

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the September 12, 2016 meeting

Attendance:

Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Bill Haltom, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Alisa Kessel, Brendan Lanctot, Noah Lumbantobing, Pierre Ly, Casey O'Brien, Emelie Peine, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Peter Wimberger

Guests: President Isiaah Crawford, Suzanne Holland

The meeting was called to order at 16:02.

Announcements:

Chair Kessel updated Senate on the FAQ sheet about the Open Hour discussion. She is soliciting feedback from the Staff Senate and ASUPS Senate and will then revise it with Ramakrishnan and Bristow in light of that.

Minutes Approvals

May 9 – The Senate received clarification about one point in the May 9 minutes. The Minutes were revised to reflect the clarification.

M/S/P to accept. Unanimous.

Minutes from August 29 – M/S/P to accept. Unanimous.

Liaison Updates

Institutional Review Board – Tim Beyer was elected chair. Tatiana Kaminsky co-chair

Academic Standards Committee – Jo Crane was elected chair for fall.

Curriculum Committee– Elise Richman elected chair. Rob Beezer secretary.

International Education Committee – Lea Fortman elected chair for Fall, Diane Kelley for Spring. The committee appointed Gareth Barkin and John Lear to the Study Abroad Work Group.

Student Life Committee – Megan Gessel was elected chair. Brad Reich appointed to ad hoc educational goals committee.

Professional Standards Committee – Jennifer Neighbors was elected chair.

University Enrichment Committee – Roger Allen was elected chair.

ASUPS – Senator Lumbantobing reported on the New York Times subscriptions because there had been some faculty concern – ASUPS decided not pay the \$15,000 annual subscription out of their budget. That subscription consumes ~20% of their budget. ASUPS does not have the financial capacity to support that program given the other demands on the budget.

LMIS - James Bernhard volunteered to chair the committee.

President Crawford's visit

Chair Kessel invited President Crawford to talk with the Senate. President Crawford thanked faculty for their work in getting the campus back into session and related that he was delighted to be back in a semester system – at his previous institution semesters and quarters were used concurrently for different programs. He said that it's been a good and busy two months; he is trying to gain an understanding of the culture here. There has been a lot of speechwriting and speech-giving, touring of the learning and living facilities, reading of briefing books, and meetings with colleagues on campus and civic leaders in the community. He has stayed busy.

President Crawford shared some of his initial reactions – he has been touched by the community's commitment to each other and our shared belief in the transformative power of liberal arts. He has found the students here to be impressive and has been struck by their earnestness. President Crawford has sensed that students feel fortunate to be here and that is in part due to the dedication, care and concern that faculty and staff have for students and the student experience. He is happy that the institution's commitment to a welcoming, supportive environment is broad-based.

President Crawford hopes to get together with every group on campus in the next year, either formally or informally. He wants to learn from faculty and hear their aspirations and concerns. He wants to get a sense for planning protocols and develop a process for developing the next strategic plan. President Crawford hopes that by the end of the year we will have put together a collaborative process that includes faculty, staff, students and the greater community in the process. He would like the strategic plan to be developed during the following year and presented to the Trustees. He hopes that once the new strategic plan is in place we can move to the next capital campaign.

President Crawford wants to continue the positive momentum of the Defining Moments strategic plan. We will continue our work on student engagement and retention, our work on experiential education and support faculty development. He is excited about the Diversity Strategic Plan and wants to make it better known to the wider community. President Crawford concluded his prepared remarks by saying that it is a delight and joy to be here and be a part of this community.

Kessel asked about strategic plan development. For instance, do we bring someone in from the outside? What are we looking for in a strategic plan, benchmarks and assessment? Are aspirations rather than logistics driving the process? How do we invite thinking in aspirational terms? President Crawford answered that the process should allow broad input from all corners including our community partners in a meaningful and equitable way. Soliciting and incorporating this input may take longer but the payoff will ultimately be greater.

O'Brien inquired how President Crawford intends to solicit student feedback --- how do we generate a process that incorporates a broader range of student input than only the elected representatives? President Crawford hopes that through focus group for different student groups that we will be able to get this broader-based input from the student community.

Bristow asked about how we will engage with the local community in a grass-roots way. President Crawford answered that he would look to faculty for input and that he would go out into the community to seek participation and input.

Johnson asked whether he has been able to take any weekends off. President Crawford answered that he's sure that he will. Someday.

Ramakrishnan asked what he hopes will be included in the strategic plan. President Crawford said that he would like to see a broad set of initiatives proposed that we want to pursue. He would like it to speak to issues of curriculum – what as a faculty do we want, and how do we appeal to students who would want to come here? How can we speak to regional and national needs? He hopes it addresses issues of access and affordability. How do we address demographic shifts and be responsive to those and take advantage of those for ongoing success? What do we need to support faculty to do their best work and support the kind of education that we want to deliver? What supports need to be in place to achieve those goals? He would like to see the plan address staff needs as well. How can we be noted as being one of the best places to work? How do we support people feeling supported and instrumental? How do we become an institution where that kind of support is part of our identity?

