

University of Puget Sound 2010-11 Faculty Senate

MINUTES

May 9, 2011, 2:30 – 4:00, Misner Room

Senators Present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Kris Bartanen, Mike Segawa, Elise Richman, Ross Singleton, Fred Hamel, Keith Ward, Rob Hutchinson, Kristin Johnson, Brad Dillman, Bill Barry, Savannah LaFerrière, Marcus Luther, and Dan Burgard

Guests Present: Peter Wimberger, Michael Johnson, Mary Rose Lamb, Bill Haltom

I. Call to order at 2:32 p.m.

II. Minutes from May 2, 2011 meeting not yet distributed.

III. Announcements: Bartanen appreciates that there has been a lot of conversation surrounding benefits proposals and the like but reports that points of information are being conflated in ways that are causing inaccurate perceptions. To summarize the work of the Benefits Task Force (BenTF), Bartanen distributed a handout (see Attachment A). She announced that no recommendation for an educational benefit will go to the Board of Trustees at their upcoming meeting. She welcomes the opportunity for folks to work on the benefit over the summer and stated that the university does not wish to decrease benefits to faculty. Bartanen said that at the May 4, 2011 meeting with faculty and staff, Ron Thomas and Sherry Mondou spoke to efforts to continue the NIC exchange in order to have the opportunity to develop other options. Reports Bartanen, the university wants education monies available to faculty and staff to stay available to faculty and staff. Bartanen wants Faculty Senators to try to make sure that folks have this accurate information and offers the attached timeline in the spirit of being helpful in that regard.

Barry said that he took the question to be whether the UPS tuition remission benefit would remain in place or was thought to be vulnerable. He reported that at the meeting of May 4<sup>th</sup>, some confusion ensued as to Ron Thomas's answer to this question. Barry asked Bartanen if it is fair to say that the tuition remission benefit is not vulnerable. Bartanen replied that she has heard nothing to suggest that it's vulnerable. Barry indicated that the phrase "cash grant" seemed to be used more frequently than did things like "alternative consortial efforts" and asked if there would be efforts to explore all options. Neshyba said that all options are open at this point.

IV. No special orders

V. **Moved (Hutchinson)/S/P** to move Agenda Item VI up to V. Moved (Hutchinson)/S/P to receive the report of the IEC. (See Attachment B.)

In presenting the end-of-year report for the International Education Committee (IEC), Wimberger announced that with its newly fixed budget, the study abroad program may reach a point at which more students want to go abroad than the university can fund. The

IEC thinks that all students should get to go yet have prioritized students according to the type of program they intend to enter. The IEC believes that determining eligibility by GPA is not fair (for GPA does not necessarily reflect a student's capabilities, as in the case of a student who begins as a pre-med major, does poorly, and opts to declare a major more suited for him/her). According to the IEC, a lottery might be the fairest way to select study-abroad students. The logistical issue is that students apply for study abroad by February 15<sup>th</sup> each year, but the budget is not known until after that. Students go in fully thinking that if they apply they'll get to go. In order to avoid telling students that they are in the program but cannot go abroad, there must be coordination between the relevant offices, such as Financial Services and Study Abroad.

Because the figures fluctuate from year to year, the IEC believes that studying a four- to five-year window in order to account for surpluses and benefits over time, will allow them better to assess the situation and to make good decisions.

M. Johnson spoke to the IEC's concern with re-acclimating students upon their return to Puget Sound. The IEC looks at re-acclimation as an opportunity to spread the idea of study abroad and to enrich the campus. Ideas include holding a symposium at which returning students would give papers or have discussions about their experiences, and to which students thinking about study abroad would be invited. Such an event would give the returning students a leadership role and re-involve them in campus activities. These students already have a photo contest. The IEC imagines adding to that a multi-media presentation and even performances. The symposium would be something that becomes a campus-wide event and give students the opportunity to be in the spotlight.

Wimberger indicated that the IEC had two pieces of uncharged work of note: 1) In the fall the IEC met with Asian Studies about the Pac Rim program and the impact of changes to financial aid regulations upon Pac Rim students. Of concern is that the rising junior class will only be permitted to take institutional aid with them up to their FAFSA need (in addition to all of their federal money). The change only affected 4 students this past year. Still, the IEC recommended that Pac Rim (currently the only program administered by and through Puget Sound) receive all of their institutional aid, for these are truly Puget Sound courses. 2) Members of the IEC were interested in the impact of study abroad upon returning students. They talked about putting together an assessment tool. The IEC would like to be charged with doing a survey next year of the impact of study abroad, an apt time given that in this large rising class, we have more students than ever who have applied for study abroad.

Hamel asked whether, given the fixed budget that study abroad is facing, there has been an analysis of how many students in an average year are likely not to be able to travel. Wimberger said that this year we are going to be slightly over budget, so this year seems like it's a year where we've hit that limit. Hamel said that he is trying to think about actual student impact. Wimberger responded that the Budget Task Force request is higher for next year because the class is really big. Bartanen said that inflation and class adjustment factor in the long-range plan. She said that we have not run into a situation where a student can't go. We have been able to offer students shifts to less expensive programs.

