time this May? Or will the final report come after the summer and truly be for the new Senate in the fall?

-Many of the things that the CTF anticipated putting into the final report are unknown due to Covid-19. Additionally, it is difficult to make recommendations that reflect reality.

There are some areas that may be worthy of recommending a pilot, however, the current moment seems like it could make a shift in the faculty in terms of innovation. It may be better not to limit the faculty's creativity with a report with recommendations.

-Senators are asked to email Freeman with ideas about finalization of CTF versus continuation.

-The CTF has meetings Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday. If senators have input for the CTF please pass it on before then.

## G. Faculty Advancement Committee

Weinberger answering questions.

Help us understand more of what is at stake in the difference between procedural and judgement grounds in the issue of how FAC decisions can be appealed

(Recommendation 1): **The FAC recommends that the Faculty Senate and/or the Professional Standards Committee consider the grounds on which the Faculty wishes appeals of FAC decisions to be possible and to clarify the language of the Faculty Code to reflect that determination.**

-Many appeals to FAC decisions are questions about FAC's judgement. However, the FAC believes that appeals based on FAC judgment, as opposed to the process, are not appropriate because it is FAC role to make those judgments. Freeman points out the appeals board is a randomized board of eligible faculty. The FAC would like the senate or an appropriate body to consider when/why someone is able to appeal an FAC decision. Whatever answer, the code needs to be clarified.

-The senators affirmed that as we receive this report, we would like the FAC to disseminate the guidance put forward widely to allow the faculty to access and act on this information.

For FAC, what are the costs and benefits of revoking the option for streamlined third year associate reviews?

-Often choosing the streamlined third year associate review is not a good option for evaluatees because they do not get appropriate input on developing their file.

-There may need to be changes to the buff document because chairs and evaluatees do not seem to read this document closely. This leads to mistakes and omissions which makes the FAC's review difficult. Moore also comments that the buff document needs to be revised; it began as a short interpretation of the code (a users manual) and does not seem to be serving this purpose any longer.

5) Discussion of Walter Lowry Sustained Service Award **\*CLOSED SESSION\***

The senate will discuss this live and vote over email

M/S/P to move Senate into closed session

M/S/P to move Senate out of closed session

6) Election of 2020–21 Senate Vice Chair and Senate Secretary

Nominations and votes for Vice Chair and Secretary will be done over email.

Usually these are not roles for people in their first term as senator.

Continuing: Alison, Andrew, Chris, Heather, Jairo, Julia, Megan

Beardsley, Kim, MacBain, and Moore are retiring from the Senate. Thank you for your service.

Thanks to Sara Freeman for her work as chair.

7) M/S/P to Adjournment at 1:37

## **Appendix**

Action items completed remotely following the May 4 Senate meeting.

- M/S/P that the Senate support the ASC's new medical withdrawal policy.
- The Senate elected Julia Looper as Senate Vice Chairperson for 2019–20.
- The Senate elected Chris Kendall as Senate Secretary for 2019–20.
- M/S/P that the Senate renew its November 2018 charge to the CTF and extends it to until May 2021, with the provision that CTF members and chairs may cycle off or step back for next year's work at their discretion. Senate directs that replacements or additions to the committee will be made if needed by Senate Exec for academic year 20-21.