

Minutes of the February 2, 2015 faculty meeting

Submitted by Alisa Kessel, acting Faculty Secretary

Attendance

Faculty members in attendance are listed in Appendix A.

Minutes

I. Call to order

Dean Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. Election of a Faculty Secretary

M/S/P to have Kessel serve as acting Secretary for the February 2, 2015 meeting.

III. Approval of minutes

M/S/P to approve the minutes of the November 11, 2014 faculty meeting.

IV. Announcements

- Nelson-Christoph: KNOW workshop at CWLT on Friday; Wednesday at 4 begins this week
- Ellen Peters (Institutional Research): the University will administer a Climate Survey this spring, including questions related to sexual assault (as per federal recommendations)
- Hastings: The PT clinic is open for spring and is accepting self-referrals

V. Question regarding reports of the President, Academic Vice President, and Faculty Senate Chair (Appendices B, C, and D).

M/S/P Weisz made a motion to distribute agenda with accompanying minutes and reports through the facultycoms listserv.

- Faculty Senate Chair Tubert and Dean Bartanen noted that reports from the President, Academic Vice President, and Faculty Senate Chair will be distributed to the faculty on the Thursday prior to any upcoming faculty meeting.

*Kessel will compile requests and distribute the agenda for the meeting on March 10, 2015.

- Neshyba shared President Thomas's query about what the faculty would like to see in the President's report. The faculty offered no feedback; Neshyba suggested that the reports should provide sufficient information to invite questions or discussion from the faculty.

VI. Resolution on Equality

M/S/F

Anderson-Connolly distributed copies of the Core Values of the University (available online at <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/strategic-planning/>)

Anderson-Connolly presented the following motion:

The faculty supports the inclusion of the following language as one of our Core Values (currently found on the Puget Sound Strategic Planning webpage).

Equality

We recognize the moral significance of equality and therefore believe that inequality in compensation is acceptable only when it is reasonably justified and widely regarded as legitimate by members of the campus community.

Anderson-Connolly spoke in favor of the motion. The faculty discussed the motion. Some noted that the language of the motion might be too specific for the “Core Values” document and that perhaps the words “in compensation” should be struck from the motion. Others thought that the language in the definition of “equality” in the motion was vague, noting that “legitimate” and “reasonably justified” might be imprecise. Some faculty suggested that striking the words “in compensation” might be problematic, and might imply that the faculty is endorsing discrimination. One faculty member believed that the question of compensation should be disentangled from the question of core values, which are not binding. A member of the Faculty Compensation Task Force noted that the task force was working to develop a philosophy for faculty compensation and that it might be helpful for the faculty members on the task force to hear from faculty about how they wish to order values like equality. Other members of the faculty noted that the conversation about compensation and the salary scale were important and worth pursuing.

A member of the faculty moved to end debate and more than 2/3 of the assembled consented to end debate.

The motion failed.

VII. Ad Hoc Committee on Medical, Family Leave and Disability Policies

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Medical, Family Leave, and Disability Policies Stacey Weiss, Gwynne Brown, and Brett Rogers gave a slide presentation ([Appendix E](#)), presented a draft motion, and invited feedback from the faculty (including through email).

Draft motion: The faculty at the University of Puget Sound find the university’s leave policies to be inequitable, inadequate, lacking in transparency, and unsupportive of the scholarly and pedagogical work faculty conduct outside the semester calendar. In order to (a) better support faculty teaching, scholarship, wellness, and morale, (b) improve students’ Puget Sound experience and (c) better align with the stated values of the university and with best practices as supported by scholarship, the faculty requests:

- 1. the implementation of paid Faculty Parental Leave (3 units) and paid Faculty Family Medical Leave policies.*
- 2. the revision of current leave policies with no- and low-cost modifications, including release(s) from service and advising, 1-year tenure delay, and a straightforward and transparent procedure for leave applications.*

The faculty offered feedback on the draft motion. A few raised questions about how a recommendation by the faculty would be implemented as policy. One faculty member asked about staff and their concerns over leave policy.

Dean Bartanen offered three clarifications:

- 1) Benefit reviews are conducted periodically and one is slated for 2016 or 2017. Because this proposal requires cost changes, it would be considered through this review process (whereas a no-cost policy change could be considered through other means).
- 2) Leave is paid for summer birth, accident, or illness when the period following the medical event overlaps with the semester (up to 6 weeks).
- 3) Paid leave can be extended beyond 6 weeks with documented need from a health care provider.

Shannon Briggs (HR) offered two clarifications:

- 1) The staff situation regarding leave is significantly different from faculty because staff accrue sick leave.
- 2) Because there are cost considerations, a policy recommendation of this sort would require approval from the Board of Trustees.

