

**Faculty Meeting**  
**College of Arts and Sciences**  
**May 3, 2016**  
**Gregg Pavilion**  
**3:30-5:00 p.m.**

The faculty clerk, Molly Robinson Kelly (Foreign Languages and Literatures), called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes were approved.

2. Announcements

A. Student Academic Affairs Board (SAAB)

Aaron Fellows (Lewis & Clark Student) spoke to the faculty as the chair of SAAB to ensure that everyone is on the same page about what the organization is, what it is doing, and how to use it as a resource. As he referenced a flow chart of the group, Mr. Fellows stated that SAAB seeks to help students extend their academic pursuits beyond what is normal or expected and has three major programs: the Board, tutoring, and the College Honor Board. The major change to the group's programs is the formal inclusion of the College Honor Board—and they are still figuring out how exactly this relationship will work.

Beginning with the Board, Mr. Fellows noted that it has various functions. As such, it facilitates student-faculty and department-wide interactions; hears and votes on student motivated grants; represents student voices on issues of academic importance; and includes one representative from each department and program with a major or minor, with a few exceptions. Mr. Fellows noted that SAAB has been involved with the ongoing work on general education. SAAB met with Paul Handstedt and spoke to the Exploration and Discovery Steering Committee. Mr. Fellows stated his belief that the Board is poised to play a role in facilitating student involvement.

Mr. Fellows stated that the tutoring program consists of students who have excelled in courses. These students also displayed enthusiasm for the material and an effective ability to communicate it to others. Last year they had over 100 tutors. The tutoring program is available as a resource to any student currently enrolled in a course for up to two hours per week.

Mr. Fellows explained that the College Honor Board is the newest addition to SAAB and helps the student body engage with the notion of academic integrity. When a student is accused of academic dishonesty a committee convenes to adjudicate the case. The committee is composed of three student members of the Honor Board and three faculty

members. A future aspiration is that the Board might participate in events, for example attending the first year PSI to promote the discussion of academic integrity.

To conclude his remarks, Mr. Fellows asked that faculty maintain open lines of communication with their department's SAAB representative. He further encouraged faculty to develop a standardized method of nominating representatives and tutors. Lastly, he asked that faculty refer students to the SAAB's website for more information or to send an email with questions to:

- Chair: [saab@lclark.edu](mailto:saab@lclark.edu)
- Board: [saabgrants@lclark.edu](mailto:saabgrants@lclark.edu)
- Tutoring: [tutoring@lclark.edu](mailto:tutoring@lclark.edu)
- Honor Board: [chb@lclark.edu](mailto:chb@lclark.edu)

Liz Stanhope (Math) inquired whether SAAB has a way to evaluate the effectiveness of tutors. Mr. Fellows responded that the tutors submit a reflection at the end of the semester and that this tells SAAB about how the program is running as a whole. Looking to the future, SAAB has a new online system and they are working on ways to use this system to solicit reflections by both tutors and those who have been tutored about their experiences.

### 3. Standing Committee Reports

#### A. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

Todd Lochner (Political Science) began his remarks by noting that he would briefly summarize the BAC's methodology and findings from their spring survey of budget priorities. Then the BAC would like to solicit information on these priorities using clickers.

Referring to the handout distributed to faculty at the meeting, Dr. Lochner made two points about the BAC's methodology. The first is that the committee sought to focus on priorities that were both under the control of the Dean's budget and listed in focus groups that were held 18 months ago. He noted that there are many important priorities that all agree with, but that they may be outside the scope of the survey, which required that the priorities examined be amenable to line item analysis. Dr. Lochner's second point concerned the results, which he noted are aggregated by the total proportion of overall money allocated to an issue. The BAC decided to show the results in this way because not every priority costs the same and to capture the intensity of preferences. For example, two people may agree that increasing adjunct salaries is good, but one person may say that we should allocate all of our money to this priority.

