

Minutes of the October 3, 2018 faculty meeting

Respectfully submitted by John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty

Attendance: Faculty members and guests in attendance are listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

I. Call to order

Faculty Senate Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

II. Approval of the minutes of September 5, 2018

The minutes of the September 5, 2018 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

III. Questions regarding reports from the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate Chair

For the reports, see Appendices B, C, and D of these minutes.

Prior to fielding questions regarding his report, President Crawford shared some numbers for the Fall 2018 incoming class. The university exceeded its first-time-in-college (FTIC) enrollment goal this year, but the numbers also indicated the need to work harder to raise yield and retention percentages. President Crawford noted that last year's incoming class comprised a relatively high number of students who evidenced a lack of affinity with the college and who also came from Washington state (our retention rate for Washington students tends to be lower than for out-of-state students). A shortfall in tuition revenue was also reported, but President Crawford said that the university will be able to balance its budget this year. With respect to retention, some faculty members expressed a desire to have more mechanisms in place to stay in touch with orientation students and former academic advisees, even after they move on to other professors and programs; another member also asked how retention compared with respect to students from underrepresented backgrounds as opposed to the rest of the student body. President Crawford welcomed the desire to connect further with students as a way of improving retention, and also that the university is committed to increasing its support for our first-generation and minoritized students, as we see the most attrition from these categories.

There were no questions regarding the reports from the President, Provost, and Senate Chair.

Senate Chair Freeman proposed a change to the order of the meeting agenda. There were no objections. The discussion of the Faculty Code revision would now follow the OCR presentation.

IV. Presentation from Associate Dean Julie Christoph: "What OCR is and why you should care"

Associate Dean Christoph proposed the urgent need for scanned readings to be encoded with Optical Character Recognition (OCR), for pedagogical and accessibility reasons. Students with OCR PDF's are able to highlight, copy and paste, conduct word searches, and annotate their readings in ways that are much more efficient and accurate than with PDF's that are not encoded

with OCR. Thus, she noted, OCR is a technology that is not limited to the concerns of accessibility or accommodation; it is a tool that improves textual engagement for all our students, regardless of disabilities. Christoph suggested that if all departments had access to Adobe Acrobat Pro, that would make it possible for all new PDFs to have OCR; she is working with Technology Services to purchase a copy of the program for each departmental administrative assistant.. This would also ease the burden on the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation, which currently spends a lot of time and resources encoding course packets with OCR on a last-minute basis—a situation that puts the university at risk for ADA compliance and that could be prevented if every student reading already had OCR. In response to questions from the faculty regarding the technology, Christoph mentioned that it is relatively simple to convert a non-OCR document to OCR using Adobe Acrobat Pro, provided the original scan is a good one. She confirmed that copy machines do not automatically convert scans to an OCR PDF, and that faculty are contacted if students in their classes need to access course readings in OCR PDFs and the readings are not already accessible. She also confirmed that Word documents saved as PDFs have OCR automatically. She stated that most readings downloaded from library databases have OCR but that some articles received through Interlibrary Loan do not have OCR; in response to a question, Christoph said she would look into whether it would be feasible for all ILL articles to have OCR.

V. Continued discussion of motion to amend the Faculty Code with new language for promotion to full professor

The background and provisional language for a suggested revision of the Faculty Code regarding promotion to full professor is provided in [Appendix E](#).

The faculty continued their informal discussion—from the April 4, 2018 faculty meeting—about a motion to amend the Faculty Code with new language for promotion to full professor. Freeman said that the Senate will take feedback from the current meeting and make some revisions to the existing draft language before presenting it to the faculty as a first reading. The Senate is particularly keen to solicit feedback about whether promotion should be based on trajectory or the meeting of a baseline, and also about how we treat service at the time of promotion.

Anonymous feedback forms were distributed to the assembly.

Freeman opened the floor to questions and comments.

