

## **Minutes of the April 29, 2020 faculty meeting**

Respectfully submitted by John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty

In compliance with state emergency orders during the coronavirus pandemic, this faculty meeting was held remotely via Google Meet.

**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 100 voting members present.

### **II. Approval of the April 1, 2020 minutes**

The minutes of the April 1, 2020 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

### **III. Questions regarding the report from the Faculty Senate Chair**

The report is included in Appendix B of these minutes.

There were no questions regarding the report.

President Crawford shared with the assembly the names of those faculty, staff, and students who will serve on the Budget Adjustment Group and Operational Planning Group committees.

### **IV. Motion to approve the Masters of Public Health program as proposed to be offered at the University of Puget Sound**

The following motion was brought from the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate, that *the faculty of the University of Puget Sound hereby approve the Master of Public Health program as proposed to be offered at the University of Puget Sound.*

The faculty discussed the motion.

A full recording of the discussion is available at the link below:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eMJHRIFDYKmwSgOMrmiE7Ydt\\_dHInBly/view?ts=5eab5fce](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eMJHRIFDYKmwSgOMrmiE7Ydt_dHInBly/view?ts=5eab5fce)

A summary of this discussion follows.

Two members of the MPH proposal working group delivered prepared remarks in favor of the motion; these can be found in Appendix C (Lewin) and Appendix D (Ryken) of these minutes.

A few members asked for the modelling data (that helped support the proposal) to be made available to the faculty. Provost Behling responded that this will be shared with the faculty prior to the vote. She also spoke in favor of the motion, noting its alignment with the strategic plan, the university's mission, and the strength of existing programs. She summarized the modelling data for the assembly, noting that the working group had taken into account both conservative and less conservative models in plotting the revenue timeline. In response to a few questions regarding the program's funding, Provost Behling and President Crawford indicated that resources had been designated and approved by the Board of Trustees for the development of new programs in accordance with the strategic plan. President Crawford also suggested the importance of investing in the future of the university while also responding to the impact of the current crisis, and the need to continue to adapt and evolve.

One member recalled that the successful graduate program of Occupational Therapy was founded in a similar time of uncertainty, namely during World War II, and in the midst of an outbreak of tuberculosis on campus in 1943-44. This member expressed their support of the MPH program, particularly as it would be implemented at a time when various public health threats, including COVID-19, are and will continue to be at the center of local, national, and international concerns. Two other members concurred and also indicated a high degree of student interest in this program. Other members also spoke to the unique draw of offering an MPH program at a liberal arts college, and in Washington state where only one other university (UW) has an accredited program. Three members suggested that the MPH would also be a draw for undergraduate enrollment, since there might be an option for pursuing a four-plus-one graduate timeline.

Two members asked whether the new faculty would be contingent or tenure-line. One member of the working group noted that they did not have a formal position on the matter, but that the accreditation body (the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)) allows for flexibility in terms of how institutions allocate faculty to the program. Another member of the working group shared the impression that there might be at least three positions that would be tenure line (including a director), but that clinical positions may be contingent. Provost Behling reminded the assembly that all current programs at the university, and particularly professional ones, have a variety of kinds of positions.

One faculty member asked about practicum components. A member of the working group gave evidence of a great number of partnerships welcomed by the local health community developed during the proposal phase. President Crawford affirmed this point and noted that going forward he would be continuing his ambassadorship in this regard.

One member shared support of the proposal but expressed a desire to see more intent in terms of aligning the MPH with existing undergraduate programs. Another member encouraged the program to include the study of social determinants like race to be at the forefront of the MPH curriculum. Members of the MPH working group expressed their support for these suggestions, noting the clear focus on elements of social determinants in the existing proposal.

It was **moved** by Johnson, and **seconded**, *to call the question*. Given the remote format of the meeting, voting on the call to question was conducted according to the presentation of

objections. Hearing no objections, Chair Freeman announced that the faculty would vote on the motion online after the meeting using a Qualtrics survey, with a voting deadline of 2:00 p.m. on Friday, May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020.

The motion **passed** on Friday, May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, with a count vote of 133 in favor, 8 not in favor, and 7 abstentions.

