

**University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
December 4, 2007**

1. President Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. Twenty-eight members of the faculty were present by 4:30 p.m.

2. Minutes of October 30, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. No announcements were made.

4. President Thomas reported that the University was encountering a challenging budget year, due primarily to the fact that the entering class was smaller and that more financial aid resources had been devoted to recruiting this year's entering class. Recruiting for next year's class, however, shows improvement. Applications have increased by 12%, and early admission applications have increased by 25%. The latter figure is very encouraging, as more early admitted students are likely to yield more matriculating students next Fall.

The capital campaign is making progress in its current "quiet" phase. More information will be coming later in the academic year, but the current commitments from donors seem to be very strong.

The Alumni Engagement Plan has begun, with successful events having occurred in Tacoma, Seattle, and Portland. Events will soon occur in Washington, D. C. and New York City. Not only are the number of participants high, but younger alumni are actively involved. President Thomas singled out the work of Allison Cannady-Smith, Director of Alumni and Parent Relations, for her work in the program, particularly in scheduling alumni events in attractive sites. The next step in the program will be to develop alumni engagement with faculty. President Thomas repeated his observation that alumni continue to identify individual faculty as key mentors in their lives, and he thanked those faculty who had already committed themselves to participate in this program.

Annual fund contributions are 30% higher than this time last year.

President Thomas and Dean Bartanen are meeting with finalists in a number of Faculty searches. In addition, the Chief Technology Officer search is nearing completion.

President Thomas offered his congratulations to Professor Nancy Bristow—supported by a round of applause from the assembled faculty—for her selection as Washington state's Professor of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). He noted that Professor Bristow is the latest recipient of this award; a Puget Sound faculty member has received this award more often than at any other independent college in the state. In fact,

only the University of Washington has had an equal number of faculty members receive this accolade.

5. In her report Dean Bartanen thanked faculty who had participated in Fall Family Weekend and Fall Campus Day presentations. She reported on the progress of the Library Director Search, which should lead to campus visits by finalists in late January. The Budget Task force has been meeting; the work of that group has been made more challenging due to the circumstance the President had recounted in his report. Faculty recruitment and selection is proceeding; one new hire has been complete, 5 Searches are in the interview phase, and 9 others will occur during the Spring 2008 semester.

6. Senate Chair Douglas Cannon reported that the Senate has complete work on a number of changes to the Faculty By-Laws and would be bringing proposed amendments to the faculty at the next Faculty Meeting. In addition, a Faculty Code Amendment proposal was being reviewed in the Senate. This proposal was the result of the work of an *ad hoc* Senate committee which had reviewed the grievance process in the Code. That proposal also would be introduced at a future Faculty meeting.

The Senate has reviewed and approved the Academic Calendar. Further consideration of the “Scheduling Principles” document was occurring in the Senate. In particular, the Senate was reviewing proposals regarding late afternoon and evening courses, seeking to ensure that multiple sections of the same course would be offered so that students who had conflicts during the late afternoon and evening could enroll in those classes. He invited all faculty members to attend Senate meetings and participate in the deliberations of that body. Future Senate business included examination of “diversity”—what does it mean and how can the faculty achieve diversity? In addition, review of the Course Evaluation form would be undertaken by the Senate.

7a. Professor George Tomlin, Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, introduced the proposed Amendment to the Faculty Code which had received a first reading at the October 30, 2007 Faculty meeting. The amendment, to Chapter III Section 5 d would read (new language in italics):

“The dean *or a designated associate dean* shall review the file, write a letter of evaluation, and forward it to the head officer.”

Tomlin reminded those assembled that the amendment was a result of a PSC decision that this designation, applicable only in the cases of “streamlined” evaluations, could not be designated a Code interpretation, but instead required an amendment. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to relieve the Dean of the burden of writing letters in the face of a growing number of requests for “streamlined” evaluations

Tomlin M/S adoption of the amendment.

Professor William Beardsley M/S to amend the motion by substituting the phrase “a member of the Faculty Advancement Committee” for the Tomlin motion.

