

Minutes of the April 14, 2015 faculty meeting

Submitted by Alisa Kessel, acting Faculty Secretary

Approved Sept. 6, 2015

Final version submitted by Amy Spivey, 2015-2016 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 4:04 p.m.

II. Approval of the minutes of the March 10, 2015 faculty meeting

Dean Bartanen explained the process for approval of minutes. Once the draft minutes are complete, the acting Faculty Secretary distributes the minutes among the President, Academic Vice President, and Chair of the Faculty Senate for preliminary feedback regarding spelling, names, and procedures. Once all basic corrections are made, the minutes are distributed to the entire faculty. The March 2015 minutes were not subjected to preliminary review and contain a few errors. Bartanen suggested that, if there were no objections, the March minutes would be corrected, distributed, and then approved or revised at the first meeting of the faculty in the fall of 2015.

III. Announcements

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos noted that the recent survey about the core curriculum had 117 respondents; 18% of respondents said they wished to keep the Core as it is. Kontogeorgopoulos suggested that the Curriculum Committee would likely, in its year-end report, ask the Faculty Senate to form a separate committee to discuss possible revisions to the Core. He thanked Ellen Peters in Institutional Research for help with the survey.

IV. Questions regarding reports from the President, Academic Vice President, and Chair of the Faculty Senate

There were no questions from the floor. Dean Bartanen extended her remarks in order to share names of students who have been awarded fellowships since Bartanen authored her report and to thank the faculty who worked on the successful Luce Foundation grant application: Garth Barkin, Peter Wimberger, Rachel DeMotts, Sunil Kukreja, and Nick Kontogeorgopoulos.

V. Old business

A) Implementation date for *Faculty Code* amendments to further streamline three-year associate and five-year full professor evaluations (passed at the March 2015 faculty meeting of 2 February 2015, pending Board of Trustees approval) (Bartanen)

Bartanen disseminated copies of the approved code changes and noted that she will take the revised Faculty Code to the Board of Trustees for approval. However, we require a plan for implementation if changes are approved.

M/S/P Pending approval by the Board of Trustees, the changes will be implemented effective in the coming academic year. (Cannon)

A member of the faculty sought clarification that, if the Board approves the changes at the May 2015 meeting, changes would be effective AY 2015-16. Cannon affirmed this clarification. The motion passed unanimously.

B) Consideration of a motion regarding the length of the spring semester (Neshyba and Despres)

M/S/P to discuss the motion. Neshyba and Despres distributed a handout (attached as Appendix B).

M/S/P to amend the motion discussed in the February faculty meeting (Neshyba).

Amended motion: *The Faculty invites the Senate to craft proposals to shorten the number of teaching days in Spring Semester to 67 days.*

The faculty discussed the amendment to the motion. One faculty member raised a question about who controls the calendar. Bartanen clarified that the Curriculum Committee has purview over the academic calendar. The amendment passed by acclamation.

The faculty discussed the amended motion. Several members of the faculty identified alternate ways to make use of the days that would be removed from the spring semester. A member of the faculty thought that the identification of 67 days was too prescriptive and did not allow sufficient creativity to the Senate in considering alternatives.

M/S/P to amend the motion (Neshyba)

Amended motion: *The Faculty invites the Senate to craft proposals to shorten the number of **regular** teaching days in Spring Semester to 67-68 days*

The faculty discussed the amended motion. A member of the faculty called the question.

M/S/P: The amended motion passed.

VI. Academic Priorities

M/S/P to begin informal consideration of academic priorities.

Bartanen noted that previous conversations about academic priorities involved participation by 56 faculty members. Bartanen identified the four issue areas open for discussion in those conversations and at this faculty meeting: experiential learning, the PacRim program, teaching load/class size/expectations/release time, and governance. She invited faculty to discuss any of these issues.

The faculty discussed the third issue area. Bartanen noted the faculty's interest in questions regarding course load and asked how the faculty would like a discussion of those issues to work. The faculty considered the discussion of issues. The faculty discussed experiential learning. The faculty discussed governance.

M/S/P to end informal consideration.

VII. Adjournment

M/S/P to adjourn at 5:30.

