

## **Minutes of the May 1, 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 12:00 p.m., at which time there were 127 voting members present.

### **II. Announcements**

An announcement was made regarding senior art studio exhibitions.

### **III. Approval of the minutes of April 24, 2019**

The minutes of the April 24, 2019 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.

### **V. Motion from Curriculum Task Force (CTF)**

For the background, rationale, and language of the motion, see Appendix F of these minutes.

It was **moved** by Chiu, and **seconded**, *that*:

*As charged by the Faculty Senate, and with intention to maximize faculty participation in curriculum development, the Curricular Task Force seeks faculty approval:*

*to empower interested groups of faculty to develop and critically evaluate key recommendations for an integrative framework for undergraduate education (outlined in the April 22, 2019, report to the faculty) regarding:*

- 1. A curricular model oriented around question-driven inquiries that is integrated with the distributional component of our curriculum.*
- 2. An introduction and orientation to academic life and inquiry, consideration of which could include its relation to (or reimagination of) Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry and advising.*

*And faculty approval to recommend that the university:*

3. *Develop a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that all students can complete one of the following high impact practices: study abroad/away, internship, summer research, or a group project-based learning opportunity.*

*At the first faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year, the CTF will report on and invite faculty feedback about the findings and recommendations of the working groups, after which meeting the CTF will survey the faculty anonymously and share those results with the faculty. The faculty will then direct the CTF about how it wishes to proceed.*

*Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.*

Chiu spoke in favor of the motion.

The faculty discussed the motion.

The following members represented the CTF in response to questions: Provost Bartanen, Gordon, Jacobson, Kessel, Kim, and Sackman.

One member asked whether it would still be possible to bring further recommendations and proposals to the CTF if the motion passed, and into summer work. Gordon responded that openness, transparency, and consensus have always been the goals of the committee, and that will extend to the work proposed for the summer; input will continue to be welcome over the summer.

Another member asked how the summer committees would be constituted. Gordon said that there is an open invitation to all interested faculty to be a part of this work, and Kessel added that the CTF is still considering its role in committee formation. Two members expressed concern about sending people to do work on models that may not be adopted by the faculty; these members suggested extending a voting process well into or throughout the 2019-2020 academic year, whereby different models and proposals could be more fully considered.

One member wished to know more about the financial cost of the process and implementation before deciding.

In response to a question about the question-driven inquiry (QDI) component of the proposed curriculum, members of the CTF clarified that this requirement—whatever it might eventually be called—would apply to a network of courses centered around a particular question.

VP for Enrollment Martin-Fedich was asked when it would be ideal for the Admissions Office to receive information about a new curriculum, and responded that August 2019 would allow her recruitment team to present the curriculum in high school visits and to applicants.

President Crawford took the floor to express his appreciation for the work and conversations that are occurring, as well as to address the issues being raised with respect to resources and timeline. He reported that the strategic plan has at its core the curriculum, students, faculty, and staff (rather than, for example, facilities and buildings): resources have been set aside to support the development of the plan and the curricular revision work that is underway, and the budget will be brought forward to support its ongoing implementation. He also noted that support for the revised curricular model will be a central component of an upcoming capital campaign. He praised and reiterated the need for collaboration, but also made clear the need to act thoughtfully and expeditiously, particularly in the context of an increasingly competitive market.

In clarifying a question about proposals shared through the faculty governance listserv, Chair Freeman mentioned that they were not yet motions. Two members who had indicated on the listserv that they would bring a motion about alternative curriculum models shared their decision not to make such a motion and expressed their satisfaction that the ideas they had expressed online could be incorporated into the summer modelling process called for with respect to part one of the CTF motion.

With respect to the summer's work on high-impact practices (HIPs), one member advised that staff and administration should be part of these committees, particularly given the need to assess the financial viability of ensuring full equity in participation. One member expressed excitement for the HIPs part of the motion, but worried that the QDI model might make faculty disposable; this member questioned the innovativeness of this model.

