**Faculty Senate Minutes**
**May 5, 2014**
McCormick Room, Library

Present: Haley Andres, Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Brad Dillman (chair), Andrew Gardner, Cynthia Gibson, Alisa Kessel, Andrea Kueter, Kriszta Kotsis, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese

Guests: Bill Haltom, Amy Ryken, Lisa Wood, Carl Toews, Carolyn Weisz

Dillman called meeting to order 4:01 pm.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Motion to approve minutes from 4/21/14.  Seconded.

4/21/14 minutes approved with minor corrections.

**Election Results:**

Wiese announced the results of the recent Senate and Faculty Advancement Committee election.  Ariela Tubert was elected as chair.  Emelie Peine and Bill Barry were announced as Senators-elect.

Dillman said that he was pleased by the willingness of the faculty to accept nominations. He noted that we had a great slate of colleagues on the election ballot.

Bartanen announced that from the slate elected for the Faculty Advancement Committee, the following faculty have accepted appointments to serve on the FAC: Stacey Weiss (beginning in Spring 2015, replacing Alexa Tullis who will serve an additional semester in Fall 2014 to provide continuity), Bill Barry, Monica Dehart, Doug Sackman, and Jeff Matthews.

Senators brought forth questions as to whether Bill Barry could/would serve on both the FAC and the Senate.  Wiese stated that Brendan Lanctot would be the new senator if Barry were to decline his Senate position.

Dillman thanked Wiese for her hard work putting the ballots together.

**Student Life Committee (SLC) Annual Report, presented by Lisa Wood, Committee Chair**

Wood stated that the major work of the SLC this semester was to develop a clearer model for how the committee should operate including how charges are processed, carried out and carried over from year to year.  Wood stated that many of the committee members didn't feel empowered to carry out the charges they had been given this year.  In order to

address this issue, the committee looked at the bylaws and came to the conclusion that the bylaws were very general. She stated that the committee found that there was room to take the language in the bylaws and make it specific to the SLC, with the goal of making the work of the committee more satisfying and productive. She added that this would give faculty more ownership of their committee work (instead of waiting for the Dean of Students to make connections and/or suggestions). Wood presented a working document that the SLC designed to help with the process of developing charges. She said the SLC designed the document to create specific connections to areas of foci, to show how a charge will relate to the work of the committee, and to outline how the committee will assess the charge and come up with goals and/or targets that can be implemented and/or carried over to the next semester.

Wood passed out copies of the working document. She stated that she hopes that every charge that comes to the SLC will have a sheet like this showing how the charge is being worked on and/or completed.

Wood stated that before the end of the year, the SLC would make a list of charges and finish the model for the worksheet. The revised list of SLC self-charges will be submitted at that time.

Buescher motioned to accept the SLC report. This was seconded.

Buescher said that he appreciated the work of the committee. He asked if Wood was suggesting that the SLC look at and revise their bylaws as a new charge for next year.

Wood said that she was not suggesting this. She added that she would prefer to see the committee structure develop documents that could be used by new committee members instead of using the current apprenticeship model. She stated that this would be especially helpful for committees that don't have very specific work (like the SLC).

Kessel noted that although the SLC felt that it did not have much to contribute to the Sexual Assault Work Group (SAWG) in response to the SAWG report, she thought that their work and recommendations were, in fact, quite helpful.

Wood said that her hope was that the process would create more contact with the Senate. She added that the SLC didn't have much contact with their Senate liaison the year.

Kessel stated that the original standing committees of the Senate have very clear jobs. Committees like Library, Media and Information Systems (LMIS), the Committee on Diversity (COD), and the SLC were added more recently in advisory roles to the existing committee structure. She said that these committees have less clearly stated goals with respect to the overall purview of the faculty (as stated in our bylaws). She stated that the Senate should consider developing charges for the LMIS, COD and the SLC that are more specific and outcome-oriented.

Wood concurred that more feedback from the Senate and/or the administration would be very important. She felt that it would help define outcomes and give the committees feedback about how they are doing.

Tubert asked how Wood was going to pass this on to next year's committee.

Wood stated that she still needed to figure out how this would really work. She said she would send the Senate the template and examples of possible charges later this semester. She added that helping the committee define its mission, even if it is only in the short-term, would be of great importance.

The Senate voted to accept the report with no objections.

**Committee on Diversity (COD) Annual Report, presented by Amy Ryken, committee chair**

Ryken began by saying that the COD had a very busy year. She highlighted two specific areas of COD work: the KNOW Proposal and the campus climate survey.

Ryken spoke first about the KNOW proposal. She stated that she was very thankful to the COD, the Burlington Northern Group (BNG) and all of the many faculty and students who provided key input. Ryken said that the discussion leading up to the KNOW proposal vote and the discussion that has continued after the proposal passed have been very important. She stated that although the conversations have been very challenging at times, we owe it to ourselves to keep the conversations going. Ryken said that it can be useful to reframe the discussion and that she felt that conversation was good and community was good. She added that we need to continue having "collective considerations" and that she felt that the challenge is good for us.

Ryken next spoke about the campus climate survey. She noted that the COD framed the charge specifically to hiring and retention with regard to sex and race. She pointed out that the COD's concern with the survey was that it privileged the voices of faculty in majority groups. She stated that the Diversity Advisory Committee (DAC) needed to look at how to attend to minoritized voices in the survey.

Ryken pointed out that gender is ranked as the number one concern between faculty and students. She added that according to the survey, faculty who identified with a minoritized group were more likely to report feeling discriminated against. Ryken said that the numbers were small (the most robust numbers were within women faculty members; she added that women were seven more times likely to report feeling marginalized than men). Ryken stated that even though the other numbers are small, they represent the structural diversity that the university has not yet achieved.

In order to better process the data, Ryken said that committee member George Tomlin suggested running a chi-square analysis. According to the data from this analysis, faculty of color are retained at a significantly lower rate.

Ryken stated that the committee anchored their recommendations to the university's strategic plan. She recommended that the COD and the Vice President conduct interviews with faculty of color to help better understand their experience on campus (what is welcoming and why this is the case). Ryken added that hiring and retention is one measure but belonging is something entirely different. She stated that we don't have a measure for belonging. The numbers don't tell us as much as the personal narratives.

Ryken said that the objectives of the COD are not always clearly defined. She stated that she has put forth a great deal of effort to find the committee meaningful work. She added that there are three other tensions with regard to the COD's work:

> 1) The committee is often reactive instead of proactive (incidents that arise throughout the year can take up many meetings).
> 2) Many of the COD charges are collaborative.
> 3) There is a deep skepticism toward the COD.

Ryken stated that the COD is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. She added that yes, the COD has an agenda—it is in the COD's charges. She said that she has persisted in this challenging work because of her deep love of the university and for everyone here. She said that she has also persisted because the university has made progress but needs to continue to make progress in the future. Ryken concluded by saying that the COD is a wonderful to place to learn about challenges with regard to inclusion and diversity.

Saucedo moved to accept the COD report. The motion was seconded.

Gardner asked what the context was for faculty leaving the university.

Ryken said that sometimes faculty leave because of a tenure decision or to follow a partner. She said that if you have a sense of belonging to a place, you may feel more like staying but if you don't feel this, you might give other reasons for leaving.

Bartanen said that the number one reason that faculty leave is because of dual-career relationships.

Gardner asked if there were issues with such small numbers. He wondered whether confidentiality was a concern when numbers were so small.

Ryken said that the COD talked about this and decided not to share certain information.

