

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 27, 2020
Minutes

Present: Julia Looper, Jung Kim, Sara Freeman, Chris Kendall, Megan Gessel, Laura Behling, Matt Warning, Mike Pohl, Luc Boisvert, Tiffany MacBain, Steven Zopfi, Alison Tracy Hale, Janet Marcavage, Jennifer Hastings, John Hanson, Gareth Barkin, Jairo Hoyos Galvis, Heather White, Heather Bailey, Garret Milam, Andrew Monaco, Carrie Woods, Sarah Moore

- I. **Call to Order** – Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:01 pm. Given that this meeting was being conducted online, Freeman clarified that the chat bar would be part of the meeting minutes and asked for permission to record the meeting. Senators had no objections to the recording.
- II. **Announcements:** Freeman congratulated and thanked all newly-elected members to committees (e.g., Senate, FAC) including ASUPS officers.
- III. **Approval of the Minutes from April 6, 2020** – Freeman asked for motion to approve the minutes of 4/6/20. She then explained several revisions to the minutes she had made as related to the MPH degree and the language for promotion to professor. M/S/P.
- IV. **End of Year Reports** – Freeman thanked all chairs for their early submission of year-end final reports. Because Senators had been asked to read all reports and post their questions about the reports prior to the meeting, Freeman noted that chairs would not review report contents but rather respond to Senators' questions.
 - A. **Faculty Salary Committee** – (presented by John Hanson, Garret Milam)
 1. Hanson noted that any reduced enrollments stemming from COVID-19 effects and subsequent impact on faculty salary will likely be something the committee will need to address next year and, possibly, years to follow. Milam also noted that total compensation, not just salary, was an issue that had been brought to the committee's attention.
 2. Freeman asked whether the committee had considered the financial tradeoff between reducing the size of the faculty versus reducing faculty salary. Milam said that the FSC might play a role in those discussions, but that this question extended beyond the purview of the FSC. He also commented that these larger issues were being taken up by a committee that President Crawford was presently convening. Hanson also pointed out that the FSC has been skilled at gathering data, but that data typically lag behind reality, a consideration that might be especially salient in the upcoming year. Monaco pointed out that the compensation philosophy language does point to how the university might consider changes to compensation during times of institutional hardship.

To provide a bit of clarification related to the President's current formation of these new committees aimed at addressing the COVID-19 effects, Freeman noted that on 4/6/20 the Senate talked about principles that could guide these broader strategic discussions as the institution seeks to respond to COVID-19 impacts. Freeman stressed that her letter describing the Senate's discussions also encouraged full access to that information by campus. (See Appendix 1.)

In addition, the Cabinet invited Senate to nominate faculty for two working groups (one for Budget and another for Operations). Behling noted that these committees will likely be established in a couple of days and that they will have complete information about enrollment, budget, etc. as they discuss both short and long-term plans. She commented that the data are changing daily and will be factored into all decision making.

3. Returning to the FSC's final report, Freeman asked if the committee had had any continued discussion about the topics of early and phased retirements. Hanson said they had been moving ahead until COVID-19 disrupted their work. He stated that they will continue their discussions next year and have been gathering input that needs to be considered (e.g., input from legal counsel).

B. Institutional Review Board (presented by Mike Pohl)

1. Responding to the Senate's pre-meeting questions, Pohl clarified that they would include a description of the change to the Bylaws and remove all mention of work with animal research in the final report.
2. Freeman then asked if there were anything going into next year that the Senate needed to monitor. Pohl said that it would be useful if Senate helped to ensure that the faculty CITI training actually gets underway next year since both he and Wendell Nakamura (current co-chairs) are rotating off the IRB. Freeman then asked who actually is responsible for ensuring that faculty complete the CITI training. Pohl said the IRB is since they should see whether the training is complete when they review the protocols. Moore and Behling added that the Associate Dean's office tracks this information as well. Pohl also suggested that mention of CITI training be added to the information received at new faculty orientation.

