

## **Minutes of the February 6, 2019 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**

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m., at which time there were eighty-eight voting members present.

### **II. Announcements**

Announcements were made regarding Summer Fellowship Internship opportunities for students, as well as upcoming events supportive of both Black History Month and the Founding Principles in U.S. Foreign Policy lecture series.

### **III. Approval of the minutes of November 7, 2018**

The minutes of the November 7, 2018 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

### **IV. Questions regarding reports from the President, Provost, Faculty Senate Chair, and Vice President for Enrollment**

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

There were no questions regarding the reports.

Following an announcement from Chair Freeman, there was a round of applause for Provost Bartanen, recently honored by the American Conference of Academic Deans with an Award for Excellence in Academic Leadership.

### **V. Report and discussion from Curriculum Task Force**

Gordon and Kessel, co-chairs of the Curriculum Task Force (CTF), took the floor.

For the presentation's slideshow, see Appendix F of these minutes.

Gordon shared that the CTF's composition reflects a desire that it should be representative of faculty, and emphasized that the CTF's primary concern is to involve the entire faculty in the decision process, each step of the way, in creating a curriculum that meets the needs of students who come to us with new needs and expectations, and from a changing demographic profile. The CTF's timeline is to have the undergraduate curricular framework affirmed by the faculty by May 1, 2019 (for endorsement by the Board of Trustees), proposals for rubrics and standards by the end of the summer, and then to work on implementation for the incoming class of Fall 2020 by the end of the Spring 2020 term. The intention is that all the work is mandated by the faculty,

which alone has the authority to decide on what kind of curriculum it wants. In describing the accompanying slideshow, Gordon highlighted the need to take seriously the characteristics of an excellent curriculum, as well as the need to restructure it so that it reflects both excellence in offerings and the appropriate realignment of faculty workload expectations. At the same time, he shared that the CTF's intention is to honor existing good work that faculty want to keep as part of the new curriculum.

Kessel asked the faculty to consider what we want students to have / have done as a result of their time at Puget Sound. She mentioned that this question is partly answered by the educational goals established in last year's meetings, with the next step a matter of discovering what we need to revise at the curricular level in order to support and meet those goals, including new ones like creative thinking, and old ones like oral communication, which we need to incorporate in a better way. With respect to the changing needs of our students and their learning environments, she also discussed the need for metaliteracy, or to think critically and informedly about how to do research in this age of digital information. Some things, however, have been taken off the table in terms of reconsideration, such as the major, the KNOW requirement, and a second language requirement; based on faculty input, factors of external legibility (especially for the sciences), and the crucial role they play in meeting the educational goals, these features will remain in the curriculum, even if, as Kessel added, we are not sure at this stage how they will look, particularly the second language requirement. Kessel highlighted some of the main areas of potential change the faculty can start thinking about, including the core, pathways, student social development, mentoring and advising, high impact practices, and workload. She reminded the faculty that this conversation has been fomenting for quite a while, and that, for example, a 2014 survey of faculty revealed that only 18% felt the core should remain unchanged, and that 25% wanted it completely overhauled.

Gordon and Kessel opened the floor to questions.

One member asked about a slide that indicated what the current curriculum was not doing well, and asked how that was measured. Kessel responded that the slide presents information gathered from core area assessments, focus groups, as well as student and faculty feedback.

Regarding the pathways model, one member expressed a concern that it might restrict the kind of exploration that currently allows students to arrive at a major they might not have otherwise imagined when first entering college. Gordon expressed sympathy with the question of flexibility and exploration that pathways raise, and Kessel added that the CTF has groups presenting different models, such as a pathway without a core, a pathway with a core, or a pathway separate from the core. Chair Freeman added further that finding the right balance of freedom and structure within the curriculum is one of the biggest tasks facing the CTF in its decision-making process, keeping in mind that students do not benefit from freedom until they have had structure (and that, currently, the first-year seminars are being asked to do too much work in terms of orienting students to the business of college). Regarding this balance and the potential for more structure, one member expressed a worry for students in the sciences who might need to prepare for graduate school requirements; this member also said that identities underrepresented in the sciences often find their way into these disciplines after a period of exploration, so adding more structure early in the game might inhibit diversification. Kessel and Gordon responded that the

CTF was looking at this carefully, particularly for majors like the sciences, and that many solutions were on the table, including double-counting and making pathways optional rather than mandatory. They shared a desire to give students some freedom of exploration and discovery when it comes to settling into a major or pathway, and the importance—when considering the needs of the sciences—of maintaining a liberal arts identity.

