

University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
October 9, 1996

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in room 103 of McIntyre Hall. Ninety-eight voting members of the faculty were present by 4:20 p.m.

John Finney was elected faculty secretary for another year.

Minutes of the March 20, 1996 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

President Pierce called for announcements. Ron Stone announced that Washington State Insurance Commissioner Deborah Senn would be giving a talk on health care reform on October 22, 1996 in Kilworth Chapel. Mott Greene distributed copies of a draft of proposed bylaws for a faculty club, and said incorporation of a faculty club could proceed if there is sufficient interest among the faculty. Bill Barry reminded faculty of the lecture October 11, 1996 at 4:00 p.m. in the McCormick Room by Alan Cameron on "Hypatia: Lynchings, Ancient and Modern." Judith Kay announced that Cornell West would be on campus February 13, 1997, at 8:00 p.m. in the Fieldhouse.

President Pierce gave the following report:

(1) At their recent retreat, the trustees approved President Pierce's recommendation that the university's retirement plan be changed to enable faculty and staff who leave the university to have full access to the accumulations in their retirement plan accounts. This is a substantial expansion of cashability which in the past was limited to a 10% distribution at the time of retirement. President Pierce said that faculty will receive an e-mail message with a more formal announcement of the change.

(2) The Board also approved creation of an espresso cafe in the Wheelock Student Center and an extensive renovation of Marshall Hall and the loft. To create the 100 seat espresso cafe, the area that is currently outside the boardroom where the bicycle racks are located will be enclosed and outdoor seating will be added. The cafe will be open until late in the evening and will serve light food. In the cafe, Marshall Hall and the loft, booth seating will be added around the periphery, data ports will be installed, and small tables will replace the large and uninviting ones currently in place. Two "wings" to the loft will be added in Marshall Hall in order to create 100 new dining spaces. The projects will be completed summer, 1997. The money for these projects will come from a housing and dining reserve fund.

(3) President Pierce reported that we are making very good progress on our yet-unannounced campaign. Because we will not announce the campaign formally until fall, 1997, she asked that we please consider this an in-house announcement: since September, 1994, we have raised in actual gifts and pledges over \$19 million.

(4) President Pierce reported that the trustees, in response to Grace Kirchner's report, believe it is critical that we revise and simplify the Faculty Code. She said that the trustees are concerned (as are many faculty) that the code is often cumbersome, intricate, ambiguous and sometimes inconsistent, and for these reasons makes us vulnerable to litigation. President Pierce reported that she met October 7 with the Faculty Senate, which endorsed a plan for creating a four-person faculty-administrative committee to begin work on the Faculty Code revision. The committee will consist of two members to be elected from the faculty and two administrators she will appoint. She said that she and the Board want to have a document that deals with such matters as appointment, tenure and promotion, and faculty responsibilities in a way that is fair, serves individual faculty members, and forwards our mission. She said that the Board was particularly

interested in our developing a Code that fosters a collegial and collaborative relationship among the board, administration, and faculty, rather than a legalistic and adversarial one.

President Pierce said that the committee will spend the fall term gathering information from members of the faculty and administration, our legal counsel, and other institutions. Then in spring, 1997, the committee will draft a revised document that they will make available to the faculty and the Board. During fall, 1997, the faculty will consider, perhaps revise, and act on the proposed draft in accordance with our normal procedures for amending the Faculty Code.

President Pierce said that she agreed with the suggestion Bill Haltom made during the October 7 Faculty Senate meeting that we should concentrate on simplifying and clarifying procedures and leave debates about any new policies until a second phase, i.e. until after the faculty and Board had approved a streamlined document. President Pierce said that faculty would receive a ballot soon for electing the faculty members of the committee. She said that the October 7, 1996 Faculty Senate minutes would include the text of her comments to the senate.

(5) President Pierce reported that Options, one of our two medical providers, has expanded its health coverage to include domestic partners, same sex and opposite sex. This new Options option will be available to all faculty and staff during the next enrollment period.

She said that, in response to the recommendation from the Domestic Partners Task Force, the Board constituted an ad hoc committee to look at this issue and at benefits generally. (The Options option did not require Board action). The Board committee concluded (and the full Board concurred) that the Board would "not consider increases in university benefit programs which would add to our costs unless we find that to not increase benefits would place the university at a serious competitive disadvantage in the employment market." The committee further concluded that the board would "not entertain increases in individual benefits outside the context of a full benefit review" that they asked President Pierce to prepare prior to any future benefits discussion with the Board. She said she thinks that what is behind these guidelines is a desire on the part of the Board to avoid receiving one ad hoc proposal after another and an equally strong desire to constrain tuition increases. (The text of the suggested guidelines from the ad hoc committee are attached).

