

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 10, 2004

Senators Present: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Julian Edgoose, Robin Foster, Paul Loeb, Keith Maxwell, David Tinsley.

Visitors: Peter Greenfield, Sue Hannaford, Ray Preiss, Peter Wimberger.

Chair Beardsley called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

M/S/P Approval of the May 3, 2004 minutes.

Announcements: Beardsley implored Senators to confirm that minutes from previous Senate meetings be submitted to the Associate Dean's office for distribution. He asked for volunteers for a Senate Awards Committee. Anton, DeMarais, and Beardsley volunteered. Beardsley expressed thanks to outgoing Senator Loeb for his service.

Elections Report: Julian Edgoose, Senate Secretary, reported that he received 111 valid ballots for the primary election. He also received two spoiled ballots, three late ballots, and 15 unsigned ballots. For the final ballot, 115 valid ballots were received, along with 12 unsigned and thus invalid ballots.

Senator Edgoose reported that Peter Wimberger was elected to the Senate for a 3-year term. The Academic VP will select one new member of the Faculty Advancement Committee from the slate of three candidates elected by the faculty. Economics Professor Doug Goodman, Chemistry Professor Ken Rousslang and Business Professor Jeff Matthews were elected to the Faculty Salary Committee

Committee Reports

The Senate M/S/P to receive the Curriculum Committee end-of-year report after a presentation by Curriculum Committee chair Sue Hannaford. The Curriculum Committee report is attached.

The Senate M/S/P to receive the Institutional Review Board (IRB) end-of-year report after a presentation by IRB chair Ray Preiss. Their report is attached. Several issues were raised following Professor Preiss' report: Professor DeMarais inquired when the University would appoint a Compliance Officer as mandated by Federal law? Professor Preiss also noted that the IRB was discussing ways of obtaining informed consent with Web based surveys. The final issue was the status of liability insurance for faculty who supervise student research, or who supervisory responsibility for student projects. Dean of Students Kris Bartanen will look into this issue and report back to the Senate at some future date.

The Senate M/S/P to receive the Library, Media, and Academic Computing (LMAC) Committee end-of-year report after a presentation by chair Peter Greenfield. Their report is attached. Senator DeMarais suggested that a charge for next year's LMAC include research into anti-plagiarism software.

The Senate welcomed incoming Senator Peter Wimberger. Robin Foster was then elected Vice Chair of the Senate and Alyce DeMarais was elected Secretary for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Chair Beardsley suggested that the Senate discuss the issue of assigning liaison's to the Standing Committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Anton

To: Bill Beardsley, Chair and the Faculty Senate

From: Sue Hannaford

Re: Curriculum Committee Final Report

Attached please find a complete list of the actions taken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2003-2004 academic year. Rather than discuss each action, I will focus on the big picture. Our work for the year falls into three broad categories: (1) 5-year reviews of departments, (2) continued implementation of the new core and the core assessment process, and (3) other business.

5-year reviews and creation of a new program designation, *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*:

Eleven programs or departments were up for review this year. We completed 7 reviews (Art, Asian Studies, International Political Economy, Economics, Exercise Science, School of Business and Leadership, and School of Music). The other four departments (Environmental Studies, Foreign Languages and Literature, Philosophy, and Physical Education) asked for and were granted a one year extension. The Curriculum Committee will assess these next year along with Biology, Religion and Women's Studies.

These 5-year reviews were generally straight forward. The committee was impressed with the thoughtful nature of the self studies. One thing I have noticed over my three-year term on the Curriculum Committee is that departments are making strides in assessing their overall programs. In previous years, individual courses were well-reviewed as were the overall goals for the department. However, most departments failed to show an assessment of the overall program and on student outcomes. This seems to be changing, and the faculty should be proud of this move – both because it is becoming essential for the University's assessment, but also because such study does strengthen our programs.