#### **V. Other business**

Chair Freeman congratulated and welcomed incoming faculty elected to governance roles. There was a round of applause for Chair Freeman.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

DRAFT

## Appendix A - Attendance

### Faculty Meeting Attendance Remote Meeting - April 29, 2020

Gareth Barkin  
Kristine Bartanen  
Laura Behling  
Francoise Belot  
Sigrun Bodine  
Luc Boisvert  
Nicholas Brody  
Gwynne Brown  
Dan Burgard  
Julie Nelson Christoph  
Lynnette Claire  
Kirsten Coffman  
Erin Colbert-White  
Johanna Crane  
Isiaah Crawford  
Monica DeHart  
Alyce DeMarais  
Rachel DeMotts  
Tanya Erzen  
Kena Fox-Dobbs  
Sara Freeman  
Megan Gessel  
Andrew Gomez  
Dexter Gordon  
Jeffrey Grinstead  
Fred Hamel  
John Hanson  
David Hanson  
Jennifer Hastings  
Suzanne Holland  
Kent Hooper  
Renee Houston  
Tina Huynh  
Martin Jackson  
Robin Jacobson  
Greg Johnson  
Kristin Johnson  
Priti Joshi

Tatiana Kaminsky  
Chris Kendall  
Alisa Kessel  
Samuel Kigar  
Jung Kim  
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos  
Alan Krause  
Laura Krughoff  
Sunil Kukreja  
John Lear  
Ha Jung Lee  
Benjamin Lewin  
Grace Livingston  
Pierre Ly  
Tiffany MacBain  
Andreas Madlung  
Janet Marcavage  
Mark Martin  
Gary McCall  
Jill McCourt  
Danny McMillian  
Amanda Mifflin  
Andrew Monaco  
Sarah Moore  
Steven Neshyba  
Ameera Nimjee  
Lisa Nunn  
Eric Orlin  
Emelie Peine  
Jennifer Pitonyak  
Jacob Price  
Elise Richman  
Holly Roberts  
Brett Rogers  
Melvin Rouse  
Amy Ryken  
Maria Sampen  
Eric Scharrer

Dan Sherman  
Katherine Smith  
Jessica Smith  
Rokiatou Soumare  
Jonathan Stockdale  
Kristen Strehle  
Jason Struna  
Yvonne Swinth  
Emily Tollefson  
George Tomlin  
Alison Tracy Hale  
Benjamin Tromly  
Ariela Tubert  
Alexa Tullis  
Andreas Udbye  
Anna Valiavska  
Renee Watling  
Stacey Weiss  
John Wesley  
Heather White  
Linda Williams  
Peter Wimberger  
Bianca Wolf  
Sheryl Zylstra

#### Guests:

Heather Bailey  
Alva Butcher  
Elizabeth Collins  
Kelli Delaney  
Eli Gandour-Rood  
Kaitly Peake  
Ellen Peters  
Ben Tucker  
Landon Wade

**Report to the Faculty**

**Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate**

**April 22, 2020**

Dear Colleagues:

More time than three weeks feels like it has passed since April 1. Because of Covid-19 we are living and working in changed circumstances. We are dealing with the immediate shift to remote operations: we are even dealing well in some areas of our short term necessity by continuing to be thoughtful, prioritize our students, and have probing, supportive discussion in learning and governance spaces. We don't get to have much of a sense of certitude about what will be middle range and long term impacts of this crisis, but we're going to deal with those too.

On that front, early this month President Crawford requested that the leadership of both Faculty Senate and Staff Senate provide input about the principles and values that will guide Cabinet and the campus as we engage in "Dual Track Planning" for operations in the summer, academic year 20-21, and perhaps beyond. Senate discussed this on April 6 and on April 13 I sent the letter included at the end of this report to President Crawford. Ben Tucker has also provided the President with a response from staff.

I received a warm response from the President regarding our input. The President has also communicated with the campus about the plan to form an Operations committee and a Budget Adjustment committee. As this report goes out to you, Senate Executive has been scheduled to meet with the Cabinet on Thursday, April 23 (along with Ben and other staff members) to discuss the formation of those two committees. Senate and I are aware that there are many concerns faculty have about future operations and budget adjustments including, among many others:

1. what happens for faculty who have research or travel leaves or support next year
2. the timing of when contingent faculty might receive new contracts, especially in relation to any still ongoing searches
3. student difficulty navigating the wide range of faculty techniques and expectations in our emergency remote learning situation and the potential need for some standards and guidelines if we continue to have instruction in this capacity.

But the most important immediate issue is the formation of the committees, which needs to be done with the utmost attention to representation and effectiveness, ideally by governance processes rather than appointment. By the time we meet as a full assembly on April 29, I will know what has happened at tomorrow's meeting and will be happy to take any questions faculty wish to pose about the forward motion on dual track planning.

In the rest of this report, I will be precise about our April 29 meeting's procedure and content and then give an update about Senate's actions and continuing to work to the end of this semester.