One member asked whether ethical concerns close to the heart of the campus community, such as its carbon footprint, would be integrated in the curriculum. Gordon answered that this integration was indeed part of the process, and invited this member and others with similar interests to share them with the CTF.

Another member thanked the CTF for their work and transparency, but expressed disappointment that the development and feedback sessions were being offered at times when many faculty teach. Kessel said that all available common hours were being used for CTF meetings.

One member raised a concern about how to evaluate creative thinking. Gordon responded that this is also a concern for the CTF and that they have proposals to radically change how we do assessment, while Provost Bartanen said that there are rubrics available for assessing creativity.

A question was brought up about how the faculty would eventually decide on the new curriculum. Kessel responded that this is still up in the air, but possibly that two models would be brought forward and the faculty would collectively decide, or that we would vote on various parts of the curriculum along the way and then put it together at the end; she reiterated the need to achieve a broad consensus on the curriculum. Gordon also mentioned that the CTF has made a list of departments and chairs with whom they want to meet in order to think about interdisciplinarity in the pathways, and forging partnerships with other programs and departments.

One member expressed concern about the timeline, and specifically that it seemed unrealistic to expect implementation by Spring 2020. Gordon clarified that it was the CTF's goal to produce a proposal for implementation in Spring 2020, and Kessel added that the implementation itself would be a process. Provost Bartanen said that every aspect of the curriculum need not be in place by Fall 2020, but that we might have enough of the curriculum ready to meet the needs of first-years in Fall 2020, and to start on whatever it is that we decide will be the new curriculum. Kessel and Gordon acknowledged—in response to a question—that students will have the right to follow the curriculum into which they matriculated, so that the university would need to offer both curricula for at least three years.

The assembly showed their appreciation for the CTF's work with a round of applause. Chair Freeman encouraged the faculty to be willing to try on new ideas as a way of making them possible.

## **VI. FEPPS BA program update: seeking endorsement for policies and procedures committee**

The FEPPS program was represented by Erzen, Jacobson, and Weinberger.

Weinberger mentioned that the committee has met with the Senate and Cabinet, and would now like the faculty to endorse a committee that will create policies and processes that will implement a FEPPS BA program. Erzen said that the committee would seek to ensure that we have procedures and handbooks that align the university and the circumstances of prison life (where, for example, there is no internet). Weinberger added that all these parts will come back to the faculty for a vote to recommend the program for eventual approval by the Cabinet. Jacobson and Weinberger said that the Curriculum Committee has already seen the FEPPS BA model, has deemed it viable, and that it matches the educational requirements of the university; the next step is to bring it to the faculty.

It was **moved** by Holland, and **seconded**, *that an ad hoc committee consisting of eight (8) faculty and staff members shall be created to develop policies and procedures to be included in a proposal for a BA program in the Washington Corrections Center for Women. The ad hoc committee shall present the proposal for the BA program at WCCW to the faculty at the first faculty meeting in fall 2019. The Academic Director of FEPPS shall chair the committee and will invite faculty and staff to join the committee.*

The faculty discussed the motion.

One member asked about the composition of the committee. Erzen responded that it will be comprised of a core group of people who are currently working on the proposal and will continue doing so; however, Erzen also indicated that other interested faculty are now welcome to join, and specified a current need for representation from non-humanities disciplines. Another member asked about the budgetary impact on the university. Weinberger said it would be negligible, with a few small costs pertinent to the Office of the Registrar; one member clarified that there are expected to be 3-5 students in the program at any given time, so there would be little impact on the Office of the Registrar. Jacobson mentioned that the FEPPS BA financial plan is available in the faculty meeting minutes from November 7, 2018. Provost Bartanen added that FEPPS is currently 501(c)(3) and has been successful in fundraising. Another member asked whether FEPPS BA faculty would be volunteers, as they are for the current AA program. Erzen said that faculty who teach in the FEPPS BA program will be paid an overload rate, the funds for which will be raised through private donation.

The faculty showed their appreciation of the committee and support for the program with a round of applause.

There was no further discussion.

The motion **passed** on a counted vote with all in favor.

## **VII. First reading of proposed change to the Faculty Code regarding language for promotion to full professor**

For the revision's rationale and the proposed language, see Appendix G of these minutes.

For a side-by-side view of the current and proposed language, see [Appendix H](#) of these minutes.

Chair Freeman reminded the faculty that a second reading of the proposed change would occur in the March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, at which time the faculty will have the opportunity to decide whether to vote on the new language.

