

Minutes of the February 9, 2016, faculty meeting  
Submitted by Amy Spivey (2015-2016 Faculty Secretary)

I. Call to order

President Thomas called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. in McIntyre 103.

II. Approval of the minutes of Nov. 3, 2015

M/S/P approval of the minutes of November 3, 2015, with no corrections or comments.

III. Announcements

1. Keith Ward – Dwayne Hulbert is retiring and will give a final performance on April 15 at 7:30 p.m. in Schneebeck Concert Hall with Maria Sampen and Alistair MacRae. Come!
2. Bill Kupinse – Moved that the resolution opposing the methanol refinery be moved up to the first order of regular business. The motion was seconded, and the motion passed unanimously without discussion.

Resolution opposing methanol refinery

Kupinse read the language of the proposed resolution and moved that the faculty pass the resolution. (See Appendix E for the resolution and Appendix F for additional background material that was distributed ahead of the meeting.) The motion was seconded.

Kupinse gave background information regarding the Northwest Innovation Works proposed plant to convert natural gas to liquefied methanol for export to China. It will use a lot of water and electricity. He pointed to issues of environmental classism and racism because of the proximity of the proposed plant to the ICE detention facility, Puyallup Tribal land, East Tacoma, etc.

Amy Spivey – Where are we in the process of approval of the plant?

Kupinse – There are a number of opportunities for public comment right now. There is a permitting process with a number of different stages, and there are a number of hurdles for the refinery to overcome. There are a number of other times when the public will be able to comment, but now is an important time. He explained that they wanted to propose this faculty resolution because of the university's language about community engagement and involvement. We are committed to democracy and to the well-being of our community.

The motion came to a vote. The motion passed with two opposed.

The meeting returned to additional announcements.

3. Renee Houston announced the new experiential learning summer immersion internship program for 14 students. There is a tight timeline for application. The students have to meet with Career and Employment Services before applying. They have pre-vetted organizations, and the students will get a fellowship award to do this. There will be a class session each week. Faculty members should look for flyers in your boxes.

4. Jennifer Hastings – The physical therapy clinic is open and is seeking people with musculoskeletal aches and pains.

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

There were no questions. (The reports are found in Appendices B, C, and D of these minutes.)

#### V. Old business: Resolution for a Fair Pay Ratio (Rich Anderson-Connolly)

Hard copies of the motion were distributed. (It was discussed at previous meetings and is shown in Appendix G.)

Rich Anderson-Connolly – Three statements are correct: 1) Inequality is increasing in the U.S. 2) Inequality is the cause of problems in society. 3) There is something we can do here and now. Major concerns expressed to date: 1) 10:1 limit (~\$40,000 annual salary at the bottom and ~\$400,000/year at the top). Rich's response – Applicants for the job of Puget Sound president who needs more money than that may not be a good fit for our values as faculty and for the students' values. Second, the possibility of losing a good candidate must be weighed against the certainty that inequality is harmful.

2) Why 10:1? Why this ratio? Rich's response – I don't have a good answer. However, fundamentally there is no empirical way to show what is the right ratio. We have to rely on our moral intuition.

Another parallel where we use our moral intuition has to do with the \$15/hour minimum wage fight right now (occurring locally in Tacoma). So, why did they pick \$15? It's a similar argument. We don't know that \$15/hour is the right number, but it would be silly for people who believe in equality to fight over whether it should be \$14.47 or \$15.05 or so on. There is no right number, but fighting over the right number will just derail the main point.

Finally, the threshold to put you in "top 1%" of income in Washington is \$380,000/year now, as of a recent study. So, our 10:1 would put the top salary in the top 1% of the state. So, that seems pretty good for leading a non-profit institution.

#### Discussion –

Keith Ward – What is the current lowest pay for a full-time employee at the university?

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I think it's about \$25,000, so with benefits it would be in the low \$30,000s.

Keith Ward – So your proposal is for total compensation, including salary and benefits?

Anderson-Connolly – Yes.

Kris Bartanen – Benefits for faculty and staff cost approximately 40% of salary.

Alisa Kessel – Why propose a fixed compensation ratio, rather than, say, go for a \$15/hour minimum wage on campus? The second question is about the impact on staff. Let's say we pass this and the board of trustees agrees. Are we putting staff jobs at risk? I don't know if staff has talked about this in Staff Senate. If we move forward, we might be operating against what we actually believe. (She mentioned that it might force the university to outsource jobs on campus, such as in the bookstore or dining services.)

Rich Anderson-Connolly – This resolution is compatible with asking for a minimum wage of \$15/hour, but it is different like poverty is different from inequality. So, inequality has to do with a ratio.

Alisa Kessel – So, why not ask for \$15/hour instead?

Rich – So, even if we move the bottom up, I think that keeping the top high is a problem. It's still unequal. The ratio of higher income to lower income still leads to a whole host of problems. There was some further discussion along these lines.

Gwynne Brown – I can't see the board doing anything even if we pass this. I wonder if it's going to be an effective gesture. We don't know how this will be enacted in reality.

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I don't know if this would result in change or not. If it's purely symbolic, great. If the board follows it, great. If they disregard us, that's interesting. At least we have made a statement.

Keith Ward – I find it problematic, particularly in combining salary and benefits. Benefits packages are different for employees across the university. So, it gets a lot more complicated.

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I don't think including compensation or just base pay makes a difference, since it's just multiplying it by a factor of 1.33 or 1.4. It wouldn't matter. The motion is worded as "total ... compensation".

Adam Smith – This math is fuzzy. I have doubts that my benefits are the same percentage of my salary as they are for others. Do we have the specific numbers?

Rich – I have a number of 1/3 at the bottom, but we don't know that it's the same at the top. So, it might be different at the top.

There was some more discussion about the issue related to the points brought up above.

Amy Spivey – Move to call the question. The motion was seconded.

There was a vote to call the question, and the motion failed.

Nancy Bristow – I agree with income equality, especially about the folks at the lower end of the scale. What is your sense that this ratio would lift the pay for the folks at the bottom? Is there something in the ratio that would lift the folks at the bottom, like a request for an increase in the minimum wage?

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I hear you saying that poverty is more problematic for you than inequality. How does it help the bottom? It creates an incentive for those at the top to pull the bottom folks up so that they can go higher, if they want to. Part of the problem is that the top incomes have increased, and lowest ones have stagnated.

Suzanne Holland – I'm uneasy about the fact that this resolution is the faculty saying what we want with respect to the lowest-paid person at the university, which is none of us. It feels paternalistic. Have we asked the staff about this?

Rich Anderson-Connolly – People at the low end need more income. So, we can assume that they would want this.

Suzanne Holland – As a matter of justice, Alisa's point about outsourcing gets at something important.

Rich Anderson-Connolly – We can resist the outsourcing if it happens. There is no end to resisting injustice.

Jason Struna spoke in favor of the motion, saying that he didn't think it would be respected by the trustees. It's a symbolic gesture, he said, and didn't think it threaten the process of hiring a new president.

Nancy Bristow- The paternalism doesn't bother me because it is hard for people at the bottom to advocate for their own benefit. History, in general, suggests that it is difficult for people to do that.

Suzanne Holland – I would still like to see the Staff Senate take this up.

Ariela Tubert recalled that the Staff Senate was going to discuss the resolution.

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I have been talking with them, but nothing has come of it yet. It has not come to a vote in Staff Senate, if they have discussed it.

