

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, April 16, 2012
McCormack Room, Collins Library

Senators Present: Steven Neshyba, Gareth Barkin, Ross Singleton, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Sue Hannaford, Keith Ward, Kelli Delaney, Fred Hamel, Leslie Saucedo, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Mike Segawa, Kriszta Kotsis.

Guests Present: Nila Wiese; Zaixin Hong; Amy Ryken; Seth Weinberger; Lisa Ferrari; Bruce Mann; Alyce DeMarais; Florence Sandler

I. Minutes of 4-2-12 adopted with minor changes.

II. Announcements

MacBain announced that the faculty elections are completed and that the results are on the Senate SoundNet site and will be attached to today's minutes. (See Attachment A.) Neshyba announced the names of the senators elected to the 2012-13 Faculty Senate, including those who will substitute for senators on leave. (See Attachment B.)

Barkin announced that Syrian-American hip-hop artist Omar Offendum will be on campus on April 24th. Offendum raps in Arabic and English.

Richman announced that the senior thesis art show has begun in Kittredge Gallery.

III. Special Orders: None.

IV. Report of the Committee on Diversity (COD) (See Attachment C for full text of report.)

Ryken (chair) said that the COD has had a better year than last of strategically finding meaningful work for itself. The 2011-12 work of the COD included:

- participation in developing initiatives that help in hiring faculty from underrepresented groups;
- generation of a series of questions that Dean Bartanen sent out to those who agreed to serve as Diversity Liaison in each department. (Having received positive feedback from departments on the contribution of the liaison, the COD recommends that the university continue this approach.)
- determination three potential ways to integrate diversity into the curriculum (per the Senate charge).
- Review of gender identity divisions in various modes of institutional reporting. For example, the COD was concerned with Cascade's forced choice of "male" or "female" in users' self-identification and so made recommendations for change to IT and OIR. As the campus moves forward with the ERP process, the issue will be addressed.
- Review of draft of campus climate survey and provision of feedback before it is distributed to campus. Ryken reported a high response rate to the survey:

the yield is a 245-page document of responses. The COD charges itself to process the faculty data next year.

Ryken stated that the challenge of this committee is that it is different from many other Senate committees in that it has no structure of self-sustaining work. To meet the challenge, Ryken has tried hard to create meaningful projects. Hong added that he has enjoyed Ryken's leadership this year and praised her for providing a focal point for every discussion the committee had.

Hannaford asked if there is potential for recurring charges. Ryken believes that the COD will have enough work in the coming year if members are encouraged to pursue the self-charges outlined in the report. The COD also responds to things that happen on campus. Ryken added that the COD would be the committee to make a study of the diversity requirement, for the COD would get it done expeditiously. (At the start of 2011-12 the Senate charged the Curriculum Committee and the COD to work on this charge together, but the Curriculum Committee has indicated that it has too many other charges to be able to complete this one in a timely manner.)

Hamel asked when results of climate survey would be shared more broadly. Ryken said that the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) just received the document last Friday. In the first week of May, the DAC will send an email to the campus community containing a few overarching points, such as response rate and responses to general questions. The DAC feels strongly about getting out some information and no misinformation. (Bartanen said that the main rollout of the survey results will be in the fall.) Ryken said that the comments on the survey are generally very thoughtful. There was a 40% response rate from students (whereas usually surveys generate responses among students in the 13-20% range) and a 60% response rate from faculty and staff. Ryken praised Ellen Peters and Emily Mullins from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) for their thoughtful work on this project.

Ryken took this opportunity to share another challenge faced by the COD and DAC: they only have systematic data on certain dimensions of social diversity on campus. So, for instance, they don't know the religious or sexuality status of faculty. This issue becomes important when one thinks about what is being tracked and by whom. Wonders Ryken, how can we know if we're getting "better" or "worse" if we don't know where we're starting?

Saucedo asked if the diversity narratives submitted by faculty and students are available online? Ryken said that they are not yet because when the authors first wrote them, they were not asked for permission to share the narratives online. However, the COD does have a pdf of three narratives for which they did receive permission to share, and Ryken would be happy to make the pdf available to Saucedo and others. The COD will explore whether and how to post narratives online.

M (Saucedo)/S/P to receive the report from the COD.

V. Report of the Student Life Committee (SLC) (See Attachment D for full text of report.)

Mann presented highlights of the report:

- There were four strong students on the committee.
- Having one too few faculty members on the SLC created a burden for the three faculty members.
- The SLC accepted the charges from the Senate and spent much time continuing a discussion from last year of the implications of the Retention Task Force (RTF) study that was done in the three years prior. Out of that study, the Dean of Students' staff brought forth a number of recommendations about ways to improve retention on campus. The SLC reacted to and reflected on these solutions, particularly as pertained to the new dorm and the changes to the student center.
- One issue that came up that causes a problem for students is how faculty work as advisors, particularly at midterm. It's not clear that all faculty do a good job of communicating to students what midterm grades indicate. The Dean of Students' Office is talking about how to support faculty in helping the students to navigate the midterm, particularly during the sophomore year. A related issue is that faculty members appear to be very good at "nuts and bolts" and departmental advising. It's the other part of advising, how faculty help students confront the problems students are facing (e.g., time use) that faculty could improve upon (according to a perception among students). One idea is to have students evaluate the advising they receive. Mann indicated that the senate might want to think about this idea. The SLC has no recommendation.
- Another issue was what to do when a student's GPA drops below 2.0.
- A related issue is that the RTF found that students' interaction with faculty in first two years impacts the success they are likely to have. The SLC joins the RTF in recommending that the university present 1st- and 2nd-year students with our "best" faculty in the classroom, that is, the faculty considered permanent, for the continuity of the student-teacher relationship is the issue.
- The SLC discussed the "sophomore slump," particularly programs to combat it and ways for 2nd-year students to become more engaged, to access resources on campus, etc.
- Finally, the SLC discussed how our "better" students still feel that the academic environment outside the classroom is not as good as it could be. Mann said that the deans are going to encourage departments to do more things to encourage students to participate in the intellectual life of the university outside the classroom. The residential seminars program helps with this issue.

