

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting

February 11, 2013

McCormick Room

Senators Present: Kristine Bartanen, Brad Dillman (Chair), Brian Ernst, Zaixin Hong, Kathryn Ginsberg, Judith Kay, Alisa Kessel, Brendan Lanctot, Amanda Mifflin, Ann Putnam, Elise Richman, Amy Spivey, Maria Sampen, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel (Staff Senate Liaison), and Ariela Tubert

Guest: Gayle McIntosh

Call to order: Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

Announcements: Chair Dillman asked for announcements.

- Kessel mentioned the two Trustee breakfasts this week. Liz Collins indicated that they could use two more faculty members on Friday Feb 15th from 7-9 a.m. Mifflin volunteered; Kay indicated she had already signed up for Friday.
- Richman reminded us that artist Paul Rucker will be performing on Feb 25th at 7:00 p.m.; he created an art project specifically for this event that is part of the series, “American Voices: Invisibility, Art, and Educational Justice.”

Approval of the minutes:

M/S/P to accept the minutes from January 28 with a minor revision.

Updates from liaisons:

- Kessel had an update from the Staff Senate, which approved unanimously the motion on transgender benefits.
- Spivey indicated that the curriculum committee is quite busy completing departmental reviews from last year as well as the current year while also reviewing first-year seminar additions.
- Ernst indicated that Danny Laesch from ASC brought a letter in support of the bereavement policy to the ASUPS senate; it was signed unanimously by all senators in attendance.
- Ernst also reported that ASUPS Senate is still seeking a faculty representative.
- Segawa reported that the Student Life Committee is missing a faculty representative. Mifflin volunteered to serve as liaison to this committee.
- Tubert volunteered to take over Kotsis’s Senate liaison assignment to LMIS.
- Putnam will replace Singleton as liaison to the IRB.
- Liaisons were reminded to read the minutes and to be in touch with the committee chair, although they do not need to attend committee meetings.
- Lanctot reported that Don Share is chair of ASC. That committee is continuing its work on dual degree requirements and a bereavement policy. Dean Bartanen also noted that the committee worked in the fall on the schedule and common hour and requested information needed to continue this work from the Office of the

Registrar. That office is unable to work on this matter until next year given the demands of transferring to People Soft.

Presentation on and Discussion of the Puget Sound Branding Initiative

Chair Dillman welcomed Gayle McIntosh, Director of Communications, to discuss the Puget Sound branding initiative or strategy.

McIntosh set three items for her agenda: 1) to talk about what branding is and why it matters; 2) to show us what the university hopes to do with branding; and 3) to spend most of the time getting our reactions to and questions about the work and how it might be relevant to faculty.

McIntosh explained that all colleges have a brand or a reputation whether or not they are intentional about it. It is good to be intentional so that others receive a compelling, authentic, consistent, and accurate message about Puget Sound rather than relying on anecdote or hearsay. The purpose of branding is to make it easy for people to recognize who we are, what we stand for, and why we matter. Possessing a clear identity—expressed consistently in what we say and what we do—helps tell our story and raise the visibility of Puget Sound. Branding, she explained, is often confused with marketing and advertising, but it is neither an advertising campaign nor is it aimed at having a tag line. Rather, branding emerges from our mission, core themes, values, and personality. It expresses the Puget Sound experience in a compelling manner that will benefit the institution for a long time.

McIntosh continued by outlining the approach to developing a brand strategy for Puget Sound, beginning with research collected by her staff. They had heard anecdotally and in focus groups with students that we were a friendly, outdoorsy campus in the Pacific Northwest, but this brand does not capture the depth or breadth of what happens here. Their two-year study began with an admission survey of likely prospective students, which asked “What are we known for? What makes us unique?” Sixty-two percent of respondents said “I don’t know.” Eleven percent responded about our location. Her staff pulled together all the existing research from diverse offices and students (including the campaign communications research (2010, 2011); the visibility, image and price research (2010); the admitted student questions/competitor analysis (2010, 2011); the capital campaign feasibility study (2008); the admission marketing communications research (2008); the National Survey of Student Engagement (2008, 2011); and our comprehensive alumni study (2008)). They conducted campus interviews and focus groups (136 participants); interviewed 21 high school guidance counselors; conducted trustee workshops; talked with the alumni Council and Parents’ Council; and examined the positioning and messaging of six peer schools (not to mimic or counter them). They then hired the firm Maguire and Associates to see what emerged from the data and to identify gaps in the research.