In support of his motion, Beardsley observed that FAC members were known to have had experience reading faculty files. During regular faculty evaluations, one FAC member reads the entire file and drafts the Committee's recommendations. Under the Tomlin amendment, however, there is no guarantee that any Associate Dean would have had experience as a FAC member. Under the current Faculty Code, Associate Deans are not a part of the evaluation procedure.

In the ensuing discussion, members of the faculty considered the advantages and disadvantages of the two amendments. Workload considerations were weighed against the desire to maintain consistency in faculty evaluations.

Professor Cannon observed that among 9 Associate Deans he knew of, only one had been a member of the Advancement Committee. Dean Bartanen noted that there were 8 streamlined evaluations in 2004-2005, 7 in 2005-2006, 17 in 2006-2007, and 10 in 2007-2008. Professor Julie McGruder, former member of the FAC, observed that the workload for Advancement Committee members (from one-half to one full day of work each week) was not adequately compensated for by a single release unit for the academic year.

Several faculty members expressed concern about the relationship between the streamlined evaluation procedure and faculty members' eligibility for teaching awards in a number of categories. Dean Bartanen stated that her past "streamlined" reviews were guided by a concern that deserving faculty should still be considered for teaching awards; as a result, the length of the letters had increased to meet this burden of fairness.

One problem that emerged from this discussion is that consideration for teaching awards lies outside the procedures outlined in the Faculty Code; procedures for bringing candidates forward for consideration of teaching awards are not specified in the Code.

After further discussion, President Thomas asked if the faculty members were ready to vote on the substitute amendment.

Beardsley's amendment passed by voice vote.

The faculty then voted on the main motion as amended.

The motion:

To amend Chapter III Section 5 d, second sentence to (new language in italics):

“The dean or a member of the Faculty Advancement Committee shall review the file, write a letter of evaluation, and forward it to the head officer.”

Passed by voice vote.

Professor Cannon assured faculty members that the Senate would include consideration of the teaching award designation process on the Senate's agenda.

7b. Professor Richard Anderson-Connolly observed that over the last three years an honorary degree has been awarded at Commencement to a high-ranking military official or military weapons researcher. He expressed his opposition to the awarding of an honorary degree to any candidate from this category put forward by the Committee on Honorary Degree. He believed the University should not vote to honor such a person. When he expressed this opinion at a Senate meeting, he had been urged by other Senators to bring the question before the Faculty.

In response to questions regarding the scope of his recommendation, Anderson-Connolly indicated that he believed it was appropriate to honor those who had served in the military, but that those who had served as strategists and weapons developers should be omitted from consideration.

Several faculty members, sharing his objections to some recent honorees, suggested that a rule excluding nominees from particular categories would be less constructive than an affirmation that honorees should be exemplars of the highest values of the University. The current situation is the wrong time for the institution to indicate any endorsement of warfare.

After questions were raised regarding the procedure for electing candidates, Dean Bartanen summarized the procedure. Nominations come from individual faculty, staff, and students; those nominations are reviewed by the Committee on Honorary Degrees; the Committee's recommendations are reviewed by the Faculty Senate, the President, and the Board of Trustees. After one faculty member commented that honorary degree recipients also seemed to be recognized for their potential to grow the university's endowment, President Thomas responded that that situation was not true. In his recollection every candidate put forward in hopes of enticing donations has been rejected by the Committee.

After expressing his opinion that Lt. Ehren Watada would be a viable candidate for an honorary degree,

Professor Steven Neshyba M/S that the Faculty recommend that Lt. Watada be awarded an honorary degree.

After discussion which included affirmations of Lt. Watada as an exemplar of the ideals of the University, concern that the faculty not pre-empt the Committee's deliberations, the observation that the Committee would need a dossier for the nominee provided by the nominator, and concern that the small number of faculty in attendance at this meeting did not represent the sentiments of the full faculty,

the motion was defeated by voice vote.

8a. Rosa Beth Gibson, Associate Vice-President for Human Resources, introduced Melissa Rubenstein, Director of Compensation and Benefits in the Human Resources Department. Gibson provided information and solicited faculty perspectives regarding a “growing trend toward automatic enrollment in voluntary retirement savings plans.”