Appendix A: Attendance

Attending

Richard Anderson-Connolly
Kris Bartanen
Bill Beardsley
Nancy Bristow
Alva Butcher
Douglas Cannon
Denise Despres
Sara Freeman
Megan Gessel
Chad Gunderson
Bill Haltom
John Hanson
Jennifer Hastings
Suzanne Holland
Martin Jackson
Alisa Kessel
Jung Kim
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Alan Krause
William Kupinse
Grace Livingston
Pierre Ly
Tiffany MacBain
Gary McCall
Steven Neshyba
Eric Orlin
Brad Richards
Leslie Saucedo
Adam Smith
Stuart Smithers
David Sousa
Amy Spivey
George Tomlin
Ariela Tubert
Keith Ward
Matt Warning
Stacy Weiss
Carolyn Weisz
Linda Williams
Paula Wilson

Guests

Ellen Peters
Brad Tomhave

Appendix B: Handout from Steven Neshyba and Denise Despres

Motion: The Faculty invites the Senate to craft proposals to shorten the number of teaching days in Spring Semester to 67 days.

Rationale:

At present, the number of teaching days in Puget Sound’s Spring Semester (72 days) exceeds that of Fall Semester (67 days). Here are some reasons Spring Semester should be reduced:

1. A shorter spring semester would expand the possibilities for extracurricular modes of teaching, e.g., permitting more ambitious student internships and study-abroad opportunities.
2. The imbalance in content that characterizes courses offered both semesters would be eliminated.
3. Comparable institutions have shorter semesters: Reed’s calendar has 65 teaching days each semester, for example.
4. At a recent meeting with faculty, trustee Rick Brooks acknowledged ongoing faculty commitment to excellence in teaching and scholarship as a key factor in recent gains in Puget Sound’s position with respect to next-step institutions. The time freed up by implementation of this proposal would facilitate a continuation of that trajectory, e.g., by facilitating development of new teaching modes and other pedagogical strategies, or the movement of research results closer to publication.

A little data:

School	Reed	Whitman	L & C	PS	Willamette	<i>Bryn Mawr</i>	<i>Oberlin</i>	<i>PS proposed</i>
Fall	65	67	68	67	70	66	66	67
Spring	65	69	68	72	70.5	69	65	67
Total	130	136	136	139	140.5	135	131	134

Appendix C: Faculty Senate Chair Report to the Faculty

Faculty Senate Chair Report to the Faculty

In advance of 04/14/2015 Faculty Meeting

By Ariela Tubert

- The elections for senators and faculty secretary have just closed. Amy Spivey has been elected secretary of the faculty for 2015-2016. We will be announcing the results for the senator positions once they can be confirmed and replacement needs are established, in the next week or so.
- As I mentioned in my last report, at the 2/23 meeting, the senate discussed steps that may be taken to increase support for faculty encountering students with behavioral and other problems in the classroom. The discussion was prompted by requests from various faculty members that the senate take up this issue of growing concern for the faculty. There will be a Wednesday at 4pm session focused on some of the issues that came up in the senate discussion. The session "Classroom Behavior: Bridging Faculty and Student Expectations" will be moderated by Tiffany MacBain (English) with panelists: Ben Lewin (SOAN), Molly Pugh (School of Education), and Ariela Tubert (Philosophy, Senate Chair) will take place on Wednesday, April 15th, at 4pm in the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching. I encourage everyone to attend the session and to send any suggestions for the discussion to me or one of the other participants in the session, or to Eric Orlin and Julie Christoph who are organizing the session.
- The senate has had an ongoing discussion at various meetings during the year of whether to charge the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) or perhaps an ad hoc committee with looking for ways to improve the course schedule. The ASC had worked on this issue in the past but was stalled last year by the lack of available data during the PeopleSoft transition. After looking over the available survey and other data, the senate approved a motion at its 3/9 meeting "to collect data relevant to concerns regarding the course schedule and forward such data to the ASC." The senate believes that it would be good to charge the ASC next academic year to look for ways to improve the current course schedule but in order to speed up the process and make it less onerous on the ASC, the senate will undertake some of the data collection with senators Derek Buescher, Andrew Gardner, and Jonathan Stockdale leading the effort.
- At the request of various faculty members, the senate discussed the issue of various possible biases in student evaluations of faculty teaching. The senators agreed that this was an important discussion to have and that it would be good to charge the Professional Standards Committee with looking into these issues next year.