One member encouraged the faculty to think beyond financial resources when reimagining the implementation and impact of the new curriculum, and in particular to attend to considerations such as faculty workload. President Crawford agreed, and iterated the need to look at the nature of the faculty's work and course load when revising the curriculum. He mentioned the need to consider: what kind of experience the new curriculum would present to its students, how we would deliver it, and what new structures would need to be created to implement it in such a way that would ensure the fulfillment of our educational goals. Provost Bartanen mentioned that until the CTF got a sense of direction from the faculty, it would be difficult to conceptualize changes to how we evaluate faculty work; for example, the load might be different for a first-year course, and we might need to structure faculty work differently to meet a HIPs component.

Kessel sympathized with the frustration expressed at the non-linear and iterative process of curricular revision; she clarified that the motion before the assembly is designed to set out some parameters for the summer work, but yet ones that might be challenged, refined, or clarified. Thus, the motion was a starting point, but one that was needed to move forward in exploration of a curriculum that would achieve broad consensus and excitement.

It was **requested** by Neighbors, and **honored** by Chair Freeman, **to divide the question** into three motions, as follows:

CTF motion 1:

*As charged by the Faculty Senate, and with intention to maximize faculty participation in curriculum development, the Curricular Task Force seeks faculty approval:*

*to empower interested groups of faculty to develop and critically evaluate key recommendations for an integrative framework for undergraduate education (outlined in the April 22, 2019, report to the faculty) regarding:*

*A curricular model oriented around question-driven inquiries that is integrated with the distributional component of our curriculum.*

*At the first faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year, the CTF will report on and invite faculty feedback about the findings and recommendations of the working groups, after which meeting the CTF will survey the faculty anonymously and share those results with the faculty. The faculty will then direct the CTF about how it wishes to proceed.*

*Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.*

#### CTF motion 2:

*As charged by the Faculty Senate, and with intention to maximize faculty participation in curriculum development, the Curricular Task Force seeks faculty approval:*

*to empower interested groups of faculty to develop and critically evaluate key recommendations for an integrative framework for undergraduate education (outlined in the April 22, 2019, report to the faculty) regarding:*

*An introduction and orientation to academic life and inquiry, consideration of which could include its relation to (or reimagination of) Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry and advising.*

*At the first faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year, the CTF will report on and invite faculty feedback about the findings and recommendations of the working groups, after which meeting the CTF will survey the faculty anonymously and share those results with the faculty. The faculty will then direct the CTF about how it wishes to proceed.*

*Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.*

#### CTF motion 3:

*And faculty approval to recommend that the university:*

*Develop a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that all students can complete one of the following high impact practices: study abroad/away, internship, summer research, or a group project-based learning opportunity.*

*At the first faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year, the CTF will report on and invite faculty feedback about the findings and recommendations of the working groups, after which meeting the CTF will survey the faculty anonymously and share those results with the faculty. The faculty will then direct the CTF about how it wishes to proceed.*

*Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.*

Hearing no objections, Chair Freeman proposed that the faculty discuss **CTF motion 3** first.

It was **moved in amendment** by Liao, and **seconded**, *that the second-to-last paragraph be removed.*

Liao **accepted a friendly amendment** *to include as part of his amendment the replacement of “And faculty approval to recommend that the university” with “The faculty recommends that the university.”*

The faculty discussed the amendment.

It was **moved** by Jacobson, and **seconded**, to **call the question** on the amendment. The motion **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

The amendment **passed** on a voice vote.

The faculty continued their discussion of CTF motion 3.

One member said that the faculty were voting on process, not on a particular curriculum; this member suggested to the assembly that the CTF is not proposing a radical restructuring of the curriculum, and the primary focus must be on recruitment and retention. Chair Freeman noted that faculty would be compensated for their summer work if the motion passed.

It was **moved in amendment** by Weinberger, and **seconded**, *that “Develop and report on a policy” replace “Develop a policy.”*

There was no discussion of the amendment.

The amendment **passed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved in amendment** by Provost Bartanen, and **seconded**, *that “all undergraduate students” replace “all students.”*

There was no discussion of the amendment.