**April 29 Virtual Full Faculty Meeting:**

Thank you to everyone for your exemplary participation in and navigation of our first virtual full faculty meeting on April 1. We now know we can do it, though I heartily hope we won't have to do it much more. April 29 will not have the joint Town Hall aspect with staff, so there should be plenty of space for logging in to the meeting.

As before, I have kept the agenda extremely brief. There is one voting item, which is the proposal for a Masters of Public Health program that has come through Curriculum Committee. Because of the limitations of virtual meetings, Senate and the MPH working group created a Canvas site and comment period to allow for questions and discussion about the MPH proposal. I am happy to see people are actively engaging there already. The working group will host its virtual forums on April 24 and 28. Senate will do a final check on this topic at its meeting on April 27, then it will come to the floor of the full assembly.

I urge faculty to prepare questions and comments they know they need to raise on any of the items of business in advance. If you wish to notify me that you will be requesting to speak, I am happy to receive that information prior to the meeting. I will also recognize people in the meeting from the chat bar. It tends to work best if people signal in the chat bar that they want to be recognized by typing an X or a ? in the chat and then when I call on them unmuting and speaking (or typing and I will read it to the group). It is very overwhelming if people start posting their content in the chat bar before being recognized, because people do always track at the same rate, plus there are people who will dial in to the meeting and only hear what is said. Again, the chat bar will be monitored and is part of the meeting's proceedings, so we should not have side conversations on it.

Nonetheless, given all these caveats, we should have all the discussion needed about the MPH proposal. Should discussion conclude so that we can move to vote on the motion to approve, the voting will happen in Qualtrics after the meeting. Please also see below about the Senate action regarding changing the code language related to promotion. If needed, faculty can call for action related to that during the April 29 meeting as well.

**Senate Business**

Senate has been doing work at virtual meetings and over email, monitoring and approving the actions of standing committees, and trying to keep direct updates coming to faculty about temporary and permanent policy changes. In the last three weeks, you've received updates about temporary ASC policies related to grading, withdrawal, academic sanctions, and Dean's List criteria for our spring and now summer virtual operations. The PSC guidelines about the use of student evaluations and the submission of tenure and promotion files under these circumstances have also gone out. IRB has sent an update about procedural updates and requirements as well.

The Senate action that most needs to be highlighted for faculty as this moment is a decision regarding the motion changing the code language about promotion that we voted on in the January 22 full faculty meeting. We had a split the original motion into two: one changing the

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

language and one establishing the timeline for implementation. In January we voted to change the language, and then needed to return to the implementation motion. Due to the interruptions created by Covid 19, Senate has concluded that sorting out the timeline for implementation of the new standards could not be accomplished this spring with clear enough faculty deliberation. Because of Covid 19, but also because this code change has a three-year history of debate and necessary delay, this code change has a lot of complication attached to it. Senate also continues to receive feedback that suggests we need more work to build an adequate sense of shared definitions and clarity about the new promotion language and timeline. Therefore, on this item of business, Senate decided to act as the executive body of the faculty and withdraw the pending motion about implementation, and also stop the approved motion about language change before it goes to the Board of Trustees. In sum, Senate is making the call that there will be no changes to the code language about promotion right now. Future Senates can initiate a new round of business on promotion language when able, but we will no longer be carrying over this business from 2017-2018. This Senate action means that people who will be up for tenure and promotion in the foreseeable future will be working under the code language that exists now, but, given the motion for phased implementation of the new language, that is the same situation they would have been in, in almost any case. This Senate action is something that the faculty can overturn at the April 29 meeting or within 30 working days of when Senate's April 6 meeting minutes post, should they choose. Thirty working days will extend into the early fall next year because we have not historically counted summer session days. But there is no request to discuss it and no motions brought the attention of this year or next year's Senate leadership, Senate's action will stand.

In its final two meetings of the year, Senate will receive all the end of year reports from standing committees and focus on providing good continuity for next year. We will also decide the recipient of the Walter Lowry Award. Please nominate people for this award!

This is my last report to the faculty as Senate Chair. I am preparing my final report to the Board of Trustees this week as well. I feel it is an honor to serve as Senate chair: the work is thrilling, albeit with many highs and lows. I now move on to the Budget Task Force, and truly look forward to working with all of you in a range of governance, instructional, and collegial capacities in coming years.

Finally, congratulations to the newly elected Senators, members of FAC and FSC, and our incoming Faculty Senate Chair! The garden of governance has been reseeded for a new cycle.

