

Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, April 30, 2012
McCormick Room, Collins Library

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

Guests Present: Ann Putnam, Alva Butcher, Garrett Milam, Dexter Gordon, Ann Wilson, Barbara Warren

I. Report of the Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Garrett Milam introduced the report, highlighting issues of particular concern for the IRB, for example, Charge A, “Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and monitor records for research involving human subjects,” and Charge H, updating “the IRB website to reflect recent changes” and to make “the site easier to navigate.” (See Attachment A for the full report.)

Milam indicated that the IRB did not complete all Senate charges for 2011-12 because the committee directed its full resources toward addressing the several it describes in detail in the report. Hannaford asked if the IRB needs a larger committee, to which Milam responded no. In reference to Senate Charge A, Hamel asked how many designates there are in the system, to which Milam responded, one per department. Hamel asked why the IRB did not pick up Senate Charge E, “Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.” Milam indicated that the committee questioned whether the IRB is the place for such a charge. He said that the IRB deals specifically with *human* subjects and suggested that the IRB might work in conjunction with another committee—perhaps the Professional Standards Committee—on the charge, for the term “research integrity” goes beyond human subjects. It was determined that the Senate would take up this issue in the fall, as they determine charges for 2012-13.

M (Bartanen)/S/P to receive this thoughtful IRB report.

II. Report of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC)

Alva Butcher introduced the report, highlighting elements of the PSC’s approach to the four Senate charges. (See Attachment B for the full report.) She emphasized the changes to implementation of the university’s policy on family leave, and she indicated that the PSC continues to wait for information from Human Resources (HR) to effect a university policy on performing background checks on faculty. She recommends that Senate Charge 2 be taken up in the fall as the Senate determines charges for 2012-13. Butcher reported that Lisa Ferrari and Garrett Milam met with the full committee to begin the process of updating the university’s scientific misconduct policy, which currently dates back to 1997. Questions have been drafted and referred to the university’s legal counsel. Finally, the PSC interpreted the section of the Faculty Code concerning how “consensual sexual

relationships” affect “supervisory responsibility and evaluation.” In addition to the four charges, the PSC also addressed issues listed under “Other Business” on the report.

In response to a clarifying question asked by Neshyba with regard to Item #4 under “Other Business,” Butcher said that the question at hand was, “If there is animosity between a head officer and a person being reviewed, should the head officer still lead the review?” Butcher said that the PSC suggested that the evaluatee should use the regular evaluation process rather than the streamlined process.

Hamel asked for more information on Senate Charge #4, specifically the nature of “supervisory” in the description. Butcher said that the PSC determined that evaluation is supervisory and that faculty members are meant to recuse themselves from exercising supervisory duties over colleagues with whom they are involved in consensual sexual relationships. Hiring would be another example of a supervisory duty. At times, determined the PSC, the responsibility of serving as Department Chair may be considered a supervisory responsibility; if such a situation should arise, Chairs should recuse themselves from “supervising” colleagues with whom they are in consensual sexual relationships. Neshyba asked whether *non-sexual* personal relationships are covered by this section of the Code and, if not, whether or not the exclusion is intentional. Butcher said that the PSC had not investigated that question. Hamel asked the clarifying question, “A Chair could serve as chair [to a colleague with whom s/he is in a consensual sexual relationship], but they can’t act in an evaluative capacity?” Butcher answered in the affirmative. Bartanen added that the university has a dual-career policy for tenure-line faculty who share positions and that in each of the situations there are clearly outlined provisions regarding evaluation. (The interpretation will be made available once it has been reviewed by counsel.)

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

M (Bartanen)/S/P to move the Report of the Faculty Advancement Committee higher on the agenda.

III. Report of the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC)

Dexter Gordon reported that by the close of 2012-13 the FAC will have completed 47 evaluations, the breakdown of which can be found in the report. (See Attachment C for the full report.)

Gordon highlighted some challenges faced by the FAC, one of which gave rise to their concern with adequate patterns of class visits by colleagues. To address this concern the FAC finds that it needs: 1) head officers to insert a clear chart at the beginning of deliberative summary letters that provide dates and the like about classroom observations. To facilitate this process, the Dean will add a sample grid to the buff document; 2) Department colleagues must visit a breadth of classes; 3) Colleagues must date their evaluation letters, including the summary letter and the summary of deliberations. Gordon noted that these are not only important documents but they are also legal documents; 4) Letter writers must make a recommendation when colleague is up for tenure and/or promotion.

In addition, Gordon said that the PSC must clarify: 1) expectations about junior faculty participating in reviews; 2) who is responsible for ensuring adequate visits; 3) whether or not a letter submitted directly to the Dean can be read by the evaluatee if the file is an open one.

Finally, Gordon offered thanks to the faculty members rotating off the FAC and issued a welcome to those beginning in Fall 2012.

