Senate Meeting Minutes, October 11, 2010

Senators in attendance: Kristin Johnson, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Dan Burgard, Amy Spivey, Billy Barry, Dan Miller, Lisa Johnson, Rob Hutchinson, Keith Ward, Kris Bartanen, Elise Richman, Fred Hamel, Steven Neshyba, Ross Singleton. *Guests in attendance:* Alyce DeMarais, Bill Haltom, Jane Carlin, Debbie Chee, Gary McCall

Steven Neshyba started the meeting at 4:01.

I.   *Approval of minutes:* Minutes from the September 27 meeting were approved with one correction.

II.   *Announcements*: Richman announced an opening at Kittredge Gallery Wednesday Oct 13th from 5 – 7pm.

III.   *Special Orders:* Hamel observed that carpool parking spaces in the Warner lot are rarely filled, often leaving 4 parking spaces unoccupied through the day. He asked the extent to which parking incentives for carpools are working.

IV.   *Reports of committee liaisons:* Barry reported that the ASC is considering expanding pool of people who can report violations of academic integrity. This might include academic support staff working with students. No motion has formed yet.

V.   *Senate chair report on faculty meeting of 4 October, 2010:* Neshyba reported on a straw poll taken at the faculty meeting regarding the educational benefits situation, specifically the recent Board of Trustees decision not to fund a BTF proposal. Results were: OK with the current education benefits situation (0 votes), somewhat dissatisfied (18 votes), and very upset with the situation (7 votes). Discussion followed. Lisa Johnson noted that at the meeting faculty were confused about the straw poll categories; she is not sure everyone understood what they were voting for. Barry commented that the vote total equaled 25. He was unclear whether this number can be said to reflect the faculty's will. MacBain noted that not all in attendance at the faculty meeting seemed informed about the issue, and that before Trustees hear about faculty views, the entire faculty needs to be informed and in possession of facts. Bartanen commented that the purpose of the straw poll was to inform the Benefits Task Force and not the trustees. MacBain felt that the straw poll did not clearly convey a "general sense" of the faculty's thoughts regarding the educational benefits situation even to the task force and was unclear how meaningful the straw poll numbers were. Barry suggested putting the issue on the agenda before the next faculty meeting – which might bring a bigger turnout. Neshyba will discuss the issue at an upcoming BenTF ad hoc meeting. Singleton commented that there are a number of potential ideas among faculty about how to respond to this situation that may be unknown by the BenTF. He felt it would be important for the BenTF to make itself open to this wider pool of ideas. Ward indicated that the issue is not just about faculty but is a staff issue as well. Bartanen

clarified that the Staff Senate and Faculty Senate Chair were apprised simultaneously and that the staff senate wrote a response to the interim proposal.

Neshyba reported that the faculty voted to increase the allowed activity units from 1.5 to 2.

Neshyba explained that 2 carry-over motions from the spring with regard to Pass / Fail did not pass at the meeting (regarding permission of instructor and eliminating anonymity), but a 3rd motion passed giving instructors the power to designate how many students can take Pass / Fail in a particular course. Two further motions related to Pass-Fail (voted on by the ASC but not in effect) include: No P/F in the department of major or minor and no P/F for freshmen or sophomores. These two issues remain "in limbo" and, after some discussion of procedure, Neshyba announced that they will go on the agenda of the next Senate meeting.

Bartanen clarified that implementation of changes in the activity credit policy will go into effect with next year's bulletin, which is printed in June. Students can choose which bulletin to abide by – the one in effect when they arrived on campus or the one in effect when they graduate. Haltom added that students must abide by one bulletin only and cannot mix and match.

VI.   *2010-11 Charges to the IRB*:   M/S/P (Spivey) to approve IRB charges 1-6, with 7th charge added by Bartanen.   Final charges are:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.

2. Post and monitor current IRB information on the webpage for UPS researchers and work to improve information regarding the IRB submission process for students and faculty advisors of student research. This will include a revision to the documents which are intended to serve as a guide and provide examples for research protocols.

3. Finalize the implementation of a memorandum of understanding with the Office of Institutional Research regarding IRB oversight of OIR work.

4. Work with the PSC to revise the Research Misconduct Policy.

5. Develop and distribute (via the IRB website) a set of procedures for researchers wishing to appeal a decision by the Board regarding a research protocol.

6. Investigate and provide guidance for researchers regarding the responsibilities, legally and ethically, for reporting evidence of child abuse which comes to light in the process of research involving human subjects.

7. Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.

VII.   *2010-11 Charges to the International Education Committee:* M/S/P (Singleton) to approve charges A–J in meeting agenda. Kristin Johnson friendly amendment to delete charge C. Final charges are:

1. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty. Reevaluate programs placed on probation.

2. Evaluate offerings from a global and disciplinary perspective with an eye to providing coverage in geographic and disciplinary areas that are currently not represented or are underrepresented. Complete the consultations with departments to find out if there are programs that they think we should have, or have additional insights about programs we have that they don't think we should keep.

3. Communicate with Office of Institutional Research to make sure that the Study Abroad Survey is administered to students prior to leaving and again 6 months after they return from study abroad.

4. Finalize criteria for choosing students in the event that demand exceeds the Study Abroad budget.

5. Establish a process through which demand relative to budget will be assessed and the criteria applied in a timely manner.

6. Continue work with faculty to encourage the integration of study abroad experiences into on-campus classes and research symposia, and work with the SLC and Dean of Students to encourage integration of study abroad experiences into co-curricular activities.

7. Discuss Summer Programs including resources for faculty who are interested in offering Summer study abroad classes and how to better publicize opportunities.

8. Discuss and recommend BTF request for Study Abroad.

VIII.   *2010-11 Charges to Diversity Committee*: M/S/P (Ward) to approve charges 1-4 in meeting agenda. Final charges are:

1. Promote faculty and student engagement with the Fall 2010 Race and Pedagogy Conference (including offering any funding that might be available from the committee's resources).

2. Increase awareness of and participation in the on-going efforts with the Campus Climate Survey.

3. Investigate the possibilities of grant writing to support diversity efforts.

4. Create and maintain a website with technical assistance from the Associate Deans' Office that displays courses at Puget Sound with significant diversity content.

IX.   *2010-11 LMIS charges*: Jane Carlin spoke to the Senate seeking advice and direction regarding next steps in relation to the 2009 Senate resolution on information literacy. Carlin noted that the intent of this resolution to support greater information literacy on campus has been echoed in the recent library accreditation review. Carlin clarified the many steps LMIS has already taken to support information literacy both for faculty and students. One challenge is that the library has not been integrated into the orientation process (beyond planning), so that students can opt out of any resources provided. Carlin provided data suggesting that the library is engaging roughly 50% of Puget Sound students and commented that some students do not interact with a librarian until they are juniors (see

appended information sheet). LMIS sees a need for closer connection between their own efforts to support information literacy and a larger curricular program. Carlin pointed out that many of our peer institutions have more fully integrated information literacy programs.

Kristin Johnson asked the extent to which the SCIS rubric involves information literacy DeMarais replied that information literacy is alluded to in the rubric and that students do a research project, but there is strong concern among faculty that the SCIS and W/R rubrics are already packed. Carlin reiterated the importance of integration, or weaving, of information literacy into existing courses and projects – not just having a "library day" out of context. Ward recommended that LMIS take its own draft of core competencies regarding info literacy and turn this into a formal statement to the campus community. Ward felt that such a document could then be used to foster discussions at the department level. Spivey argued that it might be easier for faculty to incorporate info literacy resources if there was a "repository of exercises" that faculty could draw upon online. MacBain suggested LMIS link with Julie Christoph in her capacity as support person for first-year seminar faculty. MacBain also asked whether LMIS could help to ensure that all campus departments schedule group information literacy sessions with librarians. There was a suggestion that LMIS might aim to work with one or two departments closely on this issue – to provide a model for other departments to work from.

Ward moved to add one charge to the LMIS list -- "to work with library staff and educational technology on proposing best practices for information literacy." Kristin Johnson suggested dropping the charge regarding Moodle support, since most of the transition has occurred. Barry noted a "sea of ignorance" regarding Moodle in his department and suggested the charge remain. Wording was revised to focus on Ed Tech support. M/S/P (K. Johnson) to approve the following charges for LMIS:

1. Develop and implement print management educational materials.

2. Review copyright policy and protocols.

3. Revise intellectual property policy.

4. Continue to advise Educational Technology in training and transitioning faculty to Moodle.

5. Work with library staff and Educational Technology on proposing best practices for information literacy.

X. *Action regarding Bylaws:* Ward indicated he is considering a motion that might change the bylaws regarding electing committee chairpersons. Currently the bylaws are written to allow for a single chair to be elected to each committee, and some committees believe that more than one chair during the year would be beneficial. Ward said he will study the issue more before submitting a motion, likely at the next Senate meeting. In discussion that followed, some felt the bylaws might not need to be altered and that different chairs can be elected

to serve during different times in the semester, as long as more than one chairperson is not elected for the same period of time (e.g. concurrent co-chairs).