On the topic of the "sophomore slump," Saucedo suggested moving the Ideas as Work and Play series out of freshman orientation and into the sophomore year.

Segawa indicated that 2012 inaugurated sophomore planning during the MLK holiday and that there are plans to offer something like Ideas as Work and Play to sophomores.

Barry asked, What is the evidence for the student concerns about advising and the 1st- and 2nd-year faculty teaching introductory courses? Segawa said that the RTF created a couple of focus groups, one with students who indicated that they were going to leave Puget Sound but ended up staying, and one of students whose pre-college characteristics indicated that they might not stay at Puget Sound but they did. The advising theme was one that emerged from these groups. Barry asked where the SLC sees the committee going with this information, for he was trying to ascertain whether or not the committee envisioned the senate creating charges for other committees based upon this information. Segawa indicated that much of this has been passed along to Landon Wade and Kelli Delaney in Academic Advising, and some to Kris Bartanen (in order to revise parts of the new faculty orientation). Academic Advising is thinking about how they can move beyond the “nuts and bolts” advising training with faculty. The grade point piece landed with the Academic Standards Committee, and other issues will land in other committees. Bartanen said that the RTF’s report has gone to the Cabinet, and this discussion reminds Bartanen to make the report publicly available, too.

Bartanen took a moment to add that, despite the strength of residential seminars stated in the report, we’ve got only 5 slated for Fall semester. We’d like to have 8 to 10.

M (Barry)/S/P to receive the report of the SLC.

Neshyba indicated that he would like to switch the order of Butcher’s and Ward’s issues on the agenda in order to accommodate Weinberger, who was “pinch-hitting” for Butcher.

VI. Professional Standards Committee (PSC) Code Interpretations

Two PSC interpretations of the Faculty Code are of such merit as to be included in the Senate minutes:

- 1) The interpretation of chapter 3, section 4, concerning the role of colleagues in the evaluation process.
 - a. See Attachment E for language.
 - b. See Attachment E for formal rationale.

Saucedo said that when she was a visiting faculty member she enjoyed participating. Weinberger: if a dept chooses, tenure-line or instructors could participate in the review of the adjuncts or visiting.

Registering concern, Neshyba said that one of the services the Chemistry Department provides for its visiting professors is that they get to participate in evaluations so that they get that experience. These people also carry with them to other institutions a sense of how Puget Sound’s processes work. Neshyba is

concerned that with this language, never the twain shall meet—that the visiting and adjunct faculty would not even be permitted to read the file. Bartanen said that this concern gets to the question of who votes. The subcommittee did not talk about a visitor or adjunct reading the file or listening the meeting up to a point. MacBain said that she believes that visiting and adjunct faculty are permitted by the Code to read the file and write a letter, that is, that nothing prevents them from continuing to participate in this way. Weinberger and Bartanen concurred. Hamel asked if the PSC has considered the different ways in which nonpermanent faculty might be constituted in different departments. For example, in Education, they have one permanent instructor; they also have visiting instructors who are with them for an extended period of time. According to Hamel, these people get to know the program extremely well, tenure-line faculty work with them extremely closely, and these people have taken part in evaluations. Bartanen said that clinical graduate faculty and artists in residence are deliberately not named by the PSC. Barry asked if “participation” mainly means “vote”; Weinberger said yes.

- 2) Reinterpretation of chapter 3, section 2, delaying a scheduled evaluation connected to the faculty medical and family leave policy and the medical leave policy. The reinterpretation was pursuant to a Senate charge regarding the issue of “stopping the clock” to make the university’s evaluation policy more family-friendly.
 - a. See Attachment F for language.
 - b. See Attachment F for formal rationale.

M (Ward)/S/P to receive the report from the PSC.

The Senate opted to approve the minutes of 4-16-12 without exception (M (Barkin)/S/P), with the provision that MacBain will distribute the draft of the minutes by noon on Wednesday, 4-18-12 and that senators and guests will suggest changes to the minutes by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, 4-20-12. The object is to distribute the minutes to the full faculty by April 23, 2012, in order to allow for the initiation of an appeal within ten (10) days of the minutes being posted, so that the ten days will not outlast spring semester.

VII. M (Ward)/S/P that the faculty establish a parliamentarian. The parliamentarian shall serve in a consultative role on parliamentary procedures during faculty meetings and as a resource for faculty preparing agenda items or motions for faculty meetings. The parliamentarian shall be a full-time faculty member and will be appointed for a three-year, renewable term by the Senate Executive Committee jointly with the Dean of the University.

Neshyba indicated that if the full faculty carries the motion, the position will be included on the email solicitation that goes out RE: service positions.

VIII. LMIS intellectual property policy.

Demarais explained that the university needs an intellectual property policy, for it has none now. LMIS developed and approved one about a year ago. The policy has been sent to university counsel and after that circulated through the Cabinet. From there it went back to LMIS and has now come to the Senate. Pending the final legal

review, the policy will go back to Cabinet.
M (Singleton)/S/P to acknowledge receipt of the policy.

Singleton shared that he remembers that when the policy came before the senate in the fall term, Brad Dillman had serious reservations about it. Later, in early spring semester, the Senate agreed that it would extend an invitation to Dillman at the time that we formally considered this policy. Singleton wanted to ascertain whether or not Brad had had time to provide input. Neshyba indicated that he cc'd Dillman on the agenda to today's meeting. DeMarais added that some of Dillman's concern was with what counsel thought of the policy, and since the most recent draft of the policy has been vetted by counsel (who, earlier, made suggestions that have been incorporated), Dillman's concerns may have been addressed. Bartanen suggested that we have a conversation with Dillman, and DeMarais agreed to do so.

