

Faculty Senate Meeting
March 10, 2014
McCormick Room

Present: Kriszta Kotsis, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Cynthia Gibson, Ariela Tubert, Kris Bartanen, Andrea Kueter, Alisa Kessel, Mike Segawa, Haley Andres, Eric Hopfenbeck, Nila Wiese, Brad Dillman.

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:04.

Announcements:

Kotsis announced that two exhibitions opened today at Kittredge Gallery. The show by Sandow Birk is entitled the "American Qur'an." Birk is the last artist in the visiting artist series that the Art Department hosted this year; he will be on campus for a week in mid-April. The second exhibition presents the work of John Arsenault. The opening reception is scheduled for Wed., March 12, 5-7 p.m.

Hopfenbeck announced that the ASUPS elections will be taking place this week. He will serve as ASUPS president until April 16, after which the new president will attend the meetings of the senate.

Approval of the minutes:

Before the approval of minutes of 2/24/2014 Bartanen stated that she had put together a document that provides answers for some of the questions that were not answered at the 2/24 meeting. She wondered how to introduce this document into the senate minutes. It was decided that the document would be added as appendix to the meeting of 3/10 and that we would discuss it under Old Business at our current meeting.

Wiese noted that Warning had added two comments to the draft of the minutes of 2/24/2014 which had not been included in the text of the meeting minutes. One of the comments provided correction to what was said at the 2/24/2014 meeting. It was agreed that the discussion of these comments would be introduced under Old Business during the current meeting.

M/S/P: The minutes for 2/24/2014 were approved with minor modifications.

Old Business:

M/S/P to deal with Old Business.

The conversation regarding the additional information from Bartanen and Warning in relation to the report of the FSC continued. Bartanen explained that she put together a response to questions that were asked during the last senate meeting in relation to the Faculty Salary Committee's report. She created a folder on SoundNet where all faculty members have access to this document. It was agreed that the document will also be attached to the current minutes of the senate meeting as Appendix 1.

Wiese explained that Warning's comments which had been submitted during the review of the draft of the minutes for the 2/24/2014 meeting provide clarification and correction of information that was shared at the meeting. It was agreed that these comments will be added as Appendix 2 to the minutes of 3/10/2014.

Liaison Reports:

Kessel reported that the ad hoc committee on sexual violence has solicited feedback from the faculty through Faculty.coms and that it received useful information. At the next faculty meeting, Krystle Cobian will give a short presentation outlining the reporting obligations of the faculty in the case of suspected sexual violence.

Tubert reported that the Faculty Governance Survey is under way and that 68% of faculty have started it, but only 43% had completed it. She encouraged faculty members to fill out the survey which will be closing on Friday, March 14. She also mentioned that reminders about the survey would be sent to all members of the faculty.

Stockdale reported about the ad hoc committee's work on reviewing the Connections core area. They have met three times; the committee members are Stockdale, Ostrom, and Nealey-Moore. They are in the process of assessing the results of institutional surveys that asked questions about the Connections area. They are developing ideas that would help enhance faculty expertise in this area with particular attention to the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary nature of such courses; this may come in the form of a Teagle Grant that would support faculty to make connections with colleagues in other departments and seek advice and help on elements of the material that require expertise outside the particular faculty member's area (e.g., in syllabus development; assignments, etc.)

Sampen reported that the UEC is in the process of discussing the faculty scholarship award. They will be presenting their proposal to Dean Bartanen shortly.

Kotsis reported that she sought clarification from the chair of LMIS, Denise Despres about LMIS's position on whether or not to move forward with electronically administered faculty evaluation files and student evaluations. Despres wrote in an e-mail that: "The LMIS committee felt that the legwork for electronic faculty evals needed to be done by the PSC; that committee needs to find out what faculty anxieties about this process might be, what different models appeal to the faculty, what sort of implementation is best. Then, the LMIS can move ahead on the technical side to determine what is possible, what resources are necessary, and how long it might take." Bartanen noted that PSC is focusing on the submission of faculty evaluation files in electronic form right now and will address the administration of student evaluations electronically at a later time (perhaps next year).

Kotsis also mentioned that LMIS heard a report during their 2/7/2014 meeting on the status of Sound Ideas from Ben Tucker who explained that there are 3910 records (1100 from faculty) in the repository and that 150,000 downloads have taken place. LMIS also received a report from Travis Nation and William Morse about their presentation of PeopleSoft at the faculty meeting; they reminded the committee that it is important to remember that we have completed the implementation phase but that we are in the configuration phase, which will take some time. LMIS also discussed the communication plan for the upcoming Shared Integrated Library System which will go live in June 2014. An overview of the Shared Integrated Library System Migration is provided as Appendix 3.

Kueter noted that the number of downloads from Sound Ideas indicates that our repository is working successfully. A question was raised about how the library will collect faculty scholarship more efficiently. Bartanen stated that newly published scholarship will be collected along with the call for information for the booklet on faculty scholarship that takes place each summer. Kueter also added that while the process mentioned by Bartanen will allow the collection of new scholarship, liaison librarians have or will approach faculty members to collect publication lists and when appropriate, to collect copies of already published materials to include in Sound Ideas; this process, however, will be carried out in phases.

Consideration of the Academic Standards Committee's revision of the policy on course withdrawal:

Saucedo explained that they carried out this work in response to a senate charge to ASC, which stated: "Clarify, and if necessary, amend the current policies regarding a student's right to privacy when asked to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' in order to receive a 'W' from an instructor when withdrawing from a course during weeks 7-12 of the semester." The draft of the new policy is attached as Appendix 4. Saucedo highlighted the most important changes to the policy and stated that the ASC is asking for input before they move forward with finalizing the policy. Saucedo noted that the committee went beyond the charge and offers a complete revamping of the policy on withdrawal. Saucedo provided the following summary of the changes:

- 1) The WF "default" starts at week 11 instead of week 7.
- 2) There is no longer 2 different scenarios as to how to petition a WF (previously one for 7-12 week granted by the instructor and another after the 12th week granted by the ASC)
- 3) Petition for a W instead of a WF for exceptional circumstances now always goes directly to the ASC instead of through the instructor (though the instructor can provide input).
- 4) Petition for a W instead of a WF no longer requires that the student had been receiving a passing grade (but they need to have exceptional circumstances that prevented a passing grade).

After week 11 the petition for withdrawal will go to the ASC but the instructor can provide input. A student can ask that an advocate speaks on her/his behalf for privacy reasons in order to establish the legitimacy of exceptional circumstances.

Kessel noted that prior to week 11 the faculty member can give a W or WF but that after week 11 the process is in the hands of ASC. Stockdale emphasized that this gives students five extra weeks to decide about withdrawal. It was also noted that students no longer need to have a passing grade in a course in order to be able to withdraw with a W; this would be possible, for example, in cases where a student experiences a medical or other condition that seriously impacts his/her performance for an extended period of time, hence leading to a non-passing grade.

Kessel wondered whether this change in policy benefits the students, particularly for example if a student struggles. Would this prolong the inevitable? Saucedo noted that both Brad Tomhave and Debbie Chee, who work closely with students, were in favor of the new policy. Saucedo also explained that in some courses (e.g., chemistry) 25% of students may fail the first exam which may prompt students to drop the course, however, professors work hard to convey to students that it is possible to improve on their performance in such courses and that it is possible to do well in the course despite a poor first exam; it is thought that it is good for students to have the opportunity to try to improve their performance in a class. Stockdale also noted that the additional time students would get with the new policy gives students an opportunity to receive their midterm grade before they make a decision about withdrawal.