Saucedo asked if there has been a situation on the FAC in which all evaluators have visited an evaluatee on the same day and as a result the FAC has delayed the review. If so, asked Saucedo, what is the consequence of such a delay? Gordon said that the FAC encourages colleagues to honor the spirit, not just the letter, of the requirement. The FAC has seen too many files in which the visits are all clustered and has been pretty close, as committee members address the question of the fairness of the evaluation of the entire file, including the entire period under review, to sending back more files. In the years approaching, the FAC may be more stringent, since last year the FAC recommended that this spirit be honored, and in the coming year the FAC will be emphasizing it even more. Ward said that when he was on the FAC four years ago, the committee wrote the same thing to the faculty and asked if the FAC has considered ways that it may be able to redress this issue? Gordon shared an example of what the FAC has done: invited departments to come in and to explain to the FAC why visits have been clustered. (So far these visits have sufficed.) His sense is that, given these instructions and this specific request, the FAC would deem that such a tack would not suffice any longer. The head officer will be responsible for sending the FAC a file that shows fair and adequate coverage, which means visits that reflect the entire period under review. Barry suggested, and Gordon agreed, that the Senate could charge the PSC to do a new interpretation, for the language in question doesn't capture the spirit of multiple visits. Hannaford indicated that the PSC has revisited this issue several times, and said that if one reads the interpretation in the Code there is language that supports the FAC's sense of what is fair. Bartanen offered her own opinion, which is that head officers are responsible for ensuring a pattern of visits, and to put a candidate in charge of tracking this puts the candidate in an awkward position and gives the candidate more work to do during a very busy time. If that point were clarified, suggested Bartanen, it could also help.

M (Ward)/S/P to receive this insightful report from FAC.

Barry noted that the FAC has handled more than 14 streamlined reviews this year and asked if the streamlined process is going well, to which Gordon responded that it is. Barry asked about the FAC's procedure for reviewing streamlined files, and Bartanen explained that the committee members share the responsibility, divvying up the files and then discussing them together. Barry asked whether or not the faculty seem happy with the streamlining process, and Gordon said that to date the FAC has received no complaints.

Singleton recommended asking the PSC for clarification on the language of the Code for the second issue on the FAC report but suggested that the Code is clear about Item #1 (concerning participation of junior faculty). Gordon agreed but added that there are issues, for example, brand new colleagues. These colleagues tend to issue disclaimers in their

letters and tend not to make recommendations about their senior colleagues. So there is a gray area. Situations like this merit clarity. Singleton questioned whether the PSC is the body to clarify this, or if perhaps the Faculty would be the better choice.

Of Item #3 (the issue concerning letters sent directly to the Dean), Hamel asked why such a document would not be available to the evaluatee if the file were open. Gordon said that the FAC is not arguing one way or another but is rather seeking clarity. Bartanen added that historically the option has been viewed as a way for faculty members to say something that they were not comfortable saying directly in the letter or within the meeting. Hence the desire for clarity.

IV. Report of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC)

Ann Wilson offered as highlights of the report the three charges from the Senate. (See Attachment D for the full report.)

- 1) The ASC considered the criteria for university honors and whether changes were warranted. The results are:
 - a. The hearing board has within its authority the ability to disqualify someone from receiving honors if that person has engaged in academic dishonesty;
 - b. The ASC has added a phrase in the language in the Academic Handbook to clarify the policy.
- 2) The ASC continued the discussion about the implementation of the Honor Code.
- 3) The ASC created a new dismissal policy for freshman undergraduates who earn less than a 2.0 their first semester at Puget Sound. A similar plan was put in place for continuing undergrads but with a few distinctions from the freshman policy.

Saucedo asked whether or not the ASC has under its purview the Coolidge Honors Program, to which Bartanen replied that it is separate.

On the point of the GPA being the only criterion for conferring university honors upon a student, Hamel asked if this was the same at other universities. (Yes.) Hamel asked if there were considerations beyond this fact for us. Wilson said that the ASC wanted to be sure that Puget Sound requirements were parallel with other universities—in the northwest and elsewhere.

M (Saucedo)/S/P to receive this discerning report from the ASC.

Singleton wanted to register something that has troubled him about the Internet since the ASC report brings up, in its treatment of Charge 2, issues around websites and note-sharing. Singleton was distressed to learn recently that students can access textbook answer keys online, creating an unfair advantage for themselves when completing homework assignments. Singleton believes that this issue will become important for us as a university.

V. Report of the Curriculum Committee (CC)

Barbara Warren reported on the CC's progress on the six charges from the Senate. (See Attachment E for the full report.)

