Minutes of the February 5, 2013 University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting

1. Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen, on behalf of President Ron Thomas, called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Thirty-nine members of the faculty were present by 4:15 p.m.
2. **M/S/P (Neshyba/Kessel) Approval of the minutes of the November 12, 2012 faculty meeting**.
3. Announcements: many good lectures are coming up in the next few weeks.
4. President's Report:
   - President Thomas was elected to the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) board of directors and is attending the NAICU annual meeting. Kris Bartanen provided his report.
   - While in Washington D.C., President Thomas will meet with Washington Congressional and Senate representatives regarding higher education issues.
   - There has been a high level of activity regarding the campaign—President Thomas and others have had serious conversations with donors regarding gifts. The campaign is at $91.25 M so far. The faculty and staff campaign is this year; the faculty and staff campaign committee hope for 125 new contributors.
   - Jenny Rickard, Vice President for Enrollment, is here and is working on a number of initiatives including diversity partnerships, international student recruitment, and the campus visit program. Student applications are currently 3% above last year (towards our goal of a 10% increase). We are planning on an incoming class of 665 for Fall 2013.
   - President Thomas has been elected to the board of the Annapolis Group, which includes approximately 120 of the nation's top liberal arts colleges. The organization's summer meeting will include focus on teaching and technology.
5. Academic Vice President's Report:
   - Kris Bartanen presented Professor Karl Fields the certificate associated with his 2012 Washington Professor of the Year award (to sustained applause).
   - Puget Sound will host the next Northwest Five Consortium (NW5C) workshop in May. This workshop will focus on technologies and logistics for collaborative work among the five colleges, and two project groups will meet – digital literacy and e-portfolios. Six of 14 proposed projects were funded; see the nw5c.org website for information on the consortium and the projects.
   - We still need SSI 1 seminars for the fall (have syllabi submitted by Feb 15). Priti Joshi is working with the faculty to prepare seminars for the fall.

6. Faculty Senate Chair's Report:
   - Faculty Senate Chair Brad Dillman provided some highlights from the Senate including the following.

- Four motions were discussed regarding participation at faculty meetings. Two of the motions passed—one coming up at this meeting, the other involving an overview of the faculty governance structure at an upcoming faculty meeting.
- The Senate endorsed a motion proposed by the Committee on Diversity to encourage Human Resources to include in annual negotiations with Puget Sound's health care provider consideration of the addition of coverage for sexual reassignment surgery and hormone treatments.
- Budget Task Force members presented the proposed 2013-1024 budget to the Senate.
- In an upcoming meeting the Senate will hear from Gayle McIntosh about branding initiatives, discuss the faculty senate handbook, and discuss campus quiet hours. Contact Brad Dillman with ideas for future Senate agenda items.
- Suzanne Holland wondered about the branding initiatives. "Branding" refers to how we represent ourselves in our own conversations on campus as well as to students, families, and the public. One of the strategic initiatives in progress to move the university forward is to be as clear as possible about our message, identity, and value as an institution. Steve Neshyba noted that the faculty should be more engaged in the definition of our "brand."

7. Strategic considerations for Puget Sound in the broader higher education environment

    In preparation for this discussion, Dean Bartanen relinquished the meeting chair position to Brad Dillman.

    Dean Bartanen outlined the current economic environment: college tuition costs are rising at rates higher than medical costs and much higher than median household income rates. Net tuition revenue (what students are paying) is flat or declining, given families challenges to pay for college relative to a few years ago. Economic challenges are a strategic issue. The demographics of student populations are also shifting to an increasingly diverse student population. We must address the overall strategic question of how do we continue to offer the educational program we value at a cost students and families can afford? This will be particularly challenging for Puget Sound because we are already a "lean" and efficient organization—there is not a lot to "trim." For example, we have not had across the board operating budget increases since 1996, our student-to-faculty ratio is 12:1 (higher than our peers), and our staff ratio is 7.7:1 (our staff serve more students compared to peers). Our proportional allocation of resources is similar to national peers except our overhead is lower than national peers and our student services expenditures are slightly higher, given factors such as on-site counseling services and a significant first-year orientation program that bolsters retention. This context raises questions in three main areas: technology, resources, and curriculum.

    Strategic Technology Questions: How will we add value to our liberal arts program/experience through the use of technology? How will we employ new technologies

in order to educate students more cost effectively? How do we revise our academic policies to address the increasing pervasiveness of online courses?

