

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate
March 20, 2017 McCormick Room 4:00 pm

Senators Present:

Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, David Chiu, Sara Freeman, Bill Haltom, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Andrea Kueter, Brendan Lanctot, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa, Lilian Wang, Peter Wimberger

Visitors:

Chris Kendall, Elise Richman

1. **Call to order.** Meeting was called to order at 4:03
2. **Approval of minutes.** M/S/P acceptance of the minutes of March 6, 2017, with one abstention.

3. Updates from liaisons.

Jacobson had further conversation with Elise Richman, chair of the Curriculum Committee, about their need for a larger number of committee members in the future. Kessel noted the size of the committee could be increased without a change to bylaws, but that this committee has been difficult to fill in recent years.

On the subject of the upcoming faculty elections, Kessel suggested that there are sufficient nominations for all categories except for the Faculty Advancement Committee. They currently have only two faculty members who have agreed to run for the FAC. Please forward additional nominations to Kessel.

4. Updates from ASUPS president.

President Lumbantobing was not present. Dean Segawa reported on the ASUPS election, and noted there had been a number of issues with the online voting process. The ASUPS election committee is asking that the previous election be invalidated to allow for an additional election.

Updates from Staff Senate. Kueter reported on their last meeting. They were still seeking volunteers for Friday's inaugural events. They will be running a survey with staff about the Staff Appreciation Luncheon, to determine if this is still the best way to celebrate the staff and people's contributions to the university. The Basket raffle, which raises money for their book scholarship, is coming up at end of April.

5. Discussions of spring semester calendar recommendation from the Curriculum Committee. [See appendix]

Richman presented a summary of the responses the CC has gathered from offices, services and departments across campus regarding the options for a shortened spring term. They have parsed out the pros and cons of Options A and C. (They found no support for Option B.) Also because of interest in seeing some models of

Option C, they have added to the shared document a couple of examples to help clarify the purpose and possibilities.

There was overwhelming support for Option A across departments. There was more interest in Option C in some offices.

One effect of importance that was noted is that non-exempt employees would have one less week of work with the change outlined in Option A. There was also much concern among the sciences about balancing the labs between the two semesters under Option C.

Richman wanted to know if they had fulfilled the Senate's charge, or if there was more that the Senate wanted. In response to questions she explained that they had collected material from 11 offices and the chairs' meeting, and some directors and chairs sent additional emails; a few individual faculty also sent emails. The ASUPS president also met individually with the committee.

A fulsome discussion ensued. Chiu noted that the ASUPS President expressed preference for Option C and wondered if that was an individual, leadership, or broad-based position. Richman believed it was an individual position, and perhaps more student input could be collected. Wimberger asked about the option of starting a week later in the spring, which he described as offering additional options for how the winter break could be used, for instance for travel programs. He also noted the loss of the option of a two-week spring break. Richman reminded senators that both of those options had already been eliminated last year. Jacobson noted that the senate had also eliminated the option C but the CC considered it again this year so wondered if other options beyond A-C were considered this year, and Richman replied that the working group of the CC did not do so, citing the "cons" raised about both options last year. An interchange about the problems with Option B followed as well, including the loss of cohesion over the course of the semester. Richman also clarified that the chairs had not seen the models for Option C when they offered their responses. Kessel suggested that if we were to take those models to the full faculty, we would need to have a much fuller discussion of how those new shared days would be used.

Wimberger returned to the discussion of the option to start a week later in spring semester, wondering about why this was tabled. Freeman noted the problems it would create for rehearsal and launching shows, and Bartanen mentioned the problem of athletics playing an additional week before classes began, and the desire to have the campus celebrate Martin Luther King day.

Jacobson raised the procedural issue that the Senate had worked with limited information when it selected the options the CC was told to pursue this year. (The senate sent only Options A and B, and then C was resurrected by the CC.) She wondered if additional options should have had a fuller airing, with a broader audience than the senate. Freeman suggested that whichever options we select,

there will likely be problems that emerge for programs, and we will need to be ready to negotiate work-arounds, in order to ensure they can continue to provide their programs effectively and without additional difficult burdens. Bartanen noted that there is a bit of privilege connoted in the two-week break, and that the reality is that there are many students who are not able to travel or even to return home, and so a two-week Spring Break might be very disadvantageous for them.

Kessel wondered if we have fully thought about what the purpose of a shortening of the semester would be. She suggested that the rationale, the purposes, might be an important issue to think through fully. Freeman remembered that it was equal class days and providing more time for faculty research that drove this. Bristow noted that for her the idea had been to use the release of the “extra” days of spring to do additional educational work, for instance a student research symposium. Jacobson noted that the new opportunities might actually cut against the initial impetus, that there is a tension here, and that looking for new ways to use the days might be a kind of mission creep. Haltom believed that faculty would take off time that was laid out as time off. Kessel reminded us that the issue of work-life balance had been essential in the conversation early on, and wondered if this was a place where we might have the power to contribute to mitigating the additional burdens that have landed on faculty. She wondered if the reclamation of some space for faculty might be what people want here. Lanctot wanted us to consider what structure for an academic year not in terms of ourselves but with regards to our mission as educators, and to consider whether this could be how we think through this issue. He suggested that he could imagine an additional week at winter break, for instance, making space for ourselves that would actually allow us to do our work better. Wimberger wondered whether things have actually changed, or if it has actually long been this way, so that “reclaiming” may not be the language. He turned to the question of whether “more is more,” and suggested that in fact we reach saturation. More days does not necessarily make for better education. Having the terms be equal length makes a lot of sense to him, in that context. What we would do with that week could be discussed. Richman raised the issue of what it means to be in a community of scholars, and finds that she longs for time to collectively think, together, about a book, big questions, as an intellectual community. This is time and space we do not currently have. (Some heard Dolliver Seminar here.)