It was **moved** by MacBain, and **seconded**, that section III.3.e of the Faculty Code shall be revised to read as follows:

*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 activity since promotion to associate. 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.*

The faculty discussed the motion.

One faculty member wondered how “excellent” and “significant” were distinguished as qualifiers of teaching and scholarly activity, respectively. Another member said that “activity” was used instead of “achievement” in order to highlight the value of ongoing work. One member asked why professional growth had no qualifications, while another said that the word “activity” was too vague. Chair Freeman responded that departmental evaluation criteria would specify these goals and whether they were met. Provost Bartanen described the final paragraph as getting at a standard with which to measure the three categories above it. Another member noted that one substantive change between the current and revised language is that advising has been moved from third place to join teaching in first place; this member said that it is difficult to document achievements in advising. Two members of the Faculty Senate mentioned that the language reflects feedback from focus groups of faculty at all ranks, and from the FAC.

The faculty will continue their discussion of the motion after a second reading of the revised language.

**VIII. Other business**

There was no other business.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

## Appendix A - Attendance

### Attending

Gareth Barkin  
William Barry  
Kris Bartanen  
Terence Beck  
Francoise Belot  
Michael Benveniste  
LaToya Brackett  
Nancy Bristow  
Gwynne Brown  
Derek Buescher  
Dan Burgard  
Alva Butcher  
America Chambers  
David Chiu  
Julie Nelson Christoph  
Erin Colbert-White  
Johanna Crane  
Rachel DeMotts  
Tanya Erzen  
Amy Fisher  
Lea Fortmann  
Kena Fox-Dobbs  
Sara Freeman  
Andrew Gardner  
Megan Gessel  
Dexter Gordon  
Jeffrey Grinstead  
William Haltom  
Fred Hamel  
John Hanson  
Suzanne Holland  
Renee Houston  
Darcy Irvin  
Robin Jacobson  
Greg Johnson  
Lisa Johnson  
Kristin Johnson  
Priti Joshi  
Diane Kelley  
Alisa Kessel  
Samuel Kigar  
Jung Kim  
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos

Kriszta Kotsis  
Brendan Lanctot  
John Lear  
Ha Jung Lee  
Shen-Yi Liao  
Tiffany MacBain  
Susmita Mahato  
Janet Marcavage  
Jeff Matthews  
Gary McCall  
Andrew Monaco  
Sarah Moore  
Wendell Nakamura  
Steven Neshyba  
Eric Orlin  
Susan Owen  
Jennifer Pitonyak  
Jacob Price  
Isha Rajbhandari  
Siddharth Ramakrishnan  
Amy Ryken  
Douglas Sackman  
Leslie Saucedo  
Eric Scharrer  
Dan Sherman  
Adam Smith  
Stuart Smithers  
Jason Struna  
Yvonne Swinth  
Justin Tiehen  
George Tomlin  
Alison Tracy Hale  
Ariela Tubert  
Andreas Udbye  
Kurt Walls  
Suzanne Warren  
Seth Weinberger  
Stacey Weiss  
Carolyn Weisz  
John Wesley  
Heather White  
Kirsten Wilbur  
Linda Williams  
Sheryl Zylstra

### Guests

Heather Bailey  
Uchenna Baker  
Kate Cohn  
Liz Collins  
Collin Noble  
Ellen Peters  
Landon Wade



## **President's Report to the Faculty**

January 29, 2019

Welcome to the beginning of spring semester! It is good to have our students back and the campus humming with activity. A great deal of progress is being made on many fronts. I hope you find the summary below helpful, as well as the strategic planning update that I sent via campus email in December.

I am sorry that I will not be able to join you for your meeting on Feb. 5 as I will be away for university business (see below). As always, I welcome your questions and appreciate your leadership as we work together to create the best possible future for our students and our university.

### **Leadership for a Changing World**

Our strategic plan efforts are moving forward with vigor! I am especially excited about the work of the curriculum task force, which is off to a strong start under the leadership of co-chairs Alisa Kessel and Dexter Gordon in exploring a new framework for the undergraduate curriculum that will integrate the major, interdisciplinary pathways, experiential learning, and mentorship. I look forward to receiving a recommendation from the full faculty that we can take to the board of trustees in May 2019.

Other initiatives underway include Puget Sound's participation in the national Great Colleges to Work For survey, which will help us identify and prioritize areas of opportunity and give us a better sense of how we compare in key elements of workplace satisfaction with other colleges. Look for more information soon about how to participate in the survey, which will be open March 11 – April 5.