Three Assets Emerged

1. **Teaching and learning:** Both words are intentional given the reciprocal nature of teaching at Puget Sound. The research confirmed what we know about how invested faculty members are in furthering students' lives and enlarging their ambitions. Our consultants were surprised about how much faculty and students talked with each other. The challenge is how to talk about our teaching, since it is a given at all colleges.
2. **Location:** Beyond being in the Northwest, McIntosh indicated that other aspects of our location are key, such as the types of research available; our proximity to airport; and perceptions people have about the Pacific Northwest.
3. **Outcomes:** By outcomes, McIntosh did not mean just good graduate admissions or career outcomes. Our students have outcomes while they are here. No matter where you start, you are going to travel this long distance. Students have meaningful experiences while here.

All of the above are authentic and compelling, McIntosh indicated, but were not differentiating. What does differentiate Puget Sound is *how* we deliver what we do.

The initial effort to brand the Puget Sound *experience* yielded:

- We provide a transformative, independent, personal journey in the context of a strong community.
- We meet students where they are and help them reach heights they would not have imagined otherwise.

The initial effort to brand the Puget Sound *personality* yielded:

- **Pioneering**
 - Sense of adventure, being a groundbreaker, willing to take risks
- **Confident**
 - Voice of a leader, honors true self while respecting others
- **Independent**
 - Driven by an internal compass with a strong point of view
- **Creative**
 - Interdisciplinary, original thinkers, collaborative, and curious; "Imagination without a curfew"
- **Welcoming**
 - Inviting, supportive, genuine concern for others, eager to share

McIntosh emphasized that these branding elements were not meant to describe just one aspect of campus or one area, but the entire institution. In their interviews and focus groups, people always talked about their experiences in terms of moving forward with the support of a strong and nurturing community.

Our Position (Brand Assets, Brand Experience, and Brand Personality)

- Puget Sound invites bold journeys of personal and intellectual discovery, supported by a welcoming community. We are united by a desire to meet worthy challenges and make a difference in the world.

McIntosh acknowledged that this language is still a bit fuzzy; they are trying to sharpen it.

The initial effort to brand the Puget Sound *narrative* yielded:

The metaphor of a “bold journey” might be used here.

- A Puget Sound education is something you do, not something you get. Here, education is animated by our shared passion for teaching and learning, emboldened by a commitment to lead where we are most needed, and inspired by the unique locations we call home.

The initial effort to brand the Puget Sound *assets* yielded:

- **Teaching and Learning**
 - Freedom and independence are nurtured by a deeply supportive community and connections that last a lifetime.
- **Location**
 - A beautiful campus and a unique combination of natural and urban assets support scientific, artistic, entrepreneurial, and civic scholarship in Tacoma, the Pacific Rim, and beyond.
- **Outcomes**
 - Puget Sound students journey boldly throughout their lives, making a difference in the world and in the lives of others.

McIntosh indicated that the goal is to develop a set of messaging tools to help communicate to our varied audiences. As examples: What are we putting up on walls in the student center? What art do we display? What do we say in our speeches and lectures to alumni? She indicated that we need to make the metaphor of a journey work for us. The metaphor is obvious with respect to study abroad, she said. She encouraged us to think about journeys in research, personal journeys, and any kind of situation that involves discovery.

Her office will initiate the branding strategy with the Office of Admission. She plans to develop tools that can be customized later by individuals and offices for their needs.

McIntosh then asked for questions and responses. Spivey indicated that McIntosh’s presentation helped her realize how different colleges that she has known (while all teach) really do offer different messages. Some schools have a conversation that is totally different from ours. She asked how what we put together will look unique to students who might come here.