The IEC has talked about the criteria before they've had to have occasion to use them. There have been no complaints about funding.

Barry asked whether the Pac Rim bubble has been accounted for, to which Wimberger responded, Yes. And there's a lot of variation for demand year to year: some years 40% and some years 28%.

Report received [M (Hutchinson)/S/P]

VI. **M (Hamel)/S/P** to receive Haltom's year-end report for Professional Standards Committee (PSC). (See Attachment C)

Haltom drew our attention to Item #12 on the PSC year-end report. He announced that the Faculty or the Faculty Senate might want to change the *Faculty Code*. Item 12 reads: "read Chapter 1 of the *Faculty Code* to permit departments, programs, and schools to state expectations regarding tenure-line faculty different from expectations of non-tenure-line faculty but not to permit departments, programs, or schools to withhold from non-tenure-line faculty roles, rights, and responsibilities that are available for tenure-line faculty."

Barry asked Haltom if this issue could come back to the PSC as a charge to revise language. Haltom said that he maintains that if the Senate has the PSC write the language, the faculty pass the language, and the PSC interpret the language, the Senate endows the PSC with undue power. Haltom would recommend that the Senate charge the PSC to decide what sorts of determinations or issues ought to be involved, and that the Senate then get someone else to write the language. Haltom, who will be on his fallow year from service in 2011-12, volunteered to write the language.

Report received [M (Neshyba)/S/P]

VII. Neshyba moved up Item IX to begin discussion of proposed authorization of Senate Executive Committee to negotiate increased faculty membership on the Benefits Task Force (BenTF).

**M (Neshyba)/S/P** to authorize the Senate Executive Committee (Neshyba, Ward, MacBain) to create an ad hoc committee focused on the education benefit.

Neshyba explained that it is too late in the year for us as a senate to vet an ad hoc committee to review the education benefit, so we should allow the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to perform the duty.

Barry asked if the SEC could present its picks to the Senate for approval, to which Neshyba responded that he would like the SEC not to have to wait for the fall to assemble the ad hoc committee. Singleton asked if the SEC would limit the ad hoc committee to current senators. Neshyba replied, no, that the SEC would, sometime this summer, try to pull together three to five faculty members to serve on the ad hoc committee. Burgard asked how the SEC would "pull together" these members. Neshyba said that he has a few people in mind to call. He explained that the BenTF, of which he is a member, has been designated by Sherry and has been engaged with the benefits package for the past two years. The ad

hoc committee would be grappling with a smaller chunk. Then this committee would interface with the BenTF. Burgard asked, "So it's only open to faculty?" "Correct," said Neshyba. Bartanen wondered how Neshyba saw the goal of the group: advisory to the BenTF? And what would be the motivation as relative to that of the faculty members who have served and continue to serve on the BenTF? Neshyba replied that Sherry Mondou has made it clear that she is open to new ideas and interested in opening up the conversation. The ad hoc committee would operate in an advisory capacity or make proposals to the BenTF. K. Johnson asked if the SEC would compose a charge. Neshyba replied, yes, but he hopes that the senate will not have to create the charge right now. Barry added, in support of the ad hoc committee, that the faculty members of the BenTF are doing a review on the full scale of benefits. The ad hoc committee is justified by virtue of its close focus on education. Barry asked whether or not the SEC could create this committee in consultation with Senate via email and request recommendations from Senators. Neshyba answered in the affirmative.

Ward suggested that the issue also concerns staff and expressed concern about the lack of representation of staff on the ad hoc committee in question. K. Johnson said that since the call for an ad hoc committee would come from the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate could convene its own committee. Neshyba said that we are not empowered to draft staff people into this committee work. He asked if we envision this committee as inviting members of staff. Ward asked if there are any conversations that we should be having with the Staff Senate. Segawa said that an invitation to the Staff Senate would be appropriate and that it seems inefficient to have two group working on same topic.

Thinking about the relationship between the committee and the Ben TF, Hamel wondered how the BenTF would receive this information. He asked if they welcome the input of an ad hoc committee. Singleton clarifies, explaining that the BenTF had a meeting this morning with Sherry Mondou and talked about this possibility. She pointed out that the model all along has been the Budget Task Force, which does receive proposals from a variety of groups on campus and which tries to prioritize these proposals and arrive at recommendations based upon them. Singleton said that all present agreed that they would regard an ad hoc committee as a campus group that would present the BenTF with proposals. Any ideas that the ad hoc committee wanted to bring or to propose would be very welcome. Neshyba said that it's hard to expand the faculty membership on the BenTF, so forming an ad hoc committee would be a way to open up the process without intruding on Sherry Mondou's notion of what the BenTF is and who its members are and so on.