Haltom returned us to the issue of purpose, and suggested he had found more persuasive purposes articulated today than he had heard previously. He discounted the “problem” of two semesters of different lengths. Kessel noted the tension—that faculty really would use the days in different ways. Haltom argued that if we were doing this only for the faculty, this would not prove particularly persuasive, and urged us to think about a pedagogical, student-based argument. Kessel returned us again to process, and urged us or the CC to think through the purposes, first. With that established, laying out models would then make more sense. Adding student input might also be useful, but there was some uncertainty about this among some senators. Talking to athletics is certainly significant, given the major impact it could involve. Jacobson asked whether there was written feedback that we could see from

all of the offices, and Richman affirmed that she would share this. A group including Jacobson and Kessel will coordinate with Richman to develop the purposes. Richman will collect information from Athletics.

6. Discussion of Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct (See Appendix)

Kessel explained that this is part of the ongoing work that has been underway for a couple of years. The university is currently in the process of disentangling the sexual harassment and sexual misconduct policies. For this meeting, the Senate had before it only the proposed sexual misconduct policy, and will soon need to look at the procedures for both of these policies. This might ultimately involve a revision to the code, but more likely only an interpretation of the code. The policy must comply with public law, Title IX. Important changes to the sexual misconduct policy include the disentangling of the two policies, the inclusion of terminology, and the additional language on prohibited relations developed by the PSC last year. Bartanen noted we might need two interpretations, given that the entire package would likely require a formal interpretation so that it would be registered with the code. Wimberger raised a need for revision to allow for existing relationships involving a faculty member if their partner becomes a student without always notifying the Title IX officer. Any possible edits or corrections can be sent to Sarah Shives.

7. Revision of Educational Goals

The Senate returned to the conversation it was having at the last meeting, fortunately with the addition of several voices that were missing at that earlier meeting. Kessel had shared three options for the final educational goal. Johnson offered an additional possibility, with the goal of articulating the interest in a critical thinking about values. A conversation about the possibilities ensued, with interest in the addition of the language of “critical and reflective,” a concern about the loss of the language of “influence,” concern for the length of the statement, its interaction with other educational goals already listed, and the significant faculty disinterest, discomfort and/or lack of understanding of the language of “values” in the faculty responses. Jacobson reminded us that the process of reviewing the educational goals was instituted in part to have the faculty be aware of the educational goals, and this would argue for the Senate sending the completed list of revised education goals to the full faculty. Kessel suggested that it might also be a jumping off point for a broader conversation on the curriculum. Lanctot, using a comparison to two earlier creations of the Bible, expressed concern that simply throwing this to the faculty could be quite vexing. Bartanen hoped that faculty’s earlier experience with the effort to discuss the education goals, the story of how we got there, would help to initiate the conversation in a productive way. Kessel suggested having the Ad Hoc Committee members there might be useful, as well. The winning result emerged. M/S/P with 1 NAY vote, a revision to the final educational value proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Educational Values: “An informed awareness of self, others, and influence in the world.”

8. Other business.

Some senators will serve as guinea pigs next Monday, March 27, for the focus groups on the topic of the requirements for advancement to Full Professor.

Lumbantobing, Bristow and Kessel have been working on an idea for the common period usage. [See Appendix] Kessel asked for any initial feedback or suggestions. Brown found it inspiring as a possibility, and found the question of an “open mind” to be provocative. Kessel explained that the working group was imagining a single main event that would use the common period once, at the start of the year, that the campus could then engage over the rest of the year. Again, we would only encroach on the common period once. Wimberger thought it would be interesting to incorporate a discussion of how our minds actually work, how they are made up even before we begin reasoning, and this prompted discussion of how a topic like this really could open up engagement from across disciplines. Kessel asked everyone to take time with this prior to our next meeting, and to send suggestions and ideas to Kessel or Bristow. Freeman suggested that we engage with the CC on this, allowing that committee to serve a role beyond policing. Ramakrishnan would like it to be more doing, and less talking. He thought we could actually build something, develop an idea together, a project.

Senate adjourned at 5:31.

Minutes prepared by Nancy Bristow.

