

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate

February 19, 2018 McCormick Room 12:00 pm

Attending: Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Gwynne Brown, Amanda Diaz, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Jung Kim, Sunil Kukreja, Pierre Ly, Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Robin Jacobson, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Sarah Walling-Bell, Peter Wimberger

Visitors: Liz Collins, President Isiaah Crawford, Kelli Delaney, Laura Martin-Fedich

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Alisa Kessel at 12:02pm.

2. Approval of the minutes of January 22, 2017

M/S/P

3. Updates from the ASUPS representative and the Staff Senate representative

Amanda Diaz reminds us ASUPS elections will occur this Thursday 2/22. Additionally, she shares that ASUPS has allocated \$5600 to support a student government lecture series at the 2018 Race and Pedagogy National Conference, as well as financial support of \$1.50 per student to support student attendance at the conference. We have both co-curricular and academic cords at graduation this year; AD thanks Dean Bartanen and President Crawford for their support in this effort. ASUPS is also working on an emergency fund with Dean Bartanen and Sherry Mondou. AD highlights their continued work on an anti-bias video campaign, and asks to share a list of upcoming events with the Senate. The list of events was e-mailed to AK, forwarded to the Senate, and is shared in these minutes.

Staff Senate Liaison Pagel was not in attendance. AK reports that the annual Staff Recognition event will be held on the Friday following commencement this year. AK also reports that the Staff Senate is working on a report on ongoing strategic planning.

4. Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Robin Jacobson reports from the Curriculum Committee that Experiential Learning Faculty Advisory Board (ELFAB) introduced a proposal to incorporate a drop down into the PeopleSoft course search to indicate whether a course qualifies as experiential learning. The CC rejected the proposal due to the lack of a sufficiently formal definition of what counts as experiential learning. The CC is also currently considering a Pathways proposal and the role of emphases in the curriculum broadly.

Tiffany MacBain shares that the PSC continues to talk about issues of bias in student evaluations. They hope to meet with Committee on Diversity and Tiffany Davis to discuss possible courses of

action; Kris Bartanen confirms that these meetings are scheduled to take place. The PSC is also hoping to schedule an additional faculty meeting to allow faculty to discuss student evaluations. AK replies that there is currently no meeting scheduled on the first Wednesday in May, but that PSC would like the issue to be open for discussion across at least 2 full faculty meetings. The issue will be discussed further based on PSC preparation.

PSC continues to discuss changes to the language in the faculty code regarding promotion to full professor. The PSC provided feedback on the most recent language. This topic is likely to appear on the agenda for the next faculty senate meeting.

AK reminds all committee liaisons to check in with committees if they have not already done so. This includes asking liaisons to check in with committees regarding their charges, as well as scheduling year-end report meetings for each committee.

5. Open session with President Crawford

President Isiaah Crawford thanks us for the invitation to today's meeting, welcoming more opportunities for him to provide updates and for him to receive questions and open conversations. IC expresses that his focus continues to be on the strategic planning process, with work teams progressing through their current tasks. The strategic planning steering committee (SPSC) will be meeting this week to provide feedback to these work teams. Final reports will go to the SPSC in March, who will then coordinate with IC to refine the plan and produce a draft by May, which will be presented at the Board of Trustees meeting for feedback. IC emphasizes that input will continue to be welcomed over the summer and into the fall semester. He describes the work as both collaborative and engaging, about thinking big and embracing new opportunities.

IC notes the work from Laura Martin-Fedich on the enrollment side which is focused on the incoming fall 2018 class; this work includes implementing strategic initiatives. Midway through our cycle, we are cautiously optimistic. In particular, the focus of enrollment is on yield and retention, as well as helping students make choices that are in their best interest.

IC thanks those at work to balance the fiscal 2018 budget as we maintain our high levels of academic excellence, rigor, and mentorship support.

IC has spent a lot of time with issues on the legislative front (both DC and WA). The tax legislation which was passed had many components damaging to higher education largely removed. Two elements continue to give us pause. The first is (1) the elimination of the advanced bond financing: colleges and universities can no longer refinance debt if interest rates are lowered, makes it more difficult for us to lower our debt. There is still a chance this element will be reconciled as the bill advances. The second is (2) the excise tax of 1.4% on (private and independent) colleges and universities whose endowments equates to a threshold of \$500,000/FTE student or more. While the University of Puget Sound does not currently meet the threshold for this tax, the first time it was proposed, we would have and, once a threshold is in place, it could be lowered in the future. An additional lingering concern is the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. This may impact us through decreased financial aid and support for students, through the potential elimination of Perkins loans and other higher education grants, as well as possibly charging

students interest on higher education loans while they are still in school. IC states that the impact of the act on regulatory environment remains unclear, though we may see the deregulation of profit higher education that would be detrimental to other sectors.