One big item grew out of these programmatic reviews and merits discussion here. As the Senators will probably recall, the Asian Studies faculty proposed to change their current curricular structure from a major and a minor and instead reorganize their curriculum to offer an enhancement or overlay for other fields. This change required a new curriculum category, which the Curriculum Committee ultimately adopted and which is designated an Interdisciplinary Emphasis. The guidelines for programs carrying the designation Interdisciplinary Emphasis are detailed in the minutes of the 11/17/03 Curriculum Committee meeting. In brief, this term is reserved for interdisciplinary programs, students must complete 5 to 9 courses, and unlike the guidelines for minors, there must be a distinctive structure that includes a set of common courses or experiences such as gateway or capstone courses or a study abroad experience.

Implementation of the new core and core assessment process:

Much of the committee's work involved reviewing proposals for new core courses, and the overwhelming majority of new courses targets the two freshman seminars; of the 16 core courses approved, 9 fulfill the SCIS core, 4 fulfill the WR core, and the remaining meet the Connections core. Senators may be wondering why we did not see *any* proposals for the other

new core areas, especially given that the current freshmen will be taking courses in the new Fine Arts, Humanistic, Mathematical, Natural Scientific, and Social Scientific approaches to knowing starting this fall. The answer is that since these new core areas are comprised largely of courses previously offered for the old core areas and therefore the committee expected many of these courses to “roll over”, last year we delegated the approval of these courses to the Associate Dean Bill Barry. He, of course, forwards any unusual proposal to the committee for a more thorough review.

In addition to approving new courses the committee also discussed how we might assess the new core. Our plan is detailed in the minutes of the 9/29/03 Curriculum Committee meeting. In brief, we have adopted a 5-year cycle. We will review two core areas each year for the first four years; in the fifth year we will consider the core as a whole. In 2004-5 we will review the two freshman seminars, followed by mathematical and natural scientific approaches (2005-6), fine arts and humanistic approaches (2006-7), and connections and social scientific (2007-8). The committee did not formalize the procedures by which we would implement this assessment, and creating this framework should be a major charge for next year’s Curriculum Committee. Associate Dean Bill Barry has volunteered to host a series of dinners for SCIS and WR faculty in 2004-5. These dinners will be modeled on those hosted by Julie Neff-Lippman this year. We anticipate that these dinners will serve as a starting point for examining our successes and shortcomings in the freshman core areas. One challenge to the Curriculum Committee will be to foster a non-adversarial relationship between the committee and core professors while still carrying out a thorough assessment.

In addition to implementing the first stage of the core assessment, the Curriculum Committee anticipates a busy load with 7 department/program reviews and a slew of course proposals to satisfy the Connections core. As noted above, we approved only 3 such course this year, we have 3 proposals pending review, and we approved a handful of courses for this core area last year. Thus, we anticipate seeing 20 to 30 connections proposals next year. This number will challenge the committee, particularly given the interdisciplinary nature of the proposals which may require the committee to consider not only if the course meets the core guidelines but also to assess the content of the course. The latter point merits further discussion, since the Curriculum Committee anticipates that this will be a major headache next year. One of the responsibilities of the committee is to evaluate courses for content (difficulty, currency, and rigor of the course; choice of textbooks; reasonableness of assignments). In recent years this hasn’t been a problem. For departmental courses this is handled informally within the department. Similarly, for interdisciplinary courses this is usually handled by an advisory committee. Thus, for example, the SCXT advisory committee screened proposals for the old SCXT core, allowing the Curriculum Committee to focus on whether or not the course met the guidelines without undue review of content. With the new Connections core we face the potential problem that the committee will receive proposals from individuals (not associated with an interdisciplinary program) and that we will have to assess content as well as whether the course meets core guidelines. Will a Curriculum Subcommittee (possibly composed of a historian, a physicist, and a business professor) be expected to evaluate the difficulty, currency, and rigor or the material and assignments for all Connections course proposals? If not, how will the committee handle this challenge? The current committee members felt it was important to defer this decision to those who will actually do the work next year. Thus, establishing mechanisms to consider both the core guidelines and the course content of Connections core proposals should be a charge to the committee. We refer members of next year’s Curriculum Committee to the summary of this year’s committee discussions in the 11/24/03 minutes.