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix A: Spring semester calendar recommendations from CC

Appendix B: Policy prohibiting sexual misconduct

Appendix C: Common period usage proposal

Shortened Spring Semester Responses

Offices and Services Contact	Option A The spring semester ends a week earlier.	Option B The spring semester begins one week earlier and ends two weeks earlier.	Option C Intersperse days off throughout the semester.
Dining and Conference Services Terry Halvorson	DCS second choice. The spring semester ending one week earlier is one week less of full time work for our hourly professional staff wanting to work full time.	DCS third choice. We (DCS) take full advantage of professional development and appreciate having a full week to attend training and have an all staff meeting.	DCS first choice. DCS hourly professional staff are .75 instead of 1.0 and are not guaranteed hours over the summer. For some of our staff having summers off is a wonderful benefit. For others, they work anytime there are hours available over the summer and during other break periods as a matter of necessity. Interspersing days off throughout the semester would be the least amount of impact for staff that need and want to work closer to full time.
Student Financial Services Maggie Mittuch	Of no consequence, generally in terms of complications to billing, payment deadlines or for financial aid applications. If ending spring earlier means summer session starts earlier, I still don't foresee complications for SFS student financial activities. CES might be impacted since they must work during spring to place students in employment positions for summer and are challenged to complete this work by May 15. I would	The spring semester begins one week earlier and ends two weeks earlier. Cannot accommodate earlier start than the day after MLK because of billing challenges for spring semester. As it is, we bill students on or about January 5 th , or as soon after we return to campus post holiday break. Students have only 10 or so days to finalize financial arrangements and it is an extreme push for SFS to complete this critical work in this already short time period. Accelerating the date for spring start would make this impossible for us.	A good option to consider especially as seniors are preparing for graduation

	<p>recommend consulting CES on the possibility of moving summer forward. Since May board of Trustee meetings are typically targeted around commencement this might mean board meetings would be held a week earlier. I am not certain who might need to be involved in that discussion.</p>		
<p>Human Resources/ CES Cindy Matern</p>	<p>No impact on student employment</p>	<p>No impact on student Employment Take A Logger to Work program is generally held the week before students return for spring semester and if option B was implemented, adjustments to the program</p>	<p>No impact on student Employment</p>
<p>Office of Finance Lori Seager</p>	<p>Advantageous for Facilities, as more time available for summer construction projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional week in summer could provide more time for conference activity and possibly help increase Auxiliary revenues. • Provides less working days for student employees during the spring 	<p>Spring 5th and 10th day census counts available earlier in the semester, which helps for February board reporting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantageous for Facilities, as more time available for summer construction projects. • Two additional weeks in summer could provide more time for conference activity and possibly help increase Auxiliary revenues. • Provides less working days for 	<p>Seems to be smoothest transition, keeping to current starting and ending dates for the semester, and provides extra time for students to complete class projects or short-term study away programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have observed students experience less stress when they have occasional days for a more singular focus on schoolwork catch-up, ASUPS-related tasks, etc.

	<p>semester. Students who count on this as part of their financial aid package may struggle without this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Finance relies heavily on student employees. A longer summer provides more time for summer student employment. This would change the timeframe of May board meeting and impact schedule for board meeting preparations. 	<p>student employees during the spring semester. Students who count on this as part of their financial aid package may struggle without this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Finance relies heavily on student employees. A longer summer provides more time for summer student employment. This would change the timeframe of May board meeting and impact schedule for board meeting preparations. 	
<p>Residence Life Megan Gessel</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>> Res life workers (RA's, etc.) have to come back from break one week early to get ready for students. If winter break is shortened to 3 weeks, these students would only have two weeks of winter break. Moreover, this would mean they would be traveling right around new years, when ticket prices are more expensive.</p> <p>> Greek life students also come back one week early to prepare for recruitment and they would run into similar issues.</p> <p>> Many students who live</p>	<p>Having several 3 day weekends is not ideal for res life, because there would likely not be much programming created, therefore creating more idle time, which can lead to issues, especially in the dorms.</p>

		<p>far away and/or are lower income do not get to go home during other breaks (Thanksgiving, Spring break) and so they appreciate the long winter break since it's the only time to see their family and friends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Many students get seasonal work at home during the break and appreciate the extra time to earn money for school expenses. > Many students use winter break to pursue summer jobs and internships. Often this is most easily done after New Years, due to the holiday schedules of most offices and shortening the winter break would limit their time to do this work. > One faculty member mentioned that if the University ever wanted to do a Winter term or an experiential learning activity of winter break, that shortening winter break might interfere with these potential opportunities. 	
<p>Facilities Services Bob Kief</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>Would negatively impact work done over winter break.</p>	<p>Least impact and could offer opportunities for additional maintenance during days off.</p>

<p>Staff Senate Anna Coy</p>	<p>No feedback</p>	<p>Supplies need to be ordered in such a way that the campus closure for holiday break does not interfere with delivery, which means putting in massive orders on the first day back, i.e., January 3rd, 2016. If classes were to begin a week earlier it is unlikely that all orders would have arrived in time, especially things like chemicals that can't be expedited. This would be very problematic for classes which have a lab component or supplies with expiration considerations. Starting earlier would also interfere with the ability to squeeze in PDEC for staff. There are quite a few facilities issues that are dealt with during this time when students aren't around.</p>	<p>No feedback</p>
<p>President's Office Liz Collins Alumni and Parent Relations Allison Cannady-Smith</p>	<p>Starting the term at the same time but ending it a week earlier would compress planning time quite a bit for many things that happen at the end of term—for example, the Trustee meetings wouldn't be as well spaced; Spring Break left where it is would then lead to end of term coming not long afterwards (mirroring problems associated with Thanksgiving break followed by Winter Break).</p>	<p>Starting a week later would lead to similar problems of timing/spacing – too many meetings/gatherings that need to be organized but with one less week to have those meetings and plan them.</p>	<p>...was a pretty clear favorite, mainly because not much would need to be changed from an organizational perspective in either the President's Office or for Alumni/Parent Relations.</p>