Faculty raised questions about changes to professional standards (regarding tenure review). One wondered whether implementation of this policy would preclude a move to a 2-3 teaching load at a later date. Some faculty noted that not all members of the faculty have children and asked whether, as a matter of fairness, a policy of this sort should include caring for aging or infirm parents. Others affirmed this statement. The faculty asked questions about how leaves are covered under the current system.

Faculty members are invited to provide additional feedback via email.

M/S/P: Buescher moved to suspend the rules and to swap items 8 and item 9 on the agenda

IX. Changes to the Faculty Code regarding the schedule for evaluation of associate and full professors

Beardsley presented a first reading of two motions (both are attached as Appendix F).

Beardsley explained each motion and noted that the motions were a response to a Faculty Senate charge to the Professional Standards Committee to find ways to streamline the faculty review process. Beardsley proposed recommendations to the Code in light of the PSC recommendations.

Weinberger suggested a revision to the motions, which Beardsley welcomed.

VIII) A resolution regarding the length of the spring semester

M/S/

Despres and Neshyba presented a motion.

Motion: The Faculty directs the Senate to shorten the number of teaching days in spring semester to 67 days.

Despres spoke in favor of the motion. The faculty discussed the motion.

X. Adjournment

M/S/P to adjourn at 5:28 p.m.

APPENDIX A: Attendance of February 2, 2015 Faculty Meeting

Attending

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Kris Bartanen
Bill Beardsley
Nancy Bristow
Nick Brody
Gwynne Brown
Derek Buescher
Dan Burgard
Alva Butcher
Doug Cannon
Julie Christoph
Erin Colbert-White
Alyce DeMarais
Denise Despres
Brad Dillman
Lisa Ferrari
Amy Fisher
Sara Freeman
Andrew Gardner
Bill Haltom
Jennifer Hastings
Suzanne Holland
Renee Houston
Matt Ingalls
Martin Jackson
Alisa Kessel
Grace Kirchner
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Alan Krause
Sunil Kukreja
Ben Lewin
Andreas Madlung
Amanda Mifflin
Steven Neshyba
Amy Odegard
Eric Orlin
Emelie Peine
Brett Rogers
Maria Sampen
Leslie Saucedo
David Sousa
Amy Spivey
Jonathan Stockdale

Justin Tiehen
George Tomlin
Ben Tromly
Ariela Tubert
Jennifer Utrata
Keith Ward
Seth Weinberger
Stacey Weiss
Carolyn Weisz
Paula Wilson

Guests

Shannon Briggs
Cindy Matern
Ellen Peters
Brad Tomhave
Landon Wade

Appendix B. Academic VP's Report

February 2, 2015

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Academic Vice President's Report to the Faculty Meeting

Experiential Learning: We continue to move forward with recommendations of the 2014-15 [Experiential Learning Work Group](#). As noted in summary notes for the January 27 "*The Next Big Thing* Continuing Conversation" appended to the President's report, Professor of Business and Leadership Jeff Matthews is leading strategic planning work for this semester around the experiential initiative.

Faculty Compensation Task Force: The group has completed the "knowledge building" component of the consultancy, having engaged 5 sessions (16 hours of work together with consultant Frank Casagrande) on diagnostics of Puget Sound's compensation situation, including multiple sources of comparison data; basics of budgeting and compensation systems; compensation philosophies and practices; a close look at Puget Sound's comparison groups; and a close look at how the Puget Sound faculty salary scale works in practice. For the balance of Spring semester, we have four half-day sessions scheduled to draft a faculty compensation philosophy, determine an appropriate peer group for benchmarking faculty salaries, potential adjustments to the faculty scale index, and forward-looking modeling and forecasting to inform goal-setting and planning.

Some members of the FCTF have also attended **Continuing Conversations** on the Budget Task Force process, Enrollment, "The Next Big Thing," and Campaign Wrap-up/Post-Campaign Planning. Faculty attendance (by informal observation) at these sessions – given their purpose was to open greater transparency about processes and priorities – has been thin (2, 18, 13, and 7 respectively, for four discussions) relative to staff attendance. I encourage you to read the newly formatted [Budget Task Force report](#), along with its detailed appendices that contain budget, benchmarking, and other details about all areas of the university.

Faculty Searches: Philip Phibbs Assistant Professor of Politics and Government Chris Kendall has joined us this January; please extend a warm welcome to him. Four departments have completed tenure-line searches for 2015-2016, so we look forward to welcoming in August 2015: Jason Struna, Sociology and Anthropology; Brian Thines, Biology; Andreas Udbye, Business and Leadership – Global/Accounting; and Parker Woodroof, Business and Leadership – Marketing. Three searches are in interviews: Chinese Language and Literature, Computer Science, and Philosophy. We also have three ongoing clinical searches in progress in Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy (2), as well as a post-doctoral position in digital humanities (Mellon Foundation funded, "Humanities in the Digital Age") and visiting positions to cover leaves.