Stockdale applauded the work of the COD. He then asked about the role of the COD vis-à-vis the Curriculum Committee (CC). He asked Ryken if the COD should be charged to collaborate directly with the CC (similar to the charge on the KNOW proposal).

Ryken responded by saying that in the past, the CC has asked for help in providing specific examples for implementing diversity. If the Senate were to charge the COD to

collaborate with the CC, she asked that the Senate not make it a one-way charge (both committees—the COD and the CC—should be charged).  She added that she felt that the CC is the designated space where curriculum decisions should occur.

Gibson stated that a Chi-square analysis was not appropriate for the hiring/retention data (the numbers are too small to be used in this type of analysis).

Ryken said she would welcome additional numbers and analysis from Gibson if she wanted to send them to the COD.

The Senate voted to accept the COD report with no objections.


**University Enrichment Committee (UEC) Annual Report, presented by Carl Toews, Committee Chair**

Toews briefly outlined the committee's work with regard to the Senate charges.  He stated that charge number two was not something for the committee to do.  He said that the committee felt that a move from payment based on expenses incurred to payment based on amount of time gone was a philosophical one that should be taken up by the Board of Trustees.  Toews said that charge number three contained technical issues that were not in our area so the committee was not able to address this.  With regard to charge number one, Toews stated that the UEC submitted the request and it is now being actively discussed.  He noted that funding rates have been dropping over the past few years and that it was his hope that this year would be different.  Toews stated that the UEC submitted the proposal for the Faculty Scholarship Award (charge number 4) to the FAC and Kris Bartanen.  The proposal was sent back to the UEC with questions.   Toews pointed out that progress has been made with regard to charges five and six.  The UEC webpage has been reorganized.  He noted that the publicizing of faculty work would attract more applicants for funds, show potential donors what's happening on campus, and show students what faculty are doing.  He stated that to do this properly would require additional reporting methods, adding that if the UEC has the info they can broadcast it in an appropriate way.  Toews said that the UEC discussed a proposal by Andreas Madlung to streamline student research grant applications (charge #7).  After discussion, the UEC decided that they would allow students to resubmit summer research applications but require a new cover letter (changes to be made in Spring 2015).

Gardner made a motion to accept the UEC report.  This was seconded.

Saucedo asked if Toews could submit a copy of the proposal to the BTF and include that in the report.  Toews said yes.

Gardner said that he appreciated the attention to the per diem issue.  He stated that it was an important issue to him.  He urged the UEC to keep looking at this in the future.  He wondered whether or not the Board of Trustees would actually need to be involved in a decision such as this.

Toews noted that one issue the UEC faced was that of who wanted a per diem. He said it wasn't clear to the committee where that motion came from and whether or not it was something for which there was support.

Kessel stated that certain charges are made so that information can be gathered in order to have enough information to begin a conversation. She stated that the Senate needs to make clear its intention. She sited the CHWS charge and the SAWG charges as other examples where the intention was not clear. She stated that there is a reason to give this kind of charge but the Senate needs to be clear about where it is in the process.

Saucedo noted that this was why we have liaisons.

Stockdale stated that he was baffled when, at the beginning of the year, the Senate was streamlining charges so much that the context was lost.

Dillman said that the minutes should also be part of the charges. He added that we should encourage chairs and committee members to read past minutes.

Bartanen said that she and Gayle McIntosh ask for input every year for the faculty scholarship publication. She pointed out that they would be joining with Jane Carlin so that faculty scholarship also goes into Sound Ideas (and thus faculty won't need to double report).

Gibson asked if student work went on the website.

Bartanen answered with yes, if students give permission.

Saucedo stated that it would be very beneficial if the UEC wrote to new professors once a year to describe the funds and resources available.

The Senate voted to accept the UEC report with no objections.

**Discussion of the Faculty Governance Survey:**

Dillman began by saying that he hoped the Senate would revisit this next year and make good use of the information.

Tubert stated that there were a lot of comments and that the comments were very rich. Tubert said that all three Senators who reviewed the information on the survey (Tubert, Sampen and Saucedo) felt there was a lot of information worth thinking about. She identified four major concerns regarding faculty governance:

    1) Faculty already feel pressed for time
    2) Participation in governance does not feel productive, substantive or impactful
    3) There is too much administrative presence

4) Faculty voices could be more evenly represented

Tubert then identified four possible actions for the Senate to consider:

1) Charge all committees to include in their next end-of-year reports (Spring 2015) what work they found meaningful and whether the size of the committee is appropriate.
2) Create a code of conduct for listserv posts (and have Senators post when the code has been breached?)
3) Have administrative reports available electronically prior to faculty meetings, with only a quick summary during the meeting followed by faculty questions
4) Solicit topics of faculty concern and hold Senate-moderated discussion groups

Sampen stated that Tubert suggested creating a public document that would contain progress reports on committee charges (including work that had been completed to show growth over time).

Kessel brought forth the issue of what belongs in the purview of faculty governance (how is fulfilling a charge supportive of faculty governance). She stated that it was the responsibility of the Senate to push the reports to the right places, noting that if we don't have anywhere to push the report, we shouldn't collect it. She also stated that committee work should be more closely related to issues pertaining to faculty.

Tubert said that she felt that people were doing meaningful work but some of it was getting lost. She said that by creating a public document, people would know what happened.

Sampen said that we need to know what has been accomplished, adding that this can have a positive effect on morale. She also suggested that committee charges be made at the end of the year—not at the beginning when committee membership (including Senate membership) has just changed.

Dillman said that committees are often reluctant to give an annual report until the very end of the semester.

Buescher asked if we could shift the work so that it would be completed earlier in the semester.

Dillman concurred that it would be more helpful if we scheduled the reports early in the year and each committee had a set deadline for reporting. He then added that the faculty governance listserv could communicate the work of the committees to the faculty. The liaison could report regularly on the listserv.

Kessel suggested that at the mid point of the semester the chair of the senate could send out a report on the listserv (similar to what is presented at Faculty Meetings).

Dillman stated that it is more satisfying for the members of the faculty to know what work is being done.

Buescher said that it makes sense to use the listserv for information dissemination—a proactive rather than a reactive approach. He asked if we could get data as to how many times minutes are downloaded. He stated that he guessed that most people don't read the minutes from the various committee meetings.

Bartanen suggested talking to the faculty on the portal advisory committee. She thought there might be a mechanism for using this to disseminate information.

Haltom stated that the Senate report begins each faculty meeting. He felt that the Senate Chair could put her report on the faculty governance listserv prior to the meeting.

Saucedo replied by saying that a lot of the comments on the survey spoke to wanting to hear more from the faculty at Faculty Meetings, rather than the administrators.

**Walter Lowrie Award discussed and decided.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:36pm.

Respectfully Submitted by Maria Sampen.

# 2013-14 Final Report of the Student Life Committee

## Committee Members

**Students:** Ryan Del Rosario, Jenica Holt (Fall), Max Estêvão (Spring)

**Faculty:** Brad Reich, Lisa Fortlouis Wood (Committee Chair), Mike Benveniste, Ben Lewin, David Latimer, and Poppy Fry

**Library Liaison:** Eli Gandour-Rood (Recording Secretary)

**Senate Liaison:** Amanda Mifflin

**Ex Officio:** Lisa Ferrari (Associate Academic Dean), Mike Segawa (Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students)

## Committee Meeting Dates

**Fall:** 9/26, 10/10, 10/31, 11/14, 11/21, and 12/5
**Spring:** 1/24, 2/14, 2/21, 3/14, 3/28, 4/11, 4/25, and 5/9

## Senate Charges

The Dean of Students, Mike Segawa, brought the following Faculty Senate charges to the committee at our first meeting.