The amendment **passed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved in amendment** by Buescher, and **seconded**, that *“Investigate and report to the faculty on ways to provide” replace “Develop and report to the faculty on a policy to provide.”*

The faculty discussed the motion. Buescher spoke in favor of his motion, suggesting that a policy is something we should consider after the fact. Several members spoke against the motion, noting that policy is for programmatic support rather than identifying the kind of curriculum the faculty will adopt.

There was no further discussion.

The amendment **failed** on a voice vote.

It was **moved** by Weinberger, and **seconded**, to **call the question**. The motion **passed** on a voice vote.

The faculty voted on the motion.

CTF motion 3 **passed** on a voice vote.

The language of the third part of the CTF motion now reads as follows:

*The faculty recommends that the university:*

*Develop and report to the faculty on a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that all undergraduate students can complete one of the following high impact practices: study abroad/away, internship, summer research, or a group project-based learning opportunity.*

*Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.*

## **VI. Provost’s presentation and Q&A regarding financial models for additional graduate programs**

This item was postponed to the May 8<sup>th</sup> agenda.

## **VII. Discussion of a proposal for Term Faculty positions, as shared with the Senate by the Office of the Associate Deans**

This item was postponed to the May 8<sup>th</sup> agenda.

**VIII. Other business**

There was no other business.

**IX. Adjournment**

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

## Appendix A – Attendance

Rich Anderson-Connolly	Darcy Irvin	Melvin Rouse	<u>Guests</u>
Greta Austin	Robin Jacobson	Amy Ryken	Heather Bailey
Gareth Barkin	Greg Johnson	Douglas Sackman	Peggy Burge
William Barry	Lisa Johnson	Leslie Saucedo	Kate Cohn
Kris Bartanen	Kristin Johnson	Eric Scharrer	Mushawn Knowles
Bernard Bates	Priti Joshi	Dan Sherman	Laura Martin-Fedich
William Beardsley	Diane Kelley	Katherine Smith	Michael Pastore
Terence Beck	Alisa Kessel	Adam Smith	Ellen Peters
Francoise Belot	Samuel Kigar	Stuart Smithers	Landon Wade
James Bernhard	Jung Kim	Rokiatou Soumare	
Nancy Bristow	Nick Kontogeorgopoulos	Amy Van Engen Spivey	
Gwynne Brown	Kriszta Kotsis	Jason Struna	
Derek Buescher	Alan Krause	Yvonne Swinth	
Dan Burgard	Laura Krughoff	Courtney Thatcher	
Alva Butcher	Sunil Kukreja	Bryan Thines	
America Chambers	Josefa Lago Grana	Justin Tiehen	
David Chiu	Brendan Lanctot	George Tomlin	
Julie Nelson Christoph	John Lear	Alison Tracy Hale	
Erin Colbert-White	Ha Jung Lee	Benjamin Tromly	
Johanna Crane	Jan Leuchtenberger	Ariela Tubert	
Isiaah Crawford	Benjamin Lewin	Andreas Udbye	
Monica DeHart	Pierre Ly	Kurt Walls	
Alyce DeMarais	Tiffany MacBain	Matthew Warning	
Rachel DeMotts	Mark Martin	Suzanne Warren	
Denise Despres	Gary McCall	Renee Watling	
Greg Elliott	Jill McCourt	Seth Weinberger	
Tanya Erzen	Amanda Mifflin	Stacey Weiss	
Lisa Ferrari	Garrett Milam	Carolyn Weisz	
Amy Fisher	Andrew Monaco	John Wesley	
Lea Fortmann	Sarah Moore	Heather White	
Sara Freeman	Wendell Nakamura	Nila Wiese	
Andrew Gardner	Jennifer Neighbors	Linda Williams	
Megan Gessel	Steven Neshyba	Paula Wilson	
Barry Goldstein	Lisa Nunn	Peter Wimberger	
Andrew Gomez	Eric Orlin	Carrie Woods	
Dexter Gordon	A. Susan Owen	Rand Worland	
Jeffrey Grinstead	Emelie Peine	Sheryl Zylstra	
William Haltom	Rachel Pepper		
Fred Hamel	Jennifer Pitonyak		
Susannah Hannaford	Michael Pohl		
John Hanson	Jacob Price		
David Hanson	Geoffrey Proehl		
Renee Houston	Sara Protasi		
Jairo Hoyas	Isha Rajbhandari		
Kris Imbrigotta	Andrew Rex		





**President's Report to the Faculty**

April 23, 2019

Dear Faculty Colleagues,

Along with all of you, I am operating at full speed as the end of the spring semester draws near. Below is a quick update on several issues most on my mind; as always, I look forward to your questions and comments at next week's faculty meeting.