- 1) Advised Burlington Northern first-year seminar group on its proposed revisions to the first-year seminars.
 - a. Julie Nelson Christoph's proposal was adopted by the Faculty;
 - b. The CC has approved some new syllabi for use with the workshop to be held this summer.
- 2) The discussion of the integration of a diversity component into Core or graduation requirements will need to be continued next year.
- 3) Brad Tomhave came up with new language to clarify the calendar-setting guidelines to accommodate a January university holiday.
- 4) This item, too, needs to be carried over.
- 5) Met with some essential people and came up with language to help as a guiding principle for the ASC as it identified suitable substitute courses allowing students with learning disabilities to fulfill the foreign language requirement.
- 6) The issue of the discrepancy in the length of fall and spring semester is something that the CC talks about every year. The CC has determined that if the faculty wants the same number of days per semester, the administration will have to make it happen because the change would affect a number of things (e.g., when Summer Session begins and ends and when regular semesters begin and end).

About the foreign language charge Hannaford asked, "Does this mean that a student who cannot do foreign language will have to take 2 classes?" Warren indicated that they already have to. The change was implemented to allow students and the ASC a bit more wiggle room as everyone tries to meet the requirement.

Neshyba mentioned that this report is just a draft and asked if there will be addenda, including information about departmental reviews. (Yes.) Neshyba asked Warren to please add the composition of the committee, too.

M (Hamel)/S/P to accept this candid and pithy report from the CC

Barry asked how the CC would expect a department to respond to the item about teaching the curriculum with reference to diversity. He wondered if it would move us into the evaluation of teaching by the CC? Warren said that that outcome was not the intent. This is mainly an attempt to help departments to figure out how to include something about diversity in their curricular review—particularly those departments who indicated that the question did not pertain to their disciplines.

VI. Announcements

None.

VII. Fitness Center

Florence Sandler introduced the issue that she brought to the Senate, saying that the university has had a bit of a problem since the new Fitness Center was put in for the

campus community. When the sound system was installed, a lot of faculty and staff needed to have the sound off as they used the center. At first these community members negotiated to have 20 quiet hours/week. More recently, the number was cut down to 12, and now there's been another attempt to cut it down further. According to Sandler, because there isn't any recognized procedure, the enforcement of quiet hours is a problem. She said that the people in the Fitness Center don't recognize us as faculty and don't know how to negotiate with the faculty, or with a group that represents the faculty, hence her appeal to the Senate. The Senate might indicate to the managers of the Fitness Center what seems to be a reasonable resolution to the problem from the Senate's point of view; then any faculty (or staff) who negotiate from now on with the center would that baseline of authority upon which to rely.

Neshyba drew the attention of the Senate to the 3 possible components of a motion for an endorsement, which he attached to this week's agenda:

Regarding faculty use of facilities at the Fitness Center, the Senate endorses the following positions:

1. that the Fitness Center continue to offer at least twelve Quiet Hours per week, including some weekend hours;
2. that these hours be regularly observed regardless of whether faculty are present; and
3. that these hours be conspicuously advertised so that the campus community is encouraged to take advantage of them.

Ward indicated that he has signed a letter in support of quiet hours and questioned making the motion. Is this a governance matter? It is speaking to a policy issue specific to buildings and management. It might be more appropriate for these conversations to happen between Dean Bartanen and the people over in Athletic Facilities. Hamel said that it seems like, as much as Sandler needs support for a particular agenda item, she might prefer to have a faculty member and student to be tasked with negotiating these hours. Sandler agreed with Hamel, saying that what's being done is of interest of faculty and to students. The students' best interest is being served by the current athletics director, so the question becomes who serves as a voice from the faculty.

M (Hamel)/S/T to endorse the following positions: 1. that the Fitness Center continue to offer at least twelve Quiet Hours per week, including some weekend hours; 2. that these hours be regularly observed regardless of whether faculty are present; 3. that these hours be conspicuously advertised so that the campus community is encouraged to take advantage of them; and 4. that a committee of faculty, staff, and students vet any changes proposed by the athletics director.

Bartanen said that she does not object to the Senate or others expressing wishes to the Fitness Center. But she reminded the Senate and Sandler that the Athletics Department reports to her, and she indicated that she has some concerns with the language in play. For one, one of the fitness centers has no sound system, something to consider as we discuss

the issue at hand. Also, the fitness centers are student-managed areas. Those staff members running the facilities are trying to manage competing interests, many sports, and provisions for other members of the community.

After some discussion, Hamel accepted Barry's friendly amendment to the motion, striking #4. The motion now reads: **M (Hamel)/S/T** to endorse the following positions: 1. that the Fitness Center continue to offer at least twelve Quiet Hours per week, including some weekend hours; 2. that these hours be regularly observed regardless of whether faculty are present; and 3. that these hours be conspicuously advertised so that the campus community is encouraged to take advantage of them.