<p>School of Education* Amy Ryken</p>	<p>This is a preferred option. We would still have to begin our term early to ensure that candidates have a minimum of 15 weeks of full-time student teaching as mandated by Washington state.</p>	<p>This is not a preferred option.</p>	<p>This is a preferred option; however, MAT candidates would follow the calendar of public schools. If public schools are in session they are required to be present at the school.</p>
<p>Geology Department Mike Valentine</p>	<p>Four of us prefer ending Spring semester a week early. Mostly, it would give us more summer time to pursue research and mentor student research projects. In addition, our majors need to complete a summer field course for the Geology major. Many of them also apply for Summer Research Awards that require them to dedicate 10 weeks full time to their projects to get the funding. It is difficult or impossible for them to do both in the summer between junior and senior years, so many have recently done the field camps AFTER their senior year, so they don't officially graduate until the next December. The extra week of summer would allow for more flexibility for them.</p>		

<p>Classics Department Eric Orlin</p>	<p>There's a general consensus in the Classics department that if we shorten the spring term, Option A is the best choice</p>	<p>No response</p>	<p>...a disaster waiting to happen</p>
<p>Politics and Government Alisa Kessel</p>	<p>The consensus in P&G is overwhelming preference for <u>option A</u>.</p>	<p><u>Option B</u> is particularly challenging for P&G colleagues, since course content shifts so much from year to year in response to political developments. Colleagues who teach in, say the European Politics course once a year would have had to radically retool the course in light of the Brexit vote this summer. Those who teach in foreign policy would contend with a new administration and all of the developments in foreign policy in the past year.</p>	<p><u>Option C</u> seemed undesirable to my P&G colleagues because it would impose strange constraints on all classes (the loss of a Thursday here, a Monday there, etc) and because it would contribute to a loss of momentum in the course.</p>
<p>AFAM/RPI Dexter Gordon</p>	<p>Second choice</p>	<p>no</p>	<p>RPI would consider a conference on the off year, half-way between the 4 year national conferences. This "off-year" conference would focus exclusively on campus issues. Such a conference would be over two days.</p>
<p>Communication Studies</p>	<p>Prefer this</p>		

<p>Psychology Sarah Moore</p>	<p>Best and convenient Creating a larger block of time for summer is best for faculty and students vis-à-vis research, internships, travel</p>	<p>Not preferred Time needed for prep, research, department business, workshops, etc., between semesters is important</p>	<p>This is disruptive (least preferred)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interspersed days= lost momentum, especially for 1 day/week courses • Tacoma Public Schools calendar changes frequently and is different from other districts public schools. Not a good idea to align our calendar with theirs. • Workshops- ambitious workshops or conferences (like RPI) could be scheduled at the end of the term.
<p>Chemistry Dan Burgard</p>	<p>This seems easiest</p>	<p>Not B</p>	<p>Chemistry runs 12 sections of CHEM 120. If this happened, an equal number of days of each of the days of the week need to be removed. Blocks of off days would be preferred This could be interesting if done right.</p>
<p>Philosophy Ariela Tubert</p>	<p>This is my strongly preferred option. The spring semester drags on a bit toward the end and ending a week earlier would help end the semester on a better note <i>Sam Liao also emailed his preference for this option</i></p>	<p>I worry about shortening the break because as it is there isn't a lot of time to take a break between grading and class preparation.</p>	<p>I don't feel comfortable with this option until I am clear on the details – I worry about breaking the flow of the semester and that the replacement activities will crowd even more our already busy schedule.</p>
<p>Physics Rand Worland</p>	<p>Most of Physics prefers option A</p>		<p>Not sure how this would affect lab schedules</p>
<p>Exercise Science Gary McCall</p>	<p>Like this</p>	<p>Like this equally</p>	<p>No faculty prefer</p>

<p>Biology Alyce DeMarais</p>			<p>This would be very challenging for science courses with multiple lab sections – if one day (lab) per week is cancelled, then the entire week would be cancelled. This would be unacceptable as we would severely reduce the number of labs offered in the semester (and would interrupt the continuity of lab experiments) and curtail the experiential education opportunities for our students. The scenario Martin mentioned makes sense –use existing partial weeks for educational events. We do have an “extra week” in spring so Amy’s [Spivey] Presidents Day idea would not be an idea in terms of labs but would be feasible.</p>
<p>Art and Art History Elise Richman</p>	<p>General support allows for more time to engage in faculty and student summer research projects and provides more time for summer study abroad programs and internships. The problem with this option is that it would compress the amount of time senior art majors have to prepare for their thesis exhibit. The time they currently have is already brief.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>This poses interesting campus wide community building and educational opportunities and alleviation of child care issues on at least one, consistent holiday, President’s Day.</p>