Speaking in favor of the motion, Ward added that the ad hoc committee would address the current reality on campus very well. He senses that there's a particular level of enmity that has arisen from the sense that this process has been closed for too long. Sherry Mondou's support of this ad hoc committee signals a systematic movement to respond to that and to broaden input. Ward thinks an ad hoc committee would be very good for us as a community. He welcomes the charge and supports the motion.

Segawa asked if there is a time frame for the group. Neshyba replied that the concept is that there is no revision to the educational part of the benefits that is being proposed to the trustees with the exception of the eligibility issue. In something like a month's time, it's

believed that all the NIC members will release a joint statement re: the longevity of the NIC exchange. Sherry Mondou hopes that they will agree to keep it alive for the next 4 years (technically 4+4 years, to see this fall's high-school freshmen through their college graduation). Assuming that this plan plays out, there will be a certain window in which replacements will be able to be formulated, vetted. By May of next year the campus hopes to present a new proposal to the trustees.

Barry asked if Neshyba and Singleton feel that the idea of finding alternative consortiums is alive and kicking. Barry hears that the BenTF is open to all models but wants to probe that a little, for he got a sense from the meeting with Ron Thomas and Sherry Mondou on May 4, 2011 that the term "cash grant" was being used as the default solution. Singleton replied that he thinks that it is really important to communicate the answer to that, which is that the range of ideas and options is wide open at this point, including the idea of a consortium. That doesn't mean that the idea of a consortium is going to prevail. But the BenTF welcomes those kinds of creative examples that it will learn from and that the university will perhaps adopt. Neshyba concurred.

Burgard indicated that he would like to see representation from very young faculty on the ad hoc committee, those of us who'll be affected 15 to 20 years from now. Neshyba noted Burgard's comment and added that we should try to avoid mistakes of the past and try to build in sustainability of the system—for example, solvency over time.

K. Johnson asked if it would be efficient to have one of the members of the BenTF on the ad hoc committee. Neshyba said he leans toward having it comprise a separate group of people. Barry said that the advantage of K. Johnson's solution would be that the BenTF member would usher in the ideas to the BenTF. Neshyba said that at the very least he would like for the ad hoc committee not to be chaired by someone on the BenTF.

Hamel asked if there will be an open call and how many we want on the committee. Neshyba said the he thinks that this is what the SEC would have to come up with. He would be delighted to have an open call and said that we may need to make decisions about size. Barry indicated that he does not want a volunteer committee; he wants the SEC to hand-pick the members. Neshyba asked whether eight members would be appropriate. Hamel suggested five, to which senators seemed amenable. Burgard asked Neshyba, "Is five a friendly amendment to your motion to authorize? Are we going to make it official? How amorphous is this when it leaves today?" Barry said that the issue of staff continues to "hang out there," too. Hutchinson suggested that Neshyba leave the motion more open, for the discussion of all of this will be in the minutes. The SEC will see the discussion and bear in mind senators' concerns. Added Hutchinson, we don't know what size the committee will be until the SEC goes out there to ask people to serve on it and they say yes or no. He said the same of staff participation. The main thing, urged Hutchinson, is to get the ball rolling.

**Friendly amendment M (Barry)/S/P:** Barry suggested that we limit the ad hoc committee to 5 faculty, that the SEC make a call for faculty to participate, and that the SEC consult with the Senate to pick from that pool. MacBain asked why Barry has limited the ad hoc committee to faculty in his motion. Barry said that he continues to wrestle with this

issue. He feels like there may be specific faculty interests that were represented at the meeting; also, the call is coming from the Senate. He imagines that there will be interests specific to faculty that might diverge from Staff interests and suggested that we can consult with the Staff Senate to secure information on staff interests. Neshyba said that we simply do not have the authority to create a Staff ad hoc committee. Even so, Segawa was concerned about the limit to faculty. He proposed a friendly amendment, that the Faculty Senate invite the Staff Senate to participate in the ad committee. Barry asked Segawa if he was concerned that we were excluding staff. Segawa answered in the affirmative and pointed out that the benefit is for staff as well as for faculty. Barry suggested that the SEC would appoint five faculty members and consult with the Staff Senate. MacBain indicated that we wish to form an ad hoc committee composed of people with expertise in areas related to the education benefit; several faculty members with this expertise have announced themselves publicly, and there may also be staff experts from whom we have not yet heard. Barry said that he likes the idea of a faculty ad hoc committee consulting with the Staff Senate. Hamel said that since the benefit applies across the board, it's interesting that we are not going to be representing the interests of the staff.

Neshyba asks for a straw poll of those in favor of calling the question. Two-thirds of the senators vote in favor of calling the question.

Amendment and motion passed.

**VI. M (Hutchinson)/S/P** to receive Institutional Review Board (IRB)'s year-end report to the Faculty Senate. (See Attachment D.)