One faculty member noted that the language in the existing draft suggests an “and” model rather than an “either/or” model with regard to threshold or growth models. With respect to the third item of the draft regarding service, and given that the items were listed in the “order of importance,” another member felt it was not clear whether university service took priority over professional service within item 3. One member expressed a desire to hear the thinking behind the promotion language of “maintaining” excellence, particularly in terms of the difference between moving forward to associate professor and then to full professor. In response, one member suggested we find better language for acknowledging the need for a continuation of high standards of teaching while also meeting the other criteria. Another member mentioned that the

language of growth and excellence was also captured in departmental criteria, and could include developing curriculum and new courses.

A number of members discussed the issue of timing in terms of scholarly growth and publication, in particular a) whether the measure of scholarly achievement should take into account publication at any point in one's career or only with respect to a narrow evaluation period, and b) how professional growth itself should be measured, since many faculty develop in different ways and with different timelines, depending on discipline and the nature of any given project. One member suggested that these issues might be resolved at the level of departmental criteria rather than in, or in addition to, the Code. A few members advocated for a broader understanding of demonstrated excellence in scholarly activity, which would include ongoing large projects rather than completed ones. Two members suggested that promotion to full should occur when certain criteria were met rather than timelines, while others noted that such an approach did not take into account the significant financial incentive to go up for full, nor did it recognize the myriad ways in which professors in different disciplines measure achievement or growth. One member noted that the majority of respondents so far were already full professors, and that the nature of the conversation might deter input from junior faculty. This member encouraged faculty to use the anonymous forms to provide feedback.

Provost Bartanen added that the timelines for promotion files were a matter of choice, even if the culture of the university seemed to dictate a review period six years after promotion to associate. President Crawford added that it was beneficial for the university to have a faculty who have achieved the highest honors in their fields, including attainment of the rank of full professor. At the same time, he cautioned that if the faculty decide to move to a different model or standard of evaluation to achieve the rank of professor, they are encouraged to do so in a way that includes a plan for making the old model or standard obsolete. He noted that institutions that did not plan for phasing out old promotion criteria when incorporating new ones, unintentionally, tended to create an evaluation environment that, for some, diminished the prestige associated with the promotion

Based on the discussion so far, Senate Chair Freeman concluded that, while teaching excellence remained the preeminent criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor, the period of promotion from associate to full needed to take into account its season of high service and scholarship demands while also maintaining excellence in teaching.

VI. Open discussion on next steps related to initiatives in the strategic plan

Senate Chair Freeman presented the following three questions for faculty to consider in moving forward with the strategic plan: 1) What are the issues in curriculum we most want to address? 2) What are the opportunities we are most excited about? 3) (How) do we want to take action?

Three members reported that the faculty want to revise the core curriculum, and requested conversations that would initiate changes in this regard. One member suggested that the faculty should consider what the liberal arts do, and, in particular, what makes this institution do the kind of work that is distinct from the educational models of larger research universities. Another member expressed surprise that the strategic plan document mentioned the humanities once, but

the sciences sixteen times. Provost Bartanen responded the strategic plan includes everyone and values the liberal arts, and that there was no plan to exclude any programs. Two faculty members suggested that the faculty does its best work when presented with models, and looked forward to assessing concrete curricular proposals in the near future.

IX. Other business

There was no other business.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

Appendix A – Attendance

Attending

Greta Austin
Gareth Barkin
Kris Bartanen
Francoise Belot
LaToya Brackett
Nancy Bristow
Gwynne Brown
Dan Burgard
Alva Butcher
Erin Colbert-White
Isiaah Crawford
Alyce DeMarais
Regina Duthely
Tanya Erzen
Lisa Ferrari
Amy Fisher
Kena Fox-Dobbs
Sara Freeman
Michael Furick
Megan Gessel
Jeffrey Grinstead
William Haltom
John Hanson
Renee Houston
Robin Jacobson
Greg Johnson
Lisa Johnson
Kristin Johnson