Sandler described a conflict that she had had with the facility's director that involved the disappearance of signage and the cutting of quiet weekend hours. She said that the solutions presented to her were different than the more amenable solutions presented to Ward when he talked with Brian Billings. Bartanen suggested that we should not be passing motions in the Senate about what sounds like a personnel issue. Sandler said that the problem is, How do you recognize the faculty if you've got faculty in there but there's no one to negotiate with? She maintained that if faculty gym-goers at least had some group of the faculty—the Senate—saying that faculty gym-goers have an interest in this matter, they'd have something to start with.

M (Barry)/S/P to table this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain

Secretary of the Senate

Attachment A

Institutional Review Board Report to the Faculty Senate

AY 2011-2012

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exists for the purpose of protecting the rights, health, and well-being of human beings solicited and volunteering for participation as research subjects. In the context of reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects the IRB gives very careful attention to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed information of a sensitive nature, safety, ethical recruitment practices, and the accessibility and adequacy of informed consent. This is a report to the University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate regarding activities of the IRB during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Senate charges for the IRB AY 2011-12:

- a. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and monitor records for research involving human subjects.
- b. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) regarding oversight of OIR work.
- c. Develop and distribute (via the IRB website) a set of procedures for researchers wishing to appeal a decision by the Board regarding a research protocol.
- d. Investigate and provide guidance for researchers regarding the responsibilities, legally and ethically, for reporting evidence of child abuse which comes to light in the process of research involving human subjects.
- e. Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.
- f. In consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, complete the revision of the Scientific Misconduct Policy.
- g. Complete the revision of the IRB handbook.
- h. Once the handbook is complete, update the IRB website to reflect the changes and make the site easier to navigate.
- i. Design and implement a program for training of departmental delegates.
- j. Continue to discuss the ways in which the IRB can be more transparent and supportive of research on campus.

The actions taken by the IRB during the 2011-12 academic year in response to each of these charges are as follows:

a. As charged, the IRB engaged in the review and monitoring of research protocols involving human subjects throughout the 2011-12 academic year. In line with the IRB designate structure and consistent with past history of review, the majority of research protocols were reviewed at the departmental IRB designate level due to their characterization by the appropriate designate as qualifying for 'exempt' or 'expedited' status – meaning that the study procedures, level of risk, sampling methods, or nature of participant population did not fit the criteria established by federal and university standards for full Board review. One additional element of review which follows from a policy change in 2010-11 involves a requirement that a full member of the standing IRB committee, most often the Chair, review protocols, regardless of their standing, which involve research abroad prior to final approval.

Ten protocols were reviewed by the full Board and of those six were approved. Two were deemed appropriate for designate-level review and returned to the appropriate designate. Two have been granted approval contingent upon minor revisions not yet received by the Board. In this academic year, a total of x protocols were classified as 'exempt' (8 so far, but there will certainly be more in my final draft of this report. see below.) and y were approved by an IRB departmental designate under the 'expedited' classification.(16 so far but to be updated.) In addition, the IRB Chair reviewed and approved four protocols classified as expedited that involved research outside of the United States. (I have not yet received a response to my request from CSOC, Psychology, Exercise Science, and Occupational Therapy for year end designate reports.)

b. The Board did not take up this issue this year. Although Associate Dean Ferrari facilitated an initial contact between the recently hired director of Institutional Research and the IRB Chair, neither of us followed up on this.

c. The Board did not take up this issue this year.

d. The Board did not take up this issue this year.

e. The Board did not take up this issue this year.

f. The Board forwarded recommendations regarding revisions to the scientific misconduct policy to the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). In addition, the Chair and Associate Dean Ferrari met by request with the PSC to provide further clarification regarding the issues of reconciling the misconduct policy and the faculty code.

g. The Board took initial steps to identify areas for improvement in the Handbook, but no revisions were implemented to date. A modified cover sheet for research protocols has been completed and will be posted on the IRB website.

h. The Board identified an immediate need and opportunity to improve the experience of researchers and departmental designates by updating portions of the Board website to improve the information and user friendliness. We expect that these changes will be implemented before the beginning of the new academic year.

i. The Board made plans to initiate an outreach program to small groups of designates once the changes to the IRB website are implemented. The purpose of this will be to provide both training and solicit feedback regarding the changes.

j. This was a frequent issue of discussion on the IRB this year. There was substantial discussion of recently proposed changes to federal guidelines relating to human subjects research and their impact on our approach. Discipline-specific changes to the IRB review process were further discussed but the Board has tabled these issues pending the outcome of the proposals for change at the federal level.

Self-charges for the IRB AY 2011-12:

The Board presents the Senate with the following self-charges for AY 2011-12.

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Continue progress on revisions to the IRB website, including a revision of the handbook documents.
3. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research regarding IRB oversight of OIR work.
4. Monitor changes at the federal level regarding regulations and requirements related to human subjects research.
5. Develop and distribute (via the IRB website) a set of procedures for researchers wishing to appeal a decision by the Board regarding a research protocol.
6. Investigate and provide guidance for researchers regarding the responsibilities, legally and ethically, for reporting evidence of child abuse which comes to light in the process of research involving human subjects.