In terms of findings, Dr. Lochner stated that the most important budget priority was increasing faculty salaries. That said, there was disagreement about both whether salary adjustments should be done as a fixed versus a proportional amount and whether the increase in salary should be given to all faculty versus a subset of faculty. The second

most important priority was hiring new faculty. Within this category people favored paying the diversity premium by a factor of two to one. Dr. Lochner then asked if there were questions.

Rishona Zimring (English) inquired whether some full professors who are highly compensated could be skewing the data. Dr. Lochner responded that he is happy to send a spreadsheet of median and mean faculty salaries. He noted that in the future it is necessary to find out whether full professors as a whole are paid at a higher rate compared to our peer institutions or if there is a specific cohort within this group.

Nora Beck (Music) noted her concern about gender and inquired about how much men are paid in comparison to women. Dr. Lochner thanked Dr. Beck for her question and responded that he believes that the gender comparison has changed in the last 10 years. The BAC would like to revisit this question next year by doing a study of gender and salary. This analysis will be complicated by a number of factors affecting salary, with an especially important factor being difference in compensation between disciplines.

Elliott Young (History) agreed with Dr. Zimring's concern about how the categories were broken down. He asked why salary brackets were not used. Dr. Lochner responded that BAC separated full professors from everyone else because full professors make more proportionate to our peer institutions, while assistant and associate professors do not. Dr. Lochner stated that he could only speculate about why this is the case. For example, he has heard that full professors were here during years when faculty supposedly received seven or eight percent raises. When salary adjustments are then given proportionally, they tend to compound. Dr. Lochner said that he suspected that this may have something to do with the difference in salaries, but that he cannot prove it. He added that rather than using the metric of full versus associate professor it is possible to use salary brackets.

Anne Bentley (Chemistry) then led the faculty through the survey on budget priorities using clickers.

Question 1:

If you could choose only one of the priorities listed below, would you prefer:

1. Faculty salary increase
2. Hiring new faculty

The response was 60 percent in favor of faculty salary increases and 40 percent in favor of hiring new faculty.

Question 2:

With regard to tenure-track base salary raises, do you favor a raise based on:

1. Percentage of base pay
2. Fixed dollar amount (e.g. \$1,000)

The response was 20 percent in favor of percentage of base pay and 80 percent in favor of a fixed dollar amount.

Question 3:

With regard to tenure-track faculty base salary raises, which of the following do you favor?

1. Base salary raises to all tenure-track faculty
2. Base salary raises to Assistants and Associates, but not Full Professors
3. Base salary raises to all tenure-track faculty who make under \$100,000

The response was 13 percent in favor of base salary raises to all tenure-track faculty, 26 percent in favor of base salary raises to Assistants and Associates, but not Full Professors, and 61 percent in favor of base salary raises to all tenure-track faculty who make under \$100,000.

Question 4:

Salary differentials can be caused by a variety of factors. One such factor is the inherent market difference between disciplines. Which of the following best captures your opinion on the matter?

1. Because we must compete in national academic markets, salary differentials between disciplines at Lewis & Clark are justified.
2. Even though we must compete in national academic markets, salary differentials between disciplines at Lewis & Clark are not justified.
3. I think we can attract sufficiently qualified candidates in all markets even if we were to pay incoming professors approximately the same wage.

The response was 58 percent in favor of option one, 22 percent in favor of option two, and 20 percent in favor of option three.

Dr. Beck inquired whether the Dean and Provost salaries were included in the data. Mark Figueroa (Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Planning) commented that they excluded people who have an administrative position from the faculty salary data.

Dr. Zimring added that the spread in full professor salaries is huge, whereas the spread among other ranks is much lower. Dr. Beck commented that she does not trust the data.

J. M. Fritzman (Philosophy) commented that someone who agrees with option two could also agree with option three. He stated his belief that the responses should be aggregated.

Dr. Lochner responded that while it may have been an inartful way of asking this question, the BAC was trying to better understand the reasoning behind people's preferences. For those who disagree with the first option, is it because they grant that different markets exist, but they are willing to say that more expensive disciplines should find people who are willing to earn less money? Or is it that those who disagree do not think there will be fallout from removing salary differentials? Dr. Bentley added that

their questions are very preliminary and that the BAC wanted to find areas for additional investigation.