Other business:

The Curriculum Committee handled a mix of other business. A few of these actions were substantial and merit a mention here. We clarified the language regarding the upper division graduation requirement; we approved a 16 unit upper limit for the Special Interdisciplinary Major; we voted to require all transfer students entering in Fall 2004 to fulfill the new core requirements; and, we approved language stressing that students wishing to satisfy the WR core with transfer credit “must demonstrate work in written communication, oral communication, and argumentation.”

Charges for the 2004-5 Curriculum Committee might include:

1. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including the 5-year reviews for Biology, Environmental Studies, Foreign Language and Literature, Philosophy, Physical Education, Religion, and Women’s Studies.
2. Continue implementation of the core assessment process with particular emphasis on assessing the first year seminars.
3. Establish guidelines to ensure that Connections course proposals will both satisfy the core guidelines as well as have appropriate content.

Curriculum Committee

Disposition of 2003-2004 Agenda

I. Departmental Reviews

- 09/22/2003 Art Department curriculum review approved.
- 10/27/2003 International Political Economy curriculum review approved.
- 11/17/2003 Asian Studies curriculum review approved.
- 02/09/2004 Economics curriculum review approved.
- 03/08/2004 Exercise Science curriculum review approved.
- 03/29/2004 School of Business and Leadership curriculum review approved.
- 03/29/2004 School of Music curriculum review approved.

II. On-going business

Academic Calendar

- 09/29/2003 Academic Calendar for 2004-2005 approved.

- 10.27/2003 Basic calendar for 2007-2008 approved and sent to Faculty Senate. This calendar begins the Tuesday after Labor Day (9/3/07) and ends the 21st of December

Action on core courses

- 09/22/2003 ENGL 135, Architectures of Power, approved for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core

- 09/29/2003 PHIL 103, Atrocity and Moral Responsibility in the 20th Century, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 09/29/2003 MUS 121, Musical Film Biography: Fact, Fiction, and Art, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 09/29/2003 CLSC 105, Homer, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 9/29/2003 Affirmed the five-year cycle for assessment of core curriculum adopted by 2002-2003 Curriculum Committee.

- 10/13/2003 REL 107, Galilee, Religion, Power, Politics, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 10/13/2003 CSOC122, Sociology of Consumer Culture, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 10/27/2003 HUM 306, Cultural Identity in Japan and the United States, approved for the Connections core

- 02/09/2004 CSOC130, Murderous Neighbors, Compassionate Strangers: Disparate Responses to Genocide, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 02/09/2004 HIST 130, Race, Education, and the Law: The Brown Decision and its Legacies, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core

- 03/08/2004 ENGL 136, Imagining the American West, for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core

- 03/29/2004 ENGL 135, Travel And The Other, for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core

- 04/05/2004 ENGL 137, Representing Multiculturalism, for Writing and Rhetoric seminar core
- 04/12/2004 REL 120, Communities of Resistance and Liberation, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 04/12/2004 CHEM 150, The Great Flood, approved for the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar core
- 04/26/2004 HUM 315, Drama Film, and the Musical Stage, approved for the Connections core
- 04/26/2004 SCXT 346, Strange Realities: Physics in the Twentieth Century, approved for the Connections core