Stockdale also wondered about the procedural aspects of this revised policy: when will the 30 day clock begin? Saucedo responded that ASC will approve the revised policy and then the 30 day clock will apply. Dillman noted that ASC is seeking our input to see if we have any objections to the proposed policy. The general consensus was that the senate did not object to the proposed policy. Kessel and Saucedo noted that it may be useful to highlight more clearly in the policy how it benefits students.

Consideration of the policy adopted jointly by the ASC and Curriculum Committee regarding simultaneously-earned baccalaureate degrees

Saucedo noted that the Dual Degree Requirements were developed by ASC and CC based on senate charge # 2 to ASC: "Review the wisdom of a policy change, in consultation with the Curriculum

Committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.” The proposed policy is attached as Appendix 5.

Dillman explained that if we endorse this policy in our current meeting then it can become effective immediately, which would allow the Office of the Registrar to designate dual degrees for students who are graduating this spring. Since there are several such students this is an important action the senate may take.

Bartanen noted that this policy applies to students who have completed 40 units. Wiese asked for clarification as to whether the new policy allowed students to complete two degrees at the same time. Tubert wondered about the advantages of this policy. Andres noted that it could benefit students who major in such different areas as biology and studio art; this policy would allow the earning of both a B.S. and a B.A. degree if the student elected to do so. Sampen and Wiese emphasized that having two degrees is an advantage for applications to graduate schools and that this policy will likely have an impact on the type of students we may recruit, namely students who may have strength in two different fields and who could earn dual degrees by taking an extra eight units. Mifflin wondered how was it possible that earning 8 units constitutes a whole second degree. Dillman noted that the possibility of earning a dual degree may be beneficial for students who come in with many AP credits, enticing them to stay longer and complete two degrees, rather than graduating a semester early. During the discussion, it was also clarified that this policy only applies to earning two different degrees, namely a B.S. or B.A., for example. Wiese noted that it may be important to explicitly state that the policy only applies to different degrees (e.g., B.S. vs. B.A.) so that we do not set up false expectations for students. Stockdale also mentioned that our faculty members wish to preserve the different types of degrees that students can earn at our institution, while Bartanen emphasized that we are not talking about double majors but two separate Baccalaureate degrees.

Saucedo moved to endorse the proposed policy of the ASC on dual degree requirements.

Andres noted that this change will be welcomed by students. Tubert, Sampen, and Wiese believed that being able to earn dual degrees will be a valuable asset for recruiting strong students.

M/S/P the ASC’s policy regarding simultaneously-earned dual baccalaureate degrees.

Follow-up Discussion on Student Life Committee Charges

Dillman indicated that at the last senate meeting some senators felt further discussion of the SLC’s preliminary end-of-year report was needed, especially about the charge related to conducting a review of the Counseling, Health and Wellness Services (CHWS).

Segawa noted that the SLC felt this was beyond their level of expertise and scope of responsibilities. In addition, the CHWS is subject to an external review every five years, and thus a review by the SLC seemed redundant. Dillman asked when the next review was due; Segawa indicated it will happen within the next two years.

Dillman asked for further clarification on whether the SLC felt they would not be able to achieve this task given time constraints. Segawa noted that in addition to time, some elements of the charge had become moot points; for example, assessing the effects of the CHWS’ fee that was implemented a couple of years ago is now mute given this year’s implementation of the affordable health care act. Kessel noted that although points (a) and (b) of the charge have resolved themselves, point (c) has not, and that this issue is relevant to the faculty. She asked if it made sense to re-write the charge regarding mental health so we re-

orient the work of the SLC even if this work results in input to the external review team. For example, can the SLC help determine what information or data are needed to address this issue from the perspective of the faculty.

Dillman noted that CHWS does not seem to have adequate staffing. Kessel stated that some students need to wait up to three weeks to get an appointment with a counselor. If this is so, can the SLC help determine what the CHWS needs are in order to increase the availability of services for students and/or reduce this wait periods. Segawa explained that the CHWS uses a triage approach, and that the daily drop-in hours allow CHWS staff to assess which students need more immediate attention, and which students can wait a longer time for their next appointment. In addition, the CHWS often has to refer students to external providers. Segawa also noted that this academic year another intern has been added to CHWS staff.

Dillman asked if it was expensive for students to be referred to providers off campus. Segawa said that yes, these services were more expensive, but most students had insurance to cover them. Saucedo noted that there might be privacy concerns related to students having to rely on their parents' medical insurance for their health needs. Mifflin asked if the Affordable Care Act has helped students in this regard; Segawa responded that this could be the case, but that it was too early to estimate the effects of the ACA at this point in time.

Tubert asked if the students paid for services received through CHWS; it was stated that there were no fees for counseling. She wondered if charging a small fee for these services would allow us to hire additional staff to better meet the needs of students. Segawa responded that one of the goals of CHWS is to keep low barriers to counseling, and that although sometimes students have to wait, charging a fee may discourage some students from seeking help altogether.

Mifflin asked if the center offered group counseling. Segawa explained that this was available only for the Addicted Anonymous group, which met once a week. Andres and Hopfenbeck also noted that there are classes and group meetings on relevant subjects such as managing anxiety and stress.

Kessel asked what the faculty might do to support student's health and wellness. Segawa responded that students can be walked or sent to see a counselor during drop-in hours; at in-take, it will be determined how urgent their needs are. He noted that suicidal situations, for example, are treated differently from other mental health concerns. Saucedo stated that it would be useful for faculty to know the difficulty in getting an appointment so that when a student "needs" to miss class for an appointment, the faculty understands it is not that easy to reschedule one in a timely manner. Segawa responded that information on this is shared during new faculty orientation. Wiese noted that perhaps advisor training sessions were good opportunities to share this information or remind faculty about it.

Kessel also asked how the faculty may be guided on how to respond to student health concerns. It was stated that the student alert system is highly effective, and that if faculty don't know what to do, a call to Debbie Chee in Student Affairs is all that is needed, as Debbie Chee can identify and mobilize the resources required to assist a student. Several faculty noted that the alert system (and Debbie Chee) is in fact quite effective at handling student health and related academic concerns.

Segawa offered to take back to the SLC the question of how to make CHWS services more visible to the faculty.

Respectfully submitted by Kriszta Kotsis and Nila Wiese

March 10, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen, Dean

RE: Responses to factual questions raised in the February 24, 2014 Faculty Senate Minutes

1. What is the difference between base and total compensation?

Base is the salary for the position held (for example, the base salary for Professor 4 is \$110,318). Total compensation includes salary, any additional one-time payments, and university-paid benefits. Examples of additional one-time payments include the additional dollars allocated in December 2013; overload or summer pay; stipends for participation in Prelude, faculty development seminars, external grants, etc. University-paid benefits include medical, retirement, FICA (social security and Medicare), education benefits and other benefits as described under question 2 below. Benefit totals can vary from year to year, depending on use – e.g., someone may not elect university health insurance, someone else may receive an educational benefit – which also causes total compensation to fluctuate. In the case of the President, who is required to live on campus, a value reflecting use of the President’s house must also be reported to the IRS as a non-taxable benefit and part of total compensation. For the President and some Cabinet members, deferred compensation¹ is part of total compensation.