IC stresses our continued focus on DACA, and our continued support to extend the program. The “free college tuition” issue has come out of Olympia, a proposal to make 2-year and 4-year college tuition free. This is challenging for Puget Sound to manage: while we agree that it is good for all students to have the opportunity to attend college, it is challenging when it comes at our expense. In the past, in NY state, there was a 9% drop in enrollment in private institutions when a similar policy was implemented. IC reminds everyone that the Board of Trustees will be meeting this week.

Bill Beardsley asks about balancing short-term challenges (enrollment this year) and long-term challenges (strategic planning). IC replies that the strategic plan would be better named the “strategic and financial plan,” and that both components must be coordinated to be effective. We are taking a 10-year viewpoint with the strategic planning process while also being willing to make small adaptations year-to-year. IC also advocates that we maintain an even longer view as we contend with the impacts of very new technology such as artificial intelligence. Our financial plan is for the immediate future as well as the longer term. To support long term goals and new initiatives, we will have another capital campaign, and we will examine what current programs or services we may need to eliminate.

Peter Wimberger identifies a strategic planning question about how initiatives “relate to enrollment and retention,” highlighting relationships to marketing, but acknowledges that some of the proposals (such as creating connections between admitted students and faculty) have unknown relationships. How much should we be thinking about this marketing perspective? IC confirms that we should be thinking about how to brand ourselves in a competitive marketplace, and distinguish ourselves from other institutions. He mentions Gayle McIntosh’s work in doing exactly this, and encourages recommendations (from the faculty or the SPSC directly) for this more broadly.

Siddharth Ramakrishnan mentions the potentially rushed timeline for the strategic planning process and asks if there is breathing room in the development of the plan. IC replies that the board will want to see some direction [by May] but that there will be time for feedback. He reminds that any new curricular initiatives will all still need to go through the standard university processes and continue to respect our shared governance. AK asks about the Thursday morning (2/22) community meeting [of the BoT] and the role of a presentation of the strategic planning goals (thus far). IC confirms that this is an opportunity for faculty to engage with the strategic planning process. The degree to which it will be about the process, as opposed to the actual goals, is unclear, given the SPSC will be meeting the day before [Wednesday]. AK mentions that the number of full faculty meetings - and therefore opportunities for faculty feedback on the process - is dwindling as the semester progresses, and asks for consideration of this opportunity for faculty feedback. KB reaffirms that any proposals are not for the coming academic year, and that any changed curriculum proposal would have to still go through the standard channels. PW also remarks that goal teams of the SPSC are welcoming feedback regarding these proposals. IC uses an example: creating a structure for a student to complete their Puget Sound degree in 3 years. This is one proposal. When

examining what a 3-year path entails, it would all need to be appropriately vetted by CC. These strategic plan proposals do not supersede the will of the faculty.

SR asks that if strategic plan leads to capital campaign, is it possible to incorporate funds to experiment and incubate ideas for faculty to play-test innovative ideas? Similar to Burlington Northern grants. IC agrees. An innovation fund for pilot proposals and initiatives. Jung Kim asks about how success or failure of such test ideas might be measured. KB replies by using the example of the sophomore summer immersion internship program. It's a pilot. We are not in foreign territory experimenting with these innovations. Sunil mentions first-year seminars and the process of trying, tinkering with, and testing both content and sequencing.

PW remarks that some proposed initiatives may require more major changes, such as to the core curriculum or our calendar. Academic initiatives, even if endorsed by the Board, would still need to go through the proper governance avenues. The process is likely to reveal differences among the faculty and prompt conversations. AK has a central question: how do we have those conversations and make sure they are open to feedback from all faculty? Gwynne Brown suggests visits to standing committees as a way to introduce ideas to the faculty. IC says that the proposals which move from the work teams forward as part of a proposed strategic plan will be brought to the university for feedback. RJ echoes that the sooner these proposals are brought forward to the faculty for feedback, the better. It's critical to have faculty buy-in. PW agrees, and reminds that faculty are actually involved in the process this time, relative to prior strategic plan development.

AD asks about ensuring that new strategic plan initiatives include input from students. IC emphasizes input and critical analysis from students. We will continue to reach out to students and respect shared governance process, as has happened thus far. AK asks if it is appropriate to draw faculty attention to the Thursday meeting as an appropriate forum for faculty feedback on the current state of the strategic plan. IC cautions that at this time, it may create unfair expectations on the SPSC if they may not be prepared with such proposals by Thursday. AK says as an interim moment in the development of the plan, it may be better to provide feedback now than when the plan is too far down the road. KB and SR suggest perhaps a common period campus conversation to make sure the discussion continues.

