

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

November 12, 2018

Present: Uchenna Baker, Kris Bartanen, Nick Brody, Gwynne Brown, Andrew Gardiner, Megan Gessel, Sara Freeman, Chris Kendall, Robin Jacobson, Kristin Johnson, Andrew Monaco, Alison Tracy Hale, Heather White, Peter Wimberger

Guests: Darcy Irvin

- I. Meeting called to order at 12:01
- II. **M/S/P** Nov. 5 Minutes
- III. AGENDA ITEM. Freeman reminded senators that on Monday we worked on a Call for Nominations to the Curriculum Task Force, which was voted on and approved. We took that Call to the Full Faculty because of our commitment to a transparent and iterative process, and we received feedback that we decided should be addressed. Faculty Exec talked through the concerns and revised the Call and asked for a vote on Friday via email. Meanwhile, Senator Wimberger, one of the original Goal Team #1 members, raised questions about the Call. Johnson and Wimberger carried out another revision, which has been shared (the Nov 12 Revision). We can either put the Friday Call into action. Or we can have a motion to consider the Nov 12 revision.
 - a. **M/S/P** the Nov 12 Revision. During discussion, Wimberger explained the context for the revision: a concern regarding what is driving the charge, and that we need to make that clear. Questions existed regarding the expectations and the deliverables still existed with Friday's version of the Call, which, if clarified, could alleviate some of the anxiety expressed thus far. Those questions included: Is what is going to come out of the Task Force by May a full-blown, specific proposal for a core revision, or rather a more general framework that addresses these parts of the strategic plan? Clarifying the expectations is important and will make the work more focused. Given that Pathways seems the biggest, most amorphous part of the Author Your Future framework, focusing the charge's task for May a little more on pathways, softening the timeline, making expectations clear, and including workload issues as we figure out what we are doing makes sense. Johnson and Wimberger worked with Provost and Senate Exec to make the proposed revisions.
 - b. Further discussion focused on what, precisely, we hope happens by May 1. Bartanen explained that what we need to endorse or affirm is what the framework will look like. The work on rubrics, course proposals, etc. can happen in 2019/2020. In response to a question regarding "What does framework mean?" Bartanen clarified that Goal Team 1 suggested a framework that included "major, pathway, experiential learning, mentor" that faculty has not yet endorsed or affirmed. The goal is to bring that framework to the faculty for affirmation such that the work to implement that framework can happen in 2019/2020. The framework should make clear: "This is what we wish to have students do at Puget Sound" i.e. it will show that we know what pathways are and where they fit (including: are they in the core or not, are they determined by

students or faculty, are the guardrails high or low?). These things need to be talked through by faculty. Once we decide, can move forward on rubrics, course proposals, how they will be taught, etc. Deciding on those question in turn means working out issues regarding workload, etc., which can be addressed by 2019/2020. They do not have to be addressed by May. Freeman described the goal as follows: we want to be able to narrate what a student does at Puget Sound over the next decade. Admissions and Communications will do their job of communicating that vision to students. We want to be able to state: What are we making available to them, what will they be a part of, what are our expectations of them. Jacobson asked whether the decisions regarding what happens to the core happens in the first phase (before May) or after May. Freeman replied that the Task Force figures out, for example, the relation between the core, minors, connections, interdisciplinary, and pathways, but must figure out, in concert with faculty, what that means in turns of implementation 2019/2020. Gessel asked about the scope of the Task Force's power with respect to the framework: for example, does the mentoring piece category fall within the curriculum? Jacobson noted that the Preamble still privileges a crisis narrative, while a statement about the power of what we do would be better. The Preamble was revised to move away from the impression the Task Force's call is driven entirely by admissions concerns.

- c. Election dates: Nominations will run Nov 12-19 and the Election will run 19-26. We will meet on the 26th, not the 19th.

IV. **M/S/P** to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
Kristin Johnson