

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the March 11th, 2019 meeting

Senate Members and Representatives: Bryan Thines, Jung Kim, Tiffany MacBain, Alison Hale, Gwynne Brown, Bill Beardsley, Megan Gessel, Sara Freeman, Heather White, Kelly Johnson, Andrew Monaco, Kris Bartanen, Heather Bailey, Peter Wimberger, Collin Noble

Guests: Beverly Conner, Darcy Irvin, David Hanson, Suzanne Warren, Lotus Perry

I. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm

II. Announcements: none

III. Approval of Minutes from February 25, 2018: Approved with correction that the 30-day clock (ASC Proposal regarding Credit/No Credit options) will start upon posting of minutes from that meeting.

IV. Updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate: Staff Senate – none. ASUPS - election occurred and there is a new executive team

V. Reports from Standing Committees and CTF

Academic Standards Committee (ASC). At the last meeting (2/25) the ACS had requested feedback from the Senate regarding credit/no credit options prior to starting the 30-day clock on their proposal. Senate feedback from last meeting was taken to ASC and it was determined that many of the points had already been considered. A few changes were made and the policy was voted on and approved (this will be in the ASC minutes).

Curriculum Tasks Force (CTF). The CTF had a short meeting to reflect on discussion related to at the last full faculty meeting (3/6). The CTF will consider how the feedback they received would fit the “practices” Pathway models. March 13th is next listening session. The Senate had additional discussion regarding the following points:

- *How implementation of practices will occur in different types of courses and what sort of implementation already occurs in current courses
- *Whether the driving force behind practices vs. approaches reflects student needs after graduation
- *Some additional concerns about “siloeing” of disciplines were raised
- *Concerns about the freedom that students have in course selection in situations where a set of courses is required vs. not required, especially considering their other commitments (ie. ensemble)
- *Benefits/weaknesses of having a set direction vs. find your own path
- *Certain student demographics/backgrounds might embrace choice more than others, and this can result in inequalities
- *Maybe what students want are options off a list
- *Concern about pathways seen by students as a box to be checked

*How students will reflect; how advising, mentoring, ePortfolios will fit in with this reflection

*The importance of recognizing historical pieces of the core in order to understand where we are going; why it's important for students to recognize aspects of Liberal Education

VI. Report from Julie Nelson Christoph re: information gathering - continuing contingent faculty

Over the years, a number of University-wide issues have arisen regarding the roles and employment renewal policies for contingent faculty in non-tenure line positions. Some of these issues relate to: 1) the "lore" of the 6-year rule and how long contingent faculty may be employed by the University, and 2) that different departments have varying rules/interpretations of roles and continued employment. Julie Nelson Christoph pointed out that while there is a need to staff courses without tenure line positions, what we are doing now is not working well and that it would be desirable to discontinue the "Instructor" position. A universal solution does not seem to exist, but moving forward three options were presented:

1. Formalize the 6-year rule so that it could be applied universally and equally.
2. Retract the 6-year rule. Re-appointments could be indefinite. If this option was taken evaluations would be a consideration. For a number of reasons, this option was considered non-optimal.
3. Come up with a new standard term position with evaluations. Departments could request this position based on need. Contingent faculty would be evaluated with the possibility of re-appointment. Participation in service (especially University service) could be a component.

It was pointed out that there are a lot of advantages to the 3rd option. The Faculty Code and Bylaws are being explored regarding reappointment, evaluation of/by colleagues, and how longer-term positions might be created. There was additional discussion by the Senate about this new type of position regarding:

*Salary scale

*Process for departments to provide enrollment data and designate on-going need for this position

*Degradation of tenure system; should a cap be put on the number of these positions?

*University service: how service has changed over the years for individuals in term positions. Would this position contribute to advising?

*Impact on other types of term positions: Three-year positions would not be eliminated; One- and Three-year Visiting Assistant Professor positions would continue; Long-term instructor lines would discontinue

*Creation of this position will likely need interpretation by the Professional Standards Committee

*There is unique flexibility provided by this type of position

*How to support non-tenure line people in professional growth; how to ensure these positions are not a dead end

*Some larger institutions now have tenure line lecturer positions, maybe this could be a way to go

*The role of the faculty senate in this decision to create these new positions; at some point a proposal from the Dean's office would require code changes

Senator Brown asks us to consider professional development support, such as conference travel or sabbatical, for term positions. Senator Gessel asks about how the decision to move forward on these positions will be made; if it requires any changes to the Faculty, any proposal - either from the dean's office, a committee, or the faculty - would have to come to the faculty.

Suzanne Warren made the following statement:

"I'm Suzanne Warren in English. On Friday, I learned my teaching contract would not be renewed. Next year would have been my ninth year as a visiting professor and as your colleague.

I'm not about to assign individual blame. Rather, I'd like to speak to our choices for the future of this institution. The university--our university--is currently balancing its budget on the backs of our most vulnerable members: contingent faculty, who live contract to contract, year after year. And minimum wage staff, who reportedly visit food banks to supplement their Puget Sound incomes. The University of Puget Sound is operating in defiance of its core ethical values. I have thought very carefully about how to word my closing thought, and I see no other way to articulate it. This institution is complicit in systemic barbarity.

Thank you."

Item VII: Reports from Faculty Reps to the Board of Trustees Committees about the February meetings

Among topics of discussion on the Finance Committee, Eric Orlin (faculty rep on the Finance Committee) highlighted (1) the investment performance of the endowment was a 9.5% gain, above the benchmark of a 7.5% gain; (2) updates to budget projection which is slightly in the black inclusive of the budget's 1% enrollment contingency; and (3) updates from Jeremy Cucco on Technology Services with an emphasis on cybersecurity. Senator Wimberger and Provost Bartanen clarified that an increase in investment performance above the benchmark will result in both an increase in the endowment payout which contributes to the annual operating budget and an increase in endowment reinvestment.

Among topics of discussion on the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Monica DeHart (faculty rep on the Committee) highlighted (1) reaccreditation themes and (2) the revision of the student integrity code, both language and process. Conversation contextualized concerns for students' right to have only a "support person" and not legal counsel in a hearing setting.

Among topics of discussion on the Development and Alumni Relations Committee, Suzanne Holland (faculty rep on the Committee) highlighted (1) alumni giving and current parent giving, both of which have recently decreased; (2) the 10-year survey on alumni satisfaction; and (3) planning for the next capital campaign. She also shared a conversation about trustee

responses to the concept of Pathways in the current Curriculum Task Force work, and the focus (or perceived lack thereof) of Pathways on future employment potential of Puget Sound students.

Discussion affirmed the value of receiving qualitative feedback from the faculty reps to the Board and the value of faculty engagement with the Board when they are on campus, including at the breakfast and other events. Suzanne gave positive feedback on the workshop with the Trustees surrounding the reading “The Coddling of the American Mind: How Good Intentions and Bad Ideas are Setting Up a Generation for Failure by Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt;” the Trustees shared many of the concerns shared in the reading, and were encouraged by how the faculty engage rigorously without coddling students.

Item VIII: Elections Prep

There are 3 Senator positions up for election, 3 FAC members, and at least 1 member of FSC. At 3/25, Kristin will preview election materials, then we will get nomination rolling. Reminder to ensure we put the Senate meeting time on the nomination.

Item IX: Other business

Sara will check in with Kristin regarding an update to the Academics webpage (<https://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/>). Collin Noble reaffirmed that April 1st will be the official handoff of the ASUPS executive positions, and the new president is scheduled to attend the next Senate meeting 3/25.

M/S/P to adjourn at 1:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bryan Thines and Andrew Monaco