1. Review the Sexual Assault Work Group report and provide feedback to the Dean of Students on its recommendations.

2. Monitor the work of the First Year Experience Task Force and provide feedback to the Dean of Students and the to the Faculty Senate on its work.

3. Review the programmatic initiatives of Commencement Hall, including the potential role of the IEC in the Rocchi International District program.

4. Evaluate the efficacy of Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services, including ways by which the university promotes good health practices. Issues to consider are a) the impact on access due to the co-pay fee, b) the provision of university sponsored health insurance, and c) the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.

5. Serve, on a rotating basis, on Integrity Board, Honor Court, and Sexual Misconduct Board hearings and review the efficacy of this process.

6. Evaluate and provide recommendations to the Dean of Students and the Faculty Senate regarding the Residential Seminar program.

## Committee Initiated Charges
See below: **Spring Semester Actions and Process of Committee**

## Fall Semester Actions and Process of Committee

The committee formed three working groups at the outset of the semester, and assigned each to work on one charge.  Through discussion, the committee selected charges 1, 3, & 4 as foci for the semester.  What follows are summaries of the work of each group.

### Recommendations of SLC SAWG Working group  (Senate Charge 1)

*Charge: Review the Sexual Assault Work Group report and provide feedback to the Dean of Students on its recommendations.*

1. We recommend that the new sexual assault policy not be implemented at this time for two primary reasons.  First, it is unclear what the policy's specific objectives are and, because of this, prioritization of actions to support the policy is difficult, if not impossible.  We suggest a succinct statement: "The purpose of this policy is _____" and that everything then following this statement carries out that specific purpose. Second, we are unclear what the role of this policy is relative to the current University of Puget Sound Campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment & Sexual Misconduct.  There is duplication and overlap between the two and we do not know if this is intentional or not.  If it is, we need more information as to how the two will work together.
2. Reconvene SAWG and provide ongoing institutional support to ensure permanence.
3. Identify (through "Permanent SAWG") the specific purpose of the proposed Sexual Assault Policy (including whether the policy is sexual assault specific).
4. The University must think about and address SAWG composition (including standing members and/or staggered membership).
5. The University must think about the time commitment of SAWG members (probable full year commitment, including summer).
6. Once Permanent SAWG has been created and the Sexual Assault Policy has been revised to carry out a specified purpose, immediate attention should be given to develop access to the policy/system, publicizing the policy and how to use it, and training for various groups.
7. Develop assessment criteria for SAWG (data collection, specifically looking at reporting and effectiveness of resources for reporting).  This should run commensurate with the establishment of access.  In other words, it should run from day one.
8. Establish a pattern for regular assessment and review of standing SAWG policy, possibly by a group separate from SAWG standing membership.

SAWG training recommendations:
- Identify who are mandatory reporters and how they report.
- Determine training program with specific focus and goals (who trains, with what objectives, and under what order/time frame).
- There are several groups for whom training appears to be recommended. We list them not to provide an "order", but to draw attention to the possibility that some groups may be combined, others may be sequential, and others may follow a different schedule.

1. Staff and faculty
2. Residence life student staff
3. Athletic trainers and coaches
4. Greek life
5. Orientation leaders
6. Campus security
7. Overall student body
8. Potentially partner with Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County


*We suggest that if there is training or information for all students that it should be done early in the year, and not during orientation week, due to the mass amounts of information given during this week.
**The current and future role of the green dot program needs to be considered. It is possible it may be supplementary or redundant.
***The current and future role of BHERT needs to be considered because it goes beyond sexual assault, if it in fact encompasses sexual assault.

**NOTE**: This report was discussed in full committee on 11/14/13. Please see minutes for details.


**Recommendations of the Commencement Hall Working Group**  (Senate Charge 3)

*Charge: Review the programmatic initiatives of Commencement Hall, including the potential role of the IEC in the Rocchi International District program.*

The Student Life Committee 2013 Commencement Hall working group held a focus group with students on November 21, 2013 to solicit feedback about their experience in the new dormitory. What follows is a summary of the focus group meeting and suggested actions that grew out of that discussion.

Present:
Residents {Elena Beck, Kathryn Stutz, Kieran O'Neil, Michael Denman, Laura Andersen, Hannah Butensky, Kathryn Ginsberg; SLC Faculty members Lisa Wood, and David Latimer.

Meeting notes:
Our meeting with students was really important for showing support and interest about their experience.

Most students found CH to be a beautiful building and liked the idea of the\house" concept. The residents expressed a range of experiences in regards to the social aspect of their respective houses. The Humanities and Honors houses seemed to function as tight-knit communities. On the other hand, residents of the International house reported little to no social interaction with their floor mates. After some discussion, it seems that the success of the Humanities and Honors floors can partially be attributed to shared classes or orientation activities (for the first year students). Despite shared interest in international travel, this commonality did not seem to result in any cohesion amongst the residents in the International house.

In terms of interaction among the various houses, the response from the residents was uniform; there is little interaction at all. Since students only have access to their own floors, casual interactions between different floors are nearly impossible. Planned events by Resident Community Coordinators (RCCs) would be a formal way of promoting a dorm-wide community. It was reported that there are three Resident Community Coordinators (RCCs) in the dorm. Some students felt that adding more RCCs could improve the community aspect both within a house and among the houses.

Most students were of the opinion that something should be done to improve coordination with the physical plant. Students are responsible for cleaning the common areas (kitchens and bathrooms), so without the regular attention of janitorial staff, soap dispensers often ran empty, and toilet paper could take days to be replaced.

Residents were also interested in making the common areas more inviting and amenable to social interaction. There were requests to better equip the common areas with chairs, sofas, etc. to promote the use of this space. Also, to make the space feel more like home, residents suggested that rugs be provided, and a few students lamented the fact that they could not hang pictures on the walls.

Ideas for action:
1. End of semester cookie fest with tea and coffee for Commencement students. This would involve cookies and beverages the first night of finals week, perhaps in the lounge. Maybe for that one night the couches and soft chairs could all be put in that room with music on etc.
2. Kitchen drive: Staff/Faculty/Offices will adopt houses in Commencement and donate pots and pans (sturdy and/or lightly used). We will gather over the next few weeks and distribute in January the few days before classes start.
3. Set up an email listserv for CH residents. Through the listserv, residents can be more readily aware of dorm-wide activities planned by the RCCs, and activities

might develop organically from the residents themselves.
4. Equip RCCs with the ability to plan two or three dorm-wide events each semester. The Tahoma room could be a great gathering place for coffee or a midnight movie.

Follow-up:
1. Mike Segawa organized a gingerbread house contest and cookie study break that was held on December 16.  It was attended by a small group of students who nonetheless enjoyed the festivities.
2. Mike Segawa is in the process of outfitting the kitchens in the building with new equipment.  These should be installed during spring semester.
3. We are investigating the possibility of creating a listserv.
4.  There will be an additional focus-group session late in Spring Semester to assess the experience of students returning from abroad.

**NOTE**: This report was discussed in full committee on 12/5/13.  Please see minutes for details.

### Recommendations of CHWS Working Group  (Senate Charge 4)

*Charge: Evaluate the efficacy of Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services, including ways by which the university promotes good health practices.  Issues to consider are a) the impact on access due to the co-pay fee, b) the provision of university sponsored health insurance, and c) the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.*

The working group that was assigned to evaluate the efficacy of CHWS believes that we do not have enough data to properly complete this charge.  After consultation with the full Student Life Committee, it was decided that instead of collecting and analyzing new data, the working group would instead make recommendations as to how this charge may be effectively completed in the future.