**Provost Search**

On Thursday, April 25 we will host the third of three finalists for the provost position. If you have not already done so, I urge you to provide your feedback on strengths and any concerns related to each candidate. I will proceed with all deliberate speed in reviewing your comments, consulting with the search committee, and soliciting feedback from references to ensure that we recruit the best possible academic leader for Puget Sound. Thank you again to members of the search committee for their good and hard work.

**Board of Trustees Meeting**

The trustees will join us for their spring series of meetings on May 16 and 17. The centerpiece of our meeting will be advancement on the strategic goals of Leadership for a Changing World and a workshop on the work and possible recommendations of the Curriculum Task Force. The energy of our faculty is palpable as you engage in this critical work that is so central to our ability to deliver on our goals of preparing students for success in a rapidly changing world and becoming the institution of choice for prospective students.

Other issues we will cover include a recommendation from the Finance and Facilities Committee's Investment Subcommittee, which has been reviewing the trustees' 2016 Statement on Divestment; selection of new trustees to replace those who are completing their terms of service; and an update on enrollment for 2019-20. As we are all aware, our acceptance deadline of May 1 is rapidly approaching. We remain optimistic about achieving our FTIC goal of 660 for the incoming Class of 2023, and are seeing strong demand for our graduate programs. The engagement of faculty and staff members in campus visit days and other recruitment events is highly influential and greatly appreciated!

**Commencement**

I am pleased that David Warren, president of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, will give the Class of 2019's Commencement address and receive an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters. This will be one of his last public appearances in his distinguished and long-serving role prior to retiring in June. I hope that his legacy of service and commitment to social justice will inspire our new graduates, and express my appreciation to the Honorary Degree Committee for bringing his name forward. We are also excited to confer upon Michael Mirra,

## Appendix B – Report from President Isiaah Crawford

executive director of the Tacoma Housing Authority, the honorary Doctor of Laws. Mr. Mirra is a lifelong advocate for equal justice before the law, fair housing, and the betterment of the human condition.

### **Out and About**

I continue to give attention to managing my schedule such that I can be in as many places as possible to support our institution and our campus community. Recent such events include Spring Family Weekend and the Parents Council meeting; the annual University Leadership Awards Ceremony celebrating student service and achievements; the Phi Beta Kappa Initiation reception at the President's Residence; the introduction of John Otter '91, director at the J.R. Simplot Company, at the annual Puget Sound Business Breakfast in Seattle for alumni; the Washington Campus Compact Presidents Meeting, which recognized our own Kaitlyn Calhoun '19 with the Presidents Civic Leadership Award; and chairing the Northwest College Presidents meeting, as well as meetings with donors and other friends of Puget Sound.

And I am still pondering the terrific talk by Professor Amy Spivey about solar energy at this year's Daedalus Dinner. This annual evening of scholarship, debate and dinner is a truly wonderful Puget Sound tradition.

### **Looking Ahead to Fall**

Many events are already on the calendar, and I hope you've made note of them: the Fall Faculty and Staff Welcome is scheduled for Wednesday, August 28 (invitation forthcoming), and I look forward to beginning the year with all of you at the Faculty Dinner on Tuesday, August 27.

Best wishes to you all as classes begin to wrap up and grading begins.

Sincerely,

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

Isiaah Crawford, Ph.D.  
President



April 24, 2019

TO: Faculty

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Provost Report to the May 1, 2019 Faculty Meeting

### Graduate Program Planning

Sara Freeman has conveyed that there are questions about how financial modeling will be done for possible new graduate offerings. One way to think about that is, every Fall since 2004, the Dean has presented detailed enrollment and financial information about the existing graduate programs to the Board of Trustees, based on collaborative work across Enrollment, Finance, and Academic divisions. My sense is that similar modeling would be done to project start-up costs, ongoing costs, appropriate tuition levels, and anticipated revenue for each new program proposal in order that best choices can be made. I will be happy to discuss this at the May 1 meeting, if there is time.

