Minutes of the September 18, 2019 faculty meeting
Respectfully submitted by John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty

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

I. Call to order

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m., at which time there were 115 voting members present.

II. Announcements

An announcement was made regarding a Phi Beta Kappa event.

III. Approval of the September 4, 2019 minutes

The minutes of the September 4, 2019 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

IV. Questions regarding the report from the Faculty Senate Chair

The report is included in <u>Appendix B</u> of these minutes.

There were no questions for the Chair.

V. Discussion of proposals from summer curriculum work groups

A cheat sheet summarizing key features of each final proposal was sent by the Senate Chair to facultycoms on September 13, 2019, and can be found in <u>Appendix C</u> of these minutes.

It was **moved** by Hanson, and **seconded**, *that the assembly enter informal discussion of proposals from the summer curriculum work groups*.

There was no discussion.

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

<u>The main points of discussion were as follows:</u>

a) Co-teaching

> One member asked about the findings of a recent survey that asked faculty to share their thoughts on co-teaching. The member who gathered those findings noted that there was general consensus amongst responders in supporting co-teaching as an ideal, but that there was also a list of concerns related to practice, such as class size and an increase in work load. Several members then shared their experiences, both positive and difficult, in

relation to co-taught courses. One member mentioned that, if done well, co-teaching results in better student performance and course evaluations, while another added that it has to be offered in small classes in order to be effective, which, while relatively expensive, is worth the cost. One member asked for a show of hands if they had ever had a positive experience co-teaching a class, and about a quarter of the assembly raised their hands. Others were skeptical of co-teaching, arguing not only that the positive show of hands should not be taken as representative, but also that the faculty should consider what might be compromised if extra resources were reallocated in order to facilitate co-taught classes. Another member suggested that co-teaching would also add labor in complicating the scheduling process, and one other member stated an inability to co-teach given existing staffing and course demand in their own department.

One member of the Canopy team noted that while their proposal has the most co-teaching of the proposed models, it provided a budget-neutral way in which to accomplish it. A member of the Core Community team mentioned that in their model, co-teaching is spread over an entire semester, allowing for students to reflect on approaches, and for professors to fully re-engage their own discipline. This member encouraged faculty to think broadly about different kinds of co-teaching before dismissing it. Chair Freeman noted that not all models contained co-teaching as an element, and that none of them required co-teaching of all faculty; she also mentioned that once a model was selected, discussion of any of its elements, including co-teaching, could continue in a process of refinement.

b) Mentoring and faculty labor

One member noted the invisible labor that goes into mentoring, and the difficulty in evaluating some aspects of the proposed models because they defer in several respects to the first-year experience team for mentoring. This member said that, so far, only the Mosaic plan accounts for the faculty time it takes to mentor students. Chair Freeman mentioned that there is a desire to have all models credit the faculty time it takes to mentor students. One member argued that the literature on mentorship supports its inclusion in our curriculum, while another said that the challenge with this data lies in defining what is meant by mentorship. Both of these members felt encouraged by the way Mosaic incorporated mentorship in the curriculum.

One other member suggested that mentorship was the most important factor in questions of retention, while another worried about trying to solve retention in the first year by enforcing a multi-year mentoring program, noting further that it may detract from the natural and organically-developed mentoring that occurs between faculty and students.

Another member noted that some proposals add a 0.25 unit for faculty mentoring. The existing academic cap is 4.25 units, but in Music, for example, majors and minors take a 0.25 unit lesson, so any curriculum that adds another 0.25 unit to their schedule would force them into financial overload in order complete program requirements. Chair Freeman mentioned that raising the academic cap was on the table for the CTF. Another member responded that the Education minor also requires 0.25 units and mentioned

2

scheduling concerns if another 0.25 unit were to be required of students and faculty. This member argued that the addition of a 0.25 mentoring unit has implications beyond a simple process requirement, and they involve issues of student and faculty work load.