Lamb presented the IRB's concern with its role in looking at Humanities and Social Sciences research on the campus and its regular discussion of whether or not the IRB is an impediment to research. The IRB plans to schedule a "Wednesday at 4" for the fall term to talk about IRB as help or hindrance.

Hamel said that he noticed a recommendation about student participation on the committee. He worries about what that would be like for a student but appreciates the rationale of having a student serve as liaison to other students. But he wonders: what purpose would that student serve the committee? Lamb responded that it's a federal mandate to have a member of the community on the IRB. In part that's about having a diversity of opinion. The IRB sees a similar function in having a student. Hamel noticed a bias toward bio-medical research in the reports and wondered if the IRB would want a student from inside or outside the sciences. Lamb said that most calls issue from the social sciences, so most likely they would want a student from the social sciences. Hamel suggested that someone from the graduate school—an OT/PT student, for instance—might make a good choice. Lamb said that the IRB thought of that, but in part because they see this membership as a way to show students that the IRB is not just a hoop to jump through but is needed, the IRB would like to have an undergrad as its student representative.

Report received [M (Neshyba)/S/P]

**M (Barry)/S/P** to receive the year-end report from the Academic Standards Committee (ASC).

Barry said that the ASC wants to resuscitate the Incomplete issue, so the Senate will want to review this when we create the charges. Also remaining is the concern with the relationship between the ASC and the Senate and how the ASC should navigate the shoals of rejection. Barry thinks that they just want clarity, and that next year the Senate should make sure that there's communication between the ASC and its Senate liaison. Hamel said that he is unclear on the actual nature of the concern over the Senate's rejection of the Incomplete policy: was it the rejection that was the problem, or was it the manner of the rejection? Barry said that the concern is that in past practice issues like these would percolate from the Faculty to the ASC to the Senate and then move on. The ASC wants to know whether or not they need to vet issues with the Senate when issues come from the faculty; or should they deflect issues to the Senate directly and then have the Senate direct the issues to the ASC?

Neshyba said that we will plan to set aside a Senate meeting at the beginning of the year to have a representative from the ASC here to talk through these issues. Hamel said that several groups talked about uncharged work in their presentations of year-end reports. Uncharged work is a common experience. Hamel would love to hear more about what role the Senate can play in relation to uncharged work. Barry said that between the ASC and the Senate everything went fine this year except the two issues right at the beginning, and those two issues cast a shadow upon our relations; yet they may be anomalous. Barry suggested that perhaps we should just return to the status quo and expect that things will be okay. He doesn't know that there's necessarily a huge problem.

Report received [M (Barry)/S/P]

**M (Hutchinson)/S/P** to adjourn at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Aldrich MacBain  
Senate Secretary and Meeting Scribe

## Attachment A

### Benefits Task Force Communication with the Campus

September 9, 2009: Message to Campus announcing formation of task force, outline of alternate-week, two-hour meeting schedule for September 2009 – June 2010. The message includes email address for feedback ([hr@pugetsound.edu](mailto:hr@pugetsound.edu)) and individual email addresses for all members, as does every subsequent BenTF message to campus.

October 13, 2009: Message to Campus seeking input and forecasting the upcoming Benefits Survey and Open Forums for Spring 2010.

November 13, 2009: BenTF hosts a table at the staff and faculty Health Fair. Attendees have opportunity to complete a short questionnaire regarding benefits and to share comments/questions in person with BenTF members staffing the table.

November 23, 2009: Message to Campus thanking those who participated in the health fair and offering all others opportunity to provide feedback to the questionnaire either via the BenTF [webpage](#) or directly to any of the members by email through December 10, 2009.

February 22, 2010: Message to Campus providing update and announcing BenTF survey developed in partnership with and administered by Institutional Research. (Special message also provided to 60 administrators to let staff members who do not have computers know there would be a laptop computer lab set up for February 23 and 26 so all could complete the survey.)

February 25 and March 3, 2010: Reminder messages to those who had not yet completed the survey, inviting their input through March 5.

March 9, 2010: Message to Campus providing update that 67% of faculty and staff completed the survey and offering opportunity for additional input via either the BenTF website or email to individual members.

April 20, 2010: Message to Campus providing both the dates of three open forums (two on April 27 and one on April 29) and announcing that summaries of the survey results had been posted on the BenTF website.

September 14, 2010: Message to Campus inviting feedback on draft Benefits Philosophy Statement.

January 5, 2011: Message to Campus with update that BenTF report had been submitted to Vice President Sherry Mondou and that a confidential executive summary had been shared with Cabinet in December (December 14, 2010).

[February – April 2011: Follow-up work in response to Cabinet questions and concerns; analytical work in Accounting and Budget Services offices on the costs of the benefits proposals.]

April 12, 2011: Benefits Task Force Report shared with Cabinet.



April 13, 2011: Message to Campus providing update on BenTF (and Retirement Planning Advisory Committee).

