University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate
March 7, 2011, 4:00 pm, Misner Room

Senators: Gareth Barkin, Bill Barry, Dan Burgard, Brad Dillman, Fred Hamel, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Savannah LaFerrière, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Dan Miller, Steven Neshyba, Ross Singleton, and Keith Ward

Guests: Katie Scheerer, Marcus Luther

The meeting came to order at 4:01pm.

I. The Minutes of the February 21 Senate meeting were approved.

II. Announcements: Miller introduced Marcus Luther, the new ASUPS President, who will be joining the Senate. The Senate acknowledges and thanks outgoing ASUPS President Dan Miller for his excellent service.

III. Special Orders: Johnson asked about the status of the Campus Animal Control Policy, and Ward suggested the Senate should comment on the Policy as it is being developed. Neshyba said he would place the Policy on the Senate's next agenda.

IV. Revised Student Evaluation Form

Neshyba suggested the Senate take a straw poll regarding the three options approved by the Senate in order to give the Faculty a sense of the Senate's position. Moved (Hutchinson) and seconded to present all three options to the Faculty with no straw poll. Ward spoke against the motion suggesting it would be helpful for the Faculty to appreciate the Senate's struggle with these options. Johnson spoke in favor of the motion suggesting the minutes of previous Senate meetings provide a sense of the Senate's deliberations. MacBain spoke against the motion noting that Faculty are unlikely to review Senate minutes prior to the meeting of the Faculty and that a straw poll would signal to the Faculty the Senate's long deliberation of these options. Hamel spoke against the motion noting the straw poll would provide some direction coming out of Senate deliberations. The motion failed on a voice vote.

Moved (Barry) and seconded to endorse the third option (Option A and Section 7 dropping Section 8). [See the Attachment A for a description of Option A and Sections 7 and 8.] MacBain spoke against the motion noting that Section 8 reflects the revisions suggested by the ad hoc committee to reform the evaluations. LaFerrière spoke in favor of the motion noting there has been sufficient Senate deliberation to endorse the motion (which would eliminate the most controversial element - grade information). Ward spoke in favor noting the motion would reflect the Senate's clear position. Hamel spoke in favor noting Section 7 does reflect the reform committee's work. Barry noted the endorsement would place the contentious issues associated with Section 8 squarely before the Faculty. Burgard spoke against, suggesting that the endorsement is not necessary to highlight the contentiousness of Section 8. Dillman spoke in favor, suggesting our deliberations warrant this endorsement. Barry noted this endorsement allows the Senate to "step up" and commit to this particular position. Hamel spoke in favor, suggesting the vote tally be reported to the Faculty. The motioned carried. (10-2). Barry suggested Neshyba send an email prior to the next Faculty meeting framing the issues. Neshyba agreed to do so.

V. Election Guidelines

Moved (MacBain) and seconded to approve updated Election Guidelines (see Attachment B). After considerable discussion regarding appropriate updated dates, Hamel (friendly amendment) suggested the nomination period be specified as beginning on March 22 and extending through midnight March 28. The motion passed. [The Election will be held April 5-11.]

VI. The Walter Lowrie Service Award

Several candidates were nominated for the award. Nominations will conclude at the next Senate meeting after which a recipient will be selected.

VII. Reports of Committee Liaisons

Burgard reported the Diversity Committee heard a report from Kim Bobby regarding cohort models. The Committee will incorporate student input before undertaking full committee consideration of various cohort models.

Hamel reported the Curriculum Committee (CC) discussed the regulation of the independent study process. The CC has drafted a more rigorous contract in this regard. The CC also accepted language the Academic Standards Committee developed describing the upper division course requirement for graduation. This action confirms the ASC's proposed changes to the degree requirements from *"Earn at least three academic units outside the first major at the upper division level, which is understood to be 300 or 400 level courses or 200 level courses with at least two prerequisites (Courses taken pass/fail will not fulfill the upper division course graduation requirement)"* to *"Earn at least 3.00 academic units outside the **department/program of the** first major **and requirements of first major** at the upper-division level…"* (ASC Final Report for 2009-2010). The CC is also exploring a requirement for a course or range or courses that addresses diversity.

Barry reported that the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) passed a credit by examination policy that eliminates the opportunity for students to transfer certain courses from other universities. The ASC also continues to explore the possibility of staff and students bringing charges of academic dishonesty.