Since mid-November I have visited with six alumni regional clubs (Tacoma, Seattle, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver, and Boise) to speak with alumni, parents, and other friends of Puget Sound about our strategic plan vision and how they can be involved in bringing it to fruition. It's been a wonderful opportunity to hear directly from alumni about their experiences at Puget Sound, and I continue to be impressed by their dedication to their alma mater. Next up: Washington, D.C., Portland and Honolulu, followed by New York, Chicago, and Minneapolis later this spring.

### **Provost Search**

The advisory search committee met Jan. 22 with our search consultants to review a preliminary list of applicants, and will meet again next month to review the full candidate pool and make decisions about those we wish to interview. We are on track to hold semi-finalist interviews in mid-March and meet with finalists in April.



## Appendix B – Report from President Isiaah Crawford

### **University Counsel**

Please join me in welcoming to campus on Jan. 30 Joanna Carey Cleveland, Puget Sound's new vice president and university counsel who will also serve as secretary to the board of trustees. Joanna brings to us extensive experience in higher education as an attorney, policy advisor, and faculty member. As the higher education landscape becomes increasingly complex and regulated, it will be a tremendous asset to have in-house counsel available to us. A reception to introduce Joanna to faculty and staff members is scheduled for Monday, Feb. 18, at 4 p.m. in Trimble Forum.

### **Welcome Center**

We have reached our fundraising goal and are ready to break ground in early February on the new Welcome Center, to be located at the corner of Alder St. and N. 15<sup>th</sup>. This facility will serve as an important point of entry and welcome for our prospective students and their families, and will provide needed space to hold campus events after hours when it is not needed by our Office of Admissions. We anticipate that construction will be completed in 12 – 14 months. Please see information and announcements from Facilities Services about impacts to campus during this time frame.

### **Budget and Enrollment**

The Budget Task Force (BTF) is in the process of reviewing its academic year 2019-20 recommendations with faculty, staff, and students, and I look forward to presenting a balanced budget to our trustees for their approval next month. I hope many of you were able to attend the Jan. 29 presentation offered to faculty by Alisa Kessel and Eric Orlin, faculty representatives serving on the Budget Task Force.

Our budget is based on many long-term projections, including enrollment. Our early and regular decision deadlines have passed for the undergraduate Class of 2023, and we are in the process of making financial aid offers and assisting applicants who have not yet completed their applications. Although it continues to be a highly competitive environment, we appear to have notable affinity among our applicants and our collective focus will be on yielding the Class of 2023. We are encouraged by the strong academic qualifications of our applicants, as well as the diversity they represent in terms of race, geography, experience, and more. It is likely that our tuition discount rate will increase again, and this is something we will account for in our FY20 budget planning. Thank you for all you do as faculty to support the work of enrolling our undergraduate class, and contributing to both the yield and retention of our students.

### **Higher Education Advocacy and Community Involvement**

These are challenging times for higher education, as we navigate proposed changes in federal policy that will directly impact our students and institutions of higher education, and seek to build ever stronger relationships with our legislators and local community. A few updates:

- I continue to maintain my involvement with the President's Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration, an organization of college presidents that advocates for policies that create a welcoming environment for immigrant, undocumented, and international students on our campuses.
- Earlier this month I attended the Council on Independent Colleges President's Institute, where our primary focus was on the new Congress and the issues we will look to address with them.
- On Jan. 10 I hosted more than 100 local civic leaders in a reception at the President's Residence to usher in a new year in Tacoma and strengthen our connections to our

## Appendix B – Report from President Isiaah Crawford

community and its concerns. I was honored to give the keynote address at the City of Tacoma’s Martin Luther King Jr. Day celebration, and was sorry to miss our own campus celebration last week as I traveled to Orlando with Director of Athletics Amy Hackett to advance the interests of our student-athletes and athletics program at the NCAA Convention.

- In early February, I will attend the annual meeting of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and call on members of our Congressional delegation to address the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, student aid, and Title IX.
- I recently accepted an invitation to serve on the Earth Day Northwest 2020 Leadership Group, and look forward to sharing more information with you as that work unfolds.

