

Faculty Senate  
University of Puget Sound  
April 16, 2007

Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly; Ana O'Neil; Amy Ryken; Hans Ostrom (scribe of the day); William Haltom; Robin Foster; Nancy Bristow; Kris Bartanen; Chris Kline (guest); Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (guest); Mark Reinitz (guest); Sarah Westcott McCoy (guest); Mike Segawa; Barry Anton (Chair); John Hansen; Ross Singleton.

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Election-update: As of last Thursday, 60 faculty-members had voted.

Announcement: There is a faculty-meeting, *mañana*.

**For the Student Life Committee (SLC), Chair Nick Kontogeorgopoulos gave the annual report (see appended to minutes, below).**

Anderson-Connolly asked whether the self-study mentioned in the SLC's minutes were on hold. Kontogeorgopoulos: The committee was charged by Dean Jean Kim to review CHAWS, but the process was discontinued after Dean Kim resigned. Segawa (Dean of Students) said that the CHAWS review will occur soon. Kontogeorgopoulos added that the SLC is committed to reviewing its effectiveness especially insofar as it serves as a pool of faculty-members who might be selected to serve as advisors to a variety of committees and programs related to the Dean of Students office and ASUPS, as needed.

Ryken spoke appreciatively of the student-engagement survey, which seemed to be a "myth-buster," insofar as it appeared to demonstrate that students' engagement with programs, etc., did not undermine their academic performance. **Ryken said she will forward to Anton a related charge to the SLC for next year.** Kontogeorgopoulos noted that all but one faculty-member of the SLC will return next year. Anderson-Connolly asked whether the SLC should have 6 members. Kontogeorgopoulos said he didn't see the need for this. He added that a more significant problem, in the past, had been inconsistent minute-taking, a problem the SLC has resolved. He also remarked that having Dean Segawa returning would also be a crucial factor in improving the function of the SLC.

**Anderson-Connolly moved, Bristow seconded, passed unanimously: to receive the report of the Student Life Committee, appended below.**

**Sarah Westcott McCoy (Chair) delivered the report from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), appended to these minutes (below).** She said she didn't know what the charge "completing the self-assessment" meant. Anton clarified the charge and said he would follow up with an email; perhaps the IRB can complete the self-assessment at its final meeting and send it to Anton.

Richard Anderson-Connolly noted that the IRB's web-page did not include a schedule or a roster of members.

McCoy acknowledged that there were problems with the web-page, and Foster added that the web-page has been a mess for years. McCoy asked who the web-master was.

Answer: Barb Wiest. Foster and McCoy agreed that an overhaul of the IRB's web-page was crucial. McCoy said some secretarial help would be highly useful. Bartanen suggested help may be on the way because of the reorganization of the Associate Deans' office. McCoy noted that it is getting increasingly more difficult for students doing research to find human subjects and that an improved web-page would help solve this problem. **All agreed that improving the IRB's webpage would be a charge to the IRB for next year.**

**Moved Robin Foster, seconded Richard Anderson-Connolly, passed unanimously: to receive the report (appended below) of the IRB.**

**For the University Enrichment Committee (UEC), Mark Reinitz (Chair) gave the report (appended to these minutes, below).**

Ostrom, saying that he was transmitting concerns from colleagues, observed that the UEC seems now to have less money to distribute in relation especially to the requests for travel to conferences and travel to pursue research. Reinitz said that, personally, he had felt "the squeeze," insofar as his own second conference-trip this year had not been funded. He added that the problem is not so much less money but more that the budget hasn't grown sufficiently over the years. He added that the number of travel-requests had not grown dramatically but that the average amount requested per proposal had increased significantly, owing to the increased cost of hotels and airfare. The UEC overall travel-budget has, he noted, increased only \$5,000 (total) in three years. **He said that a reasonable charge to the UEC for next year would be to put together a proposal to the Budget Task Force for more money in the travel-category. Senators agreed.**

Ryken asked whether it might be useful to survey trends of requests for funding, especially with regard to students and to untenured colleagues. Reinitz said that students had felt the squeeze, too, and that the committee had decided that no student could receive a second UEC grant because of how tight the budget is. Reinitz observed that, rather trying to increase the whole UEC budget, the UEC and the BTF should try to increase the money in one category—funding for travel—significantly.

Ostrom asked whether untenured colleagues had expressed particular concerns with regard to the absence of money for second trips. Reinitz said that some untenured colleagues had expressed concern but that the most recent and most passionate critique of insufficient funds for travel had come from a senior colleague, who had nonetheless mentioned, in his correspondence, that untenured colleagues may feel squeezed by what appears to be pressure to do research and (from another direction) a tighter UEC budget. Reinitz noted that, with regard to release-units, so few were available that the UEC had

decided to make untenured status a tie-breaker, in favor of the untenured. He said the same thing might well happen soon with regard to second trips.

