

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY FACULTY MINUTES

for May 15, 2008

Prepared by Jeff Seward, Chair Elect

Final draft, approved by Senate 8/28/2008

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. by the Senate Chair, Carole Timpone.

Roll call.

Senators present: Provost John Miller, Gail Aamodt, David Boersema, Jim Flory, Tiffany Boggs, Lynda Irons, Kevin Johnson, Shereen Khoja, James Lane, Richard London, John R. Hayes, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Lori Rynd, Jeff Seward, Carole Timpone, Camille Wainwright, Rick Whiteley

Senators absent: Jon Gietzen, Latha Reddy, Juancho Ramirez, Mark Szymanski

Approval of the minutes.

The minutes of the April 24, 2008 meeting of the Senate were corrected to delete the sentence "The motion was approved unanimously" at the end of the item on consideration of the University Conflict of Interest proposal and insert instead the following sentence: "Provost John Miller agreed to withdraw the proposed policy and bring back a revised version at a future meeting." The minutes were then approved unanimously.

Approval of degree candidates.

The administration requested that the Faculty Senate assume the responsibility for approving the candidates for University degrees, a function traditionally performed by the University Faculty meeting. The Senate agreed to take on this function. James Lane and John R. Hayes moved and seconded a motion to approve the list of degree candidates presented, and this motion passed unanimously.

New members of University Standing Committees.

The Senate unanimously approved the nomination of Liza Szeffel of the College of Arts and Sciences to the Curriculum and Standards Committee.

The Senate unanimously approved the nomination of Mike Steele of the College of Arts and Sciences as a new member of the Honors and Awards Committee.

Approval of the Ad Hoc Committee Proposal for Revisions to the University Appeals Board.

Carole Timpone relinquished the chair to Jeff Seward, the Chair Elect, in order to participate in the discussion of this item.

Camille Wainwright presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the University Appeals Board and reported that the committee's proposal had been accepted by the University Council after some discussion of concerns expressed by Eva Krebs, Vice President of Student Life, about the requirement for a "unanimous" vote by the voting members of the Appeals Board to overturn a decision by a college academic standards committee about the appropriateness of a sanction.

Following a discussion about the nature of the participation of the chair of the college standards committee in the deliberations of the Appeals Board, a friendly amendment to the proposal, offered by James Lane and Lynda Irons, was accepted. The amendment changed language in the third paragraph of section 2.5.6.b. of the proposal by substituting "clarification only" for "consultation" at the end of the next to last sentence and deleting the phrase "..., including the chair of the college academic standards committee," from the last sentence of the paragraph. The friendly amendment also made these last two sentences a separate, fourth paragraph of this section, which in its entirety would now read as follows:

"The chair of the college academic standards committee will be invited to the initial Appeals Board meeting for clarification only. If the USAB determines that a hearing will be held, all individuals who will be called upon to give testimony will be given at least five (5) University working days prior notice of the hearing date."

Jeff Seward then relinquished the chair in order to offer two amendments to the proposal.

Jeff Seward moved to amend Section 2.5.6.b.3 to replace the phrase "unanimous agreement of the voting members" with "a 2/3 majority of the voting members" in order to overturn a sanction imposed by a college academic standards committee. This motion died for lack of a second.

Jeff Seward then moved and Dave Boersema seconded a motion to amend the same section to add to Section 2.5.6.b.3 a sentence specifying that "However, for the purposes of this vote, the faculty member(s) representing the unit whose sanction is being appealed may not vote." This would have the effect of requiring a unanimous vote of all the other members of the USAB in order to overturn a sanction imposed by a college academic standards committee. After discussion, this motion was defeated by a vote of 3-12 with one abstention.

Votes for amendment: David Boersema, Jim Flory, Jeff Seward

Votes against amendment: Gail Aamodt, Lynda Irons, Kevin Johnson, Shereen Khoja, James Lane, Richard London, John R. Hayes, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Lori Rynd, Camille Wainwright, Rick Whiteley

Abstention: Tiffany Boggs

Jeff Seward resumed the chair. A friendly amendment was accepted changing the language of the final sentence of the Section 2.5.6.b.3 to replace the phrase "must reconsider the sanction" with the phrase "must apply an alternate sanction."

The ad hoc committee's amended proposal was then approved the Senate by a 13-2 vote.

Votes for motion: Gail Aamodt, David Boersema, Jim Flory, Lynda Irons, Kevin Johnson, Shereen Khoja, Richard London, John R. Hayes, Martha Rampton, Victor Rodriguez, Lori Rind, Camille Wainwright, Rick Whiteley

Votes against motion: James Lane, Jeff Seward

Abstention: Tiffany Boggs

Jeff Seward then turned the chair back over to Carole Timpone.