2. Is comparison AAUP data available for faculty salaries and for total faculty compensation?

Yes, a report is published annually of full-time faculty salaries in the March/April issue of *Academe Magazine* (2013 issue [here](#)) and both Puget Sound information and information for our Northwest and national comparison groups is provided annually to the Faculty Salary Committee by the Office of Institutional Research. Here is a table of the most recently published (2012-2013 academic year) Puget Sound information:

Average Salary Rating				Average Salary (\$1000s)					Average Compensation Rating				Average Comp (\$1000s)					Benefits as % of Salary
Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	All	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	All	
1	1	2	1*	\$104.4	\$77.4	\$63.4	\$68.7	\$83.4	1	1	2	1*	\$138.1	\$100.8	\$80.9	\$91.1	\$109.2	30.9

Definitions from the report:

Salary. This figure represents the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration.

Benefits. Benefit amounts tabulated here represent the institution (or state) contribution on behalf of the individual faculty member; the amount does not include the employee contribution. The major benefits include (a) retirement contribution, regardless of the plan’s vesting provision; (b) medical insurance; (c) disability income protection; (d) tuition for faculty dependents (both waivers and remissions are included); (e) dental insurance; (f) social security (FICA); (g) unemployment insurance; (h) group life insurance; (i) workers’ compensation premiums; and (j) other benefits with cash alternatives (for the most part, these include benefits such as moving expenses, housing, and cafeteria plans or cash options to certain benefits).

Compensation. Compensation represents salary plus institutional contribution to benefits. It is best viewed as an approximate “cost” figure for the institution, rather than an amount received by the faculty member.

Ratings of Average Salary—Each rating represents the percentile interval in which the institution’s average salary/compensation in a given rank lies (1*=95th percentile or above; 1=80th to 94.9th percentile; 2=60th to 79.9 percentile).

¹ Deferred compensation plans are often used to retain and reward key executives. Deferred compensation plans carry substantial risk of forfeiture and do not vest and are not paid out unless the executive remains employed through a particular point in time. Deferred compensation is reported in IRS schedules as unvested allocations are made and again when and if the deferred compensations vests and is paid out.

3. Did the university change its national comparison group for institutional benchmarking in order to adjust apparent relative salary position?

Puget Sound adjusted its national comparison group (as communicated in a message from Ellen Peters to chairs, directors, and deans on December 10, 2013) for the following reasons:

As you may know, Puget Sound has been using a peer group of 50 institutions, separated into the following categories: National, Next Step and Premier. In addition, we often created an additional category for our Pacific Northwest peers. Over the past year, the Office of Institutional Research has worked with the Cabinet to develop a new, smaller comparison group with whom we could more easily exchange data and that would allow us to better benchmark.

We used cluster analysis to find institutions whose data is both similar to ours and offers an appropriate range for comparison, using the following kinds of data:

- FINANCE (Endowment, Revenues, Expenses, Assets, Liabilities)
- RETENTION (First Year Retention Rate, Four, Five and Six Year Graduation Rates)
- FACULTY SALARIES (Average Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor Salaries)
- ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE (Percent FT Faculty, Percent of classes with fewer than 20 students, Percent of classes with 50 or more students)
- FINANCIAL AID (Percent of Freshmen Awarded Need-based Aid, Freshmen Percent Need Met, Average need based Freshmen Financial Aid Package, Freshmen and Undergraduate Discount Rate)
- ADMISSIONS (Cross applications, Number of Applications, Admit Rate, Yield Rate, Average Test Scores, Class Rank)
- ENROLLMENT (Number of Full time Undergraduates, Number of New Freshmen, Race/Ethnicity, Sex)

We then narrowed the group using the following criteria:

- Member of the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Data Sharing Consortium,
- One of the Pacific Northwest Five Colleges (Lewis & Clark, Willamette, Whitman, Reed, Puget Sound),
- Common Admissions overlap.

This work resulted in a list of 21 institutions (including Puget Sound). This new group includes all four Northwest peers as well as a range of regional and national institutions. All but one of these institutions are members of the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium, which will facilitate our ability to get data. This new group also includes overlap with institutions that you may already be using for comparison within your own professional networks and organizations.

Comparison institutions are: Allegheny College, Bard College, Beloit College, Connecticut College, Denison University, Dickinson College, Hendrix College, Kenyon College, Knox College, Lewis and Clark College, Linfield College, Occidental College, Pitzer College, Reed College, St. Lawrence University, St. Olaf College, Trinity University, University of Portland, Whitman College, Willamette University.

4. How does the change in comparison group impact Puget Sound's relative salary position?

Using the March/April 2013 AAUP report, I compiled in August 2013 comparison data for both the immediately prior and the current national comparison groups. I provided this information to the Faculty Salary Committee on October 21, 2013 and again on February 3, 2014.

- For the current comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 11th among 20 schools, but above the mean and median for all ranks.²

	Professor	Associate	Assistant
<i>Mean</i>	\$102,974	\$76,484	\$62,663
<i>Median</i>	\$101,350	\$75,650	\$62,650
<i>Puget Sound</i>	\$104,400	\$77,400	\$63,400

- For the immediately prior national comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 14th of 25 for professor, 15th of 25 for associate, and 13th of 25 for assistant. You can see the means and medians below.

	Professor	Associate	Assistant
<i>Mean</i>	\$104,667	\$78,017	\$63,271
<i>Median</i>	\$102,350	\$77,050	\$62,850
<i>Puget Sound</i>	\$104,400	\$77,400	\$63,400

- For the Northwest comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 4th among the 4 schools reporting to AAUP. We know that Willamette AAUP data includes law and graduate management salaries. We also know from undergraduate salary mean and median information shared among Northwest deans that Reed and Whitman outpace Puget Sound, that Puget Sound ranks above Lewis and Clark, and that we are close with Willamette (sometimes ahead, sometimes not – currently higher for professor and associate, but lower for assistant).

5. Is cost of living taken into account in considering recommendations for faculty salary pool increases?

Yes, the Budget Task Force looks at local and national CPI figures. The [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#), communicated to the campus in December 2013, explains on page 5:

For the university to remain competitive in the market, continue to function at the highest level of excellence and efficiency, and appropriately reward employees, it must maintain competitive compensation. The BTF considered many factors, including market data, inflation, family affordability, and available revenue sources, before forming its recommendation. In particular, the BTF recognized that across-the-board increases the past three years have not kept up with inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI). During that three-year period, U.S. CPI increased 6.8% and the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CPI increased 6.4%, while cumulative faculty and staff across-the-board increases were 5.4% and 5%, respectively. To the extent recommended increases this year exceed inflation (which has been low thus far, but predicted by most economists to be around 2.5% long term), it will improve the competitiveness of our market position and recognize the hard work of faculty and staff who invest significantly in the success of students and make this place a very special one.

The BTF recommends a 4.5% increase to the faculty salary pool, to fund steps and promotions within the faculty scale and also address inflation and market competitiveness. The BTF recommends a 3.5% increase to the staff salary pool to address inflation, meritorious performance, and market/equity adjustments. The BTF also recommends a 3.5% increase to the student employment budget. Lastly, the BTF recommends a fringe benefit increase of 9.32% to cover the cost of existing benefits, including a 42% increase in healthcare premiums resulting primarily from high claims experience over the past two years.