Nakisha-Renee Jones – I was at the Staff Senate meeting today. We were talking about something else, but the main thing they were concerned with is job security. So, I wouldn't be worried about getting approval as long as there is conversation between staff and faculty.

Jonathan Stockdale- I am the Faculty Senate liaison to the Staff Senate. They asked about the motion, and I filled them in about the faculty discussion and what the motion was. I mentioned that some faculty didn't want to vote on it without the staff.

Vote (paper ballot) – Motion passed with 29 Yeses, 12 Nos, and 1 blank piece of paper.

#### VI. Presentation from Faculty Senate regarding student divestment movement (Emily Peine)

Emily Peine spoke representing the Faculty Senate to let everyone know about their actions related to the student divestment campaign. The Senate endorsed the letter from the student-led coalition and wrote their own statement in support of the students' letter. She spoke on behalf of the Senate to let everyone know what the Senate did and to give the faculty the chance to sign on. She left it up to the faculty about whether we wanted to make a motion. (Materials relevant to this presentation are found in Appendix H and Appendix I.)

Alisa Kessel – What impact will this have?

Some students from the ECO club were present, and they answered Kessel's question. One mentioned that they were given some numbers yesterday, but they were not exactly what they had asked of the board of trustees. He said that it was difficult to compare the information they received to what they are asking for, and that they had requested updated numbers. Another student clarified that they had received numbers that didn't reflect what actual divestment would look like. The students implied that it was difficult to get help with the numbers they were after.

Kris Bartanen – At the October board meeting, the investment subcommittee was provided with estimates of the type that were just mentioned. They were compiled by staff here and by the investment firm. She disagreed with the assessment that no one has offered to help.

A first estimate is that the one-time loss of pulling funds from comingled investments is between \$3.2 million and \$6.4 million. The other type of cost is potential loss to the endowment of \$29-82 million by 2025, or a \$2.5-8 million loss to the annual operating budget. (She admitted that she is not an investment advisor, but offered the numbers for consideration.)

Peter Sullivan – The reduced rate of return from getting out of petrochemicals should be good. Others made additional comments.

President Thomas – These comingled investments sometimes include clean energies as well as carbon-based fuels, so it makes it complicated.

Alisa Kessel – How has the investment subcommittee responded?

President Thomas – The investment subcommittee has been thinking about it for about 18-24 months. They will look at it at the next board meeting, as well. They are weighing the ethical

and financial and fiduciary responsibilities. They are charged with maximizing the returns on investments of the university.

Emily Peine – One of the main points is that the long-term health of the hydrocarbon industry should be in question. We also are not experts in investing and specific investments, but we wanted to make an ethical statement about this. It is important because the trustees are meeting in two weeks, so if we make a decision now that might be considered, too.

Doug Cannon – I imagine that if this is like a mutual fund or CREF, then withdrawal of funds might have a significant loss associated with it. However, the funds sometimes do react, as they did with tobacco investing.

Doug Cannon moved that the faculty endorse the student divestment movement. The first line of the statement will read “We the faculty of the university endorse the student movement...” (See Appendix H for the statement.) The motion was seconded.

John Hanson – The Chemistry Department drafted their own statement, which is in the packet that was sent out (see Appendix I). We were concerned about students being hurt by increased tuition due to financial losses. We, as scientists, know that fossil fuel consumption is a problem. It’s our professional expertise. So, there is something that the university should be doing about fossil fuel consumption. We support the spirit of it, and divestment might not be the way to go, but we call for other proposals for ways to decrease our carbon footprint. He challenged the board to be creative with other solutions, and said that the chemistry department supported the students’ sentiment.

President Thomas – The things you listed are within management’s responsibilities, and not under the board of trustees’ oversight directly.

Peter Wimberger – A long time ago, I was involved in a movement to divest from investments in South Africa. People predicted large monetary losses, but the resulting losses were not so large. My sense is that these estimates are conservative.

Suzanne Holland moved to call the question. The motion was seconded.

Vote – Motion to call the question passed.

Vote on the motion – The motion passed, with two abstentions.

#### VIII. Curriculum Committee motion regarding SSI and KNOW courses

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos passed around the motion from the Curriculum Committee (see Appendix J of these minutes).

Motion 1 from the Curriculum Committee is that SSI (first-year Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry) courses can also fulfill the KNOW (Knowledge, Identity, and Power) overlay graduation requirement.

Jonathan Stockdale – Does the committee have a strong opinion?

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos – No. My sense of the KNOW proposal is that people wanted it to be a true overlay, and any course could count.

Peter Sullivan – Could this be unfair to students because some of them will be assigned an SSI that also satisfies KNOW and some will not?

Rich Anderson-Connolly – The Curriculum Committee didn't want to make policy. We wanted to implement whatever the faculty decides.

Keith Ward spoke in favor of the motion, indicating that the motion addresses the spirit of the KNOW proposal and commenting that students could take more than one KNOW course.

Jennifer Hastings – A lot of learning needs to be done in the SSI seminars. There is some struggle to have the outcome desired. I would recommend against overlapping the two.

Lisa Ferrari – The Curriculum Committee was concerned exactly about that. The disciplinary content is secondary in the SSIs to other learning, so it may be that the part of the course that speaks to KNOW is actually not addressed in the kind of depth that the KNOW folks would want.

Nancy Bristow – My course is the one that went to the Curriculum Committee in the fall, assuming that an SSI could count for KNOW. My course will inevitably do both. It's a very natural combination. I cannot teach the course without attending to the kinds of things that the KNOW requirement asks.

Jonathan Stockdale spoke in favor of the motion, saying that when he thinks of the KNOW requirement, he thinks of it as expressing the desire that all of our students are educated related to issues of power and identity. If a freshman wanders into a course where they are exposed to those issues, then they should get credit for that. Also, just for the health of the curriculum, although the issues of KNOW are complex, it's not healthy for us to save them for junior or senior year, so it's better if students see them earlier.

Tiffany MacBain spoke against the motion, saying that when she teaches SSI2 she finds that students have had an uneven experience in SSI1. She believes that a lot of faculty are making the SSI1 courses content-heavy.

Adam Smith – This seems like the motion sets up a hierarchy of KNOW classes. We want to avoid that.

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos – I think that would apply to a social science course that also counted for a KNOW. I don't think we will have a flood of SSIs that will also count for KNOWs if we pass this.

Suzanne Holland – Move to call the question. Passed.

Vote – Motion 1 passed.

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos – Moved Motion 2 from the Curriculum Committee (see Appendix J).

Doug Cannon – Moved to adjourn. Motion failed.

Motion to call the question passes.

Vote on Motion 2 by the Curriculum Committee. The motion passed.

IX. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. when time ran out.

