

## **Senate Meeting Minutes, February 4, 2008**

Senators present: Beck, Bristow, Cannon (Chair), Foster, Hanson, Holland, Hutchinson, McCullough, Saucedo, Segawa, Singleton, Swinth

Visitors: Bill Beardsley, Alyce DeMarais, Iphie Jun, Sherry Mondou, Sarah Moore (for Kris Bartanen), Bryan Smith

Chair Cannon called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

### **I. Approval of Minutes of December 10, 2007**

The minutes of the December 10, 2007 senate meeting were approved as distributed.

### **II. Announcements**

Chair Cannon introduced new Senators Jim McCullough, Rob Hutchinson, Yvonne Swinth, and Leslie Saucedo all of whom agreed to serve one semester terms replacing Senators on leave.

### **III. Special Orders**

Nothing special.

### **IV. Reports of Committee Liasons**

Bristow reported on a recent email from Academic Standards Committee Chair Mike Spivey requesting that the Senate charge the Curriculum Committee with requiring discussion of academic honesty in all first-year seminars. (See attachment).

Segawa noted that the Orientation Planning Committee is consulting with the Academic Standards Committee regarding this and other issues.

Foster reported that the Professional Standards Committee has created language regarding the review of three-year visiting appointments. This language will appear in the buff document.

### **V. Possible Agenda Items for Spring Semester**

Cannon distributed a list of possible agenda items for the Senate's consideration during the Spring Semester. (See attachment). Discussion ensued and eventually concluded with Cannon's request that each Senator send to him on or before Monday, February 11 prioritized agenda items and some indication of the length of Senate time each item might require. Cannon also invited the submission of any additional agenda items not appearing on his initial list.

Cannon reviewed the means by which individual Senate members can move the agenda forward by making motions and by calling questions.

## **VI. The Budget Task Force Report**

Sherry Mondou, with the assistance of Budget Task Force (BTF) members Bill Beardsley and Bryan Smith, presented the BTF Report. (See full Budget Task Force Report at: [http://www2.ups.edu/financeadmin/budget\\_recommendations\\_0809.pdf](http://www2.ups.edu/financeadmin/budget_recommendations_0809.pdf)).

Hanson asked about the recommendation for a sizable increase in the study abroad budget. Mondou explained that ever greater numbers of students are participating in study abroad and that when students participate in Partners Programs they take their UPS financial aid with them and UPS pays all direct program costs. She also noted that students choose among the programs, Partners versus Approved, so as to minimize the costs to themselves. These choices also maximize the costs to UPS as students with little financial aid select Approved Programs (resulting in lost tuition dollars to UPS) and students who receive substantial financial aid select Partners program (resulting in high costs to UPS in the form of financial aid and direct program costs).

Foster asked by what percent the Study Abroad program funding has grown over the years.

Mondou referred Foster to Jannie Meisberger for the precise numbers.

DeMarais noted that the Long Run Planning Model anticipates the need for an increasing study abroad budget as student participation increases.

McCullough asked about the financial consequences of this year's enrollment shortfall.

Mondou suggested that a higher retention rate has partially compensated for the 31 student under enrollment but added that UPS had to discount heavily to yield even 630 some students – consuming an additional \$.5 million in financial aid for this and the next three years.

McCullough wondered if there had been any thought given to the idea of increasing the size of the incoming class to compensate for more students choosing to study abroad.

Mondou indicated that the size of the incoming class was increased recently from 650 to 675 for just that reason.

Holland requested information regarding requests that were not funded. She wanted a better understanding of the pain associated with the budgeting process.

Mondou indicated that most of the pain is associated with unfunded compensation requests but that she would be happy to provide more information regarding unfunded requests in future reports.

Holland asked about health care expenses and how individual faculty might provide input into the decision-making around health care. Holland also asked about the possibility of partnering with other universities as a means of reducing expenses.

Mondou noted that there were serious legal hurdles to partnering but that this possibility could be reconsidered. Mondou noted that the last Benefits Task Force reinforced the principle that UPS will fully fund the health care premium for each individual employee. She also noted that the BTF's current recommendations include funds for increasing income eligibility for an allowance subsidy from \$40,000 to \$60,000 thereby easing some of the financial burden on some UPS employees and their families.

Holland requested an open meeting where individuals could discuss benefits related issues.

Mondou noted in closing that the tuition increase recommended by the BTF would continue to place UPS at or below the median among our Northwest Peer institutions. Mondou requested that any feedback regarding the report be sent directly to President Thomas.

Singleton asked Mondou about the current discount rate at UPS relative to our Northwest Peers.

Mondou responded that the discount rate at UPS is currently in the mid 30s compared to the mid 40s at peer institutions though Willamette was recently over 50%.

Foster asked is there was an association between the discount rate and retention.