c) Science and the differing approaches

One member argued in favor of keeping all current five approaches. This member expressed concern with any model in which a scientific approach would be an option rather than required, particularly since non-science students such as those in the humanities would be well-served as world citizens to understand the scientific process. Another member spoke in favor of Canopy's model because it puts two or three disciplines in a sustained conversation so that students are engaging different ways of seeing the same problem, including the sciences. One member spoke in favor of the Peak model, noting that it was built around asking questions, and that it was important for students to take a lab at least once during their college years. Another member endorsed the Peak and Mosaic models, saying that they more effectively link courses with approaches, unlike Canopy, which makes no explicit connections with other classes.

d) Budget and retention

One member suggested that, in the faculty's desire to address the 20% attrition rate of the first-year class, they should at the same time form a proposal that would not disengage the remaining 80% of students, and would rather enhance the educational experience of all students. This member cautioned against adding more requirements to the curriculum. Another member encouraged the faculty to consider what the university might look like in five years' time, adding that undergraduate numbers alongside recent shortfalls in the budget suggest an inability to sustain a faculty of the current size in the coming years. This member expressed skepticism that curricular reform will solve our enrollment and retention problems, and stated that our biggest challenge is to distinguish Puget Sound from state universities like University of Washington.

President Crawford thanked the assembly for their dialogue and good work. He said the opportunity before us as a faculty is to develop a curriculum that will energize faculty, staff, administration, students, and alumni. He stressed the importance of distinguishing ourselves in this competitive educational environment, not only in terms of state universities, but also other liberal arts colleges. He suggested that the single most important component of the "Leadership for a Changing World" strategic plan is developing a curriculum we can offer that will bring us the best and brightest, provide the edge that will set us apart in the eyes of prospective students, and promote their success when they join us. The curriculum itself can attend to retention, but there is a vast array of offices and activities across campus that are designed to help in this regard. He noted that retention does not hinge solely on the curriculum, and encouraged the faculty to think holistically and systematically about this issue. He also expressed appreciation for the issues of financial and emotional sustainability that have been raised. He stated his desire for a curriculum that energizes faculty, and cautioned against developing an

unsustainable curriculum, such that it would prevent the other good work that makes Puget Sound unique.

In addressing the uniqueness of Puget Sound, one member reported the various number of times they had encountered faculty and families around the United States who connected us favorably with the Race and Pedagogy National Conference, and the excitement this had generated. This member argued that such a level of distinction should be broadened to include high-impact practices, and to think about how to make that 20% (of students who are not retained from their first year) feel like they belong, and how to make faculty of color feel that they belong.

e) Simplicity and student perception

One member argued for the coherence of the existing core, and worried that the more we complicate our curricular structure with added requirements, the more desperate we will seem to students. This member endorsed Canopy for its simplicity and its ability to retain the core. Another member remarked that the models in their current form will punish poor decisions made by students as they work through their curriculum.

Several members spoke from the imagined perspective of a prospective student, and suggested that adding requirements (such as a 0.25 mentoring unit in the first year) would decrease yield. Others spoke from the imagined perspective of existing students, noting that the more detailed we are about what needs to be added to schedules, the more difficult we make it for them to achieve their goals in the major or minor, particularly since students are increasingly wanting to graduate with two majors and a minor, for instance. This member expressed support for the Core Community model for the reason that it is simple for students to understand. One other member appreciated dreaming big, but called for simplicity, in part because of the financial and labor resources required by some of the models in order to implement aspects like built-in mentoring, for example.

Two members suggested that flexibility and the freedom to explore were crucial to the liberal arts experience, and suggested that proposals that frontload pathways do a disservice to students and detract from the reasons students choose Puget Sound. One of those members endorsed the Canopy model because it reduced requirements in the core and incentivized taking courses outside their major focus. Chair Freeman noted that changing graduation requirements was also being considered by the CTF.