## Appendix A – Attendance record

### Attending

Rich Anderson-Connolly  
Kris Bartanen  
Bill Breitenbach  
Nancy Bristow  
Gwynne Brown  
Doug Cannon  
Julie Christoph  
Lisa Ferrari  
Amy Fisher  
Lea Fortmann  
Sara Freeman  
Bill Haltom  
John Hanson  
Jennifer Hastings  
Suzanne Holland  
Renee Houston  
Martin Jackson  
Diane Kelley  
Alisa Kessel  
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos  
Kriszta Kotsis  
Laura Krughoff  
Bill Kupinse  
Grace Livingston  
Pierre Ly  
Tiffany MacBain  
Eric Orlin  
Emelie Peine  
Elise Richman  
Steve Rodgers  
Leslie Saucedo  
Adam Smith  
Amy Spivey  
Jonathan Stockdale  
Jason Struna  
Peter Sullivan  
Ron Thomas  
George Tomlin  
Alison Tracy Hale  
Ariela Tubert  
Jennifer Utrata  
Keith Ward  
Peter Wimberger

### Guests

Nakisha Renee Jones  
Ellen Peters  
Brad Tomhave  
Representatives from the student ECO Club

## Appendix B – Report from President Ron Thomas



### President's Report to the Faculty

February 2016

We are at an important and exciting moment for the university. As the presidential search approaches completion and the board of trustees makes its determination about the university's fourteenth president, we prepare for a successful transition for the president-elect. This is a ritual we rarely see at Puget Sound, and when we do, it marks a pivotal point in our development. Let me express my appreciation to faculty colleagues who participated on the search committee so effectively, and to the faculty members who met with the finalist candidates and represented our faculty so well. I know you all share with me a commitment to keeping our momentum going under new leadership while we look forward to developing a bold plan with that new leadership to address new challenges we now face in the shifting higher education landscape. Challenging and exciting days are ahead for Puget Sound, to be sure, and we enter them in a strong position.

Meanwhile, the work on campus goes on. Let me offer a few updates in some key areas:

Recruitment of the Class of 2020: As of February 1, 2016, we have received 6,221 applications for first-year admission compared to 5,693 at the same time last year representing a 9% increase. We will continue to receive applications over the next few weeks so this data will change, but some of the early highlights are:

- We have so far enrolled 83 students through our Early Decision I program, which is 13 students more than last year at this time, largely due to enrolling our first Posse cohort of 10 students from the Bay Area. Admission decisions for our second Early Decision program will be released on February 5 and we expect the number of enrolling students to be on par with last year.
- In our first year with a test-optional admission policy, 14% of the applicants elected that option and have provided short essay questions as an alternative to standardized test scores.
- Students of color and under-represented minoritized applicants are up 16% and 20%, respectively, and first generation college applicants have increased by 7%.
- In our second year of the Tacoma Public Schools Commitment, applications from the school district are up 24% over last year.
- The top ten states of applicants in order are California, Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Hawaii, Minnesota, Illinois, Texas, Arizona, and Idaho.



- In December, I joined Jenny Rickard, Michael Benitez, and trustee Gwen Lillis (who chaired the Enrollment Work Group) in San Francisco to select our first Posse class from 21 finalists (who had been chosen from 250 nominees in the Bay Area and 50 semifinalists). We all agreed that the finalists were an outstanding group and our selected “Posse 1” class is a truly impressive group of young people who will contribute significantly to our campus.

We will be sending early notifications of admission and merit awards to our top candidates the week of February 9. Official notifications, including need-based financial aid awards, will be released on March 10. All admitted applicants will be invited to our Decision Puget Sound programs on April 2, 8, and 15. We once again plan to provide travel vouchers to selected students who have not yet visited campus.

Fundraising: We are seeing a significant increase in the annual fund, the growth of which is a stated priority coming out of the campaign to support annual operations. So far we have recorded a 9.5% increase in dollars contributed and a similar increase in the number of donors (on a year-to-year basis, as of December 31, 2015). We also anticipated a slow-down in larger capital gifts in the wake of the strong finish in capital giving at the end of the campaign, which prediction has proven to be more true than we had expected. A number of our donors who were ready to make commitments are now indicating that they need more time, a pattern likely related to the market turbulence and economic uncertainty recent months have brought. We still have ambitious capital giving objectives, especially in gifts to endowment for financial aid, over the next five-year period as we look toward the next capital campaign; and we are pursuing them aggressively.

Travel: Another key feature of our plans for the next five-year post-campaign period is the enhancement and growth of our constituent relations program and the cultivation of key relationships with donors and volunteers as we launch the university’s “next chapter.” I am now engaged in extensive travel to all our regional clubs during this year to that end, expressing our gratitude to donors and volunteers for their role in the success of the campaign and looking ahead at what’s next for Puget Sound. At the end of 2015 we visited our Washington, DC club and have subsequently held events in January for our Tacoma, Los Angeles, and San Francisco clubs, with the San Francisco event drawing about 150 attendees. I am in New York City as I write this report for a reception for the New York area club, following meetings for the NAICU board of directors in DC. This meeting featured visits to the Hill to advocate for higher education and financial aid policy with our congressional delegation (completing visits with four representatives and our two senators, as well as visits with five recent Logger alumni serving on the staffs of the delegation). Travel to Denver, Minneapolis, Chicago, Boise, Portland, and Honolulu is ahead. My gratitude to and admiration for faculty (including Monica DeHart and Pierre Ly) who have made (and are making) impressive contributions to these visits, as have some of our current students from the local areas of each club.

Campus: Following the events of the fall, we have met with members of the Advocates for Institutional Change (AIC) several times—once with the full cabinet and AIC leadership, and several times in smaller groups with individual members of cabinet on focused topics. We have organized the areas of concern into five groups (enrollment, academic/curricular, campus life, fundraising, and physical space) and have had constructive conversations in each area that we believe will result in positive plans and action steps for making our campus environment more inclusive and just. Simultaneously, the Diversity Advisory Committee’s work with our Dean of Diversity and Inclusion will roll out a new, revised Diversity Strategic Plan on which they have been working for the past year or so, a plan that naturally has some overlap with the interests of the AIC.

In addition, the board of trustees, which has over the past two years been examining the intersection of its fiduciary responsibilities with environmental, social and governance factors as they relate to achieving endowment investment objectives, conducted a workshop for the full board on the subject in October of 2015 and will continue its work in this area with a session in the February meeting that includes an opportunity for the ECO student group to present its views on fossil fuel divestment.

Finally, we have been pleased to recently announce to campus the Pierce Lecturers in Public Policy and the Arts for this spring: former attorney general Eric Holder on March 3, and celebrated Man-Booker Award winning novelist Marlon James (now on the faculty at Macalester College) on March 29.

Campus development: the new two-story fitness center portion of the Athletics and Aquatics Center is now complete and will be occupied this month as we renovate the existing fitness space and then integrate the two in the months ahead. The structure for the aquatics center is nearly complete with brick now being laid on the exterior skin. The pool is in! We expect to complete the project, now on schedule and within budget, by the end of May.

I am grateful for the great ongoing faculty work in many areas on campus, including the experiential learning initiative under Renee Houston's strong leadership, developments in Race and Pedagogy and the Freedom Education Project, and some creative thinking and work in a start-up "maker space" located in the library. These areas of experimentation and civic and project-based learning offer some promising potential gateways into the future of liberal education in which I anticipate Puget Sound will take a leadership role in the years ahead.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Dm.", is located below the text "Respectfully,".

## Appendix C – Report from Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen



February 4, 2016

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Report for the February 9 Faculty Meeting

*Because I have also been working on my update for the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board (also due February 4), I have decided to serve both purposes with close to the same document. One additional reminder: On January 19, you received an invitation to the “LIBQual” survey, which allows your input on library services; student and staff response rates have been pretty good, but faculty response rates could be better in order to have meaningful results. If you cannot find your email message with the link to the survey, drop a line to [libqual@pugetsound.edu](mailto:libqual@pugetsound.edu) to gain access. The survey is open through February 9.*

**Faculty Compensation Task Force:** The FCTF submitted its report to President Thomas on January 15, inclusive of recommendations for (1) a faculty compensation philosophy, (2) a 50-college peer group for benchmarking of Puget Sound faculty salaries, (3) a goal to attain and sustain the geographically-adjusted median of the peer group, (4) an analytical model, and (5) a clear and transparent communication plan.