### Term Appointment Proposal

I believe Sara is attaching a draft document, shared at Faculty Senate by Julie Christoph (work started by Martin Jackson) to clarify and put-to-paper practices with respect to visiting faculty members who continue beyond a single-, or two-, or three-year contract. Goals for this work include clearer expectations for departments and faculty members regarding term of appointment, eligibility for renewal, consistent opportunity for evaluations, and related issues. I will be happy to discuss this topic at the May 1 meeting, if there is time.

### Curriculum Task Force

The Faculty Meeting discussion today, April 24, was very useful; thank you. The Curricular Task Force (CTF) has devoted the most concerted, collaborative effort I have witnessed in my career at Puget Sound to bring forward recommendations to the faculty for implementation of the ***Leadership for a Changing World Strategic Plan Goal I – Initiative 1: Develop a distinctive undergraduate model of education to ensure all students graduate prepared for success.*** While all the details are very important to figure out – through processes that the CTF is bringing before you – the big picture is also important. Goal Team I recommended last Spring a framework that includes: (a) major, (b) integrative pathway, (c) high impact experiences, and (d) additional mentors, in addition to our current faculty advising process; we are in the process of implementing *Sounding Board*, the ePortfolio that “scaffolds” all of the above. Within that framework model, CTF has focused on the integrative pathway (“QDI”), a possible new first-year course to engage and support the full range of students who come to Puget Sound, and a means to enable every student to participate in a significant high impact experiential learning opportunity in the third year. *The work we are doing is not happening in isolation. Every Northwest Five Colleges institution is engaged in reform of its general education or Core curriculum.* Our goal is a revised undergraduate curricular framework that will be attractive to students, contribute to their persistence and success, distinguish the education they are able to receive at Puget Sound, and prepare them well for the future that is ahead of them.

**Report to the Faculty**  
**Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate**  
**April 24, 2019**

Dear Colleagues:

I write this report for you in the hours before we meet on April 24, so I do not know what the contours of our discussion will be regarding CTF's report on its developing recommendations. In this missive, I will reverse the order I have been following for most of this year and talk about CTF first, reiterating things likely to be discussed on April 24 and looking toward May 1.

- We are coming to May 1 at a nodal point in the curriculum process, but not with a motion to revise the curriculum. The CTF report for the April 24 meeting frames that what will come before the faculty on May 1 will not ask for a vote to implement changes. Rather, the CTF will ask for endorsement of direction such that supported faculty groups can make more fully fleshed out models that will allow the faculty to consider a curriculum revision in detail. Only after such work would any motion to actually implement a revision come before the faculty.
- Work in the summer work and early fall would allow us to explore sticking points and pressures in CTF recommendations (whether what is endorsed is directly the CTF recommendations or something revised on May 1 through amendments). It may also allow us to identify felicities and maximizations that could be pushed further. CTF feels strongly that its members should not do that deeper modeling and pressure testing alone. Just as the only way for our students to have a shared experience is for us to actually create a shared experience for them, the only way for the faculty to build portions of the curriculum together is to actually build those parts of the curriculum together.
- CTF is issuing a call to collaboration that is profound. It is a call to be generative and turn our imagination into doing. It is a call to manage our fears and marshal our critical thinking toward synthesis. We have spent a significant amount of time this semester understanding the wide range of concerns and perspectives among faculty regarding how to accomplish our educational goals, provide the best experience to our students, and address issues related to retention and achievement our university experiences. But if we remain in a space of critique without matching commitment to shared action, we shortchange our role as educators and lessen our potential as an organization.