<p>Anonymous Chairs/Directors</p>	<p>Seems most reasonable for everyone and least disruptive</p> <p>YES! Allows for more short-term study abroad options, allows for more summer research time</p> <p>Seems like the easiest/best option</p> <p>Yes – best option – least complicated</p> <p>This would be fine.</p> <p>This is by far the preferable option: it allows syllabi to be transferred from one semester to another</p> <p>This is most important: I strongly prefer not to shorten the winter break because of research/writing rhythm</p>	<p>Hard for families with need for international travel over holidays</p> <p>? it's the increasing use of short term study abroad during winter break</p> <p>Don't understand the benefit here</p> <p>Yes!</p> <p>O.K., but prefer A</p> <p>Winter break already feels a bit short, especially if at department is hiring & interviewing during break</p> <p><u>NO.</u></p>	<p>Complicated...?</p> <p>Difficult to maintain coherence/continuity unless a bundle of days is set aside for a research symposium</p> <p>Seems very complicated, again benefits not clear, starting two days late doesn't seem to have benefits If there were a clear plan of how these days would be used, it might make sense</p> <p>No!</p> <p>Need to watch out for labs and other classes that meet once a week It would be very nice to have President's Day and possible other public school holidays off. I would like to see more discussion of lengthening the fall semester by five days.</p> <p>Option C makes it harder to transfer syllabi from fall to spring semester & vice versa</p> <p>Makes no sense. Would be absorbed with projects, admin., and T/TH and M/W/F</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>Schedules would be difficulty in? Strongly NO.</p>
	<p>I think this would be the best option, but perhaps Spring Break should be moved up a week.</p> <p>This is the best option of these three</p> <p>I prefer this option. It would be beneficial for students seeking summer jobs.</p> <p>First choice</p>	<p>This is not good. EL & faculty led study abroad trips over winter recess would be adversely impacted.</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NO</p>	<p>Don not favor this idea as it is more complicated and inconvenient in terms of syllabus planning and irregularity of classes. Also, do not favor trying to synch our schedule with Tacoma Public Schools.</p> <p>This seems complicated and less rewarding overall. NO.</p> <p>2nd choice but don't care for it. Not cohesive to graduate programs However if in line</p>

	<p>Yes – anything to keep graduation off Mother’s Day. As a single mom, I often cannot participate in grad activities on Mother’s Day because it is difficult to get babysitting.</p> <p>Most straightforward</p> <p>This strikes me as the most feasible option. And sane</p> <p>Two individuals circled this option indicating support for it.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Nope</p> <p>I enter every spring term woefully underprepared. Between grades, holiday travel, and a brief respite from the fall, this would leave us w/laughably little time to get ready for spring.</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>with holiday that would be better.</p> <p>No – too hard with the flow of classes *if it’s Pres. Day, etc. that would be a consideration but it would be very hard on the OT curriculum because it would most likely be Monday’s off.</p> <p>How? We start two days later end two days or three days earlier? and President’s Day? (not as important)</p> <p>The proposed model seems like a pretext for creating more work that disrupts us from our core mission.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Maybe</p> <p>No</p>
<p>ASUPS Noah Lumbantobing</p>			<p>I'm writing to you because I recall some time ago in an all Faculty meeting you presented some options for matching the Spring to Fall semester's classes days up. I'm wondering if that conversation is still happening in committee? The reason I ask is that I've been thinking about the ways in which the University can create spaces for building cohesive community, particularly around building a collective language, framework, and conscious around equity and inclusivity. I've been chatting for sometime with Alisa Kessel and Nancy Bristow in the Faculty Senate about potentially using the space of the common hour when there aren't all Faculty meetings to have time and create space for workshopping/lectures/etc., and am always looking for other spaces as well. This past break, as I'm sure you know, Dean Benitez along with Human Resources put together a full day conference for staff and faculty centering equity and diversity and having a full day with most if not all staff and a good chunk of faculty parsing through difficult conversations. It got me thinking about whether, in aligning the Spring Semester and Fall Semester, this might be an opportunity to set a day</p>

			<p>aside for students, faculty, and staff to be in intentional community with one another and have a similar sort of conference-y, workshop-y space to engage in a difficult conversation about what equity and inclusivity looks like on our campus and build a collective, anti-oppressive consciousness. I'm also inspired by the Power and Privilege Symposium at Whitman college, which seems like an amazing space that occurs annually to engage with just that – power and privilege – and might be a neat template.</p>
--	--	--	--

*Important Context: The School of Education MAT Program has its own calendar that has never been reflected on the official university academic calendar. I am currently working with Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja to see how the official calendar might reflect how the MAT program actually operates.

MAT candidates return to campus right after the New Year holiday to begin student teaching in public schools.

Below is a contrast of the University spring term and the MAT spring term for 2017. In addition, we teach our classes during Puget Sound's Spring Recess and instead do not teach classes when public schools have spring break (this year that is the week of April 3-7).

