

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate

February 13, 2017

McCormick Room

Senate members present: David Chiu, Bill Haltom, Pierre Ly, Sara Freeman, Brendan Lanctot, Alisa Kessel, Peter Wimberger, Gwynne Brown, Nancy Bristow, Lilian Wang, Kristin Johnson, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Kris Bartanen, Andrea Kueter

Guests: Elena Becker, Ella Luazer, Ariela Tubert, Liz Collins, Eric Orlin, Sherry Mondou, Kyle Chong

1. Call to order at 4PM

2. Approval of the minutes of December 5, 2016 as amended M/S/P

Approval of the minutes of January 23, 2017 M/S/P

3. Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Jacobson reported that the Curriculum Committee has lost members this term due to service reassignment to the senate. While their reduced size is still within the guidelines of by-laws, Richman has suggested it is now difficult to provide adequate membership in the workgroups. Any change to the length of the spring semester will not take place until 2019 at the earliest. The curriculum committee has asked for feedback on how best to coordinate with the staff about discussions on a possible change of the academic calendar.

Freeman reported that Library, Information, and Media Services Committee is focused on getting more deliberate and advancing projects such as educational technology. There was a conversation about the role of the cloud now and in the future at the university. One big goal identified by the committee is to think about how to communicate with the faculty what they are doing and how to use new resources.

Johnson reported that the Student Life committee is having conversations about the flier/"UPS 3" incident and encouraged those present to review the minutes of the last two meetings. The committee would like to develop means of educating people about the boundaries of FERPA and to establish more regular reports from BHERT to the SLC and the Faculty Senate. There were conversations beginning about a shift in student expectations around what it means to be heard. Kessel suggested that since BHERT is a body of the Committee on Diversity that SLC and COD might coordinate to develop regular reporting or different lines of communication.

4. Updates from the ASUPS President and the Staff Senate representative

ASUPS President not present.

Kueter reported that the staff senate met last week and had their presentation by the Benefits Task

Force. The Staff compensation committee now needs to make a recommendation to HR about how the pool, if it is approved, should be distributed. The senate is also starting to plan for the 43rd annual staff recognition luncheon, which is on May 26th. Nominations for Excellence in Action are due April 7th and can be filed by students, staff, and faculty on line.

Subcommittee report

Faculty Work/Life balance Sub-Committee

Johnson and Ramakrishnan reported from their subcommittee that they had met with Ellen Peters to develop questions for inclusion in the HERI survey. They have asked for feedback. And presented the following two draft questions:

1. What are the expectations of you from students, your department, and the administration in terms of your energy, time, and expertise?
2. In meeting those expectations, how do those expectations match up with your goals as a teacher and scholar? What do you have to balance, and what, if any, are the trade-offs?
3. In what ways do (or don't you) you feel valued and appreciated for your work?
4. What is the relationship between teaching, service and professional growth in your work?
5. How does that align with your perception of institutional expectations?

We have 30 multiple choice questions, here are 6.

1. The distribution of teaching loads is proportionate across departments. (Likert: Agree – Disagree)
2. What kind support allows you to do your very best work? (Likert: Very much - not at all)
 - a. Additional compensation for new initiatives
 - b. Funding for projects, research
 - c. Reduced teaching load
 - d. Reduced advising for majors
 - e. Reduced advising for non-majors

5. Presentation of recommendations from the Budget Task Force ([Recommendations of the BTF are available at this link.](#))

Orlin and Tubert discussed the composition of the board, the role of members, and the process. Both agreed it was a relatively easy budget year because health insurance premiums did not go up. Orlin noted that they were able to slow the rate of tuition to the point that it is the lowest tuition increase in 45 years, fund a 4% increase in the faculty salary pool, a 3.25% increase in the staff salary pool, and fund some other items, such as a new CHWS position. Tubert stressed how tight the budget is on any given year. Orlin stressed the importance of retention.

Kessel asked if health insurance costs were going up possibly 18% next year and what that might mean. Mondou explained that the projected number was a prediction of rise in health care costs by the health care industry, not necessarily insurance premiums. However, she noted, the projection the university is making now is a 12.5% increase for premiums but we will not know till next fall. Bartanen added that the 12.5% is a “medical trend” estimate.

Tubert referenced the larger set of contingent numbers, unknown or simply projected values, that made the budgeting process difficult.

Lanctot asked if health care was the hardest to deal with because of the variability? Mondou responded that modeling class size and financial aid outlays are the biggest challenges. Health care premiums and market impacts on endowment distributions are next. Orlin said the team has been doing a good job of being fairly conservative and projecting higher costs, so we do not find ourselves having to move into deficit spending.

Kessel asked how a request for a change in conference allocation for faculty would proceed. Bartanen said a couple years ago that the BTF recommended a 50K increase to faculty and student research and travel. The UEC request was built into the request that Martin Jackson brings to the BTF on behalf of the Academic unit. Distribution decisions however, such as changing caps that might be out of date, are a UEC decision.

