

**Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, February 25, 2008**

Senators in attendance: Terry Beck, Jim McCullough, Rob Hutchinson, Ross Singleton, Ana O'Neil, Yvonne Swinth, Kris Bartanen, Suzanne Holland, Hans Ostrom, Nancy Bristow, Leslie Saucedo, John Hanson, Mike Segawa, Robin Foster, Douglas Cannon (Chair).

Visitors: Linda Williams, Alyce DeMarais

Meeting called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chair Cannon.

Announcements:

Cannon announced that since the last Senate meeting was only a week ago, he would postpone approval of the February 18, 2008 minutes until the March 10, 2008 Senate meeting.

Cannon welcomed Linda Williams from the Art Department, attending the meeting to talk about the recommendation from the Interim Study Abroad Committee.

Special Orders

Ostrom requested that the Senate talk about some of the new composite tenure lines in connection with evaluation with an eye toward looking for unforeseen consequences.

Committee Liaison Reports

No reports were made.

Standing International Education Committee Proposal from the Interim Study Abroad Committee

Cannon noted that the Interim Study Abroad Committee was supposed to last 3 years. It was renewed for a year after the initial contract ran out. The committee has a proposal suggesting that the group become a standing committee of the Senate.

Alyce DeMarais referred Senators to the document that went out earlier (attached) and walked them through the document. She noted that the new propose title of the group is "International Education Committee."

If Senate agrees the proposal will go for two readings to the faculty.

Cannon noted that there are only two scheduled faculty meeting for the rest of the year and this would need to be moved forward quickly to be acted on this year.

Motion by Hanson, seconded by Holland: To recommend to the faculty the change to the bylaws article 5 section 6 adding subsection J as described below.

Article V. Section 6. J. The International Education Committee

- a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Dean of Students (ex-officio), the Director of International Programs (ex-officio), no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two students.
- b. The duties of the Committee shall be:
 1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.
 2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.
 3. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.
 4. Represent the interests of the Faculty in international education.
 5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Explaining the rationale for the proposal, Williams explained that the committee thought the faculty should have input into the kinds of educational experiences our students are having. Faculty input is essential since so much is changing and international education is becoming increasingly popular.

Ostrom asked about b4 [“Ex-officio: Dean of the University or a member of her/his staff. The Dean of Students or representative will participate in deliberations of the International Education Committee, but will not be a voting member on the Committee”]. He wondered what the rationale is for not having the Dean of Student be a voting member.

DeMarais noted that this committee was following the recommendation of Study Abroad Task Force. In that proposal the Director of International Programs is the only ex-officio member who has a vote. In this proposal no ex-officio members vote.

Ostrom wondered if it could be a point of contention with the faculty if the status of ex-officio members isn't parallel with the other standing committees.

Cannon said he couldn't find a distinction in by-laws in voting between ex-officio and non-ex-officio members.

Hanson agreed with Ostrom that one committee operating differently seems odd.

Singleton noted that the language of the proposed motion would obviate the need to change anything along those lines. He supported the point that members should be voting. Ex-officio members often contribute meaningfully and represent ideas that should be considered.

Ostrom pressed to understand the reason the committee included that provision.

No definitive answer was given.

DeMarais voiced support for having the committee parallel to other committees.

Williams clarified that everyone on the committee would be voting members.

Cannon noted that the bylaws generally specify that Dean of the University can delegate the responsibilities for being on a committee. This keeps with the bylaws

Saucedo asked about committee duty number 3 as articulated in the motion. She wondered why the committee's responsibilities included helping select students.

DeMarais responded that each semester a subset of the committee serves on the committee to review applications that may be unusual. This function may become more important as the task force's recommendations are implemented.

McCullough asked if the committee would have some responsibility toward inbound activities for international students who might come to campus.

DeMarais responded that this was why the name International Education Committee was selected – the task is greater than Study Abroad, noting that proposed duties one, four, and five move beyond Study Abroad.

Ostrom returned to the issue of ex-officio voting member and asked if Singleton was aware if there are any competing interests between the faculty and the administration

Singleton commented and Bartanen concurred that the task force was created at a time when there were tensions about Study Abroad programs. At that time there was a felt need for broad ranging assessment.

Bartanen shared her sense that the Interim Study Abroad Committee has worked through those issues and is in a different place today.

Segawa commented that the current reality is that the work is mostly duty number 2 (Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty). He doesn't see how the committee would get much beyond that right now.