(6) President Pierce reported that the Law Center project continues to move forward, with the closing now expected to occur in December. The state plans in the shorter term to bring 350 state employees into the building and in the longer term up to 500 employees. The state will spend close to \$9 million converting the Law Center to an office building. She said that this will be good for the Tacoma economy, and that the project had the strong support of the mayor, the chamber of commerce and the Tacoma business community.

(7) President Pierce said that on Monday, October 7, State Representative Norm Dicks spent part of the day on campus discussing federal financial aid policy and meeting students. In the evening, the university hosted an event for 22 legislative candidates from Pierce County and for presidents of the seven colleges in the area. She said that the News Tribune sponsored the event, and that all of the guests were filled with praise for the university.

(8) President Pierce reminded us of the celebration tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. at the President's House in honor of the Washington State Professor of the Year, selected by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and CASE. Although she had anticipated announcing the winner at that celebratory event, she feared that the News Tribune might "beat her to the punch" with a story in tomorrow's paper, so she announced at the meeting today that Mott Greene was the person being honored. This announcement was greeted by a round of applause for Mott, whose gracious response was that he considers the whole faculty to have won; that his

selection represents all the faculty. The phrase Mott used was "it takes the whole farm to raise a pig."

Dean Potts declined to give an Academic Vice President's report so that we could move on to the main event of the day.

President Pierce called on Bill Breitenbach, who gave the first reading of the Professional Standards Committee's proposal to amend the Faculty Code by replacing the terms "career faculty" ("non-career faculty") by the terms "tenure-line faculty" (non-tenure-line faculty). Breitenbach also gave the first reading of the Professional Standards Committee's proposal to amend the Faculty Bylaws by replacing the terms "career faculty" ("non-career faculty") by the terms "tenure-line faculty" (non-tenure-line faculty). Written copies of the proposals were distributed to faculty on October 3, and are appended to the archival copy of these minutes. There was no discussion.

We then turned to a discussion of the core curriculum and the various proposals for modifications to the core. President Pierce suggested that we discuss each of the proposals for 20-25 minutes, and that we agree that no votes be taken late in the meeting. There was no dissent, and Breitenbach began by presenting the "Report of the Ad Hoc Core-Curriculum Committee," dated May 20, 1996. Copies of the proposal were distributed to faculty on October 3, 1996 and are attached to the archival copy of these minutes. Breitenbach summarized the process of election of the Ad Hoc Core-Curriculum Committee (AHCCC) and the efforts of the Committee to solicit all points of view. He said that "the most insistent view" was epitomized by Anne Wood's earlier observation that when you put good students together with good faculty teaching what they are passionate about, good education takes place. He summarized the hybrid nature of the AHCCC proposal, consisting of eight units: three core seminars to be taken during the first year, the second year, and at the upper division level, and five courses distributed broadly across five areas: arts, humanities, mathematics, natural science, and social science. The core courses would have to be taken in residence, while the distribution courses could be filled in transfer or through AP exams. Breitenbach described how, in the view of AHCCC members, the proposal addresses all of the criticisms leveled at the existing core, and provides all of the features faculty said they wanted in a revised core.

President Pierce thanked members of the AHCCC for their hard work, and faculty responded with a round of applause. She then solicited questions from the floor. Goldstein asked who would oversee the sequencing of the three core seminars and what their guidelines would consist of. Bruce Lind responded that the AHCCC did not presume to propose guidelines, that it was a faculty prerogative to establish them. Breitenbach suggested that the Curriculum Committee could work these up, or perhaps there could be "self-policing" by the instructional faculty involved. Kris Bartanen pointed out that page two of the AHCCC proposal contains guidelines for beginning the work on this by suggesting goals for the core seminars.

David Droge asked how mathematics majors would be able to meet distribution requirements. Lind quoted the answer from page eight of the proposal: "Mathematics/Computer Science majors will substitute for the mathematics distribution requirement an additional course in one of the other distribution areas." Droge next asked what the relationship would be between the freshman core seminar and English 101. Bill Haltom responded that English 101 would still exist and that some, perhaps, could even be freshman core seminars. Droge's third question was: are there elementary courses implied by the advanced core seminars (which are not intended to be introductory level courses)? Lind responded that no prerequisites are implied. He said that the departments would decide what "not introductory level" means.

David Balaam asked what the incentive would be for departments to teach in any of the three core seminars, given other interests, the demands of the major, and the fact that the core seminars would not fulfill major requirements. Breitenbach responded that the guarantee of small core seminars in areas faculty feel passionate about would provide incentive. He added that perhaps major courses might need to be offered less often if there were less overlap between them and the new core courses.