Lantz Fellowships: Michael Johnson (Art), Bill Kupinse (English), David Moore (Psychology), Hans Ostrom (African American Studies/English), Geoff Proehl (Theatre Arts), and Carolyn Weisz (Psychology) were awarded Lantz Fellowships for 2015-2016. **Thanks** go to Alva Butcher (Business and Leadership), Greg Elliott (Physics), Jan Leuchtenberger (Asian Languages and Cultures), and David Sousa

(Politics and Government) for joining the deans in serving as the selection committee. Pre-tenure sabbaticals have been awarded to Luc Boivert (Chemistry), Amy Fisher (STS), Poppy Fry (History), Peter Hodum (Biology), Jung Kim (Exercise Science), David Latimer (Physics), Siddharth Ramakrishnan (Neuroscience/Biology), Brett Rogers (Classics), Oriel Maria Siu (Hispanic Studies). In all, we have 24.5 FTE leaves for 2015-2016, compared to an average of 18 FTE for the past five years; Martin is working with department chairs to determine best strategies for replacement (not all leaves can be fully replaced) and Lisa will continue to work with chairs to prepare a 2015-2016 course schedule that provides best opportunities for students to enroll in the courses they need.

Academic Goals update: Check out the January 2015 update on 2014-2015 academic goals [here](#).

Looking ahead: Stay tuned . . .

- Puget Sound has been selected by the **Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities** as one of four “demonstration project” schools – in our case, for independent colleges in the seven state NWCCU region – to help build greater understanding of completion of the new accreditation cycle and its focus on demonstrating mission fulfillment. This means we will not have a seven-year accreditation visit in Spring 2017, but will complete our report with particular attention to how we have gone about our processes of assessment and gathering evidence of student learning outcomes.
- **Title IX Training:** New regulations from the Department of Education and Office of Civil Rights require that all faculty, staff, and students participate in updated training on prevention of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. Later in the semester, we will “roll out” improved on-line tutorials for your participation in this important work.

A few Kudos (always with the danger of having missed something):

- Nancy Bristow (History) for her selection as a visiting scholar for a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar on the 1918 Spanish flu pandemic;
- Steven Neshyba (Chemistry), for selection as a Fulbright Scholar, Spring 2016, to work in Chile;
- Don Share (Politics and Government) and John Lear (History), joined by Patrick O’Neil (P&G), for leading the successful Cuba tour seminar over winter break;
- Graduate Fellowships Advisory Committee, under the leadership of Greta Austin (Religion and Gender & Queer Studies) and Sharon Chambers Gordon for support of Rhodes Scholar Billy Rathje, Marshall finalist Liz Meuci, and those students still in the running for national and international awards, including (a partial list of work still in progress) Luce finalist Steven Baum, four Watson candidates, two German Fulbright candidates, and a Fulbright LAMDA finalist;

- Julie Christoph for hosting this weekend the first Northwest Five Colleges Peer Tutoring Conference;
- Michael Benitez and Ellen Peters, who have been selected to present a session at the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (one of only six selected sessions);
- Head coach Loree Payne and the nationally-ranked Logger Women's Basketball team;
- **Everyone** for all the great work that you do every day!

Appendix C. Faculty Senate Chair's Report

Faculty Senate Chair Report to the Faculty
In advance of 02/02/2015 Faculty Meeting
By Ariela Tubert

- At our first meeting of the spring semester last week, the senate welcomed two new senators for the semester: William Beardsley and Pierre Ly. Pierre has replaced Brendan Lanctot as secretary of the senate for the spring semester. I would like to encourage faculty members to contact any members of the senate with suggestions for issues that they would like the senate to pursue.
- A couple of the senate meetings at the end of the fall semesters were taken up by confidential discussions of the recommendations of the Committee on Honorary Degrees. The senate considered the nominees as well as the criteria used in selecting those nominees. Recommendations from the senate were forwarded to the president.
- At the November 24, 2014 meeting, the senate endorsed a letter from ASUPS requesting changes in building codes to accommodate more gender-neutral bathrooms on campus.
- At the December 8, 2014 meeting, the senate heard a report from the ad hoc committee of the senate reviewing the Faculty Medical, Family Leave, and Disability Policies. The committee will also be presenting at this upcoming faculty meeting on 2/2/15.
- At its most recent meeting, the senate approved a motion endorsing changes in the schedule for evaluations of third year associate and full professor evaluations. The Professional Standards Committee had recommended such changes in their last end of year report to the senate. The senate worked out the language for the proposed changes and it will be brought to the faculty for discussion at this upcoming faculty meeting on 2/2/15 and for vote at the following meeting on 3/10/15.
- The senate heard a report from the Budget Task Force last week. The report, presented by Brad Dillman, Kris Bartanen, and Sherry Mondou, contained interesting information about the recommendations for the budget for the next year. The senate was able to ask various questions about the process and the recommendations. The report is available by following this link <http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/btf-report-2015-16-final-3.pdf> . You can send any comments about the budget recommendations to the president till February 9th, 2015. President Thomas will forward his recommendations to the Board of Trustees at the Board Meeting in February.
- Thinking ahead to the Board Meeting, I will be preparing my report to the Board of Trustees next week. I welcome suggestions from faculty on things to mention or emphasize in the report.