With best wishes for the spring semester,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Isiaah". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Isiaah Crawford, Ph.D.  
President



January 28, 2019

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Provost's Report to the February 6 Faculty Meeting

### **Congratulations!**

- Professors Andreas Madlung, Biology, and David Latimer, Physics, received honorable mentions in the M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust's recent competition for the Lynwood W. Swanson Scientific Research and Promise Awards, respectively. In addition:
- Annie K. Lamar '19 (Classics/Computer Science), mentored by America Chambers, Computer Science, was awarded the prestigious 2018 John Van Zytveld Award in the Physical Sciences for her research project *Low-Resource Neural Machine Translation of Ancient Languages* at the 2018 Murdock College Science Research Conference.
- Tessa Nanja '19 (Biology/Environmental Policy and Decision-Making), mentored by Peter Hodum, was awarded an *Ecology-Evolution-Biodiversity* Murdock Poster Prize for her presentation *Using Age to Assess Retention Time of Ingested Plastic in Seabirds*.
- Erin Stewart '20 (Biology/Environmental Policy and Decision-Making), mentored by Dr. Michael Cramer, University of Notre Dame, also received the same prize for her presentation, *An Ear for Fear: The Influence of Background Noise on the Foraging Behavior of Peromyscus maniculatus gracilis (Woodland Deer Mice)* at the conference.

### **Appreciation!**

- Faculty development work extraordinaire over the January 2019 winter break:
  - Professor Susan Owen, project manager for the Center for Speech and Effective Advocacy, led a well-received initial workshop on *Developing and Evaluating Public Speaking Assignments Across the Curriculum*. Look for her announcement of an upcoming May workshop focused on oral communication in Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry soon.
  - Associate Dean Renee Houston and ePortfolio Manager Elize Hellam led an excellent workshop for colleagues, *Reflection 2.0: Integrative Learning with ePortfolio Pedagogy*. Reflective practices are strengthening student learning all across the campus.
  - *Intercultural Competency and Inclusive Pedagogy*: 46 colleagues, representing all but three teaching departments, schools, and programs participated in an a terrific two-day, faculty-led workshop in Olympia, with guest facilitators Amer Ahmed (Amherst) and Brooke Vick (Muhlenberg).

- Curriculum Task Force (CTF):
  - Thank you to the 38 persons to-date who have shared written comments on this project via the Campus Community Ideas Google folder.
  - CTF members – in addition to reading copious amounts of literature on higher education, future trends, and curriculum – devoted 9 hours of focused workshop time, led by Alisa Kessel and Dexter Gordon, to process considerations, foundations of Puget Sound’s current Core and graduation requirements, and formation of work groups. CTF will be meeting weekly during the Common Period and presenting to each of the Spring 2019 Faculty Meetings toward the goal of presentation of a faculty-endorsed undergraduate curricular framework to the May 2019 Board of Trustees meeting. (Update: Debbie Chee, Associate Dean of Students and Director of Residential Life, has replaced Dean of Faculty and Graduate Studies Sunil Kukreja on the CTF (non-voting) support team in order to incorporate more attention to the holistic student educational experience – also allowing Sunil more time to focus on graduate program curricular developments.)
- Tacoma Public Schools project report: Professors of Business and Leadership Lisa Johnson and Nila Wiese completed in December a detailed report and set of recommendations for forward-looking support of Tacoma Public Schools Commitment students. Their recommendations – based in student focus-groups and surveys, interviews of faculty and staff members, and a significant literature review – are the lead topic of this week’s Academic Leadership Team meeting.

**Follow-up** on facultycoms message on student retention:

- For students facing financial barriers regarding access to textbooks, Puget Sound Bookstore staff will sit together with a student to compare specific options for textbook purchases.
- Dining and Conference Services provides a Dining Dollars program to support students who need food support to complete the semester. Mary Powell, Assistant to the Dean of Students Office, and Sarah Shives, Assistant Dean of Students, are contact persons at x3360.

I will provide further information on student retention following 10<sup>th</sup> day of the semester.

**A few observations** (just for a sense of things) from Association of American Colleges and Universities meeting, January 23-26, a number of which are things that have come up in CTF work:

- The opening plenary panel returned to the topic that “liberal arts” has a branding problem, within the broader not-terribly-positive perception of higher education. Suggestions:
  - We should put greater emphasis in our discourse on critical thinking, skilled communication, collaboration and teamwork, and cultural understanding; breadth of preparation in combination with an internship or other opportunity to apply classroom learning; ability to address “unscripted problems,” innovation, and equity and inclusion – all of which make a difference for the future of our country.
  - We need to reduce costs.
  - Faculty members, along with trustees, presidents, and other academic leaders should tell stories far and wide (which might be in one’s neighborhood, in the grocery line, as well as in professional contexts) of transformative student achievements.