1) We recommend that the faculty senate create an ad hoc committee that is responsible for an external, independent review of the efficacy of CHWS.  A proper evaluation of the utilization of services and outcomes will require significant time and resources.  The creation of an ad hoc committee would allow for suitable execution of this charge.

2) In order to proper evaluate the efficacy of CHWS data should be collected from a number of sources.  Triangulation is highly recommended; both qualitative and quantitative data will help evaluators to understand student experiences during CHWS encounters and the outcomes of these encounters.  We recommend survey data and focus group interviews with students.

3) While the CHWS annual report does contain some useful information, we believe that there are a number of variables that need to be considered when evaluating CHWS efficacy that are currently missing.  For example, the 2011-2012 annual report discusses student satisfaction, but does so using questions designed to

measure student learning outcomes.  While this may be valuable in some other context, it is not a valid measure of patient satisfaction.  The importance of patient satisfaction is well documented in healthcare literature.  Patient satisfaction correlates with improved physician-patient communication, continuity of care, and compliance with treatment directives.   Although anecdotal, informal conversations with students reveal that satisfaction with CHWS may be subpar.  We suggest that a more valid measurement be used for assessing satisfaction.   We also believe that it is important to analyze return rates.  It is important to understand whether students who return to CHWS are visiting for new problems or if they are returning because their original problem was not resolved after the first visit.  It is also important to know what happened to students who did not return after their initial visit.  Did the visit successfully resolve the problem, or did the student go see an off-campus provider to continue treatment?  These are just a few examples of questions that may be addressed with a thorough assessment carried out by ad hoc committee.

4) Regarding the specific sub points in this charge:

a) *Consider the impact on access due to the co-pay fee*

There was a 23% decline in mental health utilization and a 17% decline in medical utilization during the 2012-2013 academic year.  However, it is impossible to tease apart the possible causes of the decline in CHWS utilization.  The CHWS report states that, "lower service numbers though the fall were attributed to those new fees."  However, we are unclear as to how that attribution was made.  The report goes on to say that "… requests for medical services were down in the fall, but seem to have recovered by the spring semester."  This is ambiguous.  Overall, we believe that there is no way to determine if the changes in utilization are due to staffing, the co-pay, subpar reputation among students, a healthier population, normal variation in larger trend, etc.  More detailed data is required to properly understand he effect of copay on access to CHWS services.

b) *Consider the provision of university-sponsored health insurance*

This is a massive undertaking.  A proper consideration of university sponsored health insurance would require different data than what would be required to evaluate the efficacy of CHWS.  On top of current access, utilization, and outcome data, the committee working on this part of the charge would need a significant amount of information on financing, insurance options, etc.  While we certainly agree that this worth exploring, it is beyond the scope of this working group.

c) *Consider the adequacy of staffing for mental health services.*

Given that, as of now, the only data we have to work with is the CHWS annual report, we can only echo the claims made in that document: CHWS is performing well with the limited resources that it has, but it is severely understaffed and needs more resources.

5) As noted above, a proper evaluation of CHWS will take a significant amount of time and resources.  While the evaluation is underway, there are some positive steps that CHWS could take to maintain a healthy relationship with students and continue to deliver effective care to the campus community.  Some recommendations include:

a) Highlighting the use of off-campus resources
b) Creating a "help line" that can be used for either basic health questions or to obtain information about off-campus health services
c) Finding ways to more effectively utilize the CHWS webpage
d) Q&A sessions with students about CHWS services or general health issues
e) A monthly CHWS email bulletin sent to all students
f) Findings ways to integrate suggestions from the SLC report on sexual assault into communications between CHWS and students
**NOTE**: This report was discussed in full committee on 10/31/13 and 12/5/13. Please see minutes for details.

## Spring Semester Actions and Process of Committee

### A. Senate Charges

**Charge 2** "*Monitor the work of the First Year Experience Task Force and provide feedback to the Dean of Students and the to the Faculty Senate on its work*"

Through discussion, the committee determined that one member (Prof. Poppy Fry) would focus on charges 2 from the faculty senate. Professor Fry graciously volunteered to attend meetings of the First Year Experience Task Force in order to provide a basis for shared information, and to provide feedback to the SLC regarding the progress and planning of the FYETF. Spring committee minutes include brief reports by Professor Fry regarding progress and impressions of work undertaken by the FYETF.

**Charge 6** "*Evaluate and provide recommendations to the Dean of Students and the Faculty Senate regarding the Residential Seminar program.*"

The committee opted to defer charge 6 until next year, when more data on the residential seminars will be available.

### B. Self-Initiated Charges

During spring semester, the committee addressed the following self-initiated charges.

*SI Charge a***:** *Develop a clearer understanding of the roles, functions, and scope of action, for the Student Life Committee.*

The committee had several discussions about the explicit and implicit mandates stated in the Faculty Bylaws, as well as committee history and practices. We then discussed the varied possibilities for committee action, as well as the deliverables that would serve in multiple stages of the committee process including: planning, implementation, communication, and evaluation.

***SI Charge b***: *Clarify processes in the following areas of committee work: charge development, prioritization of work, role as liaison and consultant, and deliverables.*

The committee created a document for developing, processing, and prioritizing charges from external and internal sources.  This document is currently under-revision (attached is a sample of this document, filled out with the major elements of a sample charge). The committee plans to continue piloting this document during the coming week as it develops its final list of suggested charges for next year. These will be sent as an addendum after the SLC meeting on 5/9/14.

***SI Charge c***: *Develop clearer guidelines and processes for involving students in the work of the committee. This includes those serving formally as representatives, student groups, as well as students at large.*

The committee began its work on student involvement in committee activities this past week (4/25/14) with a brief discussion about ways to increase the participation of student representatives, student groups, and students at large.  The committee also met with a student group during that meeting (Peer Allies) to hear more of their work in providing informal, yet visible, support to students who have been victims of sexual assault on campus.  The committee plans to modify the existing documents on charge development to include specific language regarding the inclusion of students in our work.  We also plan to follow up on this charge next year.

## **Summary and Conclusion**

During fall, the committee working groups identified a number of key issues in the charges put forward by the Faculty Senate last September.  As a result of the working group analyses (documented above), the committee saw a need to clarify its role, and particularly to specify appropriate targets for its work in relation to broader initiatives.  Through a process of open discussion, the committee articulated its role with greater specificity, and then began to outline its scope of action and range of potential deliverables.  Throughout these discussions, we noted the importance of liaison with faculty, students, staff, and administration. Following exploratory discussions, we focused on key processes in charge development, particularly prioritization, implementation, and assessment.  These discussions coalesced into a working document (Charge Development Worksheet).

The committee will have its final meeting next week (5/9/14), at which time we will submit a list of recommended charges and a refined version of the Charge Development Worksheet.  We anticipate using this document to shape our work on some of the charges undertaken earlier in the year when we resume in the fall.

In closing, I would like to express my gratitude to the committee members for their thoughtful contributions to our discussions this year. In addition, I am grateful to our student representatives, with a special note of appreciation to Ryan del Rosario for sharing his candid observations and recommendations about student participation on this committee. On behalf of the committee, I thank Eli Gandour-Rood for his willingness to take notes each meeting; everyone appreciated his exceptional skill in creating detailed accounts of our discussions. Appreciation also goes to Dean Segawa and Associate Dean Ferrara for their support and helpful input.