Johnson reported that the Library Committee heard a presentation regarding creation of a Digital Commons (to display faculty and student work).

Barkin reported that the Student Life Committee is considering issues around the establishment of a new fraternity.

The Senate Meeting adjourned at 5:19pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ross Singleton   Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Scribe   Secretary, Faculty Senate

Attachment A

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 <u>instructor</u>.   1   2   3   4   5

   b. Please describe what you think your <u>instructor</u> does best and what you think should be improved.

6. **Overall Course Evaluation**

   Poor   Excellent

   a. After carefully considering the items above, provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u>.   1   2   3   4   5

   b. What grade do you anticipate <u>receiving</u> in this course? _____

   c. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you <u>earned</u> in this course? _____

   d. As compared to your other courses, please rate the degree of effort you put toward this course.

   Much less   Much more
   effort   effort

   1   2   3   4   5

7. Overall Course Evaluation:
    a. Provide an overall rating of this <u>course</u>: (rated 1 (poor) – 5 (excellent)
    b. As compared to your other courses, please rate the degree of effort this <u>course</u> requires: (rated 1(much less effort) – 5 (much more effort)
    c. Please provide any feedback you have about the <u>course</u> 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 <u>receiving</u> in this course?
    b. Considering the effort and quality of your work, what grade do you believe you <u>earned</u> in this course?

Attachment B

Procedures and Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Elections

Article IV.6.D.h of the Faculty Bylaws states that "The Faculty Senate shall establish a system of voting that is reasonably secure against fraud and ensures a secret ballot." By approval of this document the Faculty Senate means to satisfy this requirement. The purpose of this document is to provide detailed information about the process to be used in faculty elections. This document should be maintained by the Faculty Senate Secretary and should be updated, reviewed, and approved by the Faculty Senate prior to each election.

As a courtesy, the Faculty Senate Secretary may run elections for other faculty groups (e.g., the Faculty Salary Committee) during the regular Senate elections.

I. The Faculty Electoral Roll

The Faculty Senate Secretary shall prepare a list of those eligible to vote. This list must be (i) published on the University website and (ii) incorporated into the electronic voting system.

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.A.b) state that those eligible to vote in the election of Senators are (by reference to Article II.1) "the President of the University, the Academic Deans, the Dean of Students, and members of the instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and full-time visiting faculty."

The Academic Dean's office (currently Chris Vernon) is able to provide the Secretary with a file of the current membership of the faculty as defined above. After review the Secretary shall contact OIS (via the helpdesk phone or email) in order to have the updated list posted on the university website at:

   http://cascade.ups.edu/cascade/faculty.voting_list

The call for nominations and the invitation to vote shall include a link to this page.

This same list provided by the Academic Dean's office shall be submitted to Institutional Research (currently Emily Mullins) to be used as the invitation list used by ViewsFlash, the program used for the election.

Any member of the faculty may challenge the presence or absence of an individual on the voting list by notifying the Faculty Senate Secretary. If the Secretary finds that the presence or absence of an individual is the result of a clerical error, the Secretary may add or delete that individual from the roll as appropriate. If, however, there is uncertainty or disagreement about whether or not an individual is an eligible voter, the matter will be brought before the Faculty Senate to decide the issue.

II. Nomination Procedures and Eligibility for Election

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.a) state: "At a time no later than one month before the last scheduled class day, or at a time designated by the Chairperson when an election to fill a vacancy is needed, the Secretary shall distribute a nomination ballot to each member of the instructional staff eligible to vote." Additionally, "the regular election of Senators shall be completed by the

last Senate meeting of the spring semester." The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall call for nominations for the spring 2011 elections on March 22, 2011.

This nomination ballot will be distributed via an email solicitation using the facultycoms@ups.edu email server. Appendix 1 includes a sample nomination e-mail that may be used as a template.

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.b) state: "Names of nominees for Senate Chairperson, Senators, or the Faculty Advancement Committee are to be submitted to the Secretary within one week. The consent of the nominee to be a candidate is to be secured by the Senate Chairperson." The Faculty Senate interprets "one week" to mean seven consecutive calendar days.

Nominations may be made via email or by sending a note via campus mail to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

The Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.A.a) states: "Eligible to be elected to the Senate are full-time members of the non-retired instructional staff classified as follows: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor."