Priti Joshi
Alisa Kessel
Samuel Kigar
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Laura Krughoff
Sunil Kukreja
Brendan Lanctot
John Lear
Ha Jung Lee
Grace Livingston
Janet Marcavage
Jeff Matthews
Gary McCall
Amanda Mifflin
Andrew Monaco
Sarah Moore
Gerard Morris
Wendell Nakamura
Steven Neshyba
Eric Orlin
A. Susan Owen
Jacob Price
Sara Protasi
Isha Rajbhandari
Elise Richman
Brett Rogers
Amy Ryken

Leslie Saucedo
Renee Simms
Jessica Smith
Stuart Smithers
Rokiatou Soumare
Jonathan Stockdale
Jason Struna
George Tomlin
Alison Tracy Hale
Ariela Tubert
Michael Valentine
Kurt Walls
Suzanne Warren
Seth Weinberger
Carolyn Weisz
John Wesley
Kirsten Wilbur
Paula Wilson
Peter Wimberger
Dawn Yoshimura-Smith
Jeffrey Yu

Guests

Kate Cohn
Kelli Delaney
Collin Noble
Ellen Peters
Sarah Shives



President's Report to the Faculty
September 25, 2018

I am pleased to provide to my faculty colleagues this brief overview of activities and initiatives since my report last month.

Enrollment Update

Now that 10th day has passed, we can officially report that for fall 2018 we have 653 first-time in college (goal = 645), 55 new transfer students (goal = 55), 141 new graduate students (goal = 127), and 1652 continuing students. We estimate that current year unrestricted educational and general revenues will be about 1% short of budget, largely due to total net tuition revenues being below budget. While total new undergraduate student headcount is on target, we saw a decline in our first-to-second-year student retention rate (a drop from 86% in fall 2017 to 80.5% in fall 2018), offset by strong enrollment in graduate programs. Additionally, undergraduate financial aid exceeded target for new and continuing students, something that private colleges around the country are experiencing as demographics shift and competition intensifies.

Strategic Planning

Thank you for your time during our September 5 Faculty meeting to discuss the strategic plan. I found the discussion to be rich and very helpful. At this writing, I have held similar sessions with ASUPS leadership, Staff Senate, and community partners and leaders, and I am scheduled to meet with our Alumni Council Executive Committee and Alumni Council on September 28 to help inform our presentation of the plan to the Board of Trustees at their meetings on October 4 and 5. I also look forward to continuing our discussion of the plan with members of the faculty on October 10 at the Club.

Vice President and University Counsel

Our search for our first vice president and university counsel is progressing well. We anticipate bringing three finalists to campus for interviews later this fall and successfully completing the search such that our new colleague will assume his/her/their duties with us in January 2019.

October Board of Trustees Meeting

As noted above, our trustees will be on campus next week. We have a full agenda and look forward to a productive set of meetings, and welcoming the return to board service of Sunshine Morrison '94 and recognizing the appointments of Shelly Heier '98, Michael Nicolais P'18, and John Walker P'18, as their terms of service commenced in July. Thursday evening, October 4 we will gather with other benefactors and friends of the college for our annual President's Leadership Society reception to celebrate and express our gratitude for the support we receive from them to carry out the mission of the institution.

Race and Pedagogy National Conference/Homecoming and Family Weekend

Also at this writing, we look forward to welcoming our keynote speakers, community partners, guests, alumni and friends to the Race and Pedagogy National Conference and our Homecoming

and Family Weekend. We will certainly be the place to be in the 253 over the next few days!

As always, thank you for all that you do for the college. I look forward to being with you next week.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Isiaah".

Isiaah Crawford, Ph.D.
President



September 26, 2018

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Provost Report to the October 3 Faculty Meeting

In addition to all the preparations, events, and considerations that get an academic year started, and daily emergent issues, the time period since the September 5 meeting has been mostly focused on getting our two Director searches open (School of Music, Counselor Education); preparation for the Race & Pedagogy Conference/Homecoming & Family Weekend; and preparation for the October 4-5 Board of Trustees meeting, for which the central focus is the *Leadership for a Changing World: Puget Sound Strategic Plan 2018-2028*.