C. International Education Committee (presented by Matt Warning, Gareth Barkin)

1. Kendall asked how COVID-19 is affecting study abroad planning for next year and whether there were issues that need to be addressed over the summer. Barkin said that the virus has devastated study abroad, but IEC has not had much of a hand in dealing with this situation; they have discussed a few issues with Roy Robinson's office (Office of International Programs, OIP), but have played more of an advisory role. The committee has continued to approve programs for next year, hoping that they will be able to occur, but are in a "wait and see" mode. Barkin said that while the IEC is willing to help OIP, this type of committee structure may not be nimble enough to respond quickly as is required during this time.
2. Kendall then asked if the IEC played a role in helping students in their earlier-than-planned return from study abroad programs. Warning clarified that this was the work of the Office of International OIP programs. There was then some

- speculation as to how COVID might change student attitudes toward study abroad to which Warning and Barkin noted that Peace Corp interest and more general interest in study abroad has seemed to remain high.
3. Hale asked if students who had planned to study abroad in Fall, 2020 had registered for on-campus classes and housing in case their abroad plans are cancelled. Behling said they had and that the needed university offices/ personnel (e.g., Registrar) would be following up with these students.
 4. To conclude, Barkin noted that a few of the committee's charges for 2019-20 AY concerned that they liaise with other committees or offices. Although they were able to make some positive headway with a few, in other places this had worked less well (e.g., curricular reform discussions, Office of Admissions as related to international students) in part due to staffing changes. He asked that the Senate renew this charge for 2020-21.

D. Library, Media, and Information Services Committee (presented by Janet Marcavage)

1. Responding to a previously posted question, Marcavage explained that a LMIS subcommittee would meet during the summer to talk about supporting online teaching efforts that may be required in Fall, 2020. At the moment, the committee has identified the following issues for discussion: (1) possible upgrades to Canvas to allow multiple meetings, (2) supporting faculty work in detecting and helping students to avoid plagiarism now that Turn It In will no longer be available, (3) addressing the potential loss of recording Google meet sessions (originally set to be available through July 1st but since extended to the end of September), (4) asking all new students to have laptops.
2. Behling asked who might serve on the summer subcommittee to which Marcavage explained that there had been some faculty who had volunteered; LMIS thought that they would need approximately 4 faculty to join with library and TS staff.
3. Moore then asked for additional detail related to the potential loss of recording the Google meet sessions. Marcavage stated that she had some tentative information that this would begin on July 1, 2020 and would follow up with TS to gather more information.

E. Committee on Diversity (presented by Steven Zopfi, Carrie Woods)

1. Responding to a question about the ongoing difficulty associated with trying to coordinate and integrate the various diversity-related work on campus, Zopfi stated that any serious changes to improve the situation would likely need to wait until the DVP search was completed.
2. Zopfi and Woods also clarified that the COD and DAC should remain separate committees given that their charges and campus representation (i.e., primarily faculty versus broader representation) were different in several important ways.

3. To clarify a section of their final report, Woods and Zopfi provided additional explanation for the sentence of “student-faculty interactions that do not rise to Code violations.” In their discussions with BHERT, they learned that there were situations where students had been hurt or offended by a faculty remark, for example, but the offense did not technically qualify as a Code violation; however, the interaction was still hurtful and needed some type of attention. Moreover, the faculty member needed the opportunity to make amends and learn from the negative interaction, preferably in the same semester during which it occurred. Woods highlighted that this must all be done with care in order to protect the student.

Zopfi explained that management of this process is difficult for several reasons: different offices (e.g., Title IX, ADO) may receive knowledge of the complaint, depending on the type of remark. Although it is the case that some type of action is taken by the office, how and when this occurs varies by office: it may well be the perception of the student that “nothing happens” and the problem is never addressed. Kendall suggested that this is another topic that could be added to the information/discussion at new faculty orientation.

Noting the key role that a DVP plays in leading, coordinating, and integrating the work of this important topic, Freeman wondered how critical reinitiating this search was once the university’s financial landscape is better known. Zopfi replied that he thought it was essential.

F. **University Enrichment Committee** (presented by Luc Boisvert)

1. In response to a question about whether the number of applications was lower this year in the past, Boisvert replied that the data provided in the UEC’s year-end reports were missing or uneven. He also commented that several year-end reports were not available. Based on his memory however, the UEC hasn’t seen any trend-like changes during the past 3 years, though there have been some yearly fluctuations in a few areas.
2. Boisvert also clarified that money awarded does not equal the money actually used, and that tracking year-to-year spending was sometimes complicated by funds that carried over between fiscal years.