Faculty Senate Business

Senate has received eight end of year reports, and will receive the final four on May 6. The full text of the final end of year reports will be included as appendices with the May 6 Senate minutes. Some highlights so far:

- The Academic Standards Committee has created a Credit/No Credit policy to replace the student option around Pass/Fail.
- There is work being done and interest across committees in the developing rubric/rationale for the second language requirement.
- The Faculty Salary Committee has opened conversation about how to consult with faculty about larger changes that might increase or expand differentials used in the faculty salary scale.
- LMIS has been circulating its draft *Standards and Best Practices for Handling Sensitive and Confidential Documents* among standing committees and plans to take it to the full faculty during AY 19-20.

## Appendix D – Report from Faculty Senate Chair Sara Freeman

- The Professional Standards committee has recommended changes shortening the time it takes for instructors to qualify for streamlined review and approved new language regarding the evaluation of visiting faculty.

The end of year report of the Student Evaluations of Teaching committee detailed the results from their survey about different attitudes and approaches related to the formative and summative use of student evaluations, and charting faculty rankings of different potential changes around the use of SETs. Given that the current faculty code requires use of some sort of student evaluations of teaching and that the survey shows that the bias in SET produced distress and harm to faculty, the report concludes that:

There is clear support for

- Formative use of SETs
- Education, such as:
  - Updating the User Guide to clarify University position on SET use
  - Educating faculty and chairs working with new faculty to understand how to work with SET data (magnification, focusing on bad)
  - Shaping students understanding of how SET are used, issues of bias
- Use SETs *in context* of other evidence (p. 18 user guide)
  - Related to Class visitation, teaching self-reflection statement & philosophy, course materials
- Revision of the course evaluation form.

And that there is less support for use in summative evaluation, evidenced by concerns such as:

- Do SETs actually provide the data we want for evaluation?
- Are SETs used similarly across departments and even individuals within departments?

The SET committee outlines a few ideas, like:

- A support system for those impacted by bias in SETs
- Explicit support for how to read SETs, how to develop statements based on SETs
- Cut biased SETs
  - Removed before given to faculty member
  - Faculty member cuts, or does not need to address, bottom and top % of SETs

Now that Senate has received this report, it will determine how to continue the work, whether through the continued activity of a SET committee during AY 19-20 or by folding the SET committee insights back into charges for standing committees like the PSC and the FAC. This will be a topic explored during the Senate retreat in August and brought back before the full faculty in the fall.

On that note, we will soon be announcing the newly elected faculty Senators and members of the Faculty Salary committee. Huge thanks to the retiring Senators, especially Kristin Johnson and Gwynne Brown for serving as part of Senate executive team as Senate Secretary and Vice Chair. Thanks are also due to John Wesley for serving as Faculty Secretary this year and continuing into next and to Amy Spivey, Monica DeHart, and Jan Leuchtenberger for moving onto the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Sincerely,

Sara

Vice President for Enrollment - Report to the Faculty

Laura Martin-Fedich

April 25, 2019

Dear Faculty Member,

I'd like to share updates on some of the current work of the Enrollment Division. All data referenced is as of April 23, 2019.

- Fall 2019 Enrollment
  - While our FTIC and transfer applications have been down all cycle compared to previous years, the academic profile and interest level of our admitted students are higher than this time last year. Both average GPA and SAT are up over 2018 and our percentage of admitted students visiting and applying for financial aid (both important signs of interest) are up over same time last year. Our minority and minoritized student percentages are also higher. The Candidate Reply Deadline, May 1, is a week away as of this writing and the date we freeze data, 10<sup>th</sup> Day, is four months away so it's too early to predict the size of the incoming FTIC and transfer classes. However, our indicators regarding 10<sup>th</sup> Day enrollment headcount are positive at this time.
  - Graduate program enrollment is progressing very well with all programs on target to meet their Fall enrollment goals
- On Campus Events
  - Daily Visits: The high season of prospective student campus visitation is coming to a close but you've no doubt noticed the large groups of visitors roaming about campus with our student tour guides over the last couple months. I am grateful to those who have opened up their classrooms to our prospective students, talked to students and their families during their campus visits, answered their questions over email and given personal tours of lab spaces or hosting program specific events during our Destination events.
  - Destination Puget Sound: Friday, April 26 is the last of FIVE Destination Puget Sound on campus events we've hosted since late March. Many of you have been involved in these great events which draw approximately 125 admitted students and their guests for a total of about 250 people per event. These events are critical to our enrollment process as this is when most will determine if they will attend Puget Sound in the Fall. Thank you to all who have supported Destination Puget Sound.
- Puget Sound Previews