² Lewis and Clark did not report data to AAUP.

6. If the faculty wanted to change the faculty salary scale, how would we go about making the change?

The scale index has been adjusted historically by consultation between the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) and the Dean. The most recent adjustment occurred for 2005-2006. The FSC made a strong case in the FY 2006 budget process to adjust the salary index upward for associate and full professors in order to increase relative salaries for faculty members in those ranks. The FSC and I discussed this with the faculty at a [Faculty Meeting of February 7, 2005](#). The faculty passed a motion of recommendation to the Dean. Using \$80,000 allocated by the Budget Task Force and a 0.59% portion of the 3.3% overall increase in the salary pool (and after testing to make sure the adjustment was viable over forward years), we adjusted the salary index as recommended by the FSC for associate professors and achieved a portion of the index adjustment requested for full professors. We could discuss, test, and make further adjustments now or in the future, but we would need to have that process completed by early April in order to have faculty contracts ready for May 2014.

7. Why is faculty compensation not addressed in the university's current capital campaign?

The capital campaign is primarily about "capital costs" rather than operating costs—new endowment for financial aid, faculty chairs, faculty support, and capital projects (new facilities). Campaign goals include \$16 million in endowment to support faculty, including funding for faculty chairs and sabbatical leaves, in alignment with the *Defining Moments* strategic plan, Goal I: Create new faculty lines to enhance faculty recruitment and retention, strengthen targeted programs at the intersection of disciplines, and generate opportunities for faculty research and student mentoring across disciplines.

8. What is the relationship between tuition and the university's budget? See pages 2-3 of the [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#).

Approximately 80% of Puget Sound's operating revenue comes from tuition and fees:

- 62% net tuition and fees
- 17% student room and board fees
- 10% endowment income and gains distributed
- 5% contributions
- 4% other sources, including auxiliary
- 2% governmental grants and contracts

Education and General Expenses include:

- 33% faculty compensation
- 35% staff compensation
- 4% student compensation
- 28% non-compensation

Operating expenses are divided as follows:

- 53% instruction and academic support
- 18% auxiliary expenses
- 16% student services
- 13% institutional support

9. Did the university publish information about the Puget Sound faculty's recognition as among the most accessible in the nation?

Yes, see August 5, 2013 [Puget Sound is Named in The Princeton Review's "The Best 378 Colleges"](#) *College makes 2014 honor roll for "most accessible professors" and "best science lab facilities."*

10. What information has been shared, by Sherry Mondou and me, with the Faculty Salary Committee? You may access these documents on the [Faculty Conversation Soundnet](#) site (folder: 2014 Faculty Compensation)
- AAUP comparison salary data for Northwest, current national, immediate prior, and 1989-1990 northwest and national peer groups
 - Fiscal year 2006-2014 AAUP comparison data
 - Statement of Institutional Goals for the 1990s
 - Board of Trustees Compensation Committee Charter
 - Board of Trustees Executive Compensation Philosophy
 - Summary of University of Puget Sound salary increases for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 for faculty, staff, and senior officers (eight Cabinet members, including President)
 - Summary of University of Puget Sound salary increases for 2008-09 through 2013-14 for faculty, staff, and senior officers (eight Cabinet members, including President)
 - [Puget Sound's Budgeting Process](#) description
 - Principles to Guide Resource Allocation
 - [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#)
 - 2013 University of Puget Sound [Financial Report](#)
 - Educational and General operating expenses dashboard charts
 - September 2011 Five-Year Strategic Plan Update (includes 2006 Strategic Plan Analysis and 2011 update)
 - Strategic Initiatives benchmarks

I hope this information is helpful to the faculty as we consider compensation issues, and I look forward to continued meetings with the Faculty Salary Committee and others as we work together to evaluate our current compensation structure and faculty scale. Attracting, retaining, and supporting an outstanding faculty is a key tenet in our strategic plan and remains a high priority for Puget Sound.

Appendix 2 – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of 3/10/2014

Clarifications provided by Matt Warning on Draft Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting 2/24/2014

p. 3

Stockdale thanked the [faculty salary] committee for their work and asked if the committee has only been met with stonewalling concerning transparency of administrative salaries or has there been a broader discussion. Warning indicated that VP Mondou provided the “executive compensation philosophy.” Since then they have had no word. Sousa indicated that the FSC has met with Kris Bartanen who has been forthcoming with information on the structure and modeling of salaries, processes of salary determination, and aggregate data regarding salaries. (David will have to confirm on this, but the meeting he was referring to involved broader budget issues and where salaries fall within in. We didn’t get into the actual modeling or salary determination processes.)

Comment [MJW1]: An FYI: I’ve since realized that I mis-spoke: some time ago they gave us heavily-aggregated data that was not of real use to us, but was nevertheless an acknowledgement that we had asked for data. After that, requests went unanswered until the meeting we had yesterday [3/6/14] with Kris in which we were given additional aggregated data.



Collins Library

Sept 20, 2013

Shared Integrated Library System (ILS) Migration Overview for LMIS Committee

by Wade Guidry, Library Applications Administrator (wguidry@pugetsound.edu)

Collins Memorial Library has recently begun planning for a major Integrated Library System (ILS) migration, with a go-live date of June 2014. An ILS provides ERP-like functionality for the library, including cataloging, acquisitions, inventory, circulation and discovery. The library implemented its current (and first) ILS system more than 20 years ago. The existing system has been upgraded several times, but continues to be hobbled by obsolete, proprietary technologies and an outdated model of library workflows. The library currently stands at a crossroads, and must migrate to a new platform to meet the demands of library work in the 21st century. But rather than migrate to another stand-alone system, the library and its regional consortium partners have chosen a more unified and innovative vision of library systems and service.

The library stands at a crossroads, and must migrate to a new platform to meet the demands of library work in the 21st century.

37 institutions – one platform

In collaboration with Orbis Cascade Alliance partners (<http://www.orbiscascade.org>), the library has embarked on a 2-year effort that will ultimately see all 37 member libraries migrate to a single, shared ILS platform. The first cohort of member libraries migrating to the new platform went live in June 2013. Among these early adopters were the University of Washington, Willamette University, Pacific University, Linfield College, Marylhurst University and Western Washington University. Three additional cohorts of libraries will follow, going live in January 2014, June 2014 (to include Puget Sound), and January 2015, respectively. This large-scale endeavor, a first-of-its-kind shared library platform migration, has brought widespread attention from the academic library community (<http://tinyurl.com/cvsfwdw>).

Built for today's collaborative library

The new shared platform will cost individual Alliance members no more, and in many cases less, than the previous, stand-alone systems being replaced.

Ex Libris Alma + Primo (<http://www.exlibrisgroup.com>), is the next-generation platform chosen by the Alliance, following a lengthy RFI / RFP process. The product runs in a multi-tenancy, software-as-a-service (SaaS) environment built upon Oracle SQL, a Web Services architecture, and open standards. It also provides a rich, unified discovery layer for library patrons. The new shared platform will cost individual Alliance members

no more, and in many cases less, than the previous, stand-alone systems being replaced. In addition, the new shared environment enables more radical collaboration among Alliance members, in the areas of materials acquisition and sharing, inventory management, electronic resource management and discovery. The platform will allow a new, shared approach to common library work that previously occurred on a library-by-library basis.