McCullough asked for additional clarification about what the ISC would oversee.

DeMarais noted that there is no desire to have the ISC overlap with the Curriculum Committee.

Ostrum noted that the title "International" is literal – between nations – and doesn't affect the curriculum in any course.

Bristow wondered if given the large amount of business the ISC currently has to do if is the current size adequate. Should it be larger?

Williams noted that the wording of the motion allows for variability in size. The ISC could be larger during a particular phase of work in the immediate future. When the program gets to a manageable size the size of the committee will be appropriate. She suggested it might not be a bad idea to make the committee larger for a year or two.

Senators agreed that the language allows for an increase in size.

Holland moved to call the question.

Hanson seconded.

Passed unanimously.

Vote on the motion: Motion carried unanimously.

Cannon will submit this and a small change to add the Diversity Officer to the Diversity Committee to the faculty for their consideration. He noted that the Senate is awaiting information from the diversity committee and it seems it won't be ready to get through on this cycle.

Course Evaluation Forms

Holland read the following statement:

"In view of two perceived "problem areas," I suggest that the Senate commission the Office of Institutional Research to survey the Puget Sound faculty on the following issues:

1. To ascertain why attendance at faculty meetings is so low, and what suggestions faculty have to remedy the problem.
2. To ascertain whether or not faculty regard the current course evaluation forms as effective, or not, and what changes (if any) faculty would propose to the current forms and why.

Having these data will allow the Senate to gain valuable information, and will allow faculty to give input anonymously, something that might benefit junior faculty especially. A sensible course of action might then be charted based on faculty feedback.”

Cannon reminded senators that last week’s minutes some had remarked that they wanted to discuss the matter of faculty attendance further.

Singleton raised the issue of the nature of the questions, noting that questions might best be open-ended so they might deliver the hoped for results.

A discussion ensued regarding the best way to gather the desired information. Suggestions ranged from asking Randy Nelson to write them, forming a focus group to gather in-depth baseline information and know how to fashion the questions, to ‘troll’ to see if there is a groundswell of response before, or to survey by constituent groups.

Ostrom argued that the question of course evaluations is much more important and interesting than the one on faculty meeting attendance. He suggested the faculty will show up to meetings if there is an important agenda item.

Hutchinson advocated for moving quickly on the issue of course evaluations.

Foster commented that the previous process examining course evaluations was unwieldy and often lacked focus. She advocated finding a professional person to help coordinate the objectives and items on our forms--to take a systematic and valid approach to making changes on them.

Holland agreed, but wondered if our institutional research people could do this well.

Ostrom commented that Holland’s initial suggestion is a low cost move to get some data unless Randy Nelson is too busy. Gathering information and then going in the direction of focus groups seems like a reasonable step forward.

Hanson agreed with Ostrom and noted that he reads this as a general survey to see if it is on people’s minds. It would provide valuable initial information.

Bristow suggested some rephrasing that Ostrom incorporated into the following motion.

Motion: That the Senate commission the Office of Institutional Research to survey the Puget Sound faculty to ascertain whether faculty regard the current course evaluation forms as effective or not and what problem areas they perceive and to have a subcommittee appointed to work with the OIR.

Hanson seconded the motion.

Senators discussed whether or not the questions should come back to the Senate before going out to faculty. At the end of the discussion Ostrom asserted that the Senate should

vote with the understanding that a general report of the nature of the questions will come back to the Senate.

Bartanen noted that the issues in the past included the appropriateness of the form for team teaching, evaluations for labs, and redundancy of questions. Questions have been raised about the ability of students to meaningfully answer some of the questions on the form and about potential gender and racial bias.

Motion carried.

Cannon assigned Holland, Foster, and Hutchinson to the subcommittee.

Hutchinson asked about faculty meetings and what we might do with the issue of faculty meeting attendance in light of last week's meeting.

Cannon allowed that we could discuss this now or later.

Bartanen noted that some of the suggestions, like meeting in a different place could be done quickly.

Holland returned to her suggestion that the faculty be surveyed.

Sausedo supported the idea of a separate survey.

Bristow commented that she favors a survey as well because we lack data. She would like to get some data to see if there is anything we could do about faculty attendance.

Moved that we request the Office of Institutional Research to survey the faculty to ascertain why the attendance at faculty meetings is so low and what suggestions faculty have to remedy the problem.

Hutchinson seconded.

Discussion ensued about the framing of the questions (should we seek to remedy the problem or use language that is less loaded?). It was decided to ask Randy Nelson to draft the questions and bring them to the Senate for review.