- Members of the senate will be conducting a faculty governance orientation for first year faculty members. The idea grew out of discussions of the results of the faculty governance survey and of ways to improve faculty experience with governance. The main goal for the session is to provide an introduction to faculty governance, clarify the role of the standing committees, their relation to the senate and to the full faculty, etc. If anyone has any suggestions for things that they think should be discussed at the session, please email Leslie Saucedo (senate vice-chair) or myself. The session will take place on April 16th.
- The Professional Standards Committee recommended changes to the current practice for submitting minutes. The updated process, which will be communicated to committee chairs, is as follows: standing committees submit electronically signed minutes to Jimmy McMichael via email, and Jimmy prints the minutes and archives them. (Note: an electronic signature is, for example, the standard "Respectfully submitted, Jane Doe.") It was also requested that Jimmy begin to tag the minutes available online at <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/committees-minutes/> with the date of posting. This change will help faculty to negotiate the 10-day and 30-day rules of review stipulated by the Code in certain situations.
- The senate received a report from the ad hoc Working Group Reviewing the Connections Core, created by the senate in fall 2013 and composed of senator Jonathan Stockdale, Jill Nealey-Moore, and Hans Ostrom. The recommendations of the working group can be found in Appendix A below, the full report will be available with the minutes from the 4/9 senate meeting.
- On 4/9, the senate discussed the Curricular Impact Statement approved by the Curriculum Committee and provided some feedback back to the committee regarding the letters required from chairs/directors of affected programs. See Appendix B for the statement as approved by the Curriculum Committee.
- The Professional Standards Committee has also approved various revisions to the Interpretations of the Faculty Code. The revised interpretations are available in Appendix C.
- In addition to the above, ongoing discussions on the senate right now include: a) the possibility of creating advisory boards for Connections Core, Know Requirement, and First Year Seminars; b) a request from the Accessibility Working Group to provide for extra time for student evaluations. As always, the senate welcomes suggestions for issues that the faculty would like the senate to take up. Please email me or any member of the senate with suggestions.

Appendix A

Excerpt from the Report of the ad hoc Working Group of the Senate Reviewing the Connections Core (full report available with the minutes of the 4/9 senate meeting):

Recommendations

1. Related to challenge #1 above regarding teaching Connections, the working group recommends that more support be provided for those developing or seeking to enhance Connections courses. The working group strongly endorses the model for faculty collaboration across disciplines modeled by the “Enhancing Connections” workshop (perhaps supported by funding from Burlington Northern curriculum development grants), whereby a faculty developing a Connections course could be paired with another faculty in an overlapping area of expertise who could provide collaborative assessment, feedback, and support.
2. Related to challenge #2 above, bringing together students of varying academic backgrounds presents a fine line for professors to negotiate in their Connections courses, and some professors appear to do this particularly well. The working group recommends that in addition to posting this report on the Connections Core, some sample syllabi of successful Connections courses be posted as well, perhaps on a future Curriculum Committee webpage.
3. Related directly to the issue of enrollment limits set at 44 for those team-teaching in the Connections Core, the working group feels that a more ideal arrangement would be a 34 student limit - commensurate with the size of two first-year seminar classes combined. However, given current budgetary constraints, it appears unlikely that this change should be expected any time soon.

Appendix B

Curricular Impact Statement

Rationale

During academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval.” The Senate’s stated rationale for the charge was “to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.” In response, the Curriculum Committee requests that proposers of new majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study complete a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS). Proposals will be considered incomplete until the statement is submitted.

Purpose

Proposals for new majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study must include a CIS in order to:

1. demonstrate the limitations of the current curricular structure and explain how those limitations warrant a new course of study;
2. ensure and document that principal stakeholders are aware of the implications of the new course of study for existing programs; and,
3. explain which additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

A Curricular Impact Statement must include each of the following:

1. A statement of rationale that explains why students are unable to meet the learning objectives of the new course of study given the university's existing offerings of majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study.
2. A statement identifying:
 - a. which departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study; and,
 - b. how these departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study. This discussion might include, but is not limited to: (1) any courses that will be cross-listed; (2) any existing courses that will be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new program; and (3) any existing departments, programs, and schools that may see a significant increase or reduction in course enrollments due to the new course of study.
 - c. which departments, programs, or schools have been notified in writing of the proposal for the new course of study.
3. Letters from all directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools identified in part 2 of the CIS that state either:
 - a. the new course of study being proposed can be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school; or,
 - b. the new course of study being proposed cannot be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school, but the department, program, or school will be able to support the new course of study by making specifically

identified adjustments in course offerings or resources by the time that the new course of study is offered.