Reflecting eighteen months to two years of work for various participants, it is an important mark of progress for the faculty. Pending review and input by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, the Puget Sound faculty will for the first time have a faculty compensation philosophy and documented practices for its Faculty Salary Committee and those with whom it collaborates. The compensation comparison group and analytical model will help the Faculty Salary Committee, the chief academic and chief financial officers, and the Budget Task Force to assess and project the progress and sustainability of one of the most significant components of the university budget.

Faculty members have gained in their understandings of university finance, compensation issues, and trade-offs; that said, there will be continuing conversations on some topics. I believe that the task force has outlined important processes by which those conversations can occur as policies, practices, comparison group, and goal are reviewed in years to come. Members of the FCTF have given significantly of their time, worked very hard, and have my sincere appreciation.

**Updated Faculty Medical, Personal, and Parental Leaves Policy:** In Spring 2015, an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate proposed changes to the Faculty Medical, Family Leave and Disabilities Policies. Sources of concern with existing policy include: (1) current provisions regarding family medical leave have not been in compliance with the Washington Family Care Act and the Washington Family Leave Act, (2) perceptions that the current policy is discouraging and unclear, (3) desire to remove the one-year of service requirement for eligibility,

and (4) hope for paid parental leave. Following meetings to discuss, review by Professional Standards Committee, consultation with legal counsel, and review by Human Resources colleagues, the policy revisions that do not entail financial expansion of benefits (other than those required by law) are ready for implementation. In addition, the revisions bring the policy into alignment with the new Tacoma Paid Leave Ordinance that took effect February 1, 2016. Policy changes that entail expansion of benefits (removal of the one-year of service eligibility provision and implementation of paid parental leave) will need to be addressed in the next Benefits Task Force, anticipated for 2017.

*[Pending ASAC concurrence, I'll send you a link to new policy information by March 1. KB]*

Things that remain the same: (1) eligibility for full-time faculty members begins after one year of service, (2) six weeks of paid personal medical leave, (3) up to one semester of unpaid parental leave. Things that change: (1) paid personal medical leave can also be used for family medical leave; (2) leave can be taken within one year of medical event, removing current disparity based on whether babies are born (or other personal medical events occur) during break periods or during a semester; (3) the faculty member is release from departmental and university service responsibilities as well as student advising during the year of an approved leave, with provision that the person can opt out of one or both of these releases; (4) a one-year delay in evaluation schedule, with provision that the person can opt out of the delay; and (5) alignment of current practice regarding absences of short duration with the new Tacoma Paid Leave Ordinance.

**Faculty Searches:** In accord with the Faculty Special Opportunity Hire Policy, approved in 2014-2015, and upon recommendation of the African American Studies Program joined by the Communication Studies Department, English Department, and the Gender and Queer Studies Program, Assistant Professor **Renee Simms** has been hired to the tenure-line faculty.

In accord with the Faculty Shared Appointments Policy and upon recommendation of the Philosophy Department, Assistant Professor **Shen-yi (Sam) Liao** – who was appointed into a shared tenure-line position with Sara Protasi for 2015-2016 – has been hired into a full-time, tenure-line appointment effective 2016-2017. Dr. Protasi's position concurrently will move to full-time, tenure-line.

The Psychology Department has completed a tenure-line search and will welcome Assistant Professor **Melvin Rouse** to the faculty next fall. Tenure-line searches are underway in Economics, Exercise Science, and Mathematics so there may be more news by the time we meet. These searches replace retirements of Cathy Hale, Psychology (Spring 2015); Bruce Mann, Economics (Spring 2016); Heidi Orloff, Exercise Science (December 2015); and Bryan Smith, Mathematics (Spring 2014). Forthcoming or recent retirements: Douglas Cannon, Philosophy (Spring 2016); Duane Hulbert, Music (Spring 2016), Betsy Kirkpatrick, Biology (career change, retroactive to Spring 2015); Don Share, Politics and Government (December 2016); and John Woodward, Education (December 2016).

**Curriculum:** Faculty members engage in ongoing development, review, and re-assessment of the curriculum. A brief sampling of new developments include: (1) approval of transition of the Global Development Studies interdisciplinary emphasis to a minor, which will strengthen the coherence of the GDS coursework, establish a capstone course, and make the program more visible to students; (2) the addition of six new courses for the Knowledge, Identity, and Power graduation requirement; (3) the addition of five new Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry; and (4) developments that align with significant grant- or endowment-funded initiatives.

History professors John Lear and Douglas Sackman will conclude their three-year program as James Dolliver/NEH Distinguished Teaching Professors with a faculty travel seminar “on the road” May 17-22, 2016. Eight colleagues, including Mellon Humanities post-doctoral fellow Andrew Gomez, will spend full days in El Paso/Ciudad Juarez, Bisbee/Nogales/Tucson, and Imperial Valley/SanYsidro/Tijuana to meet with experts in inter-American and borderland studies, community and arts leaders, border patrol officials and social agencies; tour neighborhoods and museums; and engage personal and group reflection during their 834 mile journey together. This work will inform teaching of History 383 **Borderlands: La Frontera: The U.S. Mexico Border** as well as curriculum across multiple departments and programs.

Several faculty members have developed new curriculum that expands experiential learning opportunities for students. A few examples include: Professor Robin Jacobsen has added new Politics and Government courses – *Washington State Legislative Process*, *Comparative State Politics* – to support a **semester internship and study program in Olympia**; Professor Linda Williams is launching a new Art and Art History course – *Museums: Curating in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* – as a potential foundation for an emphasis or minor in **Museum Studies**; Professor Lynda Williams has added *Portfolio Management*, a new Business and Leadership pre-requisite for the **student investment club members who will manage a new gift to the university endowment**; Mellon post-doctoral fellow Nese Devenot has received approval for *Digital Investigations into Literary Naturalism*, one of several exciting developments under the “**Humanities and Culture in the Digital Age**” grant project; and, in preparation for the Luce Foundation supported **field school in Thailand**, led by Professor Nick Kontogeogopoulos in May 2016, students this year have had opportunity to study introductory Thai language for two semesters.

**Advocates for Institutional Change:** Dean Michael Benitez and I have met twice with student leaders who have interest in academic components of the call to action articulated in November 2015 by the AIC. The actions for which students hope include: (1) increasing hiring of faculty members from historically underrepresented populations, and direct student involvement in those hiring processes; (2) new majors in African American Studies, Gender and Queer Studies, and Latina/o Studies – all of which are currently minor programs, with a proposal under consideration by the Curriculum Committee for a major in African American Studies; and (3) baccalaureate degree credit for courses completed by women at the Washington Correctional Center for Women.

**Northwest Five Colleges Consortium:** Puget Sound, Lewis and Clark, Reed, Whitman, and Willamette are completing year four of a very successful Mellon Foundation-funded initiative to develop the NW5C consortium, focused on faculty development. To-date, 497 (unduplicated headcount) faculty and staff members have participated in NW5C-funded activities, including at least 88 from Puget Sound. Activities have included 4 annual conferences and 25 communities of practice, collaborative projects, and workshops. Work is underway to complete a proposal to Mellon for the next four years of funding, with an over-arching focus on inclusive pedagogy. Puget Sound will host the third Faculty of Color Workshop in June 2016. Puget Sound faculty members have also been instrumental in establishing a NW5C database to support networking across the campuses. Learn more at [www.NW5C.org](http://www.NW5C.org).