Lisa Fortlouis Wood, Ph.D.
Student Life Committee Chair 2013-2014

# Student Life Committee

## Process Worksheet for Developing Committee Charges 2014

**A. Working Title and Rationale for Charge**

Click here to enter text.

**B. Connections to SLC Ongoing Interest Areas and Current Foci**

☐Health/Mental Health Click here to enter text.

☐Safety/Security on Campus (including Univ. Housing) Click here to enter text.

☐Belonging & Social Support Click here to enter text.

☐1st-Year Experience Click here to enter text.

☐Harm Reduction re: Substances Click here to enter text.

☐Employment/Internship Opportunities Click here to enter text.

☐Student Retention Click here to enter text.

☐Diversity/Inclusion Click here to enter text.

☐Experiential Learning Click here to enter text.

☐Academic Development Click here to enter text.

☐Other(s) Click here to enter text.

**C. Assessment/Analysis**

1. Previous/Current Work on This Topic:

   Click here to enter text.

2. Existing Groups, Staffing, Stakeholders

   Click here to enter text.

3. Existing Structures/Programs/Resources

   Click here to enter text.

4. Known Issues, Obstacles, Problems

   Click here to enter text.

5. **Definable Goals, Outcomes, Solutions**

   Click here to enter text.

**D. Specific Targets & Goals**

Based on Assessment/Analysis of Working Charge, what are the goals for completion this charge? Click here to enter text.

**E. Implementation**

What specific goals can the committee undertake this semester/year given its role (scope of practice)? Click here to enter text.

Who should be involved during implementation (within & outside committee)? Click here to enter text.

Concrete Actions and Who Does What:  Individual/Working Group/Whole Click here to enter text.

Sequencing and Prioritization Click here to enter text.

F. Deliverables,

What deliverable outcomes should the SLC consider (within its scope of practice) Click here to enter text.

☐Report and Document Findings of Assessment/Analysis Click here to enter text.

☐Recommendations/Referral to Click here to enter text.

☐Funding request(s) or Resource Development Click here to enter text.

☐Development of New Charge/Modification of Current Charge/Postpone Existing Charge
   Click here to enter text.

☐Consult on Development/Implementation of a program/intervention Click here to enter text.

☐Liaison w/ Programs/ Committees/Depts. Click here to enter text.

☐Other Click here to enter text.

G. Ongoing Evaluation

The committee should evaluate the progress and effectiveness of work on each charge in order to determine whether the charge is completed satisfactorily. As part of this process, the SLC may choose to seek feedback from: Faculty Senate, Dean of Students, Student Groups, or Other Committees and Individuals. Findings should be discussed in committee and reported in minutes as well as end of year report to the Faculty Senate.

# Student Life Committee Proposed Charges for 2014-15

1. **Sexual Violence**: Review demographic and contextual data regarding sexual violence incidents in our student population (on and off campus). Review ongoing strategies to reduce the incidence of sexual violence on and off campus. Identify strengths and gaps in the University's approach. Recommend actions for improvement, as well as implementation. Consider this charge in relation to resources, services, and opportunities available to students during evenings and weekends.

   **Priority: 5    Time line: All Year**

2. **Counseling Health and Wellness Services:** Address the following two foci:

   a. **Access**: Become familiar with the CHWS protocols for scheduling students for counseling sessions. Then identify and recommend strategies for reducing the wait time for appointments. Include faculty and staff roles in facilitating more rapid student access to counseling services during crisis intervention. Consider this charge in relation to resources, services, and opportunities available to students during evenings and weekends.

   b. **Communication:** Explore and evaluate the feasibility of enacting new modes of communication between CHWS and the student body. Examples include, but are not limited to: a) creating a "help line" that can be used for either basic health questions or to obtain information about off-campus health services, b) a monthly CHWS email bulletin sent to all students, and c) finding ways to more effectively utilize the CHWS webpage.

   **Priority: 5    Time line: All Year**

3. **SLC Procedures and Practices:** Continue to discuss and modify SLC procedures as needed. Address the philosophy, procedures, and practices of the committee, particularly the role of student members of the committee. In addition, identify opportunities to connect with students, faculty, and administration as part of work on individual charges. Solidify procedures and documents concerning the development and implementation of committee charges.

   **Priority: 2    Time line: Ongoing**

4. **First Year Experience**: Continue to consult with the First-Year Experience Working Group as it develops new models for orientation, registration, first year residential seminars, and other elements of the freshman year offerings.

   **Priority: 2    Time line: Ongoing**

| **Prioritization Key** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **D (deferred)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Low** | | | | **High** | |

**Committee on Diversity**
**2013-2014 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

**Committee on Diversity Members**
Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion), Aislinn Melchior (Fall 2013), Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay (Director Multicultural Student Services), Amy Ryken (chair), Oriel Siu, Hannah Smith (student member), George Tomlin (Spring 2014), Jennifer Utrata, Mike Valentine, Carolyn Weisz

**Senate Liaison**: Ariela Tubert

**Committee Responsibilities and Activities**

| Committee Responsibilities per the Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charges | Committee Activities |
|---|---|
| 1. To serve the university's goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus. | --See numbers 2-8 below. |
| 2. To participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty. | --Hiring and Retention Data (Tenure Line) Each year the Committee on Diversity reviews hiring and retention data for tenure line faculty in relation to sex and race (the only social diversity categories that the University systematically documents for faculty). Rates of hiring and retention from 2005-2014 are roughly equal according to sex, but vary greatly according to race.<br><br>Hiring Rate (Tenure Line)  Retention (Tenure Line)<br>Women: 51% (43/84)  Women: 85% (35/41)<br>Men: 49% (41/84)  Men: 86% (32/37)<br><br>Hiring (Tenure Line)  Retention (Tenure Line)<br>Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84)  Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15)<br>White Faculty: 81% (68/84)  White Faculty: 90% (57/63)<br><br>A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that faculty of color are retained at a statistically significantly lower rate, $X^2$ (1, N = 78) = 5.643, p < .02.<br><br>--Diversity Liaison<br>As a result of a recommendation made by the COD in 2011, departments conducting faculty searches are asked to appoint a Diversity Liaison. Percent of departments conducting tenure line searches that designated a diversity liaison:<br>    100% in AY 2013-2014<br>    100% in AY 2012-2013<br>    83% in AY 2011-2012 |

| | The Committee developed post search follow-up questions for search chairs and diversity liaisons. Dean Bartanen solicited responses. The committee will review responses and make recommendations for better supporting the work of diversity liaisons.<br><br>--Curriculum Review (Question 6 in the 5-year Program Review) See also #5 below regarding the COD recommendation to and meeting with the Curriculum Committee. |
|---|---|
| 3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed. | --Amy Ryken served as the Committee on Diversity representative on the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC).<br><br>--The Committee has worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President to review hiring and retention data and to support and review the diversity liaison role.<br><br>--The Committee has worked collaboratively with the Chief Diversity Officer by reviewing and providing feedback on the goals of BHERT. |
| 4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed. | -- The Committee collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BHERT, CWTL, the Chief Diversity Officer, and Multicultural Student Services.<br><br>--Amy Ryken met with student leaders during the Student Diversity Governing Council Retreat to discuss campus climate survey results and the KNOW proposal. In addition she participated in the Resident Assistant Training to discuss LGBTQ issues on campus.<br><br>--The COD read and discussed open letters to the campus written by Puget Sound students Mariana Molina and C.J. Queirolo. The COD wrote a public response. |
| 5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code. | --See Charge 3.<br><br>--The COD sent a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee (CC) and Faculty Senate about the CC's action to change question #6 in the 5-year program/curriculum review. Members of the COD met with the CC to discuss this issue. |
| 6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue. | -- To enact this charge, each Fall the COD appoints two of its members to serve on BHERT. Mike Valentine and Carolyn Weisz served as the COD representatives on BHERT. |