Everyone benefits when libraries work together

For members of the Puget Sound community, the new platform will offer more seamless borrowing among Alliance partners, a richer, more unified discovery interface with access to the combined collections of all 37 member libraries, better integration with complementary campus systems, and a local library able to leverage its platform partnership with 36 other institutions of higher education to provide even better and more innovative service.

The library will report on its migration progress to LMIS and the campus community as the project proceeds. For a preview of what the new catalog interface will look like, you can visit the already migrated libraries of Willamette University

(<http://library.willamette.edu>) and Pacific University (<http://www.pacificu.edu/library>). For additional information, please contact Wade Guidry, Library Applications Administrator (wguidry@pugetsound.edu).

The platform will allow a new, shared approach to common library work that previously occurred on a library-by-library basis.

Draft of New Withdrawal Policy developed by ASC

Senate Charge to ASC:

3. Clarify, and if necessary, amend current policies regarding a student's right to privacy when asked to demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" in order to receive a "W" from an instructor when withdrawing from a course during weeks 7-12 of the semester.

Summary of changes:

- 1) The WF "default" starts at week 11 instead of week 7.
- 2) There is no longer 2 different scenarios as to how to petition a WF (previously one for 7-12th week granted by the instructor and another after the 12th week granted by the ASC)
- 3) Petition for a W instead of a WF for exceptional circumstances now always goes directly to the ASC instead of through the instructor (though the instructor can provide input).
- 4) Petition for a W instead of a WF no longer requires that the student had been receiving a passing grade (or have exceptional circumstances that prevented a passing grade).

PROPOSED LANGUAGE:

Withdrawal Grades □ Withdrawal without record on the academic transcript is permissible through the first two weeks (10 class days) of the fall and spring semesters when a student withdraws or is withdrawn by an instructor. Following this period, a Withdrawal grade of W will be assigned through the tenth week of classes when a student completes withdrawal procedures through the Registrar's Office. If, following the first two weeks, a student is withdrawn without completing withdrawal procedures, or if a student withdraws after the time allowed for a W grade, a Withdrawal Failing (WF) is automatically assigned.

During the Withdrawal Failing period (class weeks 11-15), a student may petition the Academic Standards Committee requesting withdrawal with a W grade. To support such a petition, the student must 1) have completed withdrawal procedures, 2) outline in a statement to the Committee the exceptional circumstances prompting withdrawal, and 3) provide supporting documentation of exceptional circumstances from a health care provider, counselor, Puget Sound advisor, course instructor or other university advocate. Additionally, the student may submit a statement from the course instructor regarding the student's progress in the class and, in the absence of such a statement, the Registrar's Office may solicit comments or recommendations from the instructor.

The last day of class, as listed in the academic calendar, is the last day a student may withdraw from a class. Once Reading Period begins, a student is no longer eligible to withdraw.

Withdrawal from a course after the date for withdrawal without record counts as a “course attempt.” This means if a student registers again for a course that had been assigned a W or WF grade, the student is repeating that course under the terms of the policy titled “Reregistration for the Same Course.”

During the summer session, the withdrawal process described for the fall and spring semesters applies during the following weeks: first week, drop without record; second, third, and fourth weeks, automatic W grade; fifth week and later, WF is the default grade and the Academic Standards Committee may assign a W grade in response to a student’s petition.

A student who remains registered in a class but has a poor record of attendance may be subject to the registration and withdrawal policies that allow an instructor or the Registrar to drop that student. (See the sections titled "Registration and Attendance/Participation," "Non-Attendance," and "Withdrawal from a Course/From the University.")

Students who receive withdrawal grades for all courses in a given semester must petition the Committee for re-enrollment in the University.

CURRENT LANGUAGE:

Withdrawal Grades □ Withdrawal without record on the academic transcript is permissible through the first two weeks of the fall and spring semesters when a student completes official withdrawal procedures. Withdrawal Passing (W) is granted during the third through sixth weeks of the fall and spring semesters when a student completes official withdrawal procedures. After the sixth week of the semester, Withdrawal Failing (WF) is given except as noted below.

During the seventh through twelfth weeks of the fall and spring semesters, a grade of W may be granted by the instructor only if all of the following conditions are met: (1) a student completes official withdrawal procedures and (2) there have been exceptional circumstances beyond the student's control, in which case the student must demonstrate in writing to the satisfaction of the instructor that exceptional circumstances exist, and (3) either the student's work has been of passing quality or the exceptional circumstances have prevented the student from completing work of passing quality. An instructor may assign a W grade using the Faculty Withdrawal Grade Submission Form available from the Office of the Registrar.

After the twelfth week of classes, the Academic Standards Committee may permit a grade of W to be assigned. The student must withdraw from the course and submit a petition to support a claim of exceptional circumstances. The petition must include a statement by the

course instructor on the quality of the student's work in the course. If the petition is approved, a grade of W is assigned. If the petition is denied, a grade of WF is assigned.

Completing official withdrawal procedures after the last day of regularly scheduled classes is not allowed.

A withdrawal at any point past the date for withdrawal without record counts as a “course attempt” if the student registers again for the course.

During the summer session the withdrawal process described for the fall and spring semesters applies during the following weeks: first week, drop without record; second week automatic W grade; third, fourth, and fifth weeks, WF is the automatic grade and an instructor has the authority to assign a W; after the fifth week the WF remains the automatic grade and the Academic Standards Committee assumes the authority to assign a W grade.

A student who remains registered in a class but has a poor record of attendance may be subject to the registration and withdrawal policies that allow an instructor or the Registrar to drop that student. (See the sections titled "Registration and Attendance/Participation," "Non-Attendance," and "Withdrawal from a Course/From the University.")

Dual Degree requirements developed by ASC/PSC

Senate charge:

2. Review the wisdom of a policy change in consultation with the curriculum committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

The joint subcommittee finds wisdom in plainly providing for simultaneously earned baccalaureate degrees as doing so offers students recognition for not only the completion of an additional major, but for earning at least an additional year of credit to do so. Therefore, the joint subcommittee forwards the following text for consideration by their respective committees:

Second Baccalaureate Degree

Students who wish to earn a second baccalaureate degree must complete a minimum of 8.00 additional academic and graded units in residence subsequent to the awarding of the first baccalaureate degree. Students are required to complete department requirements current as of the date of postbaccalaureate enrollment.

Each additional baccalaureate degree requires 8.00 more discrete, academic, and graded units *earned in residence*. [Italics indicate new text to further clarify second baccalaureate unit requirement.]

Simultaneous Baccalaureate Degrees

Students who wish to earn two baccalaureate degrees simultaneously must complete, in addition to the university requirements for a baccalaureate degree with two majors, a minimum of 40.00 total units and a minimum of 24.00 units, including the last 8.00 units, in residence.

For purposes of other academic policies, simultaneously earned degrees may both be considered “first” degrees.

March 10, 2014

TO: Faculty Senate Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen, Dean

RE: Responses to factual questions raised in the February 24, 2014 Faculty Senate Minutes

1. What is the difference between base and total compensation?

Base is the salary for the position held (for example, the base salary for Professor 4 is \$110,318). Total compensation includes salary, any additional one-time payments, and university-paid benefits. Examples of additional one-time payments include the additional dollars allocated in December 2013; overload or summer pay; stipends for participation in Prelude, faculty development seminars, external grants, etc. University-paid benefits include medical, retirement, FICA (social security and Medicare), education benefits and other benefits as described under question 2 below. Benefit totals can vary from year to year, depending on use – e.g., someone may not elect university health insurance, someone else may receive an educational benefit – which also causes total compensation to fluctuate. In the case of the President, who is required to live on campus, a value reflecting use of the President’s house must also be reported to the IRS as a non-taxable benefit and part of total compensation. For the President and some Cabinet members, deferred compensation¹ is part of total compensation.