Tammy Weissman-Unni (Biology) asked how drastic the differences are among disciplines. Dean Catherine Kodat answered that she would reference the national market rather than make statements about Lewis & Clark specifically. Highly compensated disciplines include business, law, economics, and certain disciplines within the sciences. Also some social science and art fields are highly compensated in instances where faculty are highly specialized or may be performers or artists. Lower compensated disciplines include English, the humanities generally speaking, and some social sciences.

Dr. Robinson Kelly then suggested that the faculty continue to finish the survey and save discussions about the questions and their meaning for next fall. She noted that we can revisit the survey and that she is sure we will.

#### Question 5:

Salary differentials can be caused by a variety of factors. One such factor is the state of the economy (and hence the College's operating budget) in any given year. In some years, faculty have received large increases, and in some years faculty have received little if any increase. Which of the following best captures your opinion on the matter?

1. Salary differentials at Lewis & Clark that are caused by the timing of past budget cycles are unfortunate but do not merit correction.
2. Salary differentials at Lewis & Clark that are caused by the timing of past budget cycles merit correction, but not at the expense of denying some faculty regular base salary adjustments.
3. Salary differentials at Lewis & Clark that are caused by the timing of past budget cycles merit correction, even if it means denying some faculty regular base salary adjustments.

The response was 13 percent in favor of option one, 54 percent in favor of option two, and 33 percent in favor of option three.

Dr. Lochner concluded by thanking the faculty for their participation.

#### B. Curriculum Committee

As the chair of Subcommittee on General Education (SoGE), Greta Binford (Biology) highlighted the goals of the group. The first is to launch into the summer with a sense of optimism. She noted that SoGE has been meeting every Tuesday and wanted to especially thank Jessica Starling (Religious Studies), John Holzworth (Writing Center), Dr. Robinson Kelly, and representatives from the registrar for their regular attendance. Their other goal is to make a process that incentivizes all faculty to bring ideas to the table to create something that is very motivating.

Dr. Binford then detailed the timeline that SoGE hoped to follow in the next year. In Fall 2016, a discussion about a Lewis & Clark identity statement, goals accomplished through

general education, and models could take place. She noted that Dean Kodat has allocated lots of time at the faculty retreat to focus on general education. By the end of the Fall Semester, the aim is to agree on an identity statement and goals to be met through general education. In the spring, the focus will be on specific models and how they achieve various general education goals. Also in Spring 2017, a report on general education assessment is due to accreditors. By the end of the semester the aim is to agree on promising models to explore in 2017-2018.

Dr. Binford then briefly outlined four potential general education models: the status quo, nothing, core only, and strands. The status quo includes core (E&D) and distribution requirements as at present. Nothing means no core or distribution requirements. The core only model includes core courses required of all students; one model could include three courses across a student's career. Lastly, the strands model entails thematically linked courses spanning divisions; one model could include two strands, each with three courses linked across multiple semesters.

To further highlight how these models would work short skits were performed by Karen Gross (English), James Proctor (Environmental Studies), Aaron Fellows (Lewis & Clark Student), Hannah Swernoff (Lewis & Clark Student), and Peter Drake (Computer Science). Dr. Gross discussed the merits of the current general education model in terms of a speed date. While the current model may not be as exciting, it's still possible to work on the relationship. This model makes sure that the basics are covered, it's flexible, and this model is already a known quantity. In short this model can do a lot of thing as long as we are deliberate about why we would like to continue using this model. Dr. Proctor outlined the merits of no distribution requirements. He focused on the simplicity of this model and the amount of freedom that having no requirements gives to students. He also discussed the way that highlighting particular outcomes, like the ability to communicate effectively, can backfire if forced on students. Mr. Fellows and Ms. Swernoff talked about the merits of a core model from the viewpoint of a fitness trainer and trainee. Extending core through all four years would enable students to continually integrate their learning and the learning of their peers in the broader context of their undergraduate education. It would also challenge students to integrate perspectives across disciplines in realistic situations. Lastly, Dr. Drake discussed the benefits of a strands approach by asking faculty to imagine that students would take three classes about fire from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. A strength of this approach is that it highlights connections for students. It can bridge different ways of thinking and speaking when students are primed to pull in material from other classes.