The motion carried.

VIII. M (Barry)/S/P that the senate approve the change in probation and dismissal policies approved by the ASC at their April 5, 2012 meeting. (See Attachment G for new language.)

After some discussion of the necessity of including the phrase "one semester" and "readmission position" in the language, the motion carried.

IX. The Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Attachment A

Chair of the Faculty Senate

Brad Dillman, 100 responses, 62%
Seth Weinberger, 61 responses, 38%
Total responses: 161

Faculty Senate

David Andreson, 34 responses, 20%
Zaixin Hong, 76 responses, 44%
Kent Hooper, 115 responses, 67%
Tim Hoyt, 31 responses, 18%
Judith Kay, 66 responses, 39%
Brendan Lanctot, 57 responses, 33%
Amanda Mifflin, 31 responses, 18%
Amy Odegard, 53 responses, 31%
Ann Putnam, 47 responses, 27%
Maria Sampen, 62 responses, 36%
Ariela Tubert, 71 responses, 42%
Nila Wiese, 67 responses, 39%
Total responses: 171

Faculty Advancement Committee

Fred Hamel, 69 responses, 40%
Mark Harpring, 36 responses, 21%
Kent Hooper, 63 responses, 37%
Mark Martin, 29 responses, 17%
Gary McCall, 20 responses, 12%
Jonathan Stockdale, 46 responses, 27%
Barbara Warren, 40 responses, 23%
Seth Weinberger, 25 responses, 15%
Total responses: 171

Faculty Salary Committee

Derek Buescher, 54 responses, 32%
Lynnette Claire, 84 responses, 50%
Barry Goldstein, 65 responses, 39%
Gary McCall, 18 responses, 11%
Matt Warning, 98 responses, 59%
Total responses: 167

Attachment B

Faculty Senate Election scores

Kent Hooper, Humanities 67% (but he's going to FAC)
Zaixin Hong, Art 44%
Ariela Tubert, Philosophy 42%
Judith Kay, Religion 39%
Nila Wiese, School of Business & Leadership 39%
Maria Sampen, School of Music 36%
Brendan Lanctot, Foreign Languages and Literature 33%
Amy Odegard, Chemistry 31% (but she is on leave Spring 2013)
Ann Putnam, English 27%
David Andresen, Psychology 20%
Tim Hoyt, Chemistry 18%
Amanda Mifflin, Chemistry 18%

Therefore starting 2012-13, Senate members will be

Kris **Bartanen** & Mike **Segawa** (ex-officio)
Staff: **Kelly Delaney** (or another staff appointee)
ASUPS President and **one additional student**
Brad **Dillman** (chair)
Elise **Richman**, Ross **Singleton**, & Amy **Spivey** (through 2012-2013)
Leslie **Saucedo**, Sue **Hannaford**, Alisa **Kessel**, and Kriszta **Kotsis** (through 2013-2014)
Zaixin **Hong**, Ariela **Tubert**, Nila **Wiese**, and Judith **Kay** (through 2014-2015)
(Going off Senate: Bill **Barry**, Fred **Hamel**, Tiffany **MacBain**, Keith **Ward**)

On leave/otherwise absent in 2012-13

Saucedo will be on leave the entire year.
Tubert will be on leave Fall 2012.
Kotsis will be on leave Spring 2013.
Singleton will retire mid-year, hence not on Senate Spring 2013.

So it seems that replacements for 2012-13 should be

Sampen replaces **Saucedo** the entire year
Lanctot replaces **Tubert** in fall, **Kotsis** in Spring
Putnam replaces **Singleton** in Spring

Attachment C

Committee on Diversity 2011-2012 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Committee Members

Kim Bobby, Westley Dang (student member), Lisa Ferrari, Pepa Lago-Grana, Nadav Heman (student member, Fall 2011), Zaixin Hong, Mark Martin (Fall 2011), Margi Nowak, Susan Owen, Michel Rocchi, Czarina Ramsay, Amy Ryken (chair), Megan Sykes (student member), Kurt Walls

Senate Liaison

Gareth Barkin

Committee Activities

Committee Responsibilities 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.	--Amy Ryken collaborated with Dean Bartanen to add to search guidelines for hiring departments encouraging that each faculty search committee designate a diversity liaison. 10/12 (83%) departments conducting tenure line searches designated a diversity liaison. --The committee met with Cindy Matern, Associate Vice President for Human Resources, to discuss how to provide support for faculty serving in the diversity liaison role on search committees and processes for interviewing, hiring, and retaining faculty who contribute to Puget Sound's stated diversity-related goals. --The committee developed post search follow-up questions for search chairs and diversity liaisons. Dean Bartanen solicited responses. The committee reviewed responses and made recommendations for better supporting the work of diversity liaisons next year.
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 serves as the Committee on Diversity representative on the Diversity Advisory Council (DAC). --The committee has worked collaboratively with the Academic Vice President and the Chief Diversity officer in the creation and review of the diversity liaison role.