Appendix D. President's Report

President's Report to the Faculty for the February 2, 2015 Faculty Meeting

Admission: Applications for next fall's entering class are strong, now over 5600, representing a 6% increase over last year's record number. We harbored some concern that last year's extraordinary 20% increase over the prior year may have been soft and not sustainable, an artifact of certain changes in our own application process. We are gratified by this year's continued increase. Other members of the Northwest 5 are also reporting increases. We do not yet have an analysis of the profile and characteristics of our pool, which is currently underway. One very encouraging note is the impact of the Tacoma Commitment on the pool. We have a 115% increase in applications from TPS this year (from 59-127), with Lincoln HS and the Tacoma Science and Math Institute showing increases over 300% and Mount Tahoma a 200% growth (Lincoln (has now surpassed Stadium as the highest applicant school in the city).

Campaign: A slow few months of fundraising in the fall concluded with a strong finish in December when the One [of a Kind] Campaign total topped \$123.2 million at the close of the calendar year, representing about a \$7 million increase during the first half of the fiscal year. The Campaign concludes on June 30 2015, and we are making a major push to reach out to donors during these final 5 months to exceed our goal of \$125 million. Campaign analysis and our plans for fundraising and constituent engagement activities in the "post-campaign period" (beginning on July 1, 2015) were detailed in the January 27 "Continuing Conversation" session.

Continuing Conversations: As promised in last August's "Fall Faculty and Staff Conversation," we have conducted thus far four open forum "Continuing Conversations" to discuss key strategic issues for the year, including: the Budget process, the Enrollment Work Group report, the "Next Big Thing," and the "Campaign Countdown—and After." One more session is scheduled on Sexual Assault and Title IX for February 17, 4-5 PM in the Tahoma Room. A summary of the "Next Big Thing" session (where we began to look out to 2050 to identify the "big idea or ideas" that would guide Puget Sound's next stage of development—and how we might get there) is attached to this report.

Presidential Travel: With the Campaign wrapping up this spring and other university travel, I have a busy itinerary through June of this year. Trips to individual donors, foundations, and regional Logger Clubs will take me to New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Honolulu (in addition to Seattle and Portland). My role on the executive committees of the boards of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) and the Annapolis Group (as well as visits to our congressional delegation) will involve two trips to Washington DC (February and June) and one to San Antonio (in April). My role as chair of the Student Aid Committee for NAICU will be especially challenging this year with the Higher Education Act scheduled for reauthorization by the newly elected Republican majorities in the House and Senate and an activist White House—all of which are contemplating aid proposals that are not advantageous to students at independent colleges. I am in DC for the Annual Meeting of

NAICU starting on Sunday, February 1 through Thursday, the 5th, and will therefore miss the February 2 Faculty meeting.

Board of Trustees: The Puget Sound Board of Trustees is scheduled to meet on campus February 26 and 27. Key issues on the agenda include: presentation for approval of the president's recommendation on the operating budget for 2015-16, a workshop on the post-campaign fundraising and constituent engagement plans, consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure, a "Faculty Bookshelf" on faculty research, and opportunities for faculty to meet informally with trustees at breakfast on the 27th. The Alumni Council Executive Committee will meet on campus simultaneously and share dinner with the Board on the evening of the 26th. Of note: earlier this month members of the Board's Investment Subcommittee met with seven students interested in fossil fuel investments in the university's endowment portfolio, with the aim of listening to and exploring the students' concerns and offering some insights into the university's investment policies and the Board's fiduciary responsibilities with respect to the endowment. Those members will report back to the full Investment Subcommittee in the February meeting and review the issues involved.

