

Faculty Senate Minutes **January 25, 1999**

Senators present: Bill Haltom (Chair), Bill Beardsley, Michele Birnbaum, Nancy Bristow, Terry Cooney, Rafael Gomez, Cathy Hale, Connie Hale, Duane Hulbert, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Judith Kay, Hans Ostrom, Bob Steiner, George Tomlin, Anne Wood

Visitors: Kris Bartanen, Barry Bauska, Martin Jackson, Mike Rothman, Ross Singleton, Bryan Smith, Peter Wimberger

Meeting called to order at 4:01 p.m. by Chair Haltom

Minutes of the 12/7/98 meeting submitted by Tomlin M/S/P as earlier amended.

Announcements: Haltom noted that Connie Hale replaces Ann Neel's position as Senator. The replacement is based on the voting tally from the previous election.

Also, student representative, Stephanie Rubio, recently informed Rafael Gomez that she cannot serve out this term; Gomez agreed he would find a second student representative as soon as possible.

Business:

Cooney provided a brief introduction to the Budget Task Force (BTF) Presentation to the Faculty Senate, explaining the composition of the committee, the framework for deliberations, and the review procedures for BTF recommendations by President Pierce and the Board of Trustees. He pointed out that a summary of this information as well as the specific BTF recommendations are available in the document, "Budget Task Force Discussion of 1999-2000 Budget Development January, 1999" at <http://www.ups.edu/financeadmin/btf2000.htm>. Cooney also noted that the deadline for commentary by the university community on BTF recommendations is February 5.

Jackson offered a concise summary of recommendations in the BTF report:

- 1) a 4.1% increase in tuition, fees, room and board;
- 2) a \$600,000 increase in scholarship aid for next year (which is a ½% increase over last year)
- 3) a 3% increase in salary pools for faculty and staff
- 4) an increase to \$193.33 in the employee benefits monthly allowance and expansion of the supplemental life insurance program
- 5) in addition to the 3%, in salary pools for faculty and staff, the BTF recommends establishing a special pool for non-exempt staff members with a salary range of less than \$35,000/year "with the pool based on 1% of salary of the group."
- 6) increase of \$119,000 for OIS for information technology, including one additional staff position.

Rothman handed out copies of the BTF recommendations and handout which featured "Tuition & Fee Comparisons, 1998/99" on one side and "University of Puget Sound Budget" on the other. The tuition and fees comparisons place the University of Puget Sound in both its Northwest (Reed, Willamette, Whitman, Lewis & Clark) and National (Gettysburg, St. Lawrence, Occidental, Denison, etc.) university peer groups. The budget compares the 1998/9 and 1999/00 revenues and expenditures. Rothman noted that the largest single source of revenue—approximately 80% of total revenue—for Puget Sound comes from students and parents, making it more tuition-dependent than most peer institutions but comparatively less dependent than last year. In comparison with the listed peer institutions, he said we rank in the lower third in terms of tuition and fees, but because we offer on average less financial aid assistance in the form of scholarships and grants, in fact Puget Sound places slightly above the median.

Reviewing the "University of Puget Sound Budget," Rothman pointed out that the largest expenditure category is "compensation," which includes salary and benefits; the next sizable expense is "auxiliary services," which refers to items such as food and text books. "Academic and student services," including office supplies such as postage, and operating costs like utilities and

building equipment, ranked third in university expenditures. The single largest increase from the 1998/9 and 1999/00 budgets is in this last category.

Singleton asked Cooney about the fiscal assumptions informing budget decisions for salary “steps” and promotion. Salary increases derive from either increases to the salary scale or by moving up a step or gaining promotion. The retirement of a full professor and the hiring of an assistant saves money which can be applied toward the cost of steps and promotions in any given year, and last year, according to Cooney, a sufficient number of retirements covered this cost. But when the entire cost is not covered by retirements, a portion of any increase in the salary pool must go toward that purpose. Cooney indicated that about .04 percent from the addition to the pool would be needed to cover steps and promotions. At an earlier BTF meeting, Cooney continued, some members requested discussion of an adjustment of the index at the level of full professor (in other words, an adjustment of the salary scale). Cooney indicated his preference that the faculty as a whole take up the issue of an adjustment in index.

Bristow asked what exactly is meant by an “adjustment in index.” Cooney said it means that if the salary of an assistant professor goes up, then the salary of everyone up the scale goes up, as well.

Wimberger inquired about the status of an inquiry from Human Resources regarding death and disability benefits after twenty years of service; he asked if some of those benefits are available after ten years service. Cooney specified that after ten years’ service, staff/faculty were eligible to have dependents take classes; after twenty years’ service, all tuition money was available.