Dr. Binford concluded by thanking Ms. Swernoff and Mr. Fellows for their work, as they will not be at Lewis & Clark next year. She stated that going forward this summer the committee's hope is that people read and absorb information about general education reform. She also added that they have drafted an example vision and encouraged faculty to take a look. The link to this statement is <https://ds.lclark.edu/gened/sample-lc-identity-statementgoals/>. She encouraged faculty to talk about their ideas over the summer and to contact the committee with any questions.

### C. Dean's Report

The Dean began her remarks by noting that she would like to keep her report brief so that the Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) would have time for discussion.

Dean Kodat expressed her desire to share the numbers from the Day of Giving campaign to give faculty a sense of how it went. She noted that she has a feeling that a campaign like this one may happen again in the future. She detailed a breakdown by fund and then by donor.

#### Breakdown by Fund:

- 853 gifts toward the CAS Annual Fund totaling \$87,137
- 251 gifts toward the new Diversity and Inclusion Fund totaling \$18,115
- 83 gifts toward the Pioneers for Pioneers Fund totaling \$1,404
- 566 gifts toward other funds totaling \$65,464

#### Breakdown by Donor:

- 703 gifts from CAS Alumni totaling \$85,045
- 386 gifts from current students totaling \$2,021
- 274 gifts from parents (both current and past) totaling \$46,192
- 148 gifts from staff totaling \$6,731
- 135 gifts from faculty totaling \$9,170
- 107 gifts from other donors totaling \$22,961

After sharing these numbers, Dean Kodat stated that the Day of Giving went well and that she hopes and expects that a campaign like this one will happen in the future.

Next Dean Kodat expressed her desire to issue a number of thank you's and notes. When Dean Kodat arrived she knew that this would be the first year with College Advisors. She applauded members of the Advising Center for partnering with faculty and students. She recently attended the Sophomore Soiree and noted that Carla Harclerod (Assistant Dean for Student Success) and Rachel Orlansky (Director of Student Support Services) did a great job putting this event together.

Dean Kodat reported that there were a great number of first year students who registered for classes next fall. Based on spring registration, our retention rate was 91 percent from first to second year. She noted that this is a wonderful accomplishment and hopes to build on this in the future. By way of comparison, last year this number was 88 percent.

Based on the success of summer advising last year, which resulted in far fewer students with problems and crises, this model will be used again this summer. In the summer, faculty will receive a note from her office about the academic fair. She noted that she would like the fair to be used as a venue to explore what happens after the first semester. She noted that more information would be provided over the summer.

This year also saw an improved number of seniors who were in good shape to graduate.

Last year, 46 percent of seniors were not on track to graduate as they entered the spring term. This year 30 percent were in that situation. This semester, two departments with high numbers of majors began more formal advising partnerships. Dean Kodat expressed her thanks to the faculty for their continued good work in advising students. She also thanked Janet Davidson, Carla Harclerod, Kaiti Lemon, Krystle Perkins, Laura LeMasters, Heather Miner, and Maureen Reed.

Dean Kodat also noted what a good time she had at the Festival of Scholars (FOS). While she was unable to spend the entire day at the FOS, she stopped by various presentations and commented that it is a great event to showcase Lewis & Clark students. She thanked the FOS committee for doing a good job putting together such a wonderful event.

Dean Kodat noted that a reception was held last Friday for retiring faculty members: Peter Christenson (Rhetoric and Media Studies), Joann Geddes (Director of Academic English Studies), Marty Hart-Landsberg (Economics), Herschel Snodgrass (Physics), and Wendy Woodrich (Foreign Languages and Literatures). Dean Kodat noted that there were many wonderful tributes at this event. This great event also drove home the importance of being a part of a community.