Campus Issues: I have noted with appreciation the thoughtful and often powerful responses by faculty and students to the deeply disturbing events represented by Ferguson and Staten Island (and others) during this past year. Faculty members, the BSU, Race and Pedagogy colleagues and community partners have all contributed meaningfully to responding to these events in formal and informal ways. What is clear in my continuing conversations with students (and I am sure to many of you) is that these events have raised issues and injuries and have occasioned conversations that continue to be unsettling to them on and off campus, and require our ongoing thoughtful listening and attention. Additionally, many of you have been helpful in the significant efforts by ASUPS, the Dean of Students Office, our Title IX officer and others in addressing the scourge of sexual violence on campus, enhancing our prevention and education for employees and students on the issues, and strengthening the university's policies and procedures in responding to such incidents. We have much work to do in this important area as well, and I am grateful for the care with which so many of you have contributed to the effort.

Summary of "The Next Big Thing" Conversation follows:

--Ron Thomas

Continuing Conversation: The Next Big Thing

January 20, 2015, 4 – 5 p.m. – Trimble Forum

Attendance approximately 60, including 13 faculty members

After “setting the table” by reminding the group of the highest profile major higher education issues of **access**, **affordability**, and **accountability** – along with the important topic of **academic excellence** that is often left out of the national discussions about the key challenges in higher education– President Thomas summarized briefly changed conditions (decline of family income; loss of household wealth, equity, and credit; and continued tuition increases) that have created challenges for colleges and prospective college-goers (and their increasingly involved families). As we think about our future development, we will need to offer an innovative educational program that is true to our mission and values even as it demonstrates a “return on investment” in order for students and their families to be willing to pay the significant cost required to provide the kind of college education in which we deeply believe. We are dedicated to providing a transformative educational experience with high degree of faculty contact; but this is a labor intensive and expensive enterprise, and market forces are making such an experience unaffordable for an increasing portion of the population. We will be challenged to figure inventive ways to square that circle—preserving our values (and value) and remaining affordable.

Our options include (1) capturing more alternative revenues to reliance on tuition (e.g., fundraising, summer conferences, etc.); (2) significantly reducing our cost structure (we have parsimoniously reduced cost, but not shifted our cost structure); and (3) competing successfully for more students who can afford to pay, which is challenging and raises conflicts – such as tradeoffs in social diversity of the student body – with values that we hold as important. He noted where we had left off in the Fall Faculty and Staff Conversation in August 2014 with this equation:

$$\text{Vision} = (\text{Mission} + \text{Character}) \times \text{Time}$$

The Challenge: Tracing “big idea” eras in Puget Sound’s history – 1888-1913, 1913-1942, 1942-1973, and 1973-present – President Thomas urged participants to share their thoughts on what a Puget Sound liberal education in the year 2050 might look like. What is our next big objective equivalent in scope to becoming a respected “regional comprehensive university” (from 1942-73); or a “national liberal arts college” (as we have been pursuing successfully since 1973). What steps will be required to get that next level? What key aspects of our mission and character should we build upon? What key obstacles will we face?

Following is a summary of responses from meeting participants:

- Increased value of the Puget Sound diploma over time. Raised reputation. (President Thomas observed that this would be an effect and asked what might be the cause of such an effect.) *Staff member and parent of Puget Sound student*
- Big transition needed in living-learning environment, with greater emphasis on what it means to live in community. Rethink how we parse 32 units to enable distinctive, credit-bearing work outside of the classroom, in the community. Students demonstrate more independence, initiative. Need freedom to do things outside of class structure. *Faculty member*