Lanctot asked President Crawford to discuss his view of what liberal arts is. President Crawford answered that he thought that a Puget Sound liberal arts education was consistent with the historical tradition of liberal arts – it is a place where students get a deep and broad education. He would like students to develop the ability to think rationally and critically. He wants them to develop rhetorical skills and an appreciation of beauty and elegance. He hopes that our students develop into thoughtful citizens of our world and that they have a set of skills that they can adapt to make their way in the world. One of our challenges is speaking to general concerns of the relevance of a liberal arts education. How do we speak to return on investment (not a term he likes) of a liberal arts education?

Johnson wondered what kinds of messages we can send to freshmen so that they get this message too, especially in light of increasing enrollments in STEM and decreasing enrollments in the humanities and social sciences? President Crawford responded that when he talks to people in the business community, they are looking for well educated people, who write and speak well, are critical thinkers and problem-solvers, who work well with others and can become leaders, which describes students graduating from Puget Sound.

Kessel asked President Crawford why he didn't like the term "return on investment". He replied that he found it mechanistic and reductionist. He believes that education represents a more continuous return on investment. But the reality is that people are interested in more immediate short-term gains. He said that most students will end up having 5 or 6 careers. Liberal arts education makes it easier for them to make those transitions.

Jacobsen asked what the future of our political power and agency will be? President Crawford replied that we need to stay in control of our curriculum and how we manifest liberal arts. In the current environment we are being challenged to define ourselves more as a business and there are pushes for more regulation. President Crawford noted that we need to push back against that.

Segawa noted that President Crawford had mentioned George Kuh's work and asked him what he found attractive about his work. President Crawford answered that he is a proponent of his work as it relates to the types of activities that have the most profound impact on college students' deep learning. Kuh describes these high impact activities and finds that their effect is cumulative. President Crawford also mentioned a Gallup-Purdue study – in which college graduates who were happiest about their college

experience and life after college were those who developed a deep relationship with a faculty who believed in them and their ability to pursue their dreams.

Kessel asked what constitute low and high impact practices. President Crawford described high impact practices as things like small seminar courses, low class sizes, problem-based work and developing learning communities. Dean Bartanen noted that we do many of these things.

Bristow wondered what the role of the co-curriculum in these discussions was. President Crawford said that it is an essential part of student experience and that some of the most critical experiences are co-curricular.

President Crawford then thanked the Senate for the invitation and Chair Kessel thanked President Crawford for taking the time to talk with the Senators.

The Senate proceeded to discuss charges:

LMIS – The suggested charge was: **Work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to develop policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus.**

Wimberger wondered what the background of the charge was. Peine said that it was left-over charge from the previous year and that there was a desire to have policies in place for how institutional data are used. Dean Bartanen said that we do have some policies in place, but was not opposed to the charge. She didn't want anyone to think that were no policies. Peine wasn't sure that LMIS was aware of that and wasn't aware of the policies herself.

An amendment to the charge was suggested: **Work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to review and [if needed] develop policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus.**

M/S/A the charge as amended.

Kessel reminded the senators to preface their charges to the standing committees with, "In addition to the standing charges..."

Committee on Diversity

Brown presented two charges:

- 1) **Collaborate with the International Education Committee to increase the number of international students on campus and to be institutionally prepared to welcome and support them.**
- 2) **Examine responses to Question 6 of the Department and Program Curriculum Review ("In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"), evaluate whether the question elicits productive reflection on how best to support diversity in the curriculum, and propose to the Curriculum Committee, if desired, revised wording of the question.**

Lumbantobing asked for the rationale for charge 1 and asked about the different challenges faced by traditionally minoritized student populations and exchange students. Brown replied that the charge was requested by the Committee and that they saw it as another avenue for increasing diversity on campus. Ramakrishnan said that some of the issues faced by international students are different from those faced by traditionally minoritized, American students. Jacobsen suggested that collaboration between

committees can be difficult and suggested that it would be good to have one committee take the lead. Bartanen said that the Enrollment Work Group – a trustee work group that included faculty and staff – had outlined recommendations regarding international student recruitment. Peine, last year’s liaison to the IEC noted that this was an important charge to that committee last year.

Jacobsen moved to extend the meeting 5 minutes. M/S/P

Kessel was concerned because at least some of the implementation of the charge fell to non-faculty departments such as Admissions and Dean of Students.

The charge was amended to read:

1. In collaboration with International Education Committee and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students.
2. Examine responses to Question 6 of the Department and Program Curriculum Review (“In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?”), evaluate whether the question elicits productive reflection on how best to support diversity in the curriculum, and propose to the Curriculum Committee, if desired, revised wording of the question.

There was no discussion of charge 2.

M/S/P with 3 abstentions.

Meeting adjourned 17:39.

Minutes scribed by,

Peter Wimberger

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly

Secretary of the Faculty Senate