4. A statement identifying what additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

Motion approved by CC 4 March 2015
Motion drafted by Working Group 4 (Feb 2015)
[Beezer, Carlin, Ferrari, Johnson, & Rogers]
Based on Draft (Feb 2014) [Anderson-Connolly, Beardsley, & Johnson]

Appendix C

Recommended Revisions to Interpretations of the Faculty Code Professional Standards Committee 2014-15

Members: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

In the 2014-15 academic year, the Faculty Senate charged the Professional Standards Committee to “review all of the PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code to see if any have become obsolete by more recent interpretations and to ensure consistency of all interpretations with the current practice and policies on campus.” The PSC has completed the review and revised the interpretations as indicated below.

The PSC determines these revisions to be significant and so submits them in accordance with the instructions in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part G, Section 1: “If the Professional Standards Committee deems an interpretation to be of significant merit it shall issue a formal written interpretation which shall be delivered to the Faculty Senate for inclusion within the Senate minutes. Such interpretations shall also be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence.”

Not included below, but in need of revision to align with existing policies, is the Interpretation of Chapter VI (Grievances arising from allegations of sexual harassment). Dean of Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez will recommend changes to this Interpretation following the university’s Title IX review in the summer of 2015.

APPENDIX

Page 39, line 8: Because the Appendix contains current interpretations and interpretations that are no longer active, change “This Appendix contains current interpretations” to read “This appendix contains such interpretations.”

Page 39, lines 23-48: Given that technology has evolved to the point where it is easy to search PDFs, and given the potentially incomplete nature over time of the list of references to

“working days” in these lines of the Code, the PSC recommends that lines 23-48 be deleted from the Appendix.

Page 40, lines 8-14: Because these lines are outdated and do not align with the language of the “Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct” document, delete lines 8-14. Add to the end of this Interpretation (of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4) the line: “This policy aligns with the university’s conflict of interest provisions in the Code of Conduct as well as Section II, Part E (“Consensual Sexual Relationship”) of the Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct.”

Page 41, throughout entire Interpretation of Chapter I, Part C, Section 2, and Chapter I, Part D, Section 4: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” with “partner,” and replace “children” and “child” with “dependent children.”

Page 41, lines 42-49: Committee members expressed concern about ambiguity in the text regarding the timing of PSC reviews of departmental guidelines for the use of course assistants. Change the sentences beginning with “Thus” in line 42 to read, “Thus each department employing course assistants should submit to the Professional Standards Committee a document that explains the duties, responsibilities, and supervision of course assistants. The PSC will review departmental statements for agreement with the guidelines. Upon obtaining committee approval, the department may then employ course assistants in accordance with the departmental document and need not submit that document again for PSC review until the guidelines in the Code or the departmental document are revised.”

Page 42, line 9: To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, use the gender-neutral pronoun “their” instead of “his/her” in the phrase, “in their courses.”

Page 43, line 15: To correct a problem with sentence structure, the PSC recommends changing the first sentence of line 15 to read, “The evaluation process is clearly career-influencing.”

Page 43, lines 38-39: To correct a typographical error sending readers to an incorrect section of the Code, and to align with the recommended language for page 45, line 5 (below), the PSC recommends changing the lines to read: “If you have concerns regarding obligations under this policy, please refer to Chapter 1, Part D, Section 4 of the *Faculty Code* (‘Professional Ethics’) and/or speak with your head of department, school, or program or the Academic Vice President.” The font size and type should be the same as the surrounding document.

Page 45, line 5: “department head” becomes “head of department, school, or program.” Change sentence to read: “The faculty member must request that there be a delay in consideration for tenure or promotion by writing to the head of department, school, or program and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester before the scheduled evaluation.”

Page 46, Interpretation of Chapter III, section 4. To bring the language of the Code into compliance with Title IX, as recommended by Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Michael Benitez, replace “spouse” and “mate” with “partner.”

Page 47, lines 31-34: To correct outdated language (“photocopied”) and to affirm the writers’ ownership of their letters of evaluation, the PSC recommends that the lines read: “In the case of an open file, the faculty member being evaluated has access to letters in the evaluation file and may take notes while reviewing the file. If the faculty member desires copies of the letters, the faculty member must seek copies from the writers.”

Page 48, line 10: To clarify how outside letters should be solicited for faculty evaluations, add the following statement after the phrase “if they seem relevant”: “In consultation with the evaluatee, the head officer may also solicit appropriate letters from outside the department or university. When soliciting the letters the head officer will notify the letter writers of the status of the file as open or closed.”

Page 48, line 17: For consistency’s sake, change “confidential letters” to “a closed file.”

Page 48, line 18: For clarity’s sake, change “those individuals who submitted letters and a summary...” to “those individuals who submitted letters to the head officer and a summary....”