V. **Discussion of additional carry over topics related to End of Year Reports:**

A. **Use of Common Hour:** Stemming from the work that had been done to examine the use and impacts of common hour, Freeman made the following remarks:

1. With a few exceptions, the general consensus is that the common hour does not have a negative impact on course scheduling, provided that departments actually use the entire range of scheduling options.
2. In January, there had been a tentative proposal that the weekly Wednesday timeslot be used in the following manner: 1st Wed of month – full faculty meeting, 2nd Wed of month – standing committee meetings, 3rd Wed of month – faculty development programming, 4th Wed of month – standing committee meetings for

those that need to meet twice per month. Freeman clarified that the intention of this type of shift was intended to facilitate development of a more robust culture of university governance.

3. Kim questioned when departments would have their faculty meetings if this proposal were adopted to which Freeman replied that departments would need to find another time. Gessel commented that although she appreciated this proposed use of the common hour, she identified several issues of import, (a) some departments must begin teaching at 1:00 to accommodate labs, (b) anecdotally, she is aware of students encountering increased difficulty with scheduling their courses, and (c) some departments are disproportionately carrying the burden of teaching at undesirable times such as 8:00 am. She wondered when we might have an honest and frank discussion about this inequity.
 4. Freeman commented that in all of this, the Senate must determine its role in the discussions versus, say, the Registrar's Office or the ADO. She also remarked that while no decision is without some negative effects to some individuals or groups, we must strive to find a good balance between attending to departmental and university needs. Further, standing committees lose valuable time each semester in trying to simply figure out their meeting times.
 5. In summary then, no decision was made. Rather, the Senate plans to discuss this topic next year.
- B. **Faculty Development:** In conjunction with some of the UEC discussions, Freeman reviewed a few of the ideas that have been percolating vis-à-vis development of a more robust faculty development program or center (either physical or online) that brings together the varied resources available to faculty for teaching and research (e.g., CWLT, UEC funding). She reminded the Senate that faculty were sent a survey last week to query them about their needs, wants, challenges, and opportunities. These data will be analyzed and interpreted next year.
- C. **Summer Subcommittee Work:** Recapping Kendall's concern, Freeman explained that the rules about posting minutes and when committee action becomes official (i.e., 30 class days from when the committee posts the minutes) could either hamper or be at odds with the work of the summer subcommittees. At present, some standing committees will meet in the fall to vote on meeting minutes from Spring, 2020. This may mean that action taken by committees at the end of this academic year may not become official until September or October, 2020.

MacBain questioned the need for the Senate to authorize summer committee work and voiced a reluctance to encourage summer committee work beyond 2020; Freeman commented that summer work had been undertaken in the past when needs were pressing (e.g., SSI course development). The current COVID-19 pandemic requires a similar type of pressing need to consider curricular and technological changes that may be required to support Fall, 2020 academic programming.

Freeman moved that the Senate give authority to such summer subcommittee work with the understanding that the full committee will review any summer work: M/S/P

Motion: The Senate calls on the CC and the LMIS to create subcommittees to ensure continuity of operations over the summer months.

- D. **Faculty Code Changes related to Professor Promotion:** Owing to the COVID-19 disruption and the subsequent inability to return to the conversation about potential Code changes connected to the language related to promotion to Professor, the Senate passed two motions. Both motions were related to stopping the process that is currently underway and were intended to delay the conversation until the faculty is in a better position to have such discussion.

Motion: Faculty Senate approves withdrawing the timeline motion for the promotion language Code change from the full faculty meeting agenda. M/S/P

Motion: Faculty Senate moves to stop the approved change to the promotion language in the Faculty Code (voted on at January 22, 2020 faculty meeting) from going to the Board of Trustees for the Board's consideration. M/S/P

- VI. **Reflections from MPH comment period on Canvas:** In advance of the faculty meeting scheduled for 4/29/20, Freeman asked Senators if there were any concerns about bringing this proposal forward; there were none noted. Behling then asked Freeman to review the process going forward. Freeman clarified that there had been a motion to approve the MPH by the CC. At Wednesday's faculty meeting, MPH committee members will have a chance to speak to it; following, there will be the chance for faculty to speak for or against the motion. The proposal will then come to a faculty vote after the meeting via a Qualtrics survey.
- VII. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:32. The next Senate meeting is scheduled for 5/4/20.