Currently, faculty are enrolled in the University’s defined contribution retirement plan. After a one-year waiting period, the University contributes an amount equivalent to 12% of the faculty member’s contract salary to the plan, and faculty and staff choose how these contributions are to be invested through two fund sponsors, TIAA-CREF and the Vanguard Group.

Currently about 40% of faculty and staff make voluntary contributions to a tax-deferred annuity plan. The Human Resources Department will recommend to the Board of Trustees that this plan be called the “Voluntary Retirement Savings Plan.” There is no waiting period for the current plan, and faculty and staff also choose how these contributions are to be invested by utilizing the same fund sponsors as in the defined contribution plan.

The Human Resources Department staff would like to encourage more faculty and staff to participate in the voluntary program. Gibson stated that most experts agree that individuals should save 10% to 20% of their annual income in addition to employer retirement contributions. People are living longer, and faculty and staff members may not be saving enough to see them through their retirement years.

She noted that a majority of Puget Sound faculty and staff members are not participating in the voluntary plan. After outlining a number of suggested reasons for low retirement savings rates—procrastination, inertia, lack of investment knowledge, and the press of other obligations—she suggested that automatic enrollment in the voluntary savings plan might be a simple solution. Gibson distributed a document (attached to these minutes) which had been made available to new faculty members at their Orientation detailing the costs and benefits of voluntary contributions

Under this option, faculty and staff members would be enrolled automatically in the plan unless they chose not to participate within a specified time period. A designation percentage of earnings (e.g., a 3% deferral with 1/2 percent increase each year for four years to a total of 5%) would be deferred automatically to a default investment plan. Faculty and staff would have the opportunity to decline participation and to choose different investment options.

Gibson presented figures from the Retirement Made Simple Coalition indicating that about 23% of plan sponsors were automatically enrolling employees in their voluntary retirement savings plans, and 14% of sponsors were increasing deferrals automatically. A poll of employees sponsored by the Coalition revealed that an overwhelming majority of employees in these plans favor them, with only 7% choosing not to participate. Both the American Association of Retired People and benefits experts expect automatic retirement savings plans will soon become the norm.

She then invited faculty responses, which were largely positive. Concern was expressed, however, that the “automatic” character of the proposal seemed paternalistic and might run counter to the principle of individual autonomy. Faculty members also expressed apprehension regarding the impact of consumer debt interest on employees’ retirement resources. Gibson notes that TIAA-CREF currently provides financial counseling to Puget Sound employees and indicated these opportunities could be expanded.

8b. Tomlin introduced for a first reading a series of Code Amendments he described as “Housekeeping” amendments. (see attachment) Discussion immediately centered on the propriety of amending the Faculty Code to reflect PSC interpretations.

The time being 5:30 p.m., President Thomas asked for a motion to continue the meeting. Hearing no such motion, he declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

David Droge, Secretary of the Faculty



FINANCIAL SERVICES
FOR THE GREATER GOOD®

Home | Forms | Careers | Press | Contact Us | Help



TDA Advantage Contribution Evaluator

What does your paycheck look like after investing?

\$2,712

\$2,681

(using tax-deferred contributions)

(using after-tax contributions)

How much does it cost?

Your additional annual pre-tax contribution

\$1,500

125/mo

Your tax savings

\$375

Your reduction in take home pay

\$1,125

93.75/mo

What will my accumulation be in retirement?

Using your proposed contribution rates and other assumptions including return.

\$238,871

Why wait?

If you wait 1 year before contributing, your accumulation will be \$224,297. That is \$14,574 less than it would be if you start immediately.

If you wait 2 years before contributing, your accumulation will be \$210,397. That is \$28,474 less than it would be if you start immediately.

Your results are based on:

Current age	35
Retirement age	65
Annual salary	\$50,000
Estimated tax bracket	25.00%
Average annual salary increase rate	3.00%
Estimated rate of return	8.00%
Your proposed contribution rate	3.00%
Proposed employer matching contribution rate	0.00%

[Do Another Calculation >](#)

Additional Information

- We have provided you with hypothetical scenarios using the rate of return you provided. There are no guarantees that any specific earnings can be achieved in the future. Rates for the non-guaranteed accounts are net of fees and expenses. It's important to note that interest rates and earnings will vary over time, particularly for long-term investments. Investments that offer the potential for higher rates of return also involve a higher degree of risk to principal.
- This calculator does not account for special tax considerations such as limited deductions for high income earners or those subject to alternative minimum tax.