- Campuses should become more of “a front porch” for important community conversations.
- There is room for the 4-year, residential college educational experience to be the “craft beer, slow food” sector of education (if you’re still reading, smile now), but we need to be very clear in communicating *and delivering on* the messages that (a) we will honor the identities (political, religious, gender, race, ability, etc.) of all students who come to study with us; (b) we will take care of your student; and (c) your student will become the kind of leader that the country needs and of whom you will be proud.
- Cathy Davidson, author of *The New Education*, 2017, suggests we “Re-Model” our approaches, including:
  - Stop structuring majors designed by/for faculty to replicate faculty members.
  - Think about cohort models, rather than core models.
  - Focus general education around big questions, studied from multiple perspectives, e.g., (from Arizona State): “What will life in Phoenix be like when there is no more water?”
- Many colleges, across institutional types and sectors, are doing work to more effectively integrate curriculum and articulate clear pathways for students. Puget Sound’s curricular work has potential for distinctive features in this broader context, and the *Leadership for a Changing World* Strategic Plan’s commitment to *every* student is significant. We may want to find another metaphor than “pathway” – and I know our colleagues in Communications and Admission will help us in that regard.
- The ePortfolio work – our *Sounding Board* – that Renee Houston, Elize Hellam, and the whole experiential learning team has been doing was selected to be showcased by Digication as part of AACU’s full-day ePortfolio workshop.
- We have resources in both the Associated Colleges of the South and the Great Lakes Colleges Association as we develop a distinctive Legacies Project within our undergraduate curricular framework. For example:
  - ACS institutions are participating in collaborative projects to interrogate the racial history of the South. A September 2018 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article, “How Colleges Confront Their Racist Pasts,” may be a useful starting point if you are interested in reading more.
  - GLCA institutions have more than 40 faculty and student oral history projects underway as part of community-based curriculum. The *Oral History in the Liberal Arts* project ([www.ohla.info](http://www.ohla.info)), directed by Brooke Bryan at Antioch College, and Clara Roman-Odio’s *Latinos in Rural America* project at Kenyon College are worth a look if you are interested in oral history and/or digital storytelling.

**Report to the Faculty**  
**Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate**  
**January 30, 2019**

Dear Colleagues:

And, we're back. Happy new semester.

The agendas for the February and March faculty meetings are very full. We can anticipate that the April and May meetings will be equally lively. We have a lot of shared business to attend to, in particular business that requires faculty reflection, revision, and eventual affirmation. One of the reasons I like my work is because I am often in a place of creative problem solving with colleagues. That's what I'm gearing up for this spring. I had a great experience with faculty creativity and connection during the retreat on intercultural competency and inclusive pedagogy in Olympia the week before classes began. Thank you to the organizers of that retreat, most of all for the time to talk together as colleagues.

Here's an overview of the ongoing activities from my vantage point, and an anticipation of things to come.

Faculty Senate Business

Since the November Faculty meeting, Faculty Senate has met four times (November 12 and 26, December 3 and January 28). The business of these meeting focused on:

- Creating and charging the Curriculum Task Force to carry out an 18-month iterative process with the faculty at large toward the goal of revising Puget Sound's undergraduate curriculum framework in relation to the strategic plan.
- Hearing the first report and action plan from the Student Evaluation of Teaching Committee.
- Finalizing a proposed language revision for the section of the faculty code about promotion to full professor, which now comes before the faculty for a vote.
- Endorsing the Draft Statement on Academic Freedom and Free Speech brought to the Senate on behalf of cabinet by Gail McIntosh.
- Endorsing a Staff Senate resolution on Living Wages and staff compensation.
- Hearing and discussing the Budget Task Force's report.
- Reviewing the proposed slate for Honorary Degrees.

Senate also receives regular reports on the activities of the Standing Committees (such as the new survey from the COD and the survey from the SET committee) and has received an update on the process the FEPPS program is pursuing to bring a major proposal before the full faculty. Additionally, the Benefits Task Force will soon make its report to the Senate and the faculty at large.

### Curriculum Task Force

It seems important to include a separate section on the CTF since one of the most forceful faculty requests in the November 7 meeting was that communication around the curriculum revision not proceed “business-as-usual.” The CTF began meeting in December and elected Professors Alisa Kessel and Dexter Gordon to co-chair. The task force is taking a number of steps to communicate early and often: a shared google drive accessible to the whole faculty is up and functional. All the proposals, concerns, and visions shared by faculty with the CTF are available there. CTF is uploading notes from each of its meetings immediately, not waiting for the next meeting to vote and approve minutes. CTF is reporting to the Senate at each Senate meeting, and will have a significant amount of time in each full faculty meeting to report, engage in discussion, and ask for feedback and decisions from the faculty. There are plans for feedback sessions outside of full faculty meeting to be scheduled for each week leading up to spring break. In short, there are online and in-person avenues for communication, with formal and informal formats.