XI.   *ASC changes to Incomplete Policy*. Gary McCall, chair of ASC, spoke to the history of the ASC action that will require students (following the Bulletin's release in June 2011) to finish any incomplete (I) grade by the first Friday of the subsequent semester and professors to turn in the final course grade by the end of that add period. McCall noted that Jack Roundy has found the current policy (incompletes finished by mid-semester) to have deleterious consequences for coursework in the new semester. The policy allows an appeal for a later incomplete deadline, which can be submitted by either professor or student. Appeals would go through the ASC, and McCall felt they could be dealt with by the Petitions Preview Team. He also surmised that there would be few circumstances in which the committee might deny an appeal.

The modified policy is not yet in effect. It was developed too late to be written into this year's bulletin.

Haltom found several problems with the proposal.   First, it is not clear whether the Senate or faculty as a whole knows much about this policy change. Second, the burden will fall differentially – with Fall students having much less time than Spring students to finish an incomplete. Finally, Haltom argued that students should not be required to explain reasons for an incomplete to the ASC through the appeal process. Some circumstances may be highly personal, and students should not be put in a position of having to disclose personal information to get an extension.

Miller argued that since it is assumed that the ASC will approve an appeal, why not simply allow student and professor to decide the right time for finishing an incomplete – and thus eliminate the extra step in the process.

McCall indicated that only 1% of grades, or about 100 out of 10,000, are incompletes.   He shared data that students at UPS who take a longer time to finish incompletes seem to do worse than those with a shorter period of time   He noted that 22 of 57 students who carried incompletes into the Fall 2010 semester had finished incompletes (as of Sept 13), and that no grade was lower than a C – suggesting at least that early finishers do no worse than later finishers.

Barry suggested modifying the ASC proposal to make it slightly more lenient but still pushing the deadline close to the start of the semester. He suggested incompletes should be due the 2nd Friday, not the 1st Friday, of the next semester.

Ward called the early deadline Draconian and pointed out that only 2 days exist between the first Friday and the end of the add period, which makes for an undue burden on professors.   Lisa Johnson asked about the type of information required on petitions to the

ASC – and argued that any policy that forces a student to reveal personal information for an extension is inappropriate.

Miller said he found the first few weeks of the semester highly important for getting a good start with new classes; being forced to finish an incomplete at that time would be counterproductive. Barry argued alternatively from a faculty point of view that he finds the beginning of the semester an ideal time to deal with incompletes. There are no papers yet to grade. Likewise, students tend to have no papers due. He said that only when the incomplete drags into mid-semester do problems arise.

M/S/P (Burgard) to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:42pm.

Respectfully submitted by

Fred Hamel, Senator and Scribe   Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Secretary

Attach: Jane Carlin "Information Literacy" handout

Jane Carlin, Literacy Handout #1

Reaching first-year students

Prelude

- 2010: eight sessions = **21 percent of first-year students**
- 2009: nine sessions = **23 percent of first-year students**

Library Instruction Sessions for First-year Seminars

- 2009-2010: 46 first-year seminars (28 WR and 18 SI) = **47 percent of all first-year seminars offered**
- 2008: 45 first-year seminars (28 WR and 17 SI) = **45 percent of all first-year seminars offered**

2010 Research Practices Survey Data

Taken by 44 percent of incoming first-year students

- Students continue to be highly confident of their research skills and abilities. Examples:
  - 92 % believe that it is "very easy" or "somewhat easy" to determine whether a source is scholarly
  - 83 % believe that it is "very easy" or "somewhat easy" to know when to document a source
- Students have had limited experience with using standard library resources and tools. Examples:
  - Only 57 percent had ever used an online library catalog
  - Only 50 percent had ever used a subscription database
  - 92 percent indicated that a general search engine like Google was their main research tool
- Students have limited knowledge of standard research terms. Examples:
  - 46 percent correctly defined a peer-reviewed journal
  - When shown three citations, 59 percent could correctly identity a book, 23 percent could correctly identify a journal article, and 12 percent could correctly identify a chapter within a book.
  - 21 percent could correctly distinguish between a scholarly journal and a popular magazine
  - 73 percent could correctly distinguish between secondary and primary sources
  - 50 percent could correctly define a citation
- Students have limited knowledge of successful research strategies. Examples:

- o 37 percent knew that clicking on subject headings in a library catalog would lead them to additional publications on that topic
- o 23 percent could correctly use "and," or "or" to construct a database search query
- o Eight percent knew how to truncate a search word to retrieve all grammatical possibilities for that word
- Students have limited knowledge of strategies for evaluating sources. Examples:
  - o 37 percent said that they would consider primarily whether a source is scholarly before deciding to use it
  - o 63 percent said that they would give equal weight to multiple criteria before deciding to use a source, including whether or not it is available on the Internet, how easily they can obtain it, and whether or not it is scholarly

Information Literacy Competencies for First-Year Puget Sound Students

Since 2006, several liberal arts colleges, including the University of Puget Sound, have used the Research Practices Survey to measure the research experiences and competencies of their incoming first-year students. Results consistently show that incoming first-year students, including our own, struggle with understanding and applying basic information literacy concepts. Recognizing the importance of information literacy competencies to lifelong learning, several of our peer institutions have begun to address this issue by incorporating specific information literacy rubrics within their first-year curricula.

At the University of Puget Sound, both librarians and faculty have been paying keen attention to the need to provide our students with multiple opportunities to develop information literacy competencies. To support this effort, the Collins Library librarians have drafted a recommendation that first-year students be introduced to a set of six information literacy competencies. Because the acquisition of information literacy competencies is an iterative, developmental process, we have indicated which skills should be mastered by the end of the first year of college, and which concepts should simply be introduced.

These six information literacy competencies are not presented in weighted order; instead, we consider them to be interconnected.

- **Citations/Plagiarism/Academic Integrity**
    - **Mastery by end of first year**
        - Ability to read citations to determine whether the item is a book, an essay within a book, a journal article, or a work of multimedia (i.e., a film or a piece of recorded music).
        - Ability to create a bibliography in a specific style (i.e., APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.) of commonly used types of materials (books, journal articles, etc.)
        - Principles of academic integrity (when to cite and why)
    - **Introduction to concepts**
        - Uses of knowledge management tools like RefWorks or Zotero
- Nuances in the realm of copyright and intellectual property
- **Types, Purposes, and Uses of Information**
    - **Mastery by end of first year**
        - Ability to identify the following types of information, with the understanding that definitions are contextual:
            - Scholarly vs. Popular
            - Primary vs. secondary
            - General vs. specific
            - Current vs. historical
            - Empirical vs. anecdotal

- Qualitative vs. quantitative
    - o **Introduction to concepts**
        - Information cycles among the disciplines
        - When, how, and why to use various types of information within various disciplines
- **Information Retrieval Skills, Search Strategies, and Search Construction**
    - o **Mastery by end of first year**
        - Basic structure of academic libraries, stressing their interconnectedness (SIMON, SUMMIT, WorldCat, Interlibrary loan)
        - Known-item searching:
            - Use SIMON to locate local holdings of books, DVDs, and CDs
            - Use call numbers to physically locate books in the stacks
            - Use Journal Locator to locate specific articles, whether in digital or paper formats
            - Use interlibrary loan when materials are not available locally (SUMMIT for books, ILLiad for journal articles)
    - o **Introduction to concepts**
        - Discovery searching:
            - Identify appropriate databases to search (Research Gateway)
            - Use Boolean logic to broaden or narrow searches, as needed
            - Use knowledge of classification systems (Library of Congress, discipline-specific thesauri) to locate relevant sources
- **Formation of Research Questions (also introduced under rubrics for first-year seminars)**
    - o **Introduction to concepts**
        - Appropriate use of general information resources (subject encyclopedias, textbooks, etc.)
        - Formation of research questions within the disciplines
- **Evaluation of Information**
    - o **Introduction to concepts**
        - Critically evaluates sources for biases, reliability, scope, and situational appropriateness
        - Seeks out best possible sources, rather than settling for "good enough"
        - Moves away from binary opposition of "good vs. bad sources" to a more nuanced understanding of what kinds of information are appropriate within the disciplines
- **Seeking Help**
    - o **Introduction to concepts**
        - Recognizes situations when help or advice is needed
        - Uses online resources (tutorials, library course research pages, etc.) to answer basic questions

- Seeks advice/help/input/feedback from appropriate experts (librarians and professors) during the research process