As nominations are made, the Faculty Senate Secretary will determine if the nominee is eligible for election as described in Article IV.6.A.a. If the Faculty Senate Secretary believes that a nominee is not eligible for election, and the identity of the nominator is known, the Secretary will contact the nominator and explain why the nominee is not eligible. If the nominator agrees with the Secretary the nominee will be dropped. If the nominator disagrees with the Secretary, he or she may appeal the decision to the Faculty Senate. If the nominator is not known, the Secretary will consult with the Faculty Senate Chairperson. If both agree that the nominee is not eligible, the nominee will be dropped. If the Secretary and Chairperson do not agree, or if there is some doubt as to the eligibility of the nominee, the matter will be decided by the Faculty Senate.

Since the consent of the nominee must be secured by the Senate Chairperson, the Faculty Senate Secretary should regularly send lists of nominees to the Senate Chairperson. The Chairperson will then contact the nominees to secure their consent. The Chairperson will then send a list of those nominees who have agreed to stand for election to the Faculty Senate Secretary.

III. Balloting Procedure

See the Faculty Bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c-i).

The elections shall be conducted using ViewsFlash, the program currently operated by Institutional Research for many campus surveys. Should the Faculty Senate Secretary, in consultation with the Senate Chair, choose to design and administer the election in lieu of trusting these duties to the Office of Institutional Research, she or he must be trained in the use of ViewsFlash through the Office of Institutional Research before receiving permission from that body to operate the election. The settings used in ViewsFlash for the election are described in Appendix 3.

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c), "one week shall be allowed for the return of the ballots," which is interpreted to mean that Faculty should be able to vote for one week (seven consecutive calendar days).

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.c) "The Secretary shall list all the nominees in alphabetical order" and "Nominees and ongoing members of the Senate shall be identified by name and academic department on the election ballot."

According to the bylaws (Article IV.6.D.f) "Each person may vote for as many nominees as there are positions to be filled; however a person may not cast cumulative votes for a single candidate."

If the number of candidates is more than twice the number of positions to be filled, then the first vote is a primary and those receiving the highest number of votes in the primary (but not to exceed twice the number of positions to be filled) will be listed on the final election ballot.

The Faculty bylaws specify (Article IV.6.D.g) that "The nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes shall be elected. Tie votes shall be decided by a coin toss." If a coin toss is necessary, the Faculty Senate Secretary, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the two candidates (or their representatives) will meet to select the winner. In the event that one of the candidates or a representative fails to attend an agreed upon meeting, the coin toss shall proceed as scheduled. The secretary will have one candidate call the toss and then flip the coin. In the event neither candidate attends the coin toss, the Faculty Secretary and the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall assign "heads" to the candidate whose last name comes first in the alphabet and then flip the coin.

The balloting system will be overseen by the Faculty Senate Secretary and one other election officer selected by the Faculty Senate. This election officer should not be a candidate in the election and will provide an independent validation of the election results.

The vote count for Faculty Senate will not normally be published, but the Faculty Senate Secretary will provide the vote count upon request to any member of the faculty eligible to vote. The vote count for the Faculty Advancement Committee is published in the minutes of the first Senate meeting of the fall semester.

IV. Conflicts of Interest

Given the central role of the Faculty Senate Secretary in the election process, he or she should not be a candidate in the election. (An individual who expects to be a candidate in the next Senate election should not accept a nomination to run for Faculty Senate Secretary.) If the Secretary does decide to stand for election, he or she is automatically recused from his or her roles in running the election and the Faculty Senate will select a member of the Senate to serve in his or her place. Any faculty member may raise a question of conflict of interest. The Faculty Senate will decide the issue.

V. Resolution of Disputes

If any challenge to the election procedure or results is raised, the Faculty Senate will meet and decide the issue. Any members of the Faculty Senate who are running in the election are automatically recused from this process.

Appendix 1: Sample Nomination E-mail

Faculty Colleagues,

This is a call for nominations for the following faculty governance positions:

Four (4) members of the Faculty Senate;

Two (2) members of the Faculty Advancement Committee

One (1) member of the Faculty Salary Committee.

A list of the continuing members of these bodies can be found at the bottom of this message.

You may submit nominations for these positions by contacting the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, via email at tamacbain@pugetsound.edu or via campus mail at CMB #1045.