<p>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.</p>	<p>-- The committee collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC, BERT, CWTL, the Chief Diversity Officer, and Multicultural Student Services.</p> <p>--A sub-committee including Zaixin Hong, Pepa Lago-Grana, Lisa Ferrari, and Amy Ryken reviewed how gender is framed as a binary choice (male or female) on Cascade and within institutional reporting. The sub-committee acknowledged the tension of allowing individuals to self identify in a broad range of ways versus having consistent categories for institutional analysis. The Committee on Diversity made recommendations about gender identity designations to the Director of Institutional Research and the Associate Vice President of Technology Services to be considered during the ERP transition process.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>--Kim Bobby and Margi Nowak facilitated a workshop for new faculty focused on using teaching narratives written by Puget Sound Faculty members on unintended moments of student spotlighting.</p> <p>--The committee reviewed and provided feedback on the "What is Cultural Competence?" reflection guide which is used during new staff orientation and departmental workshops. Kim Bobby and Amy Ryken revised the guide to incorporate the suggested changes.</p> <p>--The committee worked to increase the number of faculty narratives by inviting submissions from faculty colleagues.</p> <p>--Kim Bobby and Amy Ryken helped plan two CWTL dialogues. Fall 2011: "What is Cultural Competency?" Spring 2012: "Challenges and Opportunities of Engaging Diversity in the Curriculum"</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>--BERT was activated in September 2011. Pepa Lago-Grana and Margi Nowak serve as the Committee on Diversity representatives on BERT.</p>
<p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p>	<p>--This document is our annual report.</p>

<p>8. Such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Faculty Senate.</p> <p>--Charge 1: to systematically gather information about faculty attitudes on hiring and retention of faculty and to develop recommendations for the recruitment and retention of new faculty from historically under-represented populations;</p> <p>--Charge 2: to increase awareness of and participation in the ongoing efforts with the campus climate survey;</p> <p>--Charge 3: to collaborate with Curriculum Committee as it explores integration of diversity component into core or graduation requirements;</p> <p>--Charge 4: to expand the collection of faculty narratives about diversity-related issues and experiences in the classroom.</p>	<p>--Charge 1: See number 2 above.</p> <p>--Charge 2: The committee reviewed and provided feedback on a draft of the campus climate survey before it was administered to campus community members. The committee made recommendations about how to promote the survey on campus.</p> <p>--Charge 3: The committee discussed three institutional approaches to diversity and the curriculum: (1) a list of diversity-related courses; (2) the 5-year curriculum/program review question about diversity; and (3) integration of a diversity component into core or graduation requirements. The committee recommended that the Curriculum Committee revise the question used in the 5-year curriculum/program review process to read, "How does your department, school, or program engage diversity in relation to recruitment, curriculum, pedagogy, professional membership/career trajectories, and/or in interactions with students?"</p> <p>--Charge 4: The committee solicited additional narratives from faculty colleagues.</p>
---	---

Dilemmas of Committee Work

This committee's responsibilities are described by three broad areas of focus: 1) develop initiatives to support the hiring and retention of faculty from historically underrepresented groups, 2) support campus diversity efforts, and 3) create liaisons with diversity groups on campus. Much of the committee's work is shaped in relationship to a range of diversity initiatives across campus and involves discussing, and honestly grappling with, the dilemmas of how social diversity is experienced and lived on campus. Below are examples of the kinds of questions and dilemmas the committee engages:

- Is it possible to be “not ethnocentric”?
- Does this framing of diversity essentialize or negate a more complex understanding of culture?
- How can we determine the thin line between irony and hate speech?
- How can we balance community standards and individualism? How do specific identity groups experience the campus climate?
- How does the campus community member identify who is asking for demographic/identity information and why? What do we want to get from the info and why?

Suggested Charges for 2012-2013

- Formulate recommendations for the Senate based on a review of faculty responses to the campus climate survey
- Research whether and how peer and next step institutions integrate a diversity requirement in the curriculum
- Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum

Attachment D

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Bruce Mann, Chair of the Student Life Committee

Re: Report for the year 2011-2012

Date: April 16, 2012

The Student Life Committee (SLC) met throughout the fall and spring terms, most often on a bi-weekly schedule. The members of the committee this year were: Lisa Ferrari (Associate Academic Dean, staff), Cameron Ford (student), Rebecca Kuglitsch (Library staff), Nathan Little (student), Bruce Mann (faculty, chair), Sierra Phillips (student), Geoff Proehl (faculty), Mike Segawa (Dean of Students, staff), Hannah Smith (student), and Nila Wiese (faculty). Amy Spivey was the Senate liaison during the fall, and for the balance of the year Mike Segawa shouldered the burden as Senate liaison.

It should be noted that the committee operated this year with less than the full complement of faculty appointments. Usually, four faculty are appointed, but this year SLC operated with only three. The Senate was notified, and permission was given to proceed. Rebecca Kuglitsch accepted the "visiting" position of library liaison, following the tradition started last year of having a representative from the library staff attend and participate (but not vote) in SLC affairs. We recommend this continue as the library, through a number of programs, is strongly tied to student life and the campus intellectual climate.

The Senate provided the SLC with the following charges for the 2011-12 year:

1. Review the residential housing plan and planning process and make recommendations to the Dean of Students.
2. Review the student retention plan and planning process and make recommendations to the Dean of Students.
3. Review the campus culture for underrepresented students and make recommendations to the Dean of Students.

As the charges suggest the primary purpose of the committee is to provide guidance, counsel, and advice to the Dean of Students. Hence, other items considered by SLC were at the request of the Dean.

Much time was devoted to the Dean's presentation of the continuing work on student retention and the related issue of buildings (residential facilities and the student center). The Dean's presentations followed from the report prepared by the Retention Task Force (12 July 2011). Dean Segawa noted that an important part of the report's recommendations deal with students' first and second year experiences. One set of initiatives addressed the need for better data collection to more rapidly and constructively identify students having trouble and at academic risk. The student alert system is working as intended, but creating more active intervention measures (when needed) would be beneficial. One committee observation was that not all students currently appreciate the import of mid-term grades. Instructors and advisors could be better "trained" at using mid-term information to assist students having academic problems.