April 27, 2011: Message to Campus summarizing BenTF recommendations, announcing Open Forum on May 5, and inviting feedback through May 10; May 2 Open Line also announces forum and invites input.

May 5, 2011: BenTF Open Forum on Consumer-Driven Health Care Plan and Bright Horizons childcare/eldercare program, with follow-up posting of presentations on BenTF website.

**FINAL REPORT OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**2010-11**

**Michael Johnson and Peter Wimberger (co-chairs)**

The members of the committee this year were: Gareth Barkin (fall), Lisa Ferrari (Associate Dean's office - fall), Lisa Griswold (student), Mark Harpring (Associate Dean's office - spring), Diane Kelley, Michael Johnson, Donn Marshall (Associate Dean of Students), Jan Moore (Interim Director, International Programs), Jill Nealey-Moore, Don Share, Tanya Stambuk, Peter Wimberger, Kelly Wyman (student)

Thanks to the Committee members for their hard work.

We were charged by the Senate to do the following this year:

- A. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty. Reevaluate programs placed on probation.
- B. 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.
- C. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.
- D. 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.
- E. Finalize criteria for choosing students in the event that demand exceeds the Study Abroad budget.
- F. Establish a process through which demand relative to budget will be assessed and the criteria applied in a timely manner.
- G. 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.
- H. Discuss Summer Programs including resources for faculty who are interested in offering Summer study abroad classes and how to better publicize opportunities.

J. Discuss and recommend BTF request for Study Abroad.

## **Charges**

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

The committee considered and approved three programs: CIEE Korea. We reinstated IFSA King's College at the request of the Theatre Department and SIT Madagascar after a travel warning was lifted.

The committee discussed the merits of adding both Semester at Sea and Sea Semester to our list of approved programs in response to a query from the Dean's Office. Both programs appear to offer something unique to our current list of programs. The committee will discuss the programs next year.

In addition the application forms for proposing new study abroad programs were revised and posted.

*B. 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.*

We completed our survey of departments. Most departments were happy with the selection of offerings. A couple of departments noted that they would like more offerings in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. The committee decided that the best way to add programs that complemented existing programs was to consider new programs proposed by faculty and students. It didn't make sense to the committee to add programs because of a perceived need if there was no guarantee that students would attend the programs.

*C. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.*

We continued this ongoing task.

*D. 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.*

Institutional Research sent out the pre-study abroad survey to all summer, fall and full-year 2011 students and the post survey to the fall 2010 students who were on study abroad in Spring 2010. The committee did not review these findings but plans to in the fall.

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

It is the feeling of the IEC that qualified students who want to study abroad should not be prevented from doing so. Students enter UPS with the expectation that if they want to study abroad they will be able to if they meet certain requirements e.g. GPA. However, the recent establishment of a study abroad budget means that we may face the situation where we have more students wanting to study abroad than the budget can handle. If that unfortunate scenario were to arise, the question we face is how best to maximize the numbers of qualified students studying abroad while staying within the budget.

The Committee has considered the following factors in our discussion:

GPA, limiting the number of programs or semesters per student, importance to major, language major, lottery, and class standing. In addition we discussed the possibilities of rolling over budget surpluses in some years to a study abroad contingency fund to minimize the possibility that we will need to implement limits. Some thought that a trial period of 4-5 years with budget rollover would be useful as we learn about the impact of the new financial aid structure. Despite assurances that this can't be done, we feel that the benefits of such an approach would outweigh the budgeting and public relations costs over the long term.

If limits had to be invoked we recommend the following decision process:

- 1) Students going on Puget Sound sponsored programs (e.g. Dijon, Pac Rim, Oaxaca) and students in language immersion program have highest priority.
- 2) Students are limited to a single program (semester or year). Thus, students would not be able to go on two separate semester programs, unless they fit into #1 above or have a convincing academic reason to do so.
- 3) Seniors have highest priority of remaining students.

We also discussed the possibility of a lottery for the remaining students as perhaps the fairest way to allocate the remaining spots.

The questions of how and when these criteria would be implemented need much more thought. Charge F addresses this concern.

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

The deadline for study abroad applications is February 15<sup>th</sup>. Some students have already been accepted into their programs at this time. The study abroad budget is not known until the BTF recommendations are made – usually in March which comes after students have applied to programs expecting to be able to attend if they are accepted. The IEC felt like it would be impossible to apply criteria fairly or limit students if they had gone through the process without having been made aware of the possibility they would not be able to go. The changes that are necessary to apply the criteria have to come from Financial Services.

The IEC recommends that the criteria not be applied until a timeline is established that allows the University to project the budget and determine whether the budget will be adequate to fund all the students applying to study abroad. The IEC also recommends that the study abroad demand and budget projections be shared with the committee.