One member pushed back against the idea that students come in not knowing what they want, and therefore desire freedom to explore. This member expressed desire for an academic environment that is rich with faculty facilitating the dreams of incoming students, some of whom know what that dream is before they arrive.

f) Cohort building

One member spoke in favor of cohort building, but added that it currently occurs in our campus community, and therefore expressed concern about models that impose mandates

4

with respect to cohort building, perhaps in ways that might displace what is already happening so well.

g) High-impact practices and e-portfolios

One member noted that not all of the proposed models incorporate high-impact practices, despite their inclusion in the strategic plan. Along with Chair Freeman, this member encouraged the faculty to consider ways in which to adopt such practices going forward with whatever model is selected. This member also said that some models incorporate e-portfolios—another element of the strategic plan—but expressed concern about the sustainability of an entire freshman class needing to learn how to use them.

Associate Dean Houston responded that all first-year students were oriented to e-portfolio this year, and that staff were in place to support this endeavor sustainably. President Crawford confirmed that resources can be made available to carry this forward, and mentioned that e-portfolios are one of the most exciting things we offer our students, noting the creative way they enable students to reflect on their development over four years. He encouraged the faculty to codify and inculcate e-portfolios in whatever curricular model would be developed.

As the meeting approached its scheduled adjournment, and in response to Chair Freeman's suggestion of next steps, the assembly expressed their readiness to take an online survey in order to express their proposal preferences. Chair Freeman stated that the survey will not be a binding vote on any one model, but rather would be designed to better understand faculty desires.

It was **moved** by Hanson, and **seconded**, *that the faculty end informal discussion of the proposals.*

There was no discussion.

The motion **passed** on a voice vote

VI. Other business

There was no other business.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Appendix A - Attendance

<u>September 18, 2019 Faculty Meeting Attendance</u>

Pedro Ashford
Greta Austin
Gareth Barkin
Terence Beck
Laura Behling
Michael Benveniste
LaToya Brackett
Nancy Bristow
Gwynne Brown
Dan Burgard
David Chiu
Julie Nelson Christoph
Lynnette Claire
Kirsten Coffman
Johanna Crane
Isiaah Crawford
Monica DeHart
Rachel DeMotts
Greg Elliott
Lisa Ferrari
Amy Fisher
Lea Fortmann
Kena Fox-Dobbs
Sara Freeman
Andrew Gardner
Megan Gessel
Andrew Gomez
Dexter Gordon
Jeffrey Grinstead
William Haltom
Fred Hamel
John Hanson
Peter Hodum
Suzanne Holland
Zaixin Hong
Renee Houston
Jairo Hoyos Galvas
Robert Hutchinson
Tina Huynh
Darcy Irvin
Martin Jackson
Robin Jacobson
Greg Johnson
Kristin Johnson

Priti Joshi
Ania Kapalczynski
Diane Kelley
Chris Kendall
Alisa Kessel
Samuel Kigar
Jung Kim
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Laura Krughoff
Sunil Kukreja
Jan Leuchtenberger
Benjamin Lewin
Pierre Ly
Janet Marcavage
Jeff Matthews
Gary McCall
Jill McCourt
Amanda Mifflin
Garrett Milam
Sarah Moore
Gerard Morris
Wendell Nakamura
Steven Neshyba
Ameera Nimjee
Eric Orlin
Emelie Peine
Jennifer Pitonyak
Jacob Price
Sara Protasi
Isha Rajbhandari
Brett Rogers
Amy Ryken
Douglas Sackman
Maria Sampen
Natalie Scenters-Zapico
Eric Scharrer
Dan Sherman
Renee Simms
Adam Smith
Jessica Smith
Rokiatou Soumare

David Sousa
Amy Van Engen Spivey
Tanya Stambuk
Jonathan Stockdale
Jason Struna
Justin Tiehen
Emily Tollefson
George Tomlin
Benjamin Tromly
Alexa Tullis
Andreas Udbye
Jennifer Utrata
Harry Velez-Quinones
Kurt Walls
Seth Weinberger
Stacey Weiss
Carolyn Weisz
John Wesley
Heather White
Linda Williams
Peter Wimberger
Bianca Wolf
Carrie Woods
Wind Woods
Rand Worland
Steven Zopfi
Sheryl Zylstra

<u>Guests</u>
Heather Bailey
Peggy Burge
Kathleen Campbell
Debbie Chee
Elizabeth Collins
Kelli Delaney
Katie Handick
Susan Owen
Michael Pastore
Kaity Peake
Ellen Peters
Elena Staver
Landon Wade

Report to the Faculty
Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate
September 10, 2019

Dear Colleagues:

At our September 4 meeting, we had the highest attendance at a faculty meeting I've seen here. That is a triumph for governance, and also a measure of the seriousness of the work we are doing. Endorsing the FEPPS BA was a marked occasion, and I appreciated how the faulty celebrated it with the proposers.