Page 48, line 19: To correct an error of reference, change “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (b)” to “Faculty Code: Chapter III, Section 4, b (2) (a) and Section 4, b (2) (e).”

Page 48, lines 29-30: Because the university affirms the validity of electronic signatures, change bracketed note to read: “As defined for purposes of interpretation, a letter of evaluation is a signed document.”

Appendix D: President's Report



President's Report to the Faculty

April 2015 Faculty Meeting

I regret that I will miss this meeting of the faculty as I will be traveling to San Francisco on business for the university and on to San Antonio for the annual leadership meetings of the Board of Directors for the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU). There we will be addressing and developing a course of action around the principal concerns regarding the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act—where current proposals being considered in committee and reflected in the House and Senate budgets are problematic, especially for federal financial aid. For a campus update, I offer the following report from the perspective of the president's office.

ENROLL: We received more than 5,800 applications for the 664 places in the Class of 2019, representing a 4% increase over last year's application total which was 22% more than the previous year. Unofficial reports indicate that many colleges saw application increases this year. As we work toward the results of the May 1 deposit deadline, we are encouraged that we have been welcoming more admitted-student visitors to campus than ever before. More than 575 students have already registered for our three Decision Puget Sound days, the last of which is April 17. We are grateful for the 100% participation of our academic departments and programs at the Academic Fair last Saturday and for your willingness to welcome larger numbers of admitted students to your classes on April 10 and 17. Being able to see and experience first-hand the breadth and depth of our curriculum and your high level of engagement with our students are critically important to prospective students as they consider their many college options. Thank you. We have received some very enthusiastic reports from visiting families already.

We are moving forward with implementing the recommendations of the Board of Trustees Enrollment Work Group that concluded its work in October. The recommendations included developing local, national, and international strategies to cultivate diversity in our student enrollment. With the Tacoma Public Schools Commitment and our Access Programs cohort initiative we have been able to admit and offer significant need-based financial aid to more Tacoma students than we have in years. We are now actively engaged in exploring national and international opportunities to enhance the representation on campus of students from diverse backgrounds. We are also working on the recommended changes to our application process for next year. Almost 40% of our applicants this year participated in answering two short-answer essay questions designed to obtain information regarding "non-cognitive" characteristics that can be predictive of

success in college, providing us with valuable data as we move forward with becoming test-optional for the next admission cycle.

ADVANCE: The news we announced in March when we surpassed our ambitious \$125-million goal for the One [of a Kind] Campaign for Puget Sound—more than three months prior to our deadline of June 30—has fueled our efforts and enthusiasm to continue to advance our development work and reach our objectives in endowment for financial aid and faculty chairs (and faculty support), to close the last gifts for the athletics and aquatics center, and to attain our annual giving goal. As of March 31, our overall total was \$125.6 million in documented gifts and pledges. The busy campaign travel schedule this spring is yielding some good results with several very promising conversations now taking place with donors for gifts we expect to close in April and May. Professors Neshyba and Kessel both offered compelling presentations to our parent and alumni groups in LA and San Francisco.

RECOGNIZE: Spring is the season for, among other things, our students receiving national recognition for their work. Puget Sound students have thus far been honored with two Fulbrights (one for research), a Watson Fellowship, an NCAA Post-graduate Fellowship, and a Critical Language Scholarship to join the earlier-announced Rhodes Scholarship. We also have heard many reports of students gaining admission to outstanding graduate programs around the country. Our Rhodes scholar Billy Rathje has been selected to speak at Convocation and Lee Pennebaker has earned the role of giving the student Commencement address. Professor Greta Austin will deliver the faculty Convocation address.

INNOVATE: Innovation has been a Puget Sound tradition and it remains our imperative. My meetings with foundations in New York City this week demonstrated clearly how central a priority in their planning and thinking “bold curricular innovation” is becoming. My meeting with the Andrew Mellon Foundation is a good case in point. Mellon has provided nearly \$3 million in support of Puget Sound during this campaign period alone—for junior faculty sabbaticals and for curricular innovation in humanities and honors, environmental policy and decision-making, and Latino/a studies among others. The foundation is currently considering our grant application to fund the first stages of an experiential learning initiative, aimed at realizing our vision to provide each undergraduate with a meaningful set of experiential learning opportunities that would be intentionally and seamlessly interwoven with students’ curricular work and better prepare them for life after college. Based upon Mellon’s new strategic plan that “recalibrates” their approach to philanthropy (and, consistent with the grants they have been making recently), the foundation is clearly focused on a “bold and creative approach” to fund curricular innovations that are focused on genuine “change,” that “reconceive of faculty work,” and that will also lead to making liberal arts colleges more affordable and accessible to diverse populations by cost reduction.