At the same time, the CAPTE reaccreditation visit for the DPT program is September 28-October 3; we expect to receive the candidate pool for the Director of Counseling, Health and Wellness search on October 5; the first rounds of tenure-line search "short-list" candidates are beginning the roll in; and both the Faculty Advancement Committee and Budget Task Force are launching once we hit October. I will be away for a Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities reaccreditation visit October 8-10. Dean of Faculty Sunil Kukreja and the Deans' team will convene the Chairs, Directors and Deans meeting on October 9, which has a full agenda.

The big work, of course, is moving forward the strategic plan. We committed at the August 23 Fall Faculty Workshop to sharing feedback with you at an upcoming Faculty Meeting. That material is now posted on the Faculty Conversation SoundNet site, in the "1 Strategic Planning" folder. <https://soundnet.pugetsound.edu/sites/Team/WorkTeams/Dean/SitePages/Home.aspx>. I look forward to the discussion at the meeting regarding how we best move forward the strategic plan initiatives in good and timely ways.

A reminder: Our **Religious Observances Policy**, passed by the Academic Standards Committee, 2/17/2017, provides: "The University of Puget Sound values the rich diversity of religious traditions, observances and beliefs represented in our campus community and supports the rights of students to practice their faiths. The university recognizes that in some instances a student's religious observances may conflict with the student's academic schedule. In such cases, the university endorses reasonable schedule flexibility, unless such an accommodation would create an undue burden on the student, other students, the instructor, or the college. Students shall consult with their instructor directly and in a timely manner to discuss an accommodation. The

university chaplain is available to consult with students who wish to make such requests. The instructor may consult with the university chaplain or the Office of the Dean of the University for assistance as needed.”

Here’s the link to Dave Wright’s page on dates of 2018-19 religious observances.

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/spirituality/religious-and-spiritual-holidays-and-observances/>

Attending to religious diversity is part of what it means to be an inclusive, socially just campus.

Follow-up: In response to what I heard as an earnest question from a colleague at the September 5, 2018 faculty meeting, after Vivie Nguyen and Collin Noble shared the ASUPS anti-bias video, here are a few resources to help us to be more conscious of identifying and responding to bias in and beyond the classroom.

Our own *Sound Writing* handbook: <https://soundwriting.pugetsound.edu/writing-with-awareness.html> (which covers writing with respect, inclusive language, and writing and correctness; the latter section includes a further bibliography of resources).

On the Human Resources Professional Development and Education Conference page:

[Shakti Butler, Ph.D. - "Cracking the Codes: The System of Racial Inequity"](#)

[Racial Equity Tool's Glossary](#)

[Strategic Questioning](#)

Dena R. Samuels, *The Culturally Inclusive Educator: Preparing for a Multicultural World*, Teachers College Press, 2014.

Examples from the Race/Related Newsletter, available weekly by email from *The New York Times*:

Rachel L. Swarns, “What Do You Do When Someone Makes a Racist Remark?” *New York Times*, September 21, 2018.

John Eligon, “Me and My White Teachers,” *New York Times*, September 22, 2018.

Thank you! I know I cannot begin to name all the faculty members – along with staff colleagues, students, alumni, community members and more – who have been and are dedicating incredible thought, time, and labor to preparation for and hosting of the Race and Pedagogy National Conference as well as Homecoming and Family Weekend. Your preparations of your own scholarly, artistic, and other professional work, as well as your guiding and mentoring students in their presentations of various kinds, are all important and make a difference. Your support to enable staff colleagues to attend the conference; your cooperation in meeting in a different classroom on Friday, if needed; and your embrace of the Conference as our Friday classroom also matter. We anticipate several thousand people on campus over the Thursday to Sunday period; thank you for welcoming them with warm Puget Sound hospitality.