Respectfully Submitted,
Garrett Milam, PhD
IRB Chair AY 2011-12

Attachments (5): Designate reports for Physical Therapy, School of Business and Leadership, Office of the Associate Deans, and Politics and Government, and Economics.

Attachment B

Professional Standards Committee

End-of-Academic-Year Report

30 April 2012

Prologue—In conformity with *Faculty Bylaws* (Article V, §5, C: “No later than the first week of each May, the chair of each standing committee, in consultation with the committee membership, shall develop and deliver to the Faculty Senate a written report summarizing committee actions, concerns, and suggestions for the committee's membership to consider during the next academic year.”) The chair of the Professional Standards Committee has developed in consultation with the committee and will deliver in person the following report.

Composition—The Professional Standards Committee (hereinafter, PSC) for Academic Year 2011-12 included Dean Kristine Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Alva W. Butcher, Leon Grunberg, Jennifer Hastings, Andrew F. Rex, Douglas C. Sackman, and Seth Weinberger. Butcher was elected chair for the academic year. The PSC divided into two three-person subcommittees for detailed work before decisions were ratified by the entire committee.

Charges and Dispositions—The Faculty Senate in its 14 November 2011 meeting approved four charges to the PSC.

Charge One – The PSC should review the potential for more family-friendly “stop the clock” provisions related to the intersection of the timing of evaluations and personal medical, family medical, and/or parental leave. [Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 2. Delaying a Scheduled Evaluation (Report to Faculty Senate 18 November 2004)].

Charge executed. Please see PSC minutes for 4 April 2012.

The PSC sent an interpretation of the Faculty Code to the Senate which provides that delays to evaluation automatically may occur if faculty are granted leave under the “Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy”. The PSC made revisions to the “Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy” and added language to the “Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures 2012-2013” to reflect the interpretation of the Faculty Code.

Charge Two – Review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.

The PSC awaits the draft of the policy and suggests that the charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Charge Three - The PSC should review the “Research Misconduct Policy” document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.

On February 22, 2012 the PSC met with Associate Dean Lisa Ferrari and IRB Chair Garrett Milam to discuss the document “University of Puget Sound Policy for Responding to Allegations of Scientific Misconduct (May 1997). The key areas of concern are anonymity for the whistle blower, inconsistencies of timelines for cases in which an inquiry/investigation covered by the misconduct policy also falls under the grievance procedure described in Chapter VI of the Faculty Code, and the expectation that the requirement for federal compliance might be expanded to all research if any research at the University is federally funded. The IRB recommended that cases involving allegations of research misconduct first be submitted for review under the current procedures of the Scientific Misconduct Policy. If unresolved issues remained a grievance process could be initiated as specified by the Faculty Code. The PSC referred some questions on these issues to the university’s legal counsel.

The PSC awaits the response from the university’s legal counsel and suggests that the charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Charge Four – The PSC should review how the following Campus Policy regarding consensual sexual relationships is applied with respect to supervisory responsibility and evaluation: “In accord with the University’s conflict of interest provisions, this policy prohibits faculty or staff members from exercising supervisory responsibility with respect to another faculty or staff member with whom they are involved in a consensual sexual relationship.”

Charge executed. Please see PSC minutes for 18 April 2012.

The PSC made an interpretation of the Faculty Code regarding professional ethics of faculty and relationships of a consensual sexual nature. This interpretation has been referred to the university’s legal counsel for review. The PSC awaits the response from legal counsel. Next fall the interpretation will be sent to the Faculty Senate.

Other Business—The PSC also addressed the following items:

1. reviewed and approved a letter sent to department chairs that outlined procedures for administering Instructor Evaluation forms;
2. reviewed and approved two evaluation forms for the School of Music
 - a. Music Ensemble
 - b. Applied Lessons;
3. reviewed and approved two evaluation forms for the School of Physical Therapy
 - a. Onsite Clinic