Goldstein pointed out that some departments, especially in the sciences, do not have any upper division courses that do not have pre-requisites. Lind responded that, under the AHCCC proposal, the core seminars need only be non-introductory, not necessarily at the 300/400 level. Tinsley said that distribution requirements could all theoretically be introductory, if the faculty so decided. Sandler said she liked the idea under the proposal that students able to do advanced work would not be required to do introductory work. Breitenbach went on to say that we could actually require students to do advanced work.

A student asked how we would guarantee continuity in the core seminars if they are taken in different departments. Bartanen suggested that the various core rubrics will decide what should happen in each of the courses to meet the goals established for them.

At 4:47 p.m. President Pierce asked Jim Evans to introduce the next core revision proposal, entitled "Plan B: A Proposal for the Core." Copies were distributed to faculty on October 3, 1996, and a copy is attached to the archival copy of these minutes. Evans described how Plan B came into existence over the summer as two groups of like-minded faculty gradually merged their ideas into a single written document. He said that Plan B is a model for discussion, not a complete proposal. He said that, rather than starting from scratch, Plan B tries to retain the successes of the current core. He said that the "heart" of Plan B is the freshman year experience, which should consist of "doing college," rather than "just getting ready to do college." Plan B calls for the historical and humanistic perspective core areas to be moved down to the freshmen year and be joined by a new "social science perspective" core area. Freshmen would take two of the possible three seminars in lieu of the current written and oral core courses.

Evans pointed out that, in addition to the freshman seminars, core courses in international studies (year 2), science in context (year 3), and comparative values (year 4) would be required, along with five (or six, depending on how the foreign language requirement is filled) "breadth" courses.

Ted Taranovski said that, contrary to assertions of Plan B proponents that humanistic and historical perspective courses could be taught to freshmen, current guidelines in these areas would preclude it. Terry Cooney said that Taranovski was right about this, but argued that the humanistic and historical perspective course labels could be applied to revised guidelines. Bill Beardsley asked why we would stick with these labels, and why someone in the arts or sciences couldn't teach a freshman seminar. Evans replied that the humanistic and historical perspectives are "gateways" to the liberal arts and are therefore suitable for freshman courses. Magnus added that they allow for a "tightening" of the core while developing the writing skills that freshmen need. Pierson reiterated the point that adding intellectual content to intensive writing courses is the goal.

David Tinsley asked if there is any evidence to suggest that what goes on now in the freshman year is substandard. Cooney pointed out that the AHCCC was elected out of a context of discussion about the freshman year and strengthening it. He said that what set the context for the current proposals to revise the core is that our students now are different than the students we enrolled in 1976 when the current core came into existence. The old core is no longer appropriate. Paul Loeb argued that the AHCCC proposal is too restrictive "and even remedial," and that we would lose capable students. He said that Plan B provides a much more exciting

freshman year for these students. Breitenbach countered that the AHCCC-proposed freshman courses would be exciting and would appeal to good students.

Florence Sandler said we could be headed toward making a serious mistake under either the AHCCC or the Plan B proposals. She said the mistake would be to put all students through the same writing courses regardless of their preparation or background. Sandler cited reading-level data issued by the Center for Writing and Learning that shows a large number of current freshmen reads below grade level. She said it is very difficult to teach all of these students together in the same class, given the variation in their skills. She argued that teaching writing in courses that are heavy in intellectual content as is being proposed is virtually impossible, as we learned thirty years ago when we had such courses in the curriculum. She said we need to evaluate students' preparation rationally and then respond with appropriate courses. She argued that we are not beyond the stage where we no longer need to pay attention to students with low skill levels. These impassioned remarks brought forth a strong round of applause.

David Sousa said that the only premise underlying some parts of the Plan B proposal is the unsubstantiated claim that science in context and comparative values are working well. He asked what evidence there is of that. David Magnus responded that we have in fact evaluated science in context through course evaluations and external consultants, and that the evaluations are positive. He said that other institutions are seeking to implement similar courses based on our experience with them.

With regard to the process vs. intellectual content issue, Gary Peterson asked that we keep in mind: (1) process courses are not content-free; and (2) process does need to be carefully nurtured.

A student asked whether any of the Plan B core courses could be taken elsewhere if students were away studying abroad for a year. Evans responded that, while the intention is that a core course be taken in residence each of the four years, in practice study abroad students could be accommodated.

We adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty

**Statement by Lucy P. Isaki
Board of Trustees - October 5, 1996**

Our informal committee did meet to discuss several questions related to employee benefits. We considered benefits in the context of our current competitive position and our understanding of the larger employment market and trends in employee benefits programs.

It is our conclusion that we would not consider increases in University benefit programs which would add to our costs unless we find that to not increase benefits would place the University at a serious competitive disadvantage in the employment market.

We also concluded that we would not entertain increases in individual benefits outside the context of a full benefit review, and we ask the President and her staff to prepare such a review prior to any future benefits discussion with the Board.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe this is needed in the form of a motion. I do welcome any questions from the board.