Mondou responded that she was not aware of any evidence regarding that association but that there exists a clear association between financial need and low retention – those with the greatest need have the lowest retention rates.

## **VII. Recommended Code Changes (Status Report)**

Hanson reported on the 1<sup>st</sup> reading at the last full faculty meeting of the suggested changes to the Faculty Code forwarded from the Senate. Hanson suggested that a small group of faculty “brainstorm” with him regarding comments received during the faculty meeting. Hanson would then redraft some of language to reflect the input.

Foster and Bristow volunteered to help John in this regard.

## **VIII. Faculty Role in Diversity Objectives**

Bristow presented a proposal from the Diversity Committee suggesting a restructuring of the Diversity Committee. (See Attachment)

Hanson made the following motion: The Senate encourages the Diversity Committee to develop a full proposal regarding the restructuring of the Diversity Committee and to present that proposal to the Senate by the end of the current academic year. The motion was seconded.

Beck expressed concern about the additional levels of bureaucracy the proposed restructuring would entail.

Foster proposed that concurrent processes should take place within the Staff Senate and ASUPS with clear descriptions of the standing charges to each Diversity Committee.

Singleton encouraged the Diversity Committee to clarify the role of the administration within the proposed new structure.

Hanson's motion passed unanimously.

The Senate adjourned at 5:32.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ross C. Singleton

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate  
Possible Items for Spring Semester  
February 4, 2008

- (1) Determine how the faculty and its standing committee can best serve university objectives on diversity  
See reverse for a message from Nila Wiese, Chair of Senate Diversity Committee
- (2) In cooperation with the president and the secretary of the faculty, consider scheduling faculty meetings for the coming year in advance, to facilitate greater participation  
Scheduled for February 18
- (3) Consider nominees for 2008 honorary degrees  
Scheduled for February 18
- (4) Revive prior research on revising Course Evaluation forms
- (5) Advise the Dean on practices concerning teaching awards and the designation of Distinguished Professor
- (6) Adopt By-Laws revision for electronic voting
- (7) Review Faculty Code language concerning evaluation for tenure earlier than the customary sixth year
- (8) Discuss further revisions to the Faculty Code drawn from the earlier Ad Hoc Committees on Evaluation and on the Professional Standards Committee
- (9) Settle on a policy regarding ownership of and rights to intellectual property created by faculty
- (10) Decide whether the increased frequency and expense of study abroad justifies a permanent standing committee devoted to international education.

- (11) Discuss how to meet the needs of faculty for professional travel to academic conferences.
- (12) Reach for greater uniformity among departments and better consensus among faculty as to standards of professional growth

From Nila Wiese to Douglas Cannon, February 4

I wanted to update you on where we are regarding the Curriculum Committee's discussion on its role, structure, and functions. After various meetings, we feel that the Committee should re-evaluate its structure first, and then revise its bylaws to reflect the needs and concerns of various constituencies as well as the University's appointment of a Chief Diversity Officer and its commitment to diversity as stated in the strategic plan. So, we are suggesting creating three committees on diversity under the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and ASUP.

These three committees could undertake concerns and initiatives in line with the groups they serve. Each of these committees would then appoint 2-3 representatives to an Advisory Board that would work directly with the Chief Diversity Officer. We believe this structure would be a better way of serving the needs of individual groups while addressing the issue of diversity at the University level. The CDO and the Advisory Board would be able to coordinate, implement, and monitor campus-wide initiatives related to diversity.

We would like to hear back from the Faculty Senate as to whether this proposal could move forward at this time. If so, the Diversity Committee will approach the Staff Senate and ASUPS to get their input on whether they would be interested in entertaining and adopting this structure and responsibilities. We would be happy to attend one of the Faculty Senate meetings when your agenda allows it to provide a full report of our progress. In the meantime, the Committee would like to hear a general response indicating whether or not we can move forward in exploring and developing a full-proposal to present to the Faculty Senate at a later time.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mike Z Spivey

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 4:27 PM

To: Nancy K Bristow

Subject: ASC meeting today

Nancy,

Today the ASC voted to recommend to the Senate that the Senate charge the curriculum committee with requiring a discussion of academic honesty in all first-year seminars (WR and SI) in both fall and spring semesters. The context is the ASC's continuing discussion of academic honesty. The ASC feels that the university needs to make sure that all first-year students are made aware of what academic honesty entails - both in general and in specific disciplinary contexts (hence the inclusion of the SI seminars). (After conversation with people involved with Prelude we decided Prelude was not an appropriate venue.) The ASC is also considering updating the academic handbook and supporting creation of a web-based academic honesty quiz, but we haven't made any definite decisions on those yet.

If you have any questions about this please feel free to ask.

Best,

Mike

Michael Z. Spivey

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science University of Puget  
Sound Tacoma, Washington 98416