I have also heard many concerns about MC 103 not being able to accommodate all the faculty who would like to participate in curriculum deliberation, alongside it being hot and hard to hear in there. With the Provost and the Chairs of CTF, I am considering other spaces for the September 18 meeting. As you already know, all our other large capacity spaces also have their unique drawbacks, including very bad acoustics in some rooms and fixed forward-facing seating in others which makes it hard to see each other during deliberation. We are most interested in the Rotunda and Kilworth as options. If we make the call to move the meeting to a larger space I will notify the faculty as soon as possible.

Before I continue with issues related to our curriculum revision, I want to share small pieces of Faculty Senate related business, then I will return to questions of process and focus for our deliberations in the next weeks and months.

Faculty Senate Business
In the meeting on September 9, Senate began making its charges to the standing committees. We will finish that business on September 16. For many of the committees, there are significant items coming in the Senate charges, in addition to the ongoing business represented by their standing charges. The Senate liaisons to each standing committee are important resources and nodes of communication. Feel free to contact them if you have questions or ideas related to the work of any of the standing committees. This year the Senate liaison are:

Academic Standards Committee (ASC)	Tiffany MacBain
Curriculum Committee (CC)	Julia Looper
Committee on Diversity (COD)	Alison Tracy Hale
Institutional Review Board (IRB)	Sarah Moore
International Education Committee	Andrew Monoco/Regina Dutheley
Library Media Services (LMIS)	Sara Freeman
Professional Standards Committee (PSC)	Bill Beardsley
Curriculum Task Force (CTF)	Jung Kim
Student Life Committee (SLC)	Chris Kendall
University Enrichment Committee (UEC)	Jairo Hoyos Galvas
Staff Senate Liaison:	Megan Gessel
Ad Hoc Committee on Contingent Faculty	Heather White

That last liaison designation reveals that the Senate is in the process of returning to its plans from 2018 to form an ad hoc committee on contingent faculty. We aim to form a committee by October, with both tenure line faculty and faculty in contingent lines serving. The broad goals are to collaborate with the Associate Dean's office to articulate values, provide guidance, and interface about policy related to the use of contingent faculty on campus. Provisional charges for this committee are being drafted by Megan Gessel, Heather White, and Bill Beardsley and Senate will discuss them on September 16 and September 30.

Curriculum Proposals, CTF, and Curriculum Revision
We are about to begin informal and formal deliberation about the proposals for different models of undergraduate curriculum frameworks that came out of our summer work. At the same time, CTF continues to work on its charges related to calendar adjustments and workload issues.

As I narrated in the August 27 workshop and the September 4 meeting, my sense is that four things need to happen before a motion to change the graduation requirements for undergraduate degrees at the university can come to the floor for a vote. They are:
1. An online, anonymous, ranking survey of the faculty related to the proposals
2. Deliberation on the proposals
3. Narrowing of the field of proposals
4. Completed modeling of full curriculum framework including calendar and workload.

Here are some key premises for our meeting on September 18
- The goal of this meeting is for the faculty to deliberate on the proposals and the choices they represent about what our students do and what drives our shared curriculum. If we wish to do that informally (in open discussion instead of through motions), I will need a motion to move into informal consideration.
- Summer groups will have designees answer clarifying questions about the details of their plans that aid these deliberations, but the conversation will be moved back toward the larger deliberations, reflections, and evaluations. The proposing groups will not make further presentations.
- We have much more detailed plans now, and the details matter. Nonetheless, there are many specifics about how to manage partial units, how to include things that are already being done that fit the frameworks (rather than inventing the wheel), and how to handle transfer students that can be incorporated and refined in the final modeling once the faculty has decided which overall direction to go. It would be very productive at this meeting to focus on the questions of direction.