Ryken expressed concern about a prejudice against collaborative research, which is crucial to her field and to other fields. She observed that untenured colleagues who do collaborative research may feel this prejudice acutely. Reinitz said that, in his personal opinion, the UEC should, in fact, be reticent to fund two trips that supported one conference-paper. He said that this opinion was not the view of the whole UEC, however. He also cited Doug Edwards' ongoing research project, in which many faculty have participated, receiving funds from the UEC. **A charge concerning the review of attitudes toward collaborative research did not seem to emerge, but one may arise later.**

Bristow, Ostrom, and others raised the issue of the apparent absence of UEC funding to support professional travel by colleagues who are on editorial boards of professional presses or journals; who are delegates to professional organizations or assemblies; who preside over professional organizations or conferences; etc. Out of the discussion came a charge, which was moved by Anderson-Connolly, seconded by Bristow, and passed unanimously:

**The UEC of 2007-2008 shall consider ways, including a proposal to the Budget Task Force, to support obligatory professional travel, such as that connected to service on editorial boards; being delegates to professional organizations or assemblies; and presiding over professional organizations or conferences; etc.**

**Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously, to receive the report (appended below) of the UEC.**

**For the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), Chris Kline (Chair) made the report. The written report is appended to these minutes (below).**

Anderson-Connolly asked whether there was overlap between the SLC and the ASC with regard to the issue of academic honesty.

Mike Segawa responded, noting that the Orientation Planning Committee, not necessarily the SLC, was working on how to include in orientation emphasis on academic honesty, so the overlap is minimal, at most.

Segawa also noted that the Orientation Planning Committee will work on including a "piece" in orientation on questions of "etiquette" and appropriate classroom-behavior, owing in part to the English Department's voyage into these troubled waters. Ostrom wished Segawa good luck and Godspeed.

Singleton asked about whether the ASC had followed through on the Interim Study Abroad Committee's recommendation that a notation concerning Study Abroad appear on students' transcripts. A complex discussion ensued:

O'Neil: Is a G.P.A. combining results of UPS coursework with Study Aboard coursework included on transcripts?

Answer: No, because UPS is responsible only for recording officially the UPS G.P.A.

O'Neil noted, however, that it seems to be possible to go on CASCADE, which does apparently include such a combined G.P.A., to find one's transcript, and to send the transcript digitally/electronically.

Singleton emphasized that the Interim Study Abroad Committee wanted all Study Abroad work to be reflected on the transcripts. He noted that ISAC did not appear to have received what it wanted from the ASC. **Segawa urged the chair and members of the ASC to meet with members of the ISAC, as a professional courtesy, to discuss this issue. Kline said she would insure that such a meeting would occur.**

O'Neil expressed concern that rich Study Abroad experiences were not being completely reflected in students' transcripts. She did not want certain Study Abroad experiences belittled by the way they were reflected on transcripts. She cited her experience at American University.

### **How things stand:**

#### **There are three kinds of Study Abroad Programs:**

1. **Sponsored** (example: Pac Rim): the grade from courses taken in such a program is included on students' transcripts, along with the coursework and credits.
2. **Partner, a.k.a Affiliated** (example: ILACA): coursework and credits are included on students' transcripts but not grades from the program.
3. **Approved** (example: studying at an Australian university for a semester): coursework and credits are included on the students' transcripts but not grades from the program.

Bartanen suggested that the ASC may have considered the ISAC's wishes but, because of policies governing transcripts, may have settled for the way things stand as outlined above.

Haltom and Anderson-Connolly suggested that the ASC might urge the Registrar to respond more fully to the wishes of the ISAC with regard to transcripts. Haltom emphasized that the faculty, not the Registrar, governs the curriculum. Haltom alluded to *Gone With the Wind*, suggesting that with regard to some issues, the faculty may not "give a damn" what the Registrar prefers to do and may prefer the Registrar to carry out the will of the faculty. Haltom suggested that the university may include grades from Partner and Approved programs on UPS transcripts without "vouching" for such grades; the grades might, for example, appear in a section of the transcript that is separate from

the UPS or Sponsored Study Abroad section(s). He spoke of days long past, when one might rely more confidently on literacy (with regard to interpreting transcripts). Moving from Tara to another comparison, he observed that sometimes the Registrar-tail wags the curricular dog.

Amplifying Haltom's point, Anderson-Connolly, pointing to a discussion reflected in the minutes of the ASC, wondered if there were a "balance-of-power" problem between the ASC (and hence the faculty) and the Registrar. Kline said she did not believe this to be the case.

Foster wondered why the ASC's action with regard to the ISAC's recommendation was not highlighted for the Senate, perhaps by the Senate's liaison to the ASC. Anton reported that Professor Sousa had been the liaison but had resigned from the Senate. Anderson-Connolly noted that he had recently been appointed liaison to the ASC. Ostrom noted that a gap had probably opened between the resignation of Sousa and the appointment of Anderson-Connolly and that the ASC's action with regard to this issue may have fallen into the gap. **A charge to the ASC of 2007-2008 may emerge with regard to the transcript-issue and the ISAC's recommendations, but the Senate did not formulate one.**

Ostrom asked whether the Academic Standards Committee could consider suggesting to the Advising Office that it add to the Student Alert Form two additional items that professor might check: 1) chronic tardiness 2) disruptive behavior in class. **Kline said the ASC will consider this suggestion next year.**

**Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously to receive the report of the ASC, appended to these minutes (below).**

Hansen supplemented the earlier election-update. Over 100 colleagues have voted so far, he noted.