Sid asks IC about the current fundraising climate. IC responds that Puget Sound is doing better this year than last year, and that generally people are more familiar with President Crawford himself. The new tax legislation, which includes a new increase in deductions for taxpayers, may hamper donations from moderate-income donors, but less so for wealthy donors. He says we rely on these donors. TM shares that charitable giving has emotional components as well, and encourages us to draw attention to the narrative mission and (maybe subtly) the politics of giving to Puget Sound. An approach to giving where many small gifts can add up to something big. IC ties this approach to how we tell our story, and agrees. KB says 3/20 is our first Logger Giving Day.

TM remarks on the data [previously presented by both IC and Laura Martin-Fedich at full faculty meetings] on students choosing Western Washington over UPS, and how it makes sense that many families with first-generation college graduates do not draw a sharp distinction between college and "liberal arts college". How do we identify what we provide that the state schools do not? AD

emphasizes the importance of having an opportunity to take on a leadership position (and get to know the president!), something much less common at other institutions. IC confirms that this identification of what makes Puget Sound special is very much a part of the conversation. We must crystallize this product differentiation into messaging. Critical thinking, ability to be empathic, and working in a group are some examples of things we do better than competitors. He mentions a book by former Northeastern University President Joseph Aoun (*Robot-Proof: Higher Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*) and the future of a distinctive education, which includes students who are data literate and the role of human literacy (termed “humanics” by Aoun) which includes communication and writing skills.

6. Discussion of strategies for streamlining faculty service

AK introduces the topic in two parts which are attached: (I.) a list of ideas (both from the faculty senate retreat in January and from AK) for streamlining faculty service; and, (II.) transparency for service assignments, beyond standing committee assignments. AK mentions categories for faculty service survey that goes out every year. Faculty Senate executive committee sits down with deans and parses out who goes where based on preferences, sabbaticals, and diverse representation across committees. But others committees, such as the Graduate Fellowships Advisory Committee (GFAC) submit a list of who will be on GFAC, which limits the pool of faculty available for other assignments. Bylaws also dictate minimum number of faculty members who must serve on each standing committee. Do we want to say that any ad hoc service should have to be approved by the faculty senate? This would increase transparency and create service opportunities for those made aware of such opportunities.

KB says every interdisciplinary department has an advisory committee. Each one submits a list of faculty to serve. There are cohort mentors. Many examples of these types of opportunities. The question may be: how much do faculty get to make decisions and say yes to service, versus how much goes through the assignment process? AK agrees that this is the question. How can we streamline this process to prevent creep?

AK begins with Part I. The big picture: Make visible certain kinds of service. A discussion of service can be incorporated into a discussion of a move to a 3:2 teaching load. AK introduces each idea in the Part I. heading point by point. For example, “advisory” committees typically have no actionable power (only “advising”), but it may be beneficial to group together into one faculty advisory board across many areas. Could we do some intentional work to shrink down service?

PW comments on SR’s e-mail response (to AK, also attached). Are those being asked to do more service “the usual suspects”? He thinks this is a bigger issue than the recurring assignment issues. SR is concerned that if serving as a department chair or associate chair counts as university service, this means these individuals could avoid being connected to the university more broadly.

KJ follows that we need to consider or systematize how chairs are selected and maintained. Survey results show that some people do retain chairships for longer periods of time, while others avoid serving altogether. RJ describes the broader exercise on streamlining service as an effort to give each assignment its home. What are the things we think faculty should be doing on this campus? When do faculty need to step back? AK points out the paradox in faculty wanting input on many

things across campus but also not wanting to be overextended. AD notes that a change regarding the ASUPS advisor may require a change to ASUPS bylaws. Kena Fox-Dobbs supports the advisory board model as an excellent way to streamline faculty service, providing faculty more choice and increased flexibility on timing issues. RJ mentions that the senate plays similar roles to these advisory boards. What would distinguish each of these advisory boards from the senate in “signing off” on policies? KFD replies that they co-exist.

Kelli Delaney asks us to keep in mind (especially for GFAC) that the Office of Fellowships looks for a particular collection of faculty incorporating a range of faculty experience and diverse academic fields. This is an important part of GFAC service. AK confirms that GFAC service would necessarily include input from the fellowships office.

Back to the question of making sure faculty know what service opportunities are even available to them. KB notes that the senate chair and the dean can put whatever they want on the list of service assignments for the faculty service survey. She also introduces a question: what are faculty willing to let deans do? What do faculty want to keep their hands on?