*G. 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.*

The IEC worked with the Office of International Programs to develop a Welcome Back Celebration. The event will take place in the Rotunda from 5:30 - 8:00 p.m. on September 12. Students participating in study abroad in the Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Summer 2011 will be invited. The current number of participants is set for 150. The final program will be developed in consultation with the new International Programs Director.

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

The faculty handbook for developing study abroad and other resources are now posted on the International Programs website.

*J. Discuss and recommend BTF request for Study Abroad.*

We worked with Alyce DeMarais on the BTF request for Study Abroad.

### ***UNCHARGED WORK***

The IEC met with members of Asian Studies to discuss the impacts of the new financial aid policy on next year's trip. Next year has some students under the old policy (students receive all federal, state and institutional financial aid) and some under the new policy (students receive federal, state and institutional aid only to their FAFSA determined need. The University subsequently changed aid for next year's group so that all students would receive all their federal, state and institutional aid. The IEC recommended to the administration that students attending the Pacific Rim program or any future program that is completely a Puget Sound program (courses listed as UPS courses on transcript and faculty paid by UPS) receive their entire aid package. The administration is reluctant to take this step.

All department chairs were sent a list of their majors participating in study abroad programs this past year. The chairs were forwarded their majors' student questionnaires for study abroad programs. Beginning next fall International Programs will routinely send these completed questionnaires to the student's major department for review by the student's faculty advisor.

The IEC would like to understand the impact of the new financial aid policy on student participation in study abroad. We met with Dean Kris Bartanen to discuss the rationale, content and timing of such a survey. The IEC felt that administering such a survey is necessary to understand whether and how the policy has changed study abroad patterns. We recommend next year's committee be charged with the design and administration of this survey.

### **Proposed Charges for 2011-2012**

We propose the following charges to the IEC for 2011 -12:

- A. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by university faculty. Reevaluate programs placed on probation or coming off travel warnings.
- B. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.
- C. 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. Consider the results from the 2010-11 surveys and decide whether or not the results are useful enough to keep administering the survey.
- D. 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.
- E. Discuss Summer Programs including resources for faculty who are interested in offering Summer study abroad classes and how to better publicize opportunities.
- F. Discuss and recommend BTF request for study abroad.
- G. Design and administer a survey to students to assess the impact of the new financial aid policy on student participation in study abroad.

Attachment C

Professional Standards Committee

End-of-Academic-Year Report

9 May 2011

**Prologue**—In conformity with *Faculty Bylaws* (Article V, §5, C: “No later than the first week of each May, the chair of each standing committee, in consultation with the committee membership, shall develop and deliver to the Faculty Senate a written report summarizing committee actions, concerns, and suggestions for the committee's membership to consider during the next academic year.”), the chair of the Professional Standards Committee has developed in consultation with his committee and will deliver in person the following report.

**Composition**—The Professional Standards Committee (hereinafter, PSC) for Academic Year 2010-11 included Dean Kristine Bartanen, William H. Beardsley, Geoffrey Block, Alva W. Butcher, Julie Nelson Christoph, William Haltom, Andrew F. Rex, Michael Z. Spivey, and Lisa Fortlouis Wood. Professor Wood was on leave during Spring Semester. Haltom was elected chair for the academic year. Unlike academic year 2009-2010, the PSC divided into two four-person subcommittees for detailed work before decisions were ratified by the entire committee.

**Charges and Dispositions**—The Faculty Senate in its 27 September 2010 meeting approved five charges to the PSC.

Senate Charge	Committee Disposition
1. The PSC should clarify the process to be followed when an evaluatee makes informal and formal challenges to the evaluation conducted by a department, program, or school (Code Chapter IV, Section 4 b. (4)).	Charge executed.  Please see PSC minutes for 7 April 2011.
2. The PSC should review the policy on Background Checks of Faculty, being drafted by the Human Resources Department.	The PSC awaits the draft of the policy.  PSC suggests charge be re-issued for 2011-2012 academic year.
3. The PSC should review the “Research Misconduct Policy” document and suggest changes to existing documents as needed to achieve consistency among the various response processes in the case of research misconduct.	The PSC awaits document.  PSC suggests charge be re-issued for 2011-2012 academic year.

<p>4. The PSC should improve the description in the Faculty Code of the grievance process when it occurs within a faculty evaluation [Chapter III, Section 4 f (1, 2)], and of the hearing board process [Chapter III, Section 6].</p>	<p>Charge executed.</p> <p>Please see PSC minutes for 18 November 2010.</p>
<p>5. Clarify the following matters in future editions of “the buff document”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In team-taught courses in which a faculty member only teaches a small segment of the course, should Instructor Evaluation Forms be administered at the conclusion of the faculty member’s participation in the course rather than waiting until after the 10<sup>th</sup> week?</li> <li>b. When an evaluation committee is formed, in accord with the Faculty Code, for a joint appointment, interdisciplinary appointment, or an evaluation in a very small department, we urge colleagues to be particularly vigilant about ensuring an on-going pattern of class visits in order to ensure a full basis from what to make an assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>Charge largely executed.</p> <p>The PSC formulated changes to “the buff document” that would clarify each matter.</p> <p>The PSC answered in the affirmative the question in Charge 5a. The PSC restated Charge 5b and suggested where that language might be inserted into “the buff document.”</p>