Sincerely,

Sara

## Appendix I

### Letter to President Crawford from Faculty Senate Chair, April 13, 2020

Dear Isiaah:

After discussion with the Senate at our April 6 meeting, consideration of conversation on the Faculty Governance list, and my own reflection, I am providing this input.

I have shared a draft of this with Senate, and Senators have generously helped me shape these points.

The most important point to emerge from Senate discussion is a **call to create a faculty-staff governance committee** to collaborate in the off-cycle budget and operational decisions that may need to be made so we can think holistically (though rapidly) about our programs and their future. There was strong interest in this committee being separate from but in consultation with the Budget Task Force, the Faculty Salary Committee, and the Senate. This is because there is a desire for a faculty-centered committee that will not be constrained by the need to ‘stay in its lane’ and speak only to one aspect of our functioning so that creative solutions can emerge that might cross the usual lines within our labor structures, such as job sharing, temporary redistributions, or other type of work re-imaginings that would allow us to come together to protect the liberal arts nature of the institution, as well as the livelihood of as many people in our community as possible.

A separate committee would also make a bit of space for the Senate to preserve its integrity related to its role (as outlined in the Code) when or if tough decisions are made that may have a negative impact on some of our colleagues. The Senate must retain its role of speaking against decisions if needed and giving voice to any colleagues who feel they have been harmed.

In response to your two questions in your original email:

**Question 1:** From the faculty/staff perspective, would you recommend any revisions, additions or removals from the summary of guiding principles as we consider dual-track planning and any necessary budget reductions in this very challenging and uncertain environment? Would you prioritize certain principles over others?

Among the principles listed, I would put absolute and maximum importance on the first two (“Maintain centrality to mission and adherence to Puget Sound’s core values” and “Preserve quality of educational experience for students”). I see already in your leadership that these are the lodestars.

I would put next emphasis on “encourage the innovative deployment of resources.” I urge us to “balance the budget with long-term benefits in mind” and I would like to encourage that in



adhering to that value we might deemphasize or temporarily take off the list some of the other values. In this situation being too responsive to economic and market conditions may cause us to cut off our nose to spite our face; and to focus too much on competitiveness in the higher education market in the short term might cause us to do undue damage to our liberal arts model. Likewise, the forward movement of the strategic plan may need to have a longer timeline and not drive some of the off cycle budget decisions.

As I look at the University's Core Values, I would rank **Courage, Respect and Inclusion** as the top three for us to embrace while we engage in dual-track planning around the Covid-19 crisis. **Creativity** would come next, especially as regards our support of contingent faculty and staff during this period. **Shared sacrifice** comes up as an important value to faculty and this whole community, but with the note that many have felt at previous times when that value has been invoked, such as during the 2008 financial crisis, that the sacrifice made by the administration was not equal to the sacrifice made by the faculty. It is important that the choices we make are equitable, which means attending to the way in which budget decisions impact members of our community differently, even when 'on paper' certain cuts and reductions appear to be the same.

In the Senate meeting on April 6, the other values to emerge were:

- Transparency during all phases and at all levels
- Full access to information
- Commitment to offering a curriculum that represents our full liberal arts values, across disciplines.

**Question 2:** What do you see as the key areas of input needed from faculty and staff leadership to inform our decision-making?

Key areas where input is needed:

- The duration of remote operations and the date for return to in-person operations
- Policies regarding work from home and technical access and support
- Changes to any aspect of compensation
- Actions related to the employment of contingent faculty
- Actions related to the retention or layoff of staff members
- The development of any new initiatives or consolidation of existing programs in light of the crisis

There is also strong support among Senate for student input to inform decision-making.

Finally, I will highlight the adaptive, forward-thinking ideas that faculty are putting forth on the Faculty Governance list, especially from Gwynne Brown, Lisa Wood, and David Sousa. There is ample evidence that faculty are ready and willing to help address the impacts of the crisis for our operations in creative, mutually supportive ways. This strengthens the call for a consultative committee.

Thank you for your partnership and focus during this truly upending public health crisis.

Sara

## **Appendix II**

### **Values Document from President Crawford**



#### **Principles to Guide Budget Decisions**

- Maintain centrality to mission and adherence to Puget Sound’s core values (see below)
- Preserve quality of educational experience for students
- Maintain competitiveness in the higher education marketplace
- Use strategic plan to drive resource allocations
- Encourage innovative deployment of resources
- Expect maximum operating efficiency and effectiveness
- Expenditure levels must be within available revenues and responsive to economic and market conditions
- Balance the budget with long-term benefits in mind

#### **Core Values**

We believe in the transformational power of a liberal arts education, where students come first and learning and holistic development is an absolute priority.