To that end, here are some questions that CTF and the summer working groups encourage the faculty take up and debate thoroughly:

What do the various plans offer our students?
What does each plan say about our institution? What would it mean for us to commit to that statement?
What does each plan ask of us, as a faculty, and as an institution?

Additionally, during its retreat at the start of the semester, Faculty Senate spent time reflecting on issues such as:

- We should continue to articulate what problems the proposals are addressing and how they remedy that problem, and be responsive to what our students need and what they want.
- What are the most student-centered things present in each proposal?
- Ideas that are most attractive to faculty often involve content, but a lot of what is needed is structural, is process-based
- Sequencing the transformation of first year/first three semesters with the later changes across all four years (parting it out to get it done but is also synthesized in the student's best interest)
- Prior to 18-19, there was a Student Retention Task Force as well as work on student outcomes: the CTF read their reports. Do the faculty want to hear reports from those group?

- All Academic staff departments are providing the Provost with analysis related to how their offices' work would shift with each proposal. Is that of interest to faculty in their deliberation?

Finally, if the conversation on September 18 reaches a point where faculty can express thoughts about **when** they wanted to be surveyed, the CTF and Senate are interested in that. Should the faculty choose to move out of informal deliberation at the end of the meeting, one option for action at that point would be for a motion to be made directing the CTF to take specific next actions (as outlined in the motions of May 8).

Today, those are all the things I can see to tell you about to support our shared process.

I am looking forward to the conversation.

Sincerely,

Sara

Appendix C - Cheat Sheet for Final Curriculum Proposals, sent to facultycoms 09/13/19

Basic Details						
		CIT-Explore	*PEAK*	*Mosaic*	*Core Community*	*Canopy*
1	Required for graduation?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2	Estimated change in units	-1.5 to -.75	-1 to -0.5	-2.0	None	-5
First-Year Experience						
3	Academic Launch	Yes, CIT 1xx	Defer to FYE	Yes, Mosaic Interdisciplinary Course	Yes	Yes
4	SSI	SSI1 modified as CIT 1xx SSI2 remains	As Is, but can work with both, one, or nether	SSI1 is transformed into Mosaic Interdisciplinary Course; SSI2 is Kept As-Is	Modified	Kept-as-Is with potential for modifications
5	Existing Core categories and rubrics	Categories kept, rubrics modified	Categories kept, eligibility expanded	Categories kept, Number of courses counting for the Approaches expanded	Categories kept, rubrics modified	Categories kept, rubrics modified
6	Lower-Division Mentoring & Advising	Yes, 0.25 unit Explore	Yes in PEAK Intro	Yes, 0.25 unit Mentoring Group Courses in the first three semesters	Kept somewhat as is	Defer to FYE proposal
7	Transition-to-College Work	Yes, Explore	Defer to FYE	Yes, in first Mentoring Group Course	We do not address this directly and do not have this as a requirement in our proposal.	Defer to FYE proposal
8	Small Cohort	Yes, Explore	Yes in PEAK themes and Experiences	Yes, in Mentoring Group Courses	Yes	Defer to FYE proposal
9	Student reflection on learning across classes	Yes, Explore	PEAK route map in ePortfolio	Through Mentoring Group Courses, ePortfolios, SoundingTime, integrated into curriculum	This happens in the new SSI1 which we call the Keystone Course	ePortfolio and other reflection both within and across classes
Learning Communities						
10	Upper-Division Mentoring (beyond first 2 years)	Yes, in CIE 4xx	Yes in PEAK Experience classes	Yes, ongoing Mosaic Mentor relationship, and 0.25 unit Mentoring Group Course in Fall of Senior year	We do not have this written into our proposal as our plan does not go past the first year.	No
11	Common Intellectual Experiences	Yes - across campus: CIT, Explore, CIE, & attending CIE presentations	Yes - PEAK Intro, Experience, and Capstone	Yes: Mentoring Group Courses, Sounding Time, Shared Process-Oriented Learning Experience	Yes. Entire first semester/year curriculum is taken as a cohort	Yes, co-taught SEEDS and HEIGHTS
12	Capstone or Upper-Division Experience	Yes, CIE 4xx 0.25-1 unit	Yes required 0.5-1.0 unit course	Kept in the Major and Minor As-Is; 0.25 unit Mentoring Group Course for ePortfolio and	We can envision this as an option but it is not covered in our current proposal	Required: 300/400 level HEIGHTS in YR4