SHORTENED SPRING TERM OPTIONS

SPRING TERM OPTION A

The spring semester ends a week earlier.

Preferred by most academic departments and Residence Life

Pros:

- Simple solution
- Sense of cohesion
- Will not disrupt lab schedules
- Grants facilities more time for summer projects
- More time for summer research and study abroad programs
- More time for student summer employment

Cons:

- Less full time work for hourly professional who are not guaranteed hours over the summer (Dining and Conference Services)
- Fewer working days for student staff, Office of Finance expressed concern about this as students it may affect student financial aid packages
- Compress timing of end of the year events and Trustees meetings (President's Office and Alumni and Parent Relations)

SPRING TERM OPTION C (formerly Option D)

Intersperse days off throughout the semester.

Preferred by Dining and Conference Services, President's Office, Alumni and Parent Relations, ASUPS President, Office of Finance, and RPI

Pros:

- Align with Tacoma Public School Holiday, President's Day
- Potential for University wide, community building, intellectual and civic minded programming such as thematic symposia, speakers, conversations
- Cohesive approach to showcasing student presentations/poster sessions and facilitating study groups
- Opportunities for maintenance during the semester (Facilities Services)
- Does not disrupt .75 exempt staff employment

Cons:

- Potentially disruptive
- Would entail planning

POTENTIAL OPTION C SCHEDULES

MODEL I

Day I: Friday after MLK Day, training, workshops, speakers open to all faculty and staff (and students?)

DAY II: President's Day

DAY III and IV: Two days devoted to, symposia, student presentations/poster sessions, and campus focused quadrennial RPI conference (timing TBD, towards the end of the semester)

DAY V: Extend reading period to three days (W-F)

MODEL II

Day I and II: Thursday and Friday after MLK Day, training, workshops, speakers open to all faculty and staff (and students?)

DAY III: President's Day

DAY IV and V: Tuesday and Wednesday of current last week of classes, student presentations, study groups, poster sessions

Variations on this model:

- Keep President's Day as a class day and only drop by four teaching days. Advantage: does not disrupt schedule for courses with labs. Disadvantages: does not address issue for those with school-age children; doesn't fully meet
- Student presentation/exhibit/performance days on Monday and Tuesday of current last week with reading period beginning Wednesday.

University of Puget Sound Campus Policy Prohibiting Sexual Misconduct

Statement of Purpose

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any education program or activity that receives federal funding. Under Title IX, all students, faculty, and staff, regardless of gender, are protected from any sex-based discrimination, harassment or violence that is “so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars the victim’s access to an educational opportunity or benefit.” This policy conforms to Title IX.

In addition, this policy is informed by an understanding that sexual violence destroys the respect, dignity, and trust necessary to form a vibrant community. The emotional trauma experienced by survivors and its ripple effect throughout the campus impedes the ability of community members to thrive and flourish. In addition to seeking to curb sexual misconduct, the policy is an effort to affirm Puget Sound’s care and fairness for all of its constituents and seeks to preserve the university as a welcoming place for exploration, self-expression, and the deep work of learning.

This policy is binding upon all members of the university including faculty, students, staff, and administrators. It is a charter for creating an environment in which each person is liberated to pursue their intellectual potential. It contains standards of behavior for all of us in the shared community of the university. Enforcement of this policy and reports of violations are to be fairly and impartially expedited by the Title IX Coordinator (or their designee), the Dean of Students, the Dean of the University, and/or Human Resources. The expectation is that all members of the community are participants and bear a shared responsibility for upholding these standards.

Policy Statement

The University prohibits all forms of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, stalking, intimate partner violence, and all other forms of nonconsensual sexual conduct.

This policy applies to all members of the Puget Sound community, including students, faculty, and staff, as well as off-campus visitors, vendors, independent contractors, work-study employers, internship supervisors, prospective students, volunteers, and third parties. These standards apply regardless of the sex, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression of any of the individuals involved. Adherence to these standards is expected regardless of location either on or off campus.

All members of the campus community have a responsibility to govern their own conduct in accordance with this policy. All employees of the University of Puget Sound have a special responsibility to report discriminatory harassment or sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment. It is the policy of the University of Puget Sound to respond promptly and fairly to reports of sexual misconduct. Violations of this Policy that are reported, investigated, and adjudicated may result in sanctions up to, and including termination, dismissal, or expulsion. The

University is committed to providing educational and preventative training programs regarding sexual or gender-based harassment and to providing a safe, private, and accessible reporting process.

This policy is intended to meet and may generally exceed the requirements of applicable federal, state, and local laws. However, this policy does not provide a substitute procedure for redressing any person's legal rights, or create legal rights separate from applicable laws. Additionally, the university is not prevented by this policy from acting to remedy a problem that could also be remedied by resort to legal action. The university may take appropriate protective and administrative action even in situations where the complainant is absent. An intentionally false complaint will also constitute a violation of this policy and may subject the offender to disciplinary action. A complaint is not considered to be falsely reported merely because the evidence does not suffice to support a formal charge or finding of responsibility.