We are already hearing a lot from colleagues. No one is under the illusion that we face easy decisions, but there are options and ideas matching the concerns and doubts. The work is serious, and the energy is strong. I think I can safely say, on behalf of the CTF, that we deeply appreciate the vitality of faculty engagement with this process so far and we hope it continues.

### Looking Ahead

The Board of Trustees meets during the third week of February and there are chances for faculty to engage with Trustees during this period. On the agenda for Thursday the 21<sup>st</sup> is the groundbreaking for the Welcome Center. Given faculty discussion of the Welcome Center last year, I anticipate there may be desire for faculty to understand more about the functions of the Welcome Center as it moves toward opening. Beyond February, we face the crush of business to complete before the end of the academic year. On that note, I want to remind us all that in the fall we officially added an additional full faculty meeting on Wednesday, May 1. If you didn't get that on your calendar in November, I hope you will add it now. Depending on how our work goes, we may also want to add a full faculty meeting on April 24. Please save the date.

Sincerely,

Sara

**Vice President for Enrollment – Report to the Faculty**

Laura Martin-Fedich

January 28, 2019

Dear Faculty Member,

Greetings from the Enrollment Division. We are deep in the application reading and financial aid awarding seasons. Following is a brief update.

**Admission:**

- With our final application deadline (regular decision) behind us, the focus of the admission team is on completing submitted application files and reading those that are complete.
- Spring '19 enrollment: FTIC=2; Transfer=12 Total New Students = 14 (Goal=16)
- Fall'19 enrollment: applications are running behind last year but completed applications are even. We're pleased to see an uptick in academic profile among our admitted students in addition to an increase in students of color.
- Many faculty are involved with reading applications for our upcoming Lillis and Matelich scholarship competitions. In March, Faculty and Staff committees will choose two students from each applicant pool for a four year, tuition, room and board scholarship.
- On Campus Events:
  - Prospective students and their guests are hosted each week day. Now that we are in late January, our visit numbers are increasing with large volumes expected for the next three months, particularly on Mondays and Fridays.
  - Decision Puget Sound events will begin late March and many of you will be asked to help out – thank you in advance. Following is the schedule:
    - March 30; April 5; April 12; April 19 and April 26.

**Student Financial Services:**

- The Spring 2019 financial aid disbursements to our new and returning students have been made.
- On January 29 financial aid awards will be sent to all admitted students for Fall 2019. Merit awards were included with admission decision notifications last month.

**Did you know?**

The top three traits of Generation Z are:

1. Realistic and Pragmatic – their number one concern about college is will they be able to afford it.
2. Driven – they feel competition towards others they work with – less excited about group work.
3. Desire hyper-customization – want to stand out from the rest.

Please feel free to reach out with questions.

Warm Regards,  
Laura



## Appendix F - CTF Slideshow

# Curricular Task Force Faculty meeting: February 6, 2019

### Curricular Task Force—Membership

Kris Bartanen	Provost
Peggy Burge	Humanities Librarian and Coordinator of Teaching, Learning, & Digital
Humanities	
David Chiu	Mathematics and Computer Science
Erin Colbert-White	Psychology
Sara Freeman	Theatre Arts, Faculty Senate Chair
Dexter Gordon	African American Studies, Race & Pedagogy Institute, CTF co-chair
Katie Handick	Science, Technology, & Society ('20)
Darcy Irwin	English
Diane Kelley	French Studies
Alisa Kessel	Politics & Government, CTF co-chair
Jung Kim	Exercise Science, Neuroscience
Vickie Pastore	Admissions
Doug Sackman	History
Dan Sherman	Environmental Policy & Decision-Making
Elena Staver	Psychology ('20)

#### Resource support:

Debbie Chee	Residence Life, Student Affairs
Julie Christoph	Associate Academic Dean, English
Kate Cohn	Assistant Dean for Operations and Technology
Renee Houston	Associate Dean for Experiential Learning & Civic Scholarship, Comm.