Ryken said she was shocked to receive, via email, a record of her vote; she said that, like other colleagues, she does not perceive email to be private.

Hansen acknowledged this potential problem and said it represented one of the tradeoffs between paper and electronic ballots. He suggested that we, the faculty, are still in a kind of experimental phase with regard to electronic voting, and he urged the Senate to consider carefully problems and glitches that have arisen, including the issue Ryken raised. He went on to say that one systemic problem is that, in most if not all years, a new person is running the election each time and thus has no benefit of experience, so he is attempting to create a list of problems that have become evident. However, Hansen observed that most if not all of the problems appear to be relatively minor and quickly solved (so far), and that the faculty in general seems to be pleased with electronic voting. **Senators suggested that a review of electronic voting might be in order early in the 2007-2008 academic year.**

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Hans Ostrom**

**Date: April 10, 2007**

**To: Faculty Senate**

**From: Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Chair, Student Life Committee**

**Subject: Student Life Committee Final Report, 2006-2007**

Committee Members:

Taylor Ash (student representative), Ryan Dumm (student representative), Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (International Political Economy), Jan Leuchtenberger (Foreign Languages and Literature), Mita Mahato (English), Chris McKim (Music), Cathy Hale (Psychology), Mike Segawa (ex-officio), Danni Simon (student representative), and Carrie Washburn (ex-officio, representing Academic Dean)

The Student Life Committee met during the 2006-2007 academic year to discuss the following charges from the Faculty Senate:

1. The Student Life Committee serves as a part of the Student Affairs Division's ongoing departmental review process.
2. The Student Life Committee provides input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the committee by the Dean of Students.
3. The Student Life Committee provides input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.
4. The Student Life Committee reviews information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life.

In the remainder of this report, work completed by the Student Life Committee (hereafter SLC) will be discussed according to the charge under which specific activities fall. (Please note that much of the description of what the committee accomplished is taken directly from the minutes of our meetings, recorded by our secretary, Jan Leuchtenberger.)

Charge #1: The Student Life Committee serves as a part of the Student Affairs Division's ongoing departmental review process.

As part of its regular five-year self-study (required by each division of Student Affairs), Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services (CHWS) asked for volunteers from the SLC to serve on the CHWS self-study review committee. Nick Kontogeorgopoulos and Chris McKim agreed to serve on this committee. However, this self-study was cancelled when Mike Segawa became Dean of Students in November, 2006. (The self-study process within Student Affairs has been discontinued until the procedures can be assessed and streamlined by Mike and his staff.)

Charge #2: The Student Life Committee provides input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the committee by the Dean of Students.

This is our most important charge, because there is no other place in the university where faculty, students, and staff can consult with the Dean of Students on Student Affairs projects and initiatives.

This is the charge under which most of the committee's work falls. Below is a list of Student Affairs projects or initiatives discussed by the SLC:

- *Working Group on Local Addresses.* Jean Kim asked the SLC, on behalf of the Working Group on Local Addresses, for input on how to deal with the collection of student addresses. The SLC offered the following suggestions to the Working Group:
  - In the welcoming email sent out to students every fall, there should be a link to Cascade for them to update their local addresses. Students should be advised that this information is for official use only and not for publication. They will also be informed that addresses will need to be updated before they can register for spring semester.
  - During fall registration for spring semester, there should be a prompt for those who have not yet updated addresses – they would not be able to proceed without doing it.
  
- *Proposed working group on moving from land lines to cell phones on campus.* Jean Kim informed the SLC that a new working group was to be formed soon to begin discussion of the following issues:
  - What phone numbers should be collected from students – should we be collecting cell phone numbers?
  - If primary means of contact is to be cell phones, how do we address the office budgetary issues of calling students' cell phones (that are often long distance numbers)?
  - Do land lines in dorm rooms need to be maintained when students rarely use them or even activate their voice mail?

The SLC offered the following input:

- The school probably cannot take away land lines unless it is prepared to give all students cell phones.
- One option could be common land lines in quads/halls in the dorms (rather than in each room) so that phones are available but not going unused in every room.
- When collecting local addresses, the school should ask for the phone number where the student can most likely be reached.