III. Other Curricular Business

- 09/05/2003 Approved the continuation of the current authority delegated to the Associate Dean.
- 09/15/2003 Approved deferral of Foreign Languages and Literature department curriculum review to 2004-2005
- 09/15/2003 Approved deferral of Physical Education program curriculum review to 2004-2005
- 09/15/2003 Approved the following in regard to requirements for graduation:
A score of 5, 6, or 7 on the IB Higher Level foreign language exam will satisfy the foreign language graduation requirement.
- 10/13/2003 Approved the following in regard to requirements for foreign language proficiency examination:
 1. Students who opt to take the proficiency exam in order to meet the foreign language requirement may retake the exam one time only.
 2. High school students who have successfully completed the first-year course sequence in a foreign language at the college level or the equivalent of at least one unit of Puget Sound credit of foreign language at the second-year level or above will have satisfied the foreign language requirement, even if such courses are credited towards a high-school degree. Such courses must be regular college offerings and cannot be special courses for high-school students. We will ask students who've completed self-paced or distance-learning courses to demonstrate proficiency by taking the exam, i.e., these courses will not be considered satisfactory. (Note: the registrar's office will screen courses with regard to formatting.)
 3. The language in the curriculum document should be edited to say "University of Puget Sound approved" proficiency examination in referencing the test (G2 in the curriculum statement).
Note:: The curriculum committee is satisfied with the current process for selecting foreign language tests. This selection process involves the collaboration of the foreign language faculty, administration, and Learning Center staff. We also note that the committee views the exam as an indicator of proficiency in all areas.
- 10/13/2003 Approved the following in regard to the upper division graduation requirement:

Earned at least three *academic* units outside the first major at the upper-division level.

- 10/27/2003 Revisions to Self Study Curriculum Review Guide approved to clarify the option for departments to report on their long-range plans for continued curriculum development.
- 11/03/2003 Approved the Special Interdisciplinary Major in Religious Literature of Ancient Societies approved for Alison Gray.
- 11/17/2003 Guidelines for a new program designation, Interdisciplinary Emphasis, approved.
- 03/08/2004 Approved listing Connections courses as follows:
1. All Connections courses proposed out of interdisciplinary programs will carry an interdisciplinary program label.
2. All Connections courses proposed out of other (i.e., disciplinary) departments will carry a generic label.
- 03/29/2004 Approved that all entering transfer students starting with Fall 2004 will fulfill the new core requirements.
- 04/05/2004 Approved the Special Interdisciplinary Major in Religion and Literature approved for Chai Blair-Stahn
- 04/12/2004 Approved the following guidance for evaluating transfer transcripts regarding the Writing and Rhetoric core requirement:

Students wishing to satisfy the Writing and Rhetoric core with transfer credit must demonstrate course work in written communication, oral communication, and argumentation.
- 04/12/2004 The committee agreed to grant to the Associate Dean the (summer) authority to provisionally approve freshman seminars (WR and SCIS) for a one-time-only offering the following fall.
- 04/26/2004 Approved a 16 unit limit for the Special Interdisciplinary Major, with the option of appeal up to 18 units.
- 04/26/2004 Approved Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric as a substitution for Communication I (old core).

IV. Business to be carried over to 2004-2005

Consideration of the following courses for Connections: HUM 320, AFAM 401, REL 369, and ART 150 for Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric.

Formation of subcommittee to address Connections proposals not from interdisciplinary programs.

V. Departmental reviews scheduled for 2004-2005

Biology
Environmental Studies
Foreign Languages and Literature
Philosophy
Physical Education
Religion
Women Studies



TO: William Beardsley, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Ray Preiss, Chair
Institutional Review Board

DATE: May 6, 2004

RE: IRB End-of-year Report

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) entered the 2003-2004 Academic Year with three charges: (1) implementing the Puget Sound guidelines for protecting human subjects (monitoring and reviewing protocols), (2) updating and refining the IRB presence on the web, and (3) establishing a system for insuring that protocols accurately reflect laboratory and field procedures. I am pleased to report considerable progress on these issues, as this report documents. At the close of this end-of-year report, I present issues the Faculty Senate may consider when crafting charges for the 2004-2005 IRB.