Policy Definitions

Consent:

Consent is a clear and unambiguous agreement, expressed outwardly through mutually understandable words and/or actions, to engage in a particular activity. Consent must be given voluntarily and cannot be obtained through coercion or force. An incapacitated person is unable to give consent. Coercion, force, and incapacitation are defined in subsequent sections.

Consent is not to be inferred from silence, passivity, or lack of resistance. Relying on non-verbal communication alone may not be sufficient to ascertain consent.

A person under the age of sixteen cannot consent to sexual activity of any kind.

Consent is not to be inferred from an existing or previous intimate relationship.

Consent to engage in one sexual activity is not consent to engage in a different sexual activity or to engage in the same sexual activity on a later occasion. Consent must be given at the time of the sexual activity.

Consent to engage in sexual activity with one person is not consent to engage in sexual activity with any other person. Consent cannot be conveyed by a third party but must be communicated between participants.

Consent must be on-going and may be withdrawn by any party at any point. Once consent is withdrawn, the sexual activity must cease immediately.

Coercion:

Coercion is conduct that would reasonably place an individual in fear and is employed to compel someone to engage in sexual activity. Coercion includes, but is not limited to, intimidation and expressed or implied threats of physical, emotional, reputational, academic or financial harm to

any person. The intentional use of alcohol or other drugs to render a person incapacitated also constitutes coercion.

Force:

Force is the use or threat of physical violence or intimidation to compel someone to engage in sexual activity.

Incapacitation:

Incapacitation constitutes a state in which a person can no longer adequately process information to make an informed, reasoned judgment. Incapacitation may result from the consumption of alcohol or other drugs. In addition, a person is incapacitated and cannot consent if that person is asleep, seriously ill, unconscious, intermittently conscious, or physically or mentally unable to make informed, reasoned judgments. Incapacitation will be determined on a case-by-case basis, and will involve an analysis of whether a responding party “should have known” that the complainant was incapacitated, or played a role in the complainant becoming incapacitated.

Types of Sexual Misconduct

Sexual misconduct includes sexual harassment, sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual exploitation as well as other misconduct of a sexual nature.

Sexual Harassment:

Sexual harassment includes “hostile environment” harassment and “quid pro quo” harassment.

Hostile Environment Harassment: Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment if such conduct creates a hostile environment. A hostile environment exists when the conduct is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive that it unreasonably interferes with a person’s University education, employment, or activities.

Quid Pro Quo Harassment: Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment if submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of a person’s employment, academic standing, or participation in University activities. This is referred to as “quid pro quo” harassment.

When sexual harassment occurs within the context of a sexual and/or intimate relationship, it may constitute intimate partner violence.

Sexual Assault:

Sexual assault is any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs by force or without the consent of the recipient of the unwanted sexual activity. Sexual assault includes rape as well as other forms of sexual assault. Rape is the non-consensual penetration of any orifice with any object. Other forms of sexual assault include attempted rape, fondling, and other physical sexual activity that occurs without consent. For definitions of consent, including force, coercion, and incapacitation, see the first section of this document, entitled “Consent”.

When sexual assault occurs within the context of a sexual and/or intimate relationship, it may constitute intimate partner violence.

Intimate Partner Violence:

Intimate partner violence, also known as domestic violence or dating violence, is defined as an act or pattern of abusive behavior that is used by an intimate partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner. Not all intimate partner violence is sexual in nature, but sexual misconduct and intimate partner violence can overlap.

Stalking

Stalking is the repetitive and/or menacing pursuit, following, and/or harassment of a person which interferes with that person's well-being and safety or the well-being and safety of that person's family, friends and/or associates. Stalking and harassment may also occur digitally through cell phones, the internet, social media platforms, or other technology.

Not all stalking is sexual in nature. Non-sexual stalking is prohibited under the Discrimination and Harassment Policy. (The Discrimination and Harassment Policy will be [linked here.](#))

When stalking occurs within the context of a sexual and/or intimate relationship, it may constitute intimate partner violence.

Sexual Exploitation:

Sexual exploitation may include allowing third parties to observe private sexual activity without consent, engaging in voyeurism (watching private sexual activity without consent or viewing another person's intimate parts in a place where that person has a reasonable expectation of privacy), recording, disseminating, or transmitting private sexual images or sounds without consent, and prostituting another person.

When sexual exploitation occurs within the context of a sexual and/or intimate relationship, it may constitute intimate partner violence.

Other Sexual Misconduct:

Any sexual behavior that could reasonably be expected to inflict unwanted harm upon another member of the campus community may fall under the category of sexual misconduct. Other sexual misconduct includes unwanted physical contact, touching oneself sexually for others to view without their consent, and knowingly exposing another person to a sexually transmitted infection or virus without that person's knowledge.

When such behavior occurs within the context of a romantic/intimate relationship, it may constitute domestic/intimate partner violence.

Prohibited Relations:

The ability for a student to give full and affirmative consent to intimate relations with a faculty or staff member can be diminished or compromised. Additionally, such relations have the

potential to create a negative environment for other individuals who may perceive that they are disadvantaged as a result of the relations. As a result, the University of Puget Sound prohibits any intimate relations between a faculty member and a student. The university also prohibits intimate relations between a staff member and a student whenever the staff member is in a position of professional responsibility with respect to the student. All members of the faculty are by default considered to be in a supervisory role with students.