- Prepaid phone cards could save money for departments that need to contact students' long-distance cell-phone numbers from land lines.
- *Strategic planning committee on Greek life.* Jean Kim informed the SLC that a committee had been created to explore ways to integrate the Greek community more fully in the life of the University, and to review the recruiting process of Greek organizations. SLC member Mita Mahato volunteered for, and has served on, this committee.
- *Housing review board.* Jean Kim requested that a faculty member on the SLC serve on a review board that would decide whether to allow a Greek organization to keep a campus house, and more specifically whether, and how best, to open the application process to all interested parties. SLC member Jan Leuchtenberger volunteered for, and served on, this review board.
- *Academic honesty.* The SLC was asked by the Jean Kim to give its opinion on the best place for a discussion of academic honesty with the incoming freshmen class. The committee asked Carrie Washburn to pass along several recommendations to the Orientation Planning Committee (which, the committee was informed, has been considering the issue of how to integrate discussions of academic honesty into orientation):
  - Perhaps a series of workshops could be offered that were voluntary but with attendance highly recommended by faculty (especially those teaching freshman seminars)
  - The discussion might be received better by the students if offered by Peer Advisors and Perspectives Leaders.
  - The Campus Life Skit might be an ideal place for students to see the consequences of violating policies on academic honesty – either intentionally or unintentionally.
- *Housing Occupancy Group.* Mike Segawa and Maggie Mittuch (Associate Vice President of Student Financial Services) updated the SLC on the work of the Housing Occupancy Group, which was convened to come up with proposals for improving housing occupancy and improving the physical plant. Mike and Maggie discussed with the committee several ideas that were being considered at that time.
- *First-Year Residential Seminars.* Mike Segawa reported that five of the fall seminars are currently residential – meaning that the students in the class all live on the same floor as well. This was done first on a trial basis and students who signed up for the classes did not know they would be living together. But the response has been very positive and now faculty are being recruited to increase the number to 10 next year. Because of the Mellon Grant, there is funding available for these classes to do outside activities to enhance the classroom experience. Mike informed the committee that the plan is to eventually increase the number of residential seminars even beyond the 10 planned for next year.
- *Contact information for students.* The SLC discussed the issue of how to keep contact information for students as current as possible (this issue was discussed because it has been an ongoing concern for Student Affairs). Mike Segawa reported to the committee



that OIS has purchased address verification software that will be implemented in the registration process.

- *Sexual assault and sexual harassment policy.* Mike Segawa informed the SLC that Student Affairs would like to revise the University's Sexual Assault Policy, which is currently a subset of the overall Harassment Policy. As part of the Harassment Policy, the adjudication process for sexual assault complaints follows the same process used in all other harassment claims, but this process may not be sensitive enough to the victims. For example, under the current policy, if a woman wanted to bring a student through the conduct process for alleged sexual assault, the alleged perpetrator would be allowed to choose the venue from among the following: the Dean; a smaller committee that includes students; or the Honor Court, which includes mostly students. This policy is perceived as a reason why some students might refrain from reporting attacks. In order to bring charges, the school needs the cooperation of the student victim, but because that victim loses control of the process under the current policy, she/he might not want to cooperate. Currently, a committee composed of faculty and students is writing up a draft of a new sexual harassment policy that includes: more definitions of sexual assault, rape, etc., using language borrowed from other institutions; and, an adjudication process that creates a Sexual Harassment Board of three people (one faculty member, one student, one staff member), all of whom will be trained to deal with sexual assault. This takes the adjudication process out of the hands of the alleged perpetrator. Mike informed the SLC that the draft of the new policy would be sent to the SLC for review (which it was later in the year) before sending it on to other relevant committees for approval.
- *ISLO and student reflection.* One of the SLC's charges last year was "to support, review, and respond to the work of the Task Force on Defining Integrated Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) on behalf of the Faculty Senate." ISLO, which met during the 2005-2006 year, issued a final report in October, 2006. The current SLC reviewed this report and received an overview of ISLO's work from two current members of the SLC (Nick Kontogeorgopoulos and Mike Segawa) who also served on ISLO. Among the issues discussed by ISLO, student reflection of their experiences at UPS was one that dovetails with the responsibilities of the SLC. ISLO noted in its final report (pp, 12-13) that:

One area of program development which many members of the task force felt might complement and reinforce the University's core mission, would be programs that stress the need for students to develop a pattern of "time out", to schedule time for personal reflection, to consider down-time and rest-time, and what one task forced member called "scheduled freedom." Taking time for reflective consideration of the breadth and depth of one's commitments, of the prioritization of one's activities ,of the self-assessment of one's goals, seem to us a worthwhile endeavor for all students to pursue.

Though this year's SLC was not charged with supporting, reviewing, and responding to the work of ISLO, we nonetheless took up the issue of student reflection since it clearly relates to student life, especially student engagement (discussed later in this report). The SLC noted that there are currently opportunities for seniors to participate in Senior Focus Groups but that participation is limited to a relatively small number. For quite some time, there has been interest among different groups in organizing something that would give seniors time together to reflect on their four years. The SLC discussed an idea proposed by Carrie Washburn: the idea is to have a Senior Day or Senior Week in the week before Spring classes start. Some Committee members pointed out that we welcome students

very warmly and give them so much guidance as First-Year students, and there is also a program for Sophomores, but there is nothing like that for Seniors.

Some benefits of this program and its timing would include:

- Closer to graduation, everyone is busy and many are too ready to leave for them to be interested in reflection.
- Many seniors are eager to come back to campus before spring classes start because they have difficulty staying at home for long periods.
- It would give students a chance to look back on 7 semesters and evaluate what they have done and haven't done while there is still one semester left. This could have an effect on how they spend their last semester.
- It would keep them more engaged with school and the campus community and make them better mentors in the final semester (to pass on what they have learned over the past years) and better alumni once they leave.
- This reflection could allow them to see some of the more intangible skills they have acquired while at UPS and give them a different perspective on the job hunt.
- It would provide an opportunity for students to receive advice from CES on strategies for finding jobs.