Annual Conferences:

“Collaborative Inquiry in Liberal Arts Education” (2012)

“The Global Campus” (2013)

“Cross-Consortium Enrichment of Faculty as Teacher-Scholars” (2014)

“Inclusive Pedagogy” (2015)

Communities of Practice, Collaborative Inquiry Projects, and Workshops:

Bioinformatics and Genomics

Data Management and Curation

Digital Humanities Summer Institutes

Experiential Learning, Assessing Experiential Learning

Environmental Science

Faculty of Color Workshops

Food Systems Northwest

Gender Studies Workshops

Imagining the Global: Platform for Hybrid Scholarship

Improving Collaboration through Communication and Technology

Integrating Middle East and Arabic Studies

729 Miles of Technology (our geographic challenge across campuses)

LALISA: Hispanic, Latina/o, Latin American Studies Regional Association

Negotiating the Global South

Neuroscience and Behavior

Parallel Teaching

Philosophy in an Inclusive Key

Peer Tutor Colloquium

Rhetoric, Race and Media Undergraduate Conference

Southeast by Northwest

Summer Institutes in Latin America

Teaching Asia in the Pacific Northwest

TEACH: Teaching Excellence across a Consortium in Higher Education

Transparent Teaching

Visual Cultures Colloquium

**Faculty Senate Chair Report to the Faculty  
In advance of 02/09/2016 Faculty Meeting  
By Ariela Tubert**

- We have had two senate meetings since our last faculty meeting.
- Most of our November 16, 2015 meeting was focused on a petition started by a group of students that the university divest endowment funds from the fossil fuel industry. After long discussion, the senate endorsed the petition, which I attach below in Appendix A.
- During the discussion on November 16, the senate also decided to compose a statement of its own providing context for its endorsement of the divestment petition. Draft statements were disused on December 7, 2015 and January 25, 2016. The senate approved the statement on January 25, 2016, which I attach in Appendix B.
- Both the student petition and the senate statement will be discussed at the upcoming Faculty Meeting.
- As you all know, over break, I worked with the faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee to select faculty members to participate in the interview panels with the two finalists. I also participated with 14 other faculty members in the interview panels. I would like to take this opportunity to thank once again the 3 faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee and the 14 faculty members participating in the interview panels for their service. Some updates and details on the process were sent to the faculty governance listserv. If you are not receiving emails from the faculty governance listserv but would like to receive them, please let me know so that I can add you to it.
- As always, I encourage your questions about the senate’s work and suggestions for issues that you would like the senate to pursue. I especially welcome suggestions for issues for the senate to pursue now, early in the semester, before things get busy towards the end of the year.

**Appendix A**

To the Board of Trustees,

As leaders of the University of Puget Sound campus community, we the undersigned give our support to the divestment campaign undertaken by students of E.C.O. The campaign has been in communication with the board of trustees since the fall of 2014 and has expressed its goals in the following terms:

We find it unacceptable that any percentage of the University of Puget Sound's endowment fund is invested in coal and fossil fuels, contributing millions of dollars to an industry that is responsible for devastating climate change.

We call on the board of trustees of the University of Puget Sound and its outsourced chief investment officer to commit to the following:

1. Abstaining from all new investments in the Underground 200, including the Filthy 15, and private hydrocarbon companies.
2. Divesting from all current holdings in the Underground 200, including the Filthy 15, and private hydrocarbon companies within five years.

Note: The Underground 200 is an annually updated list of the world's 100 largest coal companies and the world's 100 largest oil and gas companies. The Filthy 15 is a list of the 15 largest and dirtiest coal companies in the United States.

In our capacity as campus community leaders, we represent the university in a variety of contexts. We want the University of Puget Sound to be an institution we are proud to represent, one that makes ethical decisions compatible with its mission statement and reputation. Divesting the university's endowment from the fossil fuel industry is one of the most significant steps Puget Sound can take to safeguard the future of its endowment as well as the environment on which its current and future students depend.

Signed,

The Coalition for the Divestment of the University of Puget Sound

## **Appendix B**

### Statement of support for the student divestment campaign

We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Puget Sound, have voted to endorse the student movement to divest the university of its hydrocarbon holdings. We acknowledge the concerns of the Board of Trustees regarding the potential economic impact of this process. However, given the scientific consensus on the effects of climate change, we feel strongly that our students' future and the future of this institution absolutely depend on dramatically reducing our consumption of fossil fuels and leaving unexploited hydrocarbons where they are—in the ground. Climate change threatens food and ecological security, exacerbates global inequity, and disproportionately impacts the world's most vulnerable populations. Using our endowment to finance (and thereby profit from) oil, coal, and gas companies contradicts the mission of our institution.

As a fossil fuel-based economy becomes untenable, it is possible that moving our investments out of that sector will prove to be prescient. We believe that the University of Puget Sound should be a leader of this movement, rather than playing catch-up years from



now. Our university should also be an *ethical leader*, and should provide a model for institutions like ours that are interested in building a more sustainable and equitable future.

We recognize that it is not the fiduciary duty of the Faculty Senate to protect and grow the university's endowment. We are not finance experts, and it is not our job to approve specific investments. However, we share in the duty to protect and support the university's mission, and in that spirit we express our support for the student-led divestment campaign.

Appendix E – Resolution opposing methanol refinery (PASSED)

Resolution

Regarding the natural gas-to-methanol refinery proposed by NW Innovation Works in the Port of Tacoma,

whereas the proposed refinery poses a grave and perpetual threat to the health of the University of Puget Sound and Tacoma communities, to student recruitment and retention, and to the area environment, and

whereas such a facility is inherently dangerous because of the storage of large amounts of methanol and natural gas, and

whereas we believe that no changes or revisions to the proposal can make the proposal acceptable, then be it resolved that:

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound strongly oppose the construction of the natural gas-to-methanol refinery proposed by NW Innovation Works in the Port of Tacoma.

Appendix F - Supporting materials related to the resolution in Appendix E (circulated in advance of the meeting)

**Faculty Resolution Opposing Methanol Refinery** – updated 1/20/15

Dear Colleagues:

We write to alert the faculty to an issue of pressing concern to the university. A company called NW Innovation Works has proposed to build a \$3.4 billion methanol refinery at the Port of Tacoma. It would be the largest refinery of its kind in the world and would convert natural gas to methanol, a toxic form of alcohol used in manufacturing. The methanol would be shipped in supertankers to China, where it would be used to make plastics.

We're posting this email to the Faculty Governance list serve because we believe that civic engagement is part of what Puget Sound is supposed to do, and that it is a proper role of faculty to define that engagement, especially when the consequences for the university are as significant as we believe they are. Specifically, we are concerned about the threat to the health of university students, staff, and faculty; the threat to our student recruitment and retention efforts; and (more broadly) the threat to the Puget Sound brand as a place where environmental stewardship is taken seriously. We send this email to inform faculty about the issue in anticipation of a resolution we expect to propose at the next faculty meeting.

For these reasons (some described in more detail below), we are planning to propose a resolution along the following lines at the next faculty meeting:

Regarding the natural gas-to-methanol refinery proposed by NW Innovation Works in the Port of Tacoma,

whereas the proposed refinery poses a grave and perpetual threat to the health of the University of Puget Sound and Tacoma communities, to student recruitment and retention, and to the area environment, and

whereas such a facility is inherently dangerous because of the storage of large amounts of methanol and natural gas, and

whereas we believe that no changes or revisions to the proposal can make the proposal acceptable, then be it resolved that:

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound strongly oppose the construction of the natural gas-to-methanol refinery proposed by NW Innovation Works in the Port of Tacoma.