- b. Research Mentor;
4. sent an interpretation of Chapter III, Section 4 of the Faculty Code to the Faculty Senate which provides that adjuncts and visiting faculty should not participate in the evaluation of faculty;
 - a. 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 of faculty. Our discussion has centered on Chapter I, Section 2, of the code which defines the different categories of "non-tenure-line faculty" and states that their " roles, rights, and responsibilities" are "the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter I of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code." In Chapter III, Section 4, those performing evaluations are referred to as "colleagues." The Committee decided an exception in the rights and responsibilities of adjuncts and visiting faculty exists in Chapter III with respect to evaluation because their evaluation process only includes the Chair or Head Officer.
5. added language to the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria & Procedures 2012-2013" to reflect the two interpretations of the Faculty Code;
6. reviewed and made recommendations to the English Department's "Statement of Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation";
7. consulted with Dean Kris Bartanen on a process question regarding streamlined reviews;
8. began discussion on the Faculty Code provisions on Guidelines for the Use of Course Assistants and departmental statements on the use of course assistants (Interpretation of Chapter 1, Part C, Section 2.a.);
 - a. Rationale: The Faculty Advancement Committee has observed in recent files comments from students about challenges related to course assistants. At the same time, pedagogy in at least some areas of the curriculum has changed since 1986 when the Code interpretation was filed.
 - b. Departments using course assistants are: Art, Biology, Chemistry, Communication Studies, Comparative Sociology, Economics, Environmental Policy and Decision Making, Exercise Science, Geology, Math and Computer Science, Occupational Therapy, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, and Physical Therapy.
 - c. The PSC suggests that this charge be reissued for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Attachment C

April 30, 2012

TO: Faculty Senate

FR: Dexter Gordon, Chair of the Faculty Advancement Committee

RE: 2011-2012 Annual Report

The Faculty Advancement Committee this year will have completed 47 evaluations:

Type of Review	Number and Status of Evaluations
Tenure	3 (all closed)
Tenure and promotion to associate	4 (1 closed and 3 open)
Promotion to associate/clinical associate	7 (4 closed and 3 open)
Promotion to professor	3 (1 closed and 2 open)
3 year assistant	6 (3 closed and 3 open)
3 year associate	5 (all streamlined)
5 year professor	14 (4 closed, 4 open, 6 streamlined)
3 year instructor	5 (1 closed, 1 open, 3 streamlined)
Total	47

The committee has forwarded evaluations for tenure, tenure and promotion, promotion to associate, and promotion to professor to the President. Some of these cases were considered by the Board of Trustees at the February 2012 meeting; some will be considered at the May 2012 meeting. At present, 42 evaluations are scheduled for 2012-2013.

The Advancement Committee met 2-4 hours per week from October 5 through December 15, and 3-4.5 hours per week from January 23 through May 1.

Discerning adequate patterns of class visits by colleagues was a challenge for FAC much of this year. We need the following:

1. Head officers to insert a clear chart at the beginning of deliberative summary letters that provides dates, number of visits, and classes visited by persons participating in the review. The Dean will add a sample grid to the "buff document."
2. Department colleagues to visit a breadth of classes, demonstrating both a range of dates and a range of courses. (We see too many files where multiple people visit the same classes on the same dates, often in the Fall term of the review year rather than in semesters for which Instructor Evaluation Forms have been collected for the review.)
3. Colleagues to date their evaluation letters, including the summary letter and the summary of deliberations.
4. Letter writers to make a recommendation when the evaluation is for promotion and/or tenure.

The FAC asks that PSC further clarify the following:

1. Expectations about junior faculty participation in evaluations and the necessity of their recommendations in a change of status review.

2. Who is responsible for insuring adequate visits – the head officer or the evaluatee.
3. Whether a letter sent directly to the Dean/FAC in an open file may be read by an evaluatee.

Continuing members Cathy Hale, Suzanne Holland, Alexa Tullis, and Kris Bartanen express appreciation to Eric Orlin and Dexter Gordon for their considerable and careful work over the past three years. The Dean has confirmed that Kent Hooper and Fred Hamel will join the FAC next year.

Attachment D

**Academic Standards Committee
Final Report
AY 2011-2012**

The members of the 2010-11 Academic Standards Committee were: James Bernhard (spring), Tim Beyer, Debbie Chee, Greg Elliott, Duane Hulbert, Robin Jacobsen, Benjamin Lewin, Gary McCall (fall), Sarah Moore, Kali Odell (student), Amy Odegard, Lori Ricigliano, Brad Tomhave, Landon Wade, Madeleine Werhane (student), Ann Wilson (co-chair), Paula Wilson (co-chair), and Bianca Wolf. Bill Barry was the Faculty Senate Liaison to the ASC.

The ASC met every other week during the 2011-2012 academic year with the Petitions Subcommittee meeting every week as needed.

2011-12 ASC Charges from Senate:

1. The ASC will explore the desired criteria for graduating with university honors and revise the policies and procedures to be consistent with any revisions in the criteria.
2. The ASC will continue the discussion and development of effective and innovative means to foster the implementation of the Honor Code. As a subset of this charge, the ASC will continue its discussions to develop a course of action(s) that facilitates faculty education and provides practical guidelines and suggestions for course procedures to minimize the utility of note-sharing and similar websites.
3. The ASC will further explore establishing a policy and procedure for staff to report violations of academic integrity. In addition, the adjudication and ramifications of a violation should be clear, as well as consistent with existing policies for academic violations.