Alva Butcher asked about our current policy regarding online courses. Kris Bartanen reported that we have accepted some online courses but need to address the changing nature of courses [such as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)]. Jenn Hastings noted many more PT applicants are taking prerequisites as online courses. PT has the policy that if the applicant's undergraduate institution accepted the course for credit then the program will accept the course as fulfilling the prerequisite. The PT faculty is continuing to investigate this issue. Any Spivey noted edX is offering a MOOC for second semester introductory physics—our students are aware of this and we need to address whether this would be an appropriate course for our students. Kris noted the literature reports in increase in the number of high school students who are taking online courses. Pierre Ly wondered about what cost effective online strategies means. Does this mean "outsourcing" some requirements? Will our faculty offer online classes to anyone (as revenue generating activity)? Martin Jackson outlined one scenario where our small upper division courses could be offered within the NW5C. Kris does not envision Puget Sound as an online provider, but we should consider how Puget Sound becomes an online course consumer. Would we accept outstanding online courses as intro courses, freeing our faculty to teach in other areas? Doug Cannon noted some of these issues arise from the inability to articulate what is special about the way we teach courses. He offered his logic course as an example. Online course materials (e.g., from Stanford University) have pedagogy that is not good and content that is not appropriate for our students. We require students to write (and instructors read what students write); this cannot be done in online courses. We need to emphasize this.

Strategic Resource Questions: How will we best use our faculty resources to sustain and enhance our distinctive, liberal arts program? How do we cover sabbaticals within a constrained budget? Could we develop a five year plan that evens out coverage needs? Do we adjust release time? Do we revisit/adjust the salary scale (our salaries are relatively compressed compared to some of our peers)?

Strategic Curricular Questions: What curricular opportunities will address areas of demand, demographics, and/or destination (our location)?   Faculty are working on moving Environmental Policy and Decision-Making and African American Studies from minors to majors; we have a planning grant to develop a Latino Studies minor; we could tap our unique campus-community capacity for a minor in Museum Studies. Are there "big ideas" we should consider? For example, should we consider a year-round calendar? Should we consider programs for BA/BS + 1 = MA in four years? Should some students have three year degrees? Should we grow OT and PT cohorts to address demand?

Kris Bartanen then asked how should the faculty engage these kinds of questions?

Nancy Bristow noted that the demographic shift in the student population needs big ideas—we need to rethink what we do to address the demographic shifts of students. We should be ethically and morally committed to serve all students. We need big ideas for this (not just a rebranding). Steven Neshyba raised the issue of increasing resources for faculty to adapt to new technologies. He proposes reducing the spring semester by one week and setting aside time (one week) to acquire skills we need. Judith Kay would like to continue discussions in faculty meetings (a larger group) before breaking into smaller workgroups. David Tinsley referred to Harry Velez-Quinones' post on the faculty listserve. We use technology effectively (in Foreign Languages and Literature and other departments). An online approach will not save us time as faculty members. It is challenging to keep up with the rapid pace of technology changes. David Tinsley suggests looking at Rob Beezer's site for crowd sourced problem solving. Suzanne Holland concurred with Judith about broader discussions. Carolyn Weisz wondered about considering non-traditional ways students could earn units for graduation (internships, community experiences, etc.). She noted that these options must be Puget Sound experiences (not transferred in). Rich Anderson-Connolly identified three questions we need to consider: Why come to Puget Sound, especially given online options? Will technology improve quality? Can we become more efficient using technology (increase number of students per faculty)? If there are challenges coming, we as a faculty might respond better if faculty members are involved in the governance of the institution—some notion of co-governance would be beneficial. Julie Christoph noted that community learning opportunities take faculty time and we are using technology in much of what we do. Suzanne Holland wondered if we should consider three year degree options. Kris Bartanen welcomed other thoughts by email or in person.

Brad Dillman returned chairing of the meeting to Kris Bartanen.

8. Faculty Senate Proposal: the names of faculty members who attend faculty meetings will be added to the minutes of each faculty meeting.

   M/S/P (A. Spivey/Kay) that the names of faculty members who attend faculty meetings be added to the minutes for each faculty meeting.

   John Hanson asked for the rationale of this motion. Amy Spivey noted that this was one idea the Senate discussed for how to get more faculty members involved in governance. This would also make the faculty meetings similar to other meetings where the minutes include names of attendees. John Hanson worried about stigmatization of faculty who might have legitimate reasons for not attending (e.g., class/lab conflicts). Amanda Mifflin concurred and suggested alternating the days [already occurs] or finding a common time. Brad Dillman spoke in favor of the motion noting that we should consider faculty meetings to be part of our responsibility as faculty members. Perhaps this would be a good impetus for determining a common hour for meetings. He also noted that it is good to have a record of who says what in the faculty meetings. Brett Rogers thought shame might not produce the outcome we want (higher attendance) but predictability of meetings would be helpful. Steven Neshyba also spoke in favor of the motion and noted that faculty members can ask

for a schedule that allows attendance. Nancy Bristow feels intense responsibility to participate but hesitates to create pressure for other faculty members, especially for new faculty. Rich Anderson-Connolly did not think that listing attendees would have the effect of shaming people or modifying turn-out, but would help with learning names of faculty members.