Intimate relations are defined as occurring when intimate, romantic, or sexual contact is established between one person or persons and another person or persons. Such contact may be a single instance or it may involve an ongoing pattern of contact. Intimate relations may involve a range of activities that may or may not be viewed as romantic or sexual by the parties involved. All reported violations of this policy will be investigated as an incident of sexual misconduct.

Any pre-existing relationships (such as might occur if a faculty spouse audits a partner's class, or if a recent alumnus/a is hired who continues dating a partner who is still matriculating at the university) should be disclosed to Title IX Coordinator when there is any possibility of a supervisory or career-influencing role between the parties so that alternative arrangements can be facilitated or documented as necessary.

Retaliation and Violation of Interim Measures

In addition to the behaviors defined above, the policy also prohibits retaliation and the violation of interim measures.

Retaliation includes acts, words, or attempts to seek retribution or take action against a person because of that person's good faith participation in the reporting, investigation, or resolution of an alleged violation of this policy. Retaliation may include intimidation, threats, coercion, or adverse educational or employment actions. A good faith pursuit by either party of civil, criminal, or other legal action does not constitute retaliation.

Interim measures are those services, accommodations, agreements, and arrangements that the University secures for complainants after receiving notice of alleged violations of policy, but before any final outcomes have been determined. Failure to comply with interim measures is a violation of this policy.

Proposal: Campus conversations at the University of Puget Sound
Respectfully submitted by Nancy Bristow, Noah Lumbantobing, and Alisa Kessel
19 March 2017

Rationale: During the debate over the common period, the Faculty Senate observed widespread interest from faculty, staff, and students in using the common period to support a shared, community-wide conversation each year. The Faculty Senate understands that the common period should not be dedicated extensively to this project, since the primary purpose of the common period is to foster shared governance. Therefore, we propose that one campus-wide event, oriented around a single question, and hosted during the common period in the first few weeks of the academic year, be used to initiate conversation and skill-development that extends to other time slots, venues, and reflections throughout the year.

Question identification: Each year, in collaboration with members of the campus community, the Faculty Senate can identify a shared question as the 'theme' of the year's investigations. A committee of the Faculty Senate (Bristow, Lumbantobing, and Kessel) have developed the following proposal for consideration by members of the campus community.

Our intention is to open a campus conversation in 2017-8 that:

- fosters disciplinary and interdisciplinary inquiry
- contributes positively to campus-wide endeavors like the development of a new strategic plan and ongoing considerations of our curriculum
- attends to the national conversations around higher education
- anticipates campus-wide events like the 2018 Race and Pedagogy national conference.

To that end, we propose the following question for the 2017-8 Campus Conversation:

What does it mean to know?

In a way, this question is central to all scholarly inquiry, but it is also a question about limits, information, access, beliefs, power, the self, and the world. A campus-wide conversation about this question will focus participants inward, toward their own limits and presumptions as 'knowers,' and outward, toward the broader context in which we all make claims and interrogate the claims of others.

This question also invites several subsidiary questions. For example:

- Whose ideas matter to me? Whose don't?*
- Whose knowledge or facts do I accept and whose do I reject?*
- Do I do enough to engage ideas, beliefs, and values that differ from my own?*
- Should I engage the ideas of those who deny that my ideas or experiences matter?*
- What are the limits of proof?*
- What counts as a fact?*
- What are my habits of mind?*
- How might I examine the assumptions that undergird my responses to these questions?*

The question also invites skill development. For example:

- How can I practice keeping my mind open? Why is this important to me?*
- What are/should be the limits to my engagement with ideas, beliefs, or values that differ from my own? When should I push myself to expand my engagement?*
- What role can I play in the development of new or different knowledge(s)?*

How can I engage the ideas of those who deny that my ideas or experiences matter?

Some venues for ongoing conversation (not exhaustive): Orientation, Prelude, ASUPS-sponsored events, named lectures, classroom activities, library materials and exhibitions, Kittredge and Slater programming and exhibitions, Wed@4, the Thompson Hall series, annual writing workshops, CWLT events, department-sponsored programming, student leadership training, Race and Pedagogy Institute events, Courageous Conversations, student club activities, MLK Day celebrations, professional development workshops

Model 1: Shared text, speaker, & campus-wide workshop

Once the theme of the campus conversation is established, the campus community is invited to propose nominations for a shared text or texts related to the theme ('texts' is meant as a broad invitation to consider books, films, works of art, articles, etc). The text(s) should be accessible and legible to a diverse array of backgrounds, skill levels, and disciplinary interests.

A speaker (perhaps the author or creator of the work) is invited to present some kind of response to the question. Our hope is that this event will have a strong interactive component in order to help participants engage ideas and texts in active ways.

Model 2: Campus-wide speaker and workshop

Once the theme of the campus conversation is established, a speaker can be invited to host a campus-wide workshop (along the lines of the Shakti Butler event in January 2017). Again, our hope is that this event will have a strong interactive component in order to help participants engage ideas and texts in active ways.