The program could include:

- A structure much like Prelude, where small groups meet with 35 faculty members willing to participate.
- A possibility to bring together original Prelude groups, some of whom may not have seen much of each other during their four years on campus.
- Some new traditions that could become important rites of passage.
- Participation from CES.

Possible sources for planning this program:

- The Freshman Orientation Committee, which already organizes a similar program and has representation from all areas that would also be good for this program.
- The Prelude Committee.
- The SLC could provide faculty input.
- A task force or committee in charge of planning could look at other schools and see what they do for their seniors.

Student members of the SLC stated that students would be interested in this opportunity and would be happy to return early for it. Faculty members also felt that faculty would be willing to participate if they were compensated as they are for Prelude.

SLC members suggested going forward next January with a “beta project” to get the concept up and running on a smaller scale with perhaps 10 faculty members. This could be done with the expectation that the full project could be implemented in two or three years.

The SLC asked Mike Segawa to convey to Kris Bartanen the SLC’s strong support of the idea and its recommendation that a task force be developed to flesh out the details. That task force could draw on the Orientation Planning Committee and any others it sees fit.

Charge #3: The Student Life Committee provides input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body’s executives.

ASUPS did not seek SLC input on any projects. One of the committee’s goals for next year is to communicate with the ASUPS Executive and make sure that they know that they can seek faculty input through the SLC.

Charge #4: The Student Life Committee reviews information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life.

There are several sources of information that allow the SLC to identify issues relevant to student life. Other than information received from students, faculty, and staff—all of whom may at any time bring relevant concerns or ideas to the SLC—there are two primary sources of information.

First, beginning this Spring, the SLC will each semester receive a report from the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee. In February, Jesse Rowe, Chair of the ASUPS Student Concerns, submitted the committee’s report summarizing student concerns/complaints received by her committee. The SLC reviewed this report, deciding that nothing warranted further action on our part (i.e., follow-up action on any of the particular student complaints summarized in the report).

Second, the SLC noted that the large amount of data gathered by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) is not shared with the campus community, and that the only place where it is currently discussed is in Cabinet meetings. Hoping to use IR data to identify issues relevant to student life, the SLC initiated a conversation with Randy Nelson, Director of IR.

On October 5<sup>th</sup>, Randy attended a SLC meeting and gave us an overview of the various surveys conducted on campus, and the data that these surveys produced. Randy also addressed the following questions, which were sent to him prior to the meeting:

1. What assessments are done annually of students and faculty?
2. What ongoing assessments are done of students and faculty?
3. What data sets are available to the Student Life Committee?
4. What does your office do with the data that it collects (i.e., is there a formal protocol? How is the information on data distributed and to whom?)

5. Do you have any ideas on what this committee may want to do with the data available in order to identify issues of importance to students?
6. Are there any data the university is not collecting, but should?

In response, Randy reported the following at the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting:

- His department officially reports to the Academic Dean but also conducts surveys as requested in other areas, the results of which are reported to the parties that requested them.
- He gave a list of all of the regularly scheduled assessments, when they are given, to whom they are reported, and how they are reported. He also listed some of the more recently conducted special assessment projects.
- He suggested that the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) and the Senior Focus Groups might be the most helpful to the SLC in isolating issues.
- He pointed out that some of the findings could be shared immediately while others would have to be requested and formally released by the Academic Dean.
- In addition, he assured all that anything that is released is compiled data, never raw data.

Following this meeting, the SLC deliberated on what variables to investigate, or more specifically, on what questions to ask Randy (who stated that he could work with his data sets to provide information on specific variables). The SLC decided to focus on the issue of *student engagement*, since Jean Kim and Mike Segawa both reported that UPS students appeared to become less engaged in campus life in their senior year. Another reason that the SLC focused on student engagement is that it was also a prominent issue in the deliberations of ISLO.

Towards this end, the SLC requested that Randy tap into existing data to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How does the depth of student involvement in co-curricular activities (measured in hours of participation) change between the freshman and senior years?
2. Are juniors and seniors more selective in their co-curricular activities than freshmen and sophomores?
3. Do students demonstrate different patterns of engagement (in particular, are they more or less engaged) after returning from being away on study abroad programs?
4. Does engagement vary according to variables such as gender, home state (or region), socioeconomic class, major, etc.?
5. Is there a relationship between depth of student involvement in co-curricular activities (measured in hours of participation) and academic performance (measured by GPA)?

In response to our questions on student engagement, Randy made the following observations:

- The results show that students with higher GPAs tend to be more engaged, which in general demonstrates that co-curricular involvement is not detrimental to academic achievement. However, there are still some cases in which students make poor choices – i.e., when forced to choose between class or activity, they choose the activity.
- Many of the answers to existing survey questions deal with hours spent on various college-related tasks and activities, but “hours spent” does not accurately answer our question about students’ level of involvement in and focus on activities. The number of hours does not specify what those hours are being used for or whether the students are reflecting on those hours spent and their benefit to them overall.
- A better way to measure the above and answer our questions would be focus groups. This would also more closely tie the concerns of ISLO with our own questions.
- Results also show that students tend to be in leadership roles in second and third years at college, but then pull away in the senior year. Their replacements often start over in that position without the benefit of the previous person’s experience. It would be good to find a mechanism for “downloading” the brain of the previous leader – to find a way they can mentor those who come after them before they actually leave campus.