In addition to the matter of student recruitment, the refinery raises the following concerns, which we share with you:

**HARM TO PUBLIC HEALTH:** Producing, storing, and shipping methanol in Tacoma would cause perpetual harm to the public health and pose an ever-present danger of catastrophic spills or explosions. During the refining process, carcinogens such as benzene, formaldehyde, and sulfur dioxide would be released into the air. When ingested by humans,

methanol itself is metabolized into formaldehyde by the liver.

**ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM AND CLASSISM:** Current demographic patterns in Tacoma mean that a disproportionate number of Tacoma's residents of color and residents of lower economic status will be living within two miles of the refinery and are thus more likely to be affected by toxic discharges or to suffer harm from an explosion or spill.

**EXCESSIVE WATER USE:** The plant would use 7,200 gallons of fresh water per minute, or 3.8 billion gallons per year. Since Tacoma's total residential water use is around 5.9 billion gallons per year, the company's own figures mean that the refinery would use 64.4% of all the water the city uses annually. Given the uncertain future of our region's own water supply—the result of global warming—it seems unconscionable to allow a single industry to consume so much water.

**PROBLEMS WITH WASTEWATER DISCHARGE:** Tacoma's wastewater treatment facility would be overwhelmed with an additional 1.44 million gallons of wastewater per day.

**THREAT OF SEISMIC CATASTROPHE:** Those of you who read [the New Yorker piece "The Really Big One"](#) know a sobering fact about our beloved Pacific Northwest: we are overdue for a major earthquake. One of the scientists cited in the article puts the chance of an earthquake registering 8.0 or greater on the Richter scale in the next fifty years at one in three. An earthquake of this size will form a tsunami. No amount of safety engineering will protect a refinery built on the Tide Flats from being inundated. Thus, in addition to all the problems caused by the earthquake itself, we will also have a spill of 112 millions gallons of methanol.

**DAMAGE TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY:** Although refinery proponents point to the 1000 temporary jobs they claim the plant's construction will create, with 260 permanent jobs to remain thereafter, there is strong reason to believe that the long-term net effect on the local economy will be negative. Tacoma has come a long way in terms of cleaning up the damage from the polluting industries of our past and presenting a forward-looking image to the world. We're starting to be recognized for all of the good things we have here: our diversity, our vibrant arts scene, our proximity to mountains and water. If the proposed NW Innovation Works plant is built, it will signal that Tacoma is once again a dumping ground for dangerous and dirty industries, and the kinds of employers the city really wants—high technology, green energy, healthcare, financial services, etc.—will look elsewhere.

**INHERENT SAFETY RISK:** Methanol is highly volatile at room temperature. No precautions or revisions to the proposal can remedy what is inherently a dangerous industry. A methanol plant of the size proposed, using the method proposed, has never before been built in human history—a fact worth keeping in mind before accepting the safety assurances of NW Innovation Works.

**CONCERNS ABOUT THE COMPANY'S TRACK RECORD:** NW Innovation Works isn't a company with an established record, but rather three individuals who have joined forces to build methanol plants in WA State with the backing of the Chinese government. (They have smaller projects proposed in Kalama and St. Helens). NW Innovation Works has never built anything as a company.

CONCERNS ABOUT PLASTIC WASTE: Last February, [the journal \*Science\* reported that “about 4 million to 12 million metric tons of plastic washed offshore in 2010 alone, or about 1.5% to 4.5% of the world’s total plastic production—enough to cover every foot of coastline on the planet.”](#) Only a small percentage of plastic produced today is recycled. The City of Tacoma does not need to enable the production of additional amounts of a material causing profound damage to marine ecosystems.

While the threat of harm is compelling, the issue itself is a complex one, and we encourage you all to research the methanol refinery proposal on your own. In addition to the in-text hyperlinks above, we gathered the information we presented from the following sources, which you may find helpful:

**Citizens for a Healthy Bay**

[http://www.healthybay.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=212:proposed-methanol-plant-in-tacoma&catid=42:news-and-events&Itemid=74](http://www.healthybay.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=212:proposed-methanol-plant-in-tacoma&catid=42:news-and-events&Itemid=74)

**The Tacoma News Tribune**

<http://www.thenewstribune.com/news/local/politics-government/article53345740.html>

**KPLU**

<http://www.kplu.org/post/tacoma-residents-will-get-chance-weigh-plans-giant-methanol-plant>

**The Methanol Materials Safety Data Sheet from the Chemistry Department at Iowa State University**

<http://avogadro.chem.iastate.edu/msds/methanol.htm>

**Redline Tacoma**, the citizen group opposing the project

<http://redlinetacoma.org>

**The Sierra Club’s Tatoosh Group**, which is also opposing the project

<http://www.sierraclub.org/washington/tatoosh-group-pierce-county>

**The website of NW Innovation Works**, the company behind the proposal:

<http://nwinnovationworks.com>

We know how busy everyone is, so we thank you for taking the time to read this. We welcome your thoughts and look forward to a thorough discussion on this list-serve and at the next Faculty Meeting.

Sincerely,

Bill Kupinse, Alison Tracy Hale, Steven Neshyba, and Tiffany MacBain

P.S. Should the readers of this list want to take immediate action not only as faculty members but as Tacoma citizens, here the two most important actions one can take.

**1) Send an email or letter of public comment during the public comment period that extends**

**from now until Feb 17.**

Here's the email address the letter goes to: [tacoma.methanol.sepa@cityoftacoma.org](mailto:tacoma.methanol.sepa@cityoftacoma.org)

And the recipient's title/info:

Ian Munce, AICP, Principal Planner  
City of Tacoma  
Planning & Development  
Services Department  
747 Market Street, Suite 345  
Tacoma, WA 98402

**2) Show up at the informational meeting this Thursday, January 21 at the Tacoma Convention Center, 1500 Broadway, Tacoma, WA 98402. Redline Tacoma is asking those opposed to the refinery to wear red to indicate their opposition.** The informational portion of the meeting will begin at 5 p.m., with a public commenting to begin at 6:30 p.m. If you'd like to speak publicly at the meeting, you should plan on arriving at 5 p.m. to sign up; speakers will be limited to three minutes. (It's not required that you speak publicly; simply attending will show your support). This is the first of two public meetings; the second meeting will be February 16. A strong turnout of opposition to the plant at both meetings will be essential to stopping the refinery.

If you'd like a printable flyer announcing the meeting to post and/or share with friends, please email Bill Kupinse at [wkupinse@pugetsound.edu](mailto:wkupinse@pugetsound.edu). You can keep up with meeting-related news by joining Redline Tacoma's Facebook group [www.facebook.com/NoWaterForMethanol](https://www.facebook.com/NoWaterForMethanol) or by visiting the group's updated webpage: <http://redlinetacoma.org>.