Dean Kodat then provided her reflections on this year. It was not the easiest year for her personally, as her father passed away and her mother fell and broke her right femur. She thanked the faculty for all of their support during this difficult time, which made her not only feel welcomed, but also cared for.

Summer is coming up and Dean Kodat and Bruce Suttmeier (Associate Dean) have plans to dive into the search handbook to develop ways to change how search committees are put together as a response to the issues raised by the CPT committee. These changes will include an increase in departmental involvement. She will bring back more information to faculty on this point in the fall.

Dean Kodat added that she is looking forward to commencement. She noted her excitement to introduce Nicholas Kristof, the keynote speaker.

Dean Kodat thanked SoGE for the wonderful skit. She noted that it has been great working so consistently with the Curriculum Committee and the Committee on Promotion and Tenure this year. She learned so much so fast, and people very patiently answered her questions. She stated that she is also personally excited because she and her husband will be moving to the Division neighborhood after commencement and she is looking forward to having people over.

Applause ensued with a standing ovation for Dean Kodat.



#### D. Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT)

Bob Mandel (International Affairs) began his remarks by noting that although they do not have a skit, the CPT report will be short. He commented that he would make some introductory comments about why the CPT introduced the principles that they did and the purpose behind their recent survey. Elizabeth Safran (Environmental Studies) will then present the data.

Dr. Mandel stated that the committee's goal is to create greater transparency about the tenure process. In the past there has been a sense of covertness about the CPT, much like the CIA, although this is not exactly how the committee operates. He introduced the current members with him: Mitch Reyes (Rhetoric & Media Studies), Dr. Safran, and Jane Hunter (History). Matthieu Raillard (Foreign Languages and Literatures) could not be there.

In the last two years there has been a concern among CPT members and those who have served in the recent past about the ambiguity of standards. This has resulted in a culture of fear about how letters should be written and uncertainty regarding the standards that should be used to evaluate faculty that is shared among pre-tenure faculty, members of developmental review committees, and department chairs. There continue to be questions about how to best promote, encourage, and mentor faculty to achieve everything that they can in the classroom and in their scholarly research. The goal of the CPT is to create greater clarity and coherence than in the past. However, at the same time, the CPT recognizes that there will always be a need for interpretation and a sense of personal judgment involved about the meaning of excellence at Lewis & Clark among CPT and other community members.

Dr. Safran thanked those who participated in the survey. Overall there were 64 responses. She noted that the CPT committee appreciated faculty comments.

Dr. Safran then summarized responses to each of their seven questions by referencing displayed histograms of the results. On the question of one versus two reviews, it was clear that the preference of faculty is to retain two reviews. There was some support and indifference as to whether the CPT should be involved in the pre-tenure review process. In contrast, there was strong support for tenured members of a department to assess a file prior to submitting it for tenure. In addition, there was fairly strong support for a formalized mentor program. There was largely indifference about changing the size and term of the CPT. In contrast, there was strong support for adding clarifying language in the handbook about the meaning of excellence. Lastly, there was pretty strong support for the idea of clarifying what materials CPT will review.

Dr. Safran then sought to capture some of the qualitative comments that were made along with the survey. She noted that these comments were many and rich. For example, there was a lot of praise for the developmental character of the current system, a desire for two chances at a "course correction," and some anxiety about unsupportive departments and the need for shielding by Developmental Review Committees.

Dr. Mandel commented that because of the mixed responses to their survey, faculty may be relieved to know that the CPT is not pushing forward with a proposal to be voted on now. The CPT had consensus on that. They will instead hand over these questions to next year's committee. He announced that in addition to Dr. Safran and Dr. Raillard, Brian Detweiler-Bedell (Psychology), Cliff Bekar (Economics), Andrew Bernstein (History), and Julio De Paula (Chemistry) will serve on the committee.

Dean Kodat commented that this was not the right list, as Cara Tomlinson (Art) will serve on the committee and not Dr. Bernstein.

Seeing that there were no questions, Dr. Mandel concluded by saying that he wanted to thank his faculty colleagues and Dean Kodat, who was a wonderful contributor to the CPT throughout the year. He wished the faculty a fun summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.