2. Is comparison AAUP data available for faculty salaries and for total faculty compensation?

Yes, a report is published annually of full-time faculty salaries in the March/April issue of *Academe Magazine* (2013 issue [here](#)) and both Puget Sound information and information for our Northwest and national comparison groups is provided annually to the Faculty Salary Committee by the Office of Institutional Research. Here is a table of the most recently published (2012-2013 academic year) Puget Sound information:

Average Salary Rating				Average Salary (\$1000s)					Average Compensation Rating				Average Comp (\$1000s)					Benefits as % of Salary
Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	All	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	Prof	Asso	Asst	Inst	All	
1	1	2	1*	\$104.4	\$77.4	\$63.4	\$68.7	\$83.4	1	1	2	1*	\$138.1	\$100.8	\$80.9	\$91.1	\$109.2	30.9

Definitions from the report:

Salary. This figure represents the contracted salary excluding summer teaching, stipends, extra load, or other forms of remuneration.

Benefits. Benefit amounts tabulated here represent the institution (or state) contribution on behalf of the individual faculty member; the amount does not include the employee contribution. The major benefits include (a) retirement contribution, regardless of the plan’s vesting provision; (b) medical insurance; (c) disability income protection; (d) tuition for faculty dependents (both waivers and remissions are included); (e) dental insurance; (f) social security (FICA); (g) unemployment insurance; (h) group life insurance; (i) workers’ compensation premiums; and (j) other benefits with cash alternatives (for the most part, these include benefits such as moving expenses, housing, and cafeteria plans or cash options to certain benefits).

Compensation. Compensation represents salary plus institutional contribution to benefits. It is best viewed as an approximate “cost” figure for the institution, rather than an amount received by the faculty member.

Ratings of Average Salary—Each rating represents the percentile interval in which the institution’s average salary/compensation in a given rank lies (1*=95th percentile or above; 1=80th to 94.9th percentile; 2=60th to 79.9 percentile).

¹ Deferred compensation plans are often used to retain and reward key executives. Deferred compensation plans carry substantial risk of forfeiture and do not vest and are not paid out unless the executive remains employed through a particular point in time. Deferred compensation is reported in IRS schedules as unvested allocations are made and again when and if the deferred compensations vests and is paid out.

3. Did the university change its national comparison group for institutional benchmarking in order to adjust apparent relative salary position?

Puget Sound adjusted its national comparison group (as communicated in a message from Ellen Peters to chairs, directors, and deans on December 10, 2013) for the following reasons:

As you may know, Puget Sound has been using a peer group of 50 institutions, separated into the following categories: National, Next Step and Premier. In addition, we often created an additional category for our Pacific Northwest peers. Over the past year, the Office of Institutional Research has worked with the Cabinet to develop a new, smaller comparison group with whom we could more easily exchange data and that would allow us to better benchmark.

We used cluster analysis to find institutions whose data is both similar to ours and offers an appropriate range for comparison, using the following kinds of data:

- FINANCE (Endowment, Revenues, Expenses, Assets, Liabilities)
- RETENTION (First Year Retention Rate, Four, Five and Six Year Graduation Rates)
- FACULTY SALARIES (Average Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor Salaries)
- ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE (Percent FT Faculty, Percent of classes with fewer than 20 students, Percent of classes with 50 or more students)
- FINANCIAL AID (Percent of Freshmen Awarded Need-based Aid, Freshmen Percent Need Met, Average need based Freshmen Financial Aid Package, Freshmen and Undergraduate Discount Rate)
- ADMISSIONS (Cross applications, Number of Applications, Admit Rate, Yield Rate, Average Test Scores, Class Rank)
- ENROLLMENT (Number of Full time Undergraduates, Number of New Freshmen, Race/Ethnicity, Sex)

We then narrowed the group using the following criteria:

- Member of the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Data Sharing Consortium,
- One of the Pacific Northwest Five Colleges (Lewis & Clark, Willamette, Whitman, Reed, Puget Sound),
- Common Admissions overlap.

This work resulted in a list of 21 institutions (including Puget Sound). This new group includes all four Northwest peers as well as a range of regional and national institutions. All but one of these institutions are members of the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium, which will facilitate our ability to get data. This new group also includes overlap with institutions that you may already be using for comparison within your own professional networks and organizations.

Comparison institutions are: Allegheny College, Bard College, Beloit College, Connecticut College, Denison University, Dickinson College, Hendrix College, Kenyon College, Knox College, Lewis and Clark College, Linfield College, Occidental College, Pitzer College, Reed College, St. Lawrence University, St. Olaf College, Trinity University, University of Portland, Whitman College, Willamette University.

4. How does the change in comparison group impact Puget Sound's relative salary position?

Using the March/April 2013 AAUP report, I compiled in August 2013 comparison data for both the immediately prior and the current national comparison groups. I provided this information to the Faculty Salary Committee on October 21, 2013 and again on February 3, 2014.

- For the current comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 11th among 20 schools, but above the mean and median for all ranks.²

	Professor	Associate	Assistant
<i>Mean</i>	\$102,974	\$76,484	\$62,663
<i>Median</i>	\$101,350	\$75,650	\$62,650
<i>Puget Sound</i>	\$104,400	\$77,400	\$63,400

- For the immediately prior national comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 14th of 25 for professor, 15th of 25 for associate, and 13th of 25 for assistant. You can see the means and medians below.

	Professor	Associate	Assistant
<i>Mean</i>	\$104,667	\$78,017	\$63,271
<i>Median</i>	\$102,350	\$77,050	\$62,850
<i>Puget Sound</i>	\$104,400	\$77,400	\$63,400

- For the Northwest comparison group, Puget Sound ranks 4th among the 4 schools reporting to AAUP. We know that Willamette AAUP data includes law and graduate management salaries. We also know from undergraduate salary mean and median information shared among Northwest deans that Reed and Whitman outpace Puget Sound, that Puget Sound ranks above Lewis and Clark, and that we are close with Willamette (sometimes ahead, sometimes not – currently higher for professor and associate, but lower for assistant).

5. Is cost of living taken into account in considering recommendations for faculty salary pool increases?

Yes, the Budget Task Force looks at local and national CPI figures. The [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#), communicated to the campus in December 2013, explains on page 5:

For the university to remain competitive in the market, continue to function at the highest level of excellence and efficiency, and appropriately reward employees, it must maintain competitive compensation. The BTF considered many factors, including market data, inflation, family affordability, and available revenue sources, before forming its recommendation. In particular, the BTF recognized that across-the-board increases the past three years have not kept up with inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index (CPI). During that three-year period, U.S. CPI increased 6.8% and the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CPI increased 6.4%, while cumulative faculty and staff across-the-board increases were 5.4% and 5%, respectively. To the extent recommended increases this year exceed inflation (which has been low thus far, but predicted by most economists to be around 2.5% long term), it will improve the competitiveness of our market position and recognize the hard work of faculty and staff who invest significantly in the success of students and make this place a very special one.