It is important to name **Dexter Gordon, Grace Livingston, Nancy Bristow, Carolyn Weisz, Michael Benitez, La Toya Brackett and program assistant Tina McLeod** for their leadership work in hosting the 2018 Race and Pedagogy National Conference. Please share in thanking them over the coming days.

Appendix D - Report from Senate Chair Sara Freeman

Report to the Faculty **Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate** **September 25, 2018**

Campus Events

I write this report two days before the Fourth quadrennial Race and Pedagogy Conference begins on campus, an event happening in concert with Family and Homecoming Weekend. Years of work have gone into the programming for the coming three days. I am in the thick of stage managing for the four extraordinary keynote speeches and I am deeply excited to hear Brian Cladoosby, Jeff Chang, Valerie Jarrett, Alicia Garza, and Patrisse Cullors speak. The spotlight sessions and concurrent panels also feature a very wide range of faculty presenting about their scholarship, their cross-campus collaborations, and their pedagogical practices. I think I can safely say that as a faculty, we are *here* for the RPNC.

Coming fast on the heels of those encompassing events, campus will host the fall Board of Trustees Meeting on October 3-5. I offer my hearty thanks to Professors Brown, Jacobson, and Hale who will be attending Trustees meetings in my stead since I will be at my brother's wedding during those days – I am comforting myself that there are many Trustees meetings in the future for me to attend, whereas the wedding is happening only once. Faculty Senate will look forward to hearing reports about the Trustees proceedings and continuing to engage with our partners in shared governance.

Senate Work

Since the last full faculty meeting, the Senate completed the process of providing additional charges to each of the standing committees. The Senate responded to resolutions passed by the Curriculum Committee in spring 2018 about a need to help the CC and the Committee on Diversity navigate shared business related to campus diversity initiatives. The Senate also opened the possibility of changing the makeup of the Library and Media Service Committee. The Senate is following up on both fronts.

In our meetings so far, it has been a pleasure to start to get to know Dr. Uchenna Baker, Dean of Students. She is a welcome addition to our proceedings.

The Senate is moving forward with the motion from last spring to amend the code language related to tenure and promotion to full professor. As this motion returns to the full faculty for its second reading on October 3, the Senate is aware that junior faculty may feel less free to speak about their evaluation of the proposed changes. I urge colleagues to share perspectives with Senators, who can share representative viewpoints when faculty members don't wish to speak in full meeting.

The Senate also continues to discuss next steps related to initiatives in the draft Strategic Plan (*Leadership for a Changing World: Puget Sound Strategic Plan 2018-2028*), pursuing especially the desire for further conversation among faculty. In her report, the Provost is sharing a link to

the feedback from the August 23 workshop. For the October 3 Faculty meeting, I've put it on the agenda to have some open discussion time to invite us to explore what it means to act in relation to the strategic plan, and how the faculty wants to do that. Additionally, the Faculty Senate will spend a session in informal conversation with President Crawford in the early evening on October 10. As we approach Fall Break, the Senate will weigh what those conversations have produced.

Looking ahead at work to come for the Faculty Senate — colleagues from Student Affairs will share the draft revision of Student Integrity Code; the Senate will review the draft policy on "Academic Freedom and the Exercise of Free Speech" begun last year; and we will return to the initiatives to equalize the semester calendar, continue evaluation of common hour, and explore the need for set meeting times for standing committees. Stay tuned into 2019.

An Appreciation

On the occasion of the Provost announcing her intention to transition back to the faculty, and move into a sabbatical next year, I would like to take a moment to appreciate Kris Bartanen. Her long tenure in leadership on campus stands as a truly inspirational record. I am saddened that I will not have more time to work with her; likewise, I am thankful for the period I have been a faculty member, department chair, committee chair, and now leader of Faculty Senate with her as head of the academic division. The retirements and staffing changes of the last few years seem to mark a time of generational change on campus: it is daunting to recognize this period of change. I also want to express deep admiration for Kris, and for the hope, excitement, and good guidance she provided even in her letter outlining her transition plan.

