

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 21, 2011

Present: Gareth Barkin, Bill Barry, Kris Bartanen, Dan Burgard, Brad Dillman, Fred Hamel, Robert Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Savannah LaFerrière, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Elise Richman, Mike Segawa, Ross Singleton, Keith Ward. Visitor: Kim Bobby

I. The meeting was called to order at 4:01

II. Minutes of the January 31, 2011 were approved as corrected.

III. Announcements

MacBain announced that preliminary work on upcoming elections, assisted by Institutional Research, has begun. There will be multiple openings in the Senate (4) and Faculty Advancement Committee (3). MacBain will contact the Faculty Salary Committee to determine the number of open positions in that body. MacBain plans to solicit nominations in the next few weeks and run the election shortly following Spring Break.

Neshyba asked senators to begin thinking about possible candidates for the Walter Lowrie Sustained Service Award. He reminded senators that there is no fixed schedule for how often the Senate makes this award, although traditionally it has been given annually. He also reminded senators that nominations should be treated confidentially and kept within the Senate.

Neshyba brought attention to a motion approved last year by the Senate that directed the Chair to compile a list of former members of the Faculty Advancement Committee, purportedly for individuals undergoing faculty reviews who may wish to consult with them. He announced he would begin compiling these names and approach former FAC members about being identified as contacts. Ward asked how this differed from Kris Bartanen's current practice of asking former members of FAC to meet with second-year faculty. Neshyba said he would move forward by reviewing the terms of the motion and conferring with Kris.

IV. Special Orders: None were offered.

V. Cohort models

Kim Bobby, Chief Diversity Officer and from the School of Education, came to seek input from senators on the possibility of the university developing a cohort model for underrepresented students in the vein of programs by the Posse Foundation.¹ The goal of such a program would be to provide a mechanism to improve retention within this student cohort. The model includes preparatory work before matriculation and ongoing work within college. A local version of such a program in Tacoma is offered by the Act 6 Leadership and Scholarship Program, an organization separate from Posse, although modeled after the national foundation.² Neshyba reported that the Diversity Committee has discussed the possibility of developing a model and may even assume leadership in developing a proposal. Bobby reported that the university was approached by the Posse Foundation in 2000. Participation by the university would have

¹ <http://www.possefoundation.org/>

² <http://www.actsix.org/>

included fully funding a group of ten students. Admitted students would also be required to participate in a leadership academy, and they would be expected to “give something back” (Bobby) to the campus. Bobby reported that we also have been approached recently by ACT 6.

Bobby solicited input from the Senate on how a university-originated pilot, in the spirit of Posse and Act 6, might be tested with a group of historically underrepresented students admitted to Puget Sound. Of particular interest was what faculty mentoring, leadership experience, and giving back to the university would look like in such a program. Bobby said the next step she and Neshyba wanted to explore was to collect student feedback and input on such a model. Bobby emphasized that this initiative, which is in its formative stage, viewed faculty mentoring as a big part of the model.

Discussion followed:

Responding to questions from MacBain, Barkin, and Burgard, Bobby described differences and similarities between Posse, Act 6, and our developing model specific to establishing the cohort of participating students.

MacBain inquired about selection of faculty for the program. Bobby responded that it has not been pieced together yet. Specific to faculty involvement in diversity awareness, Bobby described a project in which narratives from faculty are being collected around campus in which faculty spotlight a difficult or challenging moment in the classroom, how they handled it, and how, upon reflection, they might have handled it differently.

Bobby said these narratives have been used in new faculty orientation as a way of expanding frames of reference around diversity issues. Her hope is that faculty who participated in that project may also be interested in the pilot being developed. MacBain suggested that a wider net be cast to include faculty who have developed effective mentoring relationships with students. She encouraged Bobby to remind faculty of different categories from which students will have been chosen for these cohorts when asking them to be paired with one or two students.

Barkin reported on the success and positive effect of the Posse program in developing group identify when he taught at Centre College.³ He noted part of the success included assigning a specific faculty member as the mentor of the Posse group. Bobby responded that the model under development at Puget Sound also would have a similar point person.