The SLC plans next year to continue its correspondence with Randy Nelson regarding the use of data to identify issues relevant to student life.

#### Other Business

In addition to the work outlined above, the SLC completed the following activities:

*Self-Evaluation.* At the end of last year (2005-2006), the SLC began to discuss the Senate charge that asked all standing committees to deliberate on particular questions related to self-evaluation. As part of that deliberation, the committee began to discuss the need to develop more consistent charges from year to year. No report was sent to the Senate last year, and the current SLC requested an extension of the Fall deadline in order to assess adequately the implementation of new charges and new actions (for example, working with Randy Nelson in IR). The committee completed its self-evaluation and sent it to the Senate Chair on March 1, 2007.

*Faculty Bylaws.* The SLC received a request from the Senate Chair to take a look at the proposed changes to Section II 2 of the Faculty Bylaws. At the first reading of the proposed changes to the Faculty Bylaws in the January 29<sup>th</sup> Faculty Meeting, at least two faculty members expressed a concern that the proposed change would remove language highlighting faculty involvement in “...other student affairs related to the academic life of the University.” In order to address this concern, the SLC added to the proposed revision of Section II 2 of the Faculty Bylaws the following section, taken verbatim from Ch. I, Part D 2e of the Faculty Code:

“The Faculty shall participate in service that advances the mission of the university, including participation in departmental and university governance, in co-curricular programs, in promoting intellectual vitality and a high quality of life on the campus, and in activities which help convey the nature and purpose of the university to its constituencies.”

*Other* – Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, the Chair of the SLC, attended several events pertinent to student life, including a presentation and discussion at the Center for Writing, Learning, &

Teaching entitled “Residential Seminars: Challenges and Opportunities,” and several Faculty-Student Affairs (FacSA) Lunch Seminars.

### Looking Forward

The SLC looks forward to next year for several reasons. First, having the same Dean of Students for the entire year will allow for more consistency and better communication since many of the projects initiated by the previous Dean have either been discontinued or have not produced any follow-up information for the SLC. All but one faculty member of the SLC is returning to the committee next year; this will also promote continuity and consistency.

Second, the SLC has identified charges (discussed below) that we believe will work well for us next year: these charges are based on this year’s charges, which have also worked well. Last year’s committee felt that there was a need for more consistent charges that avoided redundancy with the work being done by other committees. For this reason, this year’s committee developed four charges that are deliberately open-ended, flexible, and do not replicate the work being done by other faculty committees. The reason that we sought flexibility in our charges is because the committee is not always aware at the end of the previous year which initiatives, projects, or issues that the Dean of Students will need to bring before the committee for discussion or advice in the coming year. Thus, the SLC’s charges this year may appear broader than the charges for other committees, but they have served the committee well. Charge #2 has been especially important since it affirms the central role of this committee, namely to serve as an advisory body to the Dean of Students.

At its last meeting, the SLC discussed its charges for next year, and would like to propose the following four charges:

1. The Student Life Committee provides input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the committee by the Dean of Students.
2. The Student Life Committee provides input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body’s executives.
3. The Student Life Committee reviews information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.
4. The Student Life Committee provides a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees.

The SLC dropped from its proposed charges for next year the charge (from this year) related to the Student Affairs Division’s ongoing departmental review process, because (a) this process has been discontinued and is currently under review, and (b) charge #4 in our proposed charges for next year would allow the participation of SLC faculty members in Student Affairs departmental reviews, were this process to be continued again.

At its last meeting, the SLC also identified the following goals for next year:

1. To better inform faculty, students, and staff of the role of the SLC, and in particular, the ability of any member of the campus community to bring to the committee issues of concern related to student life.
2. To work more closely with ASUPS in order to allow ASUPS officials to bring projects to the SLC for faculty input.
3. To follow up more rigorously and consistently the work of Student Affairs committees that request input from the SLC.
4. To determine more clearly with the Senate the identity of the Senate liaison to our committee. (This year, a total of four names were mentioned at one point or another as the Senate Liaison.)
5. To discuss a request brought forth by a student member of the SLC to explore the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program. This year, two UPS students organized such activities during Spring Break, but the SLC plans to discuss this idea further and explore whether this can be made into a more regular opportunity (perhaps arranged through the Community Involvement and Action Center (CIAC)).
6. To establish an ongoing relationship with Institutional Research that would continue beyond this year and provide a steady flow of information helpful in identifying long-term issues. These could then be addressed by the SLC in addition to emerging issues that are brought to its attention throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Kontogeorgopoulos  
Chair, Student Life Committee, 2006-2007

\* \* \*

TO: Barry Anton, Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Sarah Westcott McCoy, Chair  
Institutional Review Board

DATE: April 9, 2007

RE: Institutional Review Board End-of-year Report

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) entered the 2006-2007 academic year with the charges of:

1. implementing the Puget Sound guidelines for protecting human subjects (monitoring and reviewing protocols),
2. upgrading and refining the IRB web page,
3. posting FAQs appropriate for UPS researchers
4. continuing development of a system for monitoring ongoing research,
5. planning for the transition to a new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the Administration,

6. completing a self assessment by December 1, 2006, and
7. discussing meeting more frequently and over breaks.