The BTF recommends a 4.5% increase to the faculty salary pool, to fund steps and promotions within the faculty scale and also address inflation and market competitiveness. The BTF recommends a 3.5% increase to the staff salary pool to address inflation, meritorious performance, and market/equity adjustments. The BTF also recommends a 3.5% increase to the student employment budget. Lastly, the BTF recommends a fringe benefit increase of 9.32% to cover the cost of existing benefits, including a 42% increase in healthcare premiums resulting primarily from high claims experience over the past two years.

² Lewis and Clark did not report data to AAUP.

6. If the faculty wanted to change the faculty salary scale, how would we go about making the change?

The scale index has been adjusted historically by consultation between the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) and the Dean. The most recent adjustment occurred for 2005-2006. The FSC made a strong case in the FY 2006 budget process to adjust the salary index upward for associate and full professors in order to increase relative salaries for faculty members in those ranks. The FSC and I discussed this with the faculty at a [Faculty Meeting of February 7, 2005](#). The faculty passed a motion of recommendation to the Dean. Using \$80,000 allocated by the Budget Task Force and a 0.59% portion of the 3.3% overall increase in the salary pool (and after testing to make sure the adjustment was viable over forward years), we adjusted the salary index as recommended by the FSC for associate professors and achieved a portion of the index adjustment requested for full professors. We could discuss, test, and make further adjustments now or in the future, but we would need to have that process completed by early April in order to have faculty contracts ready for May 2014.

7. Why is faculty compensation not addressed in the university's current capital campaign?

The capital campaign is primarily about "capital costs" rather than operating costs—new endowment for financial aid, faculty chairs, faculty support, and capital projects (new facilities). Campaign goals include \$16 million in endowment to support faculty, including funding for faculty chairs and sabbatical leaves, in alignment with the *Defining Moments* strategic plan, Goal I: Create new faculty lines to enhance faculty recruitment and retention, strengthen targeted programs at the intersection of disciplines, and generate opportunities for faculty research and student mentoring across disciplines.

8. What is the relationship between tuition and the university's budget? See pages 2-3 of the [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#).

Approximately 80% of Puget Sound's operating revenue comes from tuition and fees:

- 62% net tuition and fees
- 17% student room and board fees
- 10% endowment income and gains distributed
- 5% contributions
- 4% other sources, including auxiliary
- 2% governmental grants and contracts

Education and General Expenses include:

- 33% faculty compensation
- 35% staff compensation
- 4% student compensation
- 28% non-compensation

Operating expenses are divided as follows:

- 53% instruction and academic support
- 18% auxiliary expenses
- 16% student services
- 13% institutional support

9. Did the university publish information about the Puget Sound faculty's recognition as among the most accessible in the nation?

Yes, see August 5, 2013 [Puget Sound is Named in The Princeton Review's "The Best 378 Colleges"](#) *College makes 2014 honor roll for "most accessible professors" and "best science lab facilities."*

10. What information has been shared, by Sherry Mondou and me, with the Faculty Salary Committee? You may access these documents on the [Faculty Conversation Soundnet](#) site (folder: 2014 Faculty Compensation)
- AAUP comparison salary data for Northwest, current national, immediate prior, and 1989-1990 northwest and national peer groups
 - Fiscal year 2006-2014 AAUP comparison data
 - Statement of Institutional Goals for the 1990s
 - Board of Trustees Compensation Committee Charter
 - Board of Trustees Executive Compensation Philosophy
 - Summary of University of Puget Sound salary increases for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 for faculty, staff, and senior officers (eight Cabinet members, including President)
 - Summary of University of Puget Sound salary increases for 2008-09 through 2013-14 for faculty, staff, and senior officers (eight Cabinet members, including President)
 - [Puget Sound's Budgeting Process](#) description
 - Principles to Guide Resource Allocation
 - [2014-2015 Budget Task Force Report](#)
 - 2013 University of Puget Sound [Financial Report](#)
 - Educational and General operating expenses dashboard charts
 - September 2011 Five-Year Strategic Plan Update (includes 2006 Strategic Plan Analysis and 2011 update)
 - Strategic Initiatives benchmarks

I hope this information is helpful to the faculty as we consider compensation issues, and I look forward to continued meetings with the Faculty Salary Committee and others as we work together to evaluate our current compensation structure and faculty scale. Attracting, retaining, and supporting an outstanding faculty is a key tenet in our strategic plan and remains a high priority for Puget Sound.

Appendix 2 – Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of 3/10/2014

Clarifications provided by Matt Warning on Draft Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting 2/24/2014

p. 3

Stockdale thanked the [faculty salary] committee for their work and asked if the committee has only been met with stonewalling concerning transparency of administrative salaries or has there been a broader discussion. Warning indicated that VP Mondou provided the “executive compensation philosophy.” Since then they have had no word. Sousa indicated that the FSC has met with Kris Bartanen who has been forthcoming with information on the structure and modeling of salaries, processes of salary determination, and aggregate data regarding salaries. (David will have to confirm on this, but the meeting he was referring to involved broader budget issues and where salaries fall within in. We didn’t get into the actual modeling or salary determination processes.)

Comment [MJW1]: An FYI: I’ve since realized that I mis-spoke: some time ago they gave us heavily-aggregated data that was not of real use to us, but was nevertheless an acknowledgement that we had asked for data. After that, requests went unanswered until the meeting we had yesterday [3/6/14] with Kris in which we were given additional aggregated data.



Sept 20, 2013

Shared Integrated Library System (ILS) Migration Overview for LMIS Committee

by Wade Guidry, Library Applications Administrator (wguidry@pugetsound.edu)

Collins Memorial Library has recently begun planning for a major Integrated Library System (ILS) migration, with a go-live date of June 2014. An ILS provides ERP-like functionality for the library, including cataloging, acquisitions, inventory, circulation and discovery. The library implemented its current (and first) ILS system more than 20 years ago. The existing system has been upgraded several times, but continues to be hobbled by obsolete, proprietary technologies and an outdated model of library workflows. The library currently stands at a crossroads, and must migrate to a new platform to meet the demands of library work in the 21st century. But rather than migrate to another stand-alone system, the library and its regional consortium partners have chosen a more unified and innovative vision of library systems and service.

The library stands at a crossroads, and must migrate to a new platform to meet the demands of library work in the 21st century.

37 institutions – one platform

In collaboration with Orbis Cascade Alliance partners (<http://www.orbiscascade.org>), the library has embarked on a 2-year effort that will ultimately see all 37 member libraries migrate to a single, shared ILS platform. The first cohort of member libraries migrating to the new platform went live in June 2013. Among these early adopters were the University of Washington, Willamette University, Pacific University, Linfield College, Marylhurst University and Western Washington University. Three additional cohorts of libraries will follow, going live in January 2014, June 2014 (to include Puget Sound), and January 2015, respectively. This large-scale endeavor, a first-of-its-kind shared library platform migration, has brought widespread attention from the academic library community (<http://tinyurl.com/cvsfwdw>).

Built for today's collaborative library

The new shared platform will cost individual Alliance members no more, and in many cases less, than the previous, stand-alone systems being replaced.