**Other Business—**The PSC also

1. reviewed and approved a letter sent to department chairs that outlined procedures for administering university Instructor Evaluation forms with an amendment regarding use of alternative “Form A” by faculty not required by upcoming evaluations to use the university’s official form;
2. reviewed changes to the Faculty Recruitment Guidelines in light of the online Employment Applicant Tracking System;
3. reviewed an inquiry from a faculty member regarding participation from afar in departmental deliberations for faculty evaluations;
4. counseled the Dean regarding participation via Skype in departmental deliberations in evaluating faculty and regarding procedures for writing a letter and voting or making a recommendation in a department evaluation while on leave;
5. determined PSC internal policy for dealing with departmental guidelines for evaluation, promotion, and tenure:



- a. the PSC is entitled but not obligated to review the entire set of guidelines, as opposed merely to reviewing changes since the last set of guidelines was approved,
  - b. department guidelines should be regularly reviewed by the PSC (albeit that the PSC remained unsure about the appropriate way to implement such a shift),
  - c. the PSC reiterates that its responsibility is to evaluate departmental guidelines rather than to adjudge how well departments are actually adhering to their guidelines, which is the job of the Faculty Advancement Committee,
  - d. the PSC does consider content of departmental guidelines in its reviews, but the PSC concerned itself primarily with clarity in the guidelines, and
  - e. the PSC recognizes that the individual departments are best able to determine appropriate evaluation standards in their respective disciplines or fields;
6. approved statement of standards and procedures for faculty evaluation of Physics and Politics and Government departments;
  7. consulted with English department regarding statement of standards and procedures for faculty evaluation;
  8. declared, in an informal interpretation of the Faculty Code and of practice, that newly approved departmental criteria for evaluation, tenure, and promotion take effect in at the beginning of the next academic year;
  9. expressed its opinion that the Code is sufficiently clear regarding ethical or other grievances that arise or may be raised during evaluation of faculty, but recommended that the following sentence be appended to the description of departmental evaluation processes in “the buff document:”
 

As indicated in the Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 4, the evaluation process is designed to provide a substantial body of credible evidence in writing as the basis for a fair and impartial review. Moreover, “the evaluation process should be fair and ensure that adequate consideration is given the faculty member involved. Fairness and adequate consideration shall be achieved consistent with the criteria and procedures outlined in Chapter III, Sections 2-4.” Note that Chapter III, Section 4f requires that if, during an evaluation, a question or concern regarding ethical behavior is raised, the faculty member shall initiate a grievance process.
  10. proposed that “the buff document” (p. 15, item 6; p. 19, item 7e; and p. 19, item 8d) be modified to correspond to the language of the Faculty Code on p. 19 7/e;
  11. answered questions pertaining to formal and informal appeals of faculty evaluations, highlighting especially that a formal appeal may be filed only in case of an alleged Code violation, but an informal appeal has no such restriction (to be added to “the buff document”) and suggesting two additional reminders (see PSC minutes for 4-7-11, addendum);

12. read Chapter 1 of the *Faculty Code* to permit departments, programs, and schools to state expectations regarding tenure-line faculty different from expectations of non-tenure-line faculty but not to permit departments, programs, or schools to withhold from non-tenure-line faculty roles, rights, and responsibilities that are available for tenure-line faculty; and

Consulted with the dean regarding streamlined evaluations.

## Attachment D

### Institutional Review Board Report to the Faculty Senate

AY 2010-2011

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exists for the purpose of protecting the rights, health, and well-being of human beings solicited and volunteering for participation as research subjects. In the context of reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects the IRB gives very careful attention to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed information of a sensitive nature, safety, ethical recruitment practices, and the accessibility and adequacy of informed consent. This is a report to the University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate regarding activities of the IRB during the 2010-2011 academic year.

In the past the Institutional Review Board has met once a month to consider protocols and discuss policy in any time remaining. This year the IRB moved to a schedule of meeting twice a month. The first meeting of each month was devoted to the consideration of protocols and the second was solely for discussion of policy.

#### **I. Charges to the Committee and Our Response**

On October 11, 2010, the Faculty Senate approved the following charges to the Institutional Review Board:

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

This remains the major portion of our work as a standing committee. By the end of the academic year seventeen protocols and two modifications will have been considered by the full Board. At this point, twelve protocols and one modification have been approved, three protocols and one modification are pending review.

Reports of protocols that were classified as exempt or expedited by departmental designates will be appended to an amended version of this report.