Please indicate the position(s) for which you are nominating someone. The deadline for nominations is Monday, March 28, 2011.

Sincerely,
Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Continuing Chair of the Faculty Senate:

Steven Neshyba (Chemistry)

Continuing Members of the Faculty Senate:

Bill Barry (Classics)

Fred Hamel (Education)

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (English)

Elise Richman (Art)

Ross Singleton (Economics)

Amy Spivey (Physics)

Keith Ward (Music)

Continuing Members of the Faculty Advancement Committee:

Dexter Gordon (African American Studies; Communications)

Eric Orlin (Classics)

Continuing Members of the Faculty Salary Committee:

Douglas Goodman (Economics)

John Woodward (Education)

Appendix 2: Sample Invitation to Elections E-mail

Dear [Name],

This is your invitation to participate in the 2011 Faculty Elections. Please follow this link in order to vote electronically using Cascade. You will be able to log-in with your "standard" username and password. The election will be open for a period of one week.

We will elect four Senators, two members of the Faculty Advancement Committee, and one member of the Faculty Salary Committee. Per the Faculty Bylaws (IV.6.D.f) you "may vote for as many nominees as there are positions to be filled." You may therefore vote for up to four candidates for Faculty Senate, two candidates for the FAC, and two candidates for the FSC.

The continuing Chair of the Faculty Senate is:

Steven Neshyba (Chemistry)

The continuing Members of the Faculty Senate are:

Bill Barry (Classics)

Fred Hamel (Education)

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (English)

Elise Richman (Art)

Ross Singleton (Economics)

Amy Spivey (Physics)

Keith Ward (Music)

The continuing Members of the Faculty Advancement Committee are:

Dexter Gordon (African American Studies; Communications)

Eric Orlin (Classics)

The continuing Members of the Faculty Salary Committee are:

Douglas Goodman (Economics)

John Woodward (Education)

The list of eligible voters can be found here. If you believe this list contains any errors please contact me by replying to this message.

Thank you for participating in this important element of faculty governance.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix 3: Settings in ViewsFlash

For settings not identified here, use the default or seek assistance through Institutional Research (Emily Mullins).

Setup: General:

      Part 1: Select *Multiple Page Questionnaire*.

            Select *Previous*, *Next*, and *Submit*.

      Part 2: Title for the Browser Bar:

            Insert the following text: *Welcome to the 2011 Faculty Elections*

Setup: Response:

      Part 2: Body

            Insert the following text:

                    Your votes have been recorded.

              Thank you for participating in the 2011 Faculty Elections.

      Part 2: Footer:

            Insert the following text: *If you have any questions please contact <name of Secretary with link to email address>, the Faculty Senate Secretary.*

Setup: Publish:

      Part 1: Work with Institutional Research to create database table with list of eligible voters.

      Part 3: Remove test data:

                  Check the box *Delete all data, participant records, invitations, and results gathered so far* <u>only before the start of each election and after the close of each election</u>. Save and download an Excel file with the election results prior to deletion of data.

      Part 3: Incomplete Responses: Select *At closing, discard partially completed responses*

      Part 4: Click *Submit to Publish* after making any changes to the elections and before sending email invitations.

Settings: Security:

Part 1: A: Choose an authentication method:

Select *Basic. Application server single sign-on. Uses getRemoteUser.*

Part 1: A: Other Authentication tests:

Select *Questionnaire must use SSL (https://)*

Part 1: B: When a visitor attempts to participate without proper authentication:

Select *Display the following page:*

Use default setting (as of writing: viewsflash/duplicate.html).

Part 2: Handling multiple entries.

A: Select techniques to use:

Select *Using User Authentication, allow respondents to revise their entry.*

Note: This box may be left unselected while the election is being tested.

B: When a duplicate response is rejected, do not save it, and then:

Select *Display the following page:*

viewsflash/duplicate.html

Settings: Save:

Part 1: Pick Invite List:

Use the list of eligible voters created by Institutional Research.

Part 2: Compose E-Mail:

For example, the email text from appendix 2.

Settings: Invite:

Part 2: <u>Do not check *Authenticated user ID specified in Security*</u>. (This creates a secret ballot.)

Analysis: Data:

Part 2: Select questions to display:

<u>Do not select *UserID*</u>.