I would like to report good progress on most of these issues, as this report documents.

Implementing the Puget Sound guidelines for protecting human subjects (monitoring and reviewing protocols):

As a Standing Committee, the IRB is tasked with monitoring protocols, maintaining a system for managing records, and deliberating on policy questions.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, our first duty was to find a new Community member for our Committee. After searching for volunteers, we ended up with several who were willing and chose to invite Marsha Gallacher to join the Committee. She has been a valuable member and plans to continue in to the next year.

Up to this date for the 2006-2007 school year, we have received 21 protocols, and reviewed 19 of those, the other two are still under discussion and we have one more meeting in May where we expect to receive several more protocols. Of the 19 reviewed, one was discontinued by the researchers, one was approved by John Finney as expedited prior to being sent to the committee, and the rest have been approved, with the last several approved upon receipt of final required edits/additions. Several inquiries regarding research were also made which did not receive protocol numbers and were and/or are continuing to be handled by the Committee. Please see the attached Table for the details.

All deliberations have been and will continue to be posted in IRB Committee Minutes. Because the Chair is often contacted with questions related to these deliberations, the Chair's keeps files to track all protocols. The Associate Deans Office is the repository of all records, protocols, and final reports.

Upgrading and refining the IRB web page and posting FAQs appropriate for UPS researchers :



The IRB established a presence on the World Wide Web in the Summer of 1998 ([www.ups.edu/dean/irb/](http://www.ups.edu/dean/irb/)). Documents posted on the IRB Web Page include:

1. the 1998 revised IRB Guidelines document and various forms for protocol preparation. These guidelines can be downloaded.
2. the IRB policy on the Ethical Care and Use of Animals that was adopted in the Spring of 1998. The IRB provides a link to the University of Puget Sound IACUC. Forms and procedures are now available on the IACUC Web Page.
3. links to the National Institutes of Health Office of Extra-mural Research,
4. a description of the activities of the IRB,
5. a roster of IRB members and department IRB designates,
6. scheduled IRB meetings, and
7. a list of frequently asked questions.

One charge from the Faculty Senate from the previous year was to establish a Frequently Asked Questions page on the web. Rather than just post this, we decided to do an overall update of the webpage. As we have had monthly meetings with fewer protocols to review, we have been systematically reviewing the whole webpage for updates so it is accurate, easier to follow, is cohesive across sections, includes new HIPAA information, includes new consent/assent form guidelines related to the IRB approval stamp purchased this year, links to the policy on Blood Borne Pathogens, includes the updated FAQs, and includes examples of model consent and assent forms. We expect to post the new information this summer, 2007.

Another activity undertaken to improve the Committees review of submitted protocols is to plan a training session for the Departmental Designees. As we reviewed the submitted protocols this year, we found that we were sending back many due to missing information, some of these had been signed off by the Designee and some were coming to us with out the Designee's signature. To help the Designees' in their work and to review some of the changes in the web information for next year, we will be having a Designee training session from 12:00-1:00 on April 19, 2007. Ann Wilson will be running this training session. As a part of the update of the web information we are adding a Designee checklist so it is clear what the job entails. We hope this will make the Committee meetings more productive and the time from submission to approval quicker.

#### Continuing development of a system for monitoring ongoing research:

We have created a standardized form that we have been asking each researcher approved this year to complete at the end of the approved study. (See attached form.) One member of the IRB Committee, Roger Allen, will be tracking the approved studies across the next year and will email the researcher(s) prior to

the end of the approved year to remind/solicit this report to be filed in the Associate Dean's office.

Planning for the transition to a new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the Administration:

This charge was unknown to the current Chair and no action has been taken to date. Discussions at the May meeting will include this topic and a plan for action will be developed.

Completing a self assessment by December 1, 2006:

This charge was unknown to the current Chair and was not completed. I would be happy to work on this after meeting with the Senate to understand what the charge concerns.

Discussing meeting more frequently and over breaks:

The Committee discussed this and decided to meet more often, as necessary, given the flow of proposals to be reviewed. We did have one extra meeting and also handled some continued reviews over email exchanges due to problems with finding a time that all members could meet.

Upcoming Agenda Items

The IRB has identified the following goals for the next academic year:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Post and monitor upgraded IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers
3. Work with the new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration and discuss administrative duties for IRB liaison that ease the secretarial work of the Chair
4. Determine the possibility of an electronic IRB stamp for approved consent/assent forms.