| 7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6. | --This document is our annual report. |
|---|---|
| 8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate. | |
| 1. Assess the viability of expanding the number of faculty HROs (harassment reporting officers) and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate. | --Charge 1: The COD reviewed and discussed the Report of the Sexual Assault Work Group (SAWG).  The COD did not assess viability of expanding the number of faculty HROs because the Chief Diversity Officer is currently in the process of establishing a campus wide Sexual Assault Committee that will be charged with reviewing policies and making recommendations about HRO selection and role. |
| 2. Identify areas of concern for the faculty based on a review of faculty responses to the campus climate survey and make recommendations to the senate. | --Charge 2: The COD read and discussed the campus climate reports shared with the campus this academic year (e.g., gender, religion, socioeconomic status, political beliefs, race & ethnicity). The COD asked the Office of Institutional Research to analyze if minoritized faculty respondents (by race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and/or disability status) had different patterns of reply. The COD discussed the report provided, identified patterns, and wrote a report summarizing recommendations (see Appendix A). |
| 3. Collaborate with the Burlington Northern group to draft a revised proposal for a diversity requirement. | --Charge 3: Throughout the academic year the COD discussed evolving drafts of the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) learning objectives and guidelines and provided input and feedback to the Burlington Northern group.  Members of the COD also joined the Faculty Senate for conversations about the KNOW proposal.  The COD unanimously endorsed the KNOW overlay requirement, which was passed on April 9, 2014 by an electronic vote of the full faculty (132 yes; 82 no).  The COD discussed the potential role of the committee in supporting the implementation of the KNOW proposal and recommended a charge. |

**Suggested Charges for 2014-2015**
Collaborate with the Curriculum Committee to consider strategies for supporting and reviewing department responses to Question 6

Support implementation of the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) proposal

Host discussions about student letters that speak to classroom and campus climate

Review hiring and retention data by gender, race/ethnicity, and their intersections, and work with the Academic Vice President and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer to obtain data on subcategories of faculty of color (e.g., disaggregating by race and international affiliation)

Continue to collaborate with the Chief Diversity Officer in the development of the sexual assault committee structure and accessibility of HRO's.

Support the 2014 National Race and Pedagogy Conference

TO:    Faculty Senate
FM:   Committee on Diversity
       Michael Benitez, Heidi Orloff, Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken (Chair), Oriel Siu, Hannah
       Smith (Student Member) George Tomlin, Jennifer Utrata, Mike Valentine, Carolyn
       Weisz
RE:    Senate Charge: Campus Climate Concerns for Faculty
April 29, 2014

**Charge: Identify areas of concern for the faculty based on a review of faculty responses to the campus climate survey and make recommendations to the senate.**

To engage this charge, members of the Committee on Diversity (COD) read the five campus climate reports released by the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) this year. These reports focused on campus climate issues in relation to gender, religion, socio-economic status, political beliefs, and race/ethnicity. The COD did not have access to the full data set of comments written by faculty because access to that data is restricted to the Office of Institutional Research and the DAC to protect the anonymity of survey respondents.

In discussing themes and patterns in the reports a number of concerns about the data collection and reporting processes were identified:
--The climate survey responses represent majority group responses and reporting empowers the opinions of faculty in majority groups;
--The COD wondered how the campus can meaningfully solicit and hear the perspectives of minoritized groups when we do not currently have broad representation, especially of faculty of color;
--The COD highlighted that a focus on equity and inclusion refers to the process of creating equivalent outcomes for members of historically underrepresented and oppressed groups, and assuring that historically underrepresented groups feel they are empowered to participate in majority culture in ways that shape and redefine campus and community

The COD asked the office of Institutional Research to re-analyze the climate survey data to determine if the views of faculty differed based on race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and disability status. The COD reviewed the report and noted differences in response patterns. A significant and overarching pattern across these four facets of identity/social participation is that faculty who identify with a minoritized group are more likely to report feeling excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against or harassed, even subtly as a result of minoritized group belonging. Below we share data from the report:

Race/Ethnicity: Whereas less than 1% (n = 1) of White faculty respondents reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their race/ethnicity, 29% (n = 2) of Asian faculty and 50% (n = 2) of Hispanic faculty reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their race/ethnicity. It is important to note that no African American faculty (n = 3), American Indian faculty (n = 1), or faculty of two or more races (n = 1) responded to this question on the survey.

Gender: Of the 86 female faculty respondents, 28% (n = 24) reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly as a result of their gender, compared to only 4% (n = 3) of male faculty respondents. Faculty members who self identify as female are also more likely to report feeling marginalization based on age (17.4% (n=15) of female faculty compared to 9.6% (n=8) of male faculty) and race/ethnicity (5.8% (n=5) of female faculty compared to 0% of male faculty).

Sexual Orientation: Fifteen percent (n = 2) of gay/lesbian faculty respondents reported feeling excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against, or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their sexual orientation, and no other faculty respondents reported this.

Disability Status: Of the 11 faculty respondents who reported having a physical or learning difference on the 2012 Climate Survey, 18% (n = 2) reported that they felt excluded, silenced, ignored, discriminated against or harassed, even subtly, as a result of their disability status (compared to the 0% of the 164 faculty who reported not having a physical or learning difference).

While the numbers of faculty who self identify as members of minoritized groups and who report feeling marginalized are small these findings are important to note and attend to precisely because Puget Sound has not yet achieved structural diversity as articulated in the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Each year the Committee on Diversity reviews hiring and retention data in relation to sex and race. Rates of hiring and retention from 2005-2014 are roughly equal according to sex, but vary greatly according to race.

**Hiring (Tenure Line)**           **Retention (Tenure Line)**
Women: 51% (43/84)           Women: 85% (35/41)
Men: 49% (41/84)           Men: 86% (32/37)

**Hiring (Tenure Line)**           **Retention (Tenure Line)**
Faculty of Color: 19% (16/84)       Faculty of Color: 67% (10/15)
White Faculty: 81% (68/84)       White Faculty: 90% (57/63)

A chi-square analysis of the differences in retention by race suggests that faculty of color are retained at a statistically significantly lower rate, $X2$ (1, N = 78) = 5.643, $p < .02$. The COD was unable to do a chi-square analysis of differences in hiring rates because in order to do so we would need to identify hiring rates nationally for comparative analysis.

The Faculty Bylaws charge the Committee on Diversity (Section 6 H.b.2) to participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty. In considering how to summarize the reports, members of the COD strongly expressed how the one key issue with respect to diversity on campus is achieving racial diversity in faculty hiring.

Below is an outline of the goals of hiring a diverse applicant pool as articulated in the Diversity Strategic Plan.

**Goal 1: We will increase the recruitment and retention of students, staff, and faculty from underrepresented minority groups.**
> Underrepresented minority: Racial or ethnic groups that have been historically minoritized and/or are typically underrepresented in American higher education including people of Black/African-American, Latin/Hispanic, and Native American heritage.

**Goal 2: We will create a campus environment that fully welcomes and supports social diversity.**
> Social diversity: Characteristics that could cause groups or individuals to be minoritized and/or systematically excluded from full participation in higher education, including age, disability, gender, race/ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, sexual orientation, job status or socioeconomic class, personal appearance, and political beliefs.