Implementing the Puget Sound Guidelines for Protecting Human Subjects

We have diligently pursued our primary activities of receiving and assessing protocols submitted by Puget Sound faculty and students. We do, from time to time, process protocols originating from other universities (two protocols in this category were reviewed this year). We allow this to occur so that our university can be known as a reliable and cooperative partner in the search for knowledge. Also, we understand the importance to Puget Sound faculty of reciprocal access to subjects on other campuses. We allow protocols from other universities to be initiated only after full IRB review. We do not allow private parties or commercial interests to use University of Puget Sound human subjects in experimental research.

An important aspect of IRB duties involves monitoring protocols, maintaining a system for managing records, and deliberating on policy questions. During the 2003-2004 Academic Year, most of our time was devoted to evaluating protocols. We received and formally approved 21 research projects. This represents a 16% increase in submitted protocols from the previous year. Many protocols require multiple IRB deliberations. In six cases, protocols were approved pending minor modifications. Three protocols were sent back to investigators with questions and concerns. All deliberations are posted in IRB

Committee Minutes. Because the Chair is often contacted with questions related to these deliberations, the Chair's Notebook tracks all protocols. The Associate Deans Office is the repository of records, protocols, and final reports.

In the previous paragraph, I noted that deliberation regarding policy questions is an essential part of IRB responsibilities. In the past, these deliberations involved issues of vulnerable populations (e.g., children, elderly, psychological distress, and patients experiencing pain during physical rehabilitation regimens). We have offered case-by-case reviews addressing issues such as non-English speaking immigrants, physically and emotionally abused children, and student substance abuse. In these deliberations, the IRB aspires to promote knowledge acquisition while protecting human subjects. We have devised clear policies on subject anonymity, informed consent, coercion, deception, acceptable discomfort and pain levels, and sensitive activities (crime, sexuality, substance abuse, etc.). I am pleased to report that IRB deliberations continue address important issues vital to protecting human subjects.

There is an emerging consensus on the IRB that experiments must address significant questions to gain a favorable review decision. Previously, the IRB had only ruled on safety and confidentiality concerns for "minimal risk" protocols and theoretical or applied benefits for "moderate risk" and "high risk" protocols. The IRB has never processed a protocol designated "high risk." The IRB is now discussing including theoretical and applied benefits to "minimal risk" protocols as well. The idea here is that even innocuous methods impose on subjects' time, energy, and intellect. Good reasons must be provided to justify these impositions.

Presence on the World Wide Web

The IRB established a presence on the World Wide Web in the Summer of 1998 (www.ups.edu/dean/irb/). Documents posted on the IRB Web Page include the revised IRB Guidelines document and various forms for protocol preparation. These forms can be downloaded. In addition, the Web Page includes the IRB policy on the Ethical Care and Use of Animals that was adopted in the Spring of 1998. A charge to the IACUC during the 2001-2002 academic year was to place its forms and procedures on this Web Page. The IACUC now has its own Web Page, guidelines, documents, and minutes.

We continue to add documents and links to resources that may assist student and faculty researchers. The IRB first established a presence on the World Wide Web in the Summer of 1998. Currently we post links to the National Institutes of Health Office of Extra-mural Research, as well as an array of on-line resources useful to active researchers and students enrolled in research methods courses or engaged in independent research projects. In addition, the page now includes a description of the activities of the IRB, a roster of IRB members and

department IRB designates, scheduled IRB meetings, and a list of frequently asked questions.

Informal feedback regarding the Web Page continues to be favorable. The Web Page is consulted regularly for forms and procedures, to resolve questions related to individual research projects, and as a guide for protocol preparation. We will continue to refine the Web Page as the needs of our students and faculty evolve. We are pleased to report that the Web Page has increased the visibility of the IRB and provides a useful resource. We recognize, however, that some links have been deactivated, that the IRB pages are not easy to navigate, and that first-time users can be baffled by our check lists and procedures. We have made plans to offer model protocols and simplified instructions for novice student researchers. These efforts are on-going.

Insuring that Protocols Accurately Reflect Laboratory and Field Procedures

The final charge from the Faculty Senate for AY 2003-2004 involved proactively monitoring protocols. The IRB has discussed this issue at length. We have developed a framework where student protocols are to be field checked by the designated Faculty Advisor. Upon approval by the IRB Designate, the student, operating under the Advisor's directions initiates the protocol.