McIntosh indicated that we achieve this communication through repetition. For instance, we might organize the web page around our three assets. The goal would be such thorough permeation that staff and faculty members could respond to anyone with a

consistent message about the institution as a whole before diving into specifics about their area. McIntosh indicated that we are known for many outstanding individual programs and schools, but we do not do as well speaking about the institution as a whole.

Sampen spoke to the importance of the arts which is a distinctive draw that other schools do not have. The university, she said, needs to get on board with the special depth of our offerings. We have yet to tap this strength. Other schools lack our size and caliber. Putman averred that we also have a strong creative writing program on our campus.

McIntosh responded that we have a number of unique features such as the School of Music, the School of Business, and the Race and Pedagogy Initiative—there is no shortage of what we have that is unique. But how, she queried, might the School of Music integrate “to the heights” in its discourse, such as reaching new heights on the trumpet? McIntosh indicated that we currently promote a long list of distinctive programs that no one can remember. We cannot distill that list into a message. Instead, the university is looking for a frame.

Kay indicated that she liked the focus on pioneers who take risky adventures. She thought this personality might make a good contrast to East Coast colleges that could be portrayed as tradition-bound or stuffy. How might this focus on daring discoveries be a draw to prospective faculty as well as to students?

Spivey returned to the asset of teaching and learning and underscored the importance of faculty scholarship and research. Few places, she said, have an internally supported summer science program that provides opportunities to work with students on research. McIntosh asked, “How could a branding program help? How might we rename this summer program?” McIntosh suggested that, for example, instead of calling it the Summer Science Research Grant, it could be called the Summit Grant that could feed into a Summit Conference. “How might we relate all our program titles to our brand personality so as to reinforce all of our unique and terrific programs?” she asked.

Kessel liked this brand because it is a vision and story of education that she believes in. However, she wondered how a parent might worry about where the transformation might lead. How will some of this language be heard? Parents want more than personal transformation.

McIntosh responded that the goal is not to try to distill our messages into a tag line that is reductionist. Instead, we would want a narrative that says, “Transformation will transform your B students into great students perhaps with some detours along the way. But here, they will be moving and going forward.”

Segawa said that we have not been effective in communicating our outcomes. We can do a better job of tailoring our message for our audiences.

McIntosh suggested that we can communicate outcomes throughout our website. For example, outcomes are on every academic department page of the Macalester website. This focus on outcomes is a powerful message for parents as well as students.

Chair Dillman: I am surprised that departmental websites are not better coordinated. They contain out-of-date information. There is much room for improvement across departments. He believes that these websites are how people learn about us initially. Kay echoed this sentiment by saying that her department has had the goal of upgrading its website but lacked the guidance and assistance to help this become a reality. McIntosh indicated that the university's web manager can be reached at extension 2691. She also indicated that her office will re-organize this spring and will have an assistant who can help departments.

McIntosh then turned to a discussion of visual identity. She showed a picture of students climbing a mountain in the snow. They are going someplace. They are prepared. They are each carrying their own weight but are not alone. They are making a bold journey. The university wants to choose photos that are active and that do not show photos of students studying alone, but rather express engagement, movement, and risk.

McIntosh then turned to a discussion of the logo and seal. The logo represents the spirit of the university and builds recognition for Puget Sound and what we stand for. The seal is the institutional piece put on official documents such as diplomas and stationary. The current wordmark (est. 1888) will be refined to incorporate a graphic that represents the brand. The visual identity will evolve from our current wordmark and seal; we will not introduce something radically different. The logo should help us express who we are, not signal that we are changing.

McIntosh indicated that we will continue to use the mountain and the expression "to the heights." The mountain feels authentic. It is highly visible from campus; it has been the principal landmark of our area; it reflects our personality and enduring values. The logo also represents continuity: it has been the centerpiece of our seal. Incorporating the mountain into our logo creates a strong connection to and continuity with the seal. It will be used as a master identity system, where a single logo serves as the primary representation of the university. The goal is to reduce logo clutter.

McIntosh presented a new logo with bolder and larger typeface. Putting it in a square shape makes it same shape as current icons used for social media. See attachment.