When a student has serious academic problems (GPA well below 2.0) during the first (especially) or second year, there is a question of whether encouraging the student to remain enrolled is good policy. Data suggest that students in this situation rarely recover and graduate. Hence, it is recommended that a policy of encouraging those students to leave and consider other educational avenues should be considered. This problem exists for only a small fraction of the student population. SLC reacted favorably to this policy. This would relieve the university from expending resources in an area with very low potential returns, and would be more equitable to the student.

The Dean reported that first and second year student exposure – both in class and as advisors – to the “best” quality faculty makes a significant difference in student satisfaction and retention. It was recommended that the university should avoid assigning adjunct, visiting, and/or part-time faculty to first year classes. Of particular importance is the use of “best” faculty in first year seminars.

The Dean suggested that more attention could be given to helping faculty become more effective advisors. Faculty should be comfortable with more than just the “nuts and bolts” of procedures and registration. They should have an operating command concerning resources available to help students and be knowledgeable about how to make referrals. And, to the extent possible, faculty should be able to assist students in recognizing academic problems and how to address them – including the use of time issues, participation in co-curricular activities, and maximizing the benefit from the residential life experience.

The committee discussed the possibility, and the reluctance, of evaluating academic advising. The committee recognized that this should not include evaluating “personal” advising issues, but rather focus on academics and assisting student to succeed.

Finally, the committee considered ways to improve the “out-of-class” intellectual atmosphere. Concern continues from students that the campus atmosphere does not encourage scholarly and intellectual exploration beyond the classroom. In this regard, Dean Segawa reported good results from residential seminars and, therefore, an interest in expanding those offerings. He also noted that departments could do more in terms of supporting student affinity groups, encouraging attendance at speaker series, use of departmental blogs, and the like. The student members of the committee agreed these would be useful and improve the intellectual atmosphere on campus.

Dean Segawa reported on a trial program for second year students, “Possibilities and Potential,” that his office ran just before the beginning of spring term. The idea is to provide a set of short programs to inform and engage the class of second year students. The topics included sessions dealing with academic issues, social justice, group decision making, and access to university resources (advising, career planning, and research grants, for example). The response from the attendees (about 140 students) was positive. This program will be implemented and used as a “sophomore” year enhancement. The intent is to build in a coordinated way on the successful first year programs, to provide second year

students with information, and to offer opportunities to enrich their campus experiences. This program represents one step toward more active and intentional programming for second year students – this is a crucial year before students declare majors and become more academically engaged within departments.

The committee met with the University's Chief Diversity Officer (Kim Bobby) and the Director of Multicultural Student Services (Czarina Ramsey) to review diversity and multicultural concerns, activities, and programs. The committee was informed about the Campus Culture Survey. This instrument is designed to assist campus members in evaluating their cultural competency. The university continues to work with students, faculty, and staff on making the campus an open and friendly learning environment.

The committee heard from library staff (Rebecca Kuglitsch and Lori Ricigliano) and the director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching (Julie Christoph) about academic integrity programs. The library offers a number of materials for students to consult regarding scholarly practices and skills. These web-based tutorials are used by almost all entering students (97%) and indicate those students have a fairly sophisticated understanding of the basic elements (87% average score). The library staff continues to assist faculty with in-class presentations, library tours, and individualized help. Student referrals to CWLT for issues of plagiarism or inappropriate scholarship are not a large problem. Students run into trouble most often because of time pressures or inattention to details. The CWLT will provide more information and assistance to first year seminars in hopes of improving student understanding of the appropriate standards for scholarship.

Director of Security, Todd Badham, and Assistant Dean of Students, Kate Cohn, reviewed the current status of campus safety and security issues. By and large, conditions on campus remain good. Enforcement efforts focus on education and concern for personal safety. Resident assistants and the Dean of Students staff assist Campus Security, as needed. Data on reported incidents do not indicate any new trends or emerging concerns – alcohol consumption and illegal drug use problems exist, in and out of the residential units, but remain at “tolerable” levels and in line with prior years.

Finally, Dean Segawa led a discussion on the current architectural program for a new residential facility and the renovation of Wheelock Student Center. The residential building will be located between the Health Sciences Building and Seward/Regester Halls, adjacent to the Eye open area of Commencement Walk. The building will provide dormitory space for between 125 and 135 students in single occupancy rooms. Residence hall rooms will be clustered into living units, “houses,” varying in size from nine to fourteen. Each “house” will have common areas and full kitchen facilities. The building will be programmed with public meeting spaces – varying in capacity from 100-plus to 3-4 people. Separate public access will provide privacy for residents. It is anticipated that the “houses” will be affinity-based, so that common interests will promote student interaction and intellectual exploration outside of the classroom.

The new residential facility is the next step in the university's long range plan of housing more students on campus. In addition, the new facility will allow for implementation of the

two year residency requirement (taking full effect in two years) without significant disruption for continuing upper-class students.

Plans and program elements are being designed for a renovation and expansion of the student center. One important issue under discussion is the how increase the size of the dining area, especially in anticipation of more students living on campus. The planning will also consider how to create more meeting space in the facility. And, the design will provide a way to rationalize the use of office space in Wheelock.

For next year the committee recommends:

- Remove the charge concerning international programs and student integration. This is now appropriately the purview of other committees.
- Charge the committee with advising and assisting the Dean of Students as appropriate.
- Charge the committee to continue assessing issues and programs regarding campus diversity.
- Charge the committee to continue monitoring issues and programs regarding campus intellectual climate and academic integrity.
- Charge the committee to review the plans for the two year residential requirement, the new residential facility, and the renovation the Wheelock Student Center.

Attachment E

Date: April 5, 2012

To: Steven Neshyba
Chair Faculty Senate

From: Alva Butcher
Chair Professional Standards Committee

RE: Interpretation of the Faculty Code

Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4- The role of “colleagues” in the evaluation process.