**Excellence**

**Justice**

**Leadership**

**Creativity**

**Respect**

**Courage**

**Inclusion**

## Appendix C – Remarks from Lewin in Support of the MPH Proposal

### MPH Opening Remarks

Ben Lewin

I'd like to start off by thanking the working group members for the time and energy that they've put into this proposal. This was an involved process and I genuinely appreciate the hard work that all of the working group members have put into this project.

Lynnette Claire,  
Suzanne Holland,  
Sunil Kukreja  
Jenny Pitonyak,  
Holly Roberts,  
Amy Ryken,  
Bianca Wolf,

I just wanted to start with some opening comments that will hopefully help to frame our discussion today.

Public health is a transdisciplinary field that focuses on the promotion of community and environmental health, and the prevention of disease and injury to assure optimal health outcomes. A cornerstone of Public health is understanding the connection between structural inequality and health disparities while serving marginalized populations. The MPH is a professional degree that prepares students as practitioners who are responsive to contemporary challenges in public health at local, regional, national and global levels.

This proposal stems from interest in creating an MPH program that would serve five distinct, yet overlapping purposes

- 1) First, it will align very well with our *institutional mission and philosophies* such as fostering critical thinking, apt expression, social justice and community engagement,
- 2) Second, An MPH program will also align well with the *four existing graduate programs* on campus which are community- and service-centered, three of which already focus on physical or mental health professions,
- 3) Third, the creation of this program is a response to significant student interest and heavy demand for public health-related curricular content
- 4) The program would enhance university offerings which will increase graduate program enrollment, and
- 5) An MPH program will serve a regional need for quality public health care by preparing well-trained professionals.

## Appendix C – Remarks from Lewin in Support of the MPH Proposal

Overall, these objectives are in line with the *Leadership for a Changing World* strategic plan; specifically the program would “enhance our strengths in health sciences” and allow the university to “more deeply engage with and learn from our local and regional communities” thus strengthening the quality of a Puget Sound education and our role as a community asset.”

The framework contained in this proposal is informed by a close examination of the Council for Education for Public Health’s (CEPH) accreditation standards, a review of the programs and resources in the region, and the resources available at Puget Sound. The working group has also been engaged in conversations with local partners regarding the shaping of the curriculum and in particular, possible practicum placement sites.

Overall, we believe that this program will attract new graduate students to our university and that it corresponds with the current academic and professional interests of many undergraduate students, creating the potential for continued enrollment after completion of undergraduate work. Furthermore, the program will address existing needs of the Puget Sound community and region, while continuing to distinguish the university through its commitment to the education of health care professionals.

I would like to speak in favor of the motion.

The MPH program we have outlined is well aligned with the University mission, the four existing graduate programs on campus, and an interdisciplinary liberal arts context.

I see great possibilities for strong synergies between MPH graduate students with both undergraduate students and programs, and with the existing graduate programs in counseling, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and teaching.

If approved, this will be a new program so there is tremendous potential for the MPH curriculum to be intentionally designed to center social determinants of health in all aspects of the program to support the aspirational goals of the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Moving forward with the proposal is a step in working toward implementing the goal to add a few select graduate programs to diversify tuition revenue streams, which we have needed, and will need going forward. The University has a very strong track record of setting and monitoring graduate program budgets so that graduate programs generate revenue for the University. Conservative budget models for the program, modeling enrollments of 8-15 students or 10-20 students between 2022-2025 suggest that the MPH program will generate revenue within four years.

In our listening sessions, and in our communications with individual faculty members, we have been asked. Why approve this curriculum proposal at the time of fatigue, overwhelm, and uncertainty? One thing I would like to share in response to this question is that the working group has provided an initial MPH curriculum and resource framework. There is still significant program and curriculum development work to do. As is often the Puget Sound way, this initiative began, and has been sustained, by a group of faculty who have done this work on top of our existing responsibilities. To move the work forward the University needs to invest in intentional leadership and faculty with relevant expertise so the program has the resources it deserves. The impact of postponing the vote will put the working group in a holding pattern of waiting for approval (or not) before additional curriculum development can continue for six months to a year or more. It does not make sense to develop detailed syllabi or to establish community partnerships for a program that has not been approved.

Approving the MPH proposal is an act of hope we can take to affirm the vision articulated in the Leadership for a Changing World Strategic Plan to grow graduate programs to offer meaningful and timely professional education and to increase University revenue streams.