- Explore making college do-able in three years, for some students. Is 32 units a magic formula? Get away from four courses per semester. Could students take three courses and an internship? *Faculty member*
- Where do students want to be in 2050? Think of the shifts over the past 30 years, for example, growth in global reach and use of technology have been huge changes. What will students need in 2050? Get students out in the world for hands-on experience comparable to how medical students are in clinical settings early and throughout their educational programs. *Staff member*
- Students are/will be digital natives. What does/will the march of technology mean to the nature of the education we offer? Their high schools are using/will use technologies more sophisticated than what we offer; we need to prepare. *Faculty member*
- Students will be part of a diverse world. Don't worry about number of units, but what education looks like; “blow up” the traditional classroom. This is a largely and historically white campus. Students need to be prepared to work with a broad range of people; the campus needs to be accessible to a broad range of people. Need to worry more about what happens over time, not the number of courses. *Faculty member*
- A radical transformation in recruitment. Target private schools in NYC. Students want to network with “movers and shakers” (which can also bring more dollars from fundraising). Set a benchmark for recruiting from outside the West. *Faculty member*
- Recruit more international students. Natural opportunity with Pacific Rim to be more internationally diverse. *Staff member*
- Is 30 years too short a timeframe for visioning? We did the counterintuitive thing 30 years ago. Globalization and technology are here; we need a big risk/big idea to really propel us. Look to trends 50 years forward. *Faculty member*
- Need more intentional breakdown of disciplinary silos. Students must work, learn, and solve problems "interdisciplinarily." We need to be genuinely interdisciplinary. *Faculty member*
- The "Knowledge, Identity, & Power" (KNOW) graduation requirement – based on an important set of themes, rather than in disciplines – is this an example we could model in other areas?. *President Thomas*
- We have such an opportunity with the Mellon grant focused on “Humanities in the Digital Age”; foundation officers were especially enthusiastic about lessening of silos in the humanities. *Academic VP Kris Bartanen*
- Programs like the Lillis Scholars have brought us some fabulous, unusual students who not only inspire others and act as beacons in the classroom but are exceptionally gifted in intelligence and in their character (e.g., Rhodes Scholar Billy Rathje). How can we bring more such students who want to study across disciplines? *Faculty member*
- These students are extremely savvy in their college selection process. We need to be distinctive within the market of top liberal arts colleges. We need to offer experiences to attract them relative to their other choices. *Faculty member*
- Billy Rathje is an example of a student who draws connections between the classroom and the real world (a computer scientist, who studies literature, who applies applications to publishing plays and producing theatre). We can think more carefully, for example, with work study students about how what they are learning –

e.g., Excel, Qualtrics, SPSS in the IR office – is applicable beyond the campus. *Staff member*

- Revisiting the history and development of the KNOW requirement: The Burlington Northern group asked what students need to be successful in the world. Lots of faculty, across lots of disciplines weighed in. The proposal started out as two units: not a single set of skills, but a trajectory of experience developed over time. We should reconsider the benefits of such a developmental, two-unit approach to this and other curricular areas such as sustainability, technology. *Faculty member*
- Teach ethics across the curriculum. Values of democratic citizenship. More deliberate occasions to probe values and ethics across disciplines. *Faculty member*
- Our faculty at Puget Sound is an unusually interdisciplinary one in inclination, our programs are truly interdisciplinary. What themes are we hearing so far? Responses: Breaking boundaries. Culture of innovation. Building connections. Theory into practice. Have not seen another faculty as truly interdisciplinary as this one. *President Thomas and others.*
- We need some bigger classrooms so that panels of faculty can teach together, with breakout classrooms for smaller sessions. *Faculty member*
- Our students are compiling multiple majors and minors; they are telling us what areas are ripe for breaking through disciplinary boundaries; they want to do more than study traditional disciplines. *Faculty member*
- If students are, in a sense, building their own degree programs, how can we allow more of them to do so? *Faculty member*
- How would we go about having faculty work effectively in teams? What steps? *President Thomas*
- As a first step, we need to craft a compelling vision that will be persuasive and bring faculty along. *Faculty member*
- Invite current students into this conversation. Announce to a set of strong high school seniors that we want them to come here to design the 2050 Honors Program (like what Boeing did in inviting colleagues to design the Dreamliner). *Faculty member*
- Alumni could be included in such a conversation; they could reflect on what they would like to have done from the perspective of their career experiences. *Staff member*

President Thomas, wrap-up: We talk about a **Puget Sound education as not something you get, but something you do**, and a good deal of our conversation today involved variations of providing a more imaginative and integrated arc of experiences for students that effectively combines knowledge with practice, coursework with experience. Last year, the Experiential Work Group provided a gateway for consideration of some of the ideas put forward in the conversation today. Professor Jeff Matthews has just agreed to lead a strategic visioning process regarding experiential learning this semester, aimed to help move the recommendations of the Experiential Work Group to an operational level; this is an opportunity to synergize and integrate the many assets and offices currently providing experiential opportunities, focus some of the ideas at play around experiential, boundary-crossing work, and solicit further faculty thinking. Sharing good ideas with Jeff will be worthwhile.

There are many models to consider out there; one, Northeastern University in Boston, offers but one example-- of what was once a small, largely unknown (and unappreciated) regional commuter university that embraced early on a highly structured course/co-op approach to experiential learning and has now raised Northeastern's profile and reputation dramatically through a strategic leveraging and enhancing of its co-op model while cutting its enrollment nearly in half, becoming primarily residential and more selective, investing significantly in campus buildings (especially residence halls), and better integrating academics with an expanded and elaborate network of experiential sites. We certainly need not become Northeastern by any means; but we might look at such models (there are many) at different kinds of institutions to consider, for example, what a great liberal arts college version of an educational program might look like that really married knowledge with experience in imaginative ways, and how Puget Sound's version might distinctively express our mission and values and character.