Literature in higher education points to key findings about hiring and retaining underrepresented and minoritized groups and what institutions can do to address challenges with faculty diversity. Findings indicate that assuring underrepresented and minority faculty are represented in hiring processes and practices is important to achieving diversity in recruitment. With respect to hiring, findings indicate that institutions are not doing enough to assure accountability in hiring practices even though literature points to the importance of formalizing and centralizing diversity as a hiring component. This requires moving beyond nice intentions and individual perspectives about "best candidates" to situating departmental and institutional hiring practices in relation to best practices literature. According to the research, successfully recruiting of faculty of color is informed by a combination of the following:

1. Representation of key diversity personnel on search committees,
2. Presence of underrepresented faculty and staff of color in the community,
3. Development of faculty learning communities focused on cultural/community needs,
4. Faculty mentorship opportunities available, and;
5. An institution's ability to create and maintain department climates that encourage the fair and equitable treatment of pre-tenure faculty of color.

In addition to the findings listed above about hiring underrepresented and minority faculty of color, much literature also exists that focuses on retention. Both, recruitment and retention need to be considered as different but highly connected themes to be addressed to the success of assuring a diverse faculty through a lens of equity and inclusion. Hence, both goals listed above require us to consider them in integration. Working to achieve our goals will require that institutionally we work towards creating the welcoming, inclusive, and equitable campus climate necessary to achieve recruitment and retention of faculty for historically marginalized groups. Similarly, intentionally recruiting and retaining a representation of diverse faculty is a significant element to cultivating a welcoming campus community that addresses the challenges faced by underrepresented and minoritized faculty, staff, and students of color.

The Committee on Diversity poses the following questions:
--Is the Faculty committed to the goal of diversifying the faculty? If not, why not?
--Where does commitment to diversifying the faculty exist, and what might promote a broader commitment?
--What incentives might be provided to faculty of color to provide time to build community (as defined/outlined by the needs and challenges of faculty of color), to focus on teaching and/or to develop a research agenda (e.g., reduced teaching load, research funding, intentional mentorship, etc.)?
--Given the decentralized nature of hiring, how might departments be held accountable for goals articulated in the diversity strategic plan?

The Committee on Diversity recommends that the COD collaborate with the Academic Vice President, the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion/Chief Diversity Officer, and the Office of Institutional Research to determine an intentional plan to:
--Conduct interviews with faculty of color to better understand
1) What would have been important factors in hiring?
2) What might community/belonging look like?
3) What elements of the environment are welcoming and not welcoming?
4) What aspects of your job provide or impede satisfaction?

Members of the COD also discussed their concern about the importance of intentional consideration of confidentiality in the way that information is collected and disseminated.

--Consider the decentralized nature of hiring
1) How might departments be held accountable for goals articulated in the diversity strategic plan?
2) What resources or information would help departments to achieve these goals?

References
Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities

Turner, C. S. V., Gonzalez, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 39-168.

Williams., D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A., Eddy, P. L., and Beach, A. (2006). *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing,

Umbach, P. "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education." *Research in Higher Education*, *47* (3), 2006.

Smith, J. W., and Calasanti., T. "The Influences of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity on Workplace Experiences of Institutional and Social Isolation: An Exploratory Study of University Faculty." *Sociological Spectrum*, 25, 2005.

# University Enrichment Committee Final Report

# 2013-2014

**2013-2014 UEC Membership:**

David Andresen (sabbatical, Fall term), Amy Odegard, Wayne Rickoll, Sara Shapiro, Justin Tiehen (chair Fall 2013), Carl Toews (chair Spring 2014), Stacey Weiss, Rand Worland.  Student members:  Gabe Davis, Robin Vanhouten.

**The senate charges to the 2013-2014 University Enrichment Committee in addition to the committee's regular business were:**

1.  Develop a request for increased funding for faculty and student research and conference travel to be submitted to Associate Dean Martin Jackson and the BTF.

2. Investigate the logistics of a per diem system for food during university travel, including how a per diem may be implemented with current and future versions of People Soft.

3. Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to People Soft and the P-card system.

4. Continue to develop and implement the UEC Faculty Scholarship Award.

5. Work to promote UEC grants and deadlines to faculty and students and make recommendations to the Associate Deans' Office for updating the UEC webpage.

6. Make recommendations to increase the visibility of faculty and student scholarship collaborating with LMIS as needed.

7. Investigate ways to streamline UEC student research grant application submission for students who already apply for summer research stipends.

**Committee Actions Regarding Usual Duties Related to Travel, Research, and Release Time Awards**

**1.  Faculty Travel Funding**

As of April 30, the UEC has received a total of 99 travel requests for a total of $98,717.   The year-to-date total amount allocated to funding faculty travel is $69,194 (although many faculty still need to submit receipts.)

2. **Faculty Research Funding**

The committee received a total of 14 applications for faculty research funding (12 in the Fall, 2 in the Spring.)  The total amount requested was $17,948, and the total amount awarded was $12,611.

3. **Release Time Requests**

The UEC received six applications for release time.  Every application was granted.

4. **Student Research and Travel Funding**

In the Fall, the UEC received 13 applications for student travel funding and 23 applications for student research funding.  Requests for travel support amounted to $6100, and the actual funding level was $5787.  Requests for research dollars amount to $12,142, and actual research funding was $8907.
In the Spring, the committee received 38 requests for travel support and 43 requests for research funding.  Requests for travel funding amounted to $13,777, and the actual funding rate was $5161.  Requests for research funding amounted to $21,060, and the actual funding rate is pending committee decisions.

5. **Trimble Asian Studies Professional Development Awards**

The UEC received two applications for Trimble Asian Studies awards, and both were awarded.  The total outlay for the two awards was $10,000.

6. **Selection of Regester Lecturer for 2014**

The UEC is currently in the process of selecting the recipient of the 2014 Regester Award.  There are five applications.  The selection process will be completed at the Friday, May 2 2014 UEC meeting.


**Committee Actions Regarding Senate Charges**

1. **Develop a request for increased funding for faculty and student research and conference travel to be submitted to Associate Dean Martin Jackson and the BTF.**

We developed this request and submitted it.

2. **Investigate the logistics of a per diem system for food during university travel, including how a per diem may be implemented with current and future versions of People Soft**.

Current university practice is to reimburse only for expenses incurred.  A transition to a per diem system would run counter to this process, and thus probably need approval at the level of the Board of Trustees.  As the UEC has no understanding of either the origin or the intent of the suggestion to move to a per diem, the committee felt that pursuing the second part of the charge (to investigate implementation of such a system in People Soft) would be premature.

3. **Determine how the UEC might shift its role in providing oversight of faculty conference travel requests in light of the university's move to People Soft and the P-card system.**

   The UEC determined that at the moment, no shift of role seemed called for:  conference funding requests are typically vetted by the assistant Dean's office and rubber stamped if the request falls within funding guidelines.  Applications come before the UEC only in special cases (e.g. retroactive reimbursement, cases of unusual itineraries, etc.) and these cases should continue to come before the UEC, regardless of PeopleSoft, a P-card system, or any other technological convenience.

4. **Continue to develop and implement the UEC Faculty Scholarship Award**.

   Last year the UEC submitted a draft proposal for this award to the FAC and Dean Bartanen.  The FAC posed some questions about the award, and requested clarification on certain points.  The UEC drafted a response to these questions, and sought to improve the language in the proposed award criteria.  The response and revised criteria have been submitted to Dean Bartanen and the FAC.

5. **Work to promote UEC grants and deadlines to faculty and students and make recommendations to the Associate Deans' Office for updating the UEC webpage.**

   Considerable improvements were made to the layout of the webpage describing UEC funding opportunities.  Moreover, a link to this page was placed on the drop-down "Faculty" menu under the Academics section of the main Puget Sound web page.