These receptions are held in key cities across the country and are designed to reach those admitted students and their guests who are looking for more information about the Logger experience. They're hosted by the admission staff and local alumni are in attendance. Since mid-March we've hosted Previews in the following cities: Portland, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, Berkeley, Honolulu, Denver, Chicago, Minneapolis, Orange County, and San Diego. All ten events were very well attended by admitted students and their family members.

***Did you know?***

***In 2005, 17 percent of first time in college students applied to seven or more colleges. Ten years later, in 2015, 36 percent of first time in college students applied to seven or more colleges.***

Warm Regards,  
Laura

## **CTF Motion for May 1, 2019 Faculty Meeting**

Dear colleagues,

Thank you for your continued engagement with questions of reform to our curricular model.

The CTF has tried, in its words and deeds, to embrace and embody a collaborative, responsive, transparent, and inclusive process for curricular reform. Part of that process necessarily includes taking a rough-cut model to the faculty and then asking the faculty, from its various disciplines, locations, approaches, perspectives, and experiences, to determine whether the model will really work. This is what it means to try to achieve a collaborative and inclusive curricular reform, which cannot be accomplished by the CTF alone, or determined in ninety-minute chunks once (or twice!) a month in McIntyre 103.

The CTF has no investment in this model being exactly right. We have, throughout this process, responded, amended, and edited our recommendations in light of the valuable and critical insights of our fellow faculty members. We will continue to do so in the months ahead, based on recommendations from our faculty colleagues. We expect the summer work to proceed with the benefit of the insights, recommendations, and concerns that our colleagues have voiced in the last few days and in continuing conversation.

The CTF's commitment has always been to encourage the faculty to imagine the best possible curriculum for our students and then to ensure that it has the resources and opportunities to figure out, together, how to achieve it. Such a collaborative process is necessary, both for the success of any integrative curricular reform, and for the future of the liberal arts, which depends upon our continued commitments to one another and our willingness to see one another as essential to the endeavor to which we all contribute.

To that end, the motion below gives the CTF permission to facilitate the formation of summer working groups (through an inclusive process), which will likely focus on how particular questions and topics could be developed as a QDI, given current faculty strengths and interests. It is important to note that these groups would not necessarily be creating QDIs that are pre-endorsed for a later formal proposal. Both the optimal number of QDIs and the particular QDIs will be deliberated upon *after* this process, which will give us new information for the framework; different QDIs may be developed and may ultimately become part of a proposal after the summer. We would also value and encourage summer participation from colleagues in interdisciplinary programs, as they continue to develop ideas about how interdisciplinary programs might relate to QDIs (either integrated with, or as part of a separate working group, depending on faculty preferences).

This message is meant to guide you to some additional resources and to share the text of the motion the Curricular Task Force will present to the faculty at the May 1 faculty meeting.

Please note the following:

- RESOURCES: in response to faculty concerns about available resources for developing, implementing, and maintaining a new curriculum, you can find a document called “Resource

statement for faculty” from President Crawford and Provost Bartanen in the REPORTS TO THE FACULTY FOLDER, detailing the institutions commitment to this work in both the short- and the long-term, and with reference to faculty lines, development of new graduate programs, and other resources related to curricular implementation. *Please read this document.*

•THE NUMBER OF QDIs: while the April 15 draft report included a recommendation to limit the initial number of QDIs to 6, this recommendation was removed from the April 22 report, in response to feedback that faculty wanted more flexibility in determining the number of QDIs. Our intention, then and now, is to create opportunities for all interested faculty to undertake the work of QDI development; we believe it is imperative that colleagues have space to collaborate and explore, and we do not want to create conditions in which they feel as if they are competing for scarce resources. We are still working to develop a process for fostering collaboration, sharing ideas, and allowing colleagues to see connections that they might not have imagined. Whatever this process will be, we are committed to ensuring that it offer multiple sites and opportunities for participation, include all interested faculty, and invite and encourage critical reflection throughout.