These "Next Big Thing" conversations should continue on campus, and should aim to "clear some ground" for us as we move (in the next couple of years) into a next strategic planning mode, as the 10-year "Defining Moments" strategic plan becomes a decade old in 2016-17 and its objectives come to fruition. As we do, we should think about the "big idea" (or ideas) that will in a longer time frame be driving and summoning us forward as we continue to evolve as a liberal arts college, true to that mission and responsive to the conditions—social, cultural, economic—that we will be facing. We will need to think creatively, first, and then practically, too, as we shape a direction. But a big generative idea that has integrity and our own imprint is the first order of business as we proceed to adapt that idea to the constraints under which we must operate. I am confident we will, together, do some good "big" thinking.

Appendix E: Presentation from Ad hoc committee on leave policies

<p>Report from the ad hoc committee on leave policies</p> <p>Shannon Briggs (Human Resources), Gwynne Brown (Music), Kena Fox-Dobbs (Geology/EPDM), Renee Houston (Communication Studies), Brett Rogers (Classics), Ariela Tubert (Philosophy), Jennifer Utrata (SOAN) and Stacey Weiss (Biology; Committee Chair)</p> <p>02 February 2015</p>	<p>Senate charge (3/24/14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review the Faculty Medical, Family Leave and Disability Policies Make recommendations for improvement
<p>Puget Sound's "Medical, Family Leave and Disability Policies" include...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal Medical Leave (Extended Medical Leave) Family Medical Leave Parental Leave (Long-term Disabilities) <p><small>http://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/faculty_staff/resources/faculty_policies/medical_family_leave/</small></p>	<p>What we've been doing...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met throughout Summer and Fall 2014 Discussed our current policy Examined policies of NW5, regional and national comparison schools Conducted 31 faculty interviews & other information gathering Developed recommendations for improvement Presented report to Senate 12/8/14
<p>Themes from Interviews</p>	<p>Theme 1: Lack of Transparency</p> <p>"The fact that each faculty member must negotiate their case individually leads to inconsistency in how much leave is granted, and faculty members (particularly untenured faculty) may not feel comfortable negotiating on their own behalf."</p>
<p>Theme 2: Impact on Teaching</p> <p>"It was a harrowing experience to balance new parenthood and a heavy course load, even with a healthy baby and the support of my stay-at-home partner."</p> <p>"I was operating at about half to three-quarters sleep the entire spring semester."</p>	<p>Theme 3: Reliance on Colleagues</p> <p>"As an untenured professor who was not well acquainted with my new colleagues at that time, I did not feel comfortable asking anybody to cover my class for me, and ultimately I did not miss a single class that semester. In the end, the university's non-progressive leave policy and the lasting image of lecturing while wearing a hospital wristband left a feeling of resentment in my heart."</p>
<p>Theme 4: Inequity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-birth parents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoptive Foster Fathers Summer births Single parents Health challenges 	<p>Theme 5: Inadequacy</p> <p>"Part of the reason I have not started a family... is that I am the sole breadwinner, and the current parental leave policy (or lack thereof) makes it financially and logistically prohibitive for us to consider having children at this time."</p>
<p>Theme 6: Need for Change</p> <p>"I hope our policies will be updated soon to recognize the well-documented demands of caring for and bonding with newborn babies, so as to better support faculty members during the semester following such a critical life transition."</p>	<p>Institutional comparison data for parental leave</p> <p> <small> Paid personal medical and family leave * Difficult to quantify in the same way † 6 weeks / 1 unit is a common minimum </small> </p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Goals for New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity, consistency, and fairness • Better teaching (and modeling) for students • Foster a supportive community • Recognition that supporting faculty wellness and family bonding is both just and practical • Enhance diversity and equality • Improve faculty recruitment, retention, and morale 	<p style="text-align: center;">Personal Medical Leave (For a serious health condition including pregnancy / delivery)</p> <p><u>Current Policy:</u> 6 weeks paid leave which may be equivalent to 1-unit course reduction in current semester.</p> <p><u>Proposed Policy:</u> 6 weeks paid leave <u>or</u> 1-unit course reduction in current <u>or</u> subsequent semester.</p> <p><small>*Washington State Family Leave Act (FLA, 2006) allows for up to 12 weeks <u>unpaid</u> leave following the period of physical disability related to childbirth.</small></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Family Medical Leave (For care by employee of family members*: child (with a routine illness), spouse, registered domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, or grandparent with an emergency or serious health condition; or an adult child with a disability)</p> <p><u>Current Policy:</u> No paid leave.</p> <p><u>Proposed Policy:</u> 6 weeks paid leave <u>or</u> 1-unit course reduction in current <u>or</u> subsequent semester.</p> <p><small>* Definition of "family member" according to Washington State Family Care Act (FCA, 2002). Individuals above in green are covered by FCA, but not under current UPS policy.</small></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Parental Leave (For parent to bond with newborn, newly adopted, or newly placed foster child)</p> <p><u>Current Policy:</u> No paid leave.</p> <p><u>Proposed Policy:</u> 3-unit course reduction of paid leave.</p> <p><u>Eligibility:</u> At least 12 months employment or tenure-track position Parent of newborn or newly placed foster or adopted child Leave to be completed within 12 months of birth or placement</p> <p><small>*Washington State Family Leave Act (FLA, 2006) allows for up to 12 weeks <u>unpaid</u> leave following the period of physical disability related to childbirth.</small></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">No-cost changes relating to all leaves</p> <p><u>Current Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 25% pay reduction for service and advising release (though this does not actually happen...) - Tenure delay is proportional to length of leave taken - Able to opt out <p><u>Proposed Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Release from service & advising during semester(s) of course reduction - Automatic 1-year tenure delay (per event, up to 2-years/2 events before tenure) - Able to opt out - Revised process (including checklist) to connect Academic Dean, Dept Chair, <u>and</u> HR and to ensure clear communication. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Cost/Benefit Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projecting Costs (Parental Leave Only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis based upon ~9 predicted new children/year - Wide range of replacement scenarios: \$144k - \$368k per year (assuming all 27 units are replaced) • Unquantifiable Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially large and ethically significant - Examples include: focus, morale, productivity, retention, health, student experience
<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed motion</p> <p>The faculty at the University of Puget Sound find the university's leave policies to be inequitable, inadequate, lacking in transparency, and unsupportive of the scholarly and pedagogical work faculty conduct outside the semester calendar. In order to (a) better support faculty teaching, scholarship, wellness, and morale, (b) improve students' Puget Sound experience and (c) better align with the stated values of the university and with best practices as supported by scholarship, the faculty requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the implementation of paid Faculty Parental Leave (3 units) and paid Faculty Family Medical Leave policies. 2. the revision of current leave policies with no- and low-cost modifications, including release(s) from service and advising, 1-year tenure delay, and a straightforward and transparent procedure for leave applications. <p style="text-align: center;">We welcome your questions and feedback.</p>	