## Process: broad contours

- I. Basic structure: Spring 2019 (proposal for overall curricular structure)
- II. Refinement: Summer 2019-Fall 2019 (rubrics, standards, etc)
- III. Course approval, etc, through internal procedures: Fall 2019-Spring 2020

## How did we get here?

- External factors -- Changes Needs/Demands

- Demographic

- Technological

- Economic

- Internal factors

- Students

- Faculty

## Curricular Task Force scope

**Faculty Senate:** creates and charges a Curricular Task Force

**Curricular Task Force:** gathers information from faculty and other study  
makes recommendations to  
the faculty

**Faculty votes:** determines what changes to implement (if any)

### Faculty Bylaws II.2:

*Responsibilities of the Faculty.* The Faculty shall create and maintain a superior academic climate in the University. To this end, the Faculty shall prescribe, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, the graduate and undergraduate courses of study, the specific courses to be offered, the nature and requirements of graduate degrees to be conferred, the requirements for graduation and recommend all candidates for baccalaureate and advanced degrees and/or honors to the Board of Trustees, the standards of instruction, and the general rules and methods for the conduct of educational work of the University and any rules for the

## Characteristics of excellent curricular reform

- Foregrounds the liberal arts tradition
- Is inclusive of different pedagogies
- **Realigns faculty workload expectations appropriately**
- Is determined via an inclusive and evidence-based process aimed toward achieving broad consensus
- Is responsive and relevant into the future
- Allows for steadfastness & flexibility; gives students “structure & freedom”
- Scaffolds and integrates learning (skills and ideas) over time
- Fosters faculty/staff collaboration, support, and engagement
- Ensures equity
- Addresses sustainability

## What do we want students to have/have done?

### Educational Goals for the University

*A student completing the undergraduate curriculum will be able to*

- a) think critically and creatively;
- b) communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing;
- c) develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively

*and will have developed*

- d) familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them;
- e) solid grounding in the field of the student's choosing;
- f) understanding of self, others, and influence in the world; and
- g) an informed and thoughtful sense of justice and a commitment to ethical action.

## Areas for improvement (educational goals & beyond)

- Creative thinking
- Communication--oral, written *across the curriculum*
- Metaliteracy
- Social development
- Mentoring
- Collaboration (on projects)
- Leadership and action
- Self & self-understanding (reflection, responsibility)
- Ability to manage change/adaptability
- Agency
- Educational orientation toward the past (Legacies project) and extension/transfer into an unknown future (lifelong learning)

## Fixed parts: Graduation requirements

### •Majors

- faculty input
- educational goals (solid grounding in a field)
- external legibility for some fields

### •KNOW

- faculty input
- educational goals (self, other, influence in the world; sense of justice)

## Fixed parts: Graduation requirements

### •Second language

- faculty input
- educational goals
- written and oral communication skills
- collaboration
- self & other & Influence in the world (deepens sense of the world beyond the U.S.)
- supports study abroad

## Moving parts?

- The Core:

Curriculum Committee report (2015) Survey--117 respondents

18% think the core should remain unchanged; 25% want it completely overhauled

Core area assessments (from Curriculum Committee & Office of Institutional Research)

- An integrated pathway
- Student social development + mentoring/advising
- High impact practices
- Workload
- Calendar equalization

## Upcoming sessions

### **Creative Thinking Across the Curriculum**

Friday, February 8, 11-12:30, McCormick Room, hosted by Debbie Chee and Alisa Kessel

### **“Approaches to Knowing” Listening Session**

Tuesday, February 12, 4-5pm, McCormick Room, hosted by Erin Colbert-White and Dan Sherman

### **Showcasing Who We Are in the Puget Sound Region**

Tuesday, February 19, 12 – 1pm, Room TBA, hosted by Diane Kelley and Doug Sackman

### **Metaliteracy: Critical Thinking & Reflection in the Digital Age**

Thursday, February 28, 2pm-3pm, Room TBA, hosted by Peggy Burge and Darcy Irvin

### **Our Students: Preparing for an Ever-Changing Landscape**

Wednesday, March 6, 2pm-3pm, Room TBA, hosted by Sara Freeman and Vicki Pastore

### **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

## Appendix G – Background and Language of Proposed Revision to Faculty Code

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 2019-20 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), updated as of 12.3.18

"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 activity since promotion to associate. 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."



## Appendix H - Current and Proposed Promotion Language

### III.3.e

#### CURRENT

Faculty promotion shall be based upon the quality of a person's performance of academic duties. Specifically, 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;
- (2) professional growth;
- (3) advising students;
- (4) participation in university service; and
- (5) community service related to professional interests and expertise.

Because the university seeks the highest standards for faculty advancement, mere satisfactory performance is no guarantee of promotion. In addition, appointment in the rank of associate professor and professor normally requires a doctoral, or other equivalent terminal degree. **Advancement to the rank of full professor is contingent upon evidence of distinguished service in addition to sustained growth in the above-mentioned areas.**

#### DRAFT, updated as of 12.3.18

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 activity since promotion to associate. 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.**