				Sounding Time capstone experience for Mosaic process		
Other Considerations						
13	Impact on Transfer Students	A CIT 1xx and/or Explore 1xx course could be adapted for advanced transfers or they could join an existing course.	2nd year transfers complete entire PEAK model;; 3rd year transfers complete half	Transfer students take two 0.25 unit Mentoring Group Courses in their first year on campus (instead of three) and they can count transfer courses towards their Mosaics	Depends on the transfer student	Facilitates progress toward graduation with fewer Core courses & ability to take 2 HEIGHTS courses
14	Staff involvement (*e.g.*, CWLT, SAA, Library)	Emphasized	Possible	Mentoring Group Courses provide a new forum within the curriculum for student-facing staff offices / programs	Yes. We see the Library and CWLT as critical to the learning in the Keystone Course	Emphasized
15	Team Teaching	Yes, CIT 1xx	Yes in PEAK Intro	Optional; Incentivized in Mosaic Interdisciplinary Course	Yes. We see the coordinated program as one larger team-teaching initiative, so spread across multiple courses rather than just one.	Foundational to Canopy philosophy, represents 2/3 of Canopy core
16	Faculty collaboration around curriculum development	Structured into co-teaching and faculty development	Yes in PEAK intro and theme areas	Structured into Mosaic Interdisciplinary Course, Sounding Time, activities across Mentoring Group Courses	Essential to our model.	Structured into plan on ongoing basis

Scaffolding Schedule (Traditional 4-Year Student)

CIT-Explore	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4
Fa	CIT1xx (1 unit co-taught) Explore advising (0.25 units)	Explore Cohort Workshops (1-2 x per semester) (Attend campus CIE presentations)	CIE 4xx: Critical Interdisciplinary Experience (0.25-1 unit) (Attend campus CIE presentations)	
Sp	SSI 2xx Explore Cohort Workshops (1-2 x per semester)			
	5 Approaches courses, KNOW, foreign language, 2 upper-division outside the major courses			

Peak	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4
Fa			PEAK Experience (0.25 unit) [either semester]	
Sp	PEAK Introductory Course	PEAK Experience (0.25 unit) [either semester]		PEAK Capstone (0.5-1.0 unit)
	3-4 ROUTE classes covering at least 3 Approaches			

Mosaic	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4
Fa	Mosaic Interdisciplinary Course (1.0 unit) Mentoring Group Course 1: Explore (0.25 unit)	Mentoring Group Course 3: Design (0.25 unit)	[Ongoing mentoring as needed, but free of mentoring courses to allow for study abroad / away, and other HIPs]	Mentoring Group Course 4: Exhibit (0.25 unit)
Sp	Mentoring Group Course 2: Tesserae (0.25 unit) [Attend Sounding Time]	[Ongoing mentoring as needed] [Attend Sounding Time]	[Ongoing mentoring as needed]	[Sounding Time - ePortfolio and poster presentation]

CoreCom	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4
Fa	SSI1-->Keystone Course Community Course 2 Community Course 3 Community course 4	No further programming after the first year		
Sp	SSI2-->Community Research Course *3 non-community electives* *OR* *2 more Community Courses*			

Canopy	Year1	Year2	Year3	Year4
Fa	SEEDS (F or S) (1 unit)	BRANCHES (anytime Yr 2 or 3) (1 unit) [Optional second BRANCHES (anytime Yr 2 or 3) (1 unit)]		HEIGHTS (F or S) (1 unit)
Sp				