Appendix F: Motions to Amend the Code

Motion I:

To amend the Code by

1. Striking “Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure promotion and” from Chapter 3, section 5a of the Code.

[Proposed change as strike-through:

Section 5 - Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

a. ~~Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and~~ professors in years 5, 15, 25, and 35 of service in that rank may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.]

and by

2. Adding “An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review in accord with the procedures detailed in Chapter III, section 4” to Chapter 3, section 2b of the Code.

[Proposed change in **bold**:

b. An evaluation by the head officer shall be made at the conclusion of each year for the first two years of the appointment of a faculty member without tenure, or earlier if a question of non-reappointment is at stake. **An evaluation by the head officer shall also be made after each three year period of service for those at the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion unless the evaluatee elects to proceed with a full review in accord with the procedures detailed in Chapter III, section 4.** A copy of the head officer's report shall be sent to the individual under evaluation and to the dean. A copy of the head officer's report shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file (Chapter III, Section 8). Except in cases of non-reappointment (Chapter II, Section 5), no further action is required.]

Motion II:

To amend the Code by striking “in years 5, 15, 25 and 35 of service in that rank” from Chapter 3 section 5a of the Code.

[Proposed change as strike-through:

Section 5 - Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

a. Persons in the rank of associate professor who are not candidates for tenure or promotion and professors ~~in years 5, 15, 25, and 35 of service in that rank~~ may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.]

[If both proposed amendments are adopted, Section 5a will read:

Section 5 - Evaluation by Head Officer and Dean

a. Professors may elect to bypass the procedures for evaluation detailed in Chapter III, section 4 and have their next scheduled review conducted by the head officer and dean under the procedures described in this section. Instructors who have served 17 years or more in that rank may establish an alternating schedule of full and alternative reviews in consultation with the head officer and the dean under the procedures described in this section.]

Some Background

These motions are intended to implement the response by the PSC to Senate charges 2013-14. The PSC voted to recommend two changes to the Code—

(from PSC year-end report to Senate 2014)

- i. 3rd –year associate review to follow mode of 1st- and 2nd- year assistant professor reviews. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer and dean
- ii. Following promotion to professor, faculty reviews will occur every five years and be streamlined. Parties involved in evaluation: evaluatee, head officer and the dean or a designated member of the FAC.