Bristow asked about the discrepancy between the salary pool increase between faculty and staff. Orlin noted that salaries are pegged to medians, or what are fair wages relative to peers and the marketplace. Staff were generally closer to the median than faculty. While the faculty pool is higher, relative to the marketplace in which they work, Tacoma, staff are not paid poorly. Tubert clarified that it depends on the position. Some staff are below the regional median but some positions we are doing pretty well. Mondou emphasize the big market differences within various staff positions and the dynamism of those markets. She noted recent improvements in the job market has resulted in staff turnover creeping above 15%. Tubert pointed out that our benefits for staff are generally better than our regional market including things like tuition benefits. Bristow said that she is concerned about folks at the bottom. Orlin reminded the senate that the staff compensation committee will get to have input on how the 3.25% pool is distributed; this decision is made by the President's cabinet. Bartanen noted that all staff are at or above minimum wage expectations that are coming ahead and the student pool increase is big enough to get them at \$12/hr. Mondou confirmed that every staff member is already above the \$12 minimum that Tacoma is phasing in over time.

Kessel suggested our discount rate seemed low. Mondou explained that includes our graduate students which brings that number down. Kessel asked if there is a sweet spot for the tuition discount rate. Mondou reported that our national peers are discounting at 50%, a rate which would make it hard to maintain our programs. She offered that a number in the low or mid 40s would be achievable and the lower we can discount and still make it affordable, the more money for enriching the programs. Discount rate reflects all our current ongoing commitments to students.

6. CLOSED SESSION: presentation of candidates for Honorary Degrees. M/S/P slate of candidates presented for honorary degrees

7. Discussion of a motion to create an *in memoriam* recognition for students who have died will attending the University of Puget Sound (see Appendix A)

Lanctot ran this portion of the meeting.

Kessel summarized the concern about the criteria which lead to the revision being offered granting the senate more discretion rather than offering specific categories that would exclude a student from

consideration. She explained the deadline that was inserted. Because programs for graduation need to be printed by the third week of April, the current motion proposes an April 1st deadline for the registrar forwarding names for consideration to the dean of students and academic VP who will forward them to the faculty senate to make a determination and forward nominations to the office of the president.

Kyle Chong, chair of ASUP's senate, asked for feedback from ASUPS senators in writing that is due at midnight tonight. Support so far however appears unanimous. There are some technical concerns but nothing that would alter the content of the resolution. One was a concern about the hypothetical campus shooter. Kessel provided background on the senate deliberation which led to the removal of the specific criteria and granted greater discretion to the senate to make the final determination. Chong said that addressed such a concern.

M/S/P

8. Other business

Kessel resumed control of the meeting

Kessel reminded people that nominations for Wyatt, Bryning, and Wallerich are due Feb 24th.

Kessel opened a conversation on planning common hour events for the campus community as a whole focusing on who should be in conversation on this issue and what might the financial support for such events look like. Freeman suggested partnering with standing lecture series. Kessel asked if existing MOUS might restrict use during the common hour. Ramakrishnan worried about overscheduling that time period. Kessel replied that she was thinking about once a year or once a semester. Bartanen mentioned there might be a good partnership possibility with the orientation committee as they think through a revamp for Fall 2018. Bartanen also suggested considering if there may be a tie in with an MLK event. Kueter noted it would be great to be all inclusive because sometimes staff is siloed and not intellectually engaged with the whole campus. Bristow noted for full campus events, if the field house is being considered, that the athletic schedule is already set for Fall 18 so reaching out sooner rather than later is important. Bristow also noted there may be a way to connect with RPI who is holding their conference in the Fall. She also noted there is a tradeoff between themed and being able to be responsive. Jacobson suggested reaching out to Posse programmers as there may be a tie-in with their retreat theme.

9. Moved to adjourn M/S/P 5:15PM

Minutes prepared by Robin Jacobson.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: In memoriam recognition

***In memoriam* recognition**

Objective: to create an *in memoriam* recognition to be awarded to students who have died while enrolled at the University of Puget Sound.

To determine eligibility, the Faculty Senate will consider:

- 1) whether the nominee has matriculated at the University of Puget Sound, and has been attending classes and actively pursuing and making progress towards a degree,
- 2) whether the nominee was dismissed or suspended at the time of death, and
- 3) whether there are other factors deemed relevant by the Faculty Senate in determining eligibility for recognition.

The *in memoriam* recognition would be granted, upon consultation and approval from the student's family, at the Commencement ceremony (or at another time agreed upon by the family) that corresponds either to the student's anticipated graduation date or to the class with which the student matriculated.

This recognition will not affect the academic or honorary merits of other degrees awarded by the university and will not require an accounting of the student's academic achievements to date (other than as specified in #1 and #2 above).

Process:

- 1) By April 1, the Office of the Registrar will identify any student has died and who would have been a member of the forthcoming graduating class (either based on the student's anticipated graduation date or matriculation date) and will confirm matriculation and enrollment, as well as academic and/or conduct suspension or dismissal;
- 2) The Office of the Registrar will forward the nomination to the Academic Dean and the Dean of Students for additional notations;
- 3) As members of the Faculty Senate, the Academic Dean and Dean of Students will forward the nomination to the Faculty Senate for action.

Upon approval by the Faculty Senate, the Director of the Office of the President will initiate and carry out communication with the family of the nominee, as appropriate.