Richman inquired whether we could implement the Posse model. Bartanen responded that the program demands a financial commitment bigger than the university can currently assume.

Hamel asked what kind of funding goals there were with the current budget challenges to give students the incentive to join the cohort group. Bobby responded that this is one of the questions under discussion, a question that also will be posed to current students.

Neshyba asked how the faculty part of the model could be developed. As an example, he asked what the appropriate role of the Diversity Committee should be in this initiative. Noting that the Student Life Committee would have a strong interest in developing this model, Segawa

³ <http://www.centre.edu/>

encouraged Diversity to collaborate with SLC. Gareth also offered to assist as a voice from the Senate in the process of developing the model.

VI. Evaluation forms.

The Senate returned to discussion of questions 7 and 8 on the proposed revision known as Option A (see Attachment A), taking into consideration versions proposed by Hamel, Singleton, and Barry. Following a preliminary discussion of what should be sent to the faculty for consideration, it was moved (Barry) and seconded (Johnsen) that we send forward two options to faculty: the original form (Option A) and a second form with section 7 deleted.

Discussion:

Burgard: We should have options also to present to the faculty that include section 7.

Singleton: We should consider modifying questions 7 (to focus on the course) and 8 (to provide assessment of student effort) as follows:

7. Overall Course Evaluation:

- a. Provide an overall rating of this course: (rated 1 (poor) – 5 (excellent))
- b. As compared to your other courses, please rate the degree of effort this course requires: (rated 1(much less effort) – 5 (much more effort))
- c. Please provide any feedback you have about the course that would be helpful for the instructor to know in preparing to teach this course again.

8. Instructor's Evaluation of Your Performance

- a. Considering the instructor's evaluation of your work, what grade do you anticipate receiving in this course?
- b. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you earned in this course?

Hamel: We now have three versions: Option A, Singleton's revision (above), Singleton's revision without his #8.

Barry: Opposes Singleton's 7B, feeling we should clarify points of confusion or tension within the original proposal. Singleton's revision represents too much of a revision.

LaFerrière: Likes language in 7b. It asks students to consider whether they could have put in less work to have received the same grade in a class. It speaks both to student motivation and degree of difficulty of the course.

MacBain: Singleton's 8b muddies the waters, as it did in the original. A grade a student receives is a grade a student earned. Singleton's 8b suggests that professors are giving students grades instead of recognizing the 1:1 correlation between what the students has earned and what the professor is giving.

Ward: Delete Singleton's 8 entirely. The question avoids matters of cognitive development specific to asking higher order questions that certain students are going to struggle with more than others and won't understand (yet) why they are not getting higher grades.

Barry: Concurs with Ward and would even drop both 7 and 8.

Neshya: Recommends we consider forwarding Option A, Option A without 7 & 8, and Option A with Singleton's 7 & 8 replacements.

LaFerrière: Does not want to give up Singleton's 7. It is important to evaluate the course as its own entity.

MacBain: Agrees that we ought not to give up Singleton's 7, for deleting it would constitute disregard for the content and spirit of the ad hoc committee's Option A.

Hutchinson: Provide some detail on what we mean by rating a course (book selection, assignments, syllabus, other factors).

Barry, responding to Hutchinson: 1-6 address these concerns; he worries that more detail introduces repetitiveness in the form. His suggestion: include the original #8 from Option A for additional course feedback.

LaFerrière: Concur with adding the original #8, since it provides a catch-all for anything overlooked or did not seem appropriate in any other section.

Hamel: Does not concur, since it creates a redundancy with #6 (all versions).

Bartanen: We seem to be in agreement with questions 1-6. There are three areas of feedback we're trying to sort through: the course as distinct from instructor, grades, and student effort.

Dillman: Let's not ask about grades or effort. Seek rating of the course and overall comments.

LaFerrière: Deleting Singleton's 7 & 8 will produce an evaluation form similar to the current version. We are not producing an overhaul of the evaluation form without those sections.

More discussion followed that focused on which versions the Senate would forward to the faculty and more debate on whether questions of anticipated grade and effort should be included.