## Appendix G – Resolution for a fair pay ratio (PASSED)

### Resolution for a Fair Pay Ratio

Whereas economic inequality has been rising in the United States for four decades and is now at a level last seen just prior to the Great Depression;

Whereas economic inequality is a source of health and social problems in a society;

Whereas one cause of increasing inequality has been rising executive compensation and stagnating wages for the middle and working classes;

Whereas most Americans believe that the ideal pay ratio of the highest paid to lowest paid employee should be seven to one;

Whereas the pay ratio of the highest paid to the lowest paid employee at the University of Puget Sound currently exceeds 25 to 1; and

Whereas employee compensation must largely come from student tuition, which is often financed by student debt; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the faculty at the University of Puget Sound call for the ratio of total full-time equivalent compensation (including deferred compensation) of the highest paid employee to the lowest paid employee (excluding work-study students) to not exceed 10 to 1.

Appendix H – Statement of support for the student hydrocarbon divestment campaign  
(PASSED)

Statement of support for the student divestment campaign

We, the Faculty of the University of Puget Sound, endorse the student movement to divest the university of its hydrocarbon holdings. We acknowledge the concerns of the Board of Trustees regarding the potential economic impact of this process. However, given the scientific consensus on the effects of climate change, we feel strongly that our students' future and the future of this institution absolutely depend on dramatically reducing our consumption of fossil fuels and leaving unexploited hydrocarbons where they are—in the ground. Climate change threatens food and ecological security, exacerbates global inequity, and disproportionately impacts the world's most vulnerable populations. Using our endowment to finance (and thereby profit from) oil, coal, and gas companies contradicts the mission of our institution.

As a fossil fuel-based economy becomes untenable, it is possible that moving our investments out of that sector will prove to be prescient. We believe that the University of Puget Sound should be a leader of this movement, rather than playing catch-up years from now. Our university should also be an *ethical leader*, and should provide a model for institutions like ours that are interested in building a more sustainable and equitable future.

We recognize that it is not the fiduciary duty of the Faculty to protect and grow the university's endowment. We are not finance experts, and it is not our job to approve specific investments. However, we share in the duty to protect and support the university's mission, and in that spirit we express our support for the student-led divestment campaign.



Appendix I – Information sent out in advance of the meeting regarding the student divestment movement and previous actions taken by the Faculty Senate and Department of Chemistry

-----

To the Board of Trustees,

As leaders of the University of Puget Sound campus community, we the undersigned give our support to the divestment campaign undertaken by students of E.C.O. The campaign has been in communication with the Board of Trustees since the fall of 2014 and has expressed its goals in the following terms:

We find it unacceptable that any percentage of the University of Puget Sound’s endowment fund is invested in coal and fossil fuels, contributing millions of dollars to an industry that is responsible for devastating climate change.

We call on the Board of Trustees of the University of Puget Sound and its outsourced chief investment officer to commit to the following:

- 1. Abstaining from all new investments in the Underground 200, including the Filthy 15, and private hydrocarbon companies.**
- 2. Divesting from all current holdings in the Underground 200, including the Filthy 15, and private hydrocarbon companies within five years.**

Note: The Underground 200 is an annually updated list of the world's 100 largest coal companies and the world's 100 largest oil and gas companies. The Filthy 15 is a list of the 15 largest and dirtiest coal companies in the United States.

In our capacity as campus community leaders, we represent the university in a variety of contexts. We want the University of Puget Sound to be an institution we are proud to represent, one that makes ethical decisions compatible with its mission statement and reputation. Divesting the university’s endowment from the fossil fuel industry is one of the most significant steps Puget Sound can take to safeguard the future of its endowment as well as the environment on which its current and future students depend.

Signed,

The Coalition for the Divestment of the University of Puget Sound

Date: December 15, 2015

To: An open letter to the Puget Sound Board of Trustees

From: Puget Sound Chemistry Department

Re: ECO club call for divestment from fossil fuel companies

The Environmental Campus Outreach (ECO) club recently approached the Chemistry department asking for us to support their call for the University to divest of its investments in fossil fuel companies. Their simple request has led to much discussion among members of the chemistry faculty. We are, after all, educators who try to teach our students to grapple with complexity and who frequently warn them of the perils of oversimplification. And so we have grappled.

We care deeply about our students; it is why we are here. So we are concerned about changes that might lower the return on the endowment, potentially leading to higher debt loads among our students or making it financially impossible for some of them to attend here. On the other hand, it is possible that showing leadership in this area may actually increase financial support from alumni concerned about climate change. In addition, the financial hardships that students will encounter due to climate change are likely to dwarf the impact of slightly higher tuition. We are also unclear as to the effectiveness of divestment as a strategy for minimizing fossil fuel utilization, especially under conditions where alternatives to fossil fuel use are still in their infancy. An alternative strategy could be to invest in technologies that will make fossil fuel utilization unnecessary. Part of our difficulty in grappling with many of these complexities has to do with the fact that *we are not* economists or experts in investments or business.

But *we are* scientists. And as such we all agree that the evidence for global warming caused by anthropogenic activity is convincing; and we know that one of the most significant drivers of global warming is the increasing amount of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere by the burning of fossil fuels; and we realize that the global climate changes caused by global warming will negatively impact our students and future generations; and that the more fossil fuels we burn, the more severe those negative impacts will be. Thus, the Chemistry department is in complete agreement with the students that *now is the time to start doing something about fossil fuel consumption*. And while we may have some uncertainty as to whether divestment is the best place to start, we know enough history to realize that we have to start somewhere, and that even a symbolic gesture can become a catalyst leading to important change.

So we ask you to carefully consider the call to divest in fossil fuel companies. And while you are considering that proposition, we encourage you to devise and implement other effective strategies that the University can use to combat global warming. By so doing, both you and our students will have inspired us with examples of what it means to “meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship”.

## Socially Responsible Investment/Divestment Timeline

October 29, 2014	Meeting with Sherry Mondou, Vice President of Finance
November 14, 2014	Ana Goebel's article, "Students Question: How is Puget Sound Using our Money?" Luke Janssen's letter to the editor, and Emily Smaldone's analysis of the mission statement appear in <i>The Trail</i> .
November 12, 2014	Collusive meeting with prison divestment group.
November 19, 2014	Joint divestment information session for students and faculty held in conjunction with prison divestment group.
November 24, 2014	SRI information session for students and faculty held during normal ECO meeting time.
December 5, 2014	Oliver Field's letter to the editor, "'Socially Responsible' Investing Has More Than One Meaning," a criticism of the above, appears in <i>The Trail</i> .
December 9, 2014	Visit to Ron Thom's coffee hours.
December 12, 2014	The subcommittee's response to Field's letter appears in <i>The Trail</i> .
January 20, 2015	Meeting with Ken Willman, Mitzi Carletti, and Tom Leavitt of the Investment Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees.
February 2, 2015	Chris Bittman of Parella Weinberg comes to speak at UPS
February 13, 2015	Eric Nathanson's letter to the editor, "Divestment Conversation Must Continue" appears in <i>The Trail</i> .
February 18, 2015	Meeting with Alex Epstein, UPS Alumni that has worked on divestment campaigns at other universities
April 1, 2015	Meeting with Mr. Willman and Mr. Leavitt
April 17, 2015	PWP analysis released by Sherry Mondou
May 15, 2015	Letter from Mr. Willman
August 14, 2015	Petition finalization
August 18, 2015	Letter of Intent to board
August 24, 2015	Petition released to core members of ECO and faculty
August 27, 2015	Response from Ken Willman
September 4, 2015	Petition released to campus community