6. **Make recommendations to increase the visibility of faculty and student scholarship collaborating with LMIS as needed.**

   We debated various ways of increasing this visibility, including blurbs in Arches, Wednesday at 4 sessions, and a special "showcase" webpage.  To generate the data necessary to support any of these forums, we discussed introducing a new "reporting requirement" in the award descriptions.   As the improved UEC webpage has only recently come online, we did not have time to pursue any of these ideas with any particular vigor, but would encourage next year's committee to look into them.

7. **Investigate ways to streamline UEC student research grant application submission for students who already apply for summer research stipends.**

   We discussed this idea at length, and feel that some streamlining would be useful.  On the other hand, streamlining to the point of direct resubmission of existing materials was seen as inimical to the

spirit of the award, as would taking funding recommendations directly from the committee that evaluated the summer research files. Ultimately, the UEC decided that a reasonable middle ground would be to allow resubmittal of summer research applications, but with a new coverletter discussing the various budgetary contingencies in the event of a failed summer funding bid. The target implementation date for these changes is Spring 2015.

**Recommendations for next year's committee:**

1.  Continue to pursue ways to showcase creative and scholarly work that is supported by UEC funding. Some small additional reporting requirement seems a reasonable way to generate the raw information for this showcasing. These reports could be archived within a dedicated webpage, and linked to prominently. Hard copy publications like Arches, or softcopy publications like Open Line, represent good alternative options for displaying funded work. In pursuing this line of thought, attention should be paid to the matter of for whom the showcasing is really intended. Three likely candidate groups include prospective student applicants, alumni, and current award-eligible faculty.

2.  Continue to pursue the implementation of a Scholarship Award that directly parallels the existing Teaching Award. Symmetry between these two awards would draw attention to and support the teacher/scholar model that lies at the heart of the liberal arts experience.

3.  Investigate the feasibility and desirability of implementing three separate application deadlines for three separate funding periods: Fall, Spring, and Summer. Currently, there are two application deadlines (one in Fall, one in Spring) and funding from either must terminate at the end of the summer. It has been argued that this puts applicants for Fall research funding at a disadvantage, or in the position of needing to request retroactive funding. Any solution to the problem must take into account university budget cycles.

4.  Formalize and publicize rules for a "streamlined" application for summer student research support. In particular, make clear what exactly needs to appear in the revised coverletter, and how budgetary contingencies should be dealt with. These guidelines would ideally be formalized in the Fall semester, so as to allow implementation in the Spring.

The University Enrichment Committee (UEC) requests from the Budget Task Force (BTF) additional funds totaling **$50,000**; that is, $50,000 more than the 2013-14 BTF allocation of $138,000, for a total yearly allocation of $188,000. This would amount to a 36.2% increase in funds for the UEC. What follows is a breakdown of the spending categories covered by our request together with observations supporting our case for additional funds.

1. Regarding **Faculty Travel**, the 2013-14 allocation from the BTF was $93,000, while a balance of $11,100 is carried forward from the 2012-13 year, adding up to a total of $104,100. This figure is well below the 2012-13 disbursement for faculty travel, which was $113,397. That is a difference of −$9,297; or, counting just the BTF allocation of $93,000 (and not the balance carried forward), it is a difference −$20,398. Furthermore, the $93,000 BTF allocation would fail to cover faculty travel expenses in 4 of the last 6 years, with an average shortfall of $19,000. The trend in faculty conference travel expenses is increasing by roughly $3,000 per year (assuming a simple linear model), and so increased funding is needed to keep place.

In addition to these numbers, which largely speak for themselves, the UEC believes that the caps presently set on travel grants—that is, the $1,350 cap for conferences within the country, the $1,570 cap for international conferences, and the $125 per diem cap for hotel expenses—are no longer adequate. This is perhaps especially true of the per diem cap, as hotel room costs, even at (comparatively low) conference rates, regularly run higher than $125 per night.

Looking at the −$20,398 difference between the 2013-14 BTF allocation and the 2012-13 disbursement, and considering the need for higher caps on travel grants, and finally bearing in mind that the UEC does not want to keep coming back to the BTF year after year to ask for more funds given the noted trend in faculty travel expenses, the UEC requests an additional **$35,000** from the BTF for Faculty Travel; that is, $35,000 more than the 2013-14 allocation of $93,000, and so a total yearly allocation of $128,000.

2. Regarding **Faculty Research**, the 2013-14 allocation from the BTF was $17,500, while an additional $5,000 is projected to be available from the Phibbs Fund, adding up to a total of $22,500. By comparison, the 2012-13 total disbursement for faculty research was $19,642, a figure that is less than the $22,500 total that the UEC has for this category, but greater than the $17,500 BTF allocation taken alone.

In connection with Faculty Research, the UEC has been charged this year with developing a Faculty Research Award. Roughly, the idea is that what the Phibbs Awards are for recognizing teaching excellence, these new Faculty Research Awards will be for recognizing research excellence. Establishing such awards would help the UEC pursue several of the goals outlined in our charges, including promoting the visibility of faculty research that is often aided by the UEC. Under

the present category of Faculty Research, then, the UEC requests an additional **$3,000** from the BTF to support two such annual awards of $1,500 each; that is, $3,000 more than the 2013-14 allocation of $17,500 for Faculty Research, and so a yearly allocation of $20,500.

3. Regarding **Student Research and Travel Funding**, the present year's allocation from the BTF was $27,500, while an additional $2,400 is estimated to be available from ASUPS, adding up to a total of $29,900. This figure is well below the 2012-13 total disbursement for student research and travel funding, which was $40,861—a difference of −$10,961.

Breaking down that 2012-13 disbursement total by sub-category: (i) the UEC awarded a total of $23,120 for 52 different student travel grants, while (ii) the UEC awarded a total of $17,741 for 56 different student research grants. Regarding (ii), the UEC limited its awards in 2012-13 to an average of $317 per award, in comparison with the $500 cap on such awards, because of budget limitations we faced as a result of an unexpectedly high number of student travel grants awarded. If the UEC had given $500 per award for all 56 awards, the disbursement total for (ii) would be $28,000 rather than $17,741. The upshot is that the −$10,961 difference between the funds we have available for 2013-14 and our disbursement level in 2012-13 actually understates our demand for funding worthy student research projects.

An additional point worth noting is that the Fall 2012 semester saw an unusually high number of applications for research grants coming from the graduate students in Occupational and Physical Therapy (OT/PT). In previous years, many OT/PT graduate students were able to get outside funding for their research projects from a Grove Grant that their departments had secured, rather than applying to the UEC for funding their projects. However, as of 2012-13 this outside grant is no longer available, and so now the OT/PT graduate students are more dependent than they had been in the past on UEC awards—a reason for the BTF to increase the allocation for this category.

Going beyond this past year and looking longer term, the committee received 103 applications for student research and travel funding in 2012-13, 97 applications in 2011-12, 94 applications in 2010-11, and before that yearly averages in applications of between 60-70. So, there is a clear upward trend in applications.

Finally, the UEC feels strongly that student research and conference participation based on such research contributes significantly to our mission as a university. It is something that we as a university really should be strongly supporting. In light of the numbers cited here, the upward trends in applications for funding, and the point made above that the UEC does not want to have to return to the BTF time after time to ask for increased funding, we request an additional $15,000 for Student Research and Travel; that is, $15,000 more than the 2013-14 allocation of $29,900, for a total yearly allocation of $44,900.