Sincerely,

Sara

Appendix E - Background and Provisional Language for Change to Faculty Code

A brief history of work to date

For several years, the Faculty Advancement Committee has noted (in its annual report to the Faculty Senate) discrepancies in how departments interpret the phrase in the Faculty Code regarding “distinguished service,” a requirement for promotion to the rank of (full) professor. The Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee (in around 2015-2016) to render an interpretation of the language. Upon surveying departments chairs, the PSC determined that departments were split in their interpretations: some applied the modifier “distinguished” only to service, while others believed that “distinguished” applied to other categories of review. Consequently, the PSC did not feel confident rendering a decisive interpretation, for to do so would have been to impose a culture change upon half of the faculty.

That left the option of revision of the Code. Because the PSC is the body that interprets the Code, the Faculty Senate determined that it should not also be charged with writing the Code. For this reason, the Faculty Senate took on the responsibility of crafting language to present to the faculty. In AY 2016-2017, in collaboration with the Faculty Senate, the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a survey of the faculty and three focus groups—one each at the rank of assistant, associate, and full professor.

In fall 2017, a committee of the Faculty Senate (Jacobson, Kessel, Kukreja, L. Livingston, MacBain, and Wilson) convened to draft language based on the findings from the survey and focus group data. The committee saw a wide range of perspectives in the survey results, but nevertheless saw a few ideas that it believed would be important to consider in revising the Code:

- the revision should clarify an expectation that applicants for promotion to full should both meet a minimum bar and provide evidence of an upward trajectory in each category of review;
- the revision should convey the idea that each career has seasons (to borrow the Provost’s language) and that, while applicants for promotion to full are expected to have demonstrated significant achievement in each category of review, they are not expected to do everything at a significant level all the time;
- the categories of review should be simplified.

The committee developed language, which it took first to the Professional Standards Committee and then, upon incorporating the PSC’s recommendations, to the Faculty Senate. After some discussion, the Faculty Senate revised the language once more. The Faculty Senate approved its own revisions of the language and voted to take the revised language to the full faculty for consideration.

The tenor of our deliberation

A concern was voiced in the Faculty Senate that faculty members at the assistant and associate levels could feel reluctant to speak candidly during the conversation of the full faculty for fear of being misinterpreted or unfairly judged. The Faculty Senate asks participants in the discussion to entertain all points of view and to invite, in particular, the input of those who

stand directly to be affected by a change to the requirements for promotion or the schedule of implementation of the change. The Faculty Senate asks, too, that participants commit to the generous interpretation and respectful consideration of one another's ideas.

The text of the motion

Procedurally, it feels important to the Faculty Senate that the implementation of the change be debated independent of the language of the revision itself. Therefore, the motion has two parts: part one concerns implementation and part two concerns the proposed revision.

PART I. IMPLEMENTATION

If the faculty and Trustees vote to revise the Faculty Code regarding promotion standards to the rank of full professor, the revised language will apply to tenure line faculty members who join the campus in the academic year following approval of the revised language. (For example, if passed in AY 2018-19, tenure line faculty who join the faculty in AY 2019-18 will be subject to the revised language). Faculty members who are on the tenure line prior to passage of the measure will be evaluated on the standards that existed in the Code when the faculty approved the measure.

The faculty requests that the Professional Standards Committee note this implementation measure in the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document (formerly known as the "buff" document).

PART II. PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR REVISION TO THE FACULTY CODE (at III.3.e)

"Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. Appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral or other equivalent terminal degree.

Decisions whether to promote shall be based upon the quality of the faculty member's performance in the following areas, listed in order of importance:

- (1) teaching and related responsibilities, including the mentoring and advising of students;
- (2) professional growth;
- (3) participation in service a) to the university, and b) to one's profession or, in ways related to one's professional interests and expertise, to the larger community.

Promotion to the rank of full professor requires a candidate to have maintained excellence in teaching and demonstrated significant scholarly achievement. Within the category of service, candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor must provide evidence of a continued and significant contribution to the university."