•ANONYMOUS FEEDBACK: in response to requests for opportunities to provide anonymous feedback, we have done two things: 1) created a [Google form](#) to collect anonymous feedback, the responses to which will be posted on the shared drive, and 2) included in the motion a commitment to undertake an anonymous survey of the faculty once the summer work has been completed, the recommendations have been shared with the faculty, and the faculty has had a chance to discuss the recommendations.

•FIRST YEAR COURSEWORK: in response to feedback from faculty, the motion requests that the working group that considers the first year course do so in relation to (and with the possibility of restructuring or reimagining) SSIs and advising. We hope this work will be holistic, and will enlist those staff colleagues across campus whose expertise and insights will be crucial to the work, and whose curricula and programming can be designed in tandem with the faculty recommendations, with the broad intention of supporting all students in their transition to academic life and inquiry.

•ADDITIONAL REFERENCE MATERIALS: in response to faculty requests for more evidence of various kinds, you can now find additional resources and references in the REPORTS TO THE FACULTY folder about: retention, integrative learning, and high impact practices. Please note that, while we have evidence about retention and integrative learning, we do not believe there is published evidence about the interaction of the two. In our development of a framework for our particular needs and circumstances, we will continue to work to try to find answers to this and other questions, and, as always, we are working with the best evidence we can find.

## RATIONALE FOR THE MOTION



The motion before the faculty on May 1 is grounded in Puget Sound's [educational goals](#), and the Curricular Task Force has used a process of backwards design to those goals as a foundation for its work in support of a holistic and shared curriculum.

We seek an integrative model, which we hope “will not only deepen our collective understanding of how students learn to integrate their undergraduate experiences and what that ‘might actually mean in practice’; it will give us the tools and knowledge and networks necessary to go beyond ‘hoping they *get it* by the end’.” (*Peer Review*, Summer/Fall 2005). The more strongly integrative curricular model toward which we invite the faculty to work, which expands on collaborative work already in progress in and beyond the classroom, also has the capacity to showcase our strengths at Puget Sound and to improve the already strong education we provide for students. We seek to develop an educational model that “prompts students to make connections between classroom and out-of-classroom learning, between college and career, and between academic disciplines and personal purpose” and that does so for all students (*The Undergraduate Experience: Focusing Institutions on What Matters Most*, 2016, p. 172).

We look forward to continued collaborative work to build on current strengths toward an enhanced set of curricular commitments to our students, commitments that prepare them well for the challenges and leadership opportunities of their future.

#### MOTION:

As charged by the Faculty Senate, and with intention to maximize faculty participation in curriculum development, the Curricular Task Force seeks faculty approval:

to empower interested groups of faculty to develop and critically evaluate key recommendations for an integrative framework for undergraduate education (outlined in the April 22, 2019, report to the faculty) regarding:

1. A curricular model oriented around question-driven inquiries that is integrated with the distributional component of our curriculum.
2. An introduction and orientation to academic life and inquiry, consideration of which could include its relation to (or reimagination of) Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry and advising.

And faculty approval to recommend that the university:

3. Develop a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that all students can complete one of the following high impact practices: study abroad/away, internship, summer research, or a group project-based learning opportunity.

At the first faculty meeting of the 2019-2020 academic year, the CTF will report on and invite faculty feedback about the findings and recommendations of the working groups, after which meeting the CTF will survey the faculty anonymously and share those results with the faculty. The faculty will then direct the CTF about how it wishes to proceed.

Approval of this motion does not enact a change to the curriculum. The vote to change graduation requirements and implement the new curriculum will not occur until the promised

Appendix F – CTF Motion (background, rationale, and text), sent April 29, 2019 on facultycoms

discussion of workload and resources, etc. (in relation to the curriculum) takes place with the full faculty.

END MOTION TEXT

Kind regards,

The Members of the Curricular Task Force

CTF MEMBERS

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
Vicki 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. Studies
Ellen Peters	Office of Institutional Research