I owe special thanks to IRB members for their hard work over the last year: Roger Allen, James Evans, John Finney, Marsha Gallacher (Community Representative), Tatiana Kaminsky (Secretary), Karim Ochosi, Ray Preiss, Ann Wilson, and John Woodward.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah Westcott McCoy, Chair

Institutional Review Board

\* \* \*

**University Enrichment Committee  
Faculty Senate Report  
April 11, 2007**

2006-2007 UEC Membership:

Aislinn Melchior, Amy G VanEngen Spivey, Diane D Kelley; George S Erving, Jerry Yonkman, Liz P Hoffman, Travis Horton, John M Finney (ex-officio), Michael Johnson, Lisa Johnson, Mark T Reinitz, Rand Worland, Rob A Beezer, Steven Neshyba, Susan M Stewart, Suzanne Holland, Tanya Stambuk, Shane Wright, William D Barry

The senate charges to the 2006-2007 University Enrichment Committee were:

1. Selection of Register Lecturer for 2008, selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award, and the usual duties related to travel and research awards.
2. Request that the Budget Task Force increase funding for student research.
3. Respond to a set of self-evaluation questions from the Faculty Senate.

Committee actions regarding Senate charges

**Selection of Register Lecturer for 2008**

After reviewing the work of several outstanding nominees, the Committee concluded that David Tinsley's scholarly contributions and teaching excellence made him an exemplary representative of the University community. Tinsley was chosen as Register Lecturer.

**Selection for the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award**

The committee reviewed faculty activities funded by UEC research grants, and on the basis of this review voted to name Judith Kay as the Phibbs Scholar.

**Usual duties related to travel, research, and release time awards**

Travel Funding. As of this writing, UEC funded 78 first-trip faculty travel requests, leaving a balance of -\$3192 in the faculty travel budget. The committee is committed to funding any additional qualified first-trip requests, though this will require transferring money from the faculty research budget. The anticipated large negative balance made it impossible to fund second trip requests this academic year.

Research Funding. The committee received six faculty research grant proposals. Five were funded, and one was sent back to the author with a request for additional information. Subcommittees reviewed research grant proposals by undergraduate and graduate students and rank-ordered the proposals for funding.

Release Time Requests. The committee received 16 applications for teaching release units. Five units are available for scholarly research, writing, or professional development and one unit is available for technology in teaching. The committee formulated a rank-ordered list of the top applications and sent this to Dean Bartanen for her decision.

### **Request to BTF to increase funding for student research.**

George Erving presented a proposal directed to the budget task force asking for an \$11,500 increase in funds for student research projects, which was unanimously approved as written and sent to the BTF. A copy of this request is attached. The BTF did approve some new monies, the exact amount to be determined by the dean.

### **Response to self-evaluation request**

The committee devoted a meeting to self evaluation, and a summary of the committee's responses was communicated to the Chair of Faculty Senate. In general the committee felt that they had ample opportunity to discharge its obligations and had remained true to its charge and purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Reinitz  
UEC Chair

\* \* \*

Christine Kline, Chair  
Academic Standards Committee  
Final Report for the 2006-2007 Academic Year

### **Petitions**

The petitions subcommittee of the Academic Standards Committee met each week to hear and to act on student petitions for waivers of academic policies. As of the April 6 ASC meeting, the subcommittee had acted on 201 petitions. As authorized by the committee, a petition preview team handled approvals of routine petitions.

## **Hearing Boards**

One hearing board was convened to consider a grade complaint.

### **Policy Language for Repeat of a First-Year Seminar**

The committee addressed the unique need that obtains for course repeats for first-year seminars. Unlike most course repeats, which must be undertaken with the same course and course number, first-year seminars may not be scheduled in the term or terms following. The committee adopted an addition to the policy on re-registration of the same course to enable a student to take another course under the rubric of Writing and Rhetoric or Scholarly and Creative Inquiry.

### **Academic Honesty in a Digital Age**

Noting the need to review and update policy language respecting plagiarism in the handbook to address the use of the internet, a subcommittee was appointed to review concepts of academic honesty in this digital age and to make recommendations for policy updates. The committee, in preparation for the subcommittee work and in response to the subcommittee progress reports of the work, engaged in lengthy and energetic discussions about a range of plagiarism issues across the disciplines, the nature of intellectual ownership and authorship, appropriate citation in a digital age, and the responsibilities of students and faculty in an academic community across the academic experiences at UPS. The subcommittee will submit their formal recommendation at the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Review of Withdrawal Grade Policy**

The committee has undertaken a periodic review of the withdrawal grade policy over the course of the first-year implementation. The policy revision, approved in 2005-2006, extends the period of withdrawal with an automatic W through the sixth week of classes and now has a deadline at the end of the twelfth week of classes beyond which a faculty member cannot assign a W. A W can be assigned during those interim weeks if conditions, outlined in the current policy, hold. The members of the committee agree that a review of the effectiveness of the change should continue. In this first year of implementation, no major questions have arisen about its efficacy; the registrar is gathering information on how overall grading patterns and withdrawal patterns are affected by this policy.

### **Study Abroad Record Keeping**

The committee discussed a proposal from the Interim Study Abroad Committee to include on Puget Sound transcripts coursework taken by students on “partner” or “affiliated” study abroad programs. The committee received and found reasonable the registrar’s plan to retain a study abroad notation at the top of the transcript, with course-by-course listings of study abroad courses and credits inserted chronologically into the transcript record.