Bartanen volunteered to talk with Randy Nelson and report back to the Senate.

Motion carried.

Ostrum suggested we talk about focus groups with regard to course evaluation forms at another meeting.

Make up of Professional Standards Committee

Foster reported that the Senate is finishing up recommendations from two ad-hoc committees; Evaluation and Tenure, and Professional Standards. Evaluation and Tenure looked at groups that play a role in the evaluation and tenure process. The committee did extensive individual interviews and made recommendations. Grievance changes stemmed from this initial report, addressing the recommendations that committee put forward.

There are some remaining recommendations from that report that need to be addressed, notably recommendations regarding the structure of the PSC. These recommendations came from the PSC members at the time. Some thought it would be worth considering if it would be better to make the PSC two committees or having some other structure that allowed the PSC to move along with task of assessing evaluation standards when grievances come up.

Foster moved: Charge the 2008-2009 PSC to consider concerns raised about the structure and composition of the PSC that appear in the 2006 report of the Senate ad hoc committee report on tenure and evaluation and the 2006 report of the Senate ad-hoc committee on professional standards and to report back on these deliberations no later than their year end report of 2009.

Holland Seconded.

Some discussion ensued.

Motion carried.

Holland moved to adjourn. Senate adjourned at 5:15, a record of sorts.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Beck

Attachment
Interim Study Abroad Committee Proposal

2 April 2007

From: The Interim Study Abroad Committee
(Faculty Members: Lynnette Claire, Andrew Gardner, Barry Goldstein, Kent Hooper, Pat Krueger, Jonathan Stockdale, Linda Williams, chair)

To: The University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate

The Interim Study Abroad Committee, formed in 2003 at the suggestion of the Study Abroad Task Force (convened by the Senate), is nearing the end of its fourth year of existence. A year-end report (forthcoming) will relate the progress made by the committee during the 2006-2007 academic year. At the end of the initial three-year period, as noted at the inception of ISAC in the fall of 2003, the Senate was to determine whether the tasks of the Interim Committee should then be delegated to other standing committees or to compose a formal standing committee dedicated to all facets of study abroad, including student programs, exchanges, and UPS faculty-developed programs. The Interim Study Abroad Committee would like to request that the Senate compose the latter, a standing committee to be called the International Education Committee.

A) Proposed duties:

1. Review existing programs and prune where necessary. (Criteria and assessment instruments have been developed and/or refined over the past year).
 - a. Ensure that the policies reflect Puget Sound's educational goals and standards.
 - b. Maintain for our students accessibility to a broad range of study abroad programs in terms of geography, academic interests, and costs.
2. Using data collected, continue to assess programs every three to five years.
3. Represent the interests of the faculty in international education, advising and advocating for academic oversight in international programs.
4. Assist the Office of International Programs with the process of student selection of study abroad, reviewing transcripts and applications.
5. Review new program proposals initiated by students with faculty support, submitted following clearly articulated and accessible guidelines.
6. Continue to assist the transcript evaluator to develop and update a database indicating courses approved by different departments on campus.
7. Review UPS faculty-led program proposals and evaluate said programs
8. Serve in an advisory role for the UPS Global Citizenship Initiative
9. Assist the Office of International Study in any other advisory matters
10. Field existing and new singular issues as they arise or are brought forward by students, faculty, and staff members. (transcript question, residency, clarifying and justifying the various categories of financial arrangement).

B) The Committee would consist of the following twelve members:

1. *Seven members of the faculty* selected in accordance with procedures for other standing committees. Faculty members should be chosen to guarantee participation from a wide variety of disciplines.

2. Ex-officio: *Dean of the University* or a member other/his staff. The Dean of the University or representative will participate in deliberations of the International Education Committee, but will not participate in the student selection process and will not have a vote on the Committee.

3. Director of International Programs. The Director of International Programs will participate in deliberations of the International Education Committee, but will not have a vote on the Committee.

4. Ex officio: Dean of Students or a member of her /his staff. The Dean of Students or representative will participate in deliberations of the International Education Committee, but will not be a voting member on the Committee. The DOS representative will participate in the student selection process, reviewing all student applications and consulting with the IEC selection Committee in specific cases where issues of behavior and conduct are relevant to the selection process.

5. Two students selected in accordance with usual ASUPS procedures. The student members will be fully participating members in deliberations and votes of the IEC, but will not participate in the student selection process.