Ex Libris Alma + Primo (<http://www.exlibrisgroup.com>), is the next-generation platform chosen by the Alliance, following a lengthy RFI / RFP process. The product runs in a multi-tenancy, software-as-a-service (SaaS) environment built upon Oracle SQL, a Web Services architecture, and open standards. It also provides a rich, unified discovery layer for library patrons. The new shared platform will cost individual Alliance members

no more, and in many cases less, than the previous, stand-alone systems being replaced. In addition, the new shared environment enables more radical collaboration among Alliance members, in the areas of materials acquisition and sharing, inventory management, electronic resource management and discovery. The platform will allow a new, shared approach to common library work that previously occurred on a library-by-library basis.

Everyone benefits when libraries work together

For members of the Puget Sound community, the new platform will offer more seamless borrowing among Alliance partners, a richer, more unified discovery interface with access to the combined collections of all 37 member libraries, better integration with complementary campus systems, and a local library able to leverage its platform partnership with 36 other institutions of higher education to provide even better and more innovative service.

The library will report on its migration progress to LMIS and the campus community as the project proceeds. For a preview of what the new catalog interface will look like, you can visit the already migrated libraries of Willamette University

(<http://library.willamette.edu>) and Pacific University (<http://www.pacificu.edu/library>). For additional information, please contact Wade Guidry, Library Applications Administrator (wguidry@pugetsound.edu).

The platform will allow a new, shared approach to common library work that previously occurred on a library-by-library basis.

Draft of New Withdrawal Policy developed by ASC

Senate Charge to ASC:

3. Clarify, and if necessary, amend current policies regarding a student's right to privacy when asked to demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" in order to receive a "W" from an instructor when withdrawing from a course during weeks 7-12 of the semester.

Summary of changes:

- 1) The WF "default" starts at week 11 instead of week 7.
- 2) There is no longer 2 different scenarios as to how to petition a WF (previously one for 7-12th week granted by the instructor and another after the 12th week granted by the ASC)
- 3) Petition for a W instead of a WF for exceptional circumstances now always goes directly to the ASC instead of through the instructor (though the instructor can provide input).
- 4) Petition for a W instead of a WF no longer requires that the student had been receiving a passing grade (or have exceptional circumstances that prevented a passing grade).

PROPOSED LANGUAGE:

Withdrawal Grades □ Withdrawal without record on the academic transcript is permissible through the first two weeks (10 class days) of the fall and spring semesters when a student withdraws or is withdrawn by an instructor. Following this period, a Withdrawal grade of W will be assigned through the tenth week of classes when a student completes withdrawal procedures through the Registrar's Office. If, following the first two weeks, a student is withdrawn without completing withdrawal procedures, or if a student withdraws after the time allowed for a W grade, a Withdrawal Failing (WF) is automatically assigned.

During the Withdrawal Failing period (class weeks 11-15), a student may petition the Academic Standards Committee requesting withdrawal with a W grade. To support such a petition, the student must 1) have completed withdrawal procedures, 2) outline in a statement to the Committee the exceptional circumstances prompting withdrawal, and 3) provide supporting documentation of exceptional circumstances from a health care provider, counselor, Puget Sound advisor, course instructor or other university advocate. Additionally, the student may submit a statement from the course instructor regarding the student's progress in the class and, in the absence of such a statement, the Registrar's Office may solicit comments or recommendations from the instructor.

The last day of class, as listed in the academic calendar, is the last day a student may withdraw from a class. Once Reading Period begins, a student is no longer eligible to withdraw.

Withdrawal from a course after the date for withdrawal without record counts as a “course attempt.” This means if a student registers again for a course that had been assigned a W or WF grade, the student is repeating that course under the terms of the policy titled “Reregistration for the Same Course.”

During the summer session, the withdrawal process described for the fall and spring semesters applies during the following weeks: first week, drop without record; second, third, and fourth weeks, automatic W grade; fifth week and later, WF is the default grade and the Academic Standards Committee may assign a W grade in response to a student’s petition.

A student who remains registered in a class but has a poor record of attendance may be subject to the registration and withdrawal policies that allow an instructor or the Registrar to drop that student. (See the sections titled "Registration and Attendance/Participation," "Non-Attendance," and "Withdrawal from a Course/From the University.")

Students who receive withdrawal grades for all courses in a given semester must petition the Committee for re-enrollment in the University.

CURRENT LANGUAGE:

Withdrawal Grades □ Withdrawal without record on the academic transcript is permissible through the first two weeks of the fall and spring semesters when a student completes official withdrawal procedures. Withdrawal Passing (W) is granted during the third through sixth weeks of the fall and spring semesters when a student completes official withdrawal procedures. After the sixth week of the semester, Withdrawal Failing (WF) is given except as noted below.

During the seventh through twelfth weeks of the fall and spring semesters, a grade of W may be granted by the instructor only if all of the following conditions are met: (1) a student completes official withdrawal procedures and (2) there have been exceptional circumstances beyond the student's control, in which case the student must demonstrate in writing to the satisfaction of the instructor that exceptional circumstances exist, and (3) either the student's work has been of passing quality or the exceptional circumstances have prevented the student from completing work of passing quality. An instructor may assign a W grade using the Faculty Withdrawal Grade Submission Form available from the Office of the Registrar.

After the twelfth week of classes, the Academic Standards Committee may permit a grade of W to be assigned. The student must withdraw from the course and submit a petition to support a claim of exceptional circumstances. The petition must include a statement by the

course instructor on the quality of the student's work in the course. If the petition is approved, a grade of W is assigned. If the petition is denied, a grade of WF is assigned.

Completing official withdrawal procedures after the last day of regularly scheduled classes is not allowed.

A withdrawal at any point past the date for withdrawal without record counts as a “course attempt” if the student registers again for the course.

During the summer session the withdrawal process described for the fall and spring semesters applies during the following weeks: first week, drop without record; second week automatic W grade; third, fourth, and fifth weeks, WF is the automatic grade and an instructor has the authority to assign a W; after the fifth week the WF remains the automatic grade and the Academic Standards Committee assumes the authority to assign a W grade.

A student who remains registered in a class but has a poor record of attendance may be subject to the registration and withdrawal policies that allow an instructor or the Registrar to drop that student. (See the sections titled "Registration and Attendance/Participation," "Non-Attendance," and "Withdrawal from a Course/From the University.")

Dual Degree requirements developed by ASC/PSC

Senate charge:

2. Review the wisdom of a policy change in consultation with the curriculum committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

The joint subcommittee finds wisdom in plainly providing for simultaneously earned baccalaureate degrees as doing so offers students recognition for not only the completion of an additional major, but for earning at least an additional year of credit to do so. Therefore, the joint subcommittee forwards the following text for consideration by their respective committees:

Second Baccalaureate Degree

Students who wish to earn a second baccalaureate degree must complete a minimum of 8.00 additional academic and graded units in residence subsequent to the awarding of the first baccalaureate degree. Students are required to complete department requirements current as of the date of postbaccalaureate enrollment.

Each additional baccalaureate degree requires 8.00 more discrete, academic, and graded units *earned in residence*. [Italics indicate new text to further clarify second baccalaureate unit requirement.]

Simultaneous Baccalaureate Degrees

Students who wish to earn two baccalaureate degrees simultaneously must complete, in addition to the university requirements for a baccalaureate degree with two majors, a minimum of 40.00 total units and a minimum of 24.00 units, including the last 8.00 units, in residence.

For purposes of other academic policies, simultaneously earned degrees may both be considered “first” degrees.