Submitted, Sarah Moore

Appendix 1

Letter to President Crawford from Faculty Senate Chair, April 13, 2020

Dear Isiaah:

After discussion with the Senate at our April 6 meeting, consideration of conversation on the Faculty Governance list, and my own reflection, I am providing this input. I have shared a draft of this with Senate, and Senators have generously helped me shape these points.

The most important point to emerge from Senate discussion **is a call to create a faculty-staff governance committee** to collaborate in the off-cycle budget and operational decisions that may need to be made so we can think holistically (though rapidly) about our programs and their future. There was strong interest in this committee being separate from but in consultation with the Budget Task Force, the Faculty Salary Committee, and the Senate. This is because there is a desire for a faculty-centered committee that will not be constrained by the need to ‘stay in its lane’ and speak only to one aspect of our functioning so that creative solutions can emerge that might cross the usual lines within our labor structures, such as job sharing, temporary redistributions, or other type of work re-imaginings that would allow us to come together to protect the liberal arts nature of the institution, as well as the livelihood of as many people in our community as possible.

A separate committee would also make a bit of space for the Senate to preserve its integrity related to its role (as outlined in the Code) when or if tough decisions are made that may have a negative impact on some of our colleagues. The Senate must retain its role of speaking against decisions if needed and giving voice to any colleagues who feel they have been harmed.

In response to your two questions in your original email:

Question 1: From the faculty/staff perspective, would you recommend any revisions, additions or removals from the summary of guiding principles as we consider dual-track planning and any necessary budget reductions in this very challenging and uncertain environment? Would you prioritize certain principles over others?

Among the principles listed, I would put absolute and maximum importance on the first two (“Maintain centrality to mission and adherence to Puget Sound’s core values” and “Preserve quality of educational experience for students”). I see already in your leadership that these are the lodestars.

I would put next emphasis on “encourage the innovative deployment of resources.” I urge us to “balance the budget with long-term benefits in mind” and I would like to encourage that in adhering to that value we might deemphasize or temporarily take off the list some of the other values. In this situation being too responsive to economic and

market conditions may cause us to cut off our nose to spite our face; and to focus too much on competitiveness in the higher education market in the short term might cause us to do undue damage to our liberal arts model. Likewise, the forward movement of the strategic plan may need to have a longer timeline and not drive some of the off cycle budget decisions.

As I look at the University's Core Values, I would rank **Courage**, **Respect** and **Inclusion** as the top three for us to embrace while we engage in dual-track planning around the Covid-19 crisis. **Creativity** would come next, especially as regards our support of contingent faculty and staff during this period. **Shared sacrifice** comes up as an important value to faculty and this whole community, but with the note that many have felt at previous times when that value has been invoked, such as during the 2008 financial crisis, that the sacrifice made by the administration was not equal to the sacrifice made by the faculty. It is important that the choices we make are equitable, which means attending to the way in which budget decisions impact members of our community differently, even when 'on paper' certain cuts and reductions appear to be the same.

In the Senate meeting on April 6, the other values to emerge were:

- Transparency during all phases and at all levels
- Full access to information
- Commitment to offering a curriculum that represents our full liberal arts values, across disciplines.

Question 2: What do you see as the key areas of input needed from faculty and staff leadership to inform our decision-making?

Key areas where input is needed:

- The duration of remote operations and the date for return to in-person operations
- Policies regarding work from home and technical access and support
- Changes to any aspect of compensation
- Actions related to the employment of contingent faculty
- Actions related to the retention or layoff of staff members
- The development of any new initiatives or consolidation of existing programs in light of the crisis

There is also strong support among Senate for student input to inform decision-making.

Finally, I will highlight the adaptive, forward-thinking ideas that faculty are putting forth on the Faculty Governance list, especially from Gwynne Brown, Lisa Wood, and David Sousa. There is ample evidence that faculty are ready and willing to help address the impacts of the crisis for our operations in creative, mutually supportive ways. This strengthens the call for a consultative committee.

Thank you for your partnership and focus during this truly upending public health crisis.
Sara