The Teagle Foundation has a similar line of direction for new proposals—“to support institutions in pursuing an ambitious approach to curricular change” that will “accomplish their work through face-to-face meetings, virtual platforms...and/or small interest groups who communicate around shared practice and learning.” Both are looking to such bold initiatives that are “faculty led and

faculty owned,” and have indicated they will no longer fund worthy but traditional proposals that do not also reduce costs. A similar message of the need to combine innovation with cost reductions was received from Helena Kolenda at the Henry Luce Foundation, which has this past month approved a terrific \$400,000 grant to Puget Sound for field stations in SE Asia, and a total of \$1.5M in faculty and program support for Asian studies and environmental policy and decision making in recent years.

What do I take from this? At Mellon, we work with Gene Tobin as the senior officer for higher education initiatives at the foundation. Gene spent 23 years at Hamilton College as a faculty member in American history, department chair, dean of faculty, and as the eighteenth president of Hamilton. Judith Shapiro is now the president and driving force of the Teagle Foundation. She is an anthropologist who taught at Chicago and then at Bryn Mawr College where she became chair of the department, dean of the undergraduate college, and then served as the chief academic officer until she assumed the Barnard College presidency in 1994 and served until 2008. Both are highly accomplished and respected faculty members and administrators, as well as being ardent supporters and defenders of liberal education at the finest liberal arts colleges. I respect them both, and Mellon in particular has been so important to us in supporting all of our major initiatives in curriculum development in recent years.

I am impressed by how relevant these foundations’ new directions and priorities are and will be to us: to the recent conversations Kris has convened on thinking through—in creative ways—our own academic priorities together and how we think about (and do) faculty work; to other recent conversations we have been conducting about “the next big thing” and forging a bold curricular and co-curricular strategic vision for the future; to our promising initial thinking in the experiential learning area; to our desire to be more accessible and affordable to qualified students now underrepresented on our campus; and to the economic and demographic shifts through which we are living. Our challenges to achieve these innovations as we reduce costs and student debt will be significant, and will call upon us to be particularly resourceful in our thinking. But our position from which to address these questions is now very strong relative to others. Unlike many institutions, we have experience in making big changes and rethinking teaching and learning in successful ways. That experience will serve us well as we develop a bold vision. We must, and I am confident that we will.



Ronald R. Thomas
President

Appendix E: Academic Vice President's Report

April 13, 2015

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Dean's Report to the Faculty Meeting

Reminders

- If you supervise a staff member: Performance Reviews due to HR 4/15/15.
Goal = 100% of staff members receive a performance review this year.
- Please complete the 2015-2016 service preference form (coming your way soon).
- Many courses currently in the curriculum are candidates to gain KNOW designation; please submit those existing, as well as new, course proposals in early Fall 2015.
- Academic Priorities: Notes from the three conversations are posted on the Faculty Conversation Soundnet site.

Kudos

- Nakisha Renee Jones '16 elected ASUPS President
- Max Mirande '15 awarded an NCAA Post-graduate Scholarship
- Greta Austin will be faculty speaker for 2015 Academic Convocation

Thanks

- Doug Sackman, professor of history, for leadership of the Brown and Haley Lectures Committee and hosting the outstanding visit of Prof. William Cronon
- Nancy Bristow, professor of history, for outstanding service as Faculty Athletic Representative *since 1999!!*
- To Fred Hamel, professor of education, for willingness to taken on the FAR role, effective 2015-2016
- To all who are hosting class visits, participating in *Decision Puget Sound* days, and other activities support to a strong yield for the incoming first-year class for Fall 2015
- To all who are and will be supporting students in projects, presentations, and events through the end of the semester

Opportunities

April 28, 7:00 p.m., Fieldhouse: All Sports Celebration. You are welcome to attend this annual recognition of all Logger varsity athletes.

May 15, 7:00-8:30 a.m., Upper Marshall: Faculty breakfast with trustees (rsvp to Liz Collins)

Faculty Compensation Task Force: The task force meeting on April 10 continued work on a faculty compensation philosophy; a valid, realistic, and reliable peer group for benchmarking of Puget Sound faculty salaries; and modeling for long-term sustainability of the faculty salary scale. The task force convenes again on May 1.