Doug Cannon asked a technical question about how determining the list of attendees would occur. The Faculty Secretary thought she could pass a list or check a list. Alisa Kessel thought it would be good to know who is present at each meeting so we would know who is involved in making decisions for the faculty leading to more transparency of outcomes. Suzanne Holland does not see this as shaming at all but concurs that it would be helpful to know who was at the meeting. George Tomlin wondered if we could "sweeten" the agenda to include "big issues" that the faculty should have a say in. Joel Elliott asked Nancy Bristow about faculty meetings—when do faculty members attend? Nancy Bristow was not sure of correlations—in past we had large turnouts with big issues but this has not occurred in the recent past. Brett Rogers likes the transparency argument but wonders how we address attendance issues. Judith Kay proposed this should be an ongoing discussion in the Senate and elsewhere. Jenn Hastings offered that predictability and the expectation that we would cancel or curtail class or lab to attend would increase participation. Peter Wimberger noted this motion would probably not increase attendance but would be beneficial for transparency of decision making. Doug Cannon noted that in the past there was an expectation to attend the faculty meetings and the kinds of things we raised today are significant issues that will affect faculty and the institution.

9. Optimize Project – looking ahead to March 25

   Alyce DeMarais provided an update: On March 25, 2013, the PeopleSoft "Campus" module will "go-live." All fall 2013 pre-registration activities will be carried out in PeopleSoft, as well as other activities such as submitting grades for the spring 2013 semester. Look for messages in the next few weeks regarding the timeline, training opportunities, and policy/practice changes. See Kris Bartanen's message of January 31 (Appendix A) for more details.

   M/S/P (Neshyba/Hastings) to adjourn at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Alyce DeMarais, Faculty Secretary

Upcoming Faculty Meetings (all meetings will be held in McIntyre 103):
Wednesday, March 27, 7:45 – 8:55 a.m.
Monday, April 15, 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Appendix A – Message Regarding Optimize Project

From: facultycoms
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2013 10:27 AM
Subject: UPDATE: PeopleSoft Campus - Please read

Dear Colleagues,

At yesterday's Chairs, Directors and Deans Meeting, Alyce, Martin, Sarah, and I talked a bit about several of the changes we can expect on March 25th related to the PeopleSoft Campus Solutions implementation ("Campus Solutions" covers matters related to advising, registration, student records such as degree progress reports, class schedules, etc.). Although your department chairs can provide additional detail on the points below, I wanted to summarize the following items that were covered in today's meeting:

1. **March 25 is our go-live date, but please understand that this is simply a beginning**. Many additional improvements and capabilities will come online over the next months. Do not worry that what you see on March 25 is the final version of our new campus system.

2. **What does "go-live" mean?** In short, go-live means that PeopleSoft will become the system of record. All new data (such as grading and enrollments) will occur in PeopleSoft. Cascade will not "go away" at this date, but rather be "frozen in time." Although still viewable after March 25 for a while, it will become increasingly less up-to-date, and therefore less accurate, within a short period of time.

3. **Midterm grades**, due March 25, will be entered in Cascade as we have done in the past. Please make sure they are entered early or on time so they can make the conversion to PeopleSoft.

4. **Changes to Major, Minor, or Advisor**: Starting March 25, students will no longer be able to change their major, minor, or advisor online. Instead, they will need to obtain a paper *"Change of Major, Minor, or Advisor"* form from the Office of Academic Advising, complete the form with the new advisor's signature, and return this form back to the Academic Advising Office.*

5. **Pass/Fail Registration**: In order for faculty to remain "blind" to those students who are taking their courses P/F, students wishing to register for a course P/F will need to go to the Registrar's Office to register for this grading option.*

   (*These are examples of interim solutions until PeopleSoft capabilities are more fully implemented.)

6. **Faculty and Administrative Staff Training**: During the weeks of March 4-8 and March 11-15, Alyce, Martin, Sarah, and staff members from Technology Services will offer training opportunities in WEY, WY, TH/H, and MC. Topics will include tasks related to course schedule, class lists and management of one's own courses, and advising. These are the basic skills one will need to advise students for fall 2013 pre-registration (April 8-12). Please look for additional info in the coming weeks.

7. **Initial look at Course Schedule in PeopleSoft**: For those of you who would like to take a look at some preliminary screens in PeopleSoft, you may access from you Cascade Account by clicking "PeopleSoft Campus" and then clicking Main Menu -> Self-Service -> Faculty Center. Please understand that this site is currently under construction, so periodic changes, updates, and downtime are normal.

In advance, thanks very much for your help and patience. Please feel free to contact Alyce, Martin, or Sarah if you have any questions. The Technology Service Desk is also readily available to address technical questions related to PeopleSoft Finance, Human Resources, or Campus Solutions.

Best,
Kris