September 23, 2015	Signature collection at Last Sun event put on by Greek Life
September 25, 2015	Letter for formation of a coalition written
September 29, 2015	Meeting with Steven Neshyba (members present: Curtis Mraz, Emma Casey)
September 30, 2015	Meeting with Ken Willman and Tom Leavit (Members who attended: Kumar Flower-Kay, Anna Fryxll, Curtis Mraz, Emma Casey, Emily Smaldone, Sierra Coccoziello, Giulia Alexander)
October 1, 2015	Board of Trustees workshop on SRI and Divestment
October 2, 2015	ECO members stand outside of Board meetings to inform them of divestment
October 7, 2015	Petition reaches 750 signatures!
October 8, 2015	Invitation to join the Coalition for divestment
October 9, 2015	Meeting with Mike Segawa on divestment (members present: Curtis Mraz, Emma Casey, Emily Smaldone, Emma Sevier)
October 13, 2015	ASUPS Town Hall Tuesday about Divestment
October 13, 2015	Sign making for divestment rally on the 30th
October 27, 2015	Informal ASUPS Senate meeting to propose Divestment Coalition (members present: Curtis Mraz, Emily Smaldone, Emma Casey)
October 28, 2015	Meeting with Dan Sherman in regards to organizing social movements (members present: Curtis Mraz, Giulia Alexander, Emma Casey)
October 29, 2015	Formal Senate -- ASUPS signs coalition, backing the Divestment Campaign (members present: Sophia Slaus-Kliener, Emma Casey)
October 30, 2015	Article published in <i>The Trail</i> by David Balgley
October 30, 2015	Divestment Rally at the One Of A Kind campaign celebration
November 16, 2015	Faculty Senate signs coalition, backing the Divestment Campaign

	(members present: Emily Smaldone, Curtis Mraz, Emma Casey)
December 2, 2015	Meeting with Chemistry department on divestment
December 15, 2015	Chemistry department releases letter to Board of Trustees explaining stance on divestment (correspondence with John Hanson)
January 26, 2016	Faculty senate releases written statement on divestment (correspondence with Emelie Peine)
January 29, 2016	27 campus clubs, groups, and organizations have signed onto the Divestment Coalition as of this Friday
February 1, 2016	Meeting with Mike Segawa and Sherry Mondou on possible divestment panel/Board of Trustees meeting in late February (Emma Casey)

### **Concerns Expressed about Divestment from Fossil Fuels**

Q| Do we actually have money invested in fossil fuels? The report from the Board claimed no direct investments.

A. Yes, the University of Puget Sound has over \$41 million invested in oil and coal companies. The letter from Gayle McIntosh sent out to the campus community on October 7, 2015 is carefully worded to suggest otherwise. The University chooses to outsource our investment operations to a firm known as Perella Weinberg Partners (PWP). PWP is in charge of investing our endowment fund through a series of funds commingled with funds from other clients of PWP. Although the Board of Trustees isn't making any direct investments in fossil fuels, PWP is.

Q| Will divestment from fossil fuels put student scholarships at risk?

A. That's very unlikely. It is true that a significant portion of the returns on the endowment contribute to student financial aid and scholarships. Divestment from fossil fuels is unlikely to deplete these funds, however, for two reasons. Firstly, it is not a foregone conclusion that divestment will result in reduced returns, despite PWP's predictions to that effect. Recent research on socially responsible investment (SRI) strategies indicates that fully divested portfolios perform just as well as, or better than, conventional portfolios, especially after the first decade. Additionally, we believe that divesting from fossil fuels will be a publicity boon for the university that will persuade more alumni to donate, enlarging the endowment and, thus, the returns it yields. Secondly, assuming that returns on the endowment did fall, the university would be encouraged to constrict its budget elsewhere so as to ensure consistent funding for scholarships. Finally, however, a key point to keep in mind is that the Board has a legal responsibility to maintain a certain level of returns on the endowment and will not divest if it

believes doing so would cause returns to fall below that level. While that makes our task as divestment advocates harder, it also means that before this campaign can be successful, we will have to work with the Board to find a way to divest without endangering the school financially. With collaboration from the Board and PWP, we know a solution is possible.

Q| Is divesting \$41 million from oil and coal companies really going to make an economic impact?

- A. No, not initially. It is very unlikely that oil and coal companies will feel the economic impact of UPS's individual divestment. While it does have economic implications, divestment is a tool for social and political activism that is designed to frame a shift in social expectations. With colleges, religious institutions, and cities divesting from fossil fuels worldwide, it is made clear that this is not what the consumers want. Big oil and big coal will conceivably adjust products and methods according to what the consumers are demanding, which is where we would see the long-term economic shifts.

Q| Isn't divestment just another form of slacktivism? Students shouldn't tell the university to take environmental action on their behalf without first changing their own lifestyles to be more environmentally conscious.

- A. The dichotomy this question sets up between collective campaigns and individual lifestyle choices is a false one. We need to use both tactics to tackle a problem as expansive as climate change. Companies like the energy firms that divestment targets acquire their capital from two sources: consumption and investment. As important as it is that individuals make responsible personal consumption choices--recycling and composting waste, buying and donating used products, eating locally grown food, minimizing use of water, electricity, and gasoline, etc.--the global market will not undergo the radical changes it needs to just because students at Puget Sound drink out of reusable water bottles. Moreover, there is a limit to the reductions individuals can make in their personal consumption of commodities as deeply entrenched in the market as fossil fuels. To target fossil fuels companies, then, we need to reduce the amount of money we invest in them. For changes in investment strategy to have an impact, though, they need to happen on a large scale, and withdrawing individuals' investments isn't enough. We need to change the investment strategies of the institutions of which we're a part, and for that we need to build power in layers, first coming together as individuals, then as an organization, as an institution, and finally as part of a movement. Individual action is not enough; to change the practices of the powerful companies who control the energy industry, we need activism of scale.

Q| Shouldn't we be divesting from other socially irresponsible companies as well (e.g. for-profit prisons)?

- A. Though many of us at E.C.O. stand in solidarity with those advocating divestment from *all* types of socially irresponsible investments, we feel that it is our club's responsibility to focus on the agenda that best suits our mission of environmental preservation, progress, and change. We do hope that divestment from fossil fuels will set a precedent for future divestment movements and socially responsible investing, as well as furthering transparency between the campus community, the Board of Trustees, and our Outsource Chief Investment Officer.

Further, should our campaign succeed we hope to provide insight and resources to any other groups wishing to follow our model and approach to issues of socially responsible investment.

## Appendix J – Motions 1 and 2 Regarding SSI and KNOW Courses, from the Curriculum Committee

In Fall 2015, the Curriculum Committee received a proposal for an existing Scholarly and Creative Inquiry (SSI) course to also fulfill the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) graduation requirement. The guidelines for the KNOW graduation requirement state (on page 2 of the university's Curriculum Statement) that KNOW courses "may also fulfill other program or graduation requirements." However, according to the SSI rubric (page 3 of the Curriculum Statement), SSI courses "may be taken only to fulfill core requirements."

Due to the ambiguity of the language (i.e., KNOW is a graduation requirement, but is not a core category), and in light of the current understanding that SSI courses cannot count towards anything other than core requirements, the Curriculum Committee would like the full faculty to decide whether or not SSI courses can also fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement.

Motion 1 — Courses that fulfill the Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry core category (SSI-1 and SSI-2) can also fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement. (PASSED)

Motion 2 — The statement in the current SSI rubric that "These seminars may be taken only to fulfill core requirements" shall be replaced with the following statement: "These seminars may be taken only to fulfill the SSI core requirement, and may simultaneously fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement." (PASSED)