Discussion of Chapter 4 Revisions Proposed by the University Personnel Committee.

John Hayes, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Todd Schultz, Chair of the University Personnel Committee appeared before the Senate to discuss and answer questions about the proposals by the University Personnel Committee to revise the criteria for faculty tenure and promotion in Chapter 4 of the University Handbook.

Dean Hayes called attention to three areas that have raised concern among faculty members. He reported that several faculty had raised objections to new paragraphs in Section 4.6.3.a. Teaching that created a new requirement that faculty show that they are keeping up with new developments in pedagogy and are adopting "the best pedagogy available" in their teaching. He indicated the Committee agreed that this language went too far in imposing specific new requirements on faculty and planned to redraft this section to include just a mention of the importance of pedagogy without imposing a specific requirement that faculty members show evidence of keeping up with new pedagogy or implementing any particular pedagogies in their classrooms. He also noted that the requirement to demonstrate "excellent teaching" had been changed to require "effective teaching" and "a consistent history of strong teaching performance" to reflect the real standards personnel committees have actually been applying.

The second area of concern that Dean Hayes mentioned were changes in Section 4.6.3.c. Service. Here new language has been inserted to create a new requirement, in addition to service on University committees and governing bodies, that faculty "should use their expertise as professionals and as educators in service to their professions, to the University, and to the larger community." This is meant to clarify that this sort of activity does not count in the category of "Scholarly or Creative Activity" (renamed "Scholarly and Creative Contributions" in the new draft).

Several Senators noted that this creates a new and additional category of service that has not previously been required in the old category of "University Service." Dean Hayes and Prof. Schultz defended this new requirement on the grounds that it should not be enough just to participate as members of University committees or University governing bodies to satisfy the service requirement.

A third area of concern highlighted by Dean Hayes was language in Section 4.7.1.a. that would permit the University Personnel Committee to extend the probationary period for tenure track faculty beyond the usual six years "in cases where some of the time to tenure was spent at part time." He suggested that this sort of procedure is important to create a "family friendly" personnel process that makes allowance for faculty members who move to less than full-time status during their probationary period to create more time for raising young children. Several Senators expressed concern about issues of fairness related to this proposal, and that discussion extended into discussions of the fairness of somewhat different standards for the category of scholarly and creative contributions for tenure for faculty who had been given special considerations such as substantial amounts of startup money, course releases to do research, etc. Dean Hayes defended such differential treatment while several Senators expressed concern about how criteria for such differentiated treatment could be fairly and specifically codified in the Handbook.

Dean Hayes and Prof. Schultz also highlighted language in Section 4.6.3.b. Scholarly and Creative Contributions that maintained specific emphasis on the Boyer categories of scholarship and the importance of presenting evidence of peer reviewed scholarship in whatever Boyer category scholarly and creative contributions occurred. This led to some discussion about whether this meant that only peer reviewed work should count in this category or that it meant that some minimum amount of peer reviewed work should be included in the work submitted to fulfill this criterion for tenure or promotion.

Dean Hayes and Prof. Schultz emphasized that the intention was not to "ramp up" the requirement for scholarly and creative activity but rather to clarify what had always been the standard. Senators were divided about whether the new criteria were in fact just clarification or constituted a "ramping up" of the standard. Dean Hayes noted that, in the College of Arts and Sciences, each department is being asked to prepare a document specifying the quantity and quality of scholarly and creative contributions considered appropriate by the department for meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion. The Department of Physics has already completed such a document, and it is being circulated as an example for discussion throughout the College.

The discussion then turned from the substance of the proposed revisions to a discussion of the process for deliberation and final decision relative to the revisions. Dean Hayes and Prof. Schultz emphasized that there was no intention to rush consideration of the proposed revisions through the governance process and indicated that the process of deliberation would undoubtedly continue throughout the fall semester and perhaps well into the spring semester of the 2008-2009 academic year. Dean Hayes, while acknowledging that the Chapter 4 revisions would ultimately be subject to approval by the Faculty Senate, urged the Senate not to engage in trying to redraft the specific

language of the proposed revisions but instead identify specific concerns that the University Personnel Committee would then respond to by redrafting specific language.

Kevin Johnson and Martha Rampton moved and seconded that the Senate should recommend to the University Faculty chairs and the administration that the 2008 fall University Faculty conference be primarily dedicated to consideration of the Chapter 4 revisions with both general sessions and breakout sessions devoted to discussion of the issues in a similar fashion to the process used to discuss governance reform at the 2006 fall conference. The break out sessions would be facilitated by members of the University Personnel Committee and members of the Faculty Senate. The motion was approved unanimously.

The Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.