The question called, the motion failed.

Approaching the issues from a different angle, Bartanen sketched out an approach to address the three issues of feedback about the course (as opposed to the instructor): information on grades and grades expected, and effort. She recommended that the faculty be polled about whether each is something faculty would want in or out of the evaluation form. Hutchinson then moved and Johnson seconded that the Senate forward to the faculty Option A and Option A with Singleton's revisions to questions 7 & 8, and that Bartanen work through the three identified issues as modules at the faculty meeting.

Discussion and action points:

Should numerical ratings be kept or eliminated from the course rating (Barry, Hamel, Hutchinson, Singleton)?

The motion is too complicated by delving into issues that should be debated by the faculty (Ward). Recommendation from Ward to delete the third part of the motion is accepted as a friendly amendment.

Delete Singleton's question 7 (Barry).

Include Singleton's 7a and 7c, not 7b (Hamel).

The Senate needs to give the faculty a sense of its position (Dillman).

More wordsmithing may be necessary (Neshyba).

Amend the motion to forwarding Option A, Option A with Singleton's replacements of 7 & 8, and Option A without 8 but with Singleton's replacement of 7 (Barry), accepted as a friendly amendment.

The question called, the motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:43.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Ward
Scribe for the Meeting

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary, Faculty Senate

Instructor and Course Evaluation Form

Option A

To the Student: The evaluation you are about to write is an important document for your instructor. The information provided will be used by the university in the evaluation of your instructor's teaching. It will also be used by the instructor for improving course structure and teaching. Your evaluation does count. You are encouraged to respond thoughtfully, to take this evaluation seriously, and to provide written remarks; we have allowed time for you to reflect and provide an honest appraisal.

Your instructor will not see these evaluation forms until after he or she has turned in final grades. If you do not want the instructor to see your hand-written form, check this box and your responses will be typed before it is given to the instructor.

Course# _____ Semester _____ Year _____ Instructor's Name _____

1. Student Background Information

A. Major _____ Minor (if applicable) _____

B. Status: First year Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

2. Instructor's Promotion of Students' Learning

		Disagree		Agree
a. The instructor was intellectually challenging	1	2	3	4 5
b. The instructor was skilled in helping students master relevant concepts and skills	1	2	3	4 5
c. The instructor encouraged students to take learning seriously and to think critically	1	2	3	4 5
d. The instructor encouraged students' intellectual self-reliance and self-motivation	1	2	3	4 5
e. Class assignments (e.g., homework, lab reports, papers, readings) were useful learning tools.	1	2	3	4 5
f. The instructor presented material in a clear manner.	1	2	3	4 5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

3. **Instructor's Organization and Ability to Establish Clear Expectations**

Disagree Agree

a. Overall, the course was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor was well prepared for each class session.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor established clear expectations of students' responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.
Instructor's Interaction With Students

Disagree Agree

a. showed concern for the students' understanding of the material.	1	2	3	4	5
b. was respectful of a variety of viewpoints.	1	2	3	4	5
c. was available during office hours and/or by appointment.	1	2	3	4	5
d. led students to engage the course material.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

4. **Instructor's Evaluation of Students' Learning**

Disagree Agree

a. Tests, quizzes, papers, homework, etc., were consistent with the course's contents and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
b. The instructor provided reasonable preparation for tests and quizzes.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The instructor did a thorough job of evaluating my work.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain the choices you checked above with comments that help give context to your ratings.

5. **Overall Instructor Evaluation**

a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of your instructor. 1 2 3 4
5

b. Please describe what you think your instructor does best and what you think should be improved.

6. **Overall Course Evaluation**

- | | | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| | Poor | | | Excellent | |
| a. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of this course. 1 2 3 4 5
- b. What grade do you anticipate receiving in this course? _____
- c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you earned in this course? _
- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|---|---|
| d. | | Much less
effort | | Much more
effort | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
- d. As compared to your other courses, please rate the degree of effort you put toward this course.

8. **Course Feedback:** Please provide any feedback you have about the course that would be helpful for the instructor to

know in preparing to teach this course again.