Background: In Chapter I, Section 2, non-tenure-line faculty members are identified as instructor, adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, or other positions that might be created. The code goes on to specify “Non-tenure-line faculty members’ roles, rights and responsibilities are the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code.”

An exception in rights and responsibilities exists in Chapter III with respect to evaluation. In Chapter III, Section 4, those performing the evaluation are referred to as “colleagues.” There is no formal evaluation of adjuncts and visiting faculty by other colleagues in the department. Adjuncts and visiting faculty are evaluated by the department chair. Therefore, adjuncts and visiting faculty are not “colleagues” with respect to evaluation and should not participate in the evaluation of faculty.

Rationale

The proposed Code interpretation reflects the committee’s careful reading of the Code and discussions over the course of the year regarding just who, among the many categories of faculty colleagues, are required by the Code to participate in evaluations. Our discussion has centered on Chapter I, Section 2, of the Code which explains that different categories of “non tenure line faculty” and that “the roles, rights and responsibilities” of these faculty are “the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code.” In addition, in Chapter III, Section 4, those performing the evaluation are referred to as “colleagues.” The Committee decided that, for the purposes of evaluation, adjuncts and visiting faculty are not considered colleagues because their own evaluation process only includes the Chair or Head Officer.

Attachment F

I, Family Leave & Disability Policies

The University of Puget Sound strives to accommodate within reasonable limits the needs of full-time faculty members for periods away from work and to provide equal opportunity and access for faculty members with disabilities.

Essential Functions of any Full-time Faculty Position

General and specific duties of faculty members are outlined in Chapter I, Part C of the Faculty Code. The normal expectation is that faculty members teach six units a year, meet classes at regularly scheduled times during the full academic year, prepare for courses, grade student work, and keep office hours and scheduled appointments. Faculty members are expected to advise students, participate in University governance, and maintain an active scholarly life. Apart from classroom and other scheduled activities, faculty members do all these things at times that are convenient for them and suitable to their schedules.

General Policy

There are times, however, when a full-time faculty member cannot meet his/her immediate commitments because of (1) personal illness, injury, or childbirth, (2) the serious health condition of an immediate family member, or (3) new parenthood, whether the birth of a child, adoption, or foster care. When the circumstances are likely to be of short duration, the faculty member and/or the department chair should endeavor to make arrangements with other department members to carry out the faculty member's immediate commitments. In other circumstances, the faculty member's illness or injury or the faculty member's family responsibilities may result in an extended inability to meet full-time commitments or a prolonged absence. The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 entitles eligible employees to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave each year for specified family and medical reasons. The University of Puget Sound provides for Personal Medical Leave, Extended Medical Leave, and Long-Term Disability Leave to cover situations of personal

injury or illness of a faculty member; Family Medical Leave to cover situations when a faculty member needs to care for a seriously ill family member; and Parental Leave to cover situations when a faculty member needs to care for a newborn or newly adopted/foster child.

Faculty expertise is often unique. In such circumstances, there is no one on the faculty to fill in for the faculty member when she/he experiences periods away from work. A faculty member's absence, therefore, is disruptive to the teaching schedule. The university attempts to cover such absences in the best way possible for the short term and tries to find available experts who might be hired to fill in for the longer term. When leave is needed to care for an immediate family member or to accommodate the employee's own illness, and is to allow for planned medical treatment, faculty members should try to schedule treatment so as not to disrupt unduly their classroom responsibilities. Intermittent leave may be inconsistent with the integrity of the academic courses that a faculty member is teaching. The university will seek to work with the faculty member to find leave arrangements consistent with the needs both of the faculty member and of enrolled students. In some circumstances, faculty members experiencing personal or family medical conditions may be able to work part-time or with a reduced teaching load. This policy is intended to be flexible and to provide for a leave or a reduced contract tailored to both the university's and the individual faculty member's needs.

Personal Medical Leave

Definition

The university seeks to ameliorate the financial impact of absences resulting from short term illness or injury of faculty members. Therefore, after one year of service with the University, full-time faculty members are eligible for a paid leave of absence of up to six weeks in a rolling twelve-month period for medically certified serious health conditions. This paid leave of absence will count against the faculty member's Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) entitlement of twelve weeks unpaid leave in a rolling twelve-month period. A serious health condition means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves one of the following: inpatient care; absence plus

repeated treatment, including recovery therefrom; and any period of incapacity due to pregnancy and childbirth. An absence of up to six weeks following a pregnancy and childbirth--the obstetrically accepted postpartum recovery period--will be treated for purposes of this policy as a certified short-term medical leave.

For all personal medical leaves, certification of incapacity by a health care provider is to be submitted to the Academic Vice President. In order to insure that the faculty member is able to resume normal work activities without exacerbating the illness or injury, the faculty member is to secure a written release from his/her health care provider that the return to work is medically approved and specifying limitations, if any.

Application of Policy

As soon as reasonably possible after the need for a personal medical leave has been identified, the faculty member will submit her/his written request for leave to the department chair and the Academic Vice President.

Faculty members who experience a health condition requiring a personal medical leave will be granted a delay in the evaluation for tenure or promotion proportionate to the amount of leave granted. The faculty member may request that there be no delay in consideration for tenure or promotion by writing to the department head and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester in advance of when the evaluation file is due.

Alternatives to the possibility of up to six-weeks paid leave might mean flexible staffing for faculty who request personal medical leave. Either the faculty member, in his/her application for a personal medical leave, or the Academic Vice President, in response to such an application, can initiate discussions of the flexible staffing alternatives. Flexible staffing plans must receive approval from the Academic Vice President. Flexible staffing for a faculty member's personal medical leave might include one of the following (the list is not intended to be exclusive of other options):

1. reduced teaching responsibilities: one unit reduced teaching load for the semester with full contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year;
2. reduced teaching responsibilities: two units reduced teaching load for the semester with five-sixths contract salary and full benefits for the fiscal year (retirement plan contributions and FICA tax payments will be based on five-sixths contract salary); or
3. one semester off with two-thirds contract salary and full benefits for the fiscal year (retirement plan contributions and FICA tax payments will be based on two-thirds contract salary).

In those circumstances in which personal medical leave of up to six weeks is being requested during a period in which classes are not in session, faculty would continue to receive their normal salaries and should not have reason to claim paid leave for the same condition during the period when classes are in session. Any flexible staffing arrangement which effectively results in the faculty member working less than full-time will count against the faculty member's FMLA entitlement at a rate of one unit being equivalent to six weeks leave.

Extended Medical Leave

Definition

Extended personal medical leave covers circumstances resulting from major injuries or chronic illnesses. Situations involving extended medical leave will normally be characterized by an extended period of treatment and recovery following a personal medical leave in which the faculty member is able to resume work activities on a regular basis, but at a less than full-time level. Extended medical leaves will normally be unpaid leaves. In order to insure that the faculty member is able to resume partial work activities without exacerbating the illness or injury, the faculty member is to secure a written release from his/her health care provider that the return to work is medically approved and specifying limitations, if any. The interval for periodic review of the faculty member's need for continued extended medical leave is usually agreed upon by the faculty member and the Academic Vice President, but generally leave is not approved in increments longer than one year.

Application of Policy

As soon as reasonably possible after the need for extended medical leave has been identified, the faculty member will submit her/his written request for extended medical leave to the department chair and the Academic Vice President.

Either the faculty member, in his/her application for a extended medical leave, or the Academic Vice President, in response to such an application, can initiate discussions of flexible staffing alternatives. Flexible staffing plans must receive approval from the Academic Vice President. Flexible staffing might include one of the following (the list is not intended to be exclusive of other options):

1. reduced teaching responsibilities: one unit reduced teaching load each semester with two-thirds contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year; or
2. reduced advising and service responsibilities: release from University committee work or other non-departmental service and release from student advising with three-quarters contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year.

Faculty members who experience extended medical leave will receive a delay in their evaluation proportionate to the amount of leave granted, e.g., a faculty member on two-thirds contract could delay a three-year evaluation by a maximum of one year. The faculty member may request that there be no delay in their evaluation by writing to the department head and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester in advance of when the evaluation file is due.

Faculty members who experience extended medical leave will not count medical leave time toward their eligibility for sabbatical leave. Any flexible staffing arrangement which effectively results in the faculty member working less than full-time will count against the faculty member's FMLA entitlement at a rate of one unit being equivalent to six weeks.

Family Medical Leave

Definition

Full-time faculty members who have completed one year of service with the university are eligible to apply for family medical leave. Such an unpaid leave is an approved absence for up to twelve work weeks in a rolling twelve-month period due to a faculty member's need to care for a child, spouse or parent with a serious health condition.

Application of Policy

As soon as reasonably possible after the need for a family medical leave has been identified, the faculty member will submit her/his written request for a FMLA leave to the department chair and the Academic Vice President.

The university may require medical certification to support faculty member's request for FMLA leave to care for an immediate family member, defined as a child, spouse or parent (not parent-in-law) with a serious health condition.

Either the faculty member, in his/her application for a family medical leave, or the Academic Vice President, in response to such an application, can initiate discussions of flexible staffing alternatives. Flexible staffing plans must receive approval from the Academic Vice President. Flexible staffing for faculty requesting family medical leave might include one of the following (the list is not intended to be exclusive of other options):

1. reduced teaching responsibilities: one unit reduced teaching load each semester with two-thirds contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year; or
2. reduced advising and service responsibilities: release from University committee work or other non-departmental service and release from student advising with three-quarters contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year.
3. a semester's unpaid leave.

In those circumstances in which a family medical leave is being requested prior to the beginning of a term, which would occur at least in part within the term, the University will discuss options with the person involved. Any flexible staffing arrangement which effectively results in the faculty member working

less than full-time will count against the faculty member's FMLA entitlement at a rate of one unit being equivalent to six weeks leave.

Faculty members who take family medical leave will receive a delay in their evaluation proportionate to the amount of leave granted, e.g., a faculty member on two-thirds contract could delay a three-year evaluation by a maximum of one year. The faculty member may request that there be no delay in their evaluation by writing to the department head and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester in advance of when the evaluation file is due.

Faculty members who take family medical leave will not count leave time toward their eligibility for sabbatical leave.

Parental Leave

Definition

Full-time faculty members who have completed one year of service with the university are eligible to apply for parental leave. Such an unpaid leave is an approved absence for up to twelve work weeks in a rolling twelve-month period due to a faculty member's need to care for a newborn child or a newly placed adopted or foster child. Parental leave must conclude within twelve months of the birth of a child or the placement of a foster or adopted child. When both spouses are employed by the university, a total of twelve weeks will be shared between the two faculty members for this kind of leave.¹

Application of Policy

As soon as reasonably possible after the need for a parental leave has been identified, the faculty member will submit her/his written request for a FMLA parental leave to the department chair and the Academic Vice President.

Either the faculty member, in his/her application for a parental leave, or the Academic Vice President, in response to such an application, can initiate discussions of flexible staffing alternatives. Flexible staffing plans must receive approval from the Academic Vice President. Flexible staffing for faculty

requesting parental leave might include one of the following (the list is not intended to be exclusive of other options):

1. reduced teaching responsibilities: one unit reduced teaching load each semester with two-thirds contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year; or
2. reduced advising and service responsibilities: release from university committee work or other non-departmental service and release from student advising with three-quarters contract salary and benefits for the fiscal year.
3. a semester's unpaid leave.

In those circumstances in which a parental leave is being requested prior to the beginning of a term, which would occur at least in part within the term, the university will discuss options with the person involved. Any flexible staffing arrangement which effectively results in the faculty member working less than full-time will count against the faculty member's FMLA entitlement at a rate of one unit being equivalent to six weeks leave.

Faculty members who take parental leave will receive a delay in their evaluation proportionate to the amount of leave granted, e.g., a faculty member on two-thirds contract could delay a three-year evaluation by a maximum of one year. The faculty member may request that there be no delay in their evaluation by writing to the department head and the Academic Vice President, normally no later than one semester in advance of when the evaluation file is due.

Faculty members who take parental leave will not count leave time toward their eligibility for sabbatical leave.

Long-Term Disabilities

A long-term disability is a medically certified inability to fulfill the essential functions of a faculty position for six months or more. The university sponsors a long-term disability insurance plan for full-time faculty with one academic year of service. The one-year waiting period is waived if the faculty member was covered by total disability insurance within three months before employment with the university if the total disability insurance policy provided

income benefits for five or more years of total disability. Both the university's long-term disability insurance plan and Social Security Disability benefits require a six-month waiting period. If a full-time faculty member with at least six years of full-time continuous service experiences a long-term disability, his/her regular salary will be continued during the six-month waiting period. For a faculty member with a long term disability with less than six years of service, the university will continue regular salary based on the following schedule:

1 year of service	1 and 1/2 months of salary continuance
-------------------	--

2 years of service	2 months of salary continuance
--------------------	--------------------------------

3 years of service	3 months of salary continuance
--------------------	--------------------------------

4 years of service	4 months of salary continuance
--------------------	--------------------------------

5 years of service	5 months of salary continuance
--------------------	--------------------------------

6 years of service	6 months of salary continuance
--------------------	--------------------------------

For purposes of this policy, one month's salary is equivalent to one twelfth of the faculty member's contract salary. The six weeks of paid leave which a faculty member may obtain as personal medical leave is counted in calculating the period of salary continuance described above. Long-term disability leave will count against the faculty member's FMLA entitlement.

Faculty Members with Disabilities

Definition

In compliance with Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Titles I and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, Puget Sound does not exclude otherwise qualified persons with disabilities from faculty positions.

The ADA protects "qualified individuals with disabilities" and defines disability as a medical or physical impairment which substantially limits a major life activity, such as walking, seeing, hearing, etc.; or as having a record of such an impairment; or as being regarded as having such an impairment. Applicants and faculty members are not required to identify themselves as having a disability; self-identification after employment is strictly voluntary. The qualifications and experience of all applicants and faculty members should be evaluated without regard to disability or any accommodations that may be necessary.

Application of Policy

A faculty member with a disability may request accommodation by consulting with his/her department chair and the Academic Vice President. Accommodations may include changes in facilities, equipment or practices that enable an otherwise qualified disabled faculty member to fulfill the essential functions of a faculty position described above. A reasonable accommodation is one which effectively allows the person to perform the essential job functions, while not placing an undue hardship on the university. Decisions about accommodations or undue hardships are made on an individual basis by the Academic Vice President. Department chairs should request assistance from the Academic Vice President in completing the process of reasonable accommodation.

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee, 3/6/98.

Approved by Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, 3/25/98.

¹When an eligible female faculty member takes an FMLA leave for no longer than the actual period of incapacity associated with pregnancy or childbirth

(usually 6–8 weeks), the balance of her twelve workweek FMLA entitlement (usually 4–6 weeks) falls under the FMLA parental leave guidelines. The initiation of the FMLA parental leave also initiates the female faculty member's twelve workweeks of Washington State Family Leave. As a result, the balance of the female faculty member's FMLA parental leave and her Washington State Family Leave may run concurrently for a period of time. Once the female faculty member's FMLA entitlement is exhausted, her leave conditions are governed by State law. (This means that a female faculty member may be entitled to six weeks of paid personal medical leave and up to twelve additional weeks of unpaid parental leave.)

Attachment G

This new subsection, "New Undergraduate Students" would immediately follow the second full paragraph in the major section titled "ACADEMIC STANDING"

NEW UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

New students entering Puget Sound with freshman, transfer, or non-matriculated status who earn a grade point average below 2.00 for their first semester at Puget Sound will be placed on Academic Probation or will receive Academic Dismissal as described below:

Academic Probation

If the grade point average for a new student is between 1.00 and 1.99, then the student is placed on Academic Probation.

Academic Dismissal

If the grade point average for a new student is below 1.00, then the student is dismissed for one semester. The student may petition the Committee for readmission at the end of the dismissal period provided the student can present a reasonable plan for academic improvement. The student also has the option to petition for immediate readmission and the Committee expects such a student to present a compelling argument and a compelling plan for academic improvement. The guidelines for submitting a readmission petition are provided to a student upon notification of dismissal.

CONTINUING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

After new freshman, transfer, or non-matriculated students complete their first semester of attendance, they are categorized as continuing students in terms of this policy on academic standing.

Continuing undergraduate students are subject to the sanctions of Academic Warning, Academic Suspension, Academic Probation, or Academic Dismissal as described below:

Subsections titled "Academic Warning," "Academic Suspension," "Academic Probation," and "Academic Dismissal" continue as before. The final subsection, "Academic Expulsion" has been revised slightly so as to make clear that both new and continuing students could be expelled under the extreme conditions noted.

Academic Expulsion

A new or continuing student may be dismissed and precluded from ever returning to the University. Expulsion is the most severe sanction available to a Hearing Board or to the Academic Standards Committee and may be levied, for example, in response to a severe case of academic dishonesty.