Proactively monitoring faculty protocols is more complex. The IRB has visited and examined facilities used to store confidential information and some laboratories. To date, we have not been able to be on the premises when data were being collected. The IRB does not have the staff or resources to systematically observe laboratory or field methods.

On-Going Concerns

In response to my 2002-2003 report to the Faculty Senate, one Senate member opined that the IRB was slow in rendering decisions and that student research projects were unnecessarily delayed by IRB review. In my oral remarks last year, I defended the time used to ensure effective review. I am pleased to report that during the 2003-2004AY no concerns have reached my desk regarding slow turnaround time or inconveniences attributed to delays. I take this as evidence that the IRB is doing its job in a responsive manner.

In my 2002-2003 Annual Report, I asked the Faculty Senate to consider the workload of IRB members. I again make this request. In addition to reviewing protocols, the IRB is being asked to work over the summer, to build Web resources, and to be on-site while data are being collected. We do not have a Compliance Officer (as Federal regulations specify), a budget, or support staff. I ask the Faculty Senate to discuss the recommendation that the Chair of the IRB be allowed a one unit release from teaching duties to cope with these burdens.

Upcoming Agenda Items

Based upon the progress made in addressing the charges given by the Faculty Senate this year, 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. Upgrade and refine the IRB Web Page with information appropriate for student and faculty researchers.
3. Develop a system for ensuring timely review of protocols originating during the summer months.
4. Arrange for consultations with a certified Compliance Officer to ensure that the IRB is current with evolving case law and Federal mandates.

As I end my service as Chair of the IRB and embark on a sabbatical, I would like to thank the Faculty Senate for your oversight. I owe special thanks to IRB members for hard work at inconvenient hours: Roger Allen (Secretary), Patrick Coogan (Community Representative), John Finney, Robin Foster, Dash Goodman

**REPORT OF THE LIBRARY, MEDIA AND
ACADEMIC COMPUTING COMMITTEE
2003-2004**

May 10, 2004

To: Faculty Senate

From: Peter Greenfield, chair

Actions Taken:

1. Approved the library's decision to stop binding most periodicals.
2. Endorsed the broad goals expressed in the library's draft mission statement, with the understanding that the library will develop specific goals and policies by next fall, based on its statement of priorities, and will bring those specific goals and policies to LMAC for discussion next year.

Summary of Committee Meetings:

After focusing on academic computing issues over the past couple of years, LMAC this year concerned itself primarily with the library. New library director Karen Fischer and her staff brought us several issues related to collection development, library services, and budget. The committee provided some generalized faculty views on these issues, with specific decisions on collection development to be made in consultation with departments.

Perhaps the major concern is the increasing cost of periodicals, particularly those we get in electronic form. Providers bundle the periodicals they offer, frequently forcing us to pay for journals we do not want, and to duplicate electronic versions of some popular journals. Moreover, providers go in and out of business, and alter which journals they provide, making it difficult to ensure long-term access to complete runs. One question for the future is whether electronic sources such as JSTOR mean we no longer need to keep back issues of journals indefinitely. Library staff will work with individual departments in making decisions about the purchasing and archiving of periodicals.

One means of saving on the library budget that is being tried as an experiment is to cease binding back issues of journals except in special cases. Binding appears less necessary, now that a high percentage of back issues are consulted electronically. Library staff will monitor the situation to see if paper back issues suffer more physical damage, or become badly disorganized.

Concerning academic computing, the committee heard about the trial of RefWorks, web-based citation software, about the continuing efforts to increase the number of electronic classrooms available on campus, and about new software for managing digital objects such as image files. Most important for future LMACs is Norm Imamshah's urging that the committee become more active in representing faculty views and needs on information technology to the Technology Planning Group, in order to give the faculty a strong voice in the budget planning process.