Hulbert asked if the rate of tuition versus scholarship always went down year by year. Rothman said that in fact the opposite was true: the total percentage of income derived from tuition—that is not met by scholarships—has increased by about ½% point per year. Three years ago, the BTF suggested a plan for “discounting” tuition and scholarships. The tuition/ scholarship ration is usually adjusted every three years or so, according to Rothman.

Ostrom asked how tuition-driven were other schools compared to Puget Sound. Rothman said he knew of no exact numbers but noted that the best-endowed schools generally receive 50-60% from tuition (versus the 80% we depend on). Kay asked if Reed was the best endowed among Puget Sound’s regional peer institutions. Rothman said that of that group, Whitman probably had the largest endowments.

Singleton asked about the uses of the President’s Discretionary Fund. Rothman said it was a \$100,000 fund usually used as a contingency against enrollment shortfalls, and then available for one-time funding allotments. Rothman noted that some well-received “small” requests had been made for equipment or technology. The BTF made no recommendations for the Fund’s use in its report.

Haltom was curious as to how recently the salary pool increases for faculty and staff had remained the same? Rothman said the increases had remained the same for both groups over the last four years, but Jackson pointed out that the same percentage in increase does not necessarily have the same effect for each respective group.

Haltom thanked the Budget Task Force Committee members for their presentations and for responding to Senators’ and visitors’ questions, encouraged Birnbaum to submit a draft of the minutes of this meeting for review to the BTF. The BTF Committee thanked the Senate in turn, and left.

Special Orders

Gomez said that the results of the Student Survey would be available for preview on the February 8 meeting of the Senate, and will be presented at the February 10 meeting of the faculty as a whole. Haltom told Gomez to make sure that he requested time on the schedule for that Feb. 10 presentation.

Haltom said that he would encourage the Faculty Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations, which was presented to the Senate last year, to submit their report as soon as possible to the Professional Standards Committee.

Cooney said he would draft FAC procedures to show Professional Standards.

Haltom then turned to Step Two of the Senate process approved by the faculty, noting that discussion about the second Freshman Seminar is on the agenda for the February 10 meeting of

the faculty as a whole. He said that the Chair of the Diversity Committee, Carolyn Weisz, had informed him that the Committee wished to address faculty at that meeting to possibly discuss the issue of diversity within the core curriculum—as a potential core “theme” or in some other form—because Step Two suggests that such a discussion would be appropriate at this stage in the process. Haltom said Mike Veseth’s proposal for a “citizenship” theme might also be discussed at that meeting.

Beardsley suggested the need for a more general discussion of “themes” before the meeting, asking why we required a core with a theme at all? what does it mean to have a theme?

Cooney asked if we needed to discuss the third and fourth seminars before or after any discussions of theme? This question led to a conversation concerning the timing of such issues, particularly the need to provide enough time for a full hearing of the issues and discussion or concerns surrounding them. Haltom said that for the next meeting of the faculty we should outline a schedule for the core discussion this semester. Kay said that there is a mention of possibility for discussing themes and/or diversity already written into Step Two. Haltom said he had discussed timing with Weisz, suggesting that issues of diversity could also be discussed in later Steps as well, though raising the issue now might make sure that decisions about the Core at this stage did not inadvertently preempt those later discussions. Ostrom suggested the Senate could suggest some order to the next meeting. Tomlin reiterated the general interest in making sure faculty had plenty of deliberation time, and that structuring time might guarantee this.

Bristow suggested inviting Veseth and Weisz to the next Senate meeting of February 8, not to assess their proposals in any way, but rather to simply work with them on procedure and coordination—for instance, to ask if, in fact, they would be ready with a proposal or presentation at the meeting of the faculty of the whole or whether another time would be more appropriate. Haltom agreed.

Ostrom asked if we needed to sketch out how many meetings were anticipated for Step Three and so on through the spring semester. Haltom said we would discuss how many meetings might be required at the meeting of the faculty as a whole.

Kay said that a recap of the core deliberations and motions already passed might be helpful at the upcoming meeting of February 10, especially to refresh faculty of Step Two.

Cooney said he had understood that he was asked by the Senate at the last meeting to draft a revised charge for Academic Standards regarding course scheduling. He had done so and circulated a draft of the charge, which listed five major points of consideration. Haltom said that if Senators had friendly amendments to the draft of the AS charge, we could make them through email.

Haltom then briefly reviewed a possible schedule for the next meeting of the faculty of the whole, beginning with Gomez’s presentation on the Student Survey results, then moving to a tentative timeline for Spring 1999 discussions (which, Haltom noted, could accommodate Beardsley’s questions about the rationale for “themes”), and then to Step Two and the “Inquiry” Seminar.

Motion to adjourn at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Birnbaum