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.*

We certainly spent time in discussion of these issues and have begun to produce drafts of a revision of the handbook. One of the major areas of creative tension in our discussions throughout the year was the fact that the procedures and guidelines followed by the Institutional Review Board were designed at the federal level for regulation of biomedical research but are now being applied to research in the social sciences and humanities. Members of the university community in those disciplines do not always feel well-served by

the rules designed for a very different type of research with different problems and risks to participants. For that reason, in addition to simply re-organizing and rewriting the handbook, we have been considering how to handle the array of types of research protocols that come to us. If you look at the current handbook, you will see that the examples of protocols are all from the biomedical class of protocols. As we revise the handbook we hope to make it much more accessible and usable by students in the social sciences and to give them excellent examples of protocols in their area of research.

As we considered the handbook, we looked at our coversheet and compared it to those of other institutions. We have revised the coversheet to make it look more professional. An example of the proposed coversheet is attached.

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

This issue was not considered this year. With a new director of the Office of Institutional Research, perhaps we should reopen this conversation.

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

During the fall semester we compared the old Scientific Misconduct Policy (old enough to have 756 prefixes for the phone numbers) and the current Faculty Code to bring the Misconduct Policy in line with University policy and rules for grievances. The differences noted and changes suggested were then communicated to the chair of the Professional Standards Committee. A final document has not yet been approved.

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.*

We did not deal with this issue this year.

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.*

We discussed this topic briefly at the beginning of the fall semester but have not developed policies in this area.

7. *Draft and implement a Research Integrity Policy.*

Throughout the course of the year, in each of the issues we have discussed we have always considered “best practice” in the conduct of research. For instance, both the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation have recently mandated training in research ethics for all persons (faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates) doing research supported by those agencies. We have discussed how to make the campus community aware of this requirement and whether to generalize that requirement to all of us

doing research on campus, whether supported by the NIH or not. In this case, we once again came up against the diversity of research that is done here. Is there some kind of universal training in research ethics that could be made available to the campus community? The NIH offers an on-line course in research ethics, but it is a course that is geared toward those doing research in the biomedical fields. The Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) offers research training in a variety of fields including the social and behavioral sciences, but institutional access to those courses requires an institutional subscription.

While we have discussed an array of issues that impinge on research integrity and the conduct of research, we have not yet developed a policy on research integrity.

## **II. Other Issues Discussed During the Year**

### **A. Research Involving Human Subjects Conducted Outside the United States.**

We considered whether protocols for research involving human subjects outside the United States should automatically be required to go through a full IRB review. This discussion came primarily out of concern for students doing research in developing countries where they may be somewhat naïve about the social and political climate of those countries. Students may not understand that asking questions that would be rather routine in the US might put those answering the questions at some risk. For that reason, we looked at how research in foreign countries was handled by Institutional Review Boards at other (largely research) universities. We note that these institutions have a section on the responsibilities of researchers working abroad in their handbook and will include such a section in our revised handbook (for examples, please see the IRB minutes of Oct. 20, 2010). At our most recent meeting, we voted to require any research protocols for human subject research be approved by both the departmental designate and the Chair of the Institutional Review Board. The chair may designate the protocol for a full board review. This will be added to the new coversheet.

### **B. Evidence of Research Ethics Training**

While the Schools of Occupational and Physical Therapy routinely have their students complete the NIH on-line course in research ethics, other departments do not. Institutional Review Boards at other universities require evidence of completion of a course in research ethics as a part of the submission of a protocol. We discussed making this a requirement here. Such a requirement is contingent upon finding courses that are appropriate for the wide range of research projects pursued across the campus.

## **III. Self-Charges for 2011-2012**

At the most recent meeting we discussed the work we would like to see the Institutional Review Board continue and what new business we should address. Our areas of concern include the following:

1. In consultation with the Professional Standards Committee, complete the revision of the Scientific Misconduct Policy.
2. Complete revision of the handbook.
3. Once the handbook is complete, update the IRB website to reflect the changes and make the site easier to navigate.
4. Design and implement a program for training of departmental delegates
5. Continue to discuss the ways in which the IRB can be more transparent and supportive of research on campus. We understand that members of the campus community can see the IRB as a hoop that must be jumped through on the way to research or, much worse, as a group that stifles the academic freedom of scholars. We would like to engage the campus community in a discussion of the role of the IRB on campus, both to help the community understand how we see our role and to seek the input of the community as we finish revision of the handbook. For that reason, we have been in contact with Julie-Neff Lippman to ask to arrange a “Wednesday at Four” discussion on the role of the IRB early in the fall semester, 2011.
6. Finally, we note that the IRB is one of the few standing committees on campus that does not have a student member. While the members of the IRB do not think that having a student as a voting member of the committee would be appropriate when we make decisions about protocols, we do think that having a student member who participated in discussions would help students understand the work done by the IRB and our role in the campus community. We respectfully ask the Faculty Senate to consider adding a student member to the Institutional Review Board.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Rose Lamb  
Institutional Review Board Chair, 2010-2011