[Site Map](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Terms & Conditions](#) | [Prospectuses](#)

How much you need to invest to reach \$100,000 at age 65

<u>Contributions Made from Age</u>	<u>Monthly Contributions</u>	<u>Total Contributions</u>
25 to 65	\$31	\$14,880
30 to 65	\$46	\$19,320
35 to 65	\$71	\$25,560
40 to 65	\$109	\$32,700
45 to 65	\$175	\$42,000
50 to 65	\$294	\$52,920
55 to 65	\$552	\$66,240

This table shows how much you will need to contribute each month to a tax-deferred investment paying an assumed annual return of 8% to reach your goal of accumulating \$100,000 by the time you reach age 65. (This 8% rate of return is intended for illustration purposes only.)

Overview

The Professional Standards Committee proposes the following amendments in order to remedy minor problems in the Faculty Code. Over years the PSC has become aware of a series of incorrect internal Code references, outdated or inconsistent terms, typos, and miscellaneous errors

The PSC is also recommending some stylistic changes that seek to make the Code more user-friendly.

1. Partners and Spouses

Instances where the term “spouse” or “mate” is employed in the Faculty Code instead of “partner.” In all of these cases, “spouse” or “mate” will be replaced with “partner.”

Page #	Line #'s	Content
40 and 41	p. 40:, lines 50, 54 p. 41, lines, 1, 6, 11, 23, 37	Interpretation concerning Spouses/Children Taking Courses from Faculty
44	18, 22	Interpretation regarding role of spouses in the same department, during evaluations.
44	23	Same as above, but use of term “mate” as a substitute for spouse.

2. Working Days

In order to conform to the PSC interpretation of January 31, 2005, the following references to “days” will be changed to “working days.”

Page #	Line #'s	Content
17	14	Chapter III, Section 4, e (3)
31	19	Chapter V, Section 3, Procedures for dismissal
36	8, 14, 15	Chapter VI, Grievances
44	32	PSC Interpretation regarding the time frame for setting up a hearing board

3. Housekeeping (typos, incorrect internal citations, etc.)

Page #	Line #'s	Content
8	34	Remove "p. 7."
10	29	Change internal citation from "Chapter III, Section 9" to "Chapter III, Section 8"
10	32	Change "associate professors" to "associate professor."
14	2	Change internal citation from "7" to "section 8"
14	33	The language "including a claim under Chapter III, Section 4.b.(4)" is a vestigial reference that should be deleted.
14	5-28	Indent text to be in alignment with the text on line 21 of page 13.
15	36-37	Indent text to be in alignment with the text on line 1 of page 15
15	45	Strike the reference to Chapter II, Section 3 (it seems that the only relevant reference is Chapter III, Section 3).
16	18	Change "initiate and appeal" to "initiate an appeal"
16	48	Change internal citation from "section 7 below" to "section 8 below"
18	16-17	Change internal citation from "Chapter II, section a (1)" to "Chapter V, Part A, Section 2.a"
28	22	Change internal citation from "see Chapter I, Part B" to "see Chapter I, Part C"
31	43	Change the reference "Chapter III, Section 7.e" to "Chapter III, Section 6 and 7."
36	4	Remove page reference to "p. 26"
37	40	Change "by contrary" to "be contrary"
45	25	Change last code reference from "Section 4, b (2) (b)" to "Section 4,b (2) (e)"

In addition to proposing the adoption of the above housekeeping amendments, the PSC has recommended that the Dean of the University enact the following style changes in order to make the Faculty Code more user-friendly.

Style Changes

- a) Embed all PSC Code interpretations as footnotes on those pages of the Code itself to which the interpretations apply.
- b) Two indexes should be created: one numbering the interpretations chronologically by adoption, and a second listing them by chapter in the order they appear as footnotes.
- c) Have Code chapter numbers appear in the page headers.
- d) In the PDF version of the Code turn all code references into hyperlinks to the relevant passages.