BB asks what counts as a service assignment. He notes that the FAC determines that standards for adequate service have been met, and that moreover, contractual expectations to “serve” are ambiguous. KB confirms that she interprets service broadly. AK mentions the ambiguity of “counting” service for duties for which course released are granted.

JK asks what is the goal of this exercise? Is it to determine with more transparency who is doing what? To more fairly allocate service assignments? To create a better system for determining what counts?

PW asks if we are considering estimating hours per service assignment. AK comments that the at this time, there are people who lock themselves into relatively easy positions which “count” as service. Why does this happen? Is this a fair distribution of service?

7. Other Business

None.

8. Adjournment

Adjourned at 1:30pm.

Minutes prepared by Andrew Monaco.

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Upcoming ASUPS events as shared by Amanda Diaz:

Events:

- The Pine and the Cherry: Japanese Americans in Washington
Tuesday Feb 20th, 6pm-8pm in the Rotunda
Independent writer and curator who has focused on Asian/Pacific American history talks about her familial connection to Executive Order 9066.
- Japanese American Incarceration in the South Sound
Wednesday 12pm-1pm in the Rotunda
Campus wide event about South Sound's history with Japanese American Incarceration and the Puyallup Assembly Center
- Contemporary Queerness: Why Queer Theory is for Everyone with Shawn Mendez
Thursday February 22nd from 5pm-6pm in Smith Lounge
What is queer? What is queer theory? Why and for whom does it matter?
- Board of Trustees
10:00 a.m. on Friday, Feb. 23 in Tahoma Room
- Senior Wine Night with the Board of Trustees
Wine tasting through Prof. Pierre Ly
Wednesday, February 21st 5:30-7pm
Oppenheimer Cafe
- CWLT Students of Color Study Hour
Every Wednesdays at 8pm the CWLT (Howarth 105)
- Green Fee and Expressions Fund!
Looking for a way to find additional funding for any project? Apply for the Green Fee and Expressions Fund for ASUPS to help make your project a reality! The due dates for these applications are Feb 2nd, March 9, and April 6th. Please contact Julia Lin, ASUPS Director of Student Interest at asupsdsi@pugetsound.edu

Discussion of streamlining faculty service, communicated by Alisa Kessel

- I. Proposals to streamline (and render visible) faculty service
 - 1) Count chair and associate chair positions toward service requirements [COST: 48-64]
 - 2) Decrease the number of faculty who serve on the IEC to 5 (and correspondingly change the number of student reps to 1 and eliminate the Dean of Students position to ensure a faculty majority on the committee [NET: 2]
 - 3) Create a Faculty Advisory Board to replace some standing advisory committees: 6-8 members who provide faculty advice (possibilities might include Technology Services, the Library, the Dean of Students, or the Sustainability Advisory Committee) [NET: 5-7]

- 4) Reimagine Committee on Diversity in relation to existing structure (DAC) and with clear ties to faculty governance [No net change]
- 5) Create a Speaker Series Advisory Council: a 6-8 member advisory council that would provide faculty input on the various campus speaker series: Pierce, Brown & Haley, Swope, Chisholm, Honorary Degree, Dolliver, Chism, etc. [COST: 4-6]
- 6) Create an ASUPS Advisor and cluster ASUPS positions into one (ASUPS rep, Union Board, Media Board, Honor Court, *The Trail* and KUPS) [NET: 2]
- 7) Beginning in 2019-2020 (?), reduce membership on ELFAB from 7 to 5 [NET: 2]
- 8) Pair Board reps for ASAC and DARC with standing committees or Faculty Senate assignments [NET: 2]
- 9) Pair student publication positions with other positions (such as director/associate chair positions) [NET: 3]
 - Wetlands*—Director of Gender and Queer Studies
 - Crosscurrents*—Associate Chair of English
 - Elements*—Associate Chair of Biology/Chemistry

II. Do we want to set clear guidelines for the creation of “additional service”/ad hoc committees/persistent non-standing committees, so that those are routed through the normal means of service assignments? [Elise’s question from the faculty meeting]

E-mail response to Alisa Kessel by Siddharth Ramakrishnan

With regards to faculty service ... I went to three meetings last week and seemed to interact with the same set of people

1 Are we forming cliques by calling upon 'friends/usual suspects' to serve on committees with us?

2 Are there faculty out there who wish to contribute but are just not called upon (I know we are adults and we need to put ourselves out there, but we also face imposter syndrome and may not even be aware of some things happening around us)

3 Will such a redistribution allow for more equitable faculty service

4 Is this all bunkum and are some faculty just happy to take a back seat (still doing their required service) while others plug away with self imposed extra service? (Not to blame anyone, maybe the former are wise).

--

Siddharth Ramakrishnan, PhD