Petitions Report (report provided by Registrar)

For the period April 23, 2011, to August 31, 2011, 64 petitions were acted upon with 53 approved and 11 denied. Of these petitions, more than half involved the following four categories:

- 12 reinstatements or readmissions from suspension or dismissal;
- 10 late registrations;
- 7 withdrawals after the automatic W period;
- 6 registrations with schedule conflict.

For the period September 1, 2011, to April 24, 2012, 188 petitions were acted upon with 148 approved and 40 denied. Of these petitions, more than half involved the following four categories:

37 registrations with a schedule conflict;
30 late registrations;
19 medical withdrawals;
16 reinstatements or readmissions from suspension or dismissal.

Summary of Academic Violations and Hearing Boards (report provided by Registrar)

Summary of six actions taken by Hearing Boards convened between May 1, 2011, and April 30, 2012.

A student who had reported an illness during enrollment six years ago was discovered during fall 2011 to have feigned that illness. A Hearing Board reviewed the facts and assigned failing grades in courses in which an accommodation for that illness had been made.

A student successfully disputed an instructor's grade.

Four cases of second acts of plagiarism were heard by Hearing Boards with academic sanctions imposed in each case.

Progress Report on 2011-2012 ASC Charges from Faculty Senate

Charge 1

The ASC will explore the desired criteria for graduating with university honors and revise the policies and procedures to be consistent with any revisions in the criteria.

ACTION: The committee examined language used to define the criteria for university honors at other universities and compared those criteria to Puget Sound's. It was apparent that grade point average was the only criteria for conferring university honors, thus the committee decided not to

add additional criteria. The committee discussed how to handle instances in which students who were eligible for university honors but whose actions may have violated either academic integrity or the student integrity code and determined that the Hearing Board procedures used to address matters of academic integrity gave the Hearing Board the authority to disqualify a student from receiving university honors as a sanction if appropriate. To clarify this, the committee changed the language in the Academic Handbook regarding Hearing Board Matters in Procedures of Academic Integrity to read:

“The Hearing Board may find the allegations not to be factual, or the Hearing Board may impose sanctions. Sanctions include, but are not limited to, warning, reprimand, grade penalty, removal from the course or major, disqualification from receiving university honors, probation, dismissal, suspension and/or expulsion.”

Charge 2

The ASC will continue the discussion and development of effective and innovative means to foster the implementation of the Honor Code (Student Integrity Code). As a subset of this charge, the ASC will continue its discussions to develop a course of action(s) that facilitates faculty education and provides practical guidelines and suggestions for course procedures to minimize the utility of note-sharing and similar websites.

ACTION: A subcommittee was formed to review ideas that had been proposed by the full committee in AY 2010-2011 and decided that more information was needed. In particular, the subcommittee was interested in understanding how and when Puget Sound students become aware of issues related to academic integrity and where they can go to receive assistance if needed. The subcommittee drafted five questions related to academic integrity that were added to the Spring Survey that is given annually to current undergraduates. The ASC will be reviewing the data from the survey when it becomes available to discuss the next steps with respect to developing effective and innovative means to foster the implementation of the Honor Code (Student Integrity Code).

The subcommittee discussed the issue of providing faculty education and suggested procedures to minimize the utility of note sharing and similar websites and reported back to the full committee that it would be difficult to come up with any meaningful suggestions other than to ensure that the information that could be obtained through such sources did not constitute a substantive part of the course. The full committee agreed and the issue was not discussed further.

Charge 3

The ASC will further explore establishing a policy and procedure for staff to report violations of academic integrity. In addition, the adjudication and ramifications of a violation should be clear, as well as consistent with existing policies for academic violations.

ACTION: The committee spent considerable time discussing and establishing such a policy and the following procedures were drafted and will be added to the Academic Handbook Response to Violations of Academic Integrity:

“If a staff member has reason to suspect a violation of academic integrity, the following actions will be taken:

- A. If the incident took place outside the context of a course, the staff member will report his or her concern in writing to an Associate Academic Dean not otherwise involved with the appeals or hearing board process. In this context, the Associate Academic Dean will follow procedures outlined above for the faculty member in responding to the allegations. If the Associate Dean suspects that a violation of academic integrity has or may have occurred, he or she will submit to the Registrar an Academic Integrity Incident Report and will request that a Hearing Board be convened to investigate and possibly impose sanctions if appropriate.*
- B. If the incident took place in the context of a course, the staff member will report his or her concern in writing to both the instructor of the course and to an Associate Academic Dean not otherwise involved with the appeals or hearing board process. The instructor of the course and the Associate Academic Dean will consult on how to proceed with the allegation. If the instructor elects to pursue the allegation, he or she will follow the procedure outlined above in points 1-5. If the instructor does not elect to pursue the matter further because he or she did not witness or discover the incident, then the Associate Academic Dean may substitute for the faculty member in responding to the allegation. If the Associate Dean suspects that a violation of academic integrity has or may have occurred, he or she will submit to the Registrar an Academic Integrity Incident Report and will request that a Hearing Board be convened to investigate and possibly impose sanctions if appropriate.”*

Dismissal Policy for New Students

Prompted by work of the Retention Task Force, Sarah Moore and Debbie Chee asked the ASC to consider developing a policy that would dismiss students after the first semester if the GPA is under a designated limit.