Lanctot observed that the ocean, too, is part of our alma mater and identity. McIntosh responded that both water and trees are important to Loggers. She observed that if you put all three together on a logo, Puget Sound begins to look like a summer camp. Water is harder to represent as a "bold journey" without a body paddling on it. She indicated that the new logo is drawn with a view of the mountain from the Tacoma side.

Hong informed us that the year 1888 in Asian cultures means auspicious, auspicious, and auspicious. He speculated that the homophone "ups" (as opposed to downs) might help us

move away from U.P.S. “Ups” makes people feel very happy, he surmised. Kay observed that a circle in a square indicates motion better than a square.

McIntosh indicated that a logo with too much detail does not reproduce well small. We will keep the old round seal. But it is hard to read, so we need a new, bolder logo. Sampen said that she liked the new, bold and straightforward look.

McIntosh summarized the current timeline, as follows:

Fall 2012: refine messaging; meet with campus, alumni, and parents

Jan. 2013: 125th anniversary, “To the heights!”

Spring 2013: Create brand toolkit with messaging tools, logo, brand and graphic standards

Summer-Fall 2013: New branded website, admission marketing campaign, letterhead/business cards, redesigned alumni magazine, merchandise available in bookstore.

Spivey asked about what happens when the university gets a new website. McIntosh said that each department will get a call from the web manager to see if there is anything it wants to change. There will be a brief lockout period in July. There will be a new frame around existing content. Site content and URLs will not change. The new web software will allow departments to embed video easily.

McIntosh thanked us and left.

Chair Dillman then turned to a discussion of campus quiet hours.

Kessel made a motion:

That an ad-hoc committee consisting of members of the Faculty Senate confers with faculty, conference services, athletics, and other relevant groups to enforce uniform quiet hours on campus.

The motion was seconded. Kessel indicated that this motion emerged from the request to identify non-cost ways to support faculty scholarship in a more hospitable environment. She had no specific recommendation of what form the final recommendation might take. The summer conference office already prohibits outdoor noise from 10 pm to 8 am. Kessel was not sure of the implications of such a policy for summer conferences. The subcommittee might also evaluate the use of loudspeakers for practices during the afternoons outside Wyatt.

Bartanen asked how one can host summer cheerleading and singing groups and request that they need to be quiet for four hours a day? Kessel responded that it would help if faculty knew the hours when groups would be active.

Chair Dillman: Is there a way to have a volume control by Wyatt? Groups could be limited to a certain level of decibels.

Putnam asked about mowers during the spring. Might we request quiet hours for teaching? Kessel indicated that the Faculty Senate addressed that last year and as a result, Facility Services rotates locations. Sampen noticed that the disruption was less this year.

Kessel reiterated her desire to alert the faculty about when cheer and other groups will be on campus so that the campus enables faculty members' ability to get work done in the summer rather than see the campus as a place from which they depart.

Spivey indicated that she supported the motion because it was worth looking into.

Tubert thought that perhaps a schedule could be posted or circulated about which weeks in the summer might be especially busy or noisy. Sampen thought there might just be a place for faculty to check, but Tubert indicated that new faculty members would not know that they need to check.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Kessel made a second motion:

That the Faculty Senate form an ad-hoc committee consisting of members of the Faculty Senate to identify and implement relevant policy changes—in collaboration with relevant campus partners—to promote faculty scholarship without extra cost.

Tubert seconded this motion. Kessel thought the subcommittee could explore ways to find non-cost ways to support scholarship, e.g., identify pods of groups during sabbaticals to work together or not having due dates for library books. Dillman and Spivey suggested that streamlining reference letters such as done with study abroad really helps. There are many little ideas that an ah-hoc committee could explore, such as submitting letters through Moodle or some other centralized way.

It seemed that one subcommittee of two to three people could address both motions. Dillman requested that the subcommittee report back to the full Senate.

The motion passed unanimously.

Kessel, Tubert, Lanctot, and Richman volunteered to serve on this ad hoc committee and promised to consult with colleagues on campus outside Wyatt Hall. Lanctot encouraged the subcommittee to consult with the UEC since it has been discussing these ideas recently.

The motion to adjourn was passed at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Judith W. Kay