ACTION: The committee discussed the problem of students who perform poorly in their first semester at Puget Sound. The committee invited Ellen Peters, Director of Institutional Research to share her research on 3,341 students accumulated over a five-year period. The data show that

students who earn less than a 1.0 GPA their first semester rarely earn greater than a 2.0 semester GPA the following term.

The committee drafted new policy regarding students who earn less than a 1.0 GPA their first semester. Further, the committee drafted changes to the Academic Handbook “*Academic Standing*’ section to distinguish new students from existing students.

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. 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Wilson, Paula Wilson, Co-Chairs, Academic Standards Committee, 2011-2012

Attachment E

Year-End Report of the Curriculum Committee (Draft)

Charges to Curriculum Committee (with meeting notes) from Fred Hamel

1. **M/S/P: to consult and advise the Burlington Northern (BN) first-year seminar group on its proposed revisions to the first-year seminars;**

Spivey noted that the BN Group hoped to get the proposed revisions before faculty at the October faculty meeting.

Barry and Bartanen noted that some faculty had had an opportunity to review the proposal and that the group had been supportive of suggested changes.

Response:

The curriculum committee approved the new rubrics submitted by the first year seminar group. At the April 27, 2012 curriculum committee meeting, several SS1 and SS2 courses were approved with one set of courses needing clarification. These courses will be available as examples for the writing workshop to be held Summer, 2012.

2. **M/S/P: to continue discussion of integration of a diversity component into core or graduation requirements in collaboration with the Chief Diversity Officer and the Faculty Diversity Committee;**

Senate discussion primarily concerned whether the intention of the proposed charge, which originated in last year's Curriculum Committee, was to create a new diversity core requirement or to create an "overlay" diversity requirement through a change in the graduation requirements (i.e., where certain courses meeting other core requirements might also meet a diversity requirement). Senators agreed that language in the charge that included references to both the core and graduation requirements would give the Curriculum Committee necessary latitude as it discussed possible proposals.

Response:

The following is a sentence approved by the curriculum committee to address the question on diversity that is found on the curriculum review document.

In the content, planning, teaching, and/or assessment of the curriculum, how does your department, school, or program engage diversity and/or the diverse identities of Puget Sound students and the University's goals for diversifying the students and faculty.

The issue of diversity in the core has not been addressed here and may need to be addressed next year.

3. M/S/P: to revise calendar-setting guidelines to accommodate January university holiday;

Response:

Fall semester grades shall be due by noon on the first Monday two weeks after the end of the final examination period or on January 2, whichever is later. And, if that due date is a university holiday, then grades shall be due by noon on the next business day.

4. M/S/P: to revise curriculum review guidelines in consultation with department and program heads;

Bartanen noted that the guidelines had not been updated for some time and that a revision might provide an opportunity to bring guidelines more into agreement with accreditation guidelines.

Ward argued that the Curriculum Committee ought to consult with programs about such revisions. His amendment to include "in consultation with department and program heads" was approved (and is included in the above charge).

Response:

This charge needs to be continued to next year since we made a modification on the diversity question.

5. **M/S/P: to develop guiding principles for the Academic Standards Committee to use in identifying suitable substitute courses allowing students with learning disabilities to fulfill the foreign language requirement;**

(This charge comes to the Curriculum Committee at the request of Academic Standards Committee.)

Response:

The Curriculum Committee acknowledges the intrinsic value of foreign language study as one aspect of a liberal arts education. At Puget Sound, this is accomplished through the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement. When the Academic Standards Committee reviews petitions from students asking to apply substitute courses in fulfillment of this requirement, the Curriculum Committee offers two guiding principles:

1. The language component of the requirement may be emphasized by considering substitute courses covering linguistics, literature in translation, formal language (logic, computer programming, etc.), or the history of a language.

and/or

2. The foreign component of the requirement may be emphasized by considering courses introducing students to a culture as studied through such disciplines as Art, History, and Religion, or through the broader perspective of an interdisciplinary program

6. **M/S/P: to address the discrepancy in the length of fall and spring semester;**
(MacBain)

Response:

The curriculum committee has held many discussions about this discrepancy. It is felt that it has been explored repeatedly without the ability to come to a faculty consensus that changing one semester or the other would be better. Unless the administration wants to address the cost issues related to the changes to either make the fall semester longer, or the spring semester shorter and all of the other